

I. INTRODUCTION

Act 129 of 2008 (Act 129) charged the Commission with the task of developing an energy efficiency and conservation program (EE&C Program). The Act established energy efficiency (EE) and peak demand reduction (PDR or DR) targets that each electric distribution company (EDC) with at least 100,000 customers must meet. Pursuant to Section 2806.1(C)(3) of Act 129, the Commission was also charged with evaluating the costs and benefits of the EE&C Program by November 30, 2013, and every five years thereafter. On June 18, 2025, after receiving comments and reply comments from the Companies and other interested parties, the Commission issued its Energy Efficiency and Conservation Phase V Implementation Order (Implementation Order), setting consumption reduction and demand reduction targets for each Electric Distribution Company (EDC) with at least 100,000 customers.

On December 1, 2025, Duquesne Light Company (DLC), PPL Electric Utilities, PECO Energy Company (PECO), and FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company (FE) respectively filed Petitions for Approval of their proposed Act 129 Phase IV Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plan. On January 3, 2026, the Electric Distribution Companies' (EDCs') Act 129 Phase IV Energy Efficiency and Conservation Plans were published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin, establishing a 15-day period for interested parties to file Comments in response to the EDCs' proposed Plans.

The following comments are submitted jointly by the Coalition for Equitable Energy and Housing in Pennsylvania ("CEEH-PA")¹ in response to the Commission's invitation for

¹The following organizations jointly submit these Comments as CEEH-PA:

Regional Housing Legal Services (rhls.org)

ACTION-Housing, Inc. (www.actionhousing.org)

Housing Alliance of Pennsylvania (housingalliancepa.org)

City of Bridges Land Trust (<https://cityofbridgesclt.org>)

Comment in the Pennsylvania Bulletin and contain specific recommendations for the proposed Phase V Plans.

CEEH-PA is a partnership of organizations that share a common goal of ensuring that all Pennsylvanians, including low-income families and owners and tenants of multifamily housing

Community Development of the Poconos (www.CDPoconos.org)
Media Fellowship House Inc. (mediafellowshiphouse.org)
Mt. Vernon Manor CDC (mvmedc.org)
Open Hearth, Inc. (www.openhearthisc.org)
Schuylkill Community Action (www.schuylkillcommunityaction.com)
Women's Community Revitalization Project (www.wcrpphila.org)
YCDC (Rosesymca.org)
Jefferson County Housing Authority (www.jeffcoha.com)
Shamokin Housing Authority (www.shamokincity.org)
Westmoreland county housing authority (<https://www.wchaonline.com>)
Finanta (www.finanta.org)
Scranton Area Community Foundation (<https://safdn.org/>)
Habitat for Humanity of Montgomery and Delaware Counties (www.HabitatMontDelco.org)
Monroe County Habitat for Humanity (<https://habitatmc.com>)
York Habitat for Humanity (www.yorkhabitat.org)
CHAPS (www.chapsinc.org)
Crawford County Coalition on Housing Needs, Inc. (<https://housingcoalition.wixsite.com/ccchn>)
East Long Ave (eastlongaveinc.com)
Friends & Neighbors of Pennsylvania (fnofpa.org)
Green Building United (www.greenbuildingunited.org)
Mattie N. Dixon Community Cupboard (www.community-cupboard.org)
Menta (<https://www.mentalhealthpartnerships.org>)
Mental Health Association of NWPA (mhanp.org)
NGEEC (<https://www.northgalveston.org>)
PA Climate Equity Table (<https://paclimateequity.org>)
Pocono Mountains United Way (<https://poconounitedway.org>)
The Hope and Help Network (www.thehopeandhelpnetwork.org)
The National Nurse-Led Care Consortium (<https://nurseledcare.phmc.org>)
CICADA Architecture/Planning, Inc. (www.cicadaarchitecture.com)
MaGrann Associates (<https://www.magrann.com>)
The Triskele Consulting Group (thetriskelegroup.com)
GR Translating services (www.grtranserv.org)
Dominion Due Diligence Group (D3G) (www.d3g.com)

which are traditionally underserved by efficiency programming, can access energy efficiency services to reduce the energy consumption of these buildings and to preserve existing affordable housing for economically vulnerable households.

In past phases, CEEH-PA members have provided comments and recommendations to improve Act 129 programming for multifamily affordable housing. Through our prior comments, we highlighted the fact that a substantial number of low-income families reside in multifamily buildings, and that those multifamily buildings have a high potential for energy savings yet remain largely unserved by Act 129 programming. While EDCs and the Commission have made progress promoting and serving multifamily affordable buildings there is more that can be done. CEEH-PA recommends that the Commission require the EDCs to adopt the following modifications and improvements to their proposed Phase V Plans:

1. Adjust and clarify proposed low-income measures to prioritize whole home measures that will provide deeper, longer-term savings.
2. Ensure that favorable cost sharing and no cost programs are available to both individually metered and master metered affordable housing buildings.
3. Make it easier for multifamily affordable housing count as “Low-Income” or “Resource” Constrained.”
4. Offer and fund a higher proportion of thorough physical inspections and residential energy audits at ASHRAE Level 2.
5. Create Marketing Plans with clear, specific criteria and application rules that are sent directly to multifamily affordable residences.

