CITY OF SAN CARLOS

City Council/Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency/Housing Authority
Regular Meeting

January 25, 2021 7:00 P.M.
CONDUCTED REMOTELY
www.cityofsancarlos.org

AGENDA

In accordance with Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-29-20, this meeting will be held by teleconference, and there will not be a physical location from which the public may attend. The public will have access to remotely observe the meeting and address the Council as outlined below.

Observe the Meeting Live:
- Zoom. https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83607759364; or call 1-669-900-6833 and enter the Meeting ID #: 836 0775 9364
- Meeting Webportal. www.sancarlosca.igm2.com
- Local TV. Comcast Channel 27 and AT&T Uverse Channel 99

Provide Public Comments:
If you plan to make a public comment, please observe the meeting via Zoom Webinar (see above access information), and during the public comment period for the agenda item you wish to address, use the “raise hand” feature. If joining by phone, press “9 to “raise hand”.

Note: The methods of observing the meeting or providing public comments may be altered if needed. You may check on the status of the meeting by visiting the City’s website at www.cityofsancarlos.org for any updates or changes, should they occur.

MAYOR: Laura Parmer-Lohan
COUNCIL: Ronald Collins, John Dugan, Sara McDowell, Adam Rak

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA
4. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Communications and Announcements are brief items from members of the City Council regarding upcoming events in the community and correspondence that they have received. They are informational in nature and no action will be taken on these items at this meeting.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Persons wishing to address the City Council on matters NOT on the posted agenda may do so.

Each speaker is limited to two minutes. If there are more than five individuals wishing to speak during public comment, the Mayor may draw five speaker cards from those submitted to speak during this time, and the balance of the Public Comment speakers will be called upon at the end of the Council Meeting.

If the item you are speaking on is not listed on the agenda, please be advised that the City Council may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed as allowed under The Brown Act (Government Code Section 54954.2). The City Council’s general policy is to refer items to staff for attention, or have a matter placed on a future City Council agenda for a more comprehensive action or report and formal public discussion and input at that time.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Motion to Waive Reading of All Ordinances.
b. Approve Minutes of December 14, 2020 City Council Regular Meeting.
c. Adopt a Resolution Supplementing Resolution No. 2020-086 of the City Council to Consent to the Issuance by Silicon Valley Clean Water of Refunding Bonds to Refund a State Water Resources Control Board Loan.
d. Adopt a Resolution Approving a Professional Services Agreement with Consolidated CM, Inc. in the Not-To-Exceed Amount of $697,928 to Provide Construction Management and Inspector-Of-Record Services for the Fire Station No. 16 Replacement Project C9823; and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute and Amend the Agreement as Necessary for Additional Services Within the Project Budget.
e. Adopt Ordinance 1568 Amending San Carlos Municipal Code Title 5 - Business Taxes, Licenses and Registrations, and Title 18 - Zoning Ordinance, to Update Specific Sections Pertaining to Regulations Relating to Child Care Facilities and to Comply with State Law Requirements.

7. REPORTS TO COUNCIL

Reports to Council are updates on key City projects by City Department Heads and Staff and City Council Subcommittees. They are informational in nature and no action will be taken on these items at this meeting.

a. Receive an Update on the Coronavirus (COVID-19). (Verbal Only)
8. PUBLIC HEARING

9. NEW BUSINESS
   b. Consideration of Appointing Representatives to the Grand Boulevard Initiative Working Committee.

10. AGENDA SETTING
    Items listed in this Agenda Setting Section will be considered by the Council for placing on a future agenda. No action will be taken on these items at this meeting.

11. CLOSED SESSION
    a. Conference with Real Property Negotiators Maltbie, Mui, Savay, Romo, and Rubens- (Closed Session Held Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8) to Discuss Property Located at 611 Industrial Road, San Carlos, CA (APN: 046-090-370) for the Development of a New Digital Billboard.

12. REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION

13. ADJOURNMENT

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the City Council regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection online at www.sancarlosca.iqm2.com after the meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at (650) 802-4222 or via email at cityclerk@cityofsancarlos.org. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.
ROLL CALL

City Council Present:
Ronald Collins, Mayor
Sara McDowell, Councilmember
Mark Olbert, Councilmember
Laura Parmer-Lohan, Vice Mayor
Adam Rak, Councilmember
John Dugan, Councilmember

Staff Present:
Mark Duri, Deputy Sheriff
Chuck Lax, Deputy Fire Chief
Nicole MacDonald, Senior Management Analyst
Jeff Maltbie, City Manager
Rebecca Mendenhall, Administrative Services Director
Crystal Mui, City Clerk
Amy Newby, Parks & Recreation Director
Tara Peterson, Assistant City Manager
Greg Rubens, City Attorney
Carrie Tam, Financial Services Manager

1. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Mayor Collins.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Mayor Collins led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA
None.

4. PRESENTATION
a. Present a Proclamation to a Resident for their Community Service.

Mayor Collins presented a proclamation to Brian Perkins for his service to the San Carlos community. Mr. Perkins thanked the Council for the recognition.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT
None.
6. NEW BUSINESS

a. Consideration of Adopting a Resolution Accepting the Certificate of the Chief Elections Officer and the Statement of Votes Cast in the Consolidated General Municipal Election Held on November 3, 2020 and Declaring the Results.

City Clerk Crystal Mui presented the results of the election.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Adam Rak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Laura Parmer-Lohan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>McDowell, Olbert, Parmer-Lohan, Rak, Collins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. COUNCIL REORGANIZATION

a. City Treasurer.

i. Recognition of Retiring City Treasurer Michael Galvin.

Brian Perkins from Congresswoman Jackie Speier’s Office, Mario Rendon from Assembly Member Kevin Mullin’s Office, Lena Silberman from San Mateo County Board of Supervisor Don Horsley’s Office and Mayor Collins presented proclamations/certificates to Mr. Galvin recognizing him for his service to San Carlos as City Treasurer.

Mr. Galvin commented that he was elected 8 times and requested the proclamation reflect this. He thanked the finance team for their assistance through the years and commented that he has enjoyed his time as Treasurer.

ii. Administer Oath of Office to City Treasurer Inge Tiegel Doherty.

City Clerk Crystal Mui administered the Oath of Office to newly elected Treasurer Inge Tiegel Doherty.

Treasurer Tiegel Doherty thanked residents of San Carlos for their trust and thanked her family for their support.

City Council congratulated Treasurer Tiegel Doherty and thanked her for continuing to serve the community.

iii. Receive Public Comments.

Erika Tiegel Freitas congratulated her sister on the election.

b. City Council.

i. Recognition of Retiring Councilmember Mark Olbert.

Brian Perkins from Congresswoman Jackie Speier’s Office, Mario Rendon from Assembly Member Kevin Mullin’s Office, Lena Silberman
from San Mateo County Board of Supervisor Don Horsley’s Office and Mayor Collins presented proclamations/certificates to Mr. Olbert recognizing him for his service to San Carlos as a City Councilmember.

Mr. Olbert thanked the community, City staff and his elected colleagues and shared some farewell remarks.

Council paid tribute to Mr. Olbert, thanked him for his service and wished him well.

Public Comment
Warren Lieberman, Belmont Councilmember, spoke on the time he and Mr. Olbert have served together on the Silicon Valley Clean Water and provided accolades.

Charles Stone, Belmont Mayor, (as read by Councilmember McDowell), provided accolades to Mr. Olbert.

State Senator Josh Becker, thanked Mr. Olbert for his public service and congratulated Councilmembers Dugan and Mayor Collins.

Bob Grassilli, resident and former San Carlos Councilmember and Mayor, congratulated Councilmember Dugan and Treasurer Tiegel Doherty and provided accolades to Mr. Olbert.

Danielle Lacampagne, resident, thanked Mr. Olbert for his service.

Carrie Du Bois, resident, shared her memories working with Mr. Olbert in the community and thanked Barbara for her contributions.

Karen Molinari, resident, thanked Mr. Olbert for his service and wished him well.

Kathy Parmer-Lohan, resident, thanked Mr. Olbert for his service.

Amy Buckmaster, President and CEO of the Redwood City Chamber of Commerce, congratulated Mr. Olbert in his retirement as a Councilmember and congratulated Mayor Collins and Councilmember Dugan.

Caroline Olbert, congratulated her father, Mr. Olbert, for his retirement as a Councilmember.

Seth Rosenblatt, resident and former San Carlos School Board Trustee, congratulated Treasurer Tiegel Doherty, Councilmember Dugan, Mayor Collins and Brian Perkins, and paid tribute to Mr. Olbert.

ii. Administer Oath of Office to Councilmembers Ron Collins and John Dugan.

Gayle Collins administered the Oath of Office to her spouse, Councilmember Collins.
Julia Dugan administered the Oath of Office to her spouse, Councilmember Dugan.

Mayor Collins thanked the community for re-electing him to serve on the Council and thanked the Council candidates for running.

Councilmember Dugan expressed appreciation to the community for the opportunity to serve on the Council. He thanked his mom for being an inspiration, and his family, campaign team, Mr. Olbert, the Council, and various members of the community for their support.

Council congratulated Mayor Collins and Councilmember Dugan and provided welcoming remarks.

Public Comment
Giselle Hale, Redwood City Councilmember, congratulated Mayor Collins and Councilmember Dugan, bid farewell to Mr. Olbert for his work and congratulated the incoming Mayor and Vice Mayor.

Warren Lieberman, Belmont Councilmember, congratulated the newly elected officials and provided comments to Mayor and incoming Mayor and Vice Mayor.

Charles Stone, Belmont Mayor, as read from Councilmember Rak, praised Mayor Collins' work in the community during his time as Mayor.

Mark Olbert, resident and former Councilmember and Mayor, shared a video reflecting on his public career.

Mayor Collins provided comments and shared what he learned during his year as Mayor. He thanked City staff, his Council colleagues and the community.

iii. Mayor Collins to Call for Nominations for New Mayor.

Councilmember McDowell nominated Vice Mayor Parmer-Lohan for San Carlos Mayor.

MOVER: Sara McDowell
AYES: Dugan, McDowell, Parmer-Lohan, Rak, Collins

City Clerk Crystal Mui administered the Oath of Office to Mayor Parmer-Lohan.

iv. New Mayor to Call for Nominations for Vice Mayor.

Councilmember Rak nominated Councilmember McDowell for San Carlos Vice Mayor.
RESULT: Appointed [Unanimous] Sara McDowell for San Carlos
Vice Mayor.

MOVER: Adam Rak
AYES: Collins, Dugan, McDowell, Rak, Parmer-Lohan

City Clerk Crystal Mui administered the Oath of Office to Vice Mayor
McDowell.

v. Comments by Mayor and Councilmembers.

Council spoke optimistically for changes in the coming year.

vi. Receive Public Comments.

Giselle Hale, Redwood City Councilmember, spoke on her experience
working with Mayor Parmer-Lohan and Vice Mayor McDowell.

Mayor Parmer-Lohan thanked her colleagues, staff, neighbors, friends and family and
provided remarks of optimism for the coming year.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 PM.

________________________________________
Crystal Mui,
City Clerk
MEETING DATE: January 25, 2021

ITEM TITLE: Adopt a Resolution Supplementing Resolution No. 2020-086 of the City Council to Consent to the Issuance by Silicon Valley Clean Water of Refunding Bonds to Refund a State Water Resources Control Board Loan.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City Council adopt a Resolution supplementing Resolution No. 2020-086, which was adopted on November 23, 2020, to consent to the issuance by Silicon Valley Clean Water (“SVCW”) of refunding bonds to refund a State Water Resources Control Board Loan.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Wastewater Rate Study and subsequent rate adjustments approved by Council on May 13, 2019 included the cost of this debt service. At the current market conditions, it may be possible to refinance the SRF Control Building Loan at an interest rate of approximately 1.2%, which would reduce the City’s debt service payments by approximately $124,000 in Fiscal Year 2021 and afterwards to a range of approximately $900 – $3,000 annually over the following 13 years. Nominal savings to the City over the amortization period are estimated at $127,000, or a Net Present Value (“NPV”) of $113,000.

The highest savings appear in the first year, as this financial model yields the highest NPV and gives the City the ability to recognize the savings during the COVID-19 pandemic. The current structure allows the City to avoid paying the State Water Board $124,146, which would otherwise be due on June 30, 2021. The remaining debt service, thereafter, at approximately 1.20%, will result in payments slightly lower than the original loan. Other models yield lower NPVs and thus aren’t as attractive.

BACKGROUND:

Since 2008, SVCW has funded its Capital Improvement Program (“CIP”) using a variety of sources, including Wastewater Revenue Bonds, a loan from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), and several State Revolving Fund (“SFR”) loans from the California State Water Resources Control Board (“SWRCB”). In November 2020, the Commission and Member Agencies authorized issuance of a new 2021 taxable bond series to refund outstanding 2014 and 2015 Bonds. The City’s portion was authorized through the adoption of Resolution 2020-086.
This item has been prepared as required by the applicable laws of the State of California, including but not limited to, Government Code Sections 54950 et. seq., and has not been prepared with a view to informing an investment decision in any of the City’s bonds, notes or other obligations. Any projections, plans or other forward-looking statements included in the information in this staff report are subject to a variety of uncertainties that could cause any actual plans or results to differ materially from any such statement. The information herein is not intended to be used by investors or potential investors in considering the purchase or sale of the City’s bonds, notes or other obligations, and investors and potential investors should rely only on information filed by the City on the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board’s Electronic Municipal Market Access System for municipal securities disclosures and website, maintained on the World Wide Web at https://emma.msrb.org/.

ANALYSIS:

The 2021 Series Bonds are scheduled to be sold in February 2021. In addition to refunding 2014 and 2015 Series Bonds, additional analysis now indicates it would be financially beneficial to include an existing SRF loan in the refinancing. SVCW executed this $11.5 million SRF loan in 2011 to partially fund construction of its Control Building. The loan has an outstanding principal of $8.1 million, with an interest rate of 2.60% and a 20-year amortization that began in 2013. At current market conditions, it may be possible to refinance the SRF Control Building loan at an interest rate of approximately 1.2%, which would reduce the City’s debt service payments by approximately $124,000 in Fiscal Year 2021 and a range of approximately $900 – $3,000 annually over the following 13 years. Nominal savings to the City over the amortization period are estimated at $127,000, or a Net Present Value of $113,000.

Therefore, it is recommended the Council adopt a Resolution supplementing Resolution No. 2020-086 of the City Council to consent to the issuance by SVCW of Refunding Bonds to refund a SWRCB loan.

ALTERNATIVES:

The alternatives available to the City Council include:

1. Adopt a Resolution supplementing Resolution No. 2020-086 of the City Council to consent to the issuance by Silicon Valley Clean Water of Refunding Bonds to refund a State Water Resources Control Board loan; or

2. Do not adopt the Resolution; or

3. Provide staff with alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted by:

Rebecca Mendenhall,  
Administrative Services Director
ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Resolution with Exhibit A (Good Faith Estimates)
RESOLUTION NO. 2021 -

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS
SUPPLEMENTING RESOLUTION NO. 2020-086 OF THE CITY COUNCIL TO CONSENT TO
THE ISSUANCE BY SILICON VALLEY CLEAN WATER OF REFUNDING BONDS TO
REFUND A STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD LOAN.

WHEREAS, on November 23, 2020, the City Council of the City of San Carlos (the “City”) adopted Resolution No. 2020-086 consenting to the issuance by Silicon Valley Clean Water (the “Authority”) of refunding bonds to refund all or a portion of the Authority’s 2014 Wastewater Revenue Bonds (the “2014 Bonds”) and all or a portion of the Authority’s 2015 Wastewater Revenue Bonds (the “2015 Bonds”), and approving certain documents and authorizing certain actions in connection therewith; and

WHEREAS, given the current interest rate environment, there is also an opportunity for the Authority to refund a loan from the State Water Resources Control Board (the “State Loan”) to the Authority to finance the “Administration and Plant Control Building Project,” through the issuance of refunding bonds by the Authority for debt service savings, which will benefit the City, and the City wishes to supplement Resolution No. 2020-086 to consent to the refunding of the State Loan; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Section 5852.1, a good faith estimate of costs related to the refunding bonds with respect to the State Loan allocated to the City is set forth in Exhibit A attached to this Resolution, and such information is hereby disclosed and made public.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of San Carlos, California, as follows:

Section 1. Supplement to Resolution No. 2020-086. Resolution No. 2020-086 is hereby supplemented to provide that all consents and approvals set forth therein with respect to the refunding of the 2014 Bonds and the 2015 Bonds shall also apply to the issuance of refunding bonds by the Authority for the purpose of refunding the State Loan. The Mayor, the City Manager, the Administrative Services Director, and the City Clerk and their designees are hereby authorized to approve any changes to the documents previously approved by Resolution No. 2020-086, including, but not limited to, the form of the Financing Agreement by and between the City and the Authority approved by Resolution No. 2020-086, as may be necessary to accomplish the refunding of the State Loan.

Section 2. Effective Date. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage and adoption.

* * * *

I, City Clerk Crystal Mui, hereby certify that this Resolution was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of San Carlos at a regular meeting held on the 25th day of January, 2021, by the following vote:

AYES, COUNCILMEMBERS: __________________________________________
NOES, COUNCILMEMBERS: __________________________________________
ABSENT, COUNCILMEMBERS: __________________________________________

APPROVED:

___________________________
MAYOR of the City of San Carlos

__________________________________________________
CITY CLERK of the City of San Carlos
EXHIBIT A

GOOD FAITH ESTIMATES PURSUANT TO
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 5852.1

Set forth below are good faith estimates of Fieldman, Rolapp & Associates, Inc., the municipal advisor to Silicon Valley Clean Water, as required under Section 5852.1 of the California Government Code (the “Code”). The following estimates have no bearing on, and should not be misconstrued as, any not-to-exceed financial parameters authorized by resolution.

(a) The true interest cost of the Refunding Bonds is estimated at 1.21%, calculated as provided in Section 5852.1(a)(1)(A) of the Code.

(b) The finance charge of the Refunding Bonds allocated to the City, including all fees and charges paid to third parties, is estimated at $5,887.

(c) Proceeds of the Refunding Bonds allocated to the City for the sale of the Refunding Bonds, including the estimated principal amount of the proposed Refunding Bonds of $1,150,000, less the finance charges set forth in (b) above, is equal to $1,379,206.

(d) The total payment amount allocated to the City calculated as provided in Section 5852.1(a)(1)(D) of the Code is estimated at $1,486,173.

The foregoing are estimates and the final costs will depend on market conditions and can be expected to vary from the estimated amounts set forth above.
MEETING DATE: January 25, 2021

ITEM TITLE: Adopt a Resolution Approving a Professional Services Agreement with Consolidated CM, Inc. in the Not-To-Exceed Amount of $697,928 to Provide Construction Management and Inspector-Of-Record Services for the Fire Station No. 16 Replacement Project C9823; and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute and Amend the Agreement as Necessary for Additional Services Within the Project Budget.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City Council adopt a Resolution Approving a Professional Services Agreement with Consolidated CM, Inc. in the not-to-exceed amount of $697,928 to provide construction management and inspector-of-record services for the Fire Station No. 16 Replacement Project C9823, and authorizing the City Manager to execute and amend the agreement as necessary for additional services within the project budget.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

There is no fiscal impact and no additional appropriation is needed at this time. The Fire Station 16 Replacement Project (“Project”) is currently funded as Project C9823, with an approved appropriation of $1,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2020-21. This appropriation covers professional service expenses for engineering services, construction administration, construction management, inspector-of-record services, and project close-out.

BACKGROUND:

Staff is bringing this item to City Council to award a professional design services agreement to Consolidated CM, Inc. as it exceeds the amount for City Manager approval.

Fire Station No. 16 is located at 1280 Alameda de las Pulgas, which is on the corner of Howard Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas. The existing station is a one-story, cement plaster structure constructed in 1958. The building includes four bedrooms, two apparatus bays for two fire engines, kitchen and dining areas, a living room, a gym facility, and a lobby area.

The dated and deteriorated structure no longer meets the needs of the Fire Department staff. The existing structure is non-compliant with current building codes and does not meet seismic standards for critical infrastructure. The rising maintenance and repair costs of this aging building, paired with its failure to meet current safety codes and standards, necessitates significant upgrade to the station.
The existing structure does not lend itself well to the modernizations needed to meet seismic and building codes without prohibitive cost. Council previously approved demolishing the existing fire station and constructing a new fire station on the current lot.

The construction documents for the Project are currently in design and they are expected to be completed by May 2021. Staff anticipates advertising, bidding, and awarding the Project in July 2021 with building demolition and construction starting in fall 2021. The estimated construction time is 18 months.

Fire stations are considered an essential services building, therefore, staff recommends retaining a full-time construction manager (CM) and inspector-of-record (IOR) to oversee the Project, assist staff in the constructability review, provide bidding and award assistance, manage construction and contracts, assure quality and complete post-construction project closeout. The scope of work for this agreement includes the following:

**Constructability Review:** Prepare and provide construction review of the construction documents to ensure compliance with local and states codes, laws, regulations, standards, and policies. In addition, perform value engineering of the Project to ensure it remains within the budget.

**Bidding and Award Assistance:** Perform outreach and conduct pre-bid meeting with potential bidders. The CM will also ensure compliance with the public bid process for bidding and award. In addition, evaluate the bid results, bidder’s responsiveness, and responsibilities.

**Construction Administration, Contract Management, & Quality Assurance:** Manage and oversee the contractor, ensure compliance with the construction documents, resolve all issues during construction, coordinate and oversee inspections, maintain the construction budget, and schedule to ensure timely complete of the Project.

**Post-Construction (Project Closeout):** Perform final inspections and walk-through with the contractor, prepare list of remaining action items for contractor to complete, finalize accounting for the Project, prepare and receive all closeout documents.

**ANALYSIS:**

Staff evaluated the Statements of Qualifications received and ranked the firms based on the following evaluation criteria: understanding of the project scope of work; demonstration of ability to complete and provide high quality of work; experience working on projects of similar complexity and magnitude; and qualifications of its sub-consultants staff.

The Statements of Qualifications also included cost proposals for the construction management and inspector-of-record for the Project, which were between $600,000 and $700,000. After thorough evaluation based on the established criteria, staff recommends the award of a professional services agreement to Consolidated CM, Inc.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Options available to the City Council include:
1. Adopt a Resolution approving a Professional Services Agreement with Consolidated CM, Inc. in the not-to-exceed amount of $697,928 to provide construction management and inspector-of-record services for the Fire Station No. 16 Replacement Project C9823, and authorizing the City Manager to execute and amend the agreement as necessary for additional services within the project budget; or

2. Do not adopt the Resolution; or

3. Provide staff with alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted by:

[Signature]

Steven Machida,
Public Works Director

Approved for submission by:

[Signature]

Jeff Maltbie, City Manager

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. 2021 – ____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS
APPROVING A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH
CONSOLIDATED CM, INC. IN THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $697,928 TO
PROVIDE CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AND INSPECTOR-OF-RECORD SERVICES
FOR THE FIRE STATION NO. 16 REPLACEMENT PROJECT C9823; AND AUTHORIZING
THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AND AMEND THE AGREEMENT AS NECESSARY
FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICES WITHIN THE PROJECT BUDGET.

WHEREAS, Fire Station No. 16 is located at 1280 Alameda de las Pulgas, which is on
the corner of Howard Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas; and

WHEREAS, the existing station is a one-story, cement plaster structure constructed in
1958. The building includes four bedrooms, two apparatus bays for two fire engines, kitchen and
dining areas, a living room, a gym facility, and a lobby area; and

WHEREAS, the dated and deteriorated structure no longer meets the needs of the Fire
Department staff; and

WHEREAS, the rising maintenance and repair costs of this aging building, paired with its failure
to meet current safety codes and standards, necessitates significant upgrade to the station; and

WHEREAS, Council approved demolishing the existing fire station and constructing a new fire
station on the current lot; and

WHEREAS, the fire station is considered an essential services building; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends retaining a full-time construction manager (“CM”) and
inspector-of-record (“IOR”) to oversee the Project, assist staff in the constructability review, provide
bidding and award assistance, manage construction and contracts, assure quality and complete post-
construction project closeout; and

WHEREAS, staff evaluated the Statements of Qualifications received and ranked the firms
based on the following evaluation criteria: understanding of the Project scope of work; demonstrating
the ability to complete and provide high quality of work; experience working on projects of similar
complexity and magnitude; and qualifications of its and sub-consultants staff; and

WHEREAS, after thorough evaluation based on the established criteria, staff recommends the
award of a professional services agreement to Consolidated CM, Inc.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the San Carlos City Council approves a
Professional Services Agreement with Consolidated CM, Inc. in the not-to-exceed amount of
$697,928 to provide construction management and inspector-of-record services for the Fire
Station No. 16 Replacement Project C9823, and authorizing the City Manager to execute and
amend the agreement as necessary for additional services within the project budget.
I, City Clerk Crystal Mui, hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of San Carlos at a scheduled meeting thereof held on the 25th day of January 2021, by the following vote:

AYES, COUNCILMEMBERS: ________________________________________________

NOES, COUNCILMEMBERS: ________________________________________________

ABSENT, COUNCILMEMBERS: ________________________________________________

_______________________________________
CITY CLERK of the City of San Carlos

APPROVED:

___________________________
MAYOR of the City of San Carlos
MEETING DATE: January 25, 2021

ITEM TITLE: Adopt Ordinance 1568 Amending San Carlos Municipal Code Title 5 - Business Taxes, Licenses and Registrations, and Title 18 - Zoning Ordinance, to Update Specific Sections Pertaining to Regulations Relating to Child Care Facilities and to Comply with State Law Requirements.

