

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

February 12, 2020

Agenda ID # 18179
Quasi-Legislative

~~TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 19-01-011~~

~~This is the proposed decision of Commissioner Liane M. Randolph. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's March 26, 2020 Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.~~

~~Parties of record may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.~~

~~/s/ ANNE E. SIMON~~
~~Anne E. Simon~~
~~Chief Administrative Law Judge~~

~~AES:avsAttachment~~COM/LR1/avs**PROPOSED DECISION**Agenda ID #18179 **(REV. 1)**
Quasi-Legislative
3/26/20 Item 19

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER RANDOLPH** (Mailed
2/12/2020)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking
Regarding Building Decarbonization.

Rulemaking 19-01-011

**~~PROPOSED~~ DECISION ESTABLISHING BUILDING
DECARBONIZATION PILOT PROGRAMS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
PROPOSED DECISION ESTABLISHING BUILDING - DECARBONIZATION PILOT PROGRAMS.....	2
Summary.....	2
1. Background.....	6 7
1.1. BUILD Program Statutory Requirements.....	7 8
1.2. TECH Initiative Statutory Requirements.....	8 9
1.3. SB 1477 Pilot Programs Staff Proposal Summary.....	9 10
1.4. Parties' Response to Staff Proposal.....	12 13
2. Issues Before the Commission.....	13 14
3. Discussion and Analysis of Common Issues Between the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative.....	15 16
3.1. SB 1477 Pilot Program Budgets.....	16 17
3.1.1. Staff Proposal Recommendations for Pilot Program Appropriations.....	17
3.1.2. Parties' Positions.....	18
3.1.3. Analysis: The SB 1477 Pilot Program Budget and Compliance Costs Shall Be Apportioned Across the Four Gas Corporations According to Each Gas Corporation's Percentage Share of Allocated Cap-and-Trade Allowances and Shall Comply with Cap-and-Trade Regulations.....	23 24
3.1.4. Analysis: The SB 1477 Pilot Program Budget Shall Appropriate 40 Percent of Program Funds to the BUILD Program and 60 Percent of Program Funds to the TECH Initiative.....	26 28
3.2. Pilot Program Guidelines, Program Metrics, and Performance Evaluation.....	30 32
3.2.1. Staff Proposal Summary.....	31 32
3.2.2. Parties' Positions.....	32 34
3.2.3. Analysis: To Fulfill SB 1477's Program Evaluation Requirements, a Single Evaluator Shall Evaluate Both the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative at the Initiation of Both Pilot Programs, and Throughout Implementation.....	36 37
3.2.4. Analysis: The BUILD Program and TECH Initiative Evaluator Shall Use the GHG Benefits Metrics as a Primary Factor for Measuring Success.....	37 39
3.3. Pilot Programs Education and Outreach.....	39 41

3.3.1.	Staff Proposal Summary.....	40 <u>41</u>
3.3.2.	Parties' Positions.....	40 <u>42</u>
3.3.3.	Analysis: A Successful Education and Outreach Campaign for the Pilot Programs Shall Have a Calibrated Approach with Technical Assistance Activities to Ensure Effective Market Adoption of Building Decarbonization Strategies Education and outreach will increase the effectiveness of the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative.....	41 <u>43</u>
3.4.	Refrigerants.....	43 <u>45</u>
3.4.1.	Staff Proposal Summary.....	44 <u>46</u>
3.4.2.	Parties' Positions.....	44 <u>46</u>
3.4.3.	Analysis: Reducing Refrigerant-based GHG Emissions has some of the Greatest Potential to Reduce GHG Emissions in California and the Adoption of a Lower GWP Will Further the Objectives of SB 1477 to Promote Emerging Building Decarbonization Technologies and Strategies.....	45 <u>47</u>
4.	BUILD Program.....	46 <u>48</u>
4.1.	BUILD Program Administrator.....	47 <u>49</u>
4.1.1.	Staff Proposal Summary.....	47 <u>49</u>
4.1.2.	Parties' Positions.....	47 <u>49</u>
4.1.3.	Analysis: The CEC Shall Administer the BUILD Program With Commission Oversight.....	48 <u>50</u>
4.2.	BUILD Program Parameters for New Low-Income Housing and Disadvantaged Communities with Technical Assistance.....	50 <u>52</u>
4.2.1.	Staff Proposal Summary.....	51 <u>53</u>
4.2.2.	Parties' Positions.....	52 <u>54</u>
4.2.3.	Analysis: 30 Percent of the SB 1477 Funds Allocated to New Low-Income Residential Housing of the BUILD Program is a Floor, Not a Ceiling.....	54 <u>56</u>
4.3.	BUILD Program Incentive Architecture.....	57 <u>59</u>
4.3.1.	Staff Proposal Summary.....	57 <u>60</u>
4.3.2.	Parties' Position.....	59 <u>61</u>
4.3.3.	Analysis: BUILD Program Incentives Shall Be Appropriated Only to Newly Constructed Projects That Are All Electric, Consistent with the State Requirements to a Zero-GHG Emissions Future.....	62 <u>65</u>
4.3.4.	Analysis: The CEC Shall Structure BUILD Program Incentive Design and Distribution, and Ensure that Such Incentives are	

	Proportionally Allocated by Service Territory, Consistent with Cap-and-Trade Regulations.....	64 <u>67</u>
5.	TECH Initiative.....	66 <u>69</u>
5.1.	TECH Initiative Implementer Selection.....	67 <u>70</u>
5.1.1.	Staff Proposal Summary.....	67 <u>70</u>
5.1.2.	Parties' Positions.....	67 <u>70</u>
5.1.3.	Analysis: Selection of the TECH Initiative Implementer shall be led by an Energy Division selection process, with expert advice and stakeholder advice.....	68 <u>71</u>
5.2.	TECH Initiative Market Development Parameters.....	73 <u>77</u>
5.2.1.	Staff Proposal Summary.....	74 <u>77</u>
5.2.2.	Parties' Positions.....	77 <u>80</u>
5.2.3.	Analysis: The TECH Initiative Implementer Shall Approach the Initiative with a Menu of Tactics but must Implement an Upstream and Mid-Stream Market Approach to Drive Market Transformation Consistent with Statutory Requirements.....	79 <u>82</u>
5.3.	TECH Initiative Technology Parameters.....	82 <u>86</u>
5.3.1.	Staff Proposal Summary.....	82 <u>87</u>
5.3.2.	Parties Positions.....	83 <u>88</u>
5.3.3.	Analysis: The TECH Initiative Implementer Shall Select Eligible Technologies With a Performance-based Approach on GHG Emission Reduction Baselines to Best Meet Program Goals.....	85 <u>90</u>
6.	Conclusion.....	87 <u>91</u>
7.	Comments on Proposed Decision.....	89 <u>94</u>
8.	Assignment of Proceeding.....	90 <u>95</u>
	Findings of Fact.....	90 <u>95</u>
	Conclusions of Law.....	92 <u>98</u>
	ORDER.....	97 <u>105</u>

Appendix A – Style Reference Tables

Appendix B – Appendix Cover Sheet

Appendix C – ~~[Title of Appendix C]~~ Additional Pilot Program Guidelines

**PROPOSED DECISION ESTABLISHING BUILDING
DECARBONIZATION PILOT PROGRAMS****Summary**

This decision establishes a framework for California Public Utilities Commission ([Commission or CPUC](#)) oversight of Senate Bill (SB) 1477's (Stern, 2018) two building decarbonization pilot programs – the Building Initiative for Low-Emissions Development (BUILD Program) program and the Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating (TECH Initiative) initiative. These two pilot programs are designed to develop valuable market experience for the purpose of decarbonizing California's residential buildings in order to achieve California's zero-emissions goals.

~~This building~~[Building](#) decarbonization pilot program funding is authorized and financed pursuant to SB 1477. SB 1477 makes available \$50 million annually for four years,¹ for a total of \$200 million, derived from the revenue generated from the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission allowances directly allocated to gas corporations and consigned to auction as part of the California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) Cap-and-Trade program.² This decision appropriates 40 percent of the \$200 million budget for the BUILD Program and 60 percent for the TECH Initiative.

To comply with CARB rules regarding Cap-and-Trade funds, spending for the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative shall be proportionally directed to

¹ Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-2020 to FY 2022-23.

² Four gas corporations currently participate in California's Cap-and-Trade program: Southern California Gas Company, Pacific Gas & Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southwest Gas Corporation.

the gas corporation service territories where the funds are derived.³ The percentage allocation for pilot program spending in each gas corporation service territory shall be consistent with each gas corporation's allocation of Cap-and-Trade allowances:

Southern California Gas Company: 49.26 percent
 Pacific Gas and Electric Company: 42.34 percent
 San Diego Gas & Electric Company: 6.77 percent
 Southwest Gas Corporation: 1.63 percent

Any spending for the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative with statewide or cross-territory benefits, including but not limited to administrative and evaluation spending, shall be attributed to the gas corporation service territories in proportion to their original funding contribution. To the extent that there are unspent GHG allowance proceeds allocated for an individual gas corporation's service territory, and no remaining eligible projects within that service territory, the remaining GHG allowance proceeds may be spent outside of that gas corporation's service territory, starting two years after ~~initial~~ implementation. Any unspent funds remaining as of July 1, 2033 shall be returned to the ratepayers of the respective gas corporations as part of the California Climate Credit.

The BUILD Program shall be administered by the California Energy ~~Commission (CEC)~~, with ~~California Public Utilities Commission (Commission or CPUC)~~ oversight.⁴ ~~We ask the~~ The CEC should aim to design the BUILD Program

³ See Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations Section 95893(d)(3): "Allowance value, including any allocated allowance auction proceeds, obtained by a natural gas supplier must be used for the primary benefit of retail natural gas ratepayers of each natural gas supplier, consistent with the goals of Assembly Bill 32, and may not be used for the benefit of entities or persons other than such ratepayers."

⁴ "CPUC Commission oversight," is defined as activities typically performed by the CPUC where ratepayer funds are expended for public interest purposes. For example, the CPUC retains ultimate policy oversight in the areas of energy efficiency, demand response, renewables, and general procurement of electricity. Staff Proposal, Section 4.2.

with the goal to deploy near-zero emission building technologies in the largest number of new residential housing units possible. To achieve that aim, at least 30 percent of the total \$200 million in total funding authorized by SB 1477 (*i.e.*, ~~\$80~~60 million) is appropriated for new low-income residential housing under BUILD Program. This percentage is not the ceiling for spending on low-income housing but rather, the floor.

Incentive eligibility for the BUILD Program shall be limited strictly to ~~newly constructed⁵ all-electric~~new residential housing building projects, ~~without any~~ that are all-electric and have no hookup to the gas distribution grid. New residential housing is defined as one of the following:

1. A building that has never been used or occupied for any purpose;⁵ or
2. Any work, addition to, remodel, repair, renovation, or alteration of any building(s) or structure(s) when 50 percent or more of the exterior weight bearing walls are removed or demolished;⁶ or
3. An existing building repurposed for housing, whose original use was not residential.

In the event that funds reserved for new low-income residential housing ~~building projects~~ remain unspent ~~after~~ two years ~~following~~after outreach and i
mplementation of the BUILD Program implementation, the CEC, ~~and~~ after informal consultation with the Commission's Energy Division staff, and through the implementation plan approval process, may change ~~building project~~program eligibility requirements, as allowed under Public Utilities Code Section 921.1(c)(2), to include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Extending BUILD Program to address any barriers to scaling decarbonization in low income residential housing

⁵ ~~Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations Section 100.1 defines a "newly constructed" building as a building that has never been used or occupied for any purpose. —~~

⁵ See Section 100.1 of Part 6 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (California Energy Code).

⁶ See Chapter 15.06.030 Section R202 of the California Residential Building Code.

identified by the program evaluator, the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group, or the Low Income Oversight Board, and consistent with the legislative intent of SB 1477;

2. ~~1)~~ Extending unspent funds to new market-rate housing projects;
- ~~2) Extending funding eligibility to new construction in existing buildings pursuant to the California Energy Code;~~
- ~~3) Extending funding eligibility to building projects that repurpose industrial or commercial facilities for residential use; and~~
3. ~~4)~~ Extending funding eligibility to electric-ready retrofits to ease future transitions toward all-electric buildings.

The ~~California Energy Commission~~ CEC shall ensure that program outreach has begun and technical assistance is available to all prospective applicants for new low-income residential housing ~~building projects~~ prior to the start of implementation in order to encourage greater participation in the BUILD Program. If necessary, the CEC has the discretion to solicit a third-party contractor to provide technical assistance or to implement any ~~or~~ parts of the BUILD Program for effective implementation. Following the approval of the implementation plan, and after having completed the statutory and regulatory requirements necessary to begin implementation, the CEC shall publicly notice the commencement of the BUILD Program to signal that applications for the program are being accepted. Implementation shall be considered to have begun from the date the notice is published.

The TECH Initiative shall be effectuated by a third-party implementer. The third-party implementer shall be selected with Commission oversight. The Commission directs Southern California Edison Company (SCE) to act as the contracting agent responsible for managing the solicitation for the third-party

implementer. SCE is entitled to a portion of the TECH Initiative funding, to recover expenses that may be incurred while serving as the contracting agent.

The selection of the implementer shall occur through a request for proposal (RFP) process. The Commission's Energy Division, alongside a panel of financially disinterested experts, shall score proposals and select a bidder to serve as the third-party implementer for the TECH Initiative. Upon the conclusion of the selection process, SCE shall file a Tier 32 advice letter seeking approval of candidate-implementer for the TECH Initiative.

To accelerate market development and adoption of building decarbonization technologies targeted under the TECH Initiative, we allow the implementer ~~the prerogative~~discretion to consider or build upon an array of tactics and approaches. However, we require the implementer to, at a minimum, use the upstream and midstream approaches we adopt here, as well as provide consumer education, contractor training, and vendor training. We decline to adopt a prescriptive list of eligible technologies and products, until an implementer is selected for the TECH Initiative,~~as~~ Applicants in the ~~request for proposal~~RFP process shall propose the most promising market segments areas for focused implementation efforts. We support the development of program designs that consider barriers to participation faced by low-income, disadvantaged, and hard-to-reach customers in order to maximize the market development benefits for these customer segments.

Finally, a single, independent program evaluator shall evaluate both pilot programs. SCE shall procure the independent program evaluator through a ~~request for proposal~~RFP process at the same time as the implementer for the TECH Initiative is procured. The program evaluator shall be engaged throughout the initiation of ~~these~~the two pilot programs and during the

administration of them to ensure that substantive, real-time feedback is given, and data and information gathering is meaningful to support programmatic success.

1. Background

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission or CPUC) initiated this rulemaking to craft a policy regarding the decarbonization of buildings in California. ~~Phase I~~The first phase of this proceeding focuses on the implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 1477 (Stern, 2018), which requires the Commission to develop two programs, designed to test two specific programmatic approaches to building decarbonization. The two SB 1477 pilot programs are: (1) the Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development or BUILD (BUILD Program); and (2) the Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating (TECH Initiative).

First, the BUILD Program, codified under Sections 921 and 921.1,⁶⁷ is aimed to incent the deployment of near-zero building technologies in new residential buildings that reduce ~~greenhouse gas~~ (GHG) emissions significantly beyond what otherwise would be expected to result from the implementation of the prescriptive standards described in Part 6 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (California Energy Code).⁷⁸ Second, the TECH Initiative, codified under Section 922, is ~~aimed~~intended to advance California's market for low-emissions space and water heating equipment that is in an early stage of market development in both new and existing residential buildings.

The BUILD Program and TECH Initiative are building decarbonization pilot programs intended to raise awareness of building decarbonization

⁶⁷ All subsequent references are to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise specified.

⁷⁸ The California Energy Code is updated every three years. References to the California Energy Code used in this decision mean the iteration of the code that the building project applying for the incentive will be built to.

technologies and applications, test program and policy designs, and gain practical implementation experience and knowledge necessary to develop a larger scale approach in the future. Scalability is a critical criterion for evaluating different program design and implementation options.

1.1. BUILD Program Statutory Requirements

SB 1477 establishes key ~~strictures~~parameters for the BUILD Program. First is the BUILD Program's funding source. Under Sections 748.6 and 921.1(a)(3), the Legislature provides that funding for the BUILD Program is available from a pool of \$200 million, collected ~~in~~over four years in increments totaling \$50 million ~~annual installments, from~~annually starting in Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 ~~to~~and ending in FY 2022-23. These funds are derived from ~~the greenhouse gas (GHG)~~ proceeds resulting from GHG emissions allowances directly allocated to gas corporations and consigned to auction as part of the ~~California Air Resources Board's (CARB)~~ Cap-and-Trade program.

Second, SB 1477 places specific programmatic emphasis on "new, low-income residential housing."⁸⁹ SB 1477 requires that no less than 30 percent of the total BUILD Program funding ~~allocated by SB 1477~~ be reserved to incentivize "new low-income, residential housing."⁹¹⁰ SB 1477 also requires that for new low-income, residential housing, building projects must: (a) receive higher incentives than other types of housing,¹⁰¹¹ (b) be offered technical assistance, and (c) not result in higher utility bills for occupants.¹¹¹² SB 1477 further specifies that an outreach plan must be implemented to encourage applications for projects in new low-income, residential housing building

⁸⁹ Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(c)(1).

⁹¹⁰ *Id.*

¹⁰¹¹ Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(b) and § 921.1(d)(2).

¹¹¹² Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(d)(3).

projects.¹²¹³ Finally, SB 1477 establishes ~~for all building projects funded by the BUILD Program~~ requirements for incentives¹³¹⁴ and program guidelines.¹⁴ ~~for all building projects funded by the BUILD Program.~~¹⁵

1.2. TECH Initiative Statutory Requirements

SB 1477 establishes key parameters for the TECH Initiative. First, under Sections 748.6 and 922.(d), funding for the TECH Initiative is available from a pool of \$200 million, collected ~~in~~^{over} four ~~years in increments totaling~~ \$50 million ~~annual installments~~^{annually}, starting in FY 2019-20 ~~to~~^{and ending in} FY 2022-23, and derived from ~~the GHG~~ proceeds resulting from ~~the sale of~~ GHG emissions allowances directly allocated to natural gas corporations and consigned at auction as part of the CARB's Cap-~~and~~-Trade program. This funding source is shared with the BUILD Program.¹⁵¹⁶

Second, SB 1477 places specific programmatic emphasis on eligible technology and targeting criteria. Section 922(b) specifies that~~,~~ the TECH Initiative's technology and targeting criteria are: (1) low-emission space and water heating; (2) technology at an early stage of market development; (3) technology with the greatest potential for reducing GHG emissions; and (4)

¹²¹³ Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(d)(5).

¹³¹⁴ Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(a) requires that incentives be provided ~~such as~~ to significantly reduce emissions of ~~greenhouse gases (GHGs)~~ that would otherwise be expected to result from compliance with the prescriptive building energy standards established under Section 150.1 of Subchapter 8 of Part 6 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (California Energy Code). Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(b) states that the amount of the incentive must be set in consideration of other existing available incentives and the amount of expected GHG emission reductions.

¹⁴¹⁵ Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(d)(4)(A) states that the BUILD Program guidelines must include, at a minimum: (1) a list of eligible technologies; (2) a process for evaluating new technologies; (3) criteria for scoring and selecting projects; and (4) a process and set of metrics by which to evaluate and track the BUILD Program's results pursuant to § 921.1(d)(4)(B).

¹⁵¹⁶ Pub. Util. Code §§ 748.6 and 922(d).

technology with the greatest potential for improving health and safety and energy affordability for low-income households.

Third, SB 1477 requires the Commission, in coordination with the CEC, to develop guidelines and evaluation metrics, implement outreach strategies for hard-to-reach customers, and provide job training and employment opportunities.¹⁶¹⁷ The guidelines¹⁷¹⁸ and evaluation metrics¹⁸¹⁹ require, among other things, consideration of projected utility bill savings.

1.3. SB 1477 Pilot Programs Staff Proposal Summary

~~The~~ Commission and CEC staff jointly issued a *Staff Proposal for Building Decarbonization Pilot – Draft* (Staff Proposal ~~or Staff~~) on July 16, 2019.¹⁹²⁰ The Staff Proposal provides recommendations and proposals for how to implement the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative to promote building decarbonization pursuant to SB 1477. The Staff Proposal includes policy rationales and frameworks that the Commission could use to support development of portions of the building market to support faster penetration of technologies that will help decarbonize residential buildings in California. The Staff Proposal includes the following key recommendations:

- Guiding Principles: the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative should put California on a path to have completely carbon-free homes by 2045. To do this, the pilot programs should also strive for equity, cost-effectiveness, regulatory simplicity, and market transformation.

¹⁶¹⁷ Pub. Util. Code § 922(c)(1).

¹⁷¹⁸ Pub. Util. Code § 922 (c)(2)(A) states that the TECH Initiative guidelines must include, at a minimum: (1) a list of eligible technologies; (2) a process for evaluating new technologies; and (3) a process and set of metrics by which to evaluate and track the TECH Initiatives results pursuant to § 922(c)(2)(B).

¹⁸¹⁹ Pub. Util. Code § 922(c)(2)(B) states that evaluation metrics must include: (1) market share for eligible technologies; (2) projected utility bill savings; and (3) cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions.

¹⁹²⁰ See: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=6442462255>

- Budget: the CPUC should allocate 40 percent of the total annual funding made available by SB 1477 to the BUILD Program and 60 percent to the TECH Initiative, excluding evaluation costs.
- BUILD Program Administration: the CPUC should provide policy oversight of the BUILD Program, with the CEC potentially designing and administering the program.
 - Incentive Eligibility: BUILD Program incentives should only be available for all-electric residential new construction projects.
 - Low-income and Disadvantaged Communities with Technical Assistance for Project Developers: the CPUC should set aside 30 percent of the annual funding made available to the BUILD Program ~~and~~ for new residential housing in low-income and/or disadvantaged communities. A portion of these funds should be dedicated for a contractor with low-income project development expertise to provide technical assistance to low-income residential building project developers.
 - Incentives Levels by Technology Type and Climate Region: BUILD Program incentives should be established for specific technology categories and climate regions.
 - Kicker Incentives: additional BUILD Program incentives should be made available for a small number of technologies that provide incremental GHG reductions beyond the basic incentives introduced in the Staff Proposal.
 - Project Level: the CPUC should consider offering BUILD Program incentives at the subdivision level rather than, or in addition to, the building level.
 - Education and Outreach for Builders: the CPUC should ensure the provision of outreach materials to builders, with specific information about each incentive category, including the type of equipment that is eligible, proper installation guidelines, and expected emission reductions.

- TECH Initiative Administration: the CPUC should select a third-party implementer for the TECH Initiative and create a governance structure where the CPUC provides central oversight, while also allowing the CEC and stakeholders to provide collaborative input.
- [TECH Initiative](#) Program Architecture
 - Strategy 1 (Upstream): the implementer should partner with supply-side market actors to adopt the most efficient equipment available with incentives.
 - Strategy 2 (Midstream): the implementer should provide incentives to wholesale distributors, retailers, e-commerce companies, and/or contractors to stock and/or sell more efficient products.
 - Strategy 3 (Quick Start Grants): the implementer should provide a limited carve out of the TECH Initiative budget to create grant money for high-impact projects and partnerships that rapidly test market transformation strategies.
 - Strategy 4 (Prize Program): the CPUC, implementer, and stakeholders should set up simple targets for entities to meet, with a prize given to the first entity who hits the target (e.g., the number of heat pump heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems installed).
 - Target Geographical Areas: the ~~Implementer~~[implementer](#) should consider a regional approach in its initial targeting of customers who are most likely to see bill savings. Additional priority should be given to targeting incentives in areas prone to gas infrastructure failures, particularly the area around Aliso Canyon in Southern California.
 - Education and Outreach for the TECH Initiative: the implementer should provide a robust plan to educate key market participants about the TECH Initiative.

- [Eligible Technologies for the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative](#): targeted technologies of the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative should include heat pump technologies for space and water heating, and solar thermal technologies for water heating. Other technologies that achieve comparable heating-related GHG emission reductions to heat pump and solar thermal technologies should be considered.
- [Metrics for the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative](#): program success should be measured using the following metrics: (1) volume of GHG emissions reduced or avoided; (2) cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions; (3) projected utility bill savings; (4) number of low-emission systems installed (BUILD Program only); and (5) market share for eligible technologies (TECH Initiative only).

