

# CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE_19_C_C_279_PRJ - 01949656_BldgEnvlp		
CMPA Directory Link	<a href="https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/15636">https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/15636</a>		
PA	PGE		
PA Application ID	PRJ - 01949656		
PA Application Executed Date	8/28/2019		
PA Program ID	PGE21011		
PA Program Name	Commercial Calculated Incentives - Customized Incentive Program		
PA Program Year	2019		
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	11/26/2019		
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:			
First PA Upload	10/15/2019		
Second PA Upload	#N/A		
Third PA Upload	#N/A		
PA Measure Description(s):			
Measure 1	HVAC RETROFIT/NEW-ENVELOPE-WINDOWS-INSTALL WINDOW FILM		
Measure 2	HVAC RETROFIT/NEW-ENVELOPE-WINDOWS-INSTALL WINDOW FILM		
Measure 3	HVAC RETROFIT/NEW-ENVELOPE-WINDOWS-INSTALL WINDOW FILM		
Measure 4			
Measure 5			
Measure 6			
Measure 7			
Measure 8			
Measure 9			
Measure 10			
PA Project Description:	Install V33 window film on 3 joined 7 story office buildings totaling		
PA Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	77.0		
PA Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	205,015.0		
PA Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	-2,506.0		
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$33,019.30		
PA Proposed Total Payment to Implementer \$ (not to include the above incentive to customer)			
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction			
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts			
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts			
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name			
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	SBW		
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name			
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	BMI		
PA Primary Reviewer Name			
PA Primary Reviewer Firm			
CPUC Staff Project Manager			
CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)			
CPUC Staff Recommendation Marked "X":			
	x	Application ready to proceed without exception	
		Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted	
		Application rejected.	
		Application not ready for review, revised and resubmit as noted	
Action Number:	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Action Category	Due Date

1	Savings and incentive amount in project Technical Review report do not match the values reported in the bimonthly upload. Please reconcile the differences and revise the bimonthly upload as needed. <b>Response dated 3/3/202 provided updated savings and clarified correct values. No further action required.</b>	Other - discrepancy with bimonthly upload	N/A
2	Savings from eQUEST models updated by the Technical Reviewer do not match the values in the Technical Review report. Please verify the correct eQUEST models were submitted and/or revise Technical Report as necessary to resolve conflict. <b>Response dated 3.3.2020 provided revised savings estimates. The kWh savings across the three buildings are within 9% of the values obtained from an independent eQuest run of the models provided. We attribute these discrepancies to differences