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Ordinance 1568 amending San Carlos Municipal Code Chapters: 5.04 (General Business Registration Requirements); 18.04 (Residential Districts); 18.05 (Mixed Use Districts); 18.20 (Parking and Loading); 18.23 (Standards for Specific Uses and Activities); and 18.40 (Use Classifications) to facilitate an increase in the number of child care facilities and spaces in San Carlos and for consistency with State law.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

Removal of the requirement for a business registration for large family in-home day care will result in an estimated loss in revenue of approximately $4,000 – $5,000 per year.

BACKGROUND:

In the fall of 2019, the City Council affirmed that addressing the community’s child care needs was a top priority, and identified increasing access to child care facilities as a 2020 Strategic Plan Goal. On October 14, 2019, the Council received a presentation from staff discussing long- and short-term strategies to reduce barriers to increasing the number of child care facilities.

After holding collaborative working sessions with the Council’s Child Care subcommittee, staff returned to Council in July 2020. At the meeting, Council authorized staff to implement several actions to expedite the application approval process for child care facilities, including: shortening internal review times; creating standard conditions of approval; and designating a Planner as a child care specialist.

Additionally, Council authorized staff to review existing zoning requirements related to family in-home day care and commercial child care facilities with the goal of increasing child care spaces in San Carlos. Accordingly, staff prepared recommendations, and on December 21, 2020 the Planning Commission adopted Resolution 2020-5 recommending the City Council adopt the Municipal Code changes listed herein. The Council, at its January 11, 2021 meeting, introduced Ordinance 1568 to amend the Municipal Code to reflect these changes to remove additional barriers to the creation of additional child care spaces.
ANALYSIS:

The State recognizes two types of child care facilities: Commercial Child Care Centers; and Family Child Care Homes. Currently, San Carlos has an inventory of 19 Family Child Care Homes and 19 Child Care Centers, which together provide 810 child care spaces. Staff receives numerous inquiries from potential operators about child care rules and regulations, which indicates interest in adding more facilities to the existing inventory.

To further increase application review efficiency, staff is proposing the following updates:

A. Update Municipal Code Sections 18.04 and 18.05 to Remove Minor Use Permit Requirement for Commercial Child Care Centers in Specific Zoning Districts

B. Update Municipal Code Section 18.23.090 – Standards for Specific Uses and Activities – with the following changes:
   i. Remove Outdoor Space Requirement
   ii. Allow Staff Level Review for Pick-up and Drop-Off Plan and Require Minor Use Permit for Parking Non-Compliance
   iii. Update Hours of Operation

C. Update Municipal Code Sections 18.23.090, 18.23.040, and 5.04.020 to Ensure Compliance with State law for Small and Large Family In-Home Day Care

Based on direction obtained at City Council meetings and from the City Council subcommittee, staff and the Planning Commission recommend the City Council adopt the proposed Municipal Code amendments to facilitate new child care facilities and for consistency with State law. A redlined version of the proposed changes to the Municipal Code may be found in Exhibit A of the Ordinance. Findings for the Municipal Code changes may be found in Exhibit B of the Ordinance.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

This project is consistent with the programs and policies of the San Carlos 2030 General Plan, is within the scope of the activities and impacts identified in San Carlos 2030 General Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and no new environmental effects have been found and no new mitigation is necessary. Therefore, no additional environmental review is required pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Guidelines Section 15162 and 15168. This project is also exempt from CEQA Section 15305, Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations.

ALTERNATIVES:

The alternatives available to the Council include:

1. Adopt Ordinance 1568 to Amend the San Carlos Municipal Code Section 5.04 (General Business Registration Requirements), 18.04 (Residential Districts), 18.05 (Mixed Use Districts), 18.20 (Parking and Loading), 18.23 (Standards for Specific Uses and Activities), and 18.40 (Use Classifications) to help increase the number of child care facilities and spaces in San Carlos and for consistency with State law; or
2. Do not adopt Ordinance 1568; or

3. Provide staff with alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted by:

Al Savay, AICP
Community Development Director

Approved for submission by:

Jeff Maltbie, City Manager

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Ordinance with Exhibits A (Proposed Changes) and B (Findings)
ORDINANCE NO. 1568

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS
AMENDING SAN CARLOS MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 5 – BUSINESS TAXES, LICENSES
AND REGISTRATIONS, AND TITLE 18 – ZONING ORDINANCE, TO UPDATE SPECIFIC
SECTIONS PERTAINING TO REGULATIONS RELATING TO CHILD CARE FACILITIES AND
TO COMPLY WITH STATE LAW REQUIREMENTS.

The City Council of the City of San Carlos does ordain as follows:

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of San Carlos recognizes the need for additional
child care spaces and created a 2020 City Council Strategic Plan Goal to encourage and support
the creation of child care facilities; and

WHEREAS, the City of San Carlos is proposing amendments to Chapters 5.04, 18.04,
18.05, 18.20, 18.23, and 18.40 of the San Carlos Municipal Code to help increase the number of
child care facilities in San Carlos; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments related to Chapters 5.04, 18.04, 18.05, 18.20,
18.23, and 18.40 will help streamline the child care application approval process; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments would also ensure that the San Carlos Municipal
Code conforms with State laws pertaining to business registration and regulations for small and
large in-home day care facilities; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the San Carlos Municipal Code are within the
scope of the activities and impacts identified in San Carlos 2030 General Plan Program
Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") and no new environmental effects have been found and no
new mitigation is necessary. Therefore, no additional environmental review is required pursuant
to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA")
Guidelines Section 15162 and 15168; and

WHEREAS, this project is also exempt from CEQA Section 15305, Minor Alterations in
Land Use Limitations; and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Public Hearing was duly posted and published December 10,
2020 for consideration at the Planning Commission hearing on December 21, 2020, and, on said
date, the Public Hearing was opened, held, and closed; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution 2020-5, adopted on December 21, 2020, the Planning
Commission recommended the City Council introduce an Ordinance amending San Carlos
Municipal Code chapters 5.04, 18.04, 18.05, 18.20, 18.23 and 18.40 authorizing changes related
to child care centers and small and large in-home day cares to help increase the number of child
care facilities, and to comply with State law; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of San Carlos held a duly noticed public hearing
on January 11, 2021 to consider the proposed Ordinance amendments.
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of San Carlos as follows:

SECTION 1: San Carlos Municipal Code Chapters 5.04, 18.04, 18.05, 18.20, 18.23, and 18.40 are hereby amended as indicated in Exhibit A to this Ordinance.

SECTION 2: The City Council makes the findings as indicated in Exhibit B to this Ordinance.

SECTION 3: Severability. That the City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, and section by section, and does hereby declare that any provisions of this Ordinance are severable, and, if for any reason any sentence, paragraph, or section of this Ordinance shall be held invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining parts of this Ordinance.

SECTION 4: Publication. This Ordinance shall be published and posted according to law and shall take effect and be in force from and after 30 days after its passage and adoption.

** **

I, City Clerk Crystal Mui, hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance was introduced on the 11th day of January, 2021 and passed and adopted as an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of San Carlos at a regular meeting thereof held on the 25th day of January, 2021, by the following vote:

AYES, COUNCIL MEMBERS:  

NOES, COUNCIL MEMBERS:  

ABSENT, COUNCIL MEMBERS:  

CITY CLERK of the City of San Carlos

APPROVED:

MAYOR of the City of San Carlos

Exhibits:
A. Proposed Municipal Code Changes
B. Findings
Excerpt of SCMC 5.04 GENERAL BUSINESS REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

Text to be removed has a strikethrough, new text is in bold and red.

5.04.020 Registration and fees—Required when—Exemptions.
A. General Requirements. Every person or entity on a trade, calling, business, exhibition, avocation or occupation within the City limits of the City shall have a business registration certificate. All business registration fees shall be payable in advance, on or before the anniversary date of the issuance of the registration certificate. Doing business shall include but not be limited to all individuals and firms who hold a fictitious business statement, a State Board of Equalization resale permit, a listing in commercial directories such as the Yellow Pages, local business guide, real estate multiple listing book, reverse phone directory from Pacific Bell or similar listing. Determinations that a firm or individual is doing business in San Carlos may be appealed to the Finance Director.

B. Fee Exemptions. The Finance Director shall have the authority to waive registration fees for service clubs or charitable organizations operating as temporary vendors.

C. Nonprofit Festivals. Vendors selling items at weekend festivals conducted by nonprofit organizations shall also be exempt from the provisions of this chapter.

D. Child and Adult Care Exemptions. Small and Large In-Home child care facilities and Residential care facilities for children or adults which serve six or fewer persons shall not be subject to the provisions of this chapter. (Ord. 1188 § 1 (part), 1995)
Excerpt of SCMC 18.04 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

Text to be removed has a strikethrough, new text is in **bold** and *red*.

18.04 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

Sections:

18.04.010  **Purpose.**

18.04.020  **Land use regulations.**

18.04.010 **Purpose.** The specific purposes of the residential districts are to:

A.  Preserve, protect, and enhance the character of the City’s different residential neighborhoods.

B.  Ensure adequate light, air, and open space for each dwelling.

C.  Ensure that the scale and design of new development and alterations to existing structures are compatible with surrounding homes and appropriate to the physical characteristics of the site and the area where the project is proposed.

D.  Provide sites for public and semi-public land uses, such as parks and public safety facilities, that will serve City residents and will complement surrounding residential development.

Additional purposes of each residential district which follow implement General Plan classifications of “Single-Family, Low Density,” “Single-Family,” “Multiple-Family, Low Density,” and “Multiple-Family, Medium Density.”

E.  RS-3 Single-Family, Low Density. This district is intended for residential densities up to three units per net acre. Dwelling types may include detached single-unit housing and accessory dwelling units. In addition to single-unit homes, this district provides for uses such as small and large family child care, park and recreation facilities, and community gardens that may be appropriate in a single-family residential neighborhood.

F.  RS-6 Single-Family. This district is intended for residential densities up to six units per net acre. Dwelling types may include detached single-unit housing, small lot single-unit development, duplexes, townhomes, and accessory dwelling units. This district also allows for uses such as small and large family child care, park and recreation facilities, and civic and institutional uses such as schools and places for community assembly that may be appropriate in a single-family residential neighborhood.
G. RM-20 Multiple-Family, Low Density. This district is intended for residential densities of up to twenty units per net acre developed at a scale and form that is appropriate to its neighborhood context and adjacent uses. Dwelling types include small lot single-unit development, bungalow courts, front or rear loaded townhomes, multi-unit buildings, and accessory dwelling units. This district also allows for limited uses such as small and large family day care, park and recreation facilities, and civic and institutional uses such as schools and places for community assembly that are appropriate in a low density multifamily residential environment.

H. RM-59 Multiple-Family, Medium Density. This district is intended for residential development at densities up to fifty-nine units per net acre. This density range accommodates townhomes and multi-unit buildings developed at a scale and form that is appropriate to its neighborhood context and adjacent single-family residential uses and forms. Small lot single-unit and bungalow court development is allowed where site conditions exist rendering the development type equal to or better than multi-unit or townhome development. Accessory dwelling units are also permitted in this district. In addition to residential uses, this district allows for a limited number of public and semi-public uses such as day care centers, public safety facilities, and residential care facilities that are appropriate in a medium density multifamily residential environment. (Ord. 1566 (Exh. B (part)), 2020: Ord. 1537 (Exh. B (part)), 2018: Ord. 1480 (Exh. B (part)), 2015: Ord. 1438 § 4 (Exh. A (part)), 2011)

18.04.020 Land use regulations.
Table 18.04.020 prescribes the land use regulations for residential districts. The regulations for each district are established by letter designations as follows:

“P” designates permitted uses.

“M” designates use classifications that are permitted after review and approval of a minor use permit by the Zoning Administrator.

“C” designates use classifications that are permitted after review and approval of a conditional use permit by the Planning Commission.

“(#)” numbers in parentheses refer to specific limitations listed at the end of the table.

“-” designates uses that are not permitted.
Use classifications are defined in Chapter 18.40, Use Classifications. In cases where a specific land use or activity is not defined, the Director shall assign the land use or activity to a classification that is substantially similar in character. Use classifications and subclassifications not listed in the table or not found to be substantially similar to the uses below are prohibited. The table also notes additional use regulations that apply to various uses. Section numbers in the right-hand column refer to other sections of this title.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Classification</th>
<th>RS-3</th>
<th>RS-6</th>
<th>RM-20</th>
<th>RM-59</th>
<th>Additional Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Day Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See subclassifications below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>See Section 18.23.090, Day care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Semi-Public Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Centers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M-P</td>
<td>See Section 18.23.090, Day care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18.05 Land use regulations.

Table 18.05.020 prescribes the land use regulations for mixed-use districts. The regulations for each district are established by letter designations as follows:

“P” designates permitted uses.

“M” designates use classifications that are permitted after review and approval of a minor use permit by the Zoning Administrator.

“C” designates use classifications that are permitted after review and approval of a conditional use permit by the Planning Commission.

“(#)” numbers in parentheses refer to specific limitations listed at the end of the table.

“-” designates uses that are not permitted.

Use classifications are defined in Chapter 18.40, Use Classifications. In cases where a specific land use or activity is not defined, the Director shall assign the land use or activity to a classification that is substantially similar in character. Use classifications and subclassifications not listed in the table or not found to be substantially similar to the uses below are prohibited. The table also notes additional use regulations that apply to various uses. Section numbers in the right-hand column refer to other sections of this title.

**TABLE 18.05.020: LAND USE REGULATIONS—MIXED-USE DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Classifications</th>
<th>MU-DC</th>
<th>MU-D</th>
<th>MU-SA</th>
<th>MU-SC</th>
<th>MU-NB</th>
<th>MU-SB</th>
<th>Additional Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Housing Types</td>
<td>See subclassifications below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 18.05.020: LAND USE REGULATIONS—MIXED-USE DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Classifications</th>
<th>MU-DC</th>
<th>MU-D</th>
<th>MU-SA</th>
<th>MU-SC</th>
<th>MU-NB</th>
<th>MU-SB</th>
<th>Additional Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Child Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See subclassifications below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>See Section 18.23.090, Day care centers and large family child care homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Semi-Public Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Centers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>See Section 18.23.090, Day care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18.20.040-A(3): REQUIRED ON-SITE PARKING SPACES, OTHER DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Required Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Use Classifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Family Day Care</td>
<td>None in addition to what is required for the residential use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Family Day Care</td>
<td>1 per employee plus an area for loading and unloading children, on or off site. (Required spaces and the residential driveway for the primary residential use may be counted toward meeting these requirements.) None in addition to what is required for the residential use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Semi-Public Use Classifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>1 per employee plus additional parking as provided in the pick-up/drop-off plan required pursuant to Section 18.23.090, Day care. Reductions in parking may be granted upon approval of a Minor Use Permit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Replace Entirely SCMC 18.23.090
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18.23.090 Day care centers and large family child care homes.

Day care centers and large family child care homes shall be located, developed and operated in compliance with the following standards:

A. License. The operator shall secure and maintain a license from the State of California Department of Social Services.

B. Screening. A periphery wall, constructed of wood or masonry, shall be provided to screen and secure outdoor play areas and shall achieve seventy-five percent opacity. Chain metal fencing or barbed wire is prohibited.

C. Outdoor Space. Child day care centers and large family child care shall provide a minimum of seventy-five square feet of outdoor space for each child over two years old. The outdoor area shall not be located in any required front or street side yard. This area must be either owned or leased by the applicant and cannot be shared with other property owners unless written permission is granted by the other property owners. This requirement may be waived if the applicant can demonstrate that there is a public park, school or other public open area within five hundred feet of the day care.

D. Hours of Operation. Hours of operation shall only be within the hours of six a.m. and seven p.m., Monday through Friday. Additional hours may be allowed subject to approval of a minor use permit.

E. Noise. Outdoor activities shall comply with the San Carlos Noise Ordinance. Not occur before eight a.m. or after five-thirty p.m. when the site is located within or adjacent to a residential district.

F. Pick-Up and Drop-Off Plan. A plan and schedule for the pick-up and drop-off of children or clients shall be provided for approval by the Director. The plan shall demonstrate that adequate parking and loading are provided to minimize congestion and conflict points on travel aisles and public streets. The plan shall include an agreement for each parent or client to sign that includes, at a minimum:

1. A scheduled time for pick-up and drop-off with allowances for emergencies; and
2. Prohibitions of double-parking, blocking driveways of neighboring properties, or using driveways of neighboring properties to turn around.

If for any reason, the applicant cannot meet the above requirements, the minimum parking requirements, or there are concerns with the proposed parking plan or drop-off pick up plan, the Director may refer this item and require a Minor Use Permit.

(Ord. 1480 (Exh. C (part)), 2015: Ord. 1438 § 4 (Exh. A (part)), 2011)
Excerpt of SCMC 18.40 USE CLASSIFICATIONS

Text to be removed has a strikethrough, new text is in bold and red.

C. Family Child Care. A child care facility licensed by the State of California that is located in a single-unit residence or other dwelling unit where resident of the dwelling provides care, protection and supervision of children in the resident’s home for periods less than twenty-four hours per day for children under the age of eighteen. **Family Child Care, regardless of size, can only be subject to State regulations.**

1. Small. A home that provides family child care for up to six children, or for up to eight children if the criteria in Section 102416.5(b) of the Family Child Care Home Licensing Requirements under Title 22 are met. This includes children under the age of ten who live in the licensee’s home.

2. Large. A home that provides family child care for up to twelve children, or for up to fourteen children, if the criteria in Section 102416.5(c) of the Family Child Care Home Licensing Requirements under Title 22 are met. This includes children under the age of ten who live in the licensee’s home and the assistance provider’s children under the age of ten.
Exhibit B: Findings

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL:

The City of San Carlos Zoning Ordinance is required to be consistent with the City’s General Plan (§65860). This is one of two findings that must be made when considering amendments.

1. The ordinance amendment is consistent with the General Plan.

   *Basis for finding:* There are no goals in the General Plan which specifically reference child care. However, the ability to add additional child care spaces will support workers and residents, which will in turn support other policies such as:

   LU-5.1 Maintain a diversity of land uses while achieving the desired transportation level of service.
   LU-5.2 Implement the City’s adopted Economic Development Plan, which is updated annually as it relates to supporting the local economy.
   LU-5.3 Support and encourage businesses and land uses that contribute to the City’s financial viability.
   LU-5.4 Support independent local businesses that serve city residents and visitors that contribute to San Carlos’ character.
   LU-5.5 Support organizations that offer lifelong education and workforce training geared to emerging economic sectors.
   LU-5.7 Support high-wage industries that provide quality jobs for workers at all education levels.

   In addition, the General Plan has the following policy which is related to similar land uses being located in residential neighborhoods.

   LU-9.6 Encourage the location of support facilities such as schools, parks and churches within or near residential neighborhoods.

   One of the primary goals of the update is to ensure that San Carlos’ regulations for Small and Large Family Child Care Homes are consistent with State Law, which is intended to remove barriers to the creation of additional child care spaces.

2. The ordinance amendment is consistent with the purpose of this Ordinance to promote the growth of the city in an orderly manner and to promote and protect the public health, safety, peace, comfort and general welfare.

   *Basis for finding:* The proposed amendments are consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the 2030 General Plan as noted above, and are also the result of a City Council Strategic Objective, and as such promote and protect the public health, safety, peace, comfort and general welfare.
MEETING DATE: January 25, 2021


RECOMMENDATION:


FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no fiscal implications or additional appropriations required as a result of this action. The cost for adding the campaign statement disclosures system would be $2,425 per year, and there are sufficient funds available in the City Clerk Department budget to cover the cost.

BACKGROUND:

Assembly Bill 2452 (“AB 2452”) went into effect on January 1, 2013, which added Government Code §84615. This law allows a local government agency to mandate online or electronic filing for an elected officer, candidate, committee, or other person who is required to file statements, reports, or other documents under the Political Reform Act, so long as the filer receives contributions or makes expenditures totaling Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000) or more in a calendar year.

The California Fair Political Practices Commission supports and encourages efforts to move from a paper-based reporting system to a more transparent electronic system. Electronic filing makes it easier for officials to comply with reporting obligations and provides the public with the information in a more accessible and consistent format.

On January 1, 2021, Assembly Bill 2151 (“AB 2151”) went into effect requiring a local government agency to post on its internet website, within 72 hours of the applicable filing deadline, a copy of any specified statement, report, or other document filed with that agency in paper format. This bill requires that the statement, report, or other document be made available for four years from the date of the election associated with the filing.
ANALYSIS:

The City Clerk’s office accepts filing of campaign statements disclosing contributions to local candidates and ballot measure campaigns. There are many advantages to requiring electronic filing of these documents. All Fair Political Practices Commission (“FPPC”) forms are public records. By shifting to an electronic system, the public can directly access campaign statements on the City’s website. The system is also beneficial to the end user by providing multiple prompts to ensure timely filing, storing previous statements for user ease, and permitting a single filing for multiple offices. Additionally, filers submitting their campaign statements electronically will greatly help with reducing the labor of complying with AB 2151.

For the City to use and accept electronic campaign filings, the City Council must adopt an Ordinance with required findings approving the use of an electronic system, which includes that the system:

- Will operate securely and effectively and will not unduly burden filers;
- Must be available free of charge to filers and the public for viewing filings; and
- Must include a procedure for filers to comply with the requirement that they sign statements and reports under penalty of perjury.

In addition, before a city can begin implementing an all-electronic filing system, the FPPC must review and approve the program to ensure it complies with prescribed security and transparency protocols.

Although State law authorizes the City to mandate electronic filing, staff recognizes that such mandate could have a direct effect on those committees or individuals who do not have computer access or familiarity with computer programs. To ensure that the same opportunity to comply with the Political Reform Act is afforded to all committees/individuals without unduly burdening any one, the City Clerk recommends the Council approve an Opt-In/Out Program. In short, to ensure reporting continuity and accurate accounting of contributions/expenditures, once a committee/individual chooses to file a report electronically, the committee/individual is deemed "opted-in" and shall be required to file all future statements electronically using the City Clerk’s system. On the other hand, any committee/individual who wishes to continue to paper-file may “opt-out” of the electronic filing system by filing all original statements with the City Clerk. Should a committee/individual choose to only paper-file, the City Clerk will continue to accept such reports until the committee/individual “opts-in”.

At its January 11, 2021 meeting, the City Council introduced Ordinance 1569. The next step is for Council to adopt the Ordinance. Once adopted, the City Clerk can continue the process of implementing the system for campaign filings, which should be available to filers and the public as early as April 2021.

ALTERNATIVES:

The alternatives available to the City Council include:


2. Do not adopt Ordinance 1569; or
3. Provide staff with alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted by:

Crystal Mui,
City Clerk

Approved for submission by:

Jeff Maltbie, City Manager

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Ordinance 1569 - eFiling System
ORDINANCE NO. 1569

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS,
ADDING CHAPTER 2.36.030 – ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM, TO THE SAN CARLOS
MUNICIPAL CODE APPROVING ELECTRONIC AND PAPER METHODS OF FILING
CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS.