1.4. Parties' Response to Staff Proposal

Comments on the Staff Proposal were filed on August 13, 2019 by parties.

The parties are: (1) Association of Bay Area Governments ([ABAG San Francisco Bay Area Regional Energy Network or BayREN](#)); (2) Bioenergy Association of California (BAC) and American Biogas Council (ABC); (3) California Building Industry Association (CBIA); (4) California Efficiency + Demand Management Council (The Council); (5) California Energy Storage Alliance (CESA); (6) California Housing Partnership Corporation (The Partnership); (7) California Hydrogen Business Council (CHBC); (8) California Solar & Storage Association (CALSSA); (9) Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE); (10) Environmental Defense Fund (EDF); (11) Coalition for Renewable Natural Gas (CRNG); (12) National Fuel Cell Research Center (NFCRC); (13) Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E); (14) Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates); (15) San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E); (16) Natural Resources Defense Council, California Environmental Justice Alliance, and Sierra Club (Joint Environmentals); (17) Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA); (18) Sonoma Clean Power, Peninsula

Clean Energy, Marin Clean Energy, and Silicon Valley Clean Energy Authority (Joint CCAs); (19) Southern California Edison Company (SCE); (20) Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas); (21) Southwest Gas Corporation (SWG); (22) Vermont Energy Investment Corporation (VEIC); and (23) Wild Tree Foundation.

Reply Comments were filed on August 20, 2019. The parties that ~~filed~~filed reply comments are : (1) Cal Advocates; (2) Coalition for Renewable Natural Gas (CRNG); (3) CHBC; (4) CSE; (5) CALSSA; (6) EDF; (7) Joint Environmentals; (8) NFCRC; (9) SBUA; (10) SCE; (11) SoCalGas; (12) SWG; (13) VEIC; and (14) Wild Tree Foundation.

2. Issues Before the Commission

The ~~assigned~~Assigned Commissioner issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling on May 17, 2019. ²⁰²¹ The Scoping Memo determined that in the first ~~Phase~~phase of this proceeding, ~~the scope of this rulemaking~~ will focus on the implementation of SB 1477's two pilot programs, the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative.

As set forth in the Scoping Memo, the issues for this phase are:

1. How should the Commission implement SB 1477?
 - a. Who should the Commission select to administer the BUILD Program?
 - i. How should the Commission authorize funding for the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative pursuant to Section 748.6?
 - ii. How should the Commission establish budgets for the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative?
 - b. Who should the Commission select to administer the TECH Initiative?
 - c. What program design parameters should the Commission establish for the BUILD Program?
 - i. Technology eligibility criteria;
 - ii. Process for evaluating new technologies;

²⁰²¹ See: <http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M290/K324/290324466.PDF>

- iii. Guidelines and evaluation metrics;
 - iv. Criteria for scoring and selecting projects; and
 - v. Customer eligibility for benefits of the BUILD Program.
- d. What program design parameters should the Commission establish for the TECH Initiative?
- i. Technology eligibility criteria;
 - ii. Process for evaluating new technologies;
 - iii. Guidelines and evaluation metrics;
 - iv. Criteria for scoring and selecting projects; and
 - v. Customer eligibility for benefits of the TECH Initiative.
- e. Who should the Commission select to evaluate the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative?
2. Should the Commission implement any programs dedicated specifically to support the construction of decarbonized buildings in communities affected by wildfires?
3. Should the Commission make any changes to existing policies, rules, or procedures in order to facilitate better coordination with the development of Title 24 and Title 20 standards at the CEC that facilitate building decarbonization?
4. What policies, rules, and procedures should the Commission adopt to facilitate the decarbonization of buildings?

Additionally, the Scoping Memo directed the Commission's Energy Division-~~(Energy Division)~~, in joint consultation and development with CEC staff, to develop the Staff Proposal (discussed above) with a proposed approach to implement SB 1477's BUILD Program and TECH Initiative. The assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued the Staff Proposal through a ruling on July 16, 2019, requiring parties to this proceeding to comment on the Staff Proposal and respond to specific questions regarding the proposed approaches.

3. Discussion and Analysis of Common Issues Between the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative

In SB 1477, the Legislature determined that the electricity and heating fuels used in buildings are responsible for a quarter of California's GHG emissions and contribute to indoor and outdoor air pollution.²⁴²² The Legislature further found that there are a range of technologies that can achieve deep emissions reductions in buildings, including advanced energy efficiency technologies, clean heating technologies, energy storage, and load management strategies.²²²³

SB 1477's findings and declarations also identify the barriers to and benefits of building decarbonization. Barriers to building decarbonization include, but are not limited to, clean heating technologies that are not widely available in the marketplace and little uptake of near-zero emissions construction practices.²³²⁴ Benefits of building decarbonization include not only reduced GHG emissions, but also the potential for utility bill savings, improved housing affordability, and a greater selection of products available for California consumers.²⁴²⁵

In adopting SB 1477, the Legislature declared its intent that California build on its success in incentivizing rooftop solar energy systems by providing new incentives for decarbonized buildings.²⁵²⁶

3.1. SB 1477 Pilot Program Budgets

Section 748.6 requires the Commission, from FY 2019-20 ~~July 1, 2019~~ through FY 2022-~~23~~, to allocate \$50 million annually, including any accrued

²⁴²² See: http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB1477

²²²³ Id.

²³²⁴ Id.

²⁴²⁵ Id.

²⁵²⁶ Id.

interest,²⁶²⁷ from gas corporations' GHG allowance proceeds to fund the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative pursuant to SB 1477.

In the Scoping Memo and Ruling,²⁷²⁸ and in a subsequent Administrative Law Judge Ruling,²⁸²⁹ parties were asked: (1) whether the Staff Proposal's approach for using gas corporation revenue from the direct allocation of GHG allowances for funding the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative is reasonable; (2) whether the Staff Proposal's approach appropriately prescribes how to prioritize among different authorized uses of directly allocated GHG emission allowance revenues; and (3) whether the Staff Proposal's proposed budgets for the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative are appropriate.

3.1.1. Staff Proposal Recommendations for Pilot Program Appropriations

The Staff Proposal provides budgetary guidelines for both the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative. The Staff Proposal recommends allocating 40 percent of \$50 million in annual funding to the BUILD Program and 60 percent of \$50 million in annual funding to the TECH Initiative. The Staff Proposal ~~also~~ recommends a larger allocation of funds for the TECH Initiative than the BUILD Program because a successful decarbonization effort will have to address existing buildings, which is more challenging due to the number of existing buildings, their diversity, and barriers facing home energy retrofits.²⁹³⁰

The Staff Proposal ~~recommended~~^{recommends} that 10 percent of the BUILD Program's budget (~~i.e.~~, \$2 million annually) be used for administration and did not specify an administrative budget for the TECH Initiative.³⁰³¹

²⁶²⁷ Neither the statute nor the Staff Proposal defines when interest starts accruing.

²⁷²⁸ May 17, 2019 Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling.

²⁸²⁹ July 16, 2019 Assigned Administrative Law Judge's Ruling.

²⁹³⁰ Staff Proposal, Section 1.2.

³⁰³¹ Staff Proposal, Section 3.1.

Pursuant to SB 1477, as featured in the Staff Proposal, \$50 million for funding the two pilot programs is available annually for four years from the GHG allowance proceeds resulting from emission allowances directly allocated to gas corporations and consigned to auction as part of the CARB Cap-and-Trade program.

With respect to the budget appropriation for program evaluation, the Staff Proposal recommends the following:

- The program evaluation budget should be set at four ~~annual~~ percent of program costs, or \$2,000,000 per year;
- The CPUC should hire one evaluator for both pilot programs; and
- The program evaluation budget should be split between both the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative

3.1.2. Parties' Positions

Parties did not reach a consensus on the Staff Proposal's allocation of funds, but generally agreed that the Staff Proposal was compliant with the plain language of Sections 748.6, 921.1(a)(3) and 922(d). We summarize the positions of the parties⁷ below.

~~The~~ Joint Environmentals recommend that the Commission provide a four-year budget rather than an "annual budget."³¹³² ~~The~~ Joint Environmentals recommend that the allotment for low-income program costs should be a minimum, not a cap, and the budget for technical efforts should be benchmarked for similar efforts.³²³³ ~~The~~ Joint Environmentals agree with the Staff Proposal's division of funding between the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative.³³³⁴

Cal Advocates offer that to implement the statutorily required funding mechanism, the Commission should direct the gas corporations to file a Tier 1

³¹³² Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

³²³³ *Id.*

³³³⁴ *Id.* at 7.

advice letter creating an SB 1477 balancing account in which to record authorized Cap-and-Trade proceeds for the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative and from which to disburse funds to the pilot program's administrators and evaluators.³⁴³⁵ Cal Advocates recommends that ~~the~~ each gas corporation should also adjust the annual climate credit beginning with the April 2020 climate credit.³⁵³⁶ Cal Advocates also recommends that the Commission should only authorize the first year of the budget based on the Staff Proposal, and, in parallel, move forward with a phase of the proceeding to develop budgets for years two through four.³⁶³⁷

BAC asserts that the budget is too small and needs a portfolio of decarbonized fuels and technologies.³⁷³⁸ CHBC,³⁸³⁹ BayREN³⁹⁴⁰ and Wild Tree Foundation⁴⁰⁴¹ support the Staff Proposal's funding allocation division with 40 percent of the funds going to the BUILD Program and 60 percent going to the TECH Initiative.

CALSSA supports the budgetary division in the Staff Proposal, stating that retrofitting existing buildings is a "more important and more difficult challenge ... and should therefore receive a high portion of funding"⁴¹⁴² CALSSA recommends the Commission consider allocating up to 70 percent of funding for the TECH Initiative and 30 percent for the BUILD Program.⁴²⁴³

EDF believes that 40 percent of funding for the BUILD Program and 60 percent for the TECH Initiative is an appropriate allocation for an overall budget,

³⁴³⁵ Cal Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.

³⁵³⁶ *Id.*

³⁶³⁷ *Id.* at 5.

³⁷³⁸ BAC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 10.

³⁸³⁹ CHBC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

³⁹⁴⁰ BayREN Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

⁴⁰⁴¹ Wild Tree Foundation Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

⁴¹⁴² CALSSA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.

⁴²⁴³ *Id.*

but recommends that both budgets be adjusted for a 50/50 split to equally fund program evaluation efforts.⁴³⁴⁴

SCE supports the Staff Proposal's proposed budgetary split.⁴⁴⁴⁵ The Council recommends a 75 percent budget for the TECH Initiative and a 25 percent budget for the BUILD Program.⁴⁵⁴⁶

VEIC recommends that the Commission plan for a four-year budget rather than an annual budget and that the BUILD Program allotment for low-income program costs should be designated as a minimum threshold, not a cap.⁴⁶⁴⁷ VEIC also recommends reducing the administrative and/or evaluation budget to increase program impact.⁴⁷⁴⁸ Finally, VEIC encourages the Commission to allocate 70 percent for the TECH Initiative and 30 percent for the BUILD Program.⁴⁸⁴⁹

CSE⁴⁹⁵⁰ and CHBC⁵⁰⁵¹ support the Staff Proposal's greater portion of budgetary allocation to the TECH Initiative.

PG&E states that the TECH Initiative may warrant a higher level of funding, beyond 60 percent.⁵¹⁵² PG&E states that the TECH Initiative will prove a larger challenge because it involves transforming the retrofit market, which has greater barriers to entry.⁵²⁵³

⁴³⁴⁴ EDF Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

⁴⁴⁴⁵ SCE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.at 4-5.

⁴⁵⁴⁶ The Council Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

⁴⁶⁴⁷ VEIC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.at 4.

⁴⁷⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁸⁴⁹ *Id.* at 5.

⁴⁹⁵⁰ CSE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

⁵⁰⁵¹ CHBC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

⁵¹⁵² PG&E Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2-3.

⁵²⁵³ *Id.*

SBUA contends that the annual budgets should not be constant⁵³⁵⁴ and recommends that the administrative costs should be frontloaded⁵⁴⁵⁵ and evaluation costs capped.⁵⁵⁵⁶ SBUA recommends that that the initial funding level for both programs should be set at 40 percent with the remaining 20 percent to be re-allocated for the third and fourth years of the programs based on lessons learned and relative merits of available opportunities at that time.⁵⁶⁵⁷

SoCalGas⁵⁷⁵⁸ argues against using natural gas ratepayer funds to market against specific products. SWG⁵⁸⁵⁹ disagrees with the Staff Proposal's suggested use of natural gas ratepayer funds to fund electrification.

~~The~~ Joint CCAs recommend that the Commission: (1) adopt a cap on the administrative budget for the TECH Initiative; (2) eliminate the prize program so funds can be better spent; and (3) support the low-income/disadvantaged community set aside.⁵⁹⁶⁰

The Partnership asserts that the Commission should set aside at least 50 percent of the total budget for the BUILD Program⁶⁰⁶¹ and that the TECH Initiative budget should have a specific allocation for low-income and residents in disadvantaged communities.⁶¹⁶²

Several parties commented on the appropriate levels of funding for program administration, including CEDMC, CBIA, SCE, Joint Environmentals, EDF, and VEIC. Parties were divided with regard to the 10 percent administrative budget for the BUILD Program, with EDF, CEDMC, CBIA, and

⁵³⁵⁴ SBUA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4-6.

⁵⁴⁵⁵ *Id.*

⁵⁵⁵⁶ *Id.* at 4-5.

⁵⁶⁵⁷ *Id.* at 6.

⁵⁷⁵⁸ SoCalGas Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 10.

⁵⁸⁵⁹ SWG Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

⁵⁹⁶⁰ Joint CCAs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

⁶⁰⁶¹ The Partnership Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7.

⁶¹⁶² *Id.* at 8.

VEIC stating that 10 percent is too high and SCE recommending maintaining the 10 percent level for the BUILD Program in their recommended budget.

With respect to the overall evaluation budget for both the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative, parties agreed to a smaller budgetary allotment. For example, SBUA argues that the evaluation budget should be based on ~~request for proposal~~ (RFP) bids and the budget should not be fixed, but rather capped at an appropriate level with the actual price based on competitive bidding by prospective program evaluators.⁶²⁶³

VEIC⁶³⁶⁴ and CSE⁶⁴⁶⁵ recommend that the Commission contract with an independent program evaluator at the same time that the TECH Initiative implementer is selected to ensure the evaluation process is embedded within the program design early.

~~The~~ Joint Environmentals argue that the evaluation budget is too large, and should be reconsidered.⁶⁵⁶⁶ ~~The~~ Joint Environmentals recommend a total evaluation budget of \$6 million over the program life.⁶⁶⁶⁷ EDF recommends an \$800,000 evaluation budget to maximize program efficiencies.⁶⁷⁶⁸ EDF also recommends that evaluators be given guidance on how non-market participants share information.⁶⁸⁶⁹

⁶²⁶³ SBUA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4-5.

⁶³⁶⁴ VEIC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 13

⁶⁴⁶⁵ CSE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

⁶⁵⁶⁶ Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 6.

⁶⁶⁶⁷ *Id.*

⁶⁷⁶⁸ EDF Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

⁶⁸⁶⁹ EDF Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 11.

3.1.3. Analysis: The SB 1477 Pilot Program Budget and Compliance Costs Shall Be Apportioned Across the Four Gas Corporations According to Each Gas Corporation's Percentage Share of Allocated Cap-and-Trade Allowances and Shall Comply with Cap-and-Trade Regulations

Section 748.6 states:

Beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 2019, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 2023, the commission shall annually allocate fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000) of the revenues, including any accrued interest, received by a gas corporation as a result of the direct allocation of greenhouse gas emissions allowances provided to gas corporations as part of a market-based compliance mechanism adopted pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 38562 of the Health and Safety Code to fund the [BUILD] Program (Article 12 (commencing with Section 921)) and the [TECH] Initiative (Article 13 (commencing with Section 922)).

Thus, all gas corporations who receive allowances as part of the CARB Cap-and-Trade program are required collectively to contribute \$50 million annually for four years to fund the two SB 1477 pilot programs, beginning in FY 2019-20 and ending in FY 2022-23. The four-year allocation may be spent over the duration of the pilot programs. Once allocated, there is no restriction on annual spending, provided it is within the overall budget and funds are available. Any unspent funds remaining on July 1, 2033 shall be returned to the ratepayers of the respective gas corporations as part of the California Climate Credit.

D.15-10-032 determined – and D.18-03-017 reaffirmed – that 100 percent of GHG allowance proceeds shall be returned to residential natural gas customers in the form of a single annual bill credit, called the “California Climate

Credit.”⁶⁹⁷⁰ D.15-10-032 further specified the way in which gas corporations must report their GHG allowance proceeds – including all interest accrued from those proceeds – to the Commission, as well as what expenses to deduct from those proceeds in order to determine “Net GHG Proceeds Available for Customer Returns.” Each year, gas corporations must file an advice letter with the Commission, pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 5 of D.15-10-032. In these advice letters, among other things, gas corporations must seek approval for their per household California Climate Credit amounts.

The introduction of the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative necessitates changes to the existing process used to establish per household California Climate Credit amounts. Resolution G-3565, ~~pending before~~approved by the Commission on February 6, 2020, ensures that the gas corporations make available first year (*i.e.*, FY 2019-20) funding for SB 1477 pilot program implementation.⁷⁰ before determining their per household California Climate Credit amounts.⁷¹

In order to provide funding for the following three years, each gas corporation in its annual natural gas true-up advice letters that set natural gas transportation rates ~~shall henceforth in the form of a new line item, deduct and~~ determine per household California Climate Credit amounts for 2021, 2022, and

⁶⁹⁷⁰ CARB holds quarterly auctions in February, May, August, and November. Each gas corporation must put up for auction its consigned allowances within the designated calendar year. The percentage of consigned allowances for gas corporations started at 25 percent in 2015 and increases five percent each year until hitting 100 percent in 2030. Within a given year, the gas corporation can decide at its discretion how to distribute those allowances among the four auctions.

⁷⁰⁷¹ Resolution G-3565 pertains to the 2019 filings of annual natural gas true-up advice letters that set natural gas transportation rates and determine California Climate Credit amounts for 2020. We expect that the 2023 filings of annual natural gas true-up advice letters that set natural gas transportation rates and determine California Climate Credit amounts for 2024 will no longer include an allocation for the BUILD Program or TECH Initiative unless directed otherwise by a subsequent decision of the Commission.

2023 shall modify the table format established by D.15-10-032 (i.e., Table C of Appendix A of that decision) to include below line 9 a new line numbered 9b and titled "SB 1477 Compliance Costs" before calculating." This line shall record each gas utility's share of the SB 1477 funding, as established by this decision. Line 10 of Table C of Appendix A of D.15-10-032 shall also be modified to equal the Subtotal Allowance Proceeds minus Outreach and Admin Expenses minus the SB 1477 Compliance Costs. In order to reflect this change, the four gas utilities shall further modify the template for Table C by changing the description of Line 10 of Table C of Appendix A of D.15-10-032 to "Net GHG Proceeds Available for Customer Returns_(\$ (Line 8 + Line 9 + Line 9b)."

SB 1477 Compliance Costs shall be apportioned across the four gas corporations according to each gas corporation's percentage share of allocated Cap-and-Trade allowances and remain the same each year for the duration of the pilot programs:

SoCalGas: \$24,630,000 (49.26 percent of \$50 million)

PG&E: \$21,170,000 (42.34 percent of \$50 million)

SDG&E: \$3,385,000 (6.77 percent of \$50 million)

SWG: \$815,000 (1.63 percent of \$50 million)

The gas corporations shall ~~within 15 days following the Commissions of their annual natural gas true-up advice letters that set natural gas transportation rates,~~ remit their respective "SB 1477 Compliance Costs" directly ~~and in full~~ to the designated building decarbonization pilot program contracting agent (contracting agent) on a quarterly basis in four equal installments. Quarterly remittances shall be made on or before March 1, June 1, September 1, and December 1 so as to follow CARB's quarterly auctions in February, May, August, and November. ~~Southern California Edison Company (SCE)~~ SCE, serving in the capacity of the contracting agent (discussed in detail below), shall, within 15 days

of the approval of this decision, file a Tier 1 advice letter with Energy Division formalizing a new balancing account ~~for this purpose. SCE shall, immediately following approval of the new balancing account, request from the gas corporations disbursal of~~ to collect and track these remittances.. The gas corporations shall, on or before June 1, 2020, disburse to the contracting agent the entire first year funding set aside as directed by Resolution G-3565, which shall be provided no more than 15 days following the request.3565. The first quarterly remittances shall be made on or before September 1, 2020 and the last quarterly remittances shall be made on or before June 1, 2023. SCE shall account for all interest accrued, ~~prior to disbursal of funds to the BUILD Program administrator and TECH Initiative implementer~~ while pilot program funds reside in its possession..

All requests for pilot program funding disbursement shall be made in writing by the BUILD Program administrator and or the TECH Initiative implementer, as applicable, to SCE who shall disburse funds and provide monthly updates to Energy Division, the BUILD Program administrator, and the TECH Initiative implementer regarding all funding disbursements made and the status of funds available. Any interest that may have accrued while program funds ~~resides~~ are held by with SCE shall be made available to the BUILD Program ~~Administrator~~ administrator and TECH Initiative implementer for additional non-administrative spending in proportion to each pilot program's share of total funding (e.g., 40 percent for the BUILD Program and 60 percent for the TECH Initiative). Energy Division shall provide annual updates to the Legislature regarding funding and expenditures for the two pilot programs, as directed by Section 910.4.

Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations (17 CCR) Section 95893(d)(3) states, “Allowance value, including any allocated allowance auction proceeds, obtained by a natural gas supplier must be used for the primary benefit of retail natural gas ratepayers of each natural gas supplier, consistent with the goals of AB 32, and may not be used for the benefit of entities of persons other than such ratepayers.” Therefore, the regional spending for the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative must be proportionally directed in the gas corporation service territories where the funds are derived. The percentages allocated for each gas corporation service territory are consistent with the compliance cost shares outlined above:

SoCalGas: 49.26 percent

PG&E: 42.34 percent

SDG&E: 6.77 percent

SWG: 1.63 percent

Any spending for the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative with statewide or cross-territory benefits, including but not limited to administrative and evaluation spending, shall be attributed to the gas corporation service territories in proportion to their original funding contribution. To the extent that there are unspent GHG allowance proceeds allocated for a particular gas corporation’s service territory and no remaining eligible projects within that service territory, the remaining GHG allowance proceeds may be spent ~~elsewhere after two years following implementation~~ outside of that gas corporation’s service territory starting two years after pilot program implementation. Any unspent funds remaining as of July 1, 2033 shall be returned to the ratepayers of the respective gas corporations as part of the California Climate Credit.

3.1.4. Analysis: The SB 1477 Pilot Program Budget Shall Appropriate 40 Percent of Program Funds to the BUILD Program and 60 Percent of Program Funds to the TECH Initiative

The funding for these two pilot programs shall be allocated using a 40/60 percent split, with 40 percent of the funds allocated to the BUILD Program and 60 percent of the funds allocated to the TECH Initiative.⁷⁴⁷² We agree with parties and the Staff Proposal that it is easier to build a new zero-emissions building than retrofit an existing one. In addition, appropriating 60 percent of the budget will provide added support for overall market development of low-carbon technologies.

~~SB 1477 seeks to develop the state's market for low-emission space and water heating equipment for new and existing residential buildings through consumer education, contractor training, and the provision of upstream and midstream incentives for technologies that are in an early stage of market development.~~

We agree with CBIA, Joint Environmentals, VEIC, CSE, and SBUA that a four-year budget is more appropriate than an annual budget. The year-one costs, will likely be different from the subsequent ongoing costs and, thus, the BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer are not prescribed a fixed amount of annual spending. We keep in mind that, according to Section 748.6, ~~funds will only be made available on an annual basis. While collections will be annual~~ funding is accrued over four years. However, funds may be carried ~~across~~ beyond the four-year accrual period ~~beginning with FY 2019-20~~ and must be spent ~~within 10 years of their allocation~~, before July 1, 2033, at the very latest, pursuant to 17 CCR Section 95893(d)(8).