II. IDENTIFIED AREAS FOR PLAN IMPROVEMENTS

CEEH-PA recommends that the Commission require each EDC to improve their respective Phase V Plans to better reach and serve low-income populations, multifamily affordable housing providers, and other historically underserved groups. CEEH-PA believes

that every EDC must meaningfully improve their Phase V programs to ensure that low-income consumers are able to equitably access robust, deep savings measures that will reduce household energy costs. Each of our recommendations is designed to achieve this overarching goal.

1. Adjust and clarify proposed low-income measures to prioritize whole home measures that will provide deeper, longer-term savings.

CEEH-PA recommends that the Commission require each EDC to revise their proposed Phase V plans to prioritize measures meant to generate deeper, long-term savings, including whole home measures. These revisions should be accompanied by placing less focus on short term solutions, such as behavioral and educational programming components.

Any efforts to reduce electricity load and generate savings are best served by deep, long-term measures over shallow, short-term ones. For this reason, EDCs should focus on measures like direct installation and appliance recycling over behavioral and educational components. These behavioral programs produce not only shallower savings, but shorter-term savings.² Therefore, these program components should be deprioritized, and have their resources diverted to components that generate more savings, such as direct installation building envelope measures, systems upgrades and other building wide improvements.

Within the direct install space, EDCs should be prioritizing whole home approaches that perform both common space and in unit improvements in conjunction. To do this, EDCs should prioritize measures that reduce heating and cooling load such as building envelope measures, HVAC improvements, and building wide improvements combined with appliance and other unit

²See, Adriana Ciccono and Jesse Smith, Phase III Statewide Evaluation Team, *Addendum to Act 129 Home Energy Report Persistence Study* (2018), https://www.puc.pa.gov/Electric/pdf/Act129/SWE_Res_Behavioral_Program-Persistence_Study_Addendum2018.pdf (documenting consistent decays in savings after customers stopped receiving home energy reports).

focused measures. These kinds of improvements have the potential to both generate deeper, more meaningful savings and to improve comfort and quality of life for the residents in those buildings.

To improve the comprehensiveness of Act 129 programs, CEEH-PA recommends that the Commission requires each of the EDCs to amend their proposed Phase V Plans in the following ways:

- For low-income programs, require EDCs to adjust their plans to spend fewer resources on educational and behavioral initiatives, so that those resources can be spent on providing deeper, longer-term energy and bill savings to residents.
- Require EDCs to adjust their Plans to more appropriately prioritize direct installation, to ensure a focus on deeper, more impactful measures. Comprehensive programs should focus less on measures such as installing light bulbs and home energy reports and should instead emphasize measures such as the improvement of building shells and HVAC.

Specific Comments regarding DLC's Phase V Plan:

DLC's Proposed Phase V Implementation Plan includes a program component for a low-income behavioral efficiency program, intended to generate savings by education and behavioral changes in customers. DLC's Low-Income Energy Efficiency Program (LIEEP) does include no cost direct installation of various items. This list includes measures ranging from insulation and HVAC improvements to replacing refrigerators and providing LED lighting.

DLC's expected budget and proposed participation for these programs reveals a significant focus on shorter term, shallower savings measures. For example, DLC's plan includes an estimated 34,920 installations of 2'x4' LED lights across Phase V³, and only an estimated 174 air sealing

³ DLC Proposed Plan at 159

projects across Phase V.⁴

DLC should be required to amend its plan and proposed budget to focus more heavily on deeper, long-term savings. DLC's plan should be amended to reduce focus on behavioral and educational components, and to shift focus for its direct install measures on more meaningful changes, such as air sealing, envelope, and HVAC improvements.

Specific Comments regarding FE's Phase V Plan:

FE's Proposed Phase V Implementation Plan includes a program component for a low-income behavioral efficiency program, including sending peer group energy reports to residential customers. FE's low-income residential program does include no cost direct installation of various items. This list includes measures ranging from insulation and HVAC improvements to replacing appliances and providing LED lighting.

FE's expected budget and proposed participation for these programs reveals a significant focus on shorter term, shallower savings measures. For example, FE's plan includes an estimated 30,000 installations of LED linear lights across Phase V⁵, and only an estimated 25 heat pumps, all co funded via HEAR.⁶ Table 9 of FE's plan does not mention air sealing or insulation in its suite of proposed low-income measures.

FE should be required to amend its plan and proposed budget to focus more heavily on deeper, long-term savings. FE's plan should be amended to reduce focus on behavioral and educational components, and to shift focus for its direct install measures on more meaningful changes, such as air sealing, envelope, and HVAC improvements.