SECTION 1. The City Council of the City of San Carlos does hereby ordain as follows:

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 84615 provides that a legislative body
of a local government agency may adopt an ordinance that requires an elected officer, candidate,
committee, or other person required to file statements, reports, or other documents required by
Chapter 4 of the Political Reform Act, except those whose contributions and expenditures each
total less than Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000) in a calendar year, to file such statements, reports,
or other documents online or electronically with the City Clerk; and

WHEREAS, the City will enter into an agreement with a vendor certified by the Secretary
of State for campaign disclosure documents that meets the requirements set by Govern-
ment Code Section 84615; and

WHEREAS, the City Council approves the use of an electronic system, which includes that:
it will operate securely and effectively and will not unduly burden filers; it must be available free of
charge to filers and the public for viewing filings; and it must include a procedure for filers to comply
with the requirement that they sign statements and reports under penalty of perjury.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS DOES
HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 2. The City Council hereby approves the addition of Section 2.36.030 –
Electronic Filing System – to be added to Chapter 2.36 – Elections, to read as follows:

2.36.030 Electronic Filing System.

A. Required Use of Electronic Filing System.

1. Except as set forth in subsection B of this Section 2.36.030, any elected officer,
candidate, committee, other person required to file specified statements, reports,
forms, or other documents with the City Clerk as required by Chapter 4
(commencing with Section 84100 of Title 9 of the California Government Code,
also known as the Political Reform Act), and that has received contributions or
made expenditures of $2,000 or more in a calendar year, may electronically file
such statements using the City’s online system according to procedures
established by the City Clerk. However, to ensure reporting continuity, once a
statement, report, form, or other document is filed electronically on behalf of any
elected officer, candidate, committee, or other person, all future statements,
reports, forms, and other documents filed on behalf of that officer, candidate,
committee, or other person must be filed electronically.

2. An elected officer, candidate, committee, or other person may choose not to use
the electronic filing system by filing all original statements, reports, forms, or other
documents in paper format with the City Clerk, until such time as the City Council determines that electronic filing is mandatory for all filers.

B. **Paper Filing Not Required After Electronic Filing.** Any elected officer, candidate, committee, or other person who has electronically filed a statement, report, form, or other document using the City's online system is not also required to file a copy of that document in a paper format with the City Clerk.

C. **Filing Options When a Copy Must be Filed with City Clerk.** In any instance in which an original statement, report, form, or other document must be filed with the Secretary of State or other agency, and a copy of that document is required to be filed with the City Clerk, the filer may electronically file a copy with the City Clerk, or may file in a paper format.

D. **Paper Filing When Cannot File Electronically.** If, for technical reasons, the City's system is not capable of accepting a particular type of statement, report, form or other document, an elected officer, candidate, committee, or other person shall timely file that document in paper format with the City Clerk.

E. **Internet Posting of Data.** The City Clerk shall ensure that the City's system makes all electronically-filed statements, reports, forms, or other documents available on the internet in an easily understood format that provides the greatest public access. The data shall be made available free of charge and as soon as possible after receipt/deadline. The data made available on the internet shall not contain the street name of the persons or entity representatives listed on the electronically filed forms or any bank account number required to be disclosed by the filer. The City Clerk's office shall also make a complete, unredacted copy of the statement, report, form, or other document available to the Fair Political Practices Commission for Government Code Section 87200 filers.

F. **Records Retention.** The City Clerk's office shall maintain records according to the City's records retention schedule and applicable State law commencing from the date filed, a secured, official version of each online or electronic statement, report, form, or other document, which shall serve as the official version of that record.

**SECTION 3: Severability.** That the City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, and section by section, and does hereby declare that any provisions of this Ordinance are severable, and, if for any reason any sentence, paragraph or section of this Ordinance shall be held invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining parts of this Ordinance.

**SECTION 4: Publication.** This Ordinance shall be published and posted according to law and shall take effect and be in force from and after 30 days after its passage and adoption.

* * * *

I, City Clerk Crystal Mui, hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance was introduced on the 11th day of January, 2021 and passed and adopted as an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of San Carlos at a regular meeting thereof held on the 25th day of January, 2021, by the following vote:

**AYES, COUNCIL MEMBERS:**
NOES, COUNCIL MEMBERS: ________________________________________________

ABSENT, COUNCIL MEMBERS: _____________________________________________

APPROVED:

CITY CLERK of the City of San Carlos

MAYOR of the City of San Carlos
MEETING DATE: January 25, 2021


RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City Council consider introducing an Ordinance adopting reach codes by amending San Carlos Municipal Code Section 15.04.080 – Title 24, Part 6, California Energy Code with Appendices and Section 15.04.125 – Title 24, Part 11, California Green Building Standards Code (“CALGreen”) to meet greenhouse gas emission reduction goals.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no fiscal implications with introducing this Ordinance.

BACKGROUND:

Every three years, the State of California adopts new building standards. The most recent code cycle went into effect on January 1, 2020. At any time cities can adopt local building code amendments, or reach codes, that exceed minimum State standards. Historically, cities have adopted reach codes amending the California Energy Code and the California Green Building Standards Code to reduce greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions and meet local climate action goals.

Local amendments to the Energy Code must be approved by the California Energy Commission, requiring jurisdictions to demonstrate that the amendments are cost effective. Staff rely on cost-effectiveness studies showing the proposed Energy Code amendments (reach codes) do not represent an unreasonable burden to builders and property owners. See Attachment 6 for a cost-effectiveness summary for the proposed reach codes.

Reach codes act to reduce GHG emissions associated with fossil fuel consumption in buildings and transportation by electrifying these sectors. Natural gas consumption in buildings contributes 28% of all GHG emissions in San Carlos. Reducing or eliminating natural gas use in buildings can be an important component of climate mitigation. Since Peninsula Clean Energy currently provides 90% greenhouse gas free electricity, acting to electrify new buildings now will enable San Carlos to work toward achieving long term emission reductions. At the same time,
requiring additional electric vehicle ("EV") charging infrastructure during new construction facilitates a transition to EVs, thereby reducing transportation pollution, which contributes 47% of all San Carlos emissions.

At the October 26, 2020 City Council meeting, staff proposed a reach code ordinance based on the model ordinance adopted by San Mateo County. The model ordinance included three components:

1. All-electric new construction for all building types with exceptions.
3. Electric vehicle charging infrastructure readiness.

During the meeting, Council expressed the following concerns and directed staff to conduct additional research and community outreach before returning with the proposed Ordinance:

- Ordinance timeline for implementation.
- Inclusion of residential reconstruction into reach code requirements.
- Exception for scientific laboratories given future biotech development.
- Adequacy of EV charging requirements with the State’s timeline for EV adoption.
- Various concerns regarding electrification of residential buildings.

ANALYSIS:

Community Outreach
Staff sought feedback from the community on the proposed Ordinance through a community survey posted on the City website. (See Attachment 3 for the full results of the survey.) Staff also asked for feedback from the building industry regarding possible code changes. Staff received comments from or met with 13 architects, developers, and contractors as part of this effort. (Feedback from the building industry can be found in Attachment 4.)

Proposed Ordinance and Staff Recommendations
In response to Council’s concerns and community feedback, staff made eight recommended changes reflected in the proposed Ordinance as detailed below. (See Attachment 1). A summary of the proposed Ordinance code amendments can be found in Attachment 2.

Recommendation 1: Multi-family EV Charging Requirement Adjustment
Staff recommends adjusting the EV charging requirements for new multi-family buildings to require all units have access to EV charging infrastructure, but allow sharing between two units. This change does not increase the required electric infrastructure or costs compared to the original ordinance but adjusts the location of outlets to ensure that all units have access.

At the October 26 meeting, Council questioned the adequacy of the EV charging requirements given the State’s timeline for EV adoption. The community survey found support for the EV charging requirements. However, developers expressed concern that EV charging requirements add upfront costs and design constraints for new multi-family and commercial buildings.

Recommendation 2: EV charging exception for mechanical parking systems
Staff recommends including an exception to the EV charging requirements for parking spaces in multi-family units that are accessible only by mechanical parking systems. Feedback from
developers indicated that there are limited options for EV charging within mechanical parking systems and staff research confirmed this point.

**Recommendation 3: EV charging exception for affordable housing**
Staff recommends including an exception to the EV charging requirements for multi-family buildings containing 100% affordable units for any costs that surpass $400 per unit. This change ensures affordable housing developers keep costs below thresholds required by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee in order to maintain access to financing. An affordable housing developer advocated for this exception.

**Recommendation 4: Add third party verification requirement for scientific lab exception**
Under the original ordinance, scientific labs were exempt from the all-electric requirement and allowed to use gas for space conditioning systems. Council expressed concern about allowing this exemption considering the future biotech development in the city. Staff recommends requiring a scientific lab permit applicant obtain third party verification that an all-electric design would not be cost effective and technically feasible to qualify for this exception.

Biotech developers with projects in San Carlos expressed support for an exception sighting challenges with designing all-electric scientific laboratories. Developers also expressed concern with the added cost and time delays of requiring third party verification. Some planned biotechnology development projects are already planned to be all-electric.

**Recommendation 5: Remove exception for public agency owned emergency centers**
Staff recommends removing the exception for public agency owned emergency centers from the all-electric requirements. The intention of this exception is to provide flexibility when designing any future publicly owned emergency center. Staff research found, and outreach to architects specializing in this area confirmed, that all-electric emergency centers are cost effective and resilient to natural disasters with sufficient back-up power supply. Diesel generators and other back-up power sources are still allowed under the reach code. The new Fire Station 16 project is already under building review and would not be subject to this amended Ordinance.

**Recommendation 6: Exception for projects that have received planning entitlements**
Staff recommends exempting projects that have received Planning entitlements prior to the effective date of the Ordinance from adhering to the all-electric requirements. This exception would ensure that projects that have invested in design work are not subjected to additional costs or time delays resulting from new Building Code requirements.

Some builders and developers expressed concern about design constraints related to providing sufficient electrical capacity or space for certain electric appliances after a building has received entitlements. (See Attachment 5 for a list of entitled projects and rough timeline for other projects currently in Planning.)

**Recommendation 7: Change Residential Reconstruction to 50% rebuilt projects**
The previous ordinance applied to new construction and residential reconstruction as defined under Section 15.04.045 of the San Carlos Municipal Code. It was pointed out during the October 26 Council meeting that residential reconstruction could be interpreted to include certain home remodels when a home is no longer habitable. Staff recommends changing this language to be more specific and include projects only where 50% of the walls or foundation are demolished and rebuilt. This language primarily impacts single-family home rebuilds. To provide an idea as to the impact, in 2020 there were 14 residential reconstruction projects and 19 newly constructed single-family homes.
Responses in the community survey are split on the question of including 50% rebuild projects. Single-family home builders expressed concern that some clients may choose to limit the scope of projects so as to avoid being subject to the reach code requirements.

**Recommendation 8: Exception for residential cooking and fireplaces**

Staff recommends including an exception that allows gas for cooking appliances and fireplaces in residential buildings. Gas appliances and fireplaces consume less energy, and therefore contribute less GHG emissions compared to other gas appliances for space heating and water heating. Any residential development that chooses to take advantage of this exception would incur additional costs, as the cost effectiveness of all-electric buildings is based on savings from forgoing gas connections entirely.

The community survey results showed support for this exception with many sighting a preference for gas cooking appliances. Those who opposed this exception expressed concern over the emissions created by these appliances and the potential negative indoor air quality associated with gas cooking. Residential developers expressed support for this exception citing consumer demand for gas cooking appliances.

**Additional Option: Exception for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)**

In addition to the recommended changes, Council may consider including an exemption for ADUs from the all-electric requirements. Studies show that all-electric ADUs are cost effective, though not to the same extent as all-electric single-family homes due to lower capital savings on utility hookups. The purpose for this exception is to minimize any regulatory barriers to facilitate the construction of new ADUs to meet housing goals. It is likely that construction of an ADU would require a property owner to upgrade PG&E electrical service regardless of whether the ADU is all-electric or mixed-fuel.

This option came under consideration after community outreach had been completed, therefore staff looks to Council for direction for its inclusion in the Ordinance. If Council chooses to add this exception, staff will make the adjustment to the proposed Ordinance before returning to Council for adoption.

**NEXT STEPS:**

If approved, amendments to State building codes must be submitted to the California Building Standards Commission for the amendments to be in effect in the local jurisdiction. In addition, the local amendments to the Energy Code must be submitted and approved by the California Energy Commission and filed with the California Building Standards Commission. Depending upon Council direction, staff intends to submit the proposed Ordinance to the California Building Standards Commission and California Energy Commission immediately upon adoption. The proposed Ordinance would go into effect once approval has been granted by the California Energy Commission, estimated to take between 15 and 60 days.

Depending upon Council direction, staff can also begin outreach to developers with projects currently in planning to ensure awareness of the proposed building code amendments and clarify any questions regarding the new requirements. Additionally, staff can develop a dedicated webpage on the City website detailing the reach code requirements and share resources.
ALTERNATIVES:

The alternatives available to the City Council include:

1. Introduce an Ordinance amending San Carlos Municipal Code Section 15.04.080 – Title 24, Part 6, California Energy Code with Appendices, and Section 15.04.125 – Title 24, Part 11, California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen), to meet Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Goals adopting reach codes; or

2. Do not introduce an Ordinance adopting reach codes; or

3. Provide staff with alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted by:

Tara Peterson, Assistant City Manager

Chris Valley, Building Official

Adam Lokar, Management Analyst

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Ordinance - Reach Code
2. Proposed Code Amendments
3. Community Survey Results
4. Building Industry Feedback
5. Project Entitlements Timeline
6. Construction Costs for Proposed Measures
7. Other Cities All-Electric Exceptions

Approved for submission by:

Jeff Maltbie, City Manager
ORDINANCE NO. _________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS
AMENDING SAN CARLOS MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 15.04.080 – TITLE 24, PART 6,
CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE WITH APPENDICES, AND SECTION 15.04.125 - TITLE 24,
PART 11, CALIFORNIA GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS CODE (CALGREEN), TO MEET
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION REDUCTION GOALS.

WHEREAS, the State of California adopted SB 100, which requires a 100% clean electric
grid by 2045; and

WHEREAS, the City of San Carlos seeks to pass a reach code that will enable the State
of California to work toward achieving carbon neutrality by 2045; and

WHEREAS, reducing or eliminating natural gas usage in the building sector is an
important component of climate mitigation to achieve the State of California’s goal of carbon
neutrality by 2045; and

WHEREAS, the City Council seeks to meet the climate action goals set by the City of San
Carlos, San Mateo County, and the State of California.

IT IS ORDAINED, by the City Council of the City of San Carlos as follows:

SECTION 1: Findings of Fact. For the purposes of this ordinance, the City Council hereby makes
the following findings, as required by Sections 13143.5, 17958.5, 17958.7, and 18941.5 of the
California Health and Safety Code. The City Council finds and declares that the unique
characteristics of the topographic, geologic, and climatic conditions found in San Mateo County
make the local amendments to Title 24, Part 6, of the California Energy Code, and Title 24, Part
11, of the California Green Building Standards Code reasonable and necessary.

Finding 1: Topographic
Significant elevation changes occur within San Mateo County. Highly combustible dry grass,
weeds and brush are common in the hilly and open space areas adjacent to built-up locations
six to eight months of each year. When these areas experience wildland fires, they immediately
threaten nearby buildings. This condition can be found throughout San Mateo County,
especially in those developed and developing areas that interface and intermix with adjoining
open space wildlands. The threat of wildland fires could be compounded by above-ground
electrical power transmission lines suspended on poles and towers that exist throughout the
County. Many power line poles are located adjacent to streets and roads, and many of the
transmission wires are suspended above large areas of dry vegetation and near untreated
wood shake or shingle roofs. Older development has followed the path of least resistance,
creating a meandering pattern, particularly in the hillside areas. This does not lend itself to a
good systematic street and road layout, which would otherwise promote easy traffic flow. It
has resulted in a few major cross-town thoroughfares that tend to be heavily congested,
primarily during commute hours and seasonal periods of the year. This creates barriers that
reduce the response time of fire equipment and other emergency services. The topography of
the County is also challenged by major development patterns. Employment areas are located
adjacent to the major thoroughfares within the County. The people who work in these areas
have added to the traffic congestion, thereby reducing the response time capabilities of various
fire agencies. The conditions within the County create hazardous conditions for which
departure from California Energy Code and California Green Building Standards Code is warranted.

Finding 2: Geologic
The majority of San Mateo County encompasses areas classified as Seismic Design Category E, which is the most severe earthquake category. Buildings and other structures in Category E can experience major seismic damage. Within the County are active faults such as San Andreas, San Gregorio, Seal Cove, and other lesser faults. Earthquake activity with nearby epicenters has the potential for inducing landslides, which can create situations of reduced emergency response times and restoration of power utilities. Earthquakes of the magnitude experienced locally can cause major damage to electrical transmission facilities and natural gas infrastructure, which in turn cause power failures while at the same time starting fires or gas explosions throughout the County. There is a need to reduce dependence on the natural gas infrastructure to reduce harms and increase energy resiliency in the event of an earthquake. The modifications and changes cited herein are designed to reduce natural gas hazards in buildings and encourage energy resiliency through increased installation of solar and battery-type storage systems.

Finding 3: Climatic
San Mateo County is located in Climate Zone 3, as established in the 2019 California Energy Code. Climate Zone 3 incorporates mostly coastal communities from Marin County to southern Monterey County, including San Francisco. The County experiences precipitation ranging from 15 to 24 inches per year, with an average of approximately 20 inches per year. 96% of precipitation falls during the months of November through April, and 4% from May through September. This is a dry period of at least five months each year. Additionally, the area is subject to frequent periods of drought having recently suffered through an unprecedented seven-year drought. Similar periods of extended drought can be expected in the future. Relative humidity remains in the middle range most of the time. It ranges from 45% to 65% in the winter, and occasionally falls as low as 15%. Temperatures from June through September average above 80 degrees Fahrenheit. Temperatures as high as 110 degrees Fahrenheit have been recorded, and it is not unusual to experience several continuous days with temperatures in the mid to high 90s. Prevailing winds in the area are from the west. However, winds are experienced from virtually every direction at one time or another. Velocities are generally in the 12 MPH range, gusting from 25 MPH to 35 MPH. 40 MPH winds are experienced, and winds up to 55 MPH have been registered locally. Climate change is causing historic droughts, devastating wildfires, torrential storms, extreme heat, property damage, and threats to human health and food supplies. The State of California has outlined specific steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to prevent these negative impacts of changing climate, including moving the State to 100% clean energy by 2045. This gives local governments the opportunity to achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions with a climate positive impact by powering buildings with clean electricity. These climatic conditions, along with the greenhouse emissions generated from structures in both the residential and nonresidential sectors, requires exceeding the Energy Standards for building construction established in the 2019 California Building Code.

SECTION 2: Chapter 15.04 (Technical Building Codes), Section 15.04.080, Title 24, Part 6, California Energy Code is hereby amended as follows (new language is shown with **bold underline**, Removed language is shown in **strike-through**):

15.04.080 Title 24, Part 6, California Energy Code with Appendices.
Title 24, Part 6, the California Energy Code, 2019 Edition, is hereby adopted by reference, with all appendices and the following local amendments.
Sec. 9.249 – SECTION 100.0(e) (2) A OF THE ENERGY CODE AMENDED:

Section 100.0(e) (2) A of the Energy Code is amended to read as follows:

(e) Sections applicable to particular buildings. TABLE 100.0-A and this subsection list the provisions of Part 6 that are applicable to different types of buildings covered by Section 100.0(a).

1. All buildings. Sections 100.0 through 110.12 apply to all buildings.
   Exception to Section 100.0(e) 1: Spaces or requirements not listed in TABLE 100.0-A.

2. Newly constructed buildings.
   A. All newly constructed buildings. Sections 110.0 through 110.12 apply to all newly constructed buildings within the scope of Section 100.0(a). In addition, newly constructed buildings shall meet the requirements of Subsections B, C, D or E, as applicable; and shall be an All-Electric Building as defined in Section 100.1(b). For the purposes of All-Electric Building requirements, newly constructed buildings as defined in Section 100.1 shall include a construction project where an alteration includes replacement of over 50% of the existing foundation for purposes other than a repair or reinforcement as defined in California Existing Building Code Section 202; or when over 50% of the existing framing above the sill plate is removed or replaced for purposes other than repair. If either of these criteria are met within a 3-year period, measured from the date of the most recent previously obtained permit final date, that structure is considered new construction and shall be subject to the All-Electric building requirements. The final determination whether a project meets the definition of substantial reconstruction/alteration shall be made by the designated building official.

   Exception 1: Laboratory areas within Non-Residential Buildings may contain non-electric Space Conditioning Systems. To take advantage of this exception applicant shall provide third party verification that the All-Electric space heating requirement is not cost effective and feasible.

   Exception 2: If the applicant establishes that there is not an all-electric prescriptive compliance pathway for the building or space regulated by the Energy Code, and that the building or space is not able to achieve compliance with the Energy Code using the alternative calculation method and utilizing commercially available technology, then the Building Official may grant a modification. If the Building Official grants a modification pursuant to this Exception, the applicant shall comply with the pre-wiring provision of Note 1 below.

   Exception 3: Non-residential buildings containing a for-profit restaurant open to the public or an employee kitchen may apply to the Building Official for a modification to install gas-fueled cooking appliances. This request must be based on a business-related reason to cook with a flame that cannot be reasonably achieved with an electric fuel source. The Building Official may grant this modification if he or she finds the following:
   1. There is a business-related reason to cook with a flame; and
2. This need cannot be reasonably achieved with an electric fuel source.

Exception 4: All Residential buildings may contain non-electric Cooking Appliances and Fireplaces.

Exception 5: All-Electric Building requirements shall not apply to projects with planning entitlements approved by the City prior to the effective date of this ordinance.

Note 1: If natural gas appliances are used in any of the above exceptions 1-4, natural gas appliance locations must also be electrically pre-wired for future electric appliance installation. The pre-wiring shall include the following:

1. A dedicated electrical circuit for each appliance, with a minimum amperage requirement for a comparable electric appliance (see manufacturer’s recommendations) with an electrical receptacle that is connected to an electrical overcurrent protection device, extending to within 3 feet of the appliance and accessible without obstructions;

2. Panel and electrical receptacle to be labeled “For Future Electric appliance” and be electrically isolated;

3. A circuit breaker shall be installed in the electrical panel for the branch circuit and labeled for each circuit, an example is as follows (i.e.: “For Future Electric Range;”); and

4. All electrical components, including conductors, receptacles, junction boxes, or blank covers, related to this section shall be installed in accordance with the California Electrical Code.

Note 2: If any of the exceptions 1-4 are granted, the Building Official shall have the authority to approve alternate materials, design and methods of construction or equipment per CBC 104 or CRC R104, as applicable.

Sec. 9.250 – SECTION 100.1(b) OF THE ENERGY CODE AMENDED:

Section 100.1(b) of the Energy Code is amended to add definitions for “All Electric Building” and “Laboratory” to read as follows:

ALL ELECTRIC BUILDING: is a building that has no natural gas or propane plumbing installed within the building, and that uses electricity as the source of energy for its space heating, water heating, cooking appliances, and clothes drying appliances. All Electric Buildings may include solar thermal pool heating, or fossil fuels for backup power generation.

LABORATORY: is a building or area where research, experiments, and measurements in medical and life sciences are performed and/or stored requiring examination. The building may include workbenches, countertops, scientific
instruments, and supporting offices.

Sec. 9.251 – SECTION 110.2 “Certification by manufacturers” OF THE ENERGY CODE AMENDED:

Section 110.2 “Certification by manufacturers” of the Energy Code is amended to read as follows:

SECTION 110.2 – MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR SPACE-CONDITIONING EQUIPMENT

Certification by Manufacturers. Any space-conditioning equipment listed in this section, meeting the requirements of section 100.0 (e)2A, may be installed only if the manufacturer has certified to the Commission that the equipment complies with all applicable requirements of this section.

Sec. 9.252. – SECTION 110.3(a) OF THE ENERGY CODE AMENDED:

Section 110.3(a) of the Energy Code is amended to read as follows:

SECTION 110.3 – MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR SERVICE WATER-HEATING SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT

(a) Certification by Manufacturers. Any service water-heating system or equipment, meeting the requirements of section 100.0 (e)2A, may be installed only if the manufacturer has certified that the system or equipment complies with all of the requirements of this subsection for that system or equipment.