⁷⁴⁷² No more than ~~1.82.5~~ percent of each pilot program's budget allocation will be dedicated for a single, independent program evaluator who will evaluate both pilot programs with the precise budgetary allocation ultimately depending on the winning bid.

Requirements tied to an annual budget may in fact, be restrictive to market development efforts. It will take time for both the BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer to launch the pilot programs, and it will take the market actors – the builders, developers, manufacturers, distributors, contractors, and customers – time to respond to program signals. We strive to give the BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer maximal flexibility, and a four-year budget rather than an annual budget provides this flexibility so they can calibrate the pilot programs to better reflect an evolving market response. Under the funding mechanism established by this decision, first year funding will be available prior to the start of either pilot program's implementation. ~~Second year funding is anticipated to be available around January 1, 2021, meaning that when program implementation begins, or shortly thereafter, at least \$100 million~~ Subsequent year funding will be available on a quarterly basis.

We ~~are in favor of maximizing program efficiencies and agree with parties that some of the allocated administrative and evaluation budget amounts should be decreased. First, we~~ agree with the Staff Proposal that administrative spending for the BUILD Program should be capped at 10 percent⁷²⁷³ of the total BUILD Program budget.⁷³ for the duration of the program.⁷⁴ ~~Second,~~ administrative spending for the The TECH Initiative implementer's administrative costs shall also be capped at ~~five~~10 percent of the TECH Initiative budget for the duration of the program. If the selected bid to implement the TECH Initiative is below the ~~five~~10 percent cap, the difference between the

⁷²⁷³ This percentage of the BUILD Program's total cost was determined by the CEC to ensure ~~their administrative needs~~ adequate funding necessary to administer the BUILD Program.

⁷³⁷⁴ This is contingent upon Legislative authorization, as discussed in detail in Section 4.1.3 of this decision.

winning bid amount and the ~~five~~¹⁰ percent administrative costs⁷⁵ cap shall be reallocated for program costs.

We believe it is appropriate to have a single, independent program evaluator covering both programs for the purposes of economies of scale in reporting and tracking data, as well as illustrating outcomes. We direct the program evaluator to closely engage with both the BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer early on, to provide real-time feedback, and ~~to~~ ensure efficient tracking of data. A joint evaluation budget for both the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative shall not exceed ~~1.8~~^{2.5} percent of the total funding allocated for the pilot programs.

The BUILD Program is allocated 40 percent of the \$200 million (*e.g.*, \$80 million) authorized for the two pilot programs under SB 1477. Table 1 below summarizes the four-year budgetary allocation for the BUILD Program:

<u>Table 1: BUILD Program Four-year Budget</u>		
Budget Item	Amount	Notes
Program Costs ⁷⁴ (Low-Income) ⁷⁷	\$60,000,000	No less than 75% of the BUILD Program's \$80 million budget
BUILD Program Costs (Other) ⁷⁸	\$10,560,000 ^{10,000,000}	No less than 13.2 ^{12.5} % of the BUILD Program's \$80 million budget
Administrative Costs	\$8,000,000	No more than 10% of the BUILD Program's \$80 million budget
Joint Evaluation Cost Share	\$1,440,000 ^{2,000,000}	No more than 1.8 ^{2.5} % of the BUILD Program's \$80 million budget

⁷⁵ Administrative costs are defined as: (1) overhead costs, such as general and administrative labor and materials; (2) labor costs (management and clerical); (3) human resources support and development; and (4) travel/conference fees. Administrative costs do not include market, education and outreach, nor do administrative costs include developer, contractor, or distributor training and education.

⁷⁴ See *infra* Section 4.2.3.

⁷⁷ Direct incentives only

⁷⁸ Includes technical assistance budget.

Total	\$80,000,000	100%
-------	--------------	------

The TECH Initiative is allocated 60 percent of the \$200 million (*e.g.*, \$120 million) authorized for the two pilot programs under SB 1477. Table 2 below summarizes the four-year budgetary allocation for the TECH Initiative:

Table 2: TECH Initiative Four-year Budget		
Budget Item	Amount	Notes
Program Costs	\$110,640,000 103,800,000	No less than 92.286.5 92.286.5% of the TECH Initiative's \$120 million budget
Administrative Costs (Implementer)	\$6,000,000 12,000,000	No more than 5 10% of the TECH Initiative's \$120 million budget
Administrative Costs (Contracting Agent)	\$1,200,000	No more than 1% of the TECH Initiative's \$120 million budget
Joint Evaluation Cost Share	\$2,160,000 3,000,000	No more than 1.8 2.5% of the TECH Initiative's \$120 million budget
Total	\$120,000,000	100%

3.2. Pilot Program Guidelines, Program Metrics, and Performance Evaluation

For the BUILD Program, Section 921.1(d)(4)(A) requires that the Commission develop program guidelines that include: (a) a list of eligible technologies; (b) a process for evaluating new technologies; (c) criteria for scoring and selecting projects; and (d) a process and set of metrics by which to evaluate and track results.

Section 921.1(d)(4)(B) requires BUILD Program metrics to include, at a minimum: (a) the number of low-emission systems installed in each building type; (b) projected utility bill savings; and (c) cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions.

For the TECH Initiative, Sections 922(c)(1) and 922(c)(2)(A) requires the Commission to develop guidelines that include: (a) a list of eligible technologies;

(b) a process for evaluating new technologies; and (c) a process and set of metrics by which to evaluate and track results.

Section 922(c)(2)(B) requires TECH Initiative metrics to include, but not be limited to: (a) the market share for eligible technologies; (b) projected utility bill savings; and (c) the cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions.

In the assigned Administrative Law Judge's Ruling issued on July 16, 2019, parties were asked to comment on whether the Staff Proposal's recommendations pertaining to these requirements are reasonable.

3.2.1. Staff Proposal Summary

In fulfillment of Sections 921.1(d)(4)(A) and (B), and Sections 922(c)(2)(A) and (B), the Staff Proposal included the following program metrics, in addition to a list of other metrics: (a) the number of low-emission systems installed in each building type (BUILD Program only); (b) projected utility bill savings; (c) cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions; and (d) market share for eligible technologies (TECH Initiative only).⁷⁵⁷⁹

The Staff Proposal also includes a number of additional sub-metrics to calculate the cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions⁷⁶⁸⁰ and specifies that program parameters and algorithms applied to calculate the cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions should be consistent with the CEC's approach for the California Energy Code in the 2022 code cycle.⁷⁷⁸¹ The Staff Proposal recommends, consistent with 17 CCR Section 95893(e), that each gas corporation ~~will need to~~ provide the following, annually: (1) total avoided GHG emissions expected from that year's expenditures (estimated); (2) total expenditures; (3) itemization of administration and outreach expenditures; and (4) description of

⁷⁵⁷⁹ Staff Proposal, Section 3.5.

⁷⁶⁸⁰ *Id.*

⁷⁷⁸¹ *Id.*

the nature and purpose of the program. Optionally, this description may include co-benefits such as health effects of increased indoor air quality.⁷⁸⁸² The evaluator will use these metrics to generate regular BUILD Program and TECH Initiative evaluation reports and also provide these reports to the utilities for their annual reports to CARB.⁷⁹⁸³

Finally, the Staff Proposal highlighted the importance of providing early feedback through the life of the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative by forming a Project Coordination Group (PCG).⁸⁰⁸⁴

3.2.2. Parties' Positions

The Joint Environmentals disagree with the Staff Proposal's proposed recommendation of GHG emissions intensities using hourly average factors instead of long-run marginal factors.⁸¹⁸⁵ Cal Advocates also disagrees with the metrics recommended in the Staff Proposal. Cal Advocates states that the Commission should focus on metrics that will reveal whether the programs are successful in building out a market for low-emissions technologies in California.⁸²⁸⁶ Cal Advocates recommends using the following: (1) market share data (*i.e.* demographic factors) that track both the overall share of various low-emissions technologies and the share of new installations; (2) customer satisfaction; (3) number of workers trained to install each type of technology and size of available skilled workforce; and (4) contractor performance.⁸³⁸⁷

Wild Tree Foundation states that GHG metrics must include full life cycle of replaced and replacement appliances.⁸⁴⁸⁸ Wild Tree Foundation also asserts

⁷⁸⁸² *Id.*

⁷⁹⁸³ *Id.*

⁸⁰⁸⁴ Staff Proposal, Section 3.12.

⁸¹⁸⁵ Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 20.

⁸²⁸⁶ Cal Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 24.

⁸³⁸⁷ *Id.*

⁸⁴⁸⁸ Wild Tree Foundation Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 21.

that other critical metrics include utility bill savings, change in electrical load, installations of greater than six kilowatt photovoltaic systems, and building efficiency improvements.⁸⁵⁸⁹

VEIC suggests including potential metrics that measure market share for eligible technologies, as well as product availability, quality, standardization, efficacy, cost, awareness, and reliability.⁸⁶⁹⁰ VEIC also recommends that the Commission require the program implementer of the TECH initiative propose market development metrics and a data model to facilitate appropriate tracing.⁸⁷⁹¹

SBUA recommends additions to the evaluation criteria.⁸⁸⁹² SBUA recommends that evaluation and metrics criteria include: (1) an assessment of the effectiveness of the outreach strategies to hard-to-reach customers; and (2) the degree of training provided to contractors, manufacturers and employers.⁸⁹⁹³

SWG⁹⁰⁹⁴ argues that both the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative should have a balanced approach for customers in implementing SB 1477, which should include an array of technologies such as: (1) solar thermal offsetting natural gas usage; (2) natural gas heat pump technologies; (3) carbon absorption technologies applied to natural gas appliances; (4) low-NOx technologies; and (5) renewable natural gas. In a similar vein, the CHBC also argues for a balanced GHG emissions reduction portfolio of technologies.⁹¹⁹⁵

SoCalGas⁹²⁹⁶ disagrees with the Staff's Proposal's recommended metrics for evaluation, arguing there should be an inclusion of natural gas technologies

⁸⁵⁸⁹ *Id.*

⁸⁶⁹⁰ VEIC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 13.

⁸⁷⁹¹ *Id.* at 14.

⁸⁸⁹² SBUA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 6.

⁸⁹⁹³ *Id.*

⁹⁰⁹⁴ SWG Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

⁹¹⁹⁵ CHBC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

⁹²⁹⁶ SoCalGas Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7.

and renewable natural gas that could result in cost-effective mixes for customers and reduce utility bills.

Joint CCAs agree with the Staff Proposal's primary strategy for decarbonization of buildings through electrification of appliances that do not have direct emissions. Joint CCAs point out that renewable natural gas is a limited resource, in limited supply and therefore, the limited supply of this resource should be spent in areas where electrification is particularly difficult. ⁹³⁹⁷ Joint CCAs recommend that both the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative capture load shifting by adding an evaluation component for grid-dispatchable technologies in the technology eligibility criteria. ⁹⁴⁹⁸

SDG&E ⁹⁵⁹⁹ observes that these pilot programs present an opportunity to begin collecting data to inform future consideration of rate reforms to electric rates that may be needed to support California's decarbonization goals.

SCE states that the Commission should drive guidelines and evaluation metrics for the BUILD Program and should establish an approach for inputs to calculate benefits and costs to the program. ⁹⁶¹⁰⁰ With respect to the TECH Initiative, SCE states that the Staff Proposal's evaluation and metrics recommendations are reasonable. ⁹⁷¹⁰¹ SCE recommends: (1) adding other environmental impacts to the TECH Initiative scoring criteria such as criteria air pollution (NO_x, SO_x, CO, particulates, and ozone), indoor air quality, water use, and water pollution; (2) including building commissioning requirements to improve real-world operation and performance in TECH Initiative projects; (3) ~~use~~using metrics to focus on technologies and applications that have the greatest

⁹³⁹⁷ Joint CCAs Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

⁹⁴⁹⁸ Id.

⁹⁵⁹⁹ SDG&E Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.

⁹⁶¹⁰⁰ SCE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 9.

⁹⁷¹⁰¹ Id. at 14-15.

potential for scale and replicability; and (4) ~~align~~aligning the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative metrics and evaluation as close as practicable. ⁹⁸102

EDF recommends that the Commission create an evaluation framework to determine which strategies will reduce the most carbon at the least ratepayer expense, minimizing customer bill impact, and maximizing carbon reduced. ⁹⁹103 CSE encourages coordinating and streamlining the data gathering between the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative. ¹⁰⁰104

CBIA cautions that using utility bill savings as a measure of success may ~~be not be illustrative of~~reflect the full benefits of projects because many projects will be near cost-~~neutral~~, even when they offer substantial GHG emissions reduction. ¹⁰¹105 CSE recommends that the Commission contract with an evaluator as soon as an implementer is selected for the TECH Initiative to ensure program evaluation is embedded with program design. ¹⁰²106 The Partnership asserts that the TECH Initiative guidelines should articulate a clear emphasis on and plan to support clean heating technology that benefits low-income households. ¹⁰³107

3.2.3. Analysis: To Fulfill SB 1477's Program Evaluation Requirements, a Single Evaluator Shall Evaluate Both the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative at the Initiation of Both Pilot Programs, and Throughout Implementation

As stated above, we support economies of scale in tracking and evaluating the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative by having a single evaluator covering both programs. Having a single evaluator covering both programs will simplify engaging with the BUILD Program administrator and TECH Initiative

⁹⁸102 *Id.*

⁹⁹103 EDF Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

¹⁰⁰104 CSE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

¹⁰¹105 CBIA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

¹⁰²106 CSE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

¹⁰³107 The Partnership Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

implementer during program design to ensure that the pilot programs are set up with evaluation needs in mind. We direct the following guidelines for hiring ~~ana~~ program evaluator:

- The evaluation program budget will be set at ~~1.82.5~~ percent of program costs, ~~or which is \$3.65~~ million over the four-year program period. ~~Both data~~ Data collection ~~and real-time monitoring~~ will be expected of the ~~program implementers~~ BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer, who will work to deliver this data to the program evaluator in a timely fashion.
- The CPUC, working with the contracting agent (~~e.g.~~, SCE), will solicit for, hire, and manage one evaluator for both programs. The program evaluation budget will be split between the two programs ~~based on what the evaluator finds appropriate, in consultation with an evaluation PCG.~~
- The CPUC will form a PCG, which will include Energy Division staff, ~~CEC staff,~~ the BUILD Program administrator, TECH Initiative program implementer staff, and the evaluator staff. The PCG will advise the program evaluation process. It will be up to Energy Division staff to determine if any other parties are appropriate for the PCG and to design the meeting schedule and format for the PCG.
- The program evaluator will measure the impact of program activities using the metrics detailed in Section 3.2.4, as well as qualitatively assess the success and scalability of the programs' strategies.
- The CPUC will conduct a competitive solicitation for a program evaluator through the contracting process administered by SCE (contracting agent).

The program evaluator shall be continuously engaged throughout the initiation of these pilot programs and during the administration of them. This should occur in as close to real time as possible, so that timely, substantive

feedback can be used to change course when and if appropriate, and to ensure the success of these pilot programs.

3.2.4. Analysis: The BUILD Program and TECH Initiative Evaluator Shall Use the GHG Benefits a Combination of Metrics as a Primary Factor for Measuring Pilot Program Success

The program evaluator shall use the ~~GHG benefits~~program metrics, - outlined in SB ~~1477, as a primary factor~~¹⁴⁷⁷ for measuring pilot program success. Pursuant to statute, the ~~program~~ evaluator must include the following ~~pilot program~~ metrics to measure each pilot program's compliance with SB 1477: (1) cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions; (2) projected annual and lifetime utility bill savings; (3) number of low-emission systems installed (BUILD Program only); and (4) market share for eligible technologies (TECH Initiative only).

Additionally, ~~the program evaluator shall collaborate closely with Energy Division staff. Specifically,~~ the program evaluator shall work with Energy Division ~~staff~~ to determine whether – and to what extent – to apply the sub-metrics listed in Section 1.1 of ~~appendix to~~Appendix A of this decision, and if any additional metrics are needed, in order to calculate the cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions.¹⁰⁴¹⁰⁸ ~~Energy Division shall work with the program evaluator~~When appropriate and feasible for both the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative, the program evaluator shall use meter-based data as part of the data used to calculate and evaluate cost per metric ton of avoided GHG. When not appropriate or not feasible, the program evaluator shall work with Energy Division staff to determine the best method for quantifying and valuing all GHG emissions, including those associated with methane and refrigerants, ~~as they relate to the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative.~~

¹⁰⁴¹⁰⁸ Id.

We also find the ~~metrics and~~ program evaluation recommendations from Cal Advocates, Wild Tree Foundation, VEIC, and SBUA reasonable. Therefore, the program evaluator shall work with Energy Division staff, the BUILD Program administrator, and the TECH Initiative implementer to determine which of the following additional metrics should be required, as part of ~~the~~ pilot program evaluation: (1) market share data (*i.e.*, demographic factors) that track both the overall share of various low-emissions technologies and the share of new installations; (2) customer outreach and customer satisfaction; (3) number of workers trained to install each type of technology and size of available skilled workforce; (4) contractor performance; (5) full life cycle of replaced and replacement appliances; ~~and~~ (6) success in degree of training provided to market actors necessary to facilitate market transformation; and (7) types of refrigerants used, and their associated Global Warming Potential (GWP), in space and water heating equipment incentivized through both the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative.

Sections 921.1(d)(4)(B) and 922(c)(2)(B) require the calculation of participant bill savings. ~~The Staff Proposal recommends that a comprehensive cost-effectiveness analysis that tracks the net lifetime costs to end users be used in the evaluation process to determine cost-effectiveness from the participant perspective.~~¹⁰⁵ We direct the program evaluator to work with Energy Division staff to develop a cost-effectiveness analysis in its evaluation measure for ~~the~~ pilot program compliance and performance reviews to ensure that customer utility bills do not increase, and that a full range of costs and benefits to the customer (*e.g.*, non-energy impacts and improvements in energy services) is evaluated. When appropriate and feasible for both the BUILD Program and

¹⁰⁵ ~~Staff Proposal, Section 3.6.~~

TECH Initiative, the program evaluator shall calculate participant utility bill savings – or costs – using meter-based data.

The program evaluator shall ensure that the BUILD Program administrator and TECH Initiative implementer include the following data annually so that gas corporations can comply with their reporting obligations pursuant to the Cap-and-Trade program: (1) total avoided GHG emissions expected from that year's expenditures (estimated); (2) total expenditures; (3) itemization of administration and outreach expenditures; and (4) description of the nature and purpose of the program, including aspects such as eligibility requirements. ¹⁰⁶109

3.3. Pilot ~~Programs~~Program Education and Outreach

Sections 921.1(d)(5) requires the Commission to implement a BUILD Program outreach plan. Section 921.1(d)(1) requires the Commission to ensure that new low-income residential housing building projects are offered technical assistance to encourage applications eligible for BUILD Program incentives.

Section 922(a)(1) requires the TECH Initiative to advance the state's market for low-emission space and water heating equipment for new and existing buildings through several measures. These measures include consumer education, contractor training, vendor training, and the provision of upstream and midstream incentives. Section 922(c)(1) requires the development of guidelines and evaluation metrics, implementation of outreach strategies for hard-to-reach customers, and provision of job training and employment opportunities.

In the assigned Administrative Law Judge Ruling, ¹⁰⁷110 parties were asked to comment on the Staff Proposal's execution of these plans for the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative.

¹⁰⁶109 17 CCR Section 95893(e).

¹⁰⁷110 July 16, 2019 Assigned Administrative Law Judge's Ruling.

3.3.1. Staff Proposal Summary

For the BUILD Program, the Staff Proposal envisions developing and disseminating field verification protocols for equipment installation, which can be used both as outreach material to educate builders about the BUILD Program and also act as a technical guide. These protocols would include specific information on each incentive category, the type of equipment that is eligible, proper installation guidelines, and expected emission reductions.¹⁰⁸¹¹¹

For the TECH Initiative, which ~~will focus~~focuses primarily on upstream and midstream approaches, the Staff Proposal envisions treating supply chain market actors as partners, with established memoranda of understanding and shared sales, marketing, and training strategies, including close coordination with midstream HVAC programs sponsored by utilities that target the same technologies or supply chain actors.¹⁰⁹¹¹²

3.3.2. Parties' Positions

The Partnership recommends that the Commission clarify that the technical assistance provider for the BUILD Program need not be limited to a single entity so that a potential joint venture can leverage multiple organizations with varied expertise in outreach, troubleshooting, and financing, such as to become a one-stop shop resource for property owners.¹¹⁰¹¹³ For BUILD Program outreach, Joint Environmentals recommend outreaching to builders directly at the forums they already attend and through trade associations.¹¹¹¹¹⁴

For the TECH Initiative, SBUA recommends, among other things, direct education and training to cities and counties' staff through advocacy and

¹⁰⁸¹¹¹ Staff Proposal, Section 4.4.9.

¹⁰⁹¹¹² Staff Proposal, Section 5.2.2.

¹¹⁰¹¹³ The Partnership Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 11.

¹¹¹¹¹⁴ Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 9.

partnerships with existing municipal interest groups to remove barriers related to permitting.¹¹²115

Cal Advocates asks the Commission to ensure the development of a robust outreach plan to target both owners and developers of new residential housing for the BUILD Program.¹¹³116

3.3.3. Analysis: A Successful Education and Outreach Campaign for the Pilot Programs Shall Have a Calibrated Approach with Technical Assistance Activities to Ensure Effective Market Adoption of Building Decarbonization Strategies Education and ~~outreach will increase the effectiveness~~ Outreach Will Increase the Effectiveness of the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative

The ~~objectives and goals of the~~ BUILD Program and TECH Initiative education and outreach campaigns should increase the level to which market actors and, consequently, Californians are engaged in building decarbonization to such a degree that market transformation ensures that customers are able to adopt building decarbonization technologies.¹¹⁴117

For the TECH Initiative, such an education and outreach campaign should complement the upstream and midstream strategies, by seeking partnerships with supply chain actors, as discussed in the Staff Proposal,¹⁰⁹112 as well as providing technical education to installers and contractors. Therefore, we direct the TECH Initiative implementer to engage in an education and outreach campaign, in consultation with stakeholders.

The BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer ~~should~~shall engage in tactics to increase willingness of market actors to adopt building decarbonization strategies and technologies into their business practices. The administrator and implementer's efforts ~~should~~shall target

¹¹²115 SBUA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 17.

¹¹³116 Cal Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 10.

¹¹⁴117 Staff Proposal, Section 5.10.

audiences and marketing partnerships that include those with on-the-ground community-based organizations, businesses, and local governments.

The BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer shall design their education and outreach to boost awareness and adoption of building decarbonization technologies into Californian homes and businesses, including customers that are low-income, disadvantaged, and hard-to-reach. It is particularly important that the BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer form partnerships with organizations that primarily serve low-income, disadvantaged, and hard-to-reach customers to ensure active participation and partnership with customers across a variety of demographic groups.

The BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer's implementation of any education and outreach campaigns ~~should~~shall reflect the legislative intent of SB 1477 as well as the policy objectives we hold here, to ensure compliance with ~~the~~ statutory directives. ⁴⁵¹¹⁸ While we assign the implementation of the education and outreach efforts to the BUILD Program administrator and TECH Initiative implementer, the Commission will exercise its oversight power and judge the effectiveness of the education and outreach campaigns during the evaluation process to determine whether or not they have accomplished the objective of demonstrating that the customers targeted by these pilot programs have increased awareness of building decarbonization and adoption of building decarbonization technologies into their homes and businesses. This determination will be based on findings of the program evaluator. Metrics for success may include, but are not limited to: (1) customer awareness and knowledge of building decarbonization; (2) customer awareness

⁴⁵¹¹⁸ Proportional funding for these efforts must be allocated in the gas corporation service territories as detailed above.

and knowledge of specific building decarbonization actions and technologies promoted by the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative; (3) solutions to perceived barriers and benefits and sense of action efficacy; and (4) demonstration of customer and market actor transformative behavior (~~i.e.~~^{[g.](#)}, increased installation of building decarbonization technologies in the home and/or small business).

