

Tom Phillips <tjp835@sbcglobal.net>

January 29, 2016 5:25 PM

To: Trish Johnson

AB 32 Scoping Plan Update: Economic Analysis comments

Trish Johnson
Climate Change Policy Section
California Air Resources Board
Sacramento, CA

Ms. Johnson:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the economic analysis plan for updating the AB 32 Scoping Plan to meet the 2030 target. The following comments raise some important issues regarding non-energy co-benefits of GHG reductions in buildings, especially for disadvantaged communities, and regarding affordable housing. These co-benefits provide further support for reducing GHG emissions from building construction and operation, and will help California meet the mandates of SB 535 to invest cap and trade funds in disadvantaged communities.

1. The economic and health impact models used to update the scoping plan should include public health and social co-benefits from improvements in building energy efficiency, beyond the benefits of improved outdoor air quality and GHG reduction. Based on the materials posted for the January 15, 2016 workshop on the economic analysis plan, the economic model presented does not appear to address the health and social co-benefits of improved energy efficiency of buildings, such as low-income home weatherization and other energy efficiency measures for existing buildings. (p. 6 at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/meetings/1142016/e3pathways.pdf>).

The co-benefits of home weatherization can be substantial, especially for low-income households, and should be factored into the economic and public and worker health analysis. These co-benefits include not only reductions in outdoor air pollution and GHG emissions, but also improvements in health, safety, indoor air quality, thermal comfort, social benefits, and reduced peak demand on the power grid. Regarding expected increases in extreme precipitation due to

climate change, another co-benefit may be the reduction of indoor mold problems and the resultant health impacts on asthma patients. For single-family homes, the value of these co-benefits has been estimated at anywhere from 50% to 300% of energy cost savings.

Economic analyses of the federal Clean Power Plan by EPA and others have concluded that, based on the reduction of outdoor air pollution alone, building energy efficiency improvements are one the most cost-effective paths to GHG reduction. As you know, the Clean Power Plan includes an incentive for weatherization of low-income multifamily homes.

2. A range of scenarios for improving building energy efficiency should be evaluated to determine what is cost effective over the life cycle of the buildings, and what additional investments should be made. The proposed economic model does not appear to consider that residential buildings will be weatherized -- zero replacement is assumed over 35 years. (p. 43 <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/meetings/1142016/e3pathways.pdf>).

3. The economic, energy, and air quality models used for the Scoping Plan should include the expected increases in heat and humidity, especially during heat waves. The climate changes will increase peak and average cooling demands and also decrease grid efficiency and reliability. Significant increases in the number of heat waves in California are predicted by the 2020's and 2030's, and the emergence climate warming in California beyond its hottest season of the late 20th century is predicted by the 2030s. Building designers in the EU and North America have used future climate data to evaluate the performance of buildings and infrastructure over the lifecycle of the projects. FEMA now requires states to consider future climate changes in developing hazard mitigation plans for weather-related disasters.

4. Home energy improvements also provide financial co-benefits to households, building owners, and communities that should be included in the economic model. These co-benefits include improved resilience to weather disasters and power outages, increased equity, and reduced risk of loan defaults.

I have also provided some references below, in rough order of their discussion in the text above.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Tom

Thomas J. Phillips
Healthy Building Research
Davis, CA
530.756.6605

REFERENCES.

Co-Benefits

EPA, 2015a:
Fact Sheet. (on Clean Power Plan benefits.
<http://www.epa.gov/cleanpowerplan/fact-sheet-clean-power-plan-benefits#benefits>,

UCS 2015.
How Much Will the Clean Power Plan Cost?
<http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/reduce-emissions/how-much-will-clean-power-plan-cost#.VotE8FJ9TIU>.

EPA, 2015b.
Regulatory Impact Analysis.
<http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-08/documents/cpp-final-rule-ria.pdf>, see. Ch. 4.3 on estimating health co-benefits, and Ch. 8 on costs & benefits.

Hopkins, 2015.
Molding EPA's Clean Power Plan: Insights for Cost Effective Implementation.
Center Climate and Energy Solutions, Johns Hopkins University.
<http://www.c2es.org/publications/modeling-epas-clean-power-plan-insights-cost-effective-implementation>

Russell et al., 2015.
Recognizing the Value of Energy Efficiency's Multiple Benefits.
ACEEE Research Report IE1502.
<http://aceee.org/research-report/ie1502>.