Sec. 9.253. – SECTION 110.4(a) OF THE ENERGY CODE AMENDED:

Section 110.4(a) of the Energy Code is amended to read as follows:

SECTION 110.4(a) – MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR POOL AND SPA SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT

(a) Certification by Manufacturers. Any pool or spa heating system or equipment, meeting the requirements of section 100.0 (e)2A, may be installed only if the manufacturer has certified that the system or equipment has all of the following:

1. Efficiency. A thermal efficiency that complies with the Appliance Efficiency Regulations; and
2. On-off switch. A readily accessible on-off switch, mounted on the outside of the heater that allows shutting off the heater without adjusting the thermostat setting; and
3. Instructions. A permanent, easily readable, and weatherproof plate or card that gives instruction for the energy efficient operation of the pool or spa heater and for the proper care of pool or spa water when a cover is used; and
4. Electric resistance heating. No electric resistance heating.

Exception 1 to Section 110.4(a): Listed package units with fully insulated enclosures, and with tightfitting covers that are insulated to at least R-6.
Exception 2 to Section 110.4(a)4: Pools or spas deriving at least 60 percent of the annual heating energy from site solar energy or recovered energy.

Sec. 9.254 – SECTION 110.5 OF THE ENERGY CODE AMENDED:

Section 110.5 of the Energy Code is amended to read as follows:

SECTION 110.5 – COOKING EQUIPMENT, POOL AND SPA HEATERS, AND FIREPLACES

Any system or equipment listed below may be installed only if it meets the requirements of Section 100.0 (e)2A:

(a) Cooking Equipment
(b) Pool heaters
(c) Spa heaters
(d) Indoor and outdoor fireplaces

Sec. 9.255. SECTION 110.10 OF THE ENERGY CODE AMENDED:

Section 110.10 of the Energy Code is amended to read as follows:

SECTION 110.10 - MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR SOLAR READY BUILDINGS AND SOLAR PANEL SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL NEW BUILDINGS

(a) Covered Occupancies.
1. Single Family Residences. Single family residences located in new subdivisions with ten or more single family residences and where the application for a tentative subdivision map for the residences has been deemed complete or approved by the enforcement agency, which do not have a photovoltaic system installed, shall comply with the requirements of Section 110.10(b) through 110.10(e).
2. Low-rise Multifamily Buildings. Low-rise multi-family buildings that do not have a photovoltaic system installed shall comply with the requirements of Section 110.10(b) through 110.10(d).
3. Hotel/Motel Occupancies and High-rise Multifamily Buildings. Hotel/motel occupancies and high-rise multifamily buildings with ten habitable stories or fewer shall comply with the requirements of Section 110.10(b) through 110.10(d). The minimum solar photovoltaic system required is 2 watts per square foot of the building footprint or right-sized PV system shall be installed.
4. Nonresidential Buildings. Nonresidential buildings with three habitable stories or fewer, other than healthcare facilities, shall comply with the requirements of Section 110.10(b) through 110.10(d). The minimum solar photovoltaic system required is 2 watts per square foot of the building footprint or right-sized PV system shall be installed.

(b) Solar Zone.
1. Minimum Solar Zone Area. The solar zone shall have a minimum total area as described below. The solar zone shall comply with access, pathway, smoke ventilation, and spacing requirements as specified in Title 24, Part 9 or other Parts of Title 24 or in any requirements adopted by a local jurisdiction. The solar
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zone total area shall be comprised of areas that have no dimension less than five feet and are no less than 80 square feet each for buildings with roof areas less than or equal to 10,000 square feet or no less than 160 square feet each for buildings with roof areas greater than 10,000 square feet.

A. Single Family Residences. The solar zone shall be located on the roof or overhang of the building and have a total area no less than 250 square feet.

Exception 1 to Section 110.10(b)1A: Single family residences with a permanently installed domestic solar water-heating system meeting the installation criteria specified in the Reference Residential Appendix RA4 and with a minimum solar savings fraction of 0.50.

Exception 2 to Section 110.10(b)1A: Single family residences with three habitable stories or more and with a total floor area less than or equal to 2000 square feet and having a solar zone total area no less than 150 square feet.

Exception 3 to Section 110.10(b)1A: Single family residences located in the Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Area as defined in Title 24, Part 2 and having a whole house fan and having a solar zone total area no less than 150 square feet.

Exception 4 to Section 110.10(b)1A: Buildings with a designated solar zone area that is no less than 50 percent of the potential solar zone area. The potential solar zone area is the total area of any low-sloped roofs where the annual solar access is 70 percent or greater and any steep-sloped roofs oriented between 90 degrees and 300 degrees of true north where the annual solar access is 70 percent or greater. Solar access is the ratio of solar insolation including shade to the solar insolation without shade. Shading from obstructions located on the roof or any other part of the building shall not be included in the determination of annual solar access.

Exception 5 to Section 110.10(b)1A: Single family residences having a solar zone total area no less than 150 square feet and where all thermostats are demand responsive controls and comply with Section 110.12(a), and are capable of receiving and responding to Demand Response Signals prior to granting of an occupancy permit by the enforcing agency.

Exception 6 to Section 110.10(b)1A: Single family residences meeting the following conditions:

A. All thermostats are demand responsive controls that comply with Section 110.12(a), and are capable of receiving and responding to Demand Response Signals prior to granting of an occupancy permit by the enforcing agency.

B. Comply with one of the following measures:

i. Install a dishwasher that meets or exceeds the ENERGY STAR Program requirements with a refrigerator that meets or exceeds the ENERGY STAR Program requirements, a whole
house fan driven by an electronically commutated motor, or an SAE J1772 Level 2 Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE or EV Charger) with a minimum of 40 amperes; or

ii. Install a home automation system capable of, at a minimum, controlling the appliances and lighting of the dwelling and responding to demand response signals; or

iii. Install alternative plumbing piping to permit the discharge from the clothes washer and all showers and bathtubs to be used for an irrigation system in compliance with the California Plumbing Code and any applicable local ordinances; or

iv. Install a rainwater catchment system designed to comply with the California Plumbing Code and any applicable local ordinances, and that uses rainwater flowing from at least 65 percent of the available roof area.

B. Low-rise and High-rise Multifamily Buildings, Hotel/Motel Occupancies, and Nonresidential Buildings. The solar zone shall be located on the roof or overhang of the building or on the roof or overhang of another permitted structure located within 250 feet of the building or on covered parking installed with the building project, and shall have a total area no less than 15 percent of the total roof area of the building excluding any skylight area. The solar zone requirement is applicable to the entire building, including mixed occupancy.

Exception 1 to Section 110.10(b)1B: High-rise Multifamily Buildings, Hotel/Motel Occupancies, and Nonresidential Buildings with a permanently installed solar electric system having a nameplate DC power rating, measured under Standard Test Conditions, of no less than one watt per square foot of roof area.

Exception 2 to Section 110.10(b)1B: High-rise multifamily buildings, hotel/motel occupancies with a permanently installed domestic solar water-heating system complying with Section 150.1(c)8Biii and an additional collector area of 40 square feet.

Exception 3 to Section 110.10(b)1B: Buildings with a designated solar zone area that is no less than 50 percent of the potential solar zone area. The potential solar zone area is the total area of any low-sloped roofs where the annual solar access is 70 percent or greater and any steep-sloped roofs oriented between 90 degrees and 300 degrees of true north where the annual solar access is 70 percent or greater. Solar access is the ratio of solar insolation including shade to the solar insolation without shade. Shading from obstructions located on the roof or any other part of the building shall not be included in the determination of annual solar access.

Exception 4 to Section 110.10(b)1B: Low-rise and high-rise multifamily buildings with thermostats in each dwelling unit that are demand response controls in compliance with Section 110.12(a) and are capable of receiving and responding to Demand Response Signals prior to granting of an
occupancy permit by the enforcing agency. In addition, either A or B below:

A. In each dwelling unit, comply with one of the following measures:
   i. Install a dishwasher that meets or exceeds the ENERGY STAR Program requirements with either a refrigerator that meets or exceeds the ENERGY STAR Program requirements or a whole house fan driven by an electronically commutated motor; or
   ii. Install a home automation system that complies with Section 110.12(a) and is capable of, at a minimum, controlling the appliances and lighting of the dwelling and responding to demand response signals; or
   iii. Install alternative plumbing piping to permit the discharge from the clothes washer and all showers and bathtubs to be used for an irrigation system in compliance with the California Plumbing Code and any applicable local ordinances; or
   iv. Install a rainwater catchment system designed to comply with the California Plumbing Code and any applicable local ordinances, and that uses rainwater flowing from at least 65 percent of the available roof area.

B. Comply with Title 24, Part 11, Section A4.106.8.2 requirements for electric vehicle charging spaces.

Exception 5 to Section 110.10(b): Buildings where the roof is designed and approved to be used for vehicular traffic or parking or for a heliport.

Exception 6 to Section 110.10(b): Vegetative roofs covering 35 percent of the roof area or greater, meeting all relevant code requirements including considerations for wind, fire, and structural loads.

Exception 7 to Section 110.10(b): Performance equivalency approved by the Building Official.

2. Azimuth. All sections of the solar zone located on steep-sloped roofs shall be oriented between 90 degrees and 300 degrees of true north.


   A. No obstructions, including but not limited to, vents, chimneys, architectural features, and roof mounted equipment, shall be located in the solar zone.

   B. Any obstruction, located on the roof or any other part of the building that projects above a solar zone shall be located at least twice the distance, measured in the horizontal plane, of the height difference between the highest point of the obstruction and the horizontal projection of the nearest point of the solar zone, measured in the vertical plane.
Exception to Section 110.10(b): Any roof obstruction, located on the roof or any other part of the building, that is oriented north of all points on the solar zone.

C. The solar zone needs to account for shading from obstructions that may impact the area required in 110.10(b)1B. When determined by the Building Official that conditions exist where excessive shading occurs and solar zones cannot be met, a performance equivalency approved by the Building Official may be used as an alternative.

4. Structural Design Loads on Construction Documents. For areas of the roof designated as solar zone, the structural design loads for roof dead load and roof live load shall be clearly indicated on the construction documents.

   Note: Section 110.10(b)4 does not require the inclusion of any collateral loads for future solar energy systems.

(c) Interconnection Pathways.

   1. The construction documents shall indicate a location reserved for inverters and metering equipment and a pathway reserved for routing of conduit from the solar zone to the point of interconnection with the electrical service.
   
   2. For single family residences and central water-heating systems, the construction documents shall indicate a pathway for routing of plumbing from the solar zone to the water-heating system.

   (d) Documentation. A copy of the construction documents or a comparable document indicating the information from Sections 110.10(b) through 110.10(c) shall be provided to the occupant.

   (e) Main electrical service panel.

   1. The main electrical service panel shall have a minimum bus bar rating of 200 amps.

   2. The main electrical service panel shall have a reserved space to allow for the installation of a double pole circuit breaker for a future solar electric installation. The reserved space shall be permanently marked as “For Future Solar Electric”.

SECTION 3: San Carlos Municipal Code Section 15.04.125 - Title 24, Part 11, California Green Building Standards, is hereby amended as follows (new language is shown with bold underline. Removed language is shown in strikethrough):

Sec. 9.256 – SECTION 202 OF THE GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS CODE AMENDED:

(EV) Ready Space”, “Electric Vehicle Charging Station (EVSC)”, and “Automated Load Management System (ALMS)” to read as follows:

**ELECTRIC VEHICLE (EV) CAPABLE.** A listed electrical panel with sufficient capacity to provide a minimum 20 amperes to a designated charging space. Raceways from the electrical panel to the charging space(s) shall be installed to a charging space(s) only in locations that will be inaccessible in the future, either underground or where penetrations through walls, floors, or other partitions would otherwise be required for future installation of branch circuits. Raceways shall be at least 1” diameter and may be sized for multiple circuits as allowed by the California Electrical Code. The electric panel circuit directory shall identify the overcurrent protection device space(s) reserved for EV charging as “EV CAPABLE.” Construction documents shall identify the location of the raceway from the panel to the charging space.

**LEVEL 1 ELECTRIC VEHICLE (EV) READY SPACE.** A complete electric circuit with a minimum 20-ampere capacity, including electrical panel capacity, overcurrent protection device, a minimum 1” diameter raceway that may include multiple circuits as allowed by the California Electrical Code, conductors, and either a) a receptacle, labelled “Electric Vehicle Outlet” with a minimum ½” font, adjacent to the parking space, or b) electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE).

**LEVEL 2 ELECTRIC VEHICLE (EV) READY SPACE.** A complete electric circuit with a minimum 208/240 Volt, 40-ampere capacity, including electrical panel capacity, overcurrent protection device, a minimum 1” diameter raceway that may include multiple circuits as allowed by the California Electrical Code, conductors, and either a) a receptacle, labelled “Electric Vehicle Outlet” with a minimum ½” font, adjacent to the parking space, or b) electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) with a minimum output of 30 amperes.

**ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING STATION (EVCS).** One or more electric vehicle charging spaces that include the installation of electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) with a minimum capacity of 30 amperes connected to a circuit serving a Level 2 EV Space. EVCS installation may be used to satisfy a Level 2 EV Ready Space requirement.

**AUTOMATIC LOAD MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (ALMS).** A control system that allows multiple EV chargers or EV-Ready electric vehicle outlets to share an electrical circuit and automatically reduce power at each charger. ALMS systems must be designed to deliver at least 1.4kW to each EV Capable, EV Ready, or EVCS space served by the ALMS. The connected amperage on-site shall not be lower than the required connected amperage per Part 11, 2019 California Green Building Code for the relevant building types.

**SECTION 4**
**RESIDENTIAL MANDATORY MEASURES**

Sec. 9.257. – **SECTION 4.106.4 OF THE GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS CODE AMENDED:**

Section 4.106.4 of the Green Building Standards Code is amended to read as follows:
4.106.4 Electric vehicle (EV) charging for new construction. New construction and shall comply with Sections 4.106.4.1, 4.106.4.2, or 4.106.4.3 to facilitate future installation and use of EV chargers. Electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) shall be installed in accordance with the California Electrical Code, Article 625.

Exceptions:
1. Where there is no commercial power supply
2. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADU)
3. Spaces accessible only by automated mechanical car parking systems are excepted from providing EV charging infrastructure.
4. Where there is evidence substantiating that meeting the requirements will alter the local utility infrastructure design requirements on the utility side of the meter so as to increase the utility side cost by more than $400 per dwelling unit for residential buildings that entirely consist of either affordable rental units, defined as units rented at an amount consistent with the maximum rent levels for a housing development that receives an allocation of state or federal low-income housing tax credits from the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee. Residential developments meeting the above definition must have Inclusionary Housing Plan that is approved by the Housing Division pursuant to Section 18.37.090. If costs are found to exceed this level, the applicant shall provide EV infrastructure up to a level that would not exceed this cost for utility service or on-site transformer capacity.

Sec. 9.258. – SECTION 4.106.4.1 OF THE GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS CODE AMENDED:

Section 4.106.4.1 of the Green Building Standards Code is amended to read as follows:

4.106.4.1 New one- and two-family dwellings, town- houses with attached private garages. For each dwelling unit, install a Level 2 EV Ready Space and Level 1 EV Ready Space.

Exception: For each dwelling unit with only one parking space, install a Level 2 EV Ready Space.

4.106.4.1.1 Identification. The raceway termination location shall be permanently and visibly marked as “Level 2 EV-Ready”.

Sec. 9.259. – SECTION 4.106.4.2 OF THE GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS CODE AMENDED:

4.106.4.2 New multifamily dwellings. The following requirements apply to all new multifamily dwellings. Up to, and no more than, two dwelling unit parking spaces shall share access to one EV Ready Circuit that is within 3 feet of each parking space:
1. 10% of the dwelling units with parking space(s) shall be provided with at least one Level 2 EV Ready Space. Calculations for the required minimum number of Level 2 EV Ready spaces shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number.

2. In addition, each of the remaining dwelling units with parking space(s) shall be provided with at least a Level 1 EV Ready Space.

Notes:
1. ALMS may be installed to decrease electrical services and transformer capacity associated with EV Charging Equipment subject to review of the authority having jurisdiction.

2. Installation of Level 2 EV Ready Spaces above the minimum number required level may offset the minimum number Level 1 EV Ready Spaces required on a 1:1 basis.

3. The requirements apply to multifamily buildings with parking spaces including: a) assigned or leased to individual dwelling units, and b) unassigned residential parking.

4. The City of San Carlos may consider allowing exceptions, on a case by case basis, if a building permit applicant provides documentation detailing that an increased cost of utility service or on-site transformer capacity would exceed an average of $4,500 among charging spaces with Level 2 EV Ready Spaces and Level 1 EV Ready Spaces. If costs are found to exceed this level, the applicant shall provide EV infrastructure up to a level that would not exceed this cost for utility service or on-site transformer capacity.

Sec. 9.260. – SECTION 4.106.4.2.2 OF THE GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS CODE AMENDED:

Section 4.106.4.2.2 of the Green Building Standards Code is amended to read as follows:

4.106.4.2.2 Electric vehicle charging space (EV space) dimensions. Refer to the City of San Carlos Planning and Building Department Zoning Regulations for parking space dimension requirements.

SECTION 5
NONRESIDENTIAL MANDATORY MEASURES

Sec. 9.261. – SECTION 5.106.5.3 OF THE GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS CODE AMENDED:

Section 5.106.5.3 of the Green Building Standards Code is amended to read as follows:

5.106.5.3 Electric vehicle (EV) charging. [N] Construction shall comply with Section 5.106.5.3.1 or Section 5.106.5.3.2 to facilitate future installation and use of EV chargers of electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE). When EVSE(s) is/are installed, it shall be in accordance with the California Building Code, the California Electrical Code and as follows:

Exceptions:
1. Where there is no commercial power supply.
2. Spaces accessible only by automated mechanical car parking systems are excepted from providing EV charging infrastructure.

5.106.5.3.1 Office buildings: In nonresidential new construction buildings designated primarily for office use with parking:

1. When 10 or more parking spaces are constructed, 10% of the available parking spaces on site shall be equipped with Level 2 EVCS;
2. An additional 10% shall be provided with at least Level 1 EV Ready Spaces; and
3. An additional 30% shall be at least EV Capable.

Calculations for the required minimum number of spaces equipped with Level 2 EVCS, Level 1 EV Ready spaces and EV Capable spaces shall all be rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Construction plans and specifications shall demonstrate that all raceways shall be a minimum of 1” and sufficient for installation of EVCS at all required Level 1 EV Ready and EV Capable spaces; Electrical calculations shall substantiate the design of the electrical system to include the rating of equipment and any on-site distribution transformers, and have sufficient capacity to simultaneously charge EVs at all required EV spaces including Level 1 EV Ready and EV Capable spaces; and service panel or subpanel(s) shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate the required number of dedicated branch circuit(s) for the future installation of the EVSE.

Note:
1. ALMS may be installed to increase the number of EV chargers or the amperage or voltage beyond the minimum requirements in this code. The option does not allow for installing less electrical panel capacity than would be required without ALMS.

5.106.5.3.2 Other nonresidential buildings: In nonresidential new construction buildings that are not designated primarily for office use, such as retail or institutional uses:

1. When 10 or more parking spaces are constructed, 6% of the available parking spaces on site shall be equipped with Level 2 EVCS;
2. An additional 5% shall be at least Level 1 EV Ready.

Calculations for the required minimum number of spaces equipped with Level 2 EVCS and Level 1 EV Ready spaces shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Exception: Installation of each Direct Current Fast Charger with the capacity to provide at least 80 kW output may substitute for 6 Level 2 EVCS and 5 EV Ready spaces after a minimum of 6 Level 2 EVCS and 5 Level 1 EV Ready spaces are installed.
5.106.5.3.3 Clean Air Vehicle Parking Designation. EVCS qualify as designated parking as described in Section 5.106.5.2 Designated parking for clean air vehicles.

Notes:
2. See Vehicle Code Section 22511 for EV charging spaces signage in off-street parking facilities and for use of EV charging spaces.
4. Section 11B-812 of the California Building Code requires that a facility providing EVCS for public and common use also provide one or more accessible EVCS as specified in Table 11B-228.3.2.1.
5. It is encouraged that for shared parking, EV Ready Spaces are designated as “EV preferred.”

5.106.5.3.4 [N] Identification. The raceway termination location shall be permanently and visibly marked as “EV Ready”.

SECTION 4: Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, and section by section, and does hereby declare that any provisions on this Ordinance are severable and, if for any reason any sentence, paragraph or section of this Ordinance shall be held invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining parts of this Ordinance.

SECTION 5: Effective. Pursuant to Section 36937 of the Government Code of the State of California, this Ordinance shall take effect and be in full force and effect thirty (30) days after its final passage and upon approval by the California Energy Commission, whichever is later.

SECTION 6: Publication. The City Clerk shall cause this Ordinance to be published and posted in accordance with the requirements of Section 36933 of the Government Code of the State of California.

* * * *

I, City Clerk Crystal Mui, hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance was introduced by the City Council of the City of San Carlos on the 25th day of January, 2021 and passed and adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on ____ day of _______, 2021, by the following vote:

AYES, COUNCIL MEMBERS: ________________________________________________________________
NOES, COUNCIL MEMBERS: ________________________________

ABSENT, COUNCIL MEMBERS: ________________________________

ABSTAIN, COUNCIL MEMBERS: ________________________________

CITY CLERK of the City of San Carlos

APPROVED:

MAYOR of the City of San Carlos
### Proposed Energy Code and Green Building Code Amendments

#### Energy Code Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Single Family and ADU**         | • Require all-electric building including space heating, water heating, and clothes drying.  
• Pre-wiring for electric appliances where gas appliances are used.  
• 2 watts / sq. ft. of the building footprint or right-sized PV solar system installed. | • Cooking appliances and fireplaces                  |
| **Low Rise Residential (3 stories or less)** | • Require all-electric building including space heating, water heating, and clothes drying.  
• Pre-wiring for electric appliances where gas appliances are used.  
• 2 watts / sq. ft. of the building footprint or right-sized PV solar system installed. | • Cooking appliances and fireplaces                  |
| **High Rise Residential (4 or more stories)** | • Require all-electric building including space heating, water heating, and clothes drying.  
• Pre-wiring for electric appliances where gas appliances are used.  
• 2 watts / sq. ft. of the building footprint or right-sized PV solar system installed. | • Cooking appliances and fireplaces                  |
| **Commercial Buildings (excluding office use)** | • Require all-electric building including space heating, water heating, and clothes drying.  
• Pre-wiring for electric appliances where gas appliances are used.  
• 2 watts / sq. ft. of the building footprint or right-sized PV solar system installed. | • For-profit restaurant open to the public or an employee kitchen may use natural gas for cooking. |
| **Commercial Buildings (with office use)** | • Require all-electric building including space heating, water heating, and clothes drying. | • For-profit restaurant open to the public or an employee kitchen may use natural gas for cooking. |
• Pre-wiring for electric appliances where gas appliances are used.
• 2 watts / sq. ft. of the building footprint or right-sized PV solar system installed.
• use natural gas for cooking.
• Scientific lab buildings may utilize a non-electric space conditioning system with third party verification.

## Green Building Code Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family and ADU</td>
<td>• Install one Level 2 Circuit</td>
<td>• ADU’s are exempt entirely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install one Level 1 Circuit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low &amp; High Rise Residential</td>
<td>• Install Level 2 Circuit at 10% of units</td>
<td>• Multifamily buildings with 100% affordable housing units are exempt from costs above $400 per unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install Level 1 Circuit at 90% of units and allow sharing between 2 units</td>
<td>• Parking spaces only accessible by mechanical parking systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Buildings (excluding office use)</td>
<td>• Install Level 2 EV Charging Stations at 6% of parking spaces</td>
<td>• Parking spaces only accessible by mechanical parking systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install Level 1 Circuits at 5% of parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(One DC Fast Charger may substitute six Level 2 Chargers and 5 Level 1 Circuits if a minimum number of stations have been installed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Buildings (with office use)</td>
<td>• Install Level 2 EV Charging Stations at 10% of parking spaces</td>
<td>• Parking spaces only accessible by mechanical parking systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Install Level 1 Circuit at 10% of parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 30% of parking spaces to be at least EV Capable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Survey Results

Survey respondents’ self-identification. Respondents were allowed to select more than one option.

86 registered responses support or opposition of each reach code component.
Survey results from 18 respondents who are planning to move or rebuild an existing home.

Level of familiarity with induction stoves based on support or opposition to the gas cooking exception.

Most frequently shared opinions of those who opposed the reach code requirements include:

- The electrification of buildings resulting in increased vulnerability to PG&E blackouts or Public Safety Power Shutoffs.
- Possible increasing costs to new construction.
- Natural gas is clean.
- General preference for gas appliances.

