

<b>DOCKETED</b>	
<b>Docket Number:</b>	23-DECARB-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	Inflation Reduction Act Residential Energy Rebate Programs
<b>TN #:</b>	254204
<b>Document Title:</b>	Frank Pringle Comments - Think of who is submitting comments and what they stand to gain
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Frank Pringle
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	1/26/2024 4:54:04 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	1/26/2024

*Comment Received From: Frank Pringle*  
*Submitted On: 1/26/2024*  
*Docket Number: 23-DECARB-01*

## **Think of who is submitting comments and what they stand to gain**

1. This program is for the benefit of citizens, not companies' profits. There is a flood of last minute comments from companies who stand to gain financially from this program. They are not citizens, and their sole interest is profit, despite the flowery buzzwords they've carefully crafted.

Consider this while weighing their words against the words of the citizens who wrote personal accounts of what this program could mean for them. Each time a company advocates for a position, ask yourself what they stand to gain from it. Then ask yourself if that outcome benefits the citizens of California, or if it benefits the profit margins of the company or industry.

Prioritize people, not profits.

2. In a similar vein, ask yourself if the landlords who own low-income housing should be eligible for these funds. They are not low-income and have access to capital to make the upgrades themselves. Don't make this a giveaway to the affluent, any more than making it a giveaway to companies trying to extract maximum profits.

3. Make 100% of the funds prioritized for low-income applicants. There hasn't been much to suggest the limits of what "moderate" income would be but, much like the landlords referenced above, they have access to capital to make the improvements themselves. If the low income applicants are unable to use all the funds, which I doubt, then open it up to moderate income applicants.

4. One comment suggested that pay for performance would lower accessibility for low income applicants. If that's true, use a different model. Basically, just do everything that benefits low income applicants and listen to them (and their advocacy groups) before considering other comments.

5. Don't model costs on regional differences. Does it sound fair to accommodate the inflated prices of the Bay Area or tony areas of SoCal, when it will diminish the available funds for more rural applicants at a much higher rate? If anything, lower income areas should have access to more of the funds.