NOTICE OF HEALTH COMFORT SAFETY MEASURE EVALUATION

FOR THE ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE (ESA) PROGRAM

In D.14-08-030, the Commission adopted the recommendation of the Cost-Effectiveness Working Group that the IOUs be directed to conduct, during the 2015-2017 cycle, a preliminary, qualitative Equity Evaluation, with opportunity for party comment on the preliminary results. The Commission’s intent was that this Equity Evaluation be conducted for informational purposes.[[1]](#footnote-1) Please note that the Cost-Effectiveness Working Group has decided to rename the Equity Evaluation the “Health, Comfort and Safety Evaluation” (HCS Evaluation) to improve clarity surrounding the purpose of the evaluation. The results of the HCS evaluation will be used to help inform program design. As explained by the Cost-Effectiveness Working Group in its 2013 “Addendum to ESAP Cost-Effectiveness Working Group White Paper: Working Group Final Recommendations,” submitted in A.11-05-017 et al.:

“The intention of the [Health, Comfort and Safety Evaluation] is to provide an additional level of analysis of relatively qualitative non-energy benefits (e.g., health, comfort, and safety) and to address the difficulty of monetizing all relevant non-energy benefits. We recognize that there may be some overlap between the [Health, Comfort and Safety Evaluation] and the NEBs calculations. However, since we are recommending that tests such as the ESACET be applied on the program level, and the [Health, Comfort and Safety Evaluation] applied on the measure level, we do not think that any overlap will result in any sort of double-counting of benefits. “

The Cost-Effectiveness Working Group recommended that all measures in the 2015-2017 ESA program be assessed based on the following four criteria in the Equity Evaluation:

* The extent to which the measure eliminates combustion-related safety threat;
* The extent to which the measure eliminates fire safety threat/improves home security (crime prevention) and building integrity;
* The extent to which the measure reduces or eliminates extreme temperatures and temperature variations inside the home/improves customer ability to manage in-home temperatures; and
* The extent to which the measure improves air quality, ventilation and/or air flow (e.g. reduces drafts and leakage).[[2]](#footnote-2)

In D.16-11-022, the Commission modified the program cycle from 2015-2017 to 2017-2020.

Also explained by the Cost-Effectiveness Working Group in its 2013 “Addendum to ESAP Cost-Effectiveness Working Group White Paper: Working Group Final Recommendations,” is the approach to utilizing the results of the HCS Evaluation in the design of the Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) Program:

“Additionally, we recommend that at least for the 2015-17 program cycle, the [HCS Evaluation] be used for informational purposes only to better understand program impacts and design, and that the [HCS Evaluation] not be used for ESA program approval.[[3]](#footnote-3)”

In consultation with the ESA Cost-Effectiveness Working Group, the IOUs have now completed the preliminary HCS Evaluation called for in D.14-08-030, based on their 2017-2020 programs authorized in D.16-11-022, and are soliciting stakeholder input. Interested parties are encouraged to review the evaluation results and to post comments and proposed alternate scoring by December 29, 2017 at the Energy Division's Public Document Area.[[4]](#footnote-4)
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