Most frequently shared opinions of those who supported the reach code requirements include:

- Mitigating climate change by reducing local emissions of greenhouse gasses.
- Improved indoor air quality and safety of all-electric buildings.
Survey Questions

QUESTION 1
Check all options that apply to you:

• San Carlos Resident
• Work in San Carlos
• Environmental Advocate
• Developer/Designer/Architect
• Contractor
• Local Business Owner
• Other

QUESTION 2
If you are a San Carlos resident, do you have any plans to move into a newly built home or do a 50% rebuild of an existing home?

• Yes
• No
• Not applicable

QUESTION 3
Do you support the City of San Carlos adopting building codes to require new construction of residential and non-residential buildings be all-electric to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? Why or why not?

QUESTION 4
Other cities that have adopted similar building codes have included exceptions to allow gas infrastructure for home cooking appliances and fireplaces. Do you support this exception here in San Carlos?

QUESTION 5
How familiar are you with induction cook stoves? (1=not familiar, 5=very familiar)?

Row choices
• Induction Stove Familiarity:

Column choices
• 1
• 2
• 3
• 4
• 5

QUESTION 6
Do you support requiring substantial home rebuilds where 50% of the existing foundation or walls are replaced to be rebuilt as all-electric?

QUESTION 7
Do you support requiring newly constructed buildings to have rooftop solar?

QUESTION 8
Do you support requiring new construction to include infrastructure for future electric vehicle charging?

QUESTION 9
Do you have any other thoughts on this topic you would like to share?
**Individual Registered Responses**

**Name not shown**  
inside SAN CARLOS  
November 16, 2020,  3:47 PM

**Question 1**
- San Carlos Resident  
- Environmental Advocate

**Question 2**
- No

**Question 3**
Yes, I support this as well as applying it to major remodels. Without electrification of our buildings, we will be putting in place, with each new building, continued carbon emissions for decades to come. We cannot successfully solve our climate change crisis without taking this step. As it is, without upgrading remodels to electric, given the small amount of new housing in San Carlos, it will be insufficient to adequately reduce our emissions.

**Question 4**
No. Transitioning away from fossil fuel energy is going to require that we all make some changes and sacrifices. This decision cannot be one made from a personal perspective. We must look at this from the whole of humanity. If I have to give up my gas stove and fireplace, that is a small sacrifice to make for the future that my grandchildren will inherit.

**Question 5**
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 4

**Question 6**
Yes. Again, if we want to truly tackle this issue, we need to make these changes. They seem large, but they aren’t really, once we recognize the reality of what it means. Induction stoves are more precise than gas and once turned off the surface is no longer hot. The technology works by using magnetic coils to create heat in the metal cookware. Gas emits methane and creates inferior air quality in the kitchen. We should all be switching out our appliances once they no longer work. There is no reason to continue burning gas when electric alternatives are readily available and effective and competitively priced.

**Question 7**
Yes.

**Question 8**
Absolutely!

**Question 9**
Our buildings use 1/3 of the world’s energy. Our climate crisis is serious. We can make a serious dent in carbon emissions by shifting away from natural gas and other fossil fuels in our homes and buildings. Our local municipalities have an obligation to protect its residents and keep us safe. While the climate crisis is not contained within city boundaries, every municipality must do its part to reduce emissions to protect our health and our safety. Thank you for polling our community on this. I hope the decisions made from this survey are made from the perspective of what serves our community best, not necessarily by whether it is popular.

---

**Kate MacKay**  
outside City Limits  
November 17, 2020,  4:44 AM

**Question 1**
- Other - Former resident and business owner

**Question 2**
- Not applicable

**Question 3**
Electric heat is extremely inefficient. Heat pumps are efficient but don’t work well outside specific temperature ranges. We removed our hybrid electric water heater due to cold winter showers and went back to gas.

**Question 4**
Stop being ridiculous. Heat is the priority. What about blackouts? No fire and no electricity? We have a wood fireplace as a backup.

**Question 5**
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

**Question 6**
No
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
I tried this. It isn’t feasible in this state. You are going to have to provide back up generators run by gas to ensure there is heat and a way to cook during blackouts.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 4:49 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No for residences but yes for corporations. I think having incentives for this are good but requiring this is not necessary. I suggest no because I know the city of Berkeley requires this and there are some significant costs associated with this that should be explored and shared with residents before voting.

Question 4
What about water heaters? Does biotech need gas?

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
No

Question 7
No

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
Yes

No. This is an easy install later if needed. To require this is unesry.

Encouraging and supporting environmentally friendly codes is good but balancing requirements that are exclusionary and environment consciousness is also important. Be sure to research the negative impacts of having requirements from a city like Berkeley. Also, keep in mind residents vs corporations. I would say yes to corporate developer to everything above but would say no to much of it for residences.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 5:52 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Work in San Carlos

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No. Natural gas has its place in the energy mix. San Carlos should require all new construction to have rooftop solar.

Question 4
Yes

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
No

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
No
Kate Wormington
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 7:28 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
I think we can be smart about where we allow gas without being draconian or reducing quality of life.

Question 4
Yes. This would strike the perfect balance.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
No.

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Okay, but not at the expense of handicapped parking places.

Question 9
Easy does it my friends. It's okay to be progressive but don't jump down the rabbit hole. EVERYTHING has consequences!!

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 7:31 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No. I love my gas cook top and the fact that it works during a power outage. I can fix dinner or a cup of tea when the house is all dark.

Question 4
I guess so as long as it isn't attached to other things. This is a good option.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 1

Question 6
No

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Okay, but not at the expense of handicapped parking places.

Question 9
Easy does it my friends. It's okay to be progressive but don't jump down the rabbit hole. EVERYTHING has consequences!!
**All-Electric Reach Codes**

Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

### Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity: 2

### Question 6
Not sure. Seems expensive, particularly if you are just trying to replace an existing home that burned or was damaged in an earthquake.

### Question 7
No. I don’t think it’s always workable/effective. What if you have lots of big trees? Again, I support financial incentives.

### Question 8
Maybe. Would need to learn more.

### Question 9
No response

---

**Name not shown**
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 7:46 AM

### Question 1
- San Carlos Resident
- Work in San Carlos
- Environmental Advocate

### Question 2
- Yes

### Question 3
No, because I feel that the electrical grid should first be improved to be able to handle the additional surge.

### Question 4
Yes

### Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity: 2

### Question 6
No

### Question 7
No - these changes will exacerbate the exorbitant cost of living in San Carlos, pricing out the average family and making the city an enclave of the rich.

### Question 8
No - these changes will exacerbate the exorbitant cost of living in San Carlos, pricing out the average family and making the city an enclave of the rich.

### Question 9
No response

---

**Name not shown**
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 7:47 AM

### Question 1
- San Carlos Resident

### Question 2
- Yes

### Question 3
No - these changes will exacerbate the exorbitant cost of living in San Carlos, pricing out the average family and making the city an enclave of the rich.

### Question 4
I don’t support any changes to the existing code.

### Question 5
No response

### Question 6
No - these changes will exacerbate the exorbitant cost of living in San Carlos, pricing out the average family and making the city an enclave of the rich.

### Question 7
No - these changes will exacerbate the exorbitant cost of living in San Carlos, pricing out the average family and making the city an enclave of the rich.

### Question 8
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

No - these changes will exacerbate the exorbitant cost of living in San Carlos, pricing out the average family and making the city an enclave of the rich.

Question 9
The town council in San Carlos should put the interests of its citizens first, and should not be swayed by the agenda of a rich elite, which would exacerbate our housing crisis.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 7:47 AM

Question 1
- San Carlos Resident

Question 2
- Yes

Question 3
No. Natural gas is a cheap and clean form of energy. Electric only buildings will encourage people into more did burning for heat. This is counter productive to reducing emissions.

Question 4
What about water heaters and dryers? No this is a over reach. Building codes should address building safety.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 4

Question 6
No

Question 7
No

Question 8
No

Question 9
Building codes should regulate for safety. They should not be used to compel people into adding things they don't want it can't afford. This will drive up the cost of rebuilding which will make it harder it impossible for the poor. During this time of economic upheaval we shouldn't be increasing the burden most felt by they poor.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 8:22 AM
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

Question 1  
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2  
• No

Question 3  
No. Gas is essential for the home cook. On top of that it is less expensive than electricity.

Question 4  
Yes, but still do not support new buildings to be all electric.

Question 5  
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6  
No

Question 7  
No

Question 8  
No

Question 9  
The infrastructure for all electric is not there yet. Do not force the issue until it is reliable.

Name not shown  
inside SAN CARLOS  
November 17, 2020,  8:29 AM

Question 1  
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2  
• No

Question 3  
No. Unfair financial burden to new builders AND increased drain on inadequate electric grid.

Question 4  
If passed then yes.

Question 5  
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
All-Electric Reach Codes
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No

Question 7
No

Question 8
No

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 8:46 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
No - recent power outages have shown that California's mismanaged power grid can not fulfill the demand for electricity. Removing natural gas is foolish.

Question 4
No - what about an exemption for home heating?

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
yes

Question 7
yes

Question 8
yes

Question 9
No response

Maeve Knoth
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 8:50 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Absolutely. We have to do everything (even the painful things) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Question 4
No

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 4

Question 6
yes

Question 7
yes

Question 8
yes

Question 9
No response

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 8:50 AM

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Question 9

Natural economic forces, not government intervention, should drive this decision.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• San Carlos Resident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depends on how code is written. Concerns are mainly cost to homeowners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Induction Stove Familiarity:: 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - absolutely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switching to all electric household and the increasing use of EVs will put significant stress on the Electric Grid. We have to solve issues like Power Outages in California, before we can take this route.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Name not shown**
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 8:52 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• San Carlos Resident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. It is way past time to consider the planet on which we live. We are a paying a high price to live in a polluted world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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No. It's pollution and we already have plenty of that. It lowers the quality of life for everyone.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 1

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes. Yes.

Question 9
An aggressive approach to building out bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure.

Mark Peasley
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 9:10 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Local Business Owner

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No. Gas is very cost effective for water heaters, furnaces, clothes dryers, and cooktops. It’s a waste of money and effectiveness to only allow electric.

Question 4
Yes, but furnaces and clothes dryers are most effective with gas too.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
No

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 9:10 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No. Gas is very cost effective for water heaters, furnaces, clothes dryers, and cooktops. It’s a waste of money and effectiveness to only allow electric.

Question 4
Yes, but furnaces and clothes dryers are most effective with gas too.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
Absolutely not.

Question 7
Absolutely not.

Question 8
Question 9

The city council needs to spend its time on public safety, improving the roads and ingress/egress to the highways and improving the local economy which has been crushed by Covid and lockdowns.

Adam Kates
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 9:37 AM

Question 1

• San Carlos Resident
• Developer/Designer/Architect

Question 2

• No

Question 3

Not yet. While I strongly support initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we have to first resolve the fundamental reliability issues with our electric grid before mandating our way to much greater demand for electricity.

Question 4

Yes.

Question 5

Induction Stove Familiarity: 2

Question 6

No

Question 7

No

Question 8

Yes. EV charging infrastructure is not expensive when included with the new build and anticipates the continuation of a trend toward electric vehicles.

Question 9

Rather than mandating all electric buildings with rooftop solar, the City should offer incentives to builders to encourage these desired outcomes while preserving the natural gas option for those who value it most.

Nahid Varjavand
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 9:37 AM

Question 1

• San Carlos Resident
• Environmental Advocate

Question 2

• No

Question 3

Yes. We must do everything in our power to meet greenhouse emissions goals in the next decade, or face climate catastrophe.

Question 4

No

Question 5

Induction Stove Familiarity: 5

Question 6

Yes

Question 7

Yes, we surprisingly missed our opportunity for that in the last developments on El Camino and we should not make that error again.

Question 8

Yes

Question 9

I’m happy to see this survey and wholeheartedly support and would canvass for these changes.

susan vogel
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 9:48 AM

Question 1  
• San Carlos Resident  
• Developer/Designer/Architect

Question 2  
• Yes

Question 3  
Yes. Important to the environment

Question 4  
Yes for Gas stoves, BBQ and Fireplaces. Every and Any decent Cook loves the control that a Gas stove offers. It is so much better than people burning wood in their Fireplaces, indoors and out!!!

Question 5  
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 2

Question 6  
Yes

Question 7  
No. Solar panels create so-called “dirty electricity” (extra harmonics) on our power lines. When solar panel installation includes devices to remove the extra harmonics (they generally don’t now), then I would support a requirement for rooftop solar.

Question 8  
No.

Question 9  
No response

Name not shown inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 10:01 AM

Question 1  
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2  
• No
All-Electric Reach Codes
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Question 3
No. The Grid isn’t 100% reliable, and both the state and PG&E have financing problems which limit their ability to upgrade it fully. I think it’s best to maintain resilience with various systems.

Question 4
Yes, however I would also add an exception for gas *backup* furnaces and things like pool, hot tub and sauna heaters since The Grid won’t be 100% reliable for a long time.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 2

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
No response

Name not shown inside SAN CARLOS November 17, 2020, 10:20 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes, as part of a concerted effort to limit the impact of climate change.

Question 4
No, the shift away from fossil fuel should be total and irreversible.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 1

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
No response

Name not shown inside SAN CARLOS November 17, 2020, 10:09 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes. The elimination of fossil fuels for heating and cooking will be one of the most important steps we can take in mitigating climate change at the community level. We are in the process of replacing our gas furnace with a heat pump.

Question 4
No. Fireplaces are wastes of wall space. Burning gas in them without producing much useful heat is worse than a gas furnace. While my wife swears by gas cooking it is what she is used to, and induction cooking is
All-Electric Reach Codes
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better for indoor air quality.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
No. The local infrastructure must be studied before this is considered. For our remodeled home PG&E needed to add an additional transformer to cover our streets usage before connecting our home. They told me the transformer on the street was at capacity and must be replaced. Imagine how many streets are just like Sunnydale Ave.

Question 7
Possibly, but again PG&E does not have the infrastructure to handle this. Understanding how this will impact the electric infrastructure is critical before adopting such a plan.

Question 8
Possibly, but again PG&E does not have the infrastructure to handle this. Understanding how this will impact the electric infrastructure is critical before adopting such a plan.

Question 9
Please make a measured choice and do not rush into something since another City has already done it. Of course we should care for the environment at all opportunity. We can do this efficiently and with less impact to our neighbors if we are diligent in discovering the impact with such policies.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 10:26 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
I do not support adopting this resolution. We have experienced rolling black outs recently. This has many causes and one is PG&E reliance on renewables. Furthermore as more and more people decide to move to electric cars the local electric demand will increase. This is going to cause even further problems as PG&E’s equipment in many instances is at or near capacity. We found this out very recently which prevented us from moving back into our remodeled home.

Question 4
I absolutely agree to adopt these exceptions. Another which should be considered is exempting heaters for pools. The natural gas powered heaters are far more efficient than electric and this would be a costly burden for homeowners.

Raciel DePalma
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 10:28 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
We cannot except as more and more we have shut downs by PG&E. Electric is very expensive compared to gas and thirdly, we cannot burn wood in our fireplace as required. as well.

Question 4
Yes, I do support that. All electric is very costly, not reliable as of now with our many shut downs by PG&E. shows us. Gas is reliable A propane tank was all I had when we were shut out of PG&E for three days and I have an all electric stove and oven.

**Question 5**
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 1

**Question 6**
No, look at how many years we have made it without this. At this time of crisis (Pandemic) who has the money to back these costly things. Even after my question is Keep your options.

**Question 7**
Yes, I do agree with that. A city in El Dorado county has a huge housing unit that was built with every home sold as new to all. That makes sense to the home buyer.

**Question 8**
No, that should be an option for one if and when Electric cars become mandatory. That seems like a long way down the road. Not until Electric cars become mandatory.

**Question 9**
Yes, I am all for Green energy. Electric the way that we get it now is not reliable anymore at least not at this time in the year 2020.

---

**Name not shown**
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 10:48 AM

**Question 1**
• San Carlos Resident
• Environmental Advocate

**Question 2**
• No

**Question 3**
Yes, to reduce GHG emissions and stimulate alternative energy methods

**Question 4**
No
All-Electric Reach Codes
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Question 8
Yes

Question 9
Right now we are stressing the grid because of a shortage of electrical generation so this proposal is ludicrous! Additionally, it was just a few years ago when environmentalists were supporting a switch from electric to gas. These kinds of mandates often come back to bite one!

Mark Bauhaus
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 11:24 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
Yes. Its imperative to urgently get carbon emissions to ZERO. No exceptions. Solutions are cost effective and often a lifestyle improvement. Let’s get on with it!!

Question 4
NO. Not necessary and you’re fiddling with the fate of our life support system. Induction cooking is better than gas (even for us amateur chef’s!). I was skeptical but then tried an induction burner and it was good! And we can find fire place alternatives. What part of climate emergency don’t we understand here??

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 11:29 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes

Question 4
No response

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes - this will be the norm in less than 10 years so EV charging should be available in all new builds or rebuilds.

Question 9
The climate emergency is totally urgent. Make education, certification, and incentive programs active for all income categories to switch to 100% renewable electric infrastructure. In fact, tax us with a bond to help do this for low income groups too. This will be MUCH cheaper than the climate wildfires and flooding that are the alternative. Let’s be a model for climate emergency ACTION!

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 11:29 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
Yes

Question 4
No response

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
No response
**All-Electric Reach Codes**
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**Name not shown**
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 11:30 AM

**Question 1**
• San Carlos Resident

**Question 2**
• No

**Question 3**
No. California has already shown that it cannot support the electricity demands it currently has. Rolling blackouts are a direct result of the state not utilizing a variety of energy sources. Having power cut off is unacceptable in 2020! Forcing all-electric buildings and homes would increase the electricity demand and make this problem even worse. Clouds and smoke days prevent sufficient solar energy production. Take a look at where most of the greenhouse gas emissions is coming from - that is where the focus should be. Not people's homes.

**Question 4**
Absolutely. But forcing solar and electric car charging infrastructure could add enough costs to prevent a project from being done in the first place. These are projects that could update homes to be more energy efficient with insulation and windows, bringing outdated codes current, etc.

**Question 5**
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 4

**Question 6**
Yes.

**Question 7**
Yes.

**Question 8**
Yes, especially as more & more electric vehicles will be built in the years ahead and fewer gasoline powered ones be allowed.

**Question 9**
No.

---

**Linda Ferreira**
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 11:37 AM

**Question 1**
• San Carlos Resident

**Question 2**
• No
Question 3
yes except for keep gas for cooking only

Question 4
yes

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
No

Question 9
No response

David Crabbe
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 12:02 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Work in San Carlos
• Environmental Advocate
• Developer/Designer/Architect
• Local Business Owner

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes. It will help the city meet its Climate Action Goals and could save the builder money that is not needed to install gas line.

Question 4
No. I've been told induction cooktops work just fine as opposed to gas and no-one today should be installing fireplaces because of fireplace air pollution

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 1

All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?
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Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes or another source of non-polluting energy such as wind or non-fossil fuel cells

Question 8
Yes including the actual 220V outlet in the garage or parking area

Question 9
Reach codes are the wave of the future and have already been adopted by several cities on the peninsula. San Carlos should follow suit. Approving a Reach code will incentivise HVAC and HWH manufacturers to continue to improve their products and lower equipment cost and incentivise installers to learn how to properly install this equipment.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 12:30 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
No

Question 4
Yes!

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
No, we want an exception for gas fireplace and cooktop.

Question 7
Yes!

Question 8
Yes!

Question 9
Yes or another source of non-polluting energy such as wind or non-fossil fuel cells

Chet Moore
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 1:20 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No...Natural gas has legitimate uses plus cost considerations. If a Home owner wants all electric, fine. For others, why not require high efficiency water/heat appliances...and why not gas fireplaces in lieu of wood burning.

Question 4
Absolutely...this allows the homeowner a reasonable choice. Add water heaters to this list. Tankless use far less gas that a tank style...are very efficient... I have one and gas bill has dropped substantially.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
No...so you are going to tear out existing lines, meter and gas appliances if foundations need to be changed...and how about a remodel that is no where near the gas appliances.

Question 7
Yes.

Question 8
Yes...efficient, and cost effective.

Question 9
No response
All-Electric Reach Codes
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How are you going to swap out 60 or 100 amp services to handle an all electric house...when the meter is not a code compliance distance from water service? This affects a lot of older I homes...Lastly, labs and restaurants need natural gas...electric wok’s....don’t think so. is issue affects a lot of older houses in SC.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 1:20 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No. Should be exception for gas cooktops for new single family homes. Electric only stove top cooking is not ideal for wok cooking or other cultural cooking styles.

Question 4
Yes.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
No. Unless exceptions to exclude cooking appliances and fireplaces.

Question 7
Yes.

Question 8
Yes,

Question 9
No response

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 2:44 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 2:02 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No
No, because much electricity burns fossil fuels and the renewable electricity is often time dependent on the time of day/weather. There is a major loss of power when renewable energy needs to be stored. Our PG&E bills have skyrocketed in recent years due to the higher cost of renewable energy and inefficiencies with respect to energy storage.

Question 4
Absolutely

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 4

Question 6
no

Question 7
no, it doesn’t make sense depending on the direction your roof slopes and nearby trees--some of which may be on other properties.

Question 8
no

Question 9
My father worked for an electric company and I lived in an all electric home. But given a ‘deep dive’ into costs and the impacts of renewable sources of electricity and the storage of it, I don’t believe it should be mandated. My son is a lithium ion battery engineer and can speak to the environmental damage done getting the materials for the batteries and recycling is not currently done.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 3:15 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
electric is unreliable and depends on nuclear

Paul Rossi
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 3:20 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No way too expensive not practical

Question 4
Gas is great for cooking & heating

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
No no no to expensive
All-Electric Reach Codes
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Question 7
No way

Question 8
No it should be up to the home owners

Question 9
Leave gas alone

Doyle Mack
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 4:02 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No, While I am sitting here typing this my wife came home from work because the power was shut off at work. Where are we going to get the electricity to power everything and charge all of the cars that have to be electric by 2035

Question 4
yes

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 1

Question 6
no

Question 7
yes but is that the answer?

Question 8
Where is this electricity going to come from?

Question 9

We don't have enough electricity now to keep our power on 24 hrs a day. How are we going to power more things with electricity?

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 5:25 PM

Question 1

• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No. Having recently remodeled a home, there are aspects that electric appliances simply cannot yet supply, such as high quality cooktops, firepits and gas grills. While I understand there are exceptions for propane, propane apparently emits even more GHGs than natural gas -- so forcing residents to use that for grills and firepits, perversely, would have a negative environmental impact. While I absolutely believe in climate change and support taking actions to combat it, San Carlos should follow California's already progressive regulations and not look to be at the absolute forefront, which would diminish quality of life and would encourage behavior with even more adverse environmental impacts as proposed. Our building codes are already more than restrictive and costly enough.

Question 4
Yes -- if it included outdoor grills and firepits, it would completely address my concerns.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
Absolutely not.

Question 7
For commercial buildings maybe, but not residential. Construction costs are already prohibitive in the area, and this would only add to the costs of housing.

Question 8
No -- I have supplied it in my own home for our electric vehicles and
All-Electric Reach Codes
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others will do so over time without the need for an additional mandate and added cost.

Question 9
Thank you very much for considering my comments.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 6:27 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes. These appliances are long lived. We need to move to electric powered devices that use energy that gets cleaner over the life of the product.

Question 4
No

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
No response

Scott Lincke
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 11:09 PM

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 17, 2020, 11:44 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
that's a great idea

Question 7
that's a great idea

Question 8
definitely

Question 9
No response
Yes, I feel that the best way to combat the enormous and pressing issue of climate change is with policies such as this.

**Question 4**  
No

**Question 5**  
Induction Stove Familiarity: 4

**Question 6**  
Yes

**Question 7**  
Yes

**Question 8**  
Yes

**Question 9**  
No response

Governments at all levels have an urgent responsibility, I believe, to encourage and invest in sustainable energy technology and products. Change is difficult, but humans have frequently had to adapt in order to progress and survive. I think it would be wonderful if San Carlos could be a model for a cleaner, healthier future.

**Name not shown**  
inside SAN CARLOS  
November 18, 2020, 6:53 AM

**Question 1**  
• San Carlos Resident

**Question 2**  
• Yes

**Question 3**  
Yes, cleaner energy

**Question 4**  
Yes

**Question 5**  
Induction Stove Familiarity: 1

**Question 6**  
Yes

**Question 7**  
Yes

**Question 8**  
Yes

**Question 9**  
No response

---

**Justin Ryan**  
inside SAN CARLOS  
November 18, 2020, 8:43 AM

**Question 1**  
• San Carlos Resident

**Question 2**  
• Yes

**Question 3**  
No. Hot water heaters are especially efficient and effective when used with natural gas.

**Question 4**  
Yes.

**Question 5**  
Induction Stove Familiarity: 5

**Question 6**  
No.

**Question 7**  
No, the state can legislate that.
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Question 8
No, adding the required circuit for charging is not the barrier to getting an EV.