⁴ DLC Proposed Plan at 154

⁵ FE Plan Appendix B at 10

⁶ FE Plan Appendix B at 11

Specific Comments regarding PECO's Phase V Plan:

PECO's Proposed Phase V Implementation Plan includes a low-income home energy report component, with the goal of changing energy usage behaviors. PECO's low-income program does include no cost direct installation of various items, as well as various rebates. This list includes measures ranging from insulation and air sealing to replacing refrigerators and providing LED lighting.

PECO's expected budget and proposed participation in these programs reveals a significant focus on shorter term, shallower savings measures. For example, PECO's plan includes an estimated 71,317 decorative LED light bulbs across Phase V⁷, and only an estimated 410 residential air sealing projects across Phase V.⁸

PECO should be required to amend its plan and proposed budget to focus more heavily on deeper, long-term savings. PECO's plan should be amended to reduce focus on behavioral and educational components, and to shift focus for its direct install measures on more meaningful changes, such as air sealing, envelope, and HVAC improvements.

Specific Comments regarding PPL's Phase V Plan:

PPL's Proposed Phase V Implementation Plan includes a significant behavioral component, including a component for student energy education aimed at resource constrained customers. PPL's resource constrained energy efficient homes program does include no cost direct installation of various items, as well as various rebates. This list HVAC maintenance for electrically heated buildings, and health and safety repairs.

PPL's expected budget and participation for these measures does reveal a significant

⁷ PECO Proposed Plan at 39

⁸ PECO Proposed Plan at 47

proportion of envelope measures, including an estimated 51,500 air sealing measures, and 74,000 ceiling insulation installations.⁹ However, the budget and proposed participation for these still has a significant focus on shorter term, shallower savings measures. For example, PPL's plan includes an estimated 514,934 LED general service lamps installed across Phase V.¹⁰

PPL should be required to amend its plan and proposed budget to focus more heavily on deeper, long-term savings. PPL's plan should be amended to reduce focus on behavioral and educational components, and to shift focus for its direct install measures and further increase focus of the more meaningful identified measures, such as air sealing, ceiling insulation installations, envelope, and HVAC improvements.

2. Ensure that favorable cost sharing and no cost measures are available to both individually metered and master metered affordable housing buildings.

CEEH-PA recommends that the Commission requires each EDC to revise their proposed Phase V plans to implement favorable cost sharing and no cost measures for multifamily residences participating in affordable housing programs, regardless of whether they are master metered or individually metered. PA's affordable housing stock has considerable opportunities for efficiency but faces significant pricing barriers. Unlike traditional market rate housing or businesses, affordable building operators are constrained in their ability to raise rents or generate more revenue to fund these needed improvements. While this creates an obstacle to improvements it also ensures that building owners are not unjustly enriched by improvements, because of limitations on rent required by affordable housing programs, measures provided in master metered multifamily affordable housing are unlikely to lead to unjustly higher rents. The nature of these buildings and

⁹ PPL Proposed Plan at 96

¹⁰ PPL Proposed Plan at 90

the programmatic constraint on raising rent is such that even in master metered buildings, benefits given to the owners and operators benefit residents, improving comfort, energy efficiency and creating savings while affordable housing program participation protects against multifamily affordable housing owners unjustly increasing rents. Master metered affordable housing buildings should have access to beneficial cost sharing, no cost programs, and direct installation measures.

Many of the EDC's plans draw distinctions between the kinds of no cost measures available to master metered and individually metered homes. Some of those plans only provide clear no cost guidelines for one or the other and create significant cost disparity for the same measures depending on how the residence is metered. In the multifamily affordable housing context, the justification for this distinction is reduced and risks unfairly blocking access to these measures which could benefit residents of multifamily affordable housing.

Savings and no cost measures should be available to multifamily affordable housing residents regardless of whether their homes are metered individually. CEEH-PA understands that multifamily affordable housing can have more barriers to improvements, as buy-in and approval must be sought from building owners and managers. These barriers have led to untapped potential for both bill and energy savings for multifamily affordable units. EDCs should prioritize these homes precisely because they have been historically underserved and so have considerable savings potential.

To achieve greater clarity and savings for multifamily affordable residences, CEEH-PA generally recommends the Commission require each of the EDCs to amend their Phase V Plans as follows:

- Direct each EDC to revise their Phase V Plans to provide opportunities for beneficial cost sharing and no cost measures to both individually and master metered affordable housing

buildings.

- Where no cost measures are impractical or unworkable, direct each EDC to revise their Phase V Plans to provide clear cost shares for multifamily affordable housing buildings.