US Green Building Council, 2015.
Green Building Economic Impact Report.
<http://www.usgbc.org/articles/infographic-usgbc%E2%80%99s-green-building-economic-impact-report>.
Report: <http://go.usgbc.org/2015-Green-Building-Economic-Impact-Study.html>.

Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI), January 2016.
Insight Brief. Residential Energy Plus: Finance the Future.
"Home energy upgrades improve homeowners' resilience, increase home equity value, and reduce loan default risk."
http://www.rmi.org/Content/Files/residential_energy_plus_finance_the_future.pdf.

RMI. Nov 25, 2015.
Why Energy Efficiency is the Least-Cost Climate Tool.
http://blog.rmi.org/blog_2015_11_25_why_energy_efficiency_is_the_least_cost_climate_tool.
"The report also underscores the tremendous potential for carbon-emissions reductions by means of energy retrofits of existing buildings in the U.S. and the EU. The report calls for increased incentives for retrofits in the U.S. and improved standards for retrofits in the EU in order to unlock this tremendous—and cost-effective—potential. RMI, for its part, has been actively working to scale up retrofits of existing buildings."
Report at <http://www.climateworks.org/report/efficiency/>.

Galbraith et al., 2014.
Evaluating the Benefits of Commercial Building Energy Codes and Improving Federal Incentives for Code Adoption.
Environmental Science & Technology 2014 48 (24), 14121-14130.
DOI: 10.1021/es502894m, <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es502894m>.

Patz et al., 2014.
Climate change: challenges and opportunities for global health.
JAMA. 2014 Oct 15;312(15):1565-80. doi: 10.1001/jama.2014.13186.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25244362>.

Jensen, et al., 2013.

The importance of health co-benefits in macroeconomic assessments of UK Greenhouse Gas emission reduction strategies.

Climatic Change. 2013;121(2):223-237. doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0881-6.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4372778/>, Open Access.

Russell et al., 2015.

Recognizing the Value of Energy Efficiency's Multiple Benefits.

<http://aceee.org/sites/default/files/publications/researchreports/ie1502.pdf>.

Summary at <http://aceee.org/blog/2015/12/multiple-benefits-prove-energy>.

Green & Healthy Homes Initiative (GHHI).

Listing of several of their studies on energy efficiency and health.

<http://www.greenandhealthyhomes.org/blog/energy-efficiency%E2%80%99s-non-energy-benefits>

Fang et al., 2012.

Monetizing Thermal Comfort in Residential Buildings.

ACEEE 2012 Summer Study (NREL modeling study).

<http://aceee.org/files/proceedings/2012/data/papers/0193-000019.pdf>.

Lazar & Colburn, 2012. Recognizing the Full Value of Energy Efficiency (What's Under the Feel-Good Frosting of the World's Most Valuable Layer Cake of Benefits)

Study on benefits valuation that includes public and social nonenergy benefits of EE:

[https://www.puc.nh.gov/Electric/15-](https://www.puc.nh.gov/Electric/15-137%20non%20docket%20info/RAP_LazarColburn_LayerCakePaper_2013_Sep_t_9%20%281%29.pdf)

[137%20non%20docket%20info/RAP_LazarColburn_LayerCakePaper_2013_Sep_t_9%20%281%29.pdf](https://www.puc.nh.gov/Electric/15-137%20non%20docket%20info/RAP_LazarColburn_LayerCakePaper_2013_Sep_t_9%20%281%29.pdf)

Climate Change Impacts

Diffenbaugh, N.S. and M. Ashfaq, 2010.

Intensification of hot extremes in the United States.

Geophysical Research Letters, L15701, doi:10.1029/2010GL043888, 2010.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2010GL043888/abstract>.

Diffenbaugh and Scherer, 2011.

Observational and model evidence of global emergence of permanent, unprecedented heat in the 20(th) and 21(st) centuries.

Clim Change. 2011 Aug 1;107(3-4):615-624.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22707810>.