Question 9
San Carlos could restrict natural gas usage to just hot water heaters and nothing else.

Dan Bauhaus
inside SAN CARLOS
November 18, 2020, 10:42 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Work in San Carlos
• Environmental Advocate

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes

Question 4
No

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
Full steam ahead with anything that reduces carbon footprint and encourages renewable energy.

Brian Morearty
inside SAN CARLOS
November 18, 2020, 10:42 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No.

Question 4
Yes.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 1

Question 6
No.

Question 7
No.

Question 8
No.

Question 9
No response

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 18, 2020, 4:21 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Environmental Advocate

Question 2
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

• No

Yes. Climate change is happening rapidly and we must take bold action to address the many issues it is affecting. Business as usual will not get us out of danger, and all-electric homes and buildings can be very effective and affordable.

Question 4

No. Exceptions like these defeat the purpose.

Question 5

Induction Stove Familiarity:: 2

Yes.

Question 6

Yes.

Question 7

Yes, unless the buildings are in a geographic area that gets no sunlight.

Question 8

Yes. Retrofitting is expensive.

Question 9

We have to severely reduce our use of fossil fuels to counteract the damage that carbon is doing to our planet. Living in all-electric homes should be seen as a sign of caring for ourselves, much like buying an electric car.

Suzanne Emerson
inside SAN CARLOS
November 18, 2020, 4:23 PM

Question 1

• Work in San Carlos
• Environmental Advocate

Question 2

• Not applicable

Question 3

Yes. Climate change is a crisis that is already exacerbating our local wildfire risk, air quality, and flooding – and headed towards being so much worse. The built environment is responsible for 37% of San Carlos greenhouse gas emissions. We need to stop building with gas, to drive that number down. All-electric equipment is readily available to serve all of the needs that gas equipment currently serves in new buildings.

Question 4

Poor Question Phrasing: The phrasing of the question creates an incorrect impression that most cities that have adopted Reach Codes have included exceptions for cooking appliances and fireplaces. In fact, the majority of the local municipalities that have adopted Reach Codes have not included such exceptions (12/21 in San Mateo, Santa Clara, and SF counties). And based on population, since San Jose and San Francisco are in the all-electric category, far more people live in local municipalities that have adopted all-electric Reach Codes than those living in municipalities with Reach Code exceptions for cooking and fireplaces. To answer the question: No, because of the indoor air quality impact of cooking with a gas stove. Studies have demonstrated associations between elevated indoor levels of nitrogen dioxide, often attributable directly to gas stove burners, and symptoms in children including chest tightness, shortness of breath, wheeze, and increased asthma attack frequency. Children living in a home with a gas stove have a 42% increased risk of current asthma. Pollution from gas stoves doubles the odds of a woman experiencing symptoms of lung disease and nearly triples the odds she will need to take asthma medication. Most people have no idea that their use of a gas stove may be directly tied to their or their child’s asthma.

Question 5

Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Yes. This type of rebuild is common in San Carlos, and includes replacement of all major building systems. That is the perfect time to go all-electric.

Question 6

Yes. New single-family homes are already required to include solar PV. Adding solar PV on multifamily and commercial rooftops at the time they are built is more cost-effective than adding it later.

Question 7

Yes. 47% of San Carlos GHG emissions are from the transportation sector. “Encourage mass transit” and “make biking appealing” are laudable goals, and goals like this have been in the City’s CAP for a decade, but our transportation emissions are higher than ever. We need to provide EV infrastructure, especially in multifamily developments and
workplaces, where individual residents and workers may have little ability to impact EV infrastructure decision-making. EV elements in a Reach Code will slowly increase the ability to plug in around town, making EV drivership more feasible.

Question 9
It is time for San Carlos to stop taking a “do only what is mandated by the State” approach. A 2018 Yale Climate Opinion survey found that in San Mateo County, 60% of people surveyed said local officials should do more to address global warming (climatecommunication.ya.e.edu) – and that was before this year’s wildfire season and Orangepocalypse. We should be joining other cities with climate leaders in taking action to aggressively reduce carbon emissions. Also, we replaced our gas stove with an induction stovetop a few years ago, and we love it. Here’s a link to a video showing how fast it boils water: https://youtu.be/9sQ9CcRNgXQ.

Bruce Nilles
outside City Limits
November 18, 2020, 4:30 PM

Question 1
• Environmental Advocate

Question 2
• Not applicable

Question 3
Yes. Reducing gas use in buildings is a critical cornerstone to clean air and a climate safe future.

Question 4
No. Infrastructure leaks a lot of methane, a potent climate pollutant. The only way to avoid this is to prohibit new gas infrastructure.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes, it is legally required I believe.

Question 8
Yes, it is so much cheaper to design all electric at the beginning.

Question 9
Thank you for providing this opportunity for input and your leadership in raising and addressing this issue.

Marco Alves
outside City Limits
November 18, 2020, 4:34 PM

Question 1
• Developer/Designer/Architect

Question 2
• Not applicable

Question 3
Yes. all-electric residential buildings are cost effective. Commercial buildings are close to being cost effective and without electrification CA cannot meet the 2045 Carbon neutrality goal, nor will the world course correct and address climate change.

Question 4
No, there is no need for these exception. Gas use in the house has been extensively shown to negatively impact indoor air quality, plus since electrification is cost effective for residential buildings there is no good reason for these exceptions.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 4

Question 6
Not a wholesale requirement, but certainly support creating incentives to drive building owners to renovate existing buildings (i.e. like PACE financing tied to real estate taxes)

Question 7
Yes, it is cost effective and generates more renewable energy for the home or grid to use.

Question 8
Yes, definitely! We know it is coming, so it is better to plan for it, cheaper this way.

**Question 9**
No response

---

**Name not shown**
outside City Limits
November 18, 2020,  4:43 PM

**Question 1**

• Developer/Designer/Architect

No response

**Question 2**

Yes, we need to reduce GHG faster rather than slower. The efficiency of the equipment is ready, and frankly we have no time to wait.

**Question 4**

No, again, there are really good electric alternatives and they are much healthier for us in general. With Covid-19 and being indoors more, it makes sense to get rid of these harmful gases.

**Question 5**

Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

**Question 6**

Yes

**Question 7**

Yes

**Question 8**

Yes

**Question 9**

We must reverse climate change, or California burns 3 months/year.

---

**Name not shown**
inside SAN CARLOS
November 18, 2020,  5:40 PM

**Question 1**

• San Carlos Resident

**Question 2**

Yes

**Question 3**

Yes

**Question 4**

No

**Question 5**

Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

**Question 6**

Yes

**Question 7**

Yes

**Question 8**

Yes

**Question 9**

We cannot do enough to help clean our environment. Time is of the essence. 2030 or 2050 may seem like a long way away, but if we don’t do it now who will? Do It for our children.
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

• No

Question 3
No

Question 4
More exceptions needed

Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 5
Yes

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
This can be added later, but is certainly useful

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
I am confused why this is taking San Carlos so very long to decide when so many other peers have been swift given the climate emergency.

Jennifer Kitt
inside SAN CARLOS
November 18, 2020, 5:46 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• Yes

Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 5
Yes. It is an urgent need and we should make sure we are acting swiftly.

Question 6
Yes

Question 8
This can be added later, but is certainly useful

Question 9
Make this advisory only - not mandatory

Dan Johnson
outside City Limits
November 18, 2020, 5:48 PM

Question 1
• Developer/Designer/Architect

Question 2
• Not applicable

Question 3
Yes. This will save money for people building or remodeling buildings, with big health and safety co-benefits. This will also make buildings more future-proof.

Question 4
No. Because by bringing gas piping into the home, the benefits of cost savings and safety are not realized. Gas cooking has a negative medical impact, this is well established. We don't give exceptions to automakers whereby some seats in the car don't have seatbelts, for personal choice

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

Question 6
No, this could force disposal of working gas equipment and increase costs. Rather, I urge you to pass a "replace-upon-burnout" ordinance to replace failed furnaces & water heaters with heat pumps; this will maximize economic benefits to San Carlos residents.

Question 7
Only in accordance with CA Energy Code, which already requires this for new homes <4 stories. I wouldn’t push it further. It’s more important for all goals discussed here to remove gas than to add more solar.

Question 8
Yes, require the electrical circuit. This is a cost savings to owners, compared to retrofitting the same circuit.

Question 9
I’m an architect and energy consultant, I have worked on projects in San Carlos, including an all-electric home. This is established technology and the hurdle is just generalized inertia against change. This is like any health & safety measure, such as restricting cigarette smoking.

Nicholas Carter
inside SAN CARLOS
November 18, 2020, 8:52 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Work in San Carlos
• Environmental Advocate
• Local Business Owner

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes, absolutely.

Question 4
No, definitely not. Induction cooktops are the superior choice for cooking and don’t have the health implications of burning gas.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
Yes.

Question 7
Yes.

Question 8
Yes.

Question 9
There are now 39+ cities and counties that have adopted this type of measure - why is San Carlos dragging its feet? It’s shameful.

Sean Armstrong
outside City Limits
November 19, 2020, 12:07 AM

Question 1
• Environmental Advocate
• Developer/Designer/Architect

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes, I consult to affordable housing developers and have seen repeatedly that adding gas to a project slows down design, permitting, inspections and occupancy, while also adding roughly $3000 per apartment. It’s really unhelpful to have gas.

Question 4
No, the natural gas delivery system has a 3%-5% leak, regardless of consumption, which more than doubles the climate change impact of burning gas--methane is a powerful greenhouse gas. Support of the delivery system is actually more harmful than burning gas, because any interconnection is the larger climate change problem.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
Yes.
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

Question 7
Yes, that's already code for residences and should be expanded to all buildings because it is profitable and dramatically lowers the building's impact on climate change.

Question 8
Yes, all-electric vehicles are already hugely popular in California, and are rapidly becoming law world-wide.

Question 9
No response

Andrew Kitt
inside SAN CARLOS
November 19, 2020, 8:50 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Work in San Carlos

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes. We need to take the climate crisis seriously at a local—and personal—level. That’s why my family has replaced our gas stove with an all-electric one, bought an electric car, and just signed a loan for rooftop solar panels. Most people won’t make moves like those unless government tips their hand with incentives and regulations on new construction.

Question 4
No. Burning gas contributes to global warming. Time to move on.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
Yes

Question 7
Yes, to reduce global warming AND helo to solve the wildfire crisis, which PG&E contributes to substantially.

Question 8
Not a charging station but enough excess capacity to handle one, which would keep a new EV owner’s investment in retrofitting to a minimum.

Question 9
No response

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 19, 2020, 10:38 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
No, I think it is a very bad idea. Our electric supply is not reliable and gas is a more effective energy source.

Question 4
I hope nothing is adopted but if it is then I support these exceptions and hope forced air heating would also be an exemption

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
No I think it is a very bad idea

Question 7
No, homes are already too expensive this would just make them more expensive. It should be at the option of the builder/owner.

Question 8
OK

Question 9
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

Natural gas is a very clean effective energy source its benefits out way the negatives. We can’t rely on our electric grid to provide consistent energy removing the use of gas makes matters worse.

Eric Sweet
outside City Limits
November 19, 2020, 1:11 PM

Question 1
• Contractor

Question 2
• Not applicable

Question 3
Yes. Better for the planet. Better for the homeowner. Gas is dangerous and unhealthy. All electric construction is the future and will generate more jobs as well

Question 4
No. Absolutely not. Cooking with a flame is dangerous - people die because of gas stoves every day. Breathing the exhaust from a gas stove is toxic and results in asthma and other issues.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
yes

Question 7
yes

Question 8
yes

Question 9
No response

David Pollack
inside SAN CARLOS
November 20, 2020, 6:14 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes.

Question 4
No.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
yes

Question 7
yes

Question 8
yes

Question 9
No response

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 22, 2020, 10:07 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Work in San Carlos

Question 2
• No
Question 3
Yes, I support all-electric new buildings as they are more economical and energy efficient, as well as safer and healthier to occupy because the absence of natural gas means better indoor air quality, reduced risk of fire or explosion, and no threat of broken gas pipes to worry about in an earthquake or fire.

Question 4
No, the future imperative is that we eliminate fossil fuels in all aspects of our economy over time. For homes this is a small change... new homes won’t be exactly the same as older homes...but induction stove tops are better than gas stove tops.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 4

Question 6
Yes. I also recommend all homes plan to convert to all electric as appliances wear out. I’d like the City to encourage this with communication and incentives.

Question 7
Yes. And I suggest the City work with Peninsula Clean Energy and PG&E to allow switching solar to power the home in power-outage situations and/or tie into electric car batteries for short term home back up. These options are available but need permitting clarification and encouragement.

Question 8
Yes. Adding this at the time of construction adds little/no cost and is essential to accelerate the shift in personal cars from internal combustion to electric.

Question 9
I was at the 10/26 City Council meeting. I see one or more council members are skeptical of even this very small step in the direction our city, state, nation and world need to take urgently to flatten the curve of carbon emissions. This concerns me. We in San Carlos should be joining our fellow cities and even the County of San Mateo to demonstrate we are able to step up to challenges and act with foresight for the future -- not be held back by "the ways things have always been."

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 23, 2020,  9:18 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Local Business Owner

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
Yes: 1. It is good for the city to lower San Carlos’ carbon footprint -- this is a baby step with many more to come. 2. It is good for owners of these homes and 50% remodels to have all electric -- less expensive to build, safer + cleaner to live in.

Jen Peters
inside SAN CARLOS
November 23, 2020, 12:23 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Local Business Owner

Question 2
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

- No

Question 3
Yes, if there are exceptions for gas appliances, fireplaces and fire pits. We are seeing more and more spare the air days and power outages.

Question 4
Yes

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
Yes, if the exceptions for gas appliances and fireplaces are allowed.

Question 7
If possible this would be great. We actually don't have enough sun for solar panels. I do not think this is an issue you can force all into without looking at the current constraints of solar panels.

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
No response

Kristel Wickham
outside City Limits
November 23, 2020, 1:01 PM

Question 1
• Environmental Advocate

Question 2
• Not applicable

Question 3
Yes, because 1) it will reduce 'locked in' greenhouse gas emissions that come with installing gas appliances, 2) so many other cities have adopted similar reach codes it will be consistent for builders across the region, 3) it is simpler to for the public and building department officials to understand and administer, 4) the aging gas infrastructure is prone to leaks and explosions and will cost too much to maintain into the future and 5) removing gas from homes and businesses will reduce fires and improve indoor air quality.

Question 4
No. As we move from fossil fuels to clean electricity (including storage) we need to start with new construction. Exceptions only delay the ability to 'eventually' end gas service when everyone has equitably transitioned.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
Yes. Isn't this scenario already classified as needing to meet the requirements for 'new construction'?

Question 7
Yes, local grid tied solar - especially when paired with storage helps with grid resiliency which is sorely needed as the state is confronted with public safety power shutoffs to prevent wildfires, and periods of high demand when solar and wind sources are not as plentiful. Residential new construction is already required by state building code to include rooftop solar so by adding commercial new construction (which often has larger and more suitable roof areas for solar) further resilience will be built in sooner and provides energy cost savings to building occupants.

Question 8
Yes. Cost parity with combustion engine vehicles will come way before newly constructed buildings get to end of life. With phase out (Newsom’s executive order) of sales of passenger vehicles in California by 2035 much more charging infrastructure will be needed - especially for multifamily homes.

Question 9
For health, safety, climate, and resilience, a transition away from gas use in buildings is needed. Starting with new construction makes sense and will build the market and expertise for supporting the transition in existing buildings later.

Terry Nagel
outside City Limits
November 23, 2020, 5:52 PM

Question 1
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

- Other - Sustainability leader

Question 2
- No

Question 3
Absolutely! Going all electric is an important step for our city's and our world's future as well as our City’s leadership on sustainability and greenhouse gas emissions reductions. In addition to the environmental benefits, all-electric is safer for our citizens because it will eliminate the risks of gas leaks in our new homes and infrastructure. It's shocking to see aerial images of the gas leaks rising from leak in gas lines that contribute further to greenhouse gas emissions and potential risks of explosion as we know all too well because of the San Bruno tragedy. Limiting our gas infrastructure also reduces the City's infrastructure and fire risks associated with earthquakes. Further, if we look upstream, the environmental and health impacts of natural gas production are severe, while renewable electricity provides unlimited sources of non-extractive power and creates safe, meaningful green jobs.

Question 4
Definitely not. The GHG and safety benefits can really only be achieved if there are no gas poisoning possibilities and no pipes to leak/maintain/fail. Today's induction stoves are used by the world's best chefs.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
Yes. Why invest in gas infrastructure that will soon be obsolete?

Question 7
Yes! My family has rooftop solar, and we love it. Rooftop solar will make our community more resilient and affordable. It's very cost-effective to design and install solar during the construction phase, and by having it from the beginning of a building’s lifecycle will maximize the renewable energy benefits (energy conserved, costs avoided, and GHG emissions reduced).

Question 8
Absolutely! I also support deconstruction requirements to reduce waste and conserve embodied carbon.

Question 9
California is leading the nation in the transition from dirty natural gas to clean electricity. San Carlos has the opportunity to join this growing movement.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
November 23, 2020, 10:44 PM

Question 1
- San Carlos Resident
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

Question 9
Requiring all-electric codes will definitely benefit our city. I strongly encourage our City Council to adopt these requirements for new construction and major renovations with no exceptions. I would also suggest the city lead by example by upgrading city facilities and schools to become all-electric, add solar roofs and add additional EV charging capacity.

Nicole Moutoux
inside SAN CARLOS
November 25, 2020, 5:10 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Environmental Advocate

Question 2
• No

Question 3
I need to know more about the cost of electric water heaters. I heard they can increase electricity costs significantly and I also worried about current electric grid infrastructure to support this.

Question 4
yes

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
With some exceptions.

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
No

Question 9
No response

Nancy Nagel
inside SAN CARLOS
November 29, 2020, 12:38 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes. It is a highly impactful step at reasonable cost and we must take action on this critical priority.

Question 4
No.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
YES

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
No

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
December 1, 2020, 9:13 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
• Work in San Carlos
• Environmental Advocate
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

• Local Business Owner

Question 2
• No

Question 3
Yes. Climate change is real. We need to electrify everything we can (and de-carbonize electricity generation). In the past, builders had to sacrifice functionality or price to get a solution. That’s no longer the case.

Question 4
Yes. Energy for cooking is small factor overall; fireplaces probably don’t even register in the data. However, both have very high emotional factors. It’s important to strike compromises to get the whole community to support the changes. Heating and cooling our homes and the water we use should be the focus.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 4

Question 6
Yes, but only for the parts that are getting rebuilt. If a remodel plan does not include the kitchen, the city should not force a kitchen remodel.

Question 7
Yes. Exceptions should be made in cases where the shade canopy from existing heritage trees would render the solar too ineffective (e.g. if payback period would exceed predicted lifetime costs of the system, including maintenance).

Question 8
Infrastructure? Some. New construction should require an electric service panel of sufficient power (amperage, I assume) to handle the home of the future. However, I don’t think EV charging units should be required.

Question 9
Do something. Consider providing incentives for the conversion of existing buildings, not just new construction or substantial rebuilds (e.g. how about incentives to convert gas water heaters or furnaces to heat pumps?). Consider ways to mitigate PG&E power safety shutoffs -- what can the city do to get better reliability to the electricity grid if we will be more reliant on it for basic human needs?

• San Carlos Resident

Question 1

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
No. There are many ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and balance this with quality of life. I’d rather see incentives for homes to install solar and transition to electric cars than to require new construction to be all electric.

Question 4
Yes

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
No

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
No response

Laurel Lee

inside SAN CARLOS
December 5, 2020, 1:25 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

• No

Question 3  
Yes, we should create policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Question 4  
No

Question 5  
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 1

Question 6  
Yes

Question 7  
Yes

Question 8  
Yes

Question 9  
No response

Name not shown  
inside SAN CARLOS  
December 6, 2020, 3:26 PM

Question 1  
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2  
• Not applicable

Question 3  
yes - it’s critical that we do everything we can to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Question 4  
Possibly for commercial cooking, but not home.

Question 5  
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6  
Yes

Question 7  
No response

Andre Goforth  
inside SAN CARLOS  
December 7, 2020, 2:03 PM

Question 1  
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2  
• Not applicable

Question 3  
Yes, PGE wants to go to all electric; natural gas is a significant fire hazard now with California fire season; cuts out fossil fuel dumping carbon

Question 4  
No

Question 5  
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6  
Yes

Question 7
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
We need to move on to all electric. The City government clear requirements and mandates for all electric will create replacement jobs for the current work they do.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
December 18, 2020, 8:38 AM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
Natural gas is a very clean energy source

Question 4
Yes

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 5

Question 6
No

Question 7
No

Question 8
No

Question 9
San Carlos should give incentives vs forcing these issues upon folks

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
December 18, 2020, 8:04 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
We need to protect our environment and reduce our dependence on gas.

Question 4
Sure. Heating of homes, pools and water should be electric. I also suggest dual fuel stoves...gas cooktop with electric oven.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity:: 3

Question 6
Definitely. Yes

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
Consider financial incentive (rebate, Shop San Carlos gift card, etc) for appliance replacements with electric that apply to water heaters, stoves, etc.

Name not shown
inside SAN CARLOS
December 18, 2020, 10:14 PM

Question 1
• San Carlos Resident
All-Electric Reach Codes
Should San Carlos require new buildings be all-electric?

Question 2
• Yes

Question 3
No. San Carlos residents should be allowed to have gas stove. A lot of every day food especially ethnic food requires cooking by controlling the temperature precisely and for that gas stove is essential in a home.

Question 4
Yes, absolutely.

Question 5
Induction Stove Familiarity: 5

Question 6
No

Question 7
Yes

Question 8
Yes

Question 9
No response
Building Industry Feedback

How would requiring all new projects be all-electric impact your business?

- For a number of years, MidPen, like many other affordable housing developers and long-term property managers, has required all in-unit appliances to be all-electric. Gas is present in our properties for centralized hot water only. We have already evolved our internal standards to require boiler rooms to be spacious enough to accommodate a Heat Pump Hot Water system, in case we do not install such a system from the beginning. Furthermore, following our successful experiment on Edwina Benner Plaza, we have been looking at Heat Pump Hot Water design for the majority of our projects, and found out that in most cases it is a financially acceptable choice. For this reason, many of our projects currently in the entitlements phase will be all-electric.
- Concerned with delays associated with PG&E and possible alternatives if PG&E cannot provide sufficient electric infrastructure.
- General concerns with the status of electric equipment (boilers/ hot water heaters, kitchen and select lab-science) appliances.
- Veev projects are already all-electric, so we will be able to meet a reach code on this front.
- I am not well versed in all electric appliances and heating/cooling systems. I think some amount of transition needed to take place so Architects/Designers/Contractors can be educated.
- I would see more homeowners doing smaller remodels instead of a new house.
- Gas is desired by clients
- I don’t think it would impact my business. It will impact the timeline of projects
- I think people should have choices, gas being one of them

Once a project has received entitlements through Planning, are there design constraints that would prevent you from going all-electric?

- Most of the design work happens after we apply for and receive entitlements. In particular the MEP and energy modeling, which will inform the transformer sizing, are not progressed enough at entitlement to be certain that we won’t meet site constraints that would prevent us from going all electric.
- We would appreciate grace periods or exceptions for projects in the pipeline where possible.
- Yes, many projects feature tankless gas fired water heaters. I am not aware of any electric equivalent and tank water heaters are much larger.
- Location of generator in order to run appliances when PG&E shut off power during a storm.
- No, fireplace, no fire pit, forcing owners to spend more money on solar
- Not really design constraints. I would argue the financial impact to many homeowners would result in a scaled back project. Most clients have a budget and adding solar is often a luxury item or an item added after final inspection.
- Yes, there are a few, expensive choices available.
- At the time of entitlements approvals, developers have already advanced their design and engineering substantially based on the current codes and existing infrastructure within the building (if a major renovation) or in the area if ground up construction. Switching to all electric would essentially force the engineers to reset the design and would have significant architectural impacts that could force a new design review approval. One of the many examples, if a building switched to all electric there would be a need for much larger water heating and storage tanks at the roof level, taking up much more square footage and increasing roof structure loads, further driving up cost of design and construction and creating an added burden for developers. These changes would likely result in the need for more height and bulk variances as well, as current planning codes haven’t taken the impact of all electric HVAC, heaters etc into consideration. Once a project has advanced to the later entitlement stages, revising the design this late in the development would have drastic changes for the building, the site, and the existing utility infrastructure. For example, electrical transformer rooms would be much larger in comparison to the planned transformers for a mixed electric and gas supply. If San Carlos adopts reach codes before other nearby jurisdictions, preventing a uniform roll out across the region, it’s very likely that tenants (and therefore developers) will be forced to look elsewhere to develop and lease biotech and life science buildings with the utility infrastructure that meets their industry requirements. This could have a significant negative effect on the burgeoning life science hub in San Carlos. Given the adoption of reach codes is inevitable, we would recommend the municipality should provide a long enough window for grandfathering existing projects in the entitlement pipeline and all adaptive reuse projects like 777 Industrial.