Specific Comments regarding DLC's Phase V Plan:

DLC's proposed Phase V Plan treats individually and master metered buildings significantly differently in terms of eligibility for no cost programs. Individually metered buildings qualify for no cost programs if at least 45% of units must be at or below 150% of Federal Poverty Level ("FPL").¹¹ However, master meter properties do not have an equivalent guidance; DLC's plan simply indicates that it will negotiate costs on a case by case basis, and give priority to properties with a "significant proportion of low-income residents."¹²

We recommend that DLC be required to amend its plan to provide specific cost share measures for master metered affordable housing buildings. Case-by-case negotiation is a flexible approach, but it creates vagueness. Affordable housing building owners face significant resource constraints, and the additional burden of engaging in negotiations to access resources instead of providing clear guidelines is likely to reduce participation. DLC's plan should provide for no cost measures in multifamily affordable housing where possible and should prioritize cost shares where DLC takes on the majority of the cost where no cost is unworkable.

Specific Comments regarding FE's Phase V Plans:

FE's proposed Phase V Implementation plan does indicate that some low-income programs will include no cost measures, but it does not outline whether or how individually and master metered multifamily affordable housing buildings and those in reside in them can

¹¹ DLC Proposed Plan at 41

¹² DLC Proposed Plan at 41

participate in and benefit from no cost incentives.¹³ While direct install measures are available to multifamily customers, differentiation by metering typology is not specifically mentioned.

CEEH-PA appreciates that direct install measures are available to multifamily units, but FE should be required to amend its plan to specifically include both master and individually metered buildings, with clear guidance. FE's plan should be amended to include both metering types for multifamily affordable housing buildings. Because the benefits and savings in multifamily affordable housing buildings flow to the low-income tenant households without the same risk of rent increase present in traditional market rate housing, FE's plan should provide beneficial cost share and no cost measures irrespective of metering typology.

Specific Comments regarding PECO's Phase V Plan:

PECO's proposed Phase V Implementation Plan notes that it is particularly targeting low-income multifamily homes. It notes that master metered buildings can receive no cost in-unit and common area installations, and that individually metered programs receive common area programs via the multifamily program, and in-unit programs via the single-family program.¹⁴

CEEH-PA appreciates PECO for providing routes that both individually and master metered buildings can access no cost programming. However, PECO should amend its plan to ensure that both individually and master metered affordable housing properties have access to significant no cost and favorable cost share measures consistent with the whole home measures described below. This approach recognizes the rent constraints present in multifamily affordable housing and the resultingly more direct benefit to low-income tenant households.

¹³ FE Proposed Plan at 58

¹⁴ PECO Proposed Plan at 69-70

Specific Comments regarding PPL's Plan:

PPL's proposed Phase V Implementation Plan states that both individually and master metered buildings are eligible for the same resource constrained benefits, which includes programs available to all single-family homes. However, for common spaces the plan only states that rebates are available, and funding is available via braiding with state funding.¹⁵

CEEH-PA appreciates PPL's inclusion of no cost programs for single-family, individually metered, and master metered buildings. However, PPL should amend its plan to also allow for no cost measures and installation in common areas; where no cost measures are unworkable, PPL should amend its plan to provide for favorable cost share on these benefits of 10-20%, prioritizing benefits to low-income tenant households in affordable housing buildings. These large-scale measures can be considerably more impactful in resource constrained multifamily affordable housing contexts and should not be reliant wholly on state fund braiding.

3. Make it easier for multifamily affordable housing to qualify as "Low-Income" or "Resource Constrained."

CEEH-PA recommends that the Commission require each EDC to revise their proposed Phase V plans to create more clarity and lower barriers of entry for multifamily affordable housing to be considered low-income. This should be accomplished by creating presumptive eligibility for properties subject to local, state, or federal affordable housing program restrictions that meet Act 129 requirements by program design ("Affordable Housing Programs"), and clearer tests for other low-income buildings.

Each EDC provides for low-income targeting programming in their respective

¹⁵ PPL Proposed Plan at 79-80

Implementation Plans, and each program includes both single-family and multifamily plans. But it is essential that owners and operators of multifamily buildings know whether they qualify, and what administrative steps they must take to verify the status of their residents. The multifamily affordable housing portfolio is disproportionately aged and energy inefficient, as tight operational budgets and an inability to raise rent prevent owners from prioritizing and funding building improvements and efficiency upgrades. Pennsylvania is not building enough housing, resulting in a housing stock that is among the oldest and least efficient in the country along with contributing to lack of affordability in the market.¹⁶ Prioritizing these homes in the multifamily affordable housing portfolio provides not only significant savings opportunities, but serves other important public policy goals, including supporting seniors, veterans, individuals with disabilities, and low-income tenants across PA. Because owners are often legally barred from raising rents, any benefits and savings received by the owners directly benefit the tenants without increasing their housing burden.

