**Co-Benefits Memo Homework Template**

Please use this document to provide your comments/edits in redline track-changes format on the straw proposal list of evaluation criteria, their definitions, and their points allocation. Please send your comments/edits back to Zachariah Baker ([**Zachariah.Baker@energy.oregon.gov**](mailto:Zachariah.Baker@energy.oregon.gov)) by end of day Thursday, September 29th. ODOE staff will compile the responses and present them at the October 7th meeting for discussion.

**Straw Proposal** (from the 9-22-2022 [TIGHGER Co-Benefits Analysis memo](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/59c554e0f09ca40655ea6eb0/t/632de3c3c8a6c702863945a0/1663951812156/Co-Benefits+Incorporation+Process+Memo+9-22-22+FINAL.pdf))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Definition** | **Weight** |
| Cost-Effectiveness | * Relative net cost/benefit compared to the other actions, “bang for your buck” ($/MTCO2 from the MAC Curve analysis) | 25 |
| GHG Emission Reduction Amount | * Relative amount of GHG emission reduced compared to the other actions (cumulative MTCO2 reduced) | 20 |
| Risk & Uncertainty | * How likely is the cost-effectiveness and GHG emission reductions from the action likely to actually materialize (confidence in the probability: low/medium/high) | 10 |
| Health Co-Benefit | * Health benefits that result from reduction in air pollutants; specific health savings accrue from reduced: mortality, heart attacks, hospital admissions, emergency room visits, and work loss (cumulative estimated dollar amount from the EPA-COBRA analysis) * Quality of Life increases (physical activity, comfort, noise reduction) | 15 |
| Jobs and Economic Prosperity Co-Benefit | * Number of cumulative person job years estimated to be created over time as a result of implementing the action * Decrease in household or business building energy cost (from the reduction in energy use) * Decrease in household or business transportation costs | 15 |
| Equity Co-Benefit | * Relative level at which the action can serve historically and currently underserved populations and communities * Relative level at which the action will help alleviate energy burden (reducing the number of Oregonians paying more than 6% of their income on energy) | 15 |
|  | **TOTAL =** | **100** |

To help guide your comments, we would specifically like you to consider the following:

1. Do you agree that the three core evaluation criteria should be included? Would you add or subtract from this list of core evaluation criteria?
2. Are the co-benefits listed the correct ones to include in this analysis? Would you add or subtract from this list of co-benefits to include in the evaluation criteria?
3. Is the definition of each evaluation criterion correct? Do you agree with the sub-criteria? Would you add or subtract from the sub-criteria?

**Please used tracked changes in the table above, or if you’d like to start with a clean slate, please fill out the blank template below.** Please also feel free to expand upon your reasoning for any changes in comment bubbles or in text.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Definition** | **Weight** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | **TOTAL =** | **100** |