Have you experienced any issues with the availability of electric appliances?
- No
- I have experienced a hard time getting appliances in general, not just electric. Not really a valid question for this survey.
- No
- Yes. My project wanted to go all electric however the pool heater that is needed year round due to therapy is only available gas.
- Yes. They do not work for ADUs and remodels.

Have you seen a shift in market demand from gas to induction stoves?
- Not applicable to the affordable housing industry. We are using electric coil stoves. Induction stoves are at a minimum 5-time more expensive, putting them out of range.
- No most people want gas stoves instead of electric, less than 1% of my clients have specifically asked for electric stoves
- In the last 18 months I have had 4 of my projects install induction stoves.
- No

Have you seen a shift in market demand from gas to electric fireplaces?

- No, most people forgo the fireplace in general to save money when possible
- Absolutely not
- No—not a single client has requested electric fireplaces. Energy House only has a few electric units on display.
- No.

If your company develops scientific laboratories, what are some of the constraints to going all-electric?

- Current schematic design for 987 Commercial Street campus plans to be all-electric with solar, EV charging and seeking LEED certification. Requiring 3rd party verification for exceptions is not unreasonable but adds costs and could create delays.
- First, we often look to alternate fuel sources for our backup generators. Traditionally, backup generators are fueled by diesel. This means that this diesel has to be trucked to the site, stored on site, and then used and sometimes even burned off (by operating the generator). We often look to natural gas to be a better, cleaner burning fuel source for our generators, including our generator at 930 Brittan in San Carlos. Furthermore, at 1030 Brittan we are proposing to utilize a Bloom Energy box - which is a non-combustible fuel cell technology that would power the core part of our building 24/7, utilizing PG&E for backup power to that portion. Bloom Energy runs off of natural gas. What happens if you make natural gas illegal to use in this instance? What if its still legal, but market forces because of its limited use make this uneconomical? There are lots of unintended consequences here I am concerned about.
- Large lab, life science, and medical buildings all require very specialized HVAC systems, that all run on natural gas. This is because the efficiencies of heating or cooling lots of air is still far more efficiently done by natural gas. Many buildings are converted to these uses as well - and will be in the future. So, by not allowing the installation of natural gas in a new building, in effectively means it can never function as one of the uses I list above. These buildings are built with 50-100 year life spans - and in 25 years many uses that may occupy buildings haven’t even been discovered or invented yet. So, eliminating natural gas from commercial buildings may mean entire swaths of buildings have much early terminations to their useful life - again, the unintended consequences of such a code could be very catastrophic.
- Natural gas is a fundamental aspect of how biotech and life science labs function. There is a prevalence for equipment in the biotech and life science industry that relies heavily on natural
gas. Although you can find alternatives, it is a sub-optimal scenario given lack of alternative options among equipment manufacturers and familiarity with tenants. This could also potentially create a more dangerous fire and life safety issue with tenants having to use sub-optimal hand held tools (ex. handheld burner) that would not have the proper safety infrastructures (ex. shut-off valves etc). In addition, requiring scientific laboratories to be all electric would limit the marketability for life science and deterrence for leasability, driving tenants to seek out other locations without these restrictions resulting in loss of revenue for the municipality and creating undesirable prolonged vacancies. Adding to this, PG&E is an extremely challenging agency and as municipalities are moving towards all electric, we do not feel confident that PG&E will be able to react as quickly to the increase in electrical loads when existing gas infrastructure is already in place. We would recommend San Carlos establish an exclusion for lab specific equipment to be supplied by natural gas along with other critical infrastructure as needed similar to how most Bay Area municipalities are allowing natural gas to continue in commercial kitchens.

Do you have any feedback on mandatory solar requirements for non-residential and high-rise residential buildings?

- Additional mandatory solar requirements, we do not feel this is the best policy. Individual rooftop solar is not always the most carbon-friendly, cost-effective or practical solution for housing developments. We prefer to make this decision project-by-project. Housing clean energy supply options are available in San Carlos, both from Peninsula Clean Energy and PG&E, which offer 100% green energy options directly from the grid (additional price) and PG&E’s base electricity supply is very green (https://www.pge.com/en_US/about-pge/environment/what-we-are-doing/clean-energy-solutions/clean-energy-solutions.page). Utility-scale solar is more cost effective and scalable than individual projects. That said, we may choose to include rooftop solar based on project economics and market demand.
- Conceptually, we support aspects of solar requirements for non-residential and high rise buildings that are both sustainable and practical for development and tenant use. However, it is often the case these buildings do not have enough roof square footage for Solar PV to offset electrical use towards net zero therefore making the inclusion of PV panels more symbolic than practical. Requiring non-residential projects to be net zero, especially bio lab life science, is challenging due to their utility infrastructure requirements and these buildings usually do not have a large enough roof space for the correlating infrastructure for systems like water heating and storage which would lead to additional variances due to enlarged equipment, not to mention increasing roof loads which will increase the construction cost due to the additional structural work. The same can be said for high rise residential buildings, especially in high density housing projects proposed on smaller lots, there will also not be enough roof space for solar PV. We suggest referencing the City and County of San Francisco’s Better Roof’s Ordinance which provides for “flexibility for the building designer, owner, and developer to choose the best combination of solar photovoltaic, solar water heating and living roof systems to maximize
benefits based on location and building program in addition to amenities that enhance the outdoor rooftop experience.

Do you have any feedback on requiring additional electric vehicle charging infrastructure for new projects?

- Additional EV requirements are a concern to us. Due to the additional electric load required to serve the chargers, it often requires us to upsize or even add a transformer. That bigger transformer can lead to technical infeasibility outside of our control, and/or financial infeasibility due to added cost. If the City of San Carlos were to go in that direction, I would recommend looking at East Palo Alto Reach Code, and its exemption for Affordable Housing projects.

- Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure is incredibly onerous to install at properties. Much of the electrical code allows for reductions in the size of the electrical service needed at a building based on usage. For instance, there are several 20 amp plugs on a single 20 amp circuit (which trips at 16amps of draw), because the electrical code acknowledges not every outlet will be on and drawing at the same time. This sort of demand sizing is all the way through the electrical code - so there might be 1000 amps of power outlets, on 800 amps of panels that use a 600amp electrical feed (I'm simplifying this concept, but the point is the same). HOWEVER, for electric car chargers, 100% of every single car charger is assumed to be drawing power, thereby vastly increasing the size of power service needed to each building. This means larger transformers and more transformers, often which are very difficult to locate on a site given all the various demands of PG&E. This will unquestionably make certain projects not-buildable if there are too many electric car chargers required to be installed. Again, another unintended consequence of reach codes.

- Electric car charging and mechanical lifts are still largely mutually exclusive. I have experience in dealing with electric car charging stations in both semi-automated and fully-automated parking, and it’s very difficult in both. For the City of Burlingame, they exempted any sort of mechanical parking lifts from having to meet electric car charging in reach codes due to this concern.

- Requiring additional electric vehicle charging infrastructure, the market is already transforming away from ICE to EV without additional regulations. Given this, there will be strong market demand for EV charging infrastructure in our projects. Again, we prefer to make the decision based on the market needs.

- I think EV charging makes sense, the cost is minimal.

- No. I don’t see an issue about this as it is just an additional electrical circuit

- Another expense and burden for homeowners who may not want it

- No impact. Easy to install

- This should be market driven, not government driven.

- From a development perspective, we support requirements for EV charging stations, noting the future tenant is often the driver of the true number of EV charging stations that are needed for their occupants. We think the larger issue that municipalities should be addressing are revisiting parking requirements while enhancing public transportation alternatives in order to lessen the dependency on personal automobiles as the primary method of transportation.
Are there any other design constraints or concerns that prevent you from building all-electric?

- Site constraints leading to additional costs to our projects.
- Efficient water heater take up a considerable amount of space and create an excessive amount of condensation.
- Clients don’t like limitations and restrictions.
- PG&E is very difficult, local contractors not knowledgeable, solar panels are an added expense
- Yes. They likely would have to replace their electric service.

Is there any other input you’d like to provide regarding reach codes?

- It is already incredibly difficult to make housing projects economically viable with the requirements of the new 2019 codes. Any additional mandatory requirements that significantly increase the cost of housing production will reduce housing supply and put RHNA goals even further out of reach. Note that multifamily housing in San Carlos, which is centrally located near large job centers and has Caltrain TOD options, is inherently more sustainable than low-density, mega-commute locations. We encourage you to balance housing element goals with climate goals.
- I commend the San Carlos City Council for taking extra time to get this right. I think too many communities are rushing into this without doing their own research.
- I feel the it needs to be researched more regarding the amount of pollution put by water heaters and stoves and furnaces, prior to just saying all new houses need to be all electric.
- I believe the reach code should be a stair step approach depending on the total square foot of the remodel. New construction should be easier to implement and enforce. The permit process is long enough to allow education to clients and contractors on the projects that need to be specified.
- Let consumers make the choice.
- Shah Kawasaki Architects recently designed San Carlos Fire Station 16. Most of the energy consuming systems (including HVAC) are electric. If all systems were designed as electric, there would be a slight increase in capital costs that will be made up in future energy savings. I don’t see any negative effects to your future fire stations should the City adopt an all-electric code. The only exception is the back-up electrical generators which rely on diesel fuel. I recommend you exempt them for the time being. Photovoltaic panels with battery back-up are being considered by other cities. I’d wait for a few installations to be built and tested.
ATTACHMENT 5

Project Entitlements Timeline
This list does not include single family homes.

Projects that have received entitlements but have not yet applied for building permits:

993 Laurel Street
- Approved 8/3/2020
- 21,540 square feet retail and office building

575 Prospect
- Approved 8/20/2018
- 5,460 square feet, 3 unit multifamily building

Projects currently under planning review that are on track for approval around March/April:

1075/1083 American
- 5,620 square feet, warehouse and office

1360 Cherry St
- 937 square feet, commercial
- 13,347 square feet residential

680 El Camino
- 987 square feet retail
- 17,871 square feet office
Cost Effectiveness Summary for Proposed Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Build All Electric</th>
<th>Build Mixed Fuel</th>
<th>30 year Utility Bill Savings (Electric vs. Natural Gas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office (54,000 s.f.)</td>
<td>$13,442,663</td>
<td>$13,500,000</td>
<td>-$3,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$8,251,025</td>
<td>$8,275,000</td>
<td>$1,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/High Rise Multifamily</td>
<td>$9,687,735</td>
<td>$10,965,000</td>
<td>-$236,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (2,700 s.f.)</td>
<td>$799,420</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>-$2,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost to build all-electric compared to building mixed fuel at the time of new construction and 30 year utility bill savings.

Analysis done by TRC Companies for the Peninsula Clean Energy Reach Code initiative based off of assumptions in Statewide cost-effectiveness study and cost to build in San Mateo County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeled Code Scenario*</th>
<th>Market Rate</th>
<th>Affordable Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% Level 2</td>
<td>10% Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% Level 1</td>
<td>90% Level 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Cost at New Construction</th>
<th>Cost to Retrofit</th>
<th>Cost at New Construction</th>
<th>Cost to Retrofit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 Unit Multi-family Building with 60</td>
<td>$1,410</td>
<td>$4,443</td>
<td>$1,049</td>
<td>$3,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enclosed parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Unit Multi-family building with 150</td>
<td>$1,197</td>
<td>$4,101</td>
<td>$1,002</td>
<td>$3,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enclosed parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Building with 60 parking spaces</td>
<td>$1,166</td>
<td>$3,232</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost per spot to install electric vehicle chargers at the time of new constructions compared to retrofit an existing building.

*Figures were calculated using the charging infrastructure levels in Peninsula Clean Energy’s model ordinance. City Staff are proposing different levels of EV Charging, but cost figures are analogous.

Source: Report for Peninsula Clean Energy (PCE) & Silicon Valley Clean Energy (SVCE)
### Other Cities All-Electric Exceptions

Exceptions noted below in orange  
Last updated January 5, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptions</th>
<th>Brisbane</th>
<th>Burlingame</th>
<th>City of San Mateo</th>
<th>East Palo Alto</th>
<th>Menlo Park</th>
<th>Millbrae</th>
<th>Pacifica</th>
<th>Redwood City</th>
<th>San Mateo County</th>
<th>San Carlos (Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADUs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory/Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHPD 1 and 3 Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost &amp; financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received entitlements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not physically code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feasible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Technical Infeasibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING DATE: January 25, 2021

ITEM TITLE: Consideration of Development Agreement Negotiations and Processing of the Planned Development Zoning Requests Concurrently with the East Side Innovation District Vision Plan Process for the Project Applications at 888 Bransten Avenue and 1030 Brittan Avenue.

RECOMMENDATION:

Provide direction to staff on whether or not move forward with Development Agreement negotiations and associated processing of the Planned Development Zoning requests concurrently with the East Side Innovation District Vision Plan process for the project applications at 888 Bransten Avenue and 1030 Brittan Avenue. In both cases, the project cannot move forward as submitted without approval of a development agreement by the City Council.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no fiscal implications or additional appropriations associated with this item. However, there could be future fiscal impacts in the form of negotiated community benefits.

BACKGROUND:

As part of City Council’s 2020 Strategic Goals and Objectives, the Council prioritized the East Side Planning Initiative. Objective 1 is to prepare a plan to address changes in development patterns and the influx of jobs. Staff completed the initial steps with the issuance of a Request for Proposals in April 2020. The City received 18 proposals, with costs ranging from $555,300 to $1,413,303, and a timeline of 15-24 months to complete the initiative.

Due to projected budget shortfalls from the COVID-19 pandemic, staff recommended this project be placed on hold this fiscal year. However, at the August 24, 2020 Council budget study session, several Councilmembers expressed interest in moving forward with the District Vision Plan initiative. Following the budget study session, the City Council Economic Subcommittee met twice to study the issue further and discuss options for east side planning. The City Council, at its September 28, 2020 meeting, provided direction to staff to proceed with an East Side Innovation District Vision Plan.
ANALYSIS:

The City entered into a contract with Perkins&Will to assist with preparation of the Innovation District Vision Plan ("Vision Plan") process. Staff anticipates that process to take approximately nine months from initiation (Summer 2021).

It was noted at the September 28, 2020 City Council meeting that the Council wanted the Vision Plan process to be completed prior to considering large development applications that include a request to change the Zoning designation to Planned Development within the East Side Innovation Plan Area.

Two development applications, 888 Bransten Avenue and 1030 Brittan Avenue, have been reviewed by staff and are nearly ready for consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council. However, staff must complete negotiations for community benefits and prepare a draft Development Agreement to ratify the benefits before the City Council can approve the projects. Below are details about these two proposed projects.

Summary of 888 Bransten Avenue:

Black Mountain Properties submitted a request for a Planned Development Zoning, Planned Development Plan, Design Review, Transportation Demand Management Plan and Grading and Dirt Haul Permit on October 9, 2019. Staff has nearly completed the review of the plans (Attachment 1) and the City’s CEQA consultant has prepared a draft Initial Study/Mitigation Negative Declaration. The City’s economic consultant has completed the Community Benefit and Fiscal Impact Analysis, but staff has not completed community benefit negotiations with the developer.

The site is 105,416 square feet in area and is located at the corner of Bransten Avenue and Industrial Road (just north of the Alexandria development currently under construction – formerly Meridian 25). The property is zoned Heavy Industrial with a 1.0 allowed floor area ratio and a height limit of 50’. The applicant requests a Planned Development Zoning to allow a 2.0 floor area ratio and building height of 87’-6” to the roof line and 100’ to the top of the mechanical screen and 210,832 square feet of Life Science office space. The zoning code allows for such adjustments in exchange for community benefits.

Summary of 1030 Brittan Avenue:

MBH Architects, on behalf of MBC Biolabs, submitted a request for a Planned Development Zoning, Planned Development Plan, Design Review, Transportation Demand Management Plan, Creek Setback Determination, and a Grading and Dirt Haul Permit on April 12, 2019. Staff completed review of the plans (Attachment 3) and the City’s California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) consultant has prepared a draft Initial Study/Mitigation Negative Declaration. The City’s economic consultant has completed the Community Benefit and Fiscal Impact Analysis, but staff has not completed community benefits negotiations with the applicant.

The site is 87,990 square feet and is located along Brittan Avenue (currently vacant site with car storage). The site is zoned General Commercial/Industrial with a 2.0 allowed floor area ratio and a height limit of 50’. The applicant requests a Planned Development Zoning to allow the building height at 81’ to the roof line and 96’ to the top of the mechanical screen.

The following are options for the Council to consider:
1. Authorize staff to complete the Development Agreement negotiations and the planning review process.

If the Council directs staff to complete negotiations and planning review of these two development applications ahead of the Vision Plan process, staff recommends the City Council authorize the Council Economic Subcommittee to advise staff on the community benefits negotiations. After conceptual agreement on a community benefits package, staff will prepare a draft Development Agreement and advertise the CEQA documents for the public review period and schedule the project and development agreement for consideration by the Planning Commission and finally the City Council. These projects would then be able to move through the planning review process but without the benefit of any Vision Plan mitigations or best practices.

2. Do not authorize staff to move forward with negotiations or planning review process.

Applications will be paused until the Vision Plan process is complete, which will inform the projects on the scope of potential community benefits, project mitigations and guidelines from the Plan. In the interim, staff will work with the developers to ensure the applications are consistent with the recommendations of the Vision Plan.

3. Authorize staff to complete negotiations for community benefits and preparation of the draft Development Agreement but not the planning application process.

This option would provide some benefit to the applicant in that negotiations could continue, including Council Subcommittee review. Since a Development Agreement is a legal document much like a contract, it takes some time for all parties to review and agree to terms. This would reduce the overall processing time for each project. Each project would likely be able to resume Planning Commission review quickly once the Vision Plan is completed.

ALTERNATIVES:

The alternatives available to the City Council include:

1. Authorize staff to complete the Development Agreement negotiations and the planning review process; or

2. Do not authorize staff to move forward with negotiations or planning review process; or

3. Authorize staff to complete negotiations for community benefits and preparation of the draft Development Agreement but not the planning application process; or

4. Provide staff with alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted by:

Al Savay, AICP
Community Development Director
ATTACHMENT(S):
1. 888 Bransten Proposed Plans
2. 888 Bransten Applicant letter to City Council
3. 1030 Brittan Proposed Plans
888 BRANSTEN ROAD
PLANNING APPLICATION

SAN CARLOS
CALIFORNIA

03 APRIL 2020

Attachment: 888 Bransten Proposed Plans (Consider PD Applications)
### EXISTING BUILDINGS & PROJECT DATA

**Overall contribution to the enhancement of neighborhood character and the environment of San Carlos in the long term:**

This area of San Carlos, along Industrial Road, is transforming from non-descript single story industrial buildings to elegant new multi-story buildings which will attract Office, Technology and/or Research and Development tenants.

The 888 Bransten Building will enhance development along Industrial Road, and be compatible with other new buildings with high-quality designs.

The Amenity Building will provide Eating/Drinking services which are currently lacking in the area, and will benefit not only the tenants in the new buildings, but also the adjacent business and residential areas.

The 888 Bransten Building will help the City of San Carlos to achieve and realize the goals of their General Plan. San Carlos will become a very desirable destination for companies looking for space along the peninsula with easy access to highway 101.

#### Existing Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Parcel Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>814-838 Bransten</td>
<td>One-Story Concrete Warehouse</td>
<td>24,370 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>046-100-280</td>
<td>52,060 Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844-870 Bransten</td>
<td>One-Story Concrete Warehouse</td>
<td>25,115 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>046-100-270</td>
<td>44,066 Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797 Industrial</td>
<td>Two-Story Concrete Block Building</td>
<td>7,415 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>046-100-060</td>
<td>9,260 Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing Building Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>56,990 Sq. Ft.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>105,416 Sq. Ft.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Project

BMP wishes to develop a Six-Story Building with an approximate area of 210,832 Sq. Ft. The high-quality design of the Building and Site will contribute to the redevelopment occurring along Industrial Road. BMP also proposes to provide an Amenity Building, at the intersection of Industrial and Bransten, which could serve Coffee, Food, Wine Bar, etc.

#### Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Gross Area</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>888 Bransten</td>
<td>208,322 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>35,000 Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797 Industrial</td>
<td>2,500 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2,500 Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>210,832 Sq. Ft.</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,500 Sq. Ft.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio

| Site Coverage | 2.00 Current | 0.3557 = 36% |

### CONSULTANTS

- **C-0 Construction Notes**
- **C-02 Site Demolition Plan**
- **C-10 Erosion Control Plan**
- **C-11 Grading and Drainage**
- **C-12 Stormwater Control Plan**
- **C-13 Stormwater Control Details and Notes**
- **C-14 Stormwater Control Details and Notes**
- **C-21 Underground Piping Plan**
- **C-31 Details**
- **C-32 Details and Sections**
- **C-40 Construction Best Management Practices**

#### L-1 Landscape - Illustrative Site Plan

- **L-2 Landscape - Layout Plan**
- **L-3 Landscape - Planting Plan**
- **L-4 Landscape - Tree Disposition Plan**
- **L-5 Landscape - Materials Schedules**
- **L-6 Landscape - Site Landscape Character**

---

**Project Data, Location & Drawing Index**

- **888 Bransten Road, San Carlos**

---

**Packet Pg. 123**
DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Concurrent Approvals
1. Lot Merger of existing three (3) Parcels
2. Easement and Maintenance Agreement for Sidewalk along Bransten to be on 888 Bransten Property. Space between Property Line and back of curb will be a landscape and tree zone.

Development Standards
Table 18.07.030 – Development Standards – Industrial Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>More than 5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>More than 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>More than 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Match Heights approved for 887 Industrial Road (825-835 Industrial Road) 100'-6" to top of Roof Screen and 106'-2" to top of Equipment (Stacks)
Additional Height Request: 109'-4" to top of Roof over Service Elevator (Less than 200 Sq. Ft.)

Parking and Loading
Since Future Tenant Uses are unknown, Parking will be provided for the Use with the most stringent requirement (Business & Professional) in accordance with SCMC Chapter 18.20
Table 18.20.040-A (3) – Required On-Site Parking Spaces, Other Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Professional</td>
<td>100,000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>333.33 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>108,332 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>309.52 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>208,332 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>642.85 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18.20.050 – Parking Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reduced by twenty percent</th>
<th>(128.57) Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Parking</td>
<td>Subreplace up to five percent</td>
<td>(25.71) Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>208,332 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>488.57 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Parking for Amenity Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>2,500 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>10 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>524 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18.20.800 Bicycle Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Min. 4 or 10% of Vehicles</td>
<td>10 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>5% of Vehicles</td>
<td>25 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35 Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18.20.090 – Required Loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Required Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>150,001 – 230,000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>4 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210,832 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 18.20.090 – Development Standards – Industrial Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>More than 5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>More than 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>More than 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Match Heights approved for 887 Industrial Road (825-835 Industrial Road) 100'-6" to top of Roof Screen and 106'-2" to top of Equipment (Stacks)
Additional Height Request: 109'-4" to top of Roof over Service Elevator (Less than 200 Sq. Ft.)