3.4. Refrigerants

Section 921.1(b) states that the BUILD Program must aim to “encourage building designs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions beyond industry practices and to offer greater incentives for larger projected [GHG] reductions.” BUILD Program incentives must “be based on the projected amount of reduction in the emissions of [GHG] resulting from the installation of the near-zero-emission building technology.”^{[116119](#)} “Near-zero-emission building technology,” as defined in Section 921(e)(1), includes technology that reduces both the energy demand of a building and its direct and indirect GHG emissions.

Section 922(b) requires the TECH Initiative to “give consideration to technologies that have the greatest potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in California.” The TECH Initiative is further required to target “key low-emission space and water heating equipment technologies that are in an early stage of market development and would assist the state in achieving the state’s greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for 2030 and other long-term greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals established by the Legislature.”^{[117120](#)} SB 1013 (Lara, 2018) added Section 39734(a) to the Health and Safety Code, which states: “The Legislature finds and declares that certain fluorinated gases are potent causes of global warming, and it is in the public interest that restrictions or prohibitions on the use of these gases be maintained and enhanced as

^{[116119](#)} Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(b).

^{[117120](#)} Pub. Util. Code § 922(b).

appropriate in the state.”¹¹⁸¹²¹ SB 1383 (Lara, 2016) mandates a strategy to reduce hydrofluorocarbon emissions by 40 percent below 2013 levels by 2030.¹¹⁹¹²²

3.4.1. Staff Proposal Summary

Refrigerants¹²⁰¹²³ are mentioned in multiple sections of the Staff Proposal. The Staff Proposal emphasizes refrigerants as they pertain to the BUILD Program, envisioning a “kicker incentive” for, among other things, technologies that use low-~~Global Warming Potential (GWP)~~¹²¹ GWP¹²⁴ refrigerants.¹²²¹²⁵

3.4.2. Parties’ Positions

Parties generally did not comment on refrigerants. However, Wild Tree Foundation comments that the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative should both “support the development of nascent technologies that can help solve existing problems such as the high GHG emissions of most refrigerants used in heat pumps...”¹²³¹²⁶ Wild Tree Foundation notes further that the cause of those high GHG emissions in refrigerants is due to their high-GWP.¹²⁴¹²⁷ In addition, CALSSA points out that, despite best practices, a portion of refrigerants are lost to the environment, hence their impact should be “included in the evaluation of a technology’s greenhouse gas saving potential.”¹²⁵¹²⁸

¹¹⁸¹²¹ See:
http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB1013.

¹¹⁹¹²² See:
http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160SB1383.

¹²⁰¹²³ “Refrigerants” are chemical substances used in refrigerators, air conditioners, and heat pumps. These appliances leak small amounts of refrigerants during their lifetimes and large amounts during the disposal process. Most refrigerants, including certain hydrofluorocarbons and the chlorofluorocarbons they replaced as a result of the Montreal Protocol, are high- GWP fluorinated gases.

¹²¹¹²⁴ GWP measures the strength of a GHG as compared to CO₂. One of the most commonly used refrigerants, R-410a, has a GWP of 2,088 over the course of 100 years, which means that it has 2,088 times the impact of an equivalent amount of CO₂ over the same time period.

¹²²¹²⁵ Staff Proposal, Section 4.4.6.

¹²³¹²⁶ Wild Tree Foundation Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 1.

¹²⁴¹²⁷ Wild Tree Foundation Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

¹²⁵¹²⁸ CALSSA Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

**3.4.3. Analysis: Reducing Refrigerant-based GHG Emissions-
~~has some~~Has Some of the Greatest Potential to Reduce
 GHG Emissions in California and ~~the Adoption of a~~
 Lower GWP Refrigerants Will Further the Objectives of
 SB 1477 to Promote Emerging Building Decarbonization
 Technologies and Strategies**

We agree with Wild Tree Foundation and CALSSA that refrigerants should be a focus of the two pilot programs. Furthermore, we find that fulfilling SB 1477's mandate to move beyond existing industry practices requires a transition away from the refrigerants in common use today and toward lower GWP alternatives, which appropriately constitute a technology that is in an early stage of market development.

In the absence of a definition provided in the Staff Proposal - or by parties - for what constitutes a "low-GWP" refrigerant ~~or by parties~~, we rely on guidance from the CEC ~~24-CCR~~ Section 100.1 of the California Energy Code defines a "low-GWP" refrigerant as a refrigerant with a GWP less than 150, which this decision adopts for the purpose of providing "kicker incentive" eligibility. We define "high-~~GWP~~" refrigerants as refrigerants with a GWP above 750, consistent with CARB's recent regulatory proposal for new stationary air conditioning systems starting January 1, 2023. ¹²⁶¹²⁹ —

Refrigerants used in the space and water heating appliances of building projects funded by the BUILD Program or incentivized by the TECH Initiative shall not exceed the 750 GWP threshold by January 1, 2023, unless otherwise modified by the assigned Commissioner to this proceeding. By establishing this threshold, we send a market signal to immediately accelerate the transition toward lower GWP refrigerants. The Commission, in a later phase of this

¹²⁶¹²⁹ See:

https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-08/AC%20Hand-Out%20%28Final%2008-01-19%29_2.pdf.

proceeding, or in a successor proceeding, shall consider whether to maintain or modify the GWP limit or date after which incentives for appliances using high-GWP refrigerants would be prohibited. The Commission shall work with the BUILD Program administrator, TECH Initiative implementer, and CARB to track the GWP of the refrigerants for products supported by the pilot programs.

4. BUILD Program

SB 1477 also found that in cases of new construction, electrification and other decarbonizing methods may be competitive with the low costs afforded by natural gas fuel.¹²⁷¹³⁰ With the passage of SB 1477, the Legislature created the BUILD Program for decarbonization of new building construction. Section 921.1(a)(1) states that the BUILD Program is intended “for the deployment of near-zero-emission building technologies to significantly reduce the emissions of GHG from those buildings below the minimum projected emissions reductions that would otherwise be expected to result from the implementation of the prescriptive standards...” described in ~~the California’s Building Energy Efficiency Standards.”~~Code.

The major elements related to the implementation of the BUILD Program are: (1) the selection of the BUILD administrator; (2) a focus on new low-income housing; (3) incentives for participation in the BUILD Program and the availability of the appropriate amount of incentives for eligible participants; and (4) program guideline requirements. We discuss the parties’ positions with respect to each of these elements, below.

4.1. BUILD Program Administrator

Section 921.1(a)(2) provides that the “[C]ommission may determine whether each gas corporation or a third party, including the [CEC], shall

¹²⁷¹³⁰ SB 1477 Legislative History, August 30, 2018 Senate Floor Analysis, at: http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB1477

administer the [BUILD Program].”¹²⁸¹³¹ In the Scoping Memo and Ruling,¹²⁹¹³² and in a subsequent Administrative Law Judge Ruling,¹³⁰¹³³ parties were asked who the Commission should select to administer the BUILD Program.

4.1.1. Staff Proposal Summary

The Staff Proposal recommends that the CEC administer the BUILD Program.¹³¹¹³⁴ The Staff Proposal also recommends that the Commission provide policy oversight of the BUILD Program, with the CEC designing and administering the program.¹³²¹³⁵

4.1.2. Parties’ Positions

Generally, the parties agree that the Commission provide the policy oversight of the BUILD Program, with the CEC designing and administering the program.

SCE,¹³³¹³⁶ Cal Advocates,¹³⁴¹³⁷ CALSSA,¹³⁵¹³⁸ SDG&E,¹³⁶¹³⁹ PG&E,¹³⁷¹⁴⁰ VEIC,¹³⁸¹⁴¹ CSE,¹³⁹¹⁴² and Joint Environmentals,¹⁴⁰¹⁴³ state that the CEC has significant experience implementing statewide programs such as the New Solar Homes Partnership (NSHP), the Electric Program Investment Charge, and the energy efficiency standards for newly constructed buildings and renovations of existing buildings under the California Energy Code.

¹²⁸¹³¹ Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(a).

¹²⁹¹³² May 17, 2019 Assigned Commissioner’s Scoping Memo and Ruling.

¹³⁰¹³³ July 16, 2019 Assigned Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling.

¹³¹¹³⁴ Staff Proposal, Section 4.2.

¹³²¹³⁵ *Id.*

¹³³¹³⁶ SCE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

¹³⁴¹³⁷ Cal Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7.

¹³⁵¹³⁸ CALSSA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.

¹³⁶¹³⁹ SDG&E Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

¹³⁷¹⁴⁰ PG&E Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

¹³⁸¹⁴¹ VEIC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

¹³⁹¹⁴² CSE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

¹⁴⁰¹⁴³ Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7.

In response to a question in the Ruling regarding allowing technologies that receive California Energy Code performance credits to also receive program incentives, ~~the~~ Joint Environmentals refer to the compliance difficulty that the industry faces since the performance of non-Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA) Tier 3-compliant heat pump water heaters is derated by the CEC's California Energy Code compliance software.

4.1.3. Analysis: The CEC Shall Administer the BUILD Program with Commission Oversight

The CEC is a prudent and logical choice to select as the BUILD Program administrator, with Commission oversight consistent with the directives of SB 1477. The CEC has broad technical, programmatic, and policy experience. The agency has administered many incentive programs including the NSHP, the Renewable Energy Agricultural Program and Cash for Appliances. By having the CEC serve as administrator of the BUILD Program, there will be alignment and continuity with the California Energy Code that will provide market development that can support the strengthening of future Title 24 standards and market development. However, we agree with ~~the~~ Joint Environmentals that the CEC should update the California Energy Code compliance software to appropriately incent low-carbon technologies (*e.g.*, non-NEEA Tier 3-compliant heat pump water heaters for single family homes) to ensure the industry is encouraged to adopt these technologies. Disbursal of funding to the CEC for the purpose of implementing the BUILD Program shall be contingent on legislative authorization for the CEC's administrative expenses. The total funding for BUILD Program administration is \$8 million over ~~a four-year period, or \$2 million annually~~ the duration of the program. Should the Legislature authorize an administrative funding amount less than this, remaining funds shall be repurposed for non-administrative programmatic activities.

If the CEC does not receive legislative authority to administer the BUILD Program, or for any other reason that the CEC determines to be detrimental to program implementation, the Commission, in consultation with the CEC, may choose to issue BUILD Program-related RFPs through the contracting agent. In selecting the CEC to administer the BUILD Program, we give it the flexibility to propose technology criteria and incentive levels to the Commission by mandating an implementation plan that shall be filed with and approved by the Commission every two years. The CEC shall coordinate closely with Energy Division, to develop the implementation plan. We direct Energy Division staff to ensure that the CEC's implementation plan fulfills the requirements and intent of SB 1477. and this decision. The implementation plan submitted to the Commission shall include information that an applicant will need to know to apply for BUILD Program incentives, including but not limited to, program eligibility criteria, methodology or tool to discern bill savings, incentive levels, and any other program guidelines necessary to submit an application. The implementation plan shall also include a technical assistance and outreach plan as required by Section 921.1 (d)(1) and Section 921.1 (d)(5).

Following the approval of the implementation plan, and after having completed the statutory and regulatory requirements necessary to begin implementation, the CEC shall publicly notice the commencement of the BUILD Program to signal that applications for the program are being accepted. Implementation shall be considered to have begun from the date the notice is published.

The CEC, as the BUILD Program administrator, shall also be the lead entity to issue a ~~request for proposal~~ (RFP) for a third party low-income technical assistance provider, score the proposals, and select the contractor. The CEC may

choose to solicit a third-party contractor to provide this technical assistance or to implement any other part of the BUILD Program, provided that the contractor follows the same rules and guidelines laid out in this decision.

Finally, as BUILD Program administrator, the CEC shall be responsible for awarding and handling disbursement of funds to program applicants. The CEC shall also collect program performance data and information to inform evaluation and lend insight to program successes and failures. Data collection plans should be coordinated with the Commission and the program evaluator.

4.2. BUILD Program Parameters for New Low-Income Housing and Disadvantaged Communities with Technical Assistance

Section 921.1(c)(1) provides that, to encourage the adoption of near-zero building technologies in new housing located low-income and disadvantaged communities, “the program shall reserve a minimum of 30 percent of the amount allocated pursuant to Section 748.6 for new low-income residential housing.” Section 921(f) provides that “[p]rogram means the Building Initiative for Low-Emissions Development (BUILD) Program.”

The Legislature also requires that any new low-income residential housing building projects must not result in higher utility bills for occupants.^{[141](#)[144](#)} Additionally, technical assistance must be offered in conjunction with funding for projects directed at new low-income residential housing.^{[142](#)[145](#)} Finally, the Legislature authorizes that after two years, unspent funds reserved for new low-income residential housing may be directed to other purposes that are consistent with the BUILD Program, or program rules may be changed to increase participation.^{[143](#)[146](#)}

^{[141](#)[144](#)} Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(d).

^{[142](#)[145](#)} Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(d)(1).

^{[143](#)[146](#)} Pub. Util. Code § 921.1(c)(2)

In the Scoping Memo and Ruling,¹⁴⁴¹⁴⁷ and in a subsequent Administrative Law Judge's Ruling,¹⁴⁵¹⁴⁸ parties were asked: (1) whether the 30 percent funding component for the low-income focus of the BUILD Program is appropriate; and (2) whether some funding levels for the low-income component of the BUILD Program should prioritize technical assistance or for the incentive budget.

4.2.1. Staff Proposal Summary

The Staff Proposal sets aside 30 percent of BUILD Program funding for new low-income residential housing, including technical assistance to low-income developers. The Staff ~~proposes~~ Proposal recommends that a portion of this low-income funding be devoted to incentives for new low-income residential housing and a portion to a contractor with low-income project development expertise to provide technical assistance to low-income residential project developers.

The Staff Proposal also recommends that the BUILD Program administrator ~~(here, the CEC)~~ select an expert company/organization to conduct the technical assistance to reach low-income housing developers. Since the low-income housing market is different from market-rate housing, an entity with significant experience working with the low-income and disadvantaged segment, as well as field experience with deployment of low-carbon technologies, is required to ensure that funds reserved for this group are effectively and efficiently spent.

4.2.2. Parties' Positions

CBIA states that funding for low-income should be focused on incentives because there is no mechanism to capture the value of energy saved in rental housing.¹⁴⁶¹⁴⁹ PG&E recommends that the funding levels for the low-income

¹⁴⁴¹⁴⁷ May 17, 2019 Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling.

¹⁴⁵¹⁴⁸ July 16, 2019 Assigned Administrative Law Judge's Ruling.

¹⁴⁶¹⁴⁹ CBIA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

component of the BUILD Program should be prioritized for offering incentives to developers.¹⁴⁷150

Joint Environmentals argue that that the funding level for the low-income component of the BUILD Program is a minimum level, and levels above this should be pursued.¹⁴⁸151 They also argue that technical assistance and direct incentives for low-income buildings should not compete because both are critical.¹⁴⁹152 Joint Environmentals recommend that a minimum of \$24 million should be available as direct incentives and the funds for technical assistance should be in addition to this amount.¹⁵⁰153

Similarly, Cal Advocates assert that program funding targeting low-income housing should not prioritize between technical assistance work and incentive budgets.¹⁵¹154 Cal Advocates recommend that the BUILD Program's targeting of low-income housing should be designed to include both technical assistance and incentives without prioritizing one over the other.¹⁵²155

VEIC¹⁵³156 and SBUA¹⁵⁴157 state that the low-income budget should be clarified as a floor, not a ceiling and that low-income budget thresholds should be applicable to the incentive budget. VEIC asserts that a metric for technical assistance should be the number or proportion of participating affordable housing developers rather than budget threshold.¹⁵⁵158

¹⁴⁷150 PG&E Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

¹⁴⁸151 Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 10.

¹⁴⁹152 *Id.*

¹⁵⁰153 *Id.*

¹⁵¹154 Cal Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 13.

¹⁵²155 *Id.*

¹⁵³156 VEIC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7.

¹⁵⁴157 SBUA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 10.

¹⁵⁵158 VEIC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7.

BayREN,¹⁵⁶¹⁵⁹ CHBC,¹⁵⁷¹⁶⁰ and EDF¹⁵⁸¹⁶¹ ~~asserts~~assert that 30 percent of the total budget of the BUILD Program is appropriate and that the Commission should allow for an increase of up to 50 percent. EDF also argues that the low-income component could prioritize, but not limit, funding for technical assistance.¹⁵⁹¹⁶²

CSE recommends prioritizing technical assistance work for the low-income component of the BUILD Program, as well as within the BUILD Program as a whole as technical assistance may provide builders with more value to fully electrify new construction projections.¹⁶⁰¹⁶³

The Partnership asserts that 30 percent of funding for the low-income component of the BUILD Program is too low and recommends 100 percent of the BUILD Program incentives go toward low-income residents of multifamily housing across California.¹⁶¹¹⁶⁴ The Partnership also asserts that the BUILD Program should require unspent funds to be used only to benefit ~~low-~~ low-income residents.¹⁶²¹⁶⁵

Finally, CSE recommends prioritizing technical assistance work for the low-income component of the BUILD Program as well as within the BUILD Program as a whole.¹⁶³¹⁶⁶

4.2.3. Analysis: 30 Percent of the SB 1477 Funds Allocated to New Low-Income Residential Housing of the BUILD Program is a Floor, Not a Ceiling

Section 921.1(c)(1) states:

¹⁵⁶¹⁵⁹ BayREN Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

¹⁵⁷¹⁶⁰ CHBC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

¹⁵⁸¹⁶¹ EDF Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

¹⁵⁹¹⁶² *Id.* at 7.

¹⁶⁰¹⁶³ CSE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

¹⁶¹¹⁶⁴ The Partnership Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 14.

¹⁶²¹⁶⁵ *Id.* at 5.

¹⁶³¹⁶⁶ CSE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

To encourage the adoption of near-zero-emission building technologies in new low-income residential housing located in disadvantaged communities or low-income communities, the program shall reserve a minimum of 30 percent of the amount allocated pursuant to Section 748.6 for new low-income residential housing.

Section 921.1(d)(1) further requires technical assistance be offered in conjunction with funding for projects directed at new low-income housing.

The Staff Proposal states that 30 percent of BUILD Program funding shall, at a minimum, be made available, based on the statute, for new low-income residential housing. While the Staff's ~~proposal~~ Proposal is consistent with the minimum funding requirements set forth in SB 1477, we agree with parties who argue that a larger share of the BUILD Program funding should be allocated to projects that implement near-zero emissions technologies in new residential homes located in low-income and disadvantaged communities.

We find that a critical component of California's transition to a cleaner energy future is ensuring that parts of the population are not left behind. Similarly, we interpret Section 921.1(c)(1) to mean that there should be a priority given to new low-income residential housing projects built within low-income and disadvantaged communities. New low-income residential housing projects built outside of these communities are also eligible for BUILD Program funds. For illustrative purposes, using the current volume of new low-income housing statistics, ~~note that~~ 9,383 new low-income housing units sought tax credits under the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program in 2018. ¹⁶⁴167

Accordingly, we find that the minimum funding requirement for projects in new low-income residential housing should be 75 percent of the funding allocated to the BUILD Program or ~~\$80~~\$60 million, plus interest, over the life of the

¹⁶⁴167 California Housing Partnership (2019) available at: <https://chpc.net/resources/2019-state-wide-housing-need-report/>

program. Further, because SB 1477 finds it essential that achieving near-zero-emissions in new buildings also improve housing affordability, particularly in low-income communities, we direct the BUILD Program administrator ~~(here, the CEC)~~ to evaluate the needs of the low-income sector and adjust the funding amount and/or the program structure as appropriate to improve program delivery of incentives for projects in new low-income residential housing.

Joint Environmentals and Cal Advocates argue that both direct incentives and technical assistance are important for program success, and should therefore, not compete. We agree. There is no reason why technical assistance and direct incentives for low-income buildings should compete because both are critical. Thus, the minimum funding requirement is allocated exclusively for low-income housing, and the technical assistance activities shall be paid from other BUILD Program funds. This approach will ensure that a true 75 percent minimum of program funding directly benefits low-income community residents.

In the event that funds reserved for new low-income residential housing building projects remain unspent after two years following BUILD Program implementation, the ~~CEC~~BUILD Program administrator, in consultation with Energy Division staff, may and through the implementation plan approval process, may change building project eligibility requirements, as allowed under Public Utilities Code Section 921.1(c)(2), to include, but not be limited to, the following:

- 1) Extending ~~unspent funds to new market-rate housing projects;~~ the BUILD Program to address any barriers to scaling decarbonization in low-income residential housing identified by the program evaluator, the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group, or the Low Income

Oversight Board, and consistent with the legislative intent of SB 1477.

- 2) ~~Extending funding eligibility to new construction in existing buildings pursuant to the California Energy Code;~~
- 2) 3) Extending ~~funding eligibility to building projects that repurpose industrial or commercial facilities for residential use~~ unspent funds to new market-rate housing projects; and
- 3) 4) Extending funding eligibility to electric-ready retrofits to ease future transitions toward all-electric buildings.

To ensure compliance with Section 921.1(d)(3), the CEC shall develop or adopt a tool to measure bill savings as a result of the BUILD Program. While the tool is not a direct requirement of SB 1477, the law states the Legislature's intent that energy bills not rise for building occupants and *requires* that they not rise for low-income building occupants. A tool to estimate program-driven bill savings should be assessed, adopted, or modified for this purpose. The program evaluator shall examine the efficacy and accuracy of the tool and recommend any necessary improvements. The CEC shall make changes to the tool based on the evaluator's recommendations.

Given that construction timelines for multifamily and low-income housing can be long, funds set aside for approved applications shall be considered spent in interpreting this requirement.

4.3. BUILD Program Incentive Architecture

Section 921.1(b) and 921.1(d)(2) of the Public Utilities Code requires that incentives available from the BUILD Program for new low-income residential customers must be higher than incentives for other types of housing.

In the Scoping Memo and Ruling,¹⁶⁵¹⁶⁸ and in a subsequent Administrative Law Judge Ruling,¹⁶⁶¹⁶⁹ parties were asked: (1) whether the BUILD Program's incentives should be offered for individual homes or collectively, for each new subdivision; (2) whether the BUILD Program's incentives should be offered on a first-come, first-served basis or limited to regions where the largest GHG emission reduction potentials exist; (3) whether there should be a limit on the total share of incentive dollars per year, or overall; and (4) what appropriate incentive level should be for the BUILD Program.

4.3.1. Staff Proposal Summary

The Staff Proposal recommends that BUILD Program incentives be designed around projected GHG emission reductions and at the subdivision level.¹⁶⁷¹⁷⁰ First, the Staff Proposal recommends that all BUILD Program incentives be offered only to new construction projects designed to be all-electric¹⁶⁸¹⁷¹ and the amount of the incentives provided will be proportional to the projected amount of GHG emission reductions resulting from the installation of the near-zero-emission building technology.¹⁶⁹¹⁷²

Second, the Staff Proposal recommends that BUILD Program incentives be established for specific technology categories and climate regions. According to the Staff Proposal, eligible technologies include, but are not limited to the following: (a) space heating and cooling; (b) water heating; and (c) cooking.¹⁷⁰¹⁷³

Third, the Staff Proposal recommends "kicker incentives" for a small number of technologies that will provide incremental GHG emissions reductions

¹⁶⁵¹⁶⁸ May 17, 2019 Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling.

¹⁶⁶¹⁶⁹ July 16, 2019 Assigned Administrative Law Judge's Ruling.

¹⁶⁷¹⁷⁰ Staff Proposal, Section 4.4.7.

¹⁶⁸¹⁷¹ Staff Proposal, Section 4.1.

¹⁶⁹¹⁷² *Id.*

¹⁷⁰¹⁷³ *Staff Proposal*, Section 6.4.

and/or load management benefits beyond the basic incentives.¹⁷¹¹⁷⁴ Examples include the following technologies: (a) very high-efficient heat pumps for space cooling; (b) electric battery technologies where a photovoltaic system is installed; (c) heat pump water heaters that use low-GWP refrigerants; (d) thermal storage technologies, and (e) design assistance incentives to fund complex efficient designs.¹⁷²¹⁷⁵ The design assistance incentive is proposed to provide BUILD Program incentives to partially off-set additional design costs needed to include a system design or new technology in newly constructed building projects.