There are a variety of programs that require affordable housing building owners to keep housing affordable and to perform regular income verifications on their residents that require income at or below the Act 129 150% of Federal Poverty Level (“FPL”) and these Affordable Housing Programs should not have to have redundant income verification to access Act 129 measures designed for low income and resource constrained customers. Most Affordable Housing Programs set income requirements by Area Median Income (AMI) and not FPL. Since AMI varies by area, the crosswalk between AMI and FPL is dynamic but programs which often require AMIs

¹⁶ See, Pennsylvania Housing Finance Authority, *Pennsylvania Comprehensive Housing Study* (2020) https://www.phfa.org/forms/housing_study/2020/pennsylvania-comprehensive-housing-study-full-report.pdf (noting that the median home in PA had its structure build in 1962, which is 16 years older than the nationwide median, and older than all but 3 states in the county.); See also, PEW, *Pennsylvania’s Lack of Building Has Contributed to Housing Shortage, Hurt Affordability* (2025) <https://www.pew.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2025/03/pennsylvanias-lack-of-building-has-contributed-to-housing-shortage-hurt-affordability>

that meet the Act 129 FPL requirements include, but are not limited to Public Housing Authority properties, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funded programs such as the 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly, 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities, and the Rental Assistance Demonstration and Project Based Rental Assistance programs. Owners participating in such programs are required to perform income verification of residents and have entered covenants requiring certain thresholds of residents to be low-income. These programs are created for low-income tenants and should be treated as such. EDCs should implement policies to create categorical eligibility for properties participating in Affordable Housing Programs that can demonstrate compliance with the EE&C plan's income targeting through their participation in Affordable Housing Programs. Allowing properties to demonstrate their eligibility for Act 129 Low-Income programing through submission of their Affordable Housing Program participation would reduce a significant element of administrative burden. For the purposes of these comments, we are defining Affordable Housing Programs as those whose income targeting meet the Act 129 Low-Income FPL requirement, understanding that this may vary by geography and other individualized factors.

For multifamily buildings that meet low-income thresholds but participate in housing affordability programs that do not definitionally require Act 129 FPL thresholds,¹⁷ more clarity is needed on how income is verified by EDCs. Operators of multifamily affordable housing buildings operate with intensive demands on their time through compliance measures and are resource constrained through their affordability commitments and should be able to efficiently leverage their program compliance documentation for the purposes of accessing Act 129 measures.

To achieve greater clarity and accessibility regarding what households qualify for Low-

¹⁷ E.g., the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program which allows for incomes more than the Act 129 Low-Income definition but often provides housing for households that do meet the 150% FPL definition.

Income programming, CEEH-PA generally recommends the Commission require each of the EDCs to amend their Phase V Plans as follows:

- Direct EDCs to revise their Phase V Plans to make properties participating in Affordable Housing Programs categorically eligible for low-income programs when the requirements of the Affordable Housing Program themselves demonstrate meeting or exceeding the EE&C Plan requirement.
- Direct each EDC to revise their Phase V Plans to specify what portion of a building's residents must be at or below 150% FPL for the whole building to qualify under the EDC's low-income programs. CEEH-PA recommends that multifamily buildings should be considered eligible when 45% or more of residents are at or below 150% FPL.
- Direct each EDC to revise their Phase V plans to give clarity on how income is verified, with a preference for verification via owner attestation.

Specific Comments regarding PPL's Phase V Plan:

PPL's proposed Phase V plan helpfully and explicitly identifies the definition of resource constrained consumers as those at or below 150% FPL.¹⁸ It states that measures under the resource constrained program are available to both individually and master metered customers, and that income verification is based on building owner/operator attestation, subject to PPL and Conservation Service Provider ("CSP") approval.¹⁹ No specific test is given, nor are there any approval guidelines that PPL and CSP will follow. The plan contains no discussion of Affordable Housing Programs.

We appreciate that PPL's plan allows for income verification via owner attestation and believe this approach should be replicated by the other EDC's EE&C Plans. However, we recommend that more clarity be provided on required approval by PPL and CSP. PPL's Proposed

¹⁸ PPL Proposed Plan at 81

¹⁹ PPL Proposed Plan at 79-80

Phase V plan does not specify what criteria is being used for that approval. Further, we recommend that PPL be required to amend its plan to address Affordable Housing Programs and create a program for categorical eligibility for such buildings. Lastly, we recommend that PPL be required to give specific guidelines for eligibility as applied to multifamily buildings and recommend that the guidelines allow for building wide eligibility if 45% or more of building tenants are income eligible.

Specific Comments regarding DLC'S Proposed Phase V Plan:

DLC's proposed Phase V Plan has no discussion of categorical eligibility for any housing programs. Its plan does include a discussion of how multifamily housing qualifies for low-income programs. The building must be individually metered, and at least 45% of units must be at or below 150% FPL.²⁰

We appreciate DLC's clear definition and standard set to at least 45% of units and recommend that DLC be required to amend its plan to address Affordable Housing Programs and create a program for categorical eligibility for such programs. The plan lacks specifics on how income is verified, and the process for applying and certifying a building is not clearly outlined. Further, this 45% test only covers individually metered buildings. We recommend that DLC be required to amend its plan to allow for owner attestation and discuss other procedures for how income is verified, create a process for categorical eligibility based on a multifamily affordable housing provider's qualifying participation in Affordable Housing Program, and demonstrate how master metered buildings qualify for low-income programs.