Parking and Loading
Since Future Tenant Uses are unknown, Parking will be provided for the Use with the most stringent requirement (Business & Professional) in accordance with SCMC Chapter 18.20
Table 18.20.040-A (3) – Required On-Site Parking Spaces, Other Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Professional</td>
<td>100,000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>333.33 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>108,332 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>309.52 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>208,332 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>642.85 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18.20.050 – Parking Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reduced by twenty percent</th>
<th>(128.57) Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Parking</td>
<td>Subreplace up to five percent</td>
<td>(25.71) Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>208,332 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>488.57 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Parking for Amenity Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>2,500 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>10 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>524 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18.20.800 Bicycle Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Min. 4 or 10% of Vehicles</td>
<td>10 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>5% of Vehicles</td>
<td>25 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35 Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18.20.090 – Required Loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Required Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>150,001 – 230,000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>4 Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210,832 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2 Spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SOUTHEAST ELEVATION
FACING BRANSTEN ROAD

MATERIALS LEGEND:

1. CLEAR GLASS
2. TINTED GLASS
3. FRITTED GLASS
4. CEMENTITIOUS PANEL
5. ALUMINUM WINDOW MULLION
6. ALUMINUM COLUMN COVER
7. ALUMINUM SUNSHADE
8. PROFILED METAL PANEL
MATERIALS LEGEND:

1. CLEAR GLASS
2. TINTED GLASS
3. FRITTED GLASS
4. CEMENTITIOUS PANEL
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MATERIALS LEGEND:

1. CLEAR GLASS
2. TINTED GLASS
3. FRITTED GLASS
4. CEMENTITIOUS PANEL
5. ALUMINUM WINDOW MULLION
6. ALUMINUM COLUMN COVER
7. ALUMINUM SUNSHADE
8. PROFILED METAL PANEL
MATERIALS LEGEND:

1. CLEAR GLASS
2. TINTED GLASS
3. FRITTED GLASS
4. CEMENTITIOUS PANEL
5. ALUMINUM WINDOW MULLION
6. ALUMINUM COLUMN COVER
7. ALUMINUM SUNSHADE
8. PROFILED METAL PANEL
MATERIALS LEGEND:

1 CMU BLOCK
2 CORRUGATED METAL SLIDING GATE
3 CONCRETE STEM WALL

TRASH ENCLOSURE

SERVICE YARD

SCALE: 1/16
P1 LEVEL PARKING:

- CARS - STANDARD: 212
- ACCESSIBLE: 3
- MOTORCYCLE: 25
- BICYCLE LONG TERM: 25

PARKING STALLS (TYP.): 8'-6" x 18'-0"

MOTORCYCLE PARKING: 4'-0" x 7'-0"

AIR GRATE (TYP.): 2'-6" x 2'-0"

EXITS:
- EXIT STAIRS
- GARAGE ELEVATORS
- PASSENGER ELEVATOR PITS
- SERVICE ELEVATOR PITS

Scale: 1/32

BICYCLE STORAGE

9.a.1
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Attachment: 888 Bransten Proposed Plans (Consider PD Applications)
### Stormwater Control Details and Notes

**Summary of Maintenance Requirements**

Every responsible for the maintenance of the stormwater control measures.

**Prior to Ordering the Biotreatment Soil Mix**

Prior to ordering the biotreatment soil mix or delivery to the project site, the contractor shall provide a biotreatment soil mix specification checklist, completed by the soil mix supplier and certified testing lab.

---

#### Biotreatment Basin with Subdrain

![Diagram of Biotreatment Basin with Subdrain]

**Notes**

- **Previous Pavement Detail**
  - **Current Pavement**
    - **Existing Pavement Condition**
    - **New Pavement Condition**

---

**Table: Prior to Ordering the Biotreatment Soil Mix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Surfaces (E)</th>
<th>New Surfaces (N)</th>
<th>New Total (T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Surfaces (E)</td>
<td>184.29</td>
<td>204.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Surfaces (N)</td>
<td>204.09</td>
<td>204.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (T)</td>
<td>388.38</td>
<td>409.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs)

Construction projects are required to implement the stormwater best management practices (BMP) on this page, as they apply to your project, all year long.

Materials & Waste Management

- Non-Hazardous Materials
  - Items and cover stippled of sand, dirt or other construction material with tarps when rain is forecast or it is actively being used within 48 hours.
  - Use (but don’t oversaturate) reclaimed water for dust control.

- Hazardous Materials
  - Label all hazardous materials and hazardous wastes (each as pesticides, paints, thinners, solvents, fuel, oil, and antifreeze) in accordance with city, county, state, and federal regulations.
  - Store hazardous materials and wastes in water tight containers, store in an appropriate secondary containment, and cover them at the end of every work day or during wet weather or when rain is forecast.
  - Follow manufacturer’s application instructions for hazardous materials and be careful not to use more than necessary. Do not apply chemicals outdoors when rain is forecast within 24 hours.
  - Arrange for appropriate disposal of all hazardous wastes.

- Waste Management
  - Cover waste disposal containers securely with tarps at the end of every work day and during wet weather.
  - Check waste disposal containers frequently for leaks and make sure they are not overfilled. Never hose down a dumpster on the construction site.
  - Clean or replace portable toilets, and inspect them frequently for leaks and spills.
  - Dispose of all wastes and debris properly. Recycle materials and wastes that can be recycled (such as rebars, concrete, aggregate base materials, wood, plywood, pipe, etc.)
  - Dispose of liquid chemicals from paint, thinners, solvents, glue, and cleaning fluids at hazardous waste.

- Construction Entrances and Perimeter
  - Establish and maintain effective perimeter controls and stabilize all construction entrances and exits to sufficiently control erosion and sediment discharges from site and tracking.
  - Sweeps or vacuum any street tracking immediately and secure sediment source to prevent further tracking. Never hose down streets to clean up tracking.

Equipment Management & Spill Control

- Maintenance and Parking
  - Designate an area, fitted with appropriate BMPs, for vehicle and equipment parking and storage.
  - Perform major maintenance, repair jobs, vehicle and equipment washing off site.

- Spill Prevention and Control
  - Keep spill cleanup materials (e.g., rags, absorbents and cat litter) available at the construction site at all times.
  - Inspect vehicles and equipment frequently for leaks and repair leaks promptly. Use drip pans to catch leaks until repairs are made.
  - Clean up spills or leaks immediately and dispose of cleanup materials properly.
  - Do not hose down surfaces where fluids have spilled.
  - Use dry cleanup materials (absorbent materials, cat litter, and/or rags).

- Paving/Asphalt Work
  - Avoid paving and seal coating in wet weather or when rain is forecast, to prevent materials that have not cured from contaminating storm waters.
  - Cover storm drain inlets and manholes when applying seal coat, tack coat, slurry seal, fog seal, etc.
  - Collect and recycle or appropriately dispose of storm drain residue, slurry and sediment.

- Earthmoving
  - Do not clean or rinse paint brushes or rinse paint equipment offsite or in a designated washout area, where the water will flow into a temporary waste pit and in a manner that will prevent leaching into the underlying soil or into surrounding areas. Let concrete harden and dispose of as offsite or in a designated washout area.

- Revegetating & Asphalt/Concrete Removal
  - Protect nearby storm drain inlets from saw cutting. Use filter fabric, catch basin inlet filters, or gravel bags to keep slurry out of the storm drain system.
  - Shovel, absorb, or vacuum saw-cut slurry and dispose of all waste as soon as it is finished in one location or at the end of each work day (whichever is sooner).

- Concrete, Grout & Mortar Application
  - Store concrete, grout, and mortar away from storm drains or waterways, and have pailers under cover to prevent them from rain, runoff, and wind.
  - Wash out concrete equipment/trucks offsite or in a designated washout area, where the water will flow into a temporary waste pit, and in a manner that will prevent leaching into the underlying soil or into surrounding areas.
  - Let concrete harden and dispose of as appropriate.

- Landscaping
  - Protect stockpiled landscaping materials from wind and rain by storing them under tents or cover.
  - Do not work on landscaping materials on pallets or under cover.
  - Discontinue application of any erodible landscape material within 2 days before a forecast rain event or during wet weather.

- Dewatering
  - Discharges of groundwater or expelled runoff from dewatering operations must be properly managed and disposed. When possible and dewatering discharges to landscaped area or sanitary sewer. If discharging to the sanitary sewer, call your local wastewater treatment plant.
  - Driveway runs on water must be fenced off and a discharge of water into a street gutter or storm drain, filtration or diversion through a basin, tank, or sediment trap may be required.

- Storm drain pollutants may be liable for fines of up to $10,000 per day!
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BLACK MOUNTAIN PROPERTIES, LLC

Attachment: 888 Bransten Proposed Plans (Consider PD Applications)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>Bransten Proposed Plans</td>
<td>Consider PD Applications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATERIALS AND PLANT SCHEDULE**
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Attachment: 888 Bransten Proposed Plans (Consider PD Applications)
Black Mountain Properties (BMP) respectfully requests that the San Carlos City Council authorize City Planning Staff to process and to conclude the ongoing 888 Bransten project entitlements, including the negotiation of a Community Benefits Package for the project and the completion of the entitlements process for the BMP project.

**Background:**

On 5/21/19 BMP applied for entitlements on a proposed 210,832 Sq. Ft. Life Science facility at 888 Bransten. The high-quality design of the building and site’s location will positively contribute to the redevelopment occurring along Industrial Road. BMP also proposed an open-air pavilion as part of the development at the intersection of Industrial and Bransten.

The 888 Bransten project is located immediately adjacent to Highway 101, approximately ½ mile from the San Carlos Caltrain, ½ mile from the Holly Street / 101 interchange and ¼ mile from the Brittan Street / 101 South bound on ramp.

**Why BMP is Requesting City Direction to Staff:**

- BMP submitted 888 Bransten for pre-application review on 5/21/19 and has been actively engaged in processing the entitlements with the City of San Carlos for one (1) year and eight (8) months.
- 888 Bransten entitlement application is literally weeks away from being deemed complete and then going to Planning Commission.
- BMP has operated in good faith following all the rules of the applicable entitlement process, and now the rules are potentially being changed at the 11th hour.
- Like the former Meridian 25 project, 888 Bransten is located immediately adjacent to Highway 101 and thus, also like the former Meridian 25 project, 888 Bransten has no impact on residential and downtown areas.
- The project is located against the freeway where no housing can be located per CEQA.
- BMP’s proposed project constitutes less than 8% of the 2.5 to 3 million square feet of potential commercial development on the East Side (as is already contemplated and anticipated in the City’s existing General Plan 2030)

**Merits of the 888 Bransten Project:**

- Significant improvements to Industrial Road street scape and pedestrian foot traffic.
- An open-air outdoor public pavilion for community use.
- A Life Science building is less impactful than a commercial office; fewer occupants per square foot means fewer vehicle trips.
- No neighborhood views are impaired.
- Easy access to freeways north & south bound.
- Reflects the architecture of the buildings in the vicinity.

**Financial Benefits to The City of San Carlos:**

- $3,078,640 is Black Mountain’s estimated Commercial Linkage Fees. (210,832 Sq. Ft. new building – 56,900 Sq. Ft. of existing buildings = 153,932 Sq. Ft. X $20) [rounded $3 million].
- SCEF partnership: $100,000 over ten years, not contingent on project completion. BMP’s first installment has already been made.
- New 888 Bransten project will provide an estimated $2,781,250 in property taxes annually vs. $133,231.59 annually for the current use or an increase of $2,648,018.41 annually.
- Property taxes on a $250,000,000 completed 888 Bransten project would be a benefit to the City that keeps on giving for the next 30 years.

**Other Considerations:**

- At 210,832 square feet, the 888 Bransten Project is less than 8% of the potential growth of the East Side.
- BMP’s application was submitted and continues to be actively pursued in good faith, relying on existing and applicable City laws and procedures. A delay now is simply unfair.
- Founded in 1937, Black Mountain has been a San Carlos business that has grown with the community for the past 83 years.
- To date, BMP has invested close to $1 Million dollars in the process, is relocating tenants and is not renewing leases for tenants currently in the three buildings where the new building is proposed.
- A year to a year and a half delay caused by the City’s last-minute change in the process will be an extreme financial hardship.

With the most recent news of Oracle, Tesla, Hewlett Packard, Charles Schwab, Uber and others leaving the Bay Area, we in San Carlos are fortunate to have the long term, sustainable economic opportunity that comes with Life Science development projects. BMP is proud to be contributing to this dynamic.

Based on the 888 Bransten project merits (time, location, and manner of the proposed development), on a sense of fairness, and on the overall de minimis square footage proposed by BMP (when seen in light of the overall potential development), **BMP respectfully requests City Council authorize City staff to process the BMP application and to proceed with Community Benefits negotiations and complete the entitlement process for the 888 Bransten project.**

Thank you Honorable Mayor Parmer-Lohan and City Council Members McDowell, Rak, Collins and Dugan for taking the time to review and consider this request.
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Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs)

Construction projects are required to implement the stormwater best management practices (BMP) on this page, as they apply to your project, all year long.

Materials & Waste Management

- Non-Hazardous Materials
  - Burn and cover stockpiles of sand or dirt with another material when not in use or if not actively being used within 4 days.
  - Use or discard as required for dust control.

- Hazardous Materials
  - Label all hazardous materials and hazardous waste in water tight containers, store in appropriate secondary containment, and cover them at the end of every work day or during wet weather or when it is forecast.
  - Follow manufacturers' application instructions for hazardous materials and be careful not to overestimate quantities. Do not apply chemicals outdoors when rain is forecast within 24 hours.
  - Arrange for appropriate disposal of all hazardous wastes.

- Waste Management
  - Cover waste disposal containers securely with tops at the end of every work day and during wet weather.
  - Check waste disposal containers frequently for leaks and to make sure they are not overfilled. Never hose down a dumpster on the construction site.
  - Clean or replace portable toilets, and inspect them frequently for leaks and spills.
  - Dispose of all wastes and debris properly. Recycle materials and wastes that can be recycled (such as asphalt, concrete, aggregate materials, wood, glass, brass, pipe, etc.)
  - Dispose of liquified gas from tanks, trailers, solvents, glazing, and cleaning fluids from hazardous waste.

- Construction Exteriors and Perimeters
  - Install and maintain effective perimeter controls and stabilize all construction entrances and exits to sufficiently control erosion and sediment discharges from site and tracking off site.
  - Stop or vacate any active street immediately and secure adjustments to prevent further tracking. Never hose down streets to clean up tracking.

- Maintenance and Parking
  - Designate an area, with appropriate BMPs, for vehicle and equipment parking and storage.
  - Perform regular maintenance, repair, and vehicle and equipment washing off site.
  - If vehicle or equipment maintenance must be done onsite, work in a confined area away from storm drains and take steps to prevent dirt, gravel, or other materials from entering the stormwater system.
  - Do not wash vehicle or equipment onsite using soaps, solvents, degreasers, or steam cleaning equipment.

- Equipment Management & Spill Control

- Earthmoving
  - Schedule grading and excavation work during dry weather.
  - Stabilize all disturbed areas and maintain temporary erosion controls (such as erosion control fabric or tendril fabric) until vegetation is established.
  - Remove existing vegetation only as absolutely necessary, and seed or plant vegetation for erosion control on slopes or areas where construction is not immediately planned.
  - Prevent sediment from moving offsite and protect storm drain inlets, gullies, ditches, and drainage courses by stabilizing and maintaining appropriate BMPs, such as fiber stabilization, use of erosion control fabric, catch basin inlet filters, or gravel bags to stop sediment from entering the storm drain system.
  - Keep excavated soil on site and transfer it to dump trucks on site, not to the streets.

- Paving/Asphalt Work

- Concrete, Grout & Mortar Application

- Painting & Paint Removal

- Painting Cleanup and Removal
  - Never clean brushes or rinse paint containers into a street, gutter, storm drain, or stream.
  - For water-based paints, point out brushes to the extent possible, and rinse extra drain that goes to the sanitary sewer.
  - Never pour paint down a storm drain.
  - For oil-based paints, paint out brushes to the extent possible and clean with thinner or solvent in a proper container. Filter and paint rinse water through filters. Dispose of excess liquid in hazardous waste.

- Dewatering

- Landscaping

Storm drain polluters may be liable for fines of up to $10,000 per day!
MEETING DATE: January 25, 2021

ITEM TITLE: Consideration of Appointing Representatives to the Grand Boulevard Initiative Working Committee.

RECOMMENDATION:
Appoint a City Council representative and alternate to the Grand Boulevard Initiative Working Committee as deemed appropriate to ensure City representation.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:
None for this action.

BACKGROUND:
Appointments to various committees are traditionally made following City Council reorganization. Attachment 1 denotes the proposed additional assignment for 2021.

The City of San Carlos Code of Conduct & Ethics Policy for Council Members and Appointed Officials indicates that the Mayor is the presiding officer of the City Council and in this capacity “… is responsible for . . . appointing Council Members to standing or ad hoc committees. The Mayor is also responsible for appointing Council Members to certain county and regional boards and committees.” Council is requested to discuss and consider the appointments before voting to approve.

ANALYSIS:
At the last Council meeting, Council approved the appointments made by the Mayor. Since that time, the City learned that the Grand Boulevard Initiative, which was expected to be dormant in 2021, has been resurrected. The Grand Boulevard Initiative is a regional collaboration dedicated to the revitalization of the El Camino Real corridor as it runs through San Mateo and Santa Clara counties in the California Bay Area. The 2021 meeting schedule for this group is 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on the last Monday of the months of February, April, July, and October.

Due to this change in activity, Council members will need to be appointed to serve on this regional group, and the Mayor is requesting two volunteers.
ALTERNATIVES:

The alternatives available to the City Council include:

1. Discuss the new appointment opportunities and approve the changes to the appointments of the City Council Members; or

2. Do not approve the changes to the City Council Member appointments; or

3. Provide the Mayor with alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted by:

Tara Peterson,
Assistant City Manager

Approved for submission by:

Jeff Maltbie, City Manager

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. 2021 Council Boards Commissions and Committee Assignments
## CITY COUNCIL REGIONAL JPA’S, BOARDS AND COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

### 2021

#### I. APPOINTMENTS TO OTHER AGENCIES – CITY OF SAN CARLOS REPRESENTATIVE(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Committee Name</th>
<th>Primary/Alternate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance Life Support (ALS)</td>
<td>McDowell/ Dugan</td>
<td>(3rd Wed of Jan/May/Sept, 6:30 pm) San Mateo County Pre-Hospital Emergency Medical Services Group. JPA for emergency ambulance services in San Mateo County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Roundtable</td>
<td>Dugan/Rak</td>
<td>(1st Wednesday of Feb/April/June/Aug/Oct/Dec, 7:00 pm) A voluntary public forum established in 1981 for the discussion and implementation of noise mitigation strategies at San Francisco International Airport (SFO). <a href="http://www.sforoundtable.org/">www.sforoundtable.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) General Assembly</td>
<td>Dugan/Rak</td>
<td>(Annual meeting) Determine policy matters for the Association, including adopting annual general budget, and review recommendations of the Executive Board. <a href="http://abag.ca.gov/overview/ga.html">http://abag.ca.gov/overview/ga.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont-San Carlos Fire Department</td>
<td>Collins &amp; Dugan/McDowell</td>
<td>(Meetings as needed) Former fire protection services provider for San Carlos, Belmont and the Harbor Industrial Area (HIA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Modernization Local Policy Maker Working Group</td>
<td>Collins/Parmer-Lohan</td>
<td>(4th Thursday, 5:30pm) Regional committee of Council Members and County Supervisors along the Caltrain corridor in San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The group receive updates and provides comments on the Caltrain Modernization program which includes Caltrain Electrification, Blended Operations and Caltrain/California High Speed Rail operations. <a href="http://www.caltrain.com/projectsplans/CaltrainModernization.html">www.caltrain.com/projectsplans/CaltrainModernization.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)</td>
<td>Rak/Parmer-Lohan</td>
<td>(2nd Thursday, 6:30 pm) Association of cities + County on issues affecting San Mateo County. <a href="http://ccag.ca.gov/">http://ccag.ca.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC)</td>
<td>Rak/Collins</td>
<td>(4th Thursday, 4pm) Subcommittee of the City/County Association of Governments formed to advise and recommend actions regarding the updating of Airport Land Use Plan land use compatibility issues affecting the airports in San Mateo County. <a href="http://ccag.ca.gov/committees/airport-land-use-committee/">http://ccag.ca.gov/committees/airport-land-use-committee/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services Council</td>
<td>Dugan/McDowell</td>
<td>(Quarterly on 3rd Thursday, 5:30 pm) Countywide Board that prepares for mutual aid response in the event of a natural disaster or act of terrorism. Staffed through the County Sheriff’s office, this Council is funded by a 21 member-agency JPA, and funds activities including HAZMAT, mutual aid communications and OES response staffing. <a href="https://bnc.smcgov.org/emergency-services-council">https://bnc.smcgov.org/emergency-services-council</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Boulevard Initiative Working Committee</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>(Quarterly) A regional collaboration dedicated to the revitalization of the El Camino Real corridor, as it runs through San Mateo and Santa Clara counties in the California Bay Area. <a href="http://www.grandboulevard.net">www.grandboulevard.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home for All</td>
<td>Parmer-Lohan/Dugan</td>
<td>(Meetings as needed) Public, private and nonprofit agencies collaborative to address the job/housing gap and determine solutions that can be implemented County-wide. <a href="https://homeforallsmc.org/">https://homeforallsmc.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of California Cities, Peninsula Division</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>(Meets Quarterly) Represents all cities in California on legislative matters in Sacramento. The Peninsula Division runs from San Francisco to Gilroy and meets quarterly on the peninsula plus an annual breakfast to elect officers of the division during the League of California Cities Annual Conference. <a href="http://www.cacities.org/Member-Engagement/Regional-Divisions/Peninsula">www.cacities.org/Member-Engagement/Regional-Divisions/Peninsula</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Governing Board JPA</td>
<td>McDowell/Dugan</td>
<td>(Meets five times a year on Mondays, 8:15am) JPA for county library services. <a href="http://www.smcl.org">www.smcl.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peninsula Clean Energy JPA Board (4th Thursday, 6:30pm) Parmer-Lohan/Dugan

Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance (3rd Thursday in Feb/Apr/June/Sept/Nov, 8am) McDowell/Parmer-Lohan
Transportation systems management: shuttles/carpooling/Spare the Air information.
www.commute.org

San Mateo County Council of Cities (Last Friday of Month) All
Mayors and Councilmembers from San Mateo County’s 20 cities meet monthly to discuss issues/receive
presentations on issues of mutual concerns. www.councilofcities.org

City Selection Committee (Meets prior to Council of Cities) Mayor/designee votes on appointments
Subcommittee of Council of Cities. Business meeting starts at 6:15 p.m.
in order to vote on appointments to regional boards. Location changes monthly.

San Mateo County Convention and Visitors Bureau (Monthly) All
Funded by contributions of local hotels, motels, restaurants, museums and tourist attractions in the County.
Publishes monthly guides of events in the County hosted by member businesses. www.smccvb.com/

Silicon Valley Clean Water (3rd Monday, 8am) Collins/Dugan
JPA for sewage/wastewater treatment services. www.svcw.org

South Bayside Waste Management Authority (4th Thursday, 2pm) Rak/Parmer-Lohan
JPA for solid waste and recycling services. www.rethinkwaste.org

II. APPOINTMENTS TO OTHER AGENCIES – AGENCY, NOT CITY APPOINTED
(Requires Application by an Interested Council Member, When Positions Are Available)

Housing and Community Development Committee (HCDC) Collins
HCDC makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors related to the expenditure of all housing and
community development funds to review and provide a forum for public comment on affordable housing
and community development needs. www.housing.smcgov.org/hcdc

Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) Board (4th Wednesday monthly, 3pm) McDowell
HEART is a Joint Powers Authority nonprofit organization, whose board consists of 10 elected officials
and 10 members of the private sector who work to create more affordable housing throughout the County.
Appointed by the City Selection Committee. www.heartofsmc.org

III. APPOINTMENTS TO CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEES & COUNCIL AD-HOC COMMITTEES

2+2 – City/School District (as needed) McDowell and Rak
Informal liaison committee between School District and City on areas of mutual concern.
Child Care Parmer-Lohan and McDowell
Code of Conduct and Ethics Policy Subcommittee Collins and Parmer-Lohan
Communication Parmer-Lohan and Dugan
Downtown Subcommittee Collins and Rak
Economic Development McDowell and Parmer-Lohan
Four Corners Working Group (Belmont-San Carlos Cranfield Carlmont Traffic) Collins and McDowell
Housing Committee Dugan and Collins
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Liaison(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>McDowell and Rak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Public Art Task Force</td>
<td>Dugan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Circulation</td>
<td>Collins and Dugan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. COUNCIL LIAISONS TO OTHER ASSOCIATIONS & NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Liaison(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Industrial Association (1st Thursday, lunch at Van’s in Belmont)</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Educational Foundation</td>
<td>Dugan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Dugan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>