Fourth, the Staff Proposal asks the CEC and the CPUC to assess the feasibility of leveraging other complementary existing programs with energy utilities, state agencies, and local agencies.¹⁷³¹⁷⁶

Fifth, the Staff Proposal recommends that BUILD Program incentives should not be allowed for projects receiving California Energy Code performance credit.

Finally, in implementing Section 921.1(d)(1)'s requirements, the Staff Proposal recommends that the CEC select an expert entity to conduct technical assistance to reach low-income housing developers.¹⁷⁴¹⁷⁷

4.3.2. Parties' Position

BAC and ABC argue that the BUILD Program should include projects in each of California's geographic and climate zones, as heating, cooling, and other building needs vary and, therefore, the BUILD Program's pilot should test different technologies for different climate zones in California.¹⁷⁵¹⁷⁸ BAC and ABC¹⁷⁶¹⁷⁹ also argue that the Commission should utilize a portfolio of

¹⁷¹¹⁷⁴ Staff Proposal, Section 4.4.6.

¹⁷²¹⁷⁵ *Id.*

¹⁷³¹⁷⁶ Staff Proposal, Section 2.2.

¹⁷⁴¹⁷⁷ Staff Proposal, Section 4.4.8.

¹⁷⁵¹⁷⁸ BAC and ABC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7.

¹⁷⁶¹⁷⁹ *Id.* at 9-11.

technologies and fuels to decarbonize buildings.¹⁷⁷¹⁸⁰ Likewise, SoCalGas, argues that the pilot program should include renewable natural gas.¹⁷⁸¹⁸¹

However, PG&E recommends that BUILD Program incentives be limited to subdivision-level, all-electric new construction.¹⁷⁹¹⁸² PG&E asserts that the Commission should:

consider that the cost of building, maintaining, and operating the natural gas delivery system is largely fixed, but throughput in the natural gas delivery system may decline in coming years. If fixed costs are spread over fewer customers and fewer therms, customers unable to electrify may experience rising gas bills. Expanding the natural gas delivery system to serve some of the homes within a new subdivision will add to the fixed costs to be recovered from all gas customers. By contrast, utilizing the Building Decarbonization pilot programs to maximize avoided gas system investments can decarbonize buildings while promoting energy affordability for all customers.¹⁸⁰¹⁸³

Likewise, Joint Environmentals support ~~the Staff's proposal~~ Proposal's recommendation to allocate BUILD Program incentives to new construction projects that are all-electric.¹⁸¹¹⁸⁴ Joint Environmentals argue that SB 1477 requires bills paid by households in new affordable housing developments should be equal or less than those for dual-fuel new construction and all-electric, low-emissions homes fulfill that requirement.¹⁸²¹⁸⁵

Cal Advocates also recommends limiting BUILD Program incentives to all-electric new construction to eliminate the costs associated with building new natural gas infrastructure.¹⁸³¹⁸⁶ Agreeing with PG&E, Cal Advocates argues that

¹⁷⁷¹⁸⁰ *Id.* at 9-11.

¹⁷⁹¹⁸² PG&E Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 1.

¹⁸⁰¹⁸³ PG&E Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 1-2 and 5-6.

¹⁸¹¹⁸⁴ Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

¹⁸²¹⁸⁵ *Id.* at 6.

¹⁸³¹⁸⁶ Cal Advocates Reply Comments on Staff Proposal at 7-8.

the BUILD Program should avert the need for new investments in natural gas infrastructure because this approach reduces construction costs for new homes that are directly included in the program, but that also reduces the cost of natural gas infrastructure for all natural gas customers.¹⁸⁴¹⁸⁷

The Partnership offers several recommendations on the Staff Proposal's BUILD Program incentives. The Partnership recommends that all BUILD Program incentives should be allocated to benefit low-income multifamily residents with a majority of the program allocated for incentives.¹⁸⁵¹⁸⁸ The Partnership also states that the BUILD Program incentives should be offered collectively to the developers of properties serving low-income and disadvantaged community residents,¹⁸⁶¹⁸⁹ allow the incentives to be available for residents of low-income housing and disadvantaged communities residing in multifamily rental housing, and not be restricted by developers or regions, but by income and energy burden levels of residents.¹⁸⁷¹⁹⁰

Wild Tree Foundation argues that only the highest efficiency technologies should be permitted, such as: (1) highly efficient space and water heat pumps utilizing neutral, non-GHG emitting refrigerants; (2) low cost solar thermal water heating systems; and (3) efficient space heat ~~pump~~ conditioning pumps that ~~works~~ work in climate extremes of both heat and cold.¹⁸⁸¹⁹¹

EDF asks the Commission to consider strategies beyond electrification to decarbonize a building that can be included in the pilots.¹⁸⁹¹⁹² The Joint Environmentals express concern regarding technologies that receive California Energy Code performance compliance credit not being allowed BUILD Program

¹⁸⁴¹⁸⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸⁵¹⁸⁸ The Partnership Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 7.

¹⁸⁶¹⁸⁹ *Id.* at 12.

¹⁸⁷¹⁹⁰ *Id.*

¹⁸⁸¹⁹¹ Wild Tree Foundation Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 19.

¹⁸⁹¹⁹² EDF Opening Comments at Comments on Staff Proposal at 2.

incentives, as performance credits are the most reasonable pathway for all-electric homes under the 2019 iteration of the California Energy Code.¹⁹⁰¹⁹³ CALSSA argues that the BUILD Program should not focus exclusively on production homebuilders but also, on regional builders that focus on single homes.¹⁹¹¹⁹⁴ CALSSA also recommends that incentives be offered on a first-come, first-served basis across the state.¹⁹²¹⁹⁵

CSE recommends that BUILD Program parameters include preference for offering incentives or technical assistance at the subdivision level.¹⁹³¹⁹⁶ Additionally, CSE states that the BUILD Program administrator should determine whether incentives should be offered separately or collectively for a new subdivision.¹⁹⁴¹⁹⁷

CBIA argues that BUILD Program incentives should be focused at the subdivision level,¹⁹⁵¹⁹⁸ that the incentives should be focused on a first-come, first-served basis,¹⁹⁶¹⁹⁹ and the program should not set a limit for each developer or builder on the total share of incentive dollars but rather, measure success constantly and award that success.¹⁹⁷²⁰⁰

4.3.3. Analysis: BUILD Program Incentives Shall Be Appropriated Only to ~~Newly Constructed Projects That Are~~ New Residential Housing that is All Electric, Consistent with the State Requirements ~~to~~ for a Zero-GHG Emissions Future

It is reasonable to offer BUILD Program incentives at both the subdivision and custom/single family home levels, with a minimum of 30 percent of total

¹⁹⁰¹⁹³ The Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff proposal at 11.

¹⁹¹¹⁹⁴ CALSSA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

¹⁹²¹⁹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁹³¹⁹⁶ CSE Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

¹⁹⁴¹⁹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁹⁵¹⁹⁸ CBIA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 3.

¹⁹⁶¹⁹⁹ *Id.*

¹⁹⁷²⁰⁰ *Id.*

funding made available by SB 1477 specifically for new low-income residential housing projects. Eligibility for BUILD Program incentives shall be based on demonstrably higher GHG reductions than the prescriptive requirements of the California Energy Code for newly constructed buildings. Projects seeking program incentives may not trade off mandatory code requirements in lieu of high-performance incented equipment. ~~We leave it up to the California Energy Commission to~~The CEC may determine the minimum ~~greenhouse gas~~GHG performance threshold above the prescriptive compliance dual fuel baseline that a project must meet to qualify for incentives.

We direct the CEC to award BUILD Program incentives to ~~newly constructed projects~~new residential housing that ~~are,~~is at a minimum, all-electric, given the state's policy commitment to a zero-GHG electricity supply by 2045 and the risk of locking in new natural gas assets that could be unused or underutilized before the end of their life. We agree with the Staff Proposal, Cal Advocates, Joint Environmentals, PG&E, and ~~the~~The Partnership that limiting natural gas line extensions are of strategic policy value to California and it is not appropriate to provide BUILD Program incentives for projects that ultimately require natural gas infrastructure extensions to serve one or more home appliances. To do this effectively, the CEC may need data regarding natural planned gas infrastructure extensions, and upcoming housing developments. Housing rebuilds resulting from the wildfires will also need to be anticipated in BUILD Program implementation. The ~~utilities~~utility gas corporations maintain data pertaining to planned transmission and distribution infrastructure extensions and should share data that can help with program design. ¹⁹⁸201

¹⁹⁸201 If a non-disclosure agreement exists or is executed, the confidential data can be shared.

Under the performance option¹⁹⁹²⁰² for a building to achieve California Energy Code compliance, we do not assume that only the space heating, water heating, and cooking appliances identified by the Staff Proposal can achieve significant GHG reductions. Incentives shall be based on ~~demonstrable~~ whole building GHG performance modelled using the CEC's California Energy Code compliance software against a reference case. Therefore, a building project may use BUILD Program incentives to receive California Energy Code performance compliance credit when the performance *exceeds* that of the prescriptive reference case. ~~We leave it up to the CEC to~~ As long as a building is able to obtain a building permit in California, there is no restriction for the BUILD program to incentivize a specific technology or measure, but rather any combination, including but not limited to energy efficiency and demand response measures, electric battery storage, or additional solar photovoltaic beyond what is mandatory under the CEC's California Building Energy Code Compliance software. The CEC may determine how to model the reference case and establish industry standard practice ~~assumptions~~ assumption.

4.3.4. Analysis: The CEC Shall Structure BUILD Program Incentive Design and Distribution, and Ensure that Such Incentives are Proportionally Allocated by Service Territory, Consistent with Cap-and-Trade Regulations

Next, we turn to whether the BUILD Program incentives should be offered on a first-come, first-served basis across the state, or be limited to regions of the

¹⁹⁹²⁰² The California Energy Code provides two options for a building to achieve code compliance, prescriptive and performance option. The prescriptive option allows builders to comply with the code by using a pre-determined set of methods and measures that the CEC 'prescribes' as efficient. The performance option allows builders complete freedom in their designs provided that the building achieves the same overall efficiency as a hypothetical reference equivalent building that uses the prescriptive option. Section 921.1(a) requires that incentives be provided for GHG reductions beyond the prescriptive standards of the California Energy Code. Therefore, any building projects seeking BUILD Program incentives will be required to use the performance option.

state where the greatest opportunities for near-zero-emissions projects exist. We determine that it is appropriate to leave incentive design and incentive distribution to the CEC. However, it is also appropriate to prioritize BUILD Program incentives toward the regions in the state with the highest potential for achieving program goals, including reducing GHG emissions and serving low-income customers. The CEC must ensure incentives are proportionally allocated by service territory and disbursed back to the service territory from where the funds were derived, in accordance with CARB regulations. This shall include focusing on specific climate regions of the state where there is a high cooling and high heating load, low-income residential housing, or specific building ages or types. We allow the CEC to design the program incentives to ensure successful, replicable, and scalable results.

We decline to establish a limit on the total share of incentive dollars a developer may receive. However, we give the CEC the discretion to set limits on incentives by participant, location, technology, or other factors the CEC determines appropriate, during the implementation of the BUILD Program to achieve broader market penetration. The CEC is required, however, to ensure that incentives for new low-income residential housing are higher than incentives for similar new market-rate residential housing.

Finally, we decline to dictate a specific incentive level, but, rather, give the CEC the flexibility to establish and adjust incentive level based on participation rates, market activity, costs, complementary programs, ²⁰⁰²⁰³[location](#), GHG savings, grid impacts, and program data. We require the CEC, when administering the BUILD Program incentives, to act consistently and tie incentives to the cost of equipment, incremental cost difference for builders, and

²⁰⁰²⁰³[See](#) Section 2.1 of the appendix to this decision for further guidance.

estimated GHG emission reduction level with prioritization to low-income and disadvantaged communities. We also require the CEC to track the incentives, projected bill savings, costs, and estimated GHG emission reductions geographically and by income, and report them annually with the other metrics outlined, above.

In determining incentive levels, the CEC shall include kicker incentives for the purposes outlined in the Staff Proposal. The CEC may adjust or update the eligible technologies or designs that receive kicker incentives, as well as the incentive levels, through the BUILD Program ~~Implementation~~ ~~Plan~~i_mplementation plan to achieve the goals of the BUILD Program. In determining kicker incentives relating to refrigerant usage, the CEC may provide for tiered incentives that differentiate between space and water heating equipment that utilize low-GWP refrigerants and space and water heating equipment that utilize mid-range GWP refrigerants.

BUILD Program incentives shall target an entire building, project, or subdivision rather than specific equipment. Projects in areas with “reach” codes passed by local governments that surpass the requirements of the California Energy Code or any other state requirement may receive BUILD Program incentives.

5. TECH Initiative

In SB 1477, the Legislature found that there are a range of technologies that can achieve deep emissions reductions in buildings, including advanced energy efficiency technologies, clean heating technologies, energy storage, and load management strategies. ~~201~~204

~~201~~204 SB 1477 Legislative History, August 30, 2018 Senate Floor Analysis, at: http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB1477

Section 922(a)(1) requires the Commission to develop and supervise the administration of the TECH Initiative to spur the state's market for low-emission space and water heating equipment in new and existing residential buildings.

The TECH Initiative has three basic premises. First, The TECH Initiative requires consumer education about low-emission space and water heating equipment, contractor training, and vendor training, and the provision of upstream and ~~mid-stream~~midstream incentives to install low-emission space and water heating equipment in existing and new buildings.²⁰²²⁰⁵ Second, the Legislature requires the Commission to identify and target key low-emission space and water heating equipment technologies that are in an early stage of market development and would assist the state in achieving the state's GHG emissions reduction goals.²⁰³²⁰⁶

Finally, the TECH Initiative requires the Commission, in coordination with the CEC, to develop guidelines and evaluation metrics, implement outreach strategies for hard-to-reach customers, and provide for job training and employment opportunities.²⁰⁴²⁰⁷

5.1. TECH Initiative Implementer Selection

In the Scoping Memo and Ruling,²⁰⁵²⁰⁸ and in a subsequent Administrative Law Judge Ruling,²⁰⁶²⁰⁹ parties were asked: (1) whether the Staff Proposal's proposed process for selecting a TECH Initiative implementer is reasonable; and (2) who should serve as the TECH Initiative implementer.

²⁰²²⁰⁵ Pub. Util. Code § 922(a)(1)

²⁰³²⁰⁶ Pub. Util. Code § 922(b).

²⁰⁴²⁰⁷ Pub. Util. Code § 922(c)(1).

²⁰⁵²⁰⁸ May 17, 2019 Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling.

²⁰⁶²⁰⁹ July 16, 2019 Assigned Administrative Law Judge's Ruling.

5.1.1. Staff Proposal Summary

The Staff ~~proposes~~Proposal recommends a competitive solicitation process for a third-party implementer for the TECH Initiative through this proceeding.²⁰⁷210 The Staff Proposal describes this process as receiving RFP bids through the service list and allowing stakeholders to comment on the bids.²⁰⁸211

5.1.2. Parties' Positions

Generally, all parties disagree with the solicitation and selection process presented ~~by~~in the Staff Proposal. While parties support rapid selection and the opportunity for public feedback that Staff recommended in selecting an implementer, they also offered various revisions to the Staff Proposal's ~~proposed~~recommended selection process. As VEIC put it, the approach that the Staff Proposal recommends might discourage bidders because they may be reluctant to share intellectual property with potential competitors.²⁰⁹212 Some parties, such as ~~the~~ Joint Environmentals, recommend that only third-party administrators (not investor-owned utilities) be allowed to bid for the role of the TECH Initiative implementer.²¹⁰213 While others, like Cal Advocates, recommend emulating the energy efficiency third-party procurement model or allowing Energy Division to solicit bids with advice and oversight from stakeholders.²¹¹214

5.1.3. Analysis: Selection of the TECH Initiative Implementer shall be led by an Energy Division selection process, with expert advice and stakeholder advice

After consideration of comments from parties and in conjunction with review of the Staff Proposal, we believe it makes sense to depart from the recommendation ~~from~~of the Staff Proposal and adopt a modified version of Cal

²⁰⁷210 Staff Proposal, Section 5.9.

²⁰⁸211 *Id.*

²⁰⁹212 VEIC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

²¹⁰213 Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 13.

²¹¹214 Cal Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 13.

Advocates' proposal, to issue a solicitation process led by Energy Division with expert advice and stakeholder oversight. We designate SCE as the ~~Contracting Agent~~contracting agent for the solicitation process, discussed in detail below. ~~SCE shall be~~ responsible for administering ~~an~~the RFP ~~per~~pursuant to the guidelines below and for managing the SB 1477 balancing account.

Before we discuss the selection process, we adopt the following guidelines for TECH Initiative implementer selection. The requirements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Bidders must demonstrate substantial experience overseeing or participating in a market transformation initiative. Bidders should identify key personnel and describe their experience relevant to their expected role in the program.
- Bidders should show that the organization has the capability to successfully implement the program.
- Proposals should identify the most promising near-term opportunities to promote low-emissions heating technologies.
- ~~Proposals should detail how the implementer will, in the first six months, develop~~Bidders should include a market study that examines the state of the market and identifies the optimal market opportunities.
- Proposals should detail a plan for data collection, reporting and interfacing with an independent evaluator.
- Proposals should describe the bidders' strategy and preliminary logic model for how the initial pilot programs could eventually help transform the market.
- Proposals should provide a budget that ties program spending to the logic model. In other words, bidders should describe how each item in the budget contributes to program outputs and outcomes.

- Proposals should demonstrate that the proposed strategy or tactics²¹²²¹⁵ can feasibly be implemented within the budget allocated for the TECH Initiative.
- Proposals should demonstrate a targeted, regional approach, especially with regard to workforce training. We recognize that the budget for the TECH Initiative does not allow for a broad, statewide approach. As detailed above, funds spent shall be proportionally directed to the gas corporation service territories where the funds are derived.
- Proposals should consider activities to evaluate the region impacted by the Aliso Canyon gas leak.²¹³²¹⁶
- Proposals should identify the likely obstacles to success and discuss strategies for overcoming or mitigating those obstacles.

Under the model we adopt here, the organizational structure for the TECH Initiative shall have five actors:

1. • Contracting Agent: hold the contract, provide fiscal support for collection and disbursement of funds, and will facilitate RFP process for the program implementer and evaluator;
2. • CPUC: Facilitate the stakeholder process and provide oversight and management of implementer and evaluator; ~~and;~~
3. • Implementer: will plan for, execute, and implement the TECH initiative and has the largest and most significant role of the five actors;
4. • Program evaluator: evaluate TECH Initiative performance pursuant to program metrics; and
5. • Stakeholders – provide program input during facilitation.

²¹²²¹⁵ See Section 5.2.3 below for a list of mandatory and optional market development strategies to address.

²¹³²¹⁶ See Section 3.1 of the appendix to this decision for a list of specific market barriers to address.

This model leaves the details of running the TECH Initiative to the implementer while providing for oversight by the Commission and allowing the CEC and stakeholders to provide collaborative input and advice. As the TECH Initiative is intended to test and model unique approaches to building decarbonization, the implementer may be a single, leading contractor working with sub-contractors. The implementer will be required to facilitate, at minimum, quarterly, in-person stakeholder meetings, to be noticed to all parties to this proceeding. These meetings shall be public, and the implementer shall collaborate with Energy Division to ensure public ~~accessibility~~[access](#) to these meetings.

The contracting agent is the entity that holds the contract and manages the balancing account that pays the implementer. The TECH Initiative implementer shall be the entity that wins the RFP to implement and execute the program.

The Commission, in this decision, selects a utility to act as the contracting agent, and delegates authority to Energy Division to have the lead role in confidentially evaluating bids, and managing a process to select the winning bidder. This is analogous to the process established to select the statewide marketing and outreach administrators for the Energy Upgrade California program established in D.16-03-029 (*i.e.*, a scoring panel of experts will be convened among stakeholders with no financial interest in the outcome to assist in scoring proposals).

Under the adopted model, we select SCE to carry out ~~these~~[contracting a](#)
[gent](#) responsibilities. SCE has experience with administering similar programs (*i.e.*, the Solar on Multifamily Affordable Housing program and several statewide energy efficiency programs). [SCE shall file a Tier 1 advice letter with Energy Division within 15 days of the date of the approval of this decision open a](#)

balancing account to track costs associated with performing the functions required of the contracting agent. SCE shall book all costs associated with performing the functions required of the ~~Contracting Agent~~ contracting agent to ~~at~~ he new balancing account and shall be entitled to no more than one percent of TECH Initiative funding, with cost recovery subject to a true-up based on actual costs accrued and to a final verification by ~~Commission~~ Energy Division staff. All bidders and potential bidders must direct all communications and questions about the solicitation to SCE. Bids will be confidential as public bidding may reveal trade secrets.

Upon approval of this decision, we direct the ~~Commission's~~ Energy Division to draft a formal RFP. Energy Division shall collaborate with SCE, the designated contracting agent, to ensure that the RFP complies with all necessary procurement rules, to develop RFP scoring criteria, to post to a procurement website,²¹⁴²¹⁷ and to publicize the RFP to a qualified pool of contractors. Bids and the scoring of bids shall be designated as confidential, market-sensitive information pursuant to D.06--06-066.²¹⁵²¹⁸

~~Once the RFP solicitation has been made public~~ Additionally, upon a pproval of this decision, we direct Energy Division to convene a TECH Initiative Scoring Committee (Scoring Committee). The purpose of the Scoring Committee is to select the TECH Initiative implementer. The Scoring Committee consists of the following nine members:

- One representative each from Energy Division, the CEC, and the ~~Contracting Agent~~ contracting agent.
- Three market development experts, chosen by Energy Division.
- One representative each from three separate environmental or consumer public interest groups that are parties to

²¹⁴²¹⁷ SCE uses Ariba for their solicitations.

²¹⁵²¹⁸ See D.06-06-066, at 41-43.

R.19-01-011, chosen by Energy Division. Interested parties may submit to Energy Division a letter of interest, no longer than two pages, which explains their qualifications for being on the Scoring Committee. Should Energy Division receive more than three letters of interest, staff will select the three they determine to be the most qualified. Letters of interest are due to Energy Division no later than 14 days after the date of this decision is adopted. For the time and resources spent on Scoring Committee activity, qualifying public interest groups may claim intervenor compensation per the rules in Public Utilities Code 1801 - 1812.

Participation in the Scoring Committee will assist the commission and therefore constitutes a contribution to a proceeding of the Commission. The Commission shall award intervenor compensation to any participant in the Scoring Committee who makes a substantial contribution to the work of the Scoring Committee and meets all other requirements of the rules and statutes governing intervenor compensation. All members of the Scoring Committee must be financially disinterested.²¹⁶²¹⁹

The contracting agent, at the direction of Energy Division staff, shall issue the RFP using the contracting agent's solicitation portal. Once the RFP is issued, bidders have eight weeks to submit responses to the ~~Contracting Agent~~contracting agent. Bids are kept confidential and communications between bidders and members of the Scoring Committee are prohibited in order to protect confidential information.

The Scoring Committee shall evaluate bids using the pre-established RFP scoring criteria and exercising professional judgment. The Scoring Committee may request interviews or presentations with finalists. The Scoring Committee

²¹⁶²¹⁹ "Financially disinterested," for the purposes of this decision, means scoring panel should not have a financial interest in any potential program implementer or any specific company who may receive incentives from the program.

shall recommend the preferred choice. We direct Energy Division to make the final decision on the winning bid and, subsequently, inform the winning bidder of its selection.