²⁰ DLC Proposed Plan at 41

Specific Comments regarding FE's Proposed Phase V Plan:

FE's proposed Phase V plan indicates that it will target customers at or below 150% FPL but does not give further details on how it will verify this, or how it will address multifamily residences.²¹ The plan contains no discussion of Affordable Housing Programs or how they will interplay with the low-income programs.

We recommend that FE be required to amend its plan to set an eligibility standard of 45% of a multifamily building's units meeting 150% FPL, allow for owner attestation of resident income and address Affordable Housing Programs by providing for categorical eligibility for such programs. Further, we recommend that FE be required to amend its plan to address the specific requirements imposed on multifamily buildings to qualify for the low-income program. In situations where a multifamily building may meet program requirements, but owner attestation is unworkable, then FE should provide for specific, defined income verification procedures.

Specific Comments regarding PECO's Phase V Plan:

PECO'S proposed Phase V plan specifies that master metered buildings become eligible for low-income programming when 66% or more of the residents have household incomes at or below 150% FPL.²² It does not specify how income is verified, how individually metered buildings can qualify at the building level, and there is no discussion of Affordable Housing Programs.

We appreciate that PECO has provided a specific threshold at which the entire building is eligible but recommend amending the plan to lower the threshold to 45% of residents. This figure represents a very significant population of low-income tenants within a single building. PECO's plan should also be amended to allow for owner attestation to verify tenant incomes. If owner

²¹ FE Proposed Plan at 64

²² PECO Proposed Plan at 69

attestation is not possible, then the plan should still include specific, actionable ways for building owners to verify income. Further, we recommend that PECO be required to amend its plan to address Affordable Housing Programs and create a program for categorical eligibility when such program requirements themselves demonstrate eligibility under the EE&C Plan. We also recommend that FE be required to amend its plan to address how individually metered buildings can qualify for low-income programs.

4. Offer and fund a higher proportion of thorough physical inspections and residential energy audits at ASHRAE Level 2.

CEEH-PA recommends that the Commission require each EDC to revise their respective proposed Phase V plans to perform energy audits of low-income residential housing at Level 2, as defined by the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE). Plans should provide for aggressive cost sharing of ASHRAE Level 2 audits wherever possible and include implementation of measures for no cost audits when the audits are required by other programs, such as the Home Electrification and Appliance Rebate Program (HEAR) and Home Efficiency Rebates (HER) under the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). While not every audit will result in savings, many will uncover large savings opportunities. Funding of these thorough audits will identify whole home and building wide measures and remove barriers to opportunities for braiding with programs such as HEAR and HER. EDCs are in prime positions to assist in this risk and help generate large scale savings for customers by covering all or portions of these audits.

Energy audits are an essential part of determining opportunities for and generating savings for utility customers. In addition to being required by programs like HEAR and HER, thorough energy audits are also useful in determining what measures can provide the most savings to a resident and for quantifying the savings generated. Many multifamily affordable housing

properties in Pennsylvania can benefit and generate savings from these audits. EDCs should be particularly interested in performing these audits to generate savings in multifamily homes with high electrical demands, such as those with electric resistance heating systems.

Level 2 audits also represent considerable expenses for building owners, which can leave large amounts of unidentified energy efficiency opportunities. The audits themselves are expensive, as can the measures recommended. Because of this, building owners with high electrical loads who would benefit from these audits may be unwilling or unable to get them. This can be especially true for owners of affordable housing, who already face significant resource constraints. This creates a significant opportunity for EDCs. If audits were significantly funded by EDCs, building owners would have more capacity to complete these assessments and follow up on recommended measure. EDCs in turn would have the opportunity to claim savings because of such audits and assist in generating meaningful benefits to multifamily residents, load demand reduction, and cost savings. To do this, EDCs should fully fund these audits and give clear up-front guidelines on what buildings are eligible for audits, and the EDC funded portion of the audit.

To improve access to these essential energy audits for Phase V, CEEH-PA recommends that the Commission require EDCs to revise their Phase V Plans as follows:

- Include specific, measurable criteria that allow for low-income multifamily affordable housing buildings to qualify for ASHRAE level 2 audits, including buildings that are heated via electrical systems.
- Create explicit measures to pay for ASHRAE Level 2 audits when required for participation in other savings programs, such as HER and HEAR under the IRA.

