

**Table 5**  
**Most Efficiency Programs We Reviewed Did Not Meet Projected Energy Savings or Cost-Effectiveness, 2018 Through 2022**

Electric Efficiency Programs		Percentage of Projected Energy Savings Met or Exceeded					2022 Expenditures	2022 Cost-Effectiveness
		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022		
PG&E	California New Homes Multifamily	73%	44%	0%	42%	119%	\$1,300,000	
	Local Government Energy Action Resources	3	0 <sup>†</sup>	59	63	28	2,500,000*	
	Residential New Construction	79	35	54	9	0	1,300,000	
	University of California/California State University	43	100	172	303	12	1,300,000	0.0
	RES-Residential Energy Efficiency Program	39	10	19	14	30	26,000,000*	0.7
SCE	Comprehensive Manufactured Homes	29	18	20	4	10	1,200,000	1.1
	Residential Direct Install Program	63	182	16	15	1,157	4,400,000*	1.1
SDG&E	SW-COM Direct Install	53	48	45	24	31	720,000	0.4
	SW-AG-Calculated Incentives-Calculated	0	19	3	0	0	60,000	0.0
	Local-IDSM-ME&O-Behavioral Programs	120	78	114	106	88	3,600,000*	1.2
<b>Natural Gas Efficiency Programs</b>								
PG&E	Local Government Energy Action Resources	100%	0% <sup>†</sup>	92%	97%	78%	\$2,500,000*	
	Commercial Deemed Incentives	126	64	112	327	238	3,900,000	0.3
	Industrial Calculated Incentives	5	134	7	806	0	2,500,000	0.0
	Residential Energy Efficiency	45	15	21	315	218	2,100,000	0.7
SCE	Residential Direct Install Program	164	4	26	56	14	4,400,000*	1.1
SoCalGas	RES-Residential Energy Efficiency Program	485	57	118	162	203	26,000,000*	0.7
SDG&E	SW-AG-Deemed Incentives	0	114	143	0	0	80,000	0.0
	SW-IND-Deemed Incentives	0	0	17	0	43	140,000	0.95
	Local-IDSM-ME&O-Behavioral Programs	150	114	67	67	50	3,600,000*	1.2
	SW-COM-Calculated Incentives-Calculated	32	1	2	68	0	370,000	-0.1 <sup>‡</sup>

Source: CPUC data.

Note: The CPUC had an independent consulting firm evaluate utilities' claimed energy savings for accuracy but did not verify 100 percent of the data.

\* This efficiency program's expenditures include objectives to achieve both electric and natural gas energy savings and we list the combined expenditures in this table. Therefore, we list each program's cost-effectiveness value.

† This efficiency program's projected energy savings are zero, and energy savings are negative. Determining the energy savings percentage for this year's efficiency program violates the fundamental rules of arithmetic and, therefore, undefined.

‡ This efficiency program has negative electric benefits and zero natural gas benefits. We calculated the total of electric and natural gas benefits, then divided by the costs. As a result, the efficiency program reports a negative cost-effectiveness value.

■ = Beginning in 2022, the CPUC no longer determines the cost-effectiveness of market support or equity programs.

Indicates that the utility's efficiency program **met or exceeded** its projected energy-savings or that the utility's efficiency program was **cost-effective** in that year

■ = Equal to or greater than 100 percent or equal to or greater than 1.0

Indicates that the utility's efficiency program **did not** meet its projected energy-savings or that the utility's efficiency program was **not** cost-effective in that year

■ = 81 percent through 99 percent or 0.81 through 0.99

■ = 51 percent through 80 percent or 0.51 through 0.80

■ = 34 percent through 50 percent or 0.34 through 0.50

■ = 0 percent through 33 percent or 0 through 0.33