Once a bidder is selected by Energy Division, with input from the Scoring Committee, SCE, as the designated contracting agent, shall negotiate and sign a ~~preliminary~~ contract with the winning bidder ~~upon instruction by Energy Division~~. SCE shall file a Tier ~~3~~2 advice letter with ~~Energy Division seeking the~~ Commission requesting formal approval of the ~~preliminary contract, which will be voted on during a formal Commission meeting for final approval. Upon a formal Commission vote of~~ contract. Upon Energy Division's approval, the contract shall be considered ratified.²¹⁷ If final and non-appealable CPUC approval is not obtained by a date specified in the RFP, the contracting parties will have a right to terminate the contract.²²⁰

5.2. TECH Initiative Market Development Parameters

Section 922(a)(1) requires the TECH Initiative to advance the state's market for low-emission space and water heating equipment for new and existing buildings through consumer education, contractor training, vendor training, and the provision of upstream and midstream incentives to install low-emission space and water heating in new and existing buildings. The Legislature identified specific technology parameters applicable to TECH, codified under Section 922(b). These parameters require the Commission to identify and target key low-emission space and water heating equipment technologies that are in the early stage of market development and would assist in achieving the state's GHG

²¹⁷²²⁰ Ten percent of the invoiced amounts from the TECH Initiative implementer will be held back, payable at the end of each program year, contingent on the implementer meeting program targets set out in the RFP and agreed upon in the contracting process. Energy Division will authorize the payment of the 10 percent holdback.

emissions reduction goal for 2030.²¹⁸²²¹ The Legislature requires the Commission to give consideration of technologies that have the greatest potential to reduce GHG emissions in California that improve the health and safety of, and energy affordability for, households.²¹⁹²²²

In the Scoping Memo and Ruling,²²⁰²²³ and in a subsequent Administrative Law Judge Ruling,²²¹²²⁴ parties were asked: (1) are there any elements in the Staff Proposal that should be removed, changed, or added prior to initiating the solicitation process; and (2) whether the Staff Proposal's four-pronged market based effort is appropriate.

5.2.1. Staff Proposal Summary

The Staff Proposal articulates a four-pronged approach to help accelerate the market development and sales of high efficiency heating equipment in existing homes. Discussed in more detail below, the four-pronged approach contains the following elements: (1) incentives and partnerships with supply-side market actors (upstream incentives);²²²²²⁵ (2) market facilitation activities, including workforce development, education and outreach (midstream

²¹⁸²²¹ Pub. Util. Code § 922(a)(1).

²¹⁹²²² *Id.*

²²⁰²²³ May 17, 2019 Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling.

²²¹²²⁴ July 16, 2019 Assigned Administrative Law Judge's Ruling.

²²²²²⁵ Upstream is defined as a "Program element aimed at encouraging manufacturers to make the most efficient equipment available at competitive prices, as well as program elements that provide incentives to distributors. This also includes manufacturer buydowns to targeted channels such as retailers that are not in a position to collect data from the purchaser or end-user."

incentives);²²³²²⁶ (3) a quick start grants program; and (4) a prize program. For cost-effective purposes, the Staff Proposal also recommends targeting geographical areas with existing homes in California's hotter climate zones and around Aliso Canyon in Southern California.

The Staff Proposal defines "upstream" incentives as a program element aimed at encouraging manufacturers to make the most efficient equipment available at competitive prices, as well as program elements that provide incentives to distributors.²²⁴²²⁷ [The Staff Proposal](#) also states that "upstream" incentives must include manufacturer buydowns to target channels such as retailers that are not in a position to collect data from the purchaser or end-user.²²⁵²²⁸ The Staff Proposal recommends targeting the potential business risks for the "upstream" supply chain actors, which include manufacturer representatives and distributors, by collaborating with them and offering solutions to financial barriers, supporting product development in the market place, and a "compendium of best practices."²²⁶²²⁹

Second, the Staff Proposal defines "midstream" incentives as a "program element that provides incentives to wholesale distributor retailers, e-commerce companies and/or contractors to stock and/or sell more efficient products."²²⁷²³⁰ The Staff Proposal provides that this definition requires a percent pass-through

²²³²²⁶ Midstream is defined as a "Program element that provides incentives to wholesale distributors, retailers, e-commerce companies and/or contractors to stock and/or sell more efficient products," and which includes the collection of data from the market actor's purchaser. The definition includes program elements that require a percent pass-through of the incentive to the distributor's purchaser or customer and could also include a spiff/management fee paid to the applicant for participating with the program and the program's requirements such as collecting data. It could also include interventions that will affect contractors, builders, plumbers, electricians, and retail sales outlets.□

²²⁴²²⁷ Staff Proposal, Section 5.2.1

²²⁵²²⁸ *Id.*

²²⁶²²⁹ *Id.*

²²⁷²³⁰ Staff Proposal, Section 5.2.2.

of the incentive to the distributor's customer and could also include a management fee paid to the applicant for participating with the program and the program's requirements.²²⁸²³¹ The Staff Proposal summarizes that a successful midstream incentive program treats supply chain market actors as partners, with an established memorandum of understanding and shared sales, marketing, and training.²²⁹²³²

Third, the Staff Proposal recommends a quick start grants program. The quick start grants program provides the TECH Initiative implementer with a \$5 million budget to fund localized, innovative approaches to building decarbonization.²³⁰²³³ The goal of the quick start grants program aims to test market transformation strategies and approaches, support technology development, and building decarbonization market research.²³¹²³⁴

Fourth, the Staff Proposal provides for a prize program. The prize program is intended to foster innovative, short term approaches by market actors.²³²²³⁵ Here, the Commission and the TECH Initiative implementer would set simple targets for entities to hit (*i.e.*, the number of heat pump HVAC systems installed), and a prize may be given to the first party who hits the target.²³³²³⁶

Finally, the Staff Proposal recommends that the TECH ~~initiative~~Initiative take a regional approach in its initial targeting of customers who are most likely to see bill savings and where final costs are minimized.²³⁴²³⁷ Thus, the Staff P
roposal recommends targeting ~~the~~ hotter climates of California.²³⁵²³⁸

²²⁸²³¹ Id.

²²⁹²³² Id.

²³⁰²³³ Staff Proposal, Section 5.2.3.

²³¹²³⁴ Id.

²³²²³⁵ Id. at 42-43.

²³³²³⁶ Id. at 43.

²³⁴²³⁷ Id.

²³⁵²³⁸ Id.

5.2.2. Parties' Positions

All parties oppose the Staff Proposal's proposed prize program. However, parties offer recommendations on the other components of the Staff's Proposal market approach.

SBUA advocates for redistributing the prize program funds to the "quick start" grant category or reserve the funds for future allocation.²³⁶²³⁹ SBUA disagrees with the Staff Proposal's recommendation that the TECH Initiative focus on California's hotter climate zones.²³⁷²⁴⁰

Wild Tree Foundation recommends pairing the upstream and midstream strategies with a downstream strategy of decommissioning and recycling of replaced appliances.²³⁸²⁴¹ CALSSA, recommends: (1) on-bill financing to customers to cover some of the cost of installing a certain number energy efficient, electrified appliances; (2) funding a call center to provide off-site audits to help customers decided whether replacing existing water heaters; (3) ~~send~~sending customer a sticker to attach to their water heater tank with information about replacement options; and (4) ~~support~~supporting local inspector training.²³⁹²⁴² EDF supports the Staff's Proposal "upstream" approach, as well as its midstream approach but did not support the "quick start" grants program.²⁴⁰²⁴³

SWG argues that the TECH Initiative should not be limited to high efficiency electric equipment but, instead, a broader portfolio of technologies applied to natural gas appliances.²⁴¹²⁴⁴

²³⁶²³⁹ SBUA Opening Comments at 13.

²³⁷²⁴⁰ *Id.*

²³⁸ ~~WTF~~²⁴¹ Wild Tree Foundation Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 2 and 21.

²³⁹²⁴² CALSAA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

²⁴⁰²⁴³ EDF Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 10.

²⁴¹²⁴⁴ SWG Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 6.

VEIC supports the Staff Proposal's focus on specific climate markets but discourages an overly geographic focus in lieu of the broader state market.²⁴²²⁴⁵ VEIC recommends increased program administrator flexibility for the TECH Initiative, a strengthened focus on low-income households and hard-to-reach populations, and tie the quick start grants program to specific market development strategies.²⁴³²⁴⁶ PG&E similarly agrees, asserting that the TECH Initiative implementer be given the flexibility to propose only one or two of the proposed approaches presented by i_n the Staff.^{244Proposal}.²⁴⁷

The Partnership and Joint Environmentals argue that the four-pronged approach presented by i_n the Staff Proposal must ultimately benefit low-income households²⁴⁵²⁴⁸ and hard-to-reach populations and that there should be funding for the quick start grants program of up to \$10 million.²⁴⁶²⁴⁹

Cal Advocates articulates that if manufacturer offerings are not an important barrier that impedes the availability of low-emissions heating technologies, the implementer for the TECH initiative should budget less money to upstream incentives in subsequent program years.²⁴⁷²⁵⁰ Cal Advocates recommends that the implementer for the TECH Initiative should adjust the program to specific product improvements or market niches where incentives are likely to be useful.²⁴⁸²⁵¹

²⁴²²⁴⁵ VEIC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 11-12.

²⁴³²⁴⁶ *Id.*

²⁴⁴²⁴⁷ PG&E Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 10.

²⁴⁵²⁴⁸ The Partnership Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 16.

²⁴⁶²⁴⁹ Join Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 18.

²⁴⁷²⁵⁰ Cal Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 26.

²⁴⁸²⁵¹ *Id.*

**5.2.3. Analysis: The TECH Initiative Implementer Shall Approach the Initiative with a Menu of Tactics but-
~~must~~[Must](#) Implement an Upstream and Mid-Stream Market Approach to Drive Market Transformation Consistent ~~with~~[With](#) Statutory Requirements**

We decline to adopt an approach that may, in effect, become overly prescriptive for the TECH Initiative implementer. Market development initiatives involve phases that require development and testing of strategies and approaches to arrive at impactful market intervention efforts. Therefore, we adopt an approach that gives the implementer the flexibility to approach the TECH Initiative with a menu of tactics. While we grant the implementer flexibility, we do not deviate from the statutory mandate that the implementer include an upstream and midstream approach to drive market development, as well as provide consumer education, contractor training, and vendor training. The statute does not envision the TECH Initiative delivering downstream or direct-to-customer incentives. The implementer has the responsibility to evaluate the market structure and dynamics, by proposing intervention strategies ~~intervention strategies~~ to overcome barriers and to further the market.

To set some parameters to guide the implementer, we define the elements of upstream and midstream programs. Upstream^{~~249~~[252](#)} shall be defined as program elements aimed at encouraging manufacturers to make the most efficient equipment available at competitive prices. This also includes manufacturer buydowns to targeted channels such as retailers that are not positioned to collect data from the purchaser or end-user. For market adoption of energy-efficient products in the upstream supply chain, the implementer must work with upstream supply chain actors like manufacturers, manufacturer

^{~~249~~[252](#)} Staff Proposal at Section 5.2.1.

representatives, and distributors to reduce the real and perceived business risks of building decarbonization market development. Next, we define midstream.

Midstream²⁵⁰[253](#) shall mean program elements that provide incentives to wholesale distributors, retailers, e-commerce companies and/or contractors to stock and/or sell more efficient products. The definition also includes: (1) program elements that require a percent pass-through of the incentive to the distributor's purchaser or customer; (2) a spiff/management fee paid to the applicant for participating with the program and the program's requirements such as collecting data; and (3) interventions that will affect contractors, builders, plumbers, electricians, and retail sales outlets.

With respect to a menu of tactics for the implementer to pursue, we offer the following discretionary tactics the implementer may utilize as options to further market development transformation efforts through the TECH Initiative:

- **Manufacturer incentives for resilient and long-lasting equipment:** As California prepares for catastrophic wildfires, we will need equipment that is more resilient, and designed and installed with adaptive safety features. Low-income households will benefit from equipment with longer expected useful lives and manufacturer warranties to get the best return on investment.
- **Kicker incentives to manufacturers for innovative technology partnerships:** The need for flexible demand side resources means grid-responsive capabilities across multiple integrated systems. Niche products such as demand-responsive electrical panels and smart battery storage that can seamlessly work with distributed resource-enabled space and water heaters would need program support for integration into mainstream market.
- **Bulk purchasing:** This could include working with a utility to purchase a large quantity of appliances in order to take advantage of economies of scale.

²⁴⁹²⁵² [Staff Proposal at Section 5.2.2.](#)

- **Local government outreach and advocacy:** This could include educating permitting offices and inspectors on the state regulations for heat pump appliances or partnering with local governments to promote heat pump appliances to their citizens.
- **Consumer financing:** In order to reduce the up-front costs to consumers, the implementer may partner with a bank to offer loans to customers, or with a utility to offer an on-bill financing program.
- **Buyback programs:** This could include paying a customer to take their high-emissions appliance as part of an incentive program.
- **Layering incentives and financing from other programs:** We encourage bidders to consider innovative approaches to layer or stack TECH Initiative incentives with other programs, such as net energy metering, the Self-Generation Incentive Program, Home Upgrade, or the Energy Savings Assistance Program, [as well as financing products such as the Residential Energy Efficiency Loan \(REEL\) program.](#)
- **Quick Start Grants Program:** Under this program category, the implementer will work with a limited carve out of the TECH Initiative budget over the first two years of the program. These funds will be intended to fund localized, vanguard approaches to decarbonization. This program will consist of a grants program involving the procurement and administration of a portfolio of high-impact projects and strategy testing engagements with local, regional and other third-party implementers.
- **Innovation for lower-GWP refrigerants:** Using strategic partnerships and leveraging other funding sources - for instance, the EPIC program, work with manufacturers to install mid-range- or low-range GWP refrigerants in incented appliances.

Finally, SB 1477 requires the Commission to ensure that TECH Initiative implementation includes outreach strategies for hard-to-reach customers. [251254](#)

[251254](#) Pub. Util. Code § 922(c)(1).

The implementer shall employ strategies that target not only hard-to-reach customers, but also those in low-income and disadvantaged communities. These strategies should support long-term market development across these groups and communities. Each bid for the TECH Initiative implementer shall include plans to provide common marketing, education and outreach materials and tactics to support the programs that are already serving low-income populations and those in disadvantaged communities.²⁵⁵ In addition, bidders shall propose how workforce training should focus on low-income residents or those living in disadvantaged communities. We remind stakeholders that the TECH Initiative is intended to develop the market by working with upstream and midstream actors. Any resources beyond these market streams is contrary to the intention of SB 1477, and we decline to adopt an approach that is – or could be deployed as – downstream activity. Finally, we direct Energy Division staff to conduct a workshop, after the adoption of this decision, to focus on stakeholder concern for “fund-stacking.” From this workshop, Energy Division staff will produce a staff proposal with a framework for how to address funding when combining incentives from separate program budgets.

5.3. TECH Initiative Technology Parameters

Section 922(a)(2)(a) requires the Commission, ~~under~~as part of its supervision of the TECH Initiative, to develop guidelines that include a list of eligible technologies, a process for evaluating new technologies, and a process and set of metrics by which to evaluate and track the TECH Initiative results.

²⁵⁵ These are itemized in Appendix A, Part 4 below. This could include leveraging and supplementing existing marketing, education and outreach campaigns that are already in the market.

In the Scoping Memo and Ruling,²⁵²²⁵⁶ and in a subsequent Administrative Law Judge Ruling,²⁵³²⁵⁷ parties were asked: (1) what technology eligibility criteria should be utilized; (2) what process should be utilized for evaluating new technologies; (3) guidelines for evaluation metrics; and (4) what criteria should be used for scoring and selecting projects.

5.3.1. Staff Proposal Summary

In selecting the eligible technologies for the TECH Initiative, the Staff P
roposal recommends that the CEC provide preliminary technology specifications, then work with the selected contractors to finalize all technology eligibility.²⁵⁴²⁵⁸ The Staff Proposal gives the Commission final approval over technology eligibility specifications.²⁵⁵²⁵⁹ The Staff Proposal focuses on existing technical specifications for space and water heating equipment, such as the Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnership's cold-climate air-source heat pump specification.²⁵⁶²⁶⁰ For water heating, the Staff Proposal recommends utilizing the NEEA's performance specification for heat pump water heaters.²⁵⁷²⁶¹ The Staff Proposal also recommends that future decision making regarding technology eligibility consider: (1) GHG reduction potential;²⁵⁸²⁶² (2) commercial readiness;²⁵⁹²⁶³ and (3) equipment and installation costs.²⁶⁰²⁶⁴

Finally, the Staff P
roposal recommends targeting an array of technologies and approaches for the TECH Initiative. This includes the following: (1) heat pump HVAC systems in residential low-rise retrofit homes, where central air

²⁵²²⁵⁶ May 17, 2019 Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling.

²⁵³²⁵⁷ July 16, 2019 Assigned Administrative Law Judge's Ruling.

²⁵⁴²⁵⁸ Staff Proposal, Section 5.5.

²⁵⁵²⁵⁹ *Id.*

²⁵⁶²⁶⁰ *Id.*

²⁵⁷²⁶¹ *Id.*

²⁵⁸²⁶² Staff Proposal, Section 5.5.1.

²⁵⁹²⁶³ Staff Proposal, Section 5.5.2.

²⁶⁰²⁶⁴ *Id.* 46-47.

conditioning is warranted or needed; (2) HVAC heat pumps to replace space heating currently provided by propane, distillate, or electric resistance heat; (3) high efficiency HVAC heat pumps rather than standalone central AC units should be encouraged wherever possible; (4) early replacement program for older natural gas furnaces and natural gas water heaters should be considered; and (5) incentives and low-cost financing targeted to landlords and low-income consumers to overcome capital cost barriers and ensure that clean energy benefits are enjoyed by all communities.²⁶¹²⁶⁵

5.3.2. Parties Positions

Joint Environmentals support the elements of the Staff's proposal Proposal's technology parameter recommendations but caution that leveraging certain technical specifications (*i.e.*, cold climate heat pump) may not be needed everywhere and the Commission should not predetermine how the implementer should target TECH Initiative funding.²⁶²²⁶⁶ Cal Advocates also agrees that the Staff Proposal's technology eligibility criteria is reasonable but adds that it is beneficial for market transformation goals if the TECH Initiative implementer focuses on technologies with a large market potential, leaving technologies aimed at smaller market niches for later efforts.²⁶³²⁶⁷

CHBC disagrees with some of the Staff Proposal's recommendations, arguing that hydrogen should be considered²⁶⁴²⁶⁸ while EDF supports an emphasis on market ready technologies like water heating technologies that require little electrical panel work for conversion from a natural gas system.²⁶⁵²⁶⁹ SWG also argues for consideration of additional heating technologies – like solar

²⁶¹²⁶⁵ Staff Proposal, Section 5.5.4.26-27.

²⁶²²⁶⁶ Joint Environmentals Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 19.

²⁶³²⁶⁷ Cal Advocates Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 23.

²⁶⁴²⁶⁸ CHBC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 8.

²⁶⁵²⁶⁹ EDF Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 12.

thermal, gas heat pump technologies, low-NOx technologies and renewable natural gas.²⁶⁶²⁷⁰

VEIC argues that the TECH Initiative should emphasize heat pump technologies for space and heating.²⁶⁷²⁷¹ Specifically, VEIC suggests: (1) retrofit-ready technologies and specifications suitable for the California market, like low-amperage and low-wattage water heaters and space heaters that do not rely on electric resistant backup; and (2) technologies with specific application to low-income households, such as replacements for swamp coolers.²⁶⁸²⁷²

CBIA cautions against supporting heat pump water heaters because they are typically more expensive per unit and have high operating costs.²⁶⁹²⁷³ The Partnership encourages low-cost technologies that help achieve high savings to ensure that the technologies are accessible.²⁷⁰²⁷⁴

Wild Tree Foundation argues for highly efficient heat pumps utilizing natural, non-GHG emitting refrigerants, low cost solar thermal water heating systems, and efficient space heat pump that works in climate extremes of both heat and cold.²⁷¹²⁷⁵

PG&E recommends that the Commission require an evaluation plan with a program design to maximize the program evaluation's usefulness.²⁷²²⁷⁶

²⁶⁶²⁷⁰ SWG Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 5.

²⁶⁷²⁷¹ VEIC Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 12.

²⁶⁸²⁷² *Id.*

²⁶⁹²⁷³ CBIA Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 4.

²⁷⁰²⁷⁴ The Partnership Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 17.

²⁷¹²⁷⁵ Wild Tree Foundation Opening Comments at 19.

²⁷²²⁷⁶ PG&E Opening Comments on Staff Proposal at 11.

5.3.3. Analysis: The TECH Initiative Implementer Shall Select Eligible Technologies With a Performance-based Approach on GHG Emission Reduction Baselines to Best Meet Program Goals

~~The selected implementer shall work with Energy Division and the CEC to finalize all technology eligibility requirements as needed. Energy Division shall have final approval over these specifications.~~

We direct the TECH Initiative implementer to leverage existing technical specifications where possible and in doing so, delegate it the discretion to determine that such specifications may not be needed everywhere. In other words, we provide the implementer flexibility in setting technology criteria, allowing for adjustments to be made as advanced low-emission technologies become commercially available. The selected implementer shall work with Energy Division and the CEC to finalize all technology eligibility requirements as needed. Energy Division shall have final approval over these specifications.

We decline to adopt an approach that could single out any particular product, which could stymie innovation in this emerging market. Therefore, rather than having a list of eligible equipment and products, we adopt a performance-based approach on GHG emission reduction baselines. When submitting bids to serve as the TECH Initiative implementer, bidders shall propose which technologies would best meet program goals and only include technologies that are eligible for other programs if they provide evidence. Additionally, special consideration shall be given to technologies that are grid-enabled, have a high market-potential, and that improve the health and safety of, and energy affordability for, low-income households. ²⁷³²⁷⁷ Bidders are

²⁷³²⁷⁷ We note that low-GWP use refrigerants have the highest potential to reduce GHG emissions.

directed to explain their strategy for technology selection in the RFP process, and also explain what strategy they would not pursue and why.

We decline to adopt the recommendations by SWG, SoCalGas, and CHBC for the inclusion of renewable natural gas and hydrogen into these pilot programs ~~because~~. SB 1477 is focused on advancing the state's market for low-emission space and water heating equipment for new and existing residential and non-residential buildings through consumer education, contractor training, vendor training, and the provision of upstream and midstream incentives, ²⁷⁴²⁷⁸ - not on particularized infrastructure or fuels.

Finally, we direct the implementer to use its discretion to determine the most promising geographic target areas for a focused TECH Initiative effort, within the regional requirements required by CARB regulations for Cap-and-Trade funding. We agree with Joint Environmentals that targeting program funds can help achieve critical mass in certain markets and better jump start market development. We acknowledge that due to climate change, an increased number and higher intensity of heat waves is affecting many areas of the state - including the Central Valley, which experiences hotter summers and colder winters than coastal areas. Given the changing climate and the diversity of the state, we grant the implementer the flexibility to identify the most promising geographic target areas for a focused TECH Initiative implementation.

6. Conclusion

In summary, this decision establishes a framework for Commission oversight of SB 1477's two building decarbonization pilot programs. SB 1477 makes available a pool of \$200 million, collected ~~in~~over four years in increments totaling \$50 million ~~annual installments~~annually starting in FY 2019-20 and

²⁷⁴²⁷⁸ Pub. Util. Code § 922(a)(1).

ending in FY 2022-23,²⁷⁵ and derived from the revenue generated from the GHG allowances directly allocated to gas corporations and consigned to auction as part of the California's Cap-and-Trade program, from 2019-2023. We appropriate 40-percent of the \$200 million budget for the BUILD Program and sixty percent for the TECH Initiative. To comply with Cap-and-Trade rules, the spending for the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative shall be proportionally directed to the gas corporation service territories where the funds are derived.²⁷⁶²⁷⁹ The percentage allocation for each gas corporation service territory is discussed above.

Any spending for the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative with statewide or cross-territory benefits, including but not limited to administrative and evaluation spending, shall be attributed to the gas corporation service territories in proportion to their original funding contribution. To the extent that there are unspent GHG allowance proceeds allocated for an individual gas corporation's service territory, and no remaining eligible projects within that service territory, the remaining GHG allowance proceeds may be spent ~~elsewhere after two years following implementation.~~outside of that gas corporation's service territory starting two years after program implementation. Any unspent funds remaining on July 1, 2033 shall be returned to the ratepayers of the respective gas corporations as part of the California Climate Credit.