Specific Comments regarding PPL's Phase V Plan:

PPL's proposed Phase V Implementation Plan discusses performing energy assessments, and that it could fund up to \$75,000 for ASHRAE level 2 audits for no more than 10 multifamily

residential properties that qualify for HEAR or HER.²³ We appreciate that PPL is willing to assist in audits for multifamily residential properties, and that clear funding amounts are given. We hope other companies follow this model however, PPL can do more by amending its plan to create and cover eligibility criteria for more than just buildings qualifying under the HEAR and HER programs. PPL should fund these audits for multifamily affordable buildings with high savings potential and should not limit them to only 10 audits within Phase V. PPL should amend its plan to cover the cost of ASHRAE level 2 audits for qualifying customers, should create specific eligibility criteria, including buildings with high electric demand such as those with electrical heating systems.

Specific Comments regarding DLC's Phase V Plan:

DLC's proposed Phase V Implementation Plan that it may fund ASHRAE 2 audits, and its contribution will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.²⁴ DLC should amend its plan to cover the full cost of ASHRAE Level 2 audits where provided, and to create specific eligibility criteria, including buildings with high electric demand such as those with electrical heating systems. Customers who may qualify for programs under the IRA should be eligible for assistance in audit funding. In cases where DLC is unable to pay for the full audit, its plan should include clear contribution amounts and eligibility criteria that owners of multifamily affordable buildings can rely on to fund audits.

Specific Comments regarding FE's Phase V Plan:

FE's proposed Phase V Implementation Plan includes the ability to co fund ASHRAE 2 audits, as well as other technical studies.²⁵ No specific discussion is given as to the level of subsidy

²³ PPL Proposed Plan at 197

²⁴ DLC Proposed Plan at 76

²⁵ FE Proposed Plan at 58

provided, or the specific criteria required to qualify. FE should amend its plan to entirely cover the cost of these audits and studies and should prioritize funding of audits at ASHRAE Level 2. It should create specific eligibility criteria, including buildings with high electric demand such as those with electrical heating systems, or at least multifamily affordable housing buildings which qualify for programs under the IRA. In cases where FE will not pay for the full audit, its plan should include clear contribution amounts and eligibility criteria that owners of multifamily affordable buildings can rely on to fund audits.

Specific Comments regarding PECO's Phase V Plan:

PECO's proposed Phase V Implementation Plan discusses that it will engage in fund braiding, and that energy audits may be paid for via fund braiding.²⁶ But the plan gives no specific as to what residences qualify, or how much the subsidy should be. PECO should amend its plan to entirely cover the cost of ASHRAE level 2 audits for qualifying customers, and should create specific eligibility criteria, including buildings with high electric demand such as those with electrical heating systems. Customers who may qualify for programs under the IRA should also qualify to receive audits. In cases where PECO will not pay for the full audit, its plan should include clear contribution amounts and eligibility criteria that owners of multifamily affordable buildings can rely on to fund audits.

5. Create marketing plans with clear, specific criteria and application rules that are sent directly to multifamily affordable residences.

CEEH-PA recommends that the Commission require each EDC to revise their proposed Phase V plans to give stronger marketing plans. Each EDC's marketing plan should be required to lay out a specific plan, which includes direct marketing to low-income multifamily housing, lists

²⁶ PECO Proposed Plan at 25

a full suite of measures available, and gives a clear application and approval process that building owners and operators can follow.

Marketing and accessibility are essential components for any of these plans to succeed. For many affordable housing units, this is particularly a challenge. On top of funding obstacles, owners of multifamily affordable housing face significant resource constraints. Many of them provide services to residents, are engaged in community activities, and face significant compliance cost burdens on top of the already existing obligations of being buildings owners. For these resource constrained owners, vagueness and uncertainty are heightened barriers to investing the time and resources to follow up, even though their buildings have significant savings potential. Many building owners will only be interested in programs if they have clear, upfront access to information.

Because of these constraints, effective marketing plans need to involve clear documentation of what measures are available, and what the expected cost share for the building owner is. Building owners also need to be provided with clear pipelines to apply, including what information is needed for the application, and what general processing times look like.

The EDC proposed implementation plans all mention marketing generally, but do not make firm commitments to provide specifics on the full suite of measures available, cost share amounts, or how to apply for measures. To facilitate better access to information and more buy-in from multifamily affordable homes, PUC should require each EDC to amend their Phase V plans as follows:

- Include clear marketing plans that provide for direct communication to multifamily affordable building owners. These communications should involve full lists of measures available to the owners, specific cost share amounts and expectations, and clearly outlined procedures for how owners can get more information and participate in these programs.

- EDCs should be required to collect, track, and report on outreach measures and outcomes including leads generated and successful implementations resulting from outreach.

III. CONCLUSION

CEEH-PA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Act 129 Phase V Energy Efficiency and Conservation plans and urges the Commission to consider these comments as the Plans are finalized.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jack Stucker

Jack Stucker
Supervising Attorney
Regional Housing Legal Services
jack.stucker@rhls.org

/s/ Sarah Ralich

Sarah Ralich
Senior Energy & Construction Manager
ACTION-Housing, Inc.
Sralich@actionhousing.org

/s/ Chris Michael

Chris Michael
Research and Education Manager
Housing Alliance of Pennsylvania
christina@housingalliancepa.org

/s/ Tamera Dixon

Tamera Dixon
Home Owner Relations Manager
City of Bridges Land Trust
tamera@cityofbridgesclt.com

/s/ Thomas Campbell

Thomas Campbell
Executive Director
Community Development of the Poconos
tom@cdpoconos.org

/s/ Misty Farrow

Misty Farrow
Housing Counseling Supervisor
Media Fellowship House, Inc.
misty@mediafellowshiphouse.org

/s/ Keyana Johnson

Keyana Johnson
Community Development Coordinator
Mt. Vernon Manor CDC
keyana@mvmcdc.org

/s/ Kelly Raggazino

Kelly Raggazino
CEO
Open Hearth, Inc.
kraggazino@openhearhthinc.org

/s/ Lorissa Luciani

Lorissa Luciani
Executive Director
Women's Community Revitalization Project
lluciani@wcrpphila.org

/s/ Sharon Corbett

Sharon Corbett
Operations Manager
Jefferson County Housing Authority
sharon@jeffcoha.com

/s/ Michael Washowich

Michael Washowich
CEO
Westmoreland County Housing Authority
mikew@wchaonline.com

/s/ Koren Clark

Koren Clark
Community Impact Manager
Scranton Area Community Foundation
koren@safdn.org

/s/ Scott Fabian

Scott Fabian
Executive Director
Monroe County Habitat for Humanity
execdirector@habitatmc.com

/s/ David Young

David Young
Chief Executive Officer
Schuylkill Community Action
dyoung@schuylkillcommunityaction.com

/s/ Jose Santiago

Jose Santiago
Community Development Director
YDCC
jsantiago@rosesymca.org

/s/ Sheryl Jones

Sheryl Jones
Section 8 Management Aide
Shamokin Housing Authority
shasec8@gmail.com

/s/ Joan Brodhead

Joan Brodhead
Senior Executive Vice President
Finanta
jbrodhead@finanta.org

/s/ Katie Vorce

Katie Vorce
Chief Operations Officers
Habitat for Humanity of Montgomery and Delaware Counties
kvorce@habitatmontdelco.com

/s/ Terri Abruzzese

Terri Abruzzese
Office and Family Services Manager
York Habitat for Humanity
terri@yorkhabitat.org

/s/ Lynn McUmb

Lynn McUmb
Executive Director
CHAPS
lmcumber@chapsinc.org

/s/ Jeannie McAninch

Jeannie McAninch
Director of Programs
East Long Ave
Jeannie@eastlongave.com

/s/ Emily Pugliese

Emily Pugliese
Policy and Program Director
Green Building United
epugliese@greenbuildingunited.org

/s/ Julie Platt

Julie Platt
Director Policy and External Affairs
Menta
jplatt@mhasp.org

/s/ Kimberly Wingate

Kimberly Wingate
Executive Director
NGEEC
negeec@northgalveston.org

/s/ Michael Tukeva

Michael Tukeva
President/CEO
Pocono Mountains United Way
michael@poconounitedway.org

/s/ Guy McUmb

Guy McUmb
Board President
Crawford County Coalition on Housing Needs, Inc.
guymcumber@hotmail.com

/s/ Crystal Perry

Crystal Perry
Executive Director
Friends & Neighbors of Pennsylvania
c.perry@fnofpa.org

/s/ Cindy Wedholm

Cindy Wedholm
Executive Director
Mattie N. Dixon Community Cupboard
cwedholm@community-cupboard.org

/s/ Patricia Stucke

Patricia Stucke
CEO
Mental Health Association of NWPA
pstucke@mhanp.org

/s/ Prem Rajgopal

Prem Rajgopal
Coalition Coordinator
PA Climate Equity Table
prem@paclimeequity.org

/s/ Sarah Hexem Hubbard

Sarah Hexem Hubbard
Executive Director
The National Nurse-Led Care Consortium
kpratt@phmc.org

/s/ Kurt Raymond

Kurt Raymond
Principal
CICADA Architecture/Planning, Inc.
kraymond@cicadaarchitecture.com

/s/ Ben Adams

Ben Adams
Vice President, Strategic Development
MaGrann Associates
benadams@magrann.com

/s/ Maureen Hayes

Maureen Hayes
Founder
The Triskele Consulting Group
mhayes@thetriskelegroup.com

/s/ Geysa Rodgz

Geysa Rodgz
Director
GR Translating Services
transserv@gmail.com

/s/ Robert Hazelton

Robert Hazelton
CEO
Dominion Due Diligence Group (D3G)
r.hazelton@d3g.com