The BUILD Program shall be administered by the CEC, with Commission oversight. We direct the CEC to design the BUILD Program with the goal to deploy near-zero-emission building technologies in the largest number of

²⁷⁵ ~~Fiscal Year 2019-2020 to Fiscal Year 2022-23.~~

²⁷⁶²⁷⁹ See 17 CCR Section 95893(d)(3): "Allowance value, including any allocated allowance auction proceeds, obtained by a natural gas supplier must be used for the primary benefit of retail natural gas ratepayers of each natural gas supplier, consistent with the goals of AB 32, and may not be used for the benefit of entities or persons other than such ratepayers."

residential units as possible. Thirty percent of the \$200 million in total funding authorized by SB 1477 (e.g., ~~\$80 Million~~60 million) is appropriated for new low-income residential housing under the BUILD Program. This percentage is not the ceiling for spending on low-income households but rather, the floor. Incentive eligibility for the BUILD Program shall be limited strictly to ~~newly constructed~~²⁷⁷ ~~all new~~ ~~electric building projects~~ residential housing, without any hookup to the natural gas distribution grid. New residential housing is defined as one of the following:

1. A building that has never been used or occupied for any purpose;²⁸⁰ or
2. Any work, addition to, remodel, repair, renovation, or alteration of any building(s) or structure(s) when 50 percent or more of the exterior weight bearing walls are removed or demolished;²⁸¹ or
3. An existing building repurposed for housing, whose original use was not residential.

The TECH Initiative shall be effectuated by a third-party implementer. The third-party implementer shall be selected with Commission oversight. The Commission directs SCE to act as the contracting agent responsible for managing the solicitation for the third-party implementer. SCE is entitled to a portion of the TECH Initiative funding in order to recover expenses that may be incurred while serving as the contracting agent. Energy Division, alongside a panel of financially disinterested experts, shall score proposals and select a bidder to serve as the third-party implementer for the TECH Initiative. The selection process shall occur through an RFP process. Upon the conclusion of the selection

²⁷⁷ ~~Section 100.1 of Title 24, Part 6 (Building Energy Efficiency Standards) defines a “newly constructed” building as a building that has never been used or occupied for any purpose.~~

²⁸⁰ See Section 100.1 of Part 6 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (Energy Code).

²⁸¹ See 15.06.030 Section R202 of the California Residential Building Code.

process, SCE shall file a Tier [32](#) advice letter with Energy Division to seek final approval of the candidate-implementer for the TECH Initiative.

To accelerate market development and adoption of building decarbonization technologies targeted under the TECH Initiative, we allow the implementer the prerogative to select from an array of tactics and approaches. However, we require the implementer to use the upstream and midstream approaches we adopt here, as well as provide consumer education, contractor training, and vendor training, to facilitate the market development for building decarbonization technologies. Additionally, we decline to adopt a prescriptive list of eligible technologies and products at this time, as we do not want to single out a product or products which could stymie market innovation. We direct Energy Division to include in the RFP process direction to applicants to propose the most promising market segments areas for focused implementation efforts.

The TECH Initiative implementer shall employ outreach strategies that target hard-to-reach customers, as well as those in low-income and disadvantaged communities, in order to support long-term market development across these groups and communities.

Finally, a single, independent program evaluator shall evaluate both pilot programs. SCE shall procure an independent program evaluator through a RFP process at the same time as an implementer for the TECH Initiative is procured. The program evaluator shall be engaged throughout the initiation of the two pilot programs and during the administration of them to ensure that substantive, real time feedback is given, and data and information gathering is meaningful to support the success of these pilots.

7. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the CPUC's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Comments were filed on _____ ~~and reply comments were filed on~~ _____ March 3, 2020 by the following parties: (1) A.O. Smith Corporation; (2) BayREN; (3) Cal Advocates; (4) CBIA; (5) CALSSA; (6) CSE; (7) East Bay Community Energy (EBCE); (8) EDF; (9) GRID Alternatives; (10) Joint Environmentals; (11) Mitsubishi Electric US; (12) PG&E; (13) Recurve Analytics, Inc; (14) Rheem Manufacturing Company; (15) Sacramento Municipal Utility District; (16) SBUA; (17) SCE; (18) SDG&E; (19) SoCalGas and SWG (Joint Gas Corporations); (20) The Council; (21) The Partnership; (22) VEIC; and (23) Wild Tree Foundation.

Reply comments were filed on March 9, 2020 by: (1) Cal Advocates; (2) CHBC; (3) CSE; (4) EDF; (5) Joint Environmentals; (6) Joint Gas Corporations; (7) Marin Clean Energy; (8) NFCRC; (9) Orsted; (10) SBUA; (11) SCE; (12) SDG&E; (13) The Council; and (14) Wild Tree Foundation.

We have carefully considered the suggested changes proposed by parties in their comments and reply comments to this proposed decision. The proposed changes that we have accepted are reflected in the revised document.

8. Assignment of Proceeding

Liane M. Randolph is the assigned Commissioner and Colin Rizzo ~~and~~ Julie Fitch, and Jeanne McKinney are the assigned Administrative Law Judges in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission or CPUC) initiated Rulemaking (R.)19-01-011 to begin crafting policy regarding building

decarbonization in California pursuant to ~~SB 1477~~ Senate Bill (SB) 1477 (Stern, 2018).

2. SB 1477 requires the Commission to develop two programs to test specific programmatic approaches to building decarbonization.

3. The SB 1477 pilot programs are the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative.

4. SB 1477 mandates the BUILD Program to incent the deployment of building technologies in new residential buildings that GHG emissions significantly beyond what otherwise would have resulted from complying the prescriptive requirements of the California Energy Code.

5. SB 1477 mandates the TECH Initiative to incent the deployment of low-emissions space and water heating technologies that are in an early stage of market development in both new and existing residential buildings that are in an early stage of market development.

6.. These SB 1477 pilot programs are focused on advancing the state's market for low-emission space and water heating equipment for new and existing residential and non-residential buildings through customer education, contractor training, vendor training, and the provision of upstream and midstream incentives - not particularized infrastructure or fuels, such as renewable natural gas or hydrogen.

7.. ~~6.~~ SB 1477 finances the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative from a pool of \$200 million, collected ~~in~~ over four years in increments totaling \$50 million ~~annual installments~~ annually starting in FY 2019-20 and ending in FY 2022-23, and derived from the GHG proceeds resulting from emissions allowances directly allocated to gas corporations and consigned to auction as part of the CARB Cap-and-Trade program..

8.. ~~7.~~ The natural gas corporations covered under SB 1477's compliance costs are: (1) SoCalGas; (2) PG&E (3) SDG&E; and (4) SWG.

9.. ~~8.~~ SB 1477 should emphasize new, low-income residential housing by allocating no less than 75 percent of the total BUILD Program funding (*i.e.*, ~~\$80~~60 million) for new low-income residential housing.

10.0. ~~9.~~ SB 1477 ~~requires~~ states the Legislature's intent that the building decarbonization pilot programs ultimately not result in higher utility bills for occupants and requires that ~~they~~bills not rise for low-income ~~building~~ ~~occupants~~residents of buildings that are funded with the low-income portion of the BUILD Program.

11.1. ~~10.~~ SB 1477 requires a BUILD Program outreach plan that encourages applications for projects in new low-income, residential housing ~~building~~ ~~projects~~.

12.2. ~~11.~~ SB 1477 places specific programmatic emphasis on eligible technology and targeting criteria.

13.3. ~~12.~~ SB 1477 TECH Initiative's technology and targeting criteria are: (1) space and water heating technology; (2) technology at an early stage of market development; (3) technology with the greatest potential for reducing GHG emissions; and (4) technology with the greatest potential for improving health and safety and energy affordability for low-income households.

14.4. ~~13.~~ SB 1477 requires the development of an outreach plan to determine guideline and evaluation metrics, outreach strategies for hard-to-reach customers, and provide job training and employment opportunities to further building decarbonization market transformation.

15.5. ~~14.~~ Commission staff, in consultation with the CEC staff, issued a Staff Proposal for the two building decarbonization pilots in July of 2019.

~~16.6. 15.~~ The Staff Proposal offered recommendations for the implementation of SB 1477's BUILD Program and TECH Initiative.

17.7. Presently, more than 95 percent of new homes built in California are constructed as dual fuel homes.

18.8. Policy makers, program implementers and evaluators require access to certain confidential customer data to understand program efficacy and impacts.

19.9. Granular customer-level data is useful for public interest decarbonization research, but is not publicly available due to privacy and confidentiality laws

20.0. Not all low- income housing is in low income or disadvantaged communities. Participation in the TECH Initiative Scoring Committee will assist the Commission, and therefore, constitute a substantial contribution to a proceeding of the Commission.

Conclusions of Law

1. It is reasonable to appropriate the SB 1477 program budget compliance costs across California's gas corporations according to each gas corporation's percentage share of allocated Cap-and-Trade allowances, consistent with Cap-and-Trade regulations.

2. It is reasonable to set SoCalGas' SB 1477 compliance costs at \$24,630,000 annually, or 49.26 percent of the annual pool of SB 1477 funds.

3. It is reasonable to set PG&E's SB 1477 compliance costs at \$21,170,00 annually, or 42.34 percent of the annual pool of SB 1477 funds.

4. It is reasonable to set SDG&E's SB 1477 compliance costs at \$3,385,000 annually, or 6.77 percent of the annual pool of SB 1477 funds.

5. It is reasonable to set SWG's SB 1477 compliance costs at \$815,000, or 1.63 percent of the annual pool of SB 1477 funds.

6. It is reasonable to require SoCalGas, PG&E, SDG&E, and SWG to remit their respective SB 1477 compliance costs directly and in full to the Commission designated contracting agent who shall establish a new balancing account specifically for these funds.

7. It is reasonable to designate SCE as the Commission -designated building decarbonization pilot program contracting agent.

8. It is reasonable to require SCE to file a Tier 1 advice letter with the Energy Division formalizing a new SB 1477 balancing account.

9. It is reasonable to require SCE, immediately following approval of the new balancing account, to request from the gas corporations disbursal of first year funding set aside as directed by Resolution G-3565, which shall be provided no more than 15 days following the request.

10. It is reasonable to require SCE to account for all interest accrued, prior to disbursal to the BUILD Program administrator and TECH Initiative implementer.

11. It is reasonable to require SCE to immediately disburse the SB 1477 funds to the BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer when the funds are requested formally by writing.

12. It is reasonable to require SCE to provide Energy Division, [the BUILD Program administrator, and the TECH Initiative implementer](#) monthly updates regarding all disbursements of funds made and the status of the funds.

13. It is reasonable to require Energy Division to provide annual updates to the Legislature regarding funding and expenditures for the SB 1477 pilot programs.

14. It is reasonable to require spending levels for the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative in the gas corporation service territories to be proportional to where the funds are derived, consistent with Cap-and-Trade regulations.

15.5. It is reasonable that spending for the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative, with statewide or cross-territory benefits, including but not limited to administrative and evaluation spending, shall be attributed to the gas corporation service territories in proportion to their original funding contribution.

16.6. ~~15.~~ It is reasonable to appropriate 40 percent of the total program funds to the BUILD Program and 60 percent of the program funds to the TECH Initiative to maximize pilot program efforts to stimulate market transformation.

17.7. ~~16.~~ It is reasonable to encourage the BUILD Program administrator to go beyond the SB 1477 minimum of 30 percent allotment for new low-income residential housing; in other words, the BUILD Program's budgetary allotment for the low-income program costs should be considered a minimum threshold, not a cap.

18.8. ~~17.~~ It is reasonable to cap the BUILD Program administrative budget at 10 percent of the total BUILD Program budget.

19.9. It is reasonable to establish that current standard practice in new residential housing is to build building that use at least one more fuel in addition to electricity for the building's operation.

20.0. It is reasonable to allow use of SB 1477 funds in jurisdictions with local ordinances that have additional requirements beyond the California Energy Code or other state requirements.

21.1. It is reasonable to cap the TECH Initiative administrative budget at
~~18. — It is reasonable to cap the TECH Initiative administrative budget at five-~~
~~percent of the TECH Initiative budget~~ 10 percent; and establish that if the selected bid to implement the TECH Initiative is below the ~~five~~10 percent cap, then the difference between the winning ~~select~~ bid amount and the ~~total spending of the~~

~~TECH Initiative implementation cost~~ 10 percent administrative cost cap shall be reallocated for program costs.

2 2. 19. It is reasonable to ~~entitle~~ limit the TECH Initiative contracting agent to no more than one percent of TECH Initiative funding.

3 3. 20. It is reasonable to designate a single, independent program evaluator for both the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative for purposes of economies of scale and to require the program evaluator to engage closely with the initiation and ongoing implementation of both pilot programs.

4 4. 21. It is reasonable to require the program evaluator to use the SB 1477 GHG benefits metrics as the primary factor for measuring both pilot program's outcomes and success.

5 5. 22. It is reasonable to require the program evaluator to closely collaborate with Energy Division to determine whether and to what extent GHG benefits sub-metrics shall be applied.

6 6. 23. It is reasonable to require the program evaluator to include gas corporations' Cap-and-Trade reporting obligations as part of its pilot program evaluation.

7 7. 24. It is reasonable to require the BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer to calibrate the technical assistance, education, and outreach of their respective building decarbonization pilot programs to the varied regions of California.

8 8. 25. It is reasonable to require the BUILD Program administrator and the TECH Initiative implementer to partner with organizations that primarily serve low-income, disadvantaged, and hard-to-reach customers to ensure active participation and partnership with customers across a variety of demographic groups.

9. It is reasonable for the pilot program implementers and the program evaluator to sign non-disclosure agreements with the CPUC in order to gain access to confidential customer data rather than sign separate non-disclosure agreements with each investor-owned utility (IOU).

0. It is reasonable to provide IOU customers the option of voluntary public donation of their energy use data rather than assume that every customer is unwilling to share their individual energy use data for public interest decarbonization-related research.

1. ~~26.~~ It is reasonable to reduce refrigerant-based GHG emissions and thus, adopt: (1) a low-Global Warming Potential (GWP) refrigerant threshold of less than 150; and (2) a high-~~Global Warming Potential~~GWP refrigerant threshold above 750. ~~Refrigerants~~

2. It is reasonable to require that refrigerants used in the space and water heating appliances of building projects funded by the BUILD Program or incentivized by the TECH Initiative shall not exceed the 750 GWP threshold starting January 1, 2023. It is reasonable for the Commission, in a later phase of this proceeding, to consider whether to maintain or modify – for either the pilot programs or a potential permanent program – the GWP limit or the date after which incentives for appliances using high-GWP refrigerants would be prohibit.

3. ~~27.~~ It is reasonable to designate the CEC as the BUILD Program administrator, with ultimate Commission oversight, because the CEC has broad technical, programmatic, and policy experience.

4. ~~28.~~ It is reasonable to make disbursement of BUILD Program funding to the CEC contingent upon legislative authorization for the CEC's administrative expenses.

3 5. ~~29.~~ It is reasonable to cap the total BUILD Program administration at \$8 million ~~over a four-year period, or \$2 million annually~~ for the duration of the BUILD Program.

8 6. ~~30.~~ It is reasonable to ultimately defer to the Legislature should the Legislature find that BUILD Program administrative funding to the CEC should be less.

3 7. ~~31.~~ It is reasonable to appropriate BUILD Program incentives to only ~~newly constructed projects~~ new residential housing that ~~are~~ is all-electric, which is consistent with State of California ~~requirements~~ goals to achieve a zero-GHG electricity supply by 2045.

8 8. It is unreasonable to adopt the inclusion of renewable natural gas and hydrogen into the BUILD Program and TECH Initiative pilot programs because these pilot programs are not focused on particularized infrastructure or fuels.

9 9. ~~32.~~ It is reasonable to require the CEC to ensure that the structure of the BUILD Program incentives design and distribution is consistent with Cap-and-Trade regulations so that incentives are proportionally allocated back to the service territory from which they came.

0 0. It is reasonable to define new residential housing as either (a) a new building that has not previously been used or occupied; (b) an existing building where at least 50 percent of the exterior weight-bearing walls are removed or demolished for new construction; or (c) an existing building repurposed for housing, whose original use was not residential.

4 1. ~~33.~~ It is reasonable to require that BUILD Program incentives be based on-
~~demonstrable~~ whole building GHG performance modelled using the CEC's California Energy Code compliance software against a reference case.

2 2. ~~34~~. It is reasonable to reconsider the BUILD Program parameters if the CEC is unable to spend the funds after two years of implementation.

3 3. It is reasonable to establish the implementation start date for the BUILD Program as the date when the CEC notifies the public that it is accepting applications for the program.

4 4. ~~35~~. It is reasonable to consider extending BUILD Program eligibility to ~~new construction in existing buildings, buildings repurposed for residential usage,~~address barriers to scaling decarbonization in new low-income residential housing, market-rate projects, and electric-ready retrofits,~~and market-rate projects~~ if allocated funds are not spent within two years of the implementation ~~s~~ tart date. .

5 5. ~~36~~. It is reasonable to consider funds set aside for approved BUILD Program applications as spent for the purposes of this program.

6 6. ~~37~~. It is reasonable to require electric and gas corporations to release non-~~confidential data regarding planned natural gas infrastructure extensions and existing aging infrastructure that may not be worth replacing or maintaining long-term to assist with~~that may effectively inform BUILD Program design and T ECH Initiative designs.

7 7. ~~38~~. It is reasonable to require the CEC to submit an implementation plan every two years to the Commission's Deputy Executive Director for Energy and Climate Policy for approval via the Commission's resolution process.

8 8. ~~39~~. It is reasonable to designate all new low-income residential housing projects within the territories of gas corporations subject to this decision be eligible for BUILD Program incentives.

~~49.~~ ~~40.~~ It is reasonable to direct SCE, in cooperation with the Commission's Energy Division, to issue a request for proposal (RFP) to select the implementer for the TECH Initiative.

~~6~~ ~~0.~~ ~~41.~~ It is reasonable to convene a scoring committee for the purpose of selecting the TECH Initiative implementer that consists of the following nine members: (1) one representative from Energy Division; (2) one representative from the CEC; (3) one representative from SCE; (4) three market transformation experts selected by Energy Division; and (5) one representative each from three separate environmental or consumer public interest groups, or a coalition of environmental or consumer public interest groups, that are parties to R.19-01-011, as selected by Energy Division.

~~5~~ ~~1.~~ It is reasonable to award intervenor compensation to any participating in the Scoring Committee who makes a substantial contribution to the work of the Scoring Committee and meets all other requirements of the rules and statutes governing intervenor compensation. Participation in the Scoring Committee will assist the Commission and therefore constitutes a contribution to a proceeding of the Commission.

~~3~~ ~~2.~~ ~~42.~~ It is reasonable to require, upon selection of a prospective TECH Initiative implementer, to require SCE to file a Tier 3 advice letter requesting formal ~~Commission~~ Energy Division approval of the selection of the TECH Initiative implementer.

~~5~~ ~~3.~~ ~~43.~~ It is reasonable to give the TECH Initiative implementer the ~~prerogative~~ discretion to select from a menu of market transformation tactics, but it shall implement an upstream and ~~mid-stream~~ midstream market ~~transformation~~ development approach as specific drivers for market transformation.

4. 44. It is reasonable to define upstream market ~~transformation~~development as program elements aimed at encouraging manufacturers to make the most ~~efficient~~GHG-reducing equipment available at competitive prices.

5. 45. It is reasonable to define mid-stream market ~~transformation~~development as a program element that provides incentives to wholesale distributors, retailers, e-commerce companies and/or contractors to stock and/or sell more efficient products.

6. 46. It is reasonable to require the TECH Initiative implementer to select from ~~performance-based~~ technologies that demonstrably reduce GHG emissions to meet building decarbonization pilot program goals.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Pursuant to Senate Bill 1477, we order that ~~the~~ funding for the Building Initiative for Low-Emissions Development program (BUILD Program) and the Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating initiative (TECH Initiative) be made available from a pool of \$200 million, collected ~~in four \$50 annual installments~~ over four years in increments totaling \$50 million annually starting in Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 and ending in FY 2022-23, and derived from the revenue generated from the greenhouse gas emission allowances directly allocated to gas corporations and consigned to auction as part of the California Air Resources Board Cap-and-Trade program.

2. California gas corporations subject to Senate Bill (SB) 1477 funding obligations are Pacific Gas and Electric Company (~~PG&E~~), Southern California Gas Company (~~SCE~~), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (~~SDG&E~~), and Southwest Gas Company (~~SWG~~) ~~with SCE~~ Southern California Edison Company shall act as the Commission's contracting agent. To comply with California Air

Resources Board rules regarding Cap-and-Trade funds, SB 1477 compliance costs shall be allocated according to the following percentages, for each gas corporation service territory ~~is as follows~~: (a) ~~PG&E~~Pacific Gas and Electric Company : 42.34 percent; (b) ~~SoCalGas~~Southern California Gas Company 49.26 percent; (c) ~~SDG&E~~San Diego Gas & Electric Company 6.77 percent; and (d) ~~SWG~~Southwest Gas Corporation 1.63 percent.

3. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southwest Gas Corporation shall modify the table format established by D.15-10-032 (i.e., Table C of Appendix A of that decision) to include below line 9 a new line numbered 9b and titled "SB 1477 Compliance Costs." This line shall record each gas utility's share of the SB 1477 funding, as established by this decision. Line 10 of Table C of Appendix A of D.15-10-032 shall also be modified to equal the Subtotal Allowance Proceeds minus Outreach and Admin Expenses minus the SB 1477 Compliance Costs. In order to reflect this change, the four gas utilities shall further modify the template for Table C by changing the description of Line 10 of Table C of Appendix A of D.15-10-032 to "Net GHG Proceeds Available for Customer Returns (\$) (Line 8 + Line 9 + Line 9b)." To comply with California Air Resources Board's rules regarding Cap-and-Trade funds, the spending for the ~~Building Initiative for Low-Emissions Development and Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating initiative~~BUILD Program and TECH Initiative shall be proportionally directed to the gas corporation service territories where the funds are derived. ²⁷⁸²⁸² Any spending for the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative with statewide or

²⁷⁸²⁸² See Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations Section 95893(d)(3): "Allowance value, including any allocated allowance auction proceeds, obtained by a natural gas supplier must be used for the primary benefit of retail natural gas ratepayers of each natural gas supplier, consistent with the goals of Assembly Bill 32, and may not be used for the benefit of entities or persons other than such ratepayers."

cross-territory benefits, including but not limited to administrative and evaluation spending, shall be attributed to the gas corporation service territories in proportion to their original funding contribution. To the extent that there are unspent greenhouse gas allowance proceeds allocated for an individual gas corporation's service territory, and no remaining eligible projects within that service territory, the remaining greenhouse gas allowance proceeds may be spent outside of that gas corporation's service territory starting two years after program implementation. Any unspent funds remaining as of July 1, 2033 shall be returned to the ratepayers of the respective gas corporations as part of the California Climate Credit.

4.. ~~Southern California Edison~~ shall be the contracting agent responsible for: (a) managing the solicitation for the third-party implementer of the TECH Initiative; and (b) disbursing funds to both the TECH Initiative implementer and the BUILD Program administrator. ~~Southern California Edison is entitled to a portion of the TECH Initiative funding to recover expenses that may be incurred while serving as the contracting agent.~~

5.. ~~4. Southern California Edison Company (SCE) shall, immediately following approval of the new balancing account, request from the gas corporation's disbursement of first year funding set aside as directed by Commission Resolution G-3565, which shall be provided no more than 15 days following the request. SCE shall account for all interest accrued, prior to disbursement to the Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development Program administrator and Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating initiative implementer.~~ Southern California Edison shall file a Tier 1 advice letter with the Commission's Energy Division within 15 days of the date of the approval of this decision to track costs associated with performing the functions required of the contracting agent.

Southern California Edison shall book all costs associated with performing the functions required of the contracting agent to ~~the new balancing account~~ and shall be entitled to no more than one percent of TECH Initiative funding, with cost recovery subject to a true-up based on actual costs accrued and to a final verification by Energy Division staff.

6.. ~~5.~~ Southern California Edison Company shall, within 15 days of the date of the approval of this decision, file a Tier 1 advice letter with the Commission's Energy Division formalizing a new balancing account for tracking the gas corporation's remittances of their Senate Bill 1477 compliance costs.

7.. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southwest Gas Corporation shall, on or before June 1, 2020, disburse to the contracting agent the entire first year funding set aside as directed by Resolution G-3565.

8.. ~~6.~~ Pacific Gas ~~and~~ & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southwest Gas Company shall, ~~within 15 days following the Commission's approval of their annual natural gas true-up advice letters that set natural gas transportation rates,~~ beginning September 1, 2020, remit their respective ~~"SB 1477 Compliance Costs"~~ directly ~~and in full~~ to the ~~designated building decarbonization pilot program contracting agent,~~ Southern California Edison ~~contracting agent on a quarterly basis in four equal installments per fiscal year. Remittances shall be made on or before March 1, June 1, September 1, and December 1. Funding obligations shall cease following the remittances made on June 1, 2023 unless otherwise directed by a subsequent d~~ ecision of the Commission..

~~7. Southern California Gas Company, Pacific Gas & Electric, San Diego Gas & Electric, and Southwest Gas shall, within 15 days following a formal~~

~~request from the contracting agent, disburse first year funding for the two Senate Bill 1477 pilot programs set aside pursuant to Resolution G-3565.~~

9.. ~~8.~~ \$80 million of the \$200 million Senate Bill (SB) 1477 budget shall be appropriated for the ~~Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development program~~ BUILD Program and \$120 million of the \$200 million SB 1477 budget shall be appropriated for the ~~Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating~~ TECH Initiative.

10.0. ~~9.~~ The California Energy Commission (CEC) shall be the administrator of the Building Initiative for Low-Emissions Development program, with Commission oversight.

11.1. ~~10.~~ The ~~California Energy Commission's (CEC)~~ CEC administration of the Building Initiative for Low-Emissions Development program shall be contingent upon legislative authorization for the CEC's administrative expenses.

12.2. ~~11.~~ The ~~California Energy Commission~~ CEC's total administrative budget for implementing the Building Initiative for Low-Emissions Development program shall be no more than \$8 million over ~~a four year period, or \$2 million annually~~ the duration of the BUILD Program. Should the Legislature authorize an administrative funding amount less than this, remaining funds shall be repurposed for non-administrative programmatic incentives.

13.3. ~~12.~~ If the ~~California Energy Commission (CEC)~~ CEC does not receive budgetary approval from the Legislature for administering the ~~Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development~~ BUILD Program, or otherwise determines that it is unable to administer the program or parts of the program due to unforeseen circumstances, the Energy Division staff, in consultation with the CEC, may issue ~~Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development~~ BUILD Program related

request for proposals through the contracting agent, Southern California Edison Company.

14.4. The CEC, as the BUILD Program administrator, shall emphasize new, low-income residential housing by allocating no less than 75 percent of the total BUILD Program funding (i.e., \$60 million) for new low-income residential housing

15.5. The standard practice, or reference baseline, for residential new buildings shall be assumed to be a building built for dual fuel usage for both the BUILD Program and the TECH Initiative until at least the 2022 California Energy Code becomes effective. After this date, the CEC, in consultation with the program evaluator, may propose a different baseline in its biennial implementation plan.

16.6. Projects and installations in local government territories that have “reach” codes which surpass the California Energy Code – or any other state requirement – are not prohibited from participating in the BUILD Program or the TECH Initiative.

17.7. For the purposes of the pilot programs, new residential housing shall be defined as either (a) a new building that has not previously been used or occupied; (b) an existing building where at least 50 percent of the exterior weight-bearing walls are removed or demolished for new construction; or (c) an existing building repurposed for housing, whose original use was not residential.

18.8. ~~13.~~ At least 30 percent of the total Senate Bill 1477 four-year budget shall be appropriated for new low-income residential housing direct incentives, to be disbursed under the ~~Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development~~ BUILD Program.

19.9. ~~14.~~ The ~~Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development~~ program BUILD Program financial incentives are authorized solely to ~~newly~~

~~constructed projects~~ new residential housing that ~~are~~ is all-electric, consistent with the State of California's requirements to achieve a zero-greenhouse gas emissions future by 2045.

20.0. ~~15.~~ The ~~Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development~~ BUILD Program incentives shall be based on ~~demonstrable~~ whole building greenhouse gas performance modelled using the ~~California Energy Commission's~~ California Energy Code compliance software against a reference case.

21.1. ~~16.~~ The ~~Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development~~ program BUILD Program incentive design and distribution shall be implemented consistent with California's Cap-and-Trade regulations, to ensure that such incentives are proportionally allocated to the service territory from which the fund are derived.

22.2. New, low-income residential housing not located in low income or disadvantaged communities shall also be eligible to receive BUILD Program incentives.

23.3. ~~17.~~ The ~~California Energy Commission~~ CEC shall submit an implementation plan to the Commission's Deputy Executive Director for Energy and Climate Policy for approval via the Commission resolution process within one-hundred and twenty days of the adoption of this decision and every two years thereafter. Following the approval of the implementation plan by the Commission, and after having completed the statutory and regulatory requirements necessary to begin implementation, CEC shall publicly notice the commencement of the BUILD program to signal that applications for the program are being accepted. Implementation shall be considered to have begun from the date the notice is published. The notice shall also be sent to the relevant listservs at both the CEC and the Commission.

~~24.4. 18. The California Energy Commission~~The CEC shall develop or adopt a tool or a methodology to measure bill ~~savings as a result of the Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development Program~~savings prior to the start of program implementation for low-income housing.. It is reasonable to require theThe program evaluator ~~to~~shall examine the efficacy and accuracy of the tool and recommend any necessary improvements ~~and the~~. The CEC shall make changes to the tool based on the evaluator's recommendations.

~~25.5. 19. On July 1 of each year, each gas corporation shall release downloadable planned natural gas infrastructure extension maps on a publicly accessible website in GeoJSON or Keyhole Markup Language format.~~September 1 of each year, each investor-owned utility shall release required data and maps needed for program planning and assessment. Details and format of what will be released shall be decided through an Energy Division staff-led workshop. Based on the workshop, Energy Division staff will finalize and publish the data requirements no later than 90 days from the adoption of this decision.²⁸³

~~20. — On July 1 of each year, each gas corporation shall release non-confidential downloadable data regarding the number of housing units with natural gas hook-ups by zip code in JSON or CSV format.~~

~~21. — On July 1 of each year, each gas corporation shall publicly release non-confidential downloadable map-based data that shows the book value, age,~~

²⁸³ Staff may conduct future workshops to revise the requirements, provided the new requirements are published by staff no later than July 1 of each year. In the absence of any new requirements, the investor-owned utilities shall annually update the datasets based on prior year requirements. In the event of a disagreement between parties, Energy Division staff and attorneys shall be the final authority in determining confidentiality status of any required data, as governed by existing laws and regulations. Where necessary data is not readily available, the CPUC staff shall consult with all relevant stakeholders to determine how this data can best be collected and by whom. CPUC staff may require investor-owned utilities to initiate data collection through their existing processes so that it can be made available to the public in subsequent years

~~and location of existing natural gas distribution and transmission infrastructure in GeoJSON or Keyhole Markup Language format.~~

26.6. The BUILD Program administrator and TECH Initiative implementer shall ensure that any applicants to the program are made aware that program-related and customer data will be shared with authorized entities, including but not limited to, policy makers, implementers and evaluator, under confidentiality protocols. As this data will not be made public and will follow the confidentiality rules and protocols established by the CPUC in prior proceedings, it does not require individual customer permission.

27.7. ~~22.~~ The solicitation and selection process of the ~~Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating~~TECH Initiative implementer shall be led by Energy Division, with advice from partnered stakeholders, consistent with Section 5.1.3 of this decision.

28.8. ~~23.~~ The solicitation and selection process of the ~~Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating (TECH)~~TECH Initiative implementer and the program evaluator for both the ~~Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development program~~BUILD Program and TECH Initiative, shall be led by Energy Division, with advice from partnered stakeholders, and be implemented consistent with the minimum requirements as stated in Section 5.1.3 of this decision.

29.9. ~~24.~~ Energy Division shall convene a ~~Teek~~TECH Initiative Scoring Committee (Scoring Committee) to select the TECH Initiative Implementer, consisting of the following nine financially disinterested²⁷⁹²⁸⁴ entities:

- One representative each from the CPUC, the CEC, and the Contracting Agent.

²⁷⁹²⁸⁴ “Financially disinterested,” for the purposes of this decision, means scoring panel should not have a financial interest in any potential program implementer or any specific company who may receive incentives from the program.

- Three market transformation experts, chosen by Energy Division.
- One representative each from three separate environmental or consumer public interest groups, or coalitions of environmental or consumer public interest groups, that are parties to Rulemaking 19-01-011, chosen by Energy Division. Interested parties or coalitions of parties may submit to Energy Division a letter of interest, no longer than two pages, which explains their qualifications for being on the Scoring Committee. Should Energy Division receive more than three letters of interest, staff will select the three they determine to be the most qualified. Letters of interest are due to Energy Division no later than 14 days after the date of this decision's adoption.

30. With the advice of stakeholders, Energy Division shall make the final decision for selection of the TECH Initiative implementer. 285 Southern California Edison Company, as the designated contracting agent, shall negotiate and sign a preliminary contract with the winner ~~upon~~after instruction by the Energy Division on selected TECH Initiative implementer. For the time and resources spent on Scoring Committee activity, qualifying public interest groups may claim intervenor compensation per the rules in the California Public Utilities Code Section 1801 – 1812. Participation in the Scoring Committee assists the Commission, and therefore constitutes a contribution to a proceeding of the Commission. The Commission shall award intervenor compensation to any participant in the Scoring Committee who makes a substantial contribution to the work of the Scoring Committee and meets all other requirements of the rules and statutes governing intervenor compensation.

285 Southern California Edison Company shall solely evaluate these sections of the bids to the TECH Initiatives: (1) SCE's terms and conditions; (2) redlines (if applicable) (3) Cybersecurity; (4) Supplier Responsibility Forms, and (5) Diverse Business Enterprise (DBE) Certifications. General Terms and Conditions shall be finalized by SCE in consultation with CPUC attorneys.

3 1. 25. Southern California Edison Company shall, within 15 days of Energy Division's final decision for the selection of the TECH Initiative implementer, file a Tier 32 advice letter seeking ~~Commission~~ Energy Division approval of the preliminary contract.

3 2. 26. The ~~Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating~~ TECH Initiative implementer shall approach the initiative with a menu of tactics, that may include but is not limited to the list in Section 5.2.3 of this decision, but shall implement the upstream and ~~mid-stream~~ midstream market approach, as well as provide consumer education, contractor training, and vendor training, to drive market development.

3 3. Any consumer education campaign developed under the TECH Initiative shall coordinate with other space and water heating programs in the investor-owned utility territories for consistent messaging and to avoid duplicative channels. Consumer education must also prioritize outreach to low-income households

3 4. 27. The ~~Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating Initiative Implementer shall~~ TECH implementer shall in coordination with the Commission and the CEC, develop guidelines and select eligible technologies with a performance-based approach on greenhouse gas emission reduction ~~baselines to best meet~~ potential and other program goals, and ensure that any performance evaluation needs are embedded in the program design .

3 5. 28. The ~~California Energy Commission~~ CEC and the ~~Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating~~ TECH Initiative implementer shall make requests for ~~Senate Bill~~ SB 1477 funding, including any accrued interest, in writing to Southern California Edison Company who shall disburse funds and provide monthly updates to Energy Division, the BUILD Program administrator, and

the TECH Initiative implementer regarding all disbursements made and the status of funds ~~available.~~

~~29. — The Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development Program and Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating~~ BUILD Program and TECH Initiative shall be evaluated by a single evaluator and ~~supervise the initiation of both building decarbonization pilot programs, and throughout the implementation.~~

~~30. — The Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development Program and Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating Initiative single program evaluator shall use the building decarbonization pilot program evaluation~~ shall follow the guidelines, ~~at a minimum,~~ as set forth in ~~Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 as a part of its programmatic evaluation.~~ Section 3.1.4.

~~6. 31. The Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development Program (BUILD Program) and Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating and TECH Initiative (TECH)~~ single program evaluator budget is ~~1.8~~ 2.5 percent of total program costs, or ~~\$3.6~~ 5 million over the ~~four-year program period.~~ Both data duration of the pilot programs. Data collection ~~and real-time monitoring~~ will be expected of the BUILD Program administrator and TECH Initiative implementer, who shall work with the program evaluator ~~in a collaborative fashion.~~ to understand data needs and implement processes to obtain and share program data.

~~7. Refrigerants used in the appliances of building projects incentivized by the BUILD Program or by the TECH Initiative shall not exceed a 750 Global Warming Potential (GWP) threshold by January 1, 2023, unless otherwise modified or determined alternatively by the Assigned Commissioner to this proceeding. Additionally, in a later phase of this proceeding, or in a successor~~

proceeding, the Commission shall consider whether to maintain or modify –for either the pilot programs or a potential permanent program – the date after which incentives for appliances using high-GWP refrigerants would be prohibited, or what an appropriate GWP limit might be.

38. ~~32.~~ Rulemaking 19-01-011 ~~is~~ remains open.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

Appendix A – Style Reference Tables

Name	Description/Usage
Standard	Body text
Heading 1	First level headings
Heading 2	Second level headings
Heading 3	Third level headings
List Alpha	Lower case lettered list at one indent
List Bullet	Bulleted list at one indent
Block Quote	Block quotes
FoF	Findings of Fact
CoL	Conclusions of Law
OP	Ordering Paragraphs
Name	Description/Usage
No Spacing	“Standard” Style—Single spaced, no indent
Dummy	Unnumbered headings
Heading 4	Fourth level headings (avoid deep subheadings if possible)
Heading 5	Fifth level headings (avoid deep subheadings if possible)
Heading 6	Sixth level headings (avoid deep subheadings if possible)
Main	Centered titles
Mainex	“Order” title
TOC 1/2/etc.	Table of Contents style by level
TOC Heading	Table of Contents title
Footnote Text	Footnotes
Font	Description Usage
Arial 13 Bold Caps	Titles
Arial 13 Bold	Headings
Book Antiqua 13	Body Text
Book Antiqua 11	Footnotes

~~(End of Appendix~~

[APPENDIX A]

Additional Pilot Program Guidelines

Appendix B

~~[APPENDIX A]~~

~~[APPENDIX A]~~

Table of Contents

1. Program Evaluation Guidelines	2
1.1 GHG Sub-metrics	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2. BUILD Program Guidelines	2
2.1 Complementary Incentives	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3. TECH Initiative Guidelines	4
3.1 Overcoming Market Barriers	Error! Bookmark not defined.

9.

9. 1. Program Evaluation Guidelines

1.1. GHG Sub-metrics

In calculating the cost per metric ton of avoided GHG emissions, the Program Evaluator shall work with the CPUC to determine whether – and to what extent – to apply the following sub-metrics:

- Upfront incremental equipment costs
- Upfront incremental installation costs (including labor and infrastructure upgrades)
- Upfront incremental design costs
- Annual incremental operation and maintenance costs
- Avoided or incremental energy-to-the-home infrastructure costs²⁸⁰²⁸⁶
- Effective Useful Lifetime of equipment and buildings, if applicable
- Remaining useful lifetime (if applicable, re any early replacement of existing equipment)
- Annual energy consumption and load profiles of decarbonized and baseline technologies
- GHGs associated with refrigerants used in electric appliances
- GHG emissions of electric and gas generation and delivery, including methane leakage
- Avoided or incremental costs of providing electric and gas service, including transmission and distribution system costs
- Other relevant avoided or incremental costs
- Other relevant costs incurred by customers

²⁸⁰²⁸⁶ For example, costs of extending gas lines to homes with gas end uses and piping gas lines within those homes (a cost savings for all-electric homes). For all-electric homes, this would include increased panel capacity, where needed.

- [Long-run marginal avoided electric emission factors in alignment with the Commission's Integrated Resources Plan and Senate Bill 100, such as those used to inform the electric emissions in the Commission's Energy Efficiency Fuel Substitution Calculator.](#)
- [GHGs associated with gas home appliance methane leakage \("inactive house emissions" such as pipe-fitting leaks and combustion appliance pilot light flames\).](#)

2. BUILD Program Guidelines

2.1. Complimentary Incentives

The BUILD Program administrator, in consultation with the CPUC, shall assess the feasibility of using BUILD Program incentives to complement existing programs that fund decarbonization and/or GHG reduction efforts, including programs offered by Investor-Owned Utilities (IOUs), Publicly Owned Utilities (POUs), and state or local government agencies, as appropriate.

The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program of the Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) is particularly relevant for outreach and implementation of the BUILD Program. The scoring criteria used by TCAC is a significant motivating force for owners and developers, and it directly influences their design decisions. The BUILD Program administrator shall collaborate with the TCAC to ensure mutual benefit between the BUILD Program and the LIHTC Program.

Some IOU programs are particularly relevant and will require close coordination to develop complementary strategies and avoid duplication. These include but are not limited to:

1. Single-family New Homes Programs

- California Advanced Homes Program (PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, SoCalGas)

2. Newly Constructed Multifamily Programs

- California Multifamily New Homes Program (PG&E)²⁸¹²⁸⁷

3. Wildfire Rebuild Programs

As of 2019, two Wildfire Rebuild programs exist and have been approved for 2020 implementation:

- Advanced Energy Rebuild Program (PG&E/Sonoma Clean Power/~~Marin Clean Energy~~)²⁸² MCE)²⁸⁸
- Clean Energy and Resiliency Rebuild Program (SCE)

4. Statewide Codes & Standards Program

5. Low Income Programs

- a . San Joaquin Valley Pilots (AB 2672)
- b . Energy Savings Assistance Programs

3. TECH Initiative Guidelines

3.1. Overcoming Market Barriers

Bidders seeking to become the TECH Initiative Implementer shall clearly state how they intend to address the following market barriers:

- Lack of incentives encouraging customer adoption
- Lack of financing solutions to help customers manage up-front costs
- Lack of coordination with existing building weatherization support programs
- Lack of paths to market for electric load shift enabled by heat pumps
- Lack of customer bill savings in some utility service territories at current electric and gas rates
- Lack of markets to monetize grid and climate values

²⁸¹²⁸⁷ This program is also often sought by low-income multifamily owners applying for tax credits through the state treasurer's office.

²⁸²²⁸⁸ This program also leverages Bay Area Air Quality Management District funds to pursue electrification strategies.

- Lack of incentives encouraging builders to construct carbon-free structures
- Lack of training for builders and contractors
- Lack of recognition for builders and contractors promoting building decarbonization
- Lack of coordination and support for local government permitting offices
- Lack of adequate measurement and valuation of GHG emissions
- Lack of consumer demand
- [Incentive Programs for Heat Pump Technologies Already Approved or Being Considered](#)

Program	Technology Type	Sector	Budget Incentive (millions)	Description	Implementation Status
<u>MCE's LIFT Program</u>	<u>HPWH HP HVAC</u>	<u>Residential - Multifamily</u>	<u>\$3.5</u>	<u>This program is funded through the Energy Savings Assistance Program (ESAP) budget through 12/31/2020.</u>	<u>Implementation activities are ongoing. Funds expire on 12/31/2020.</u>
<u>San Joaquin Valley (SVJ) Clean Energy Pilot</u>	<u>HPWH HP HVAC Induction Stoves Solar Thermal for 53 households Gas Line Extension to 224 Households</u>	<u>Residential - Low-Income</u>	<u>\$56.4</u>	<u>This program will install up to an estimated 1,667 HPWHs at an estimated cost of \$4.8 million of the total program budget.</u>	<u>Early implementation activities including community outreach, appliance purchasing, and site visits are ongoing.</u>
<u>Southern California Edison's (SCE's) Demand Response Disadvantaged</u>	<u>Grid-enabled HPWHs</u>	<u>Residential - Low-Income</u>	<u>\$1.3</u>	<u>This program will cover the costs for the installation of grid-enabled control technologies and</u>	<u>The program Advice Letter was approved in August 2019. Early control designs and strategies work</u>

Community Pilot & Grid Responsive HPWH Study				required plumbing retrofits on SCE installed SJV pilot HPWHs.	ongoing.
<u>Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) - Water Saver Pilot program</u>	<u>Grid-enabled HPWHs</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>\$6.4</u>	This program will cover the costs for the installation of grid-enabled control technologies and required plumbing retrofits on PG&E installed SJV pilot, existing HPWHs, and electric resistance water heaters.	Program Advice Letter was submitted on 12/31/2019, suspended on 01/31/2020, and is currently under review by the CPUC.
<u>Self-Generation Incentive Program (SGIP)</u>	<u>HPWH</u>	<u>Residential & Commercial</u>	<u>\$44.6</u>	This program will provide incentives for HPWHs, and eligibility requirements of (grid-enabled or not) are forthcoming.	The CPUC held an all-day HPWH SGIP workshop on 3/19/2020.
<u>Building Initiative for Low Emissions Development (BUILD)</u>	<u>HPWH HP HVAC HP Dryer Induction Stove</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>\$80</u>	This program will provide incentives to builders to construct all-electric homes. Program funding is pending CPUC adoption.	Final decision expected March 26, 2020
<u>Technology and Equipment for Clean Heating (TECH)</u>	<u>HPWH HP HVAC</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>\$120</u>	This program will provide incentives to HP technology to encourage sales and adoption. Funding is pending CPUC adoption.	Final decision expected March 26, 2020
<u>SCE's ESA Building</u>	<u>HPWH HP HVAC</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>\$47.4</u>	This program focuses on	<u>Application 19-11-004, A</u>

<u>E</u> lectrification Pilot (2021 – 2026)	<u>H</u> P Dryer <u>I</u> nduction <u>S</u> tove			electrifying existing ESAP eligible buildings is pending CPUC approval.	Proposed Decision is scheduled for issuance in September 2020.
<u>S</u> CE's ESA Building Electrification New Construction Pilot	<u>H</u> PWH <u>H</u> P HVAC <u>H</u> P Dryer <u>I</u> nduction <u>S</u> tove	<u>R</u> esidential	\$21	This program focuses on encouraging the electrification of new low-income buildings. Funding is pending CPUC approval.	Application 19-11-004. A Proposed Decision is scheduled for issuance in September 2020.
<u>P</u> G&E's & <u>S</u> CE's Wildfire Rebuild Programs	<u>H</u> PWH <u>H</u> P HVAC <u>H</u> P Dryer <u>I</u> nduction <u>S</u> tove	<u>R</u> esidential & <u>C</u> ommercial	\$6.4	These programs provide incentives for "above" code and all-electric reconstruction structures destroyed by wildfires.	PG&E's wildfire rebuild program implementation is ongoing. SCE recently began program outreach.
<u>E</u> nergy Efficiency & Fuel Substitution Measures	<u>H</u> PWH <u>H</u> P HVAC <u>H</u> P Dryer <u>I</u> nduction <u>S</u> tove	<u>R</u> esidential & <u>C</u> ommercial	TBD	A variety of future programs will incentivize electric device/appliance retrofits as well as potentially all-electric new building construction. Existing energy efficiency programs currently provide incentives to retrofit electric resistance hot water heaters with HPWHs.	The CPUC is reviewing 11 Fuel Substitution work papers including residential and commercial HPWH measures.
Total CPUC Potential Program Incentive Funding Through 2024: \$381.5					

(End of Appendix **B**A)



Document comparison by Workshare Compare on Friday, March 20, 2020
3:41:28 PM

Input:	
Document 1 ID	file://C:\Users\AVS\Desktop\R1901011 Randolph Comment DEC FEB 10 pm_.docx
Description	R1901011 Randolph Comment DEC FEB 10 pm_
Document 2 ID	file://C:\Users\AVS\Desktop\R1901011 Randolph (REV 1) Agenda Dec Establishing Building Decarbonization Pilot Programs_.docx
Description	R1901011 Randolph (REV 1) Agenda Dec Establishing Building Decarbonization Pilot Programs_
Rendering set	Standard

Legend:	
Insertion	
Deletion	
Moved from	
Moved to	
Style change	
Format change	
Moved deletion	
Inserted cell	
Deleted cell	
Moved cell	
Split/Merged cell	
Padding cell	

Statistics:	
	Count
Insertions	1248
Deletions	1154
Moved from	9
Moved to	9
Style change	0
Format changed	0
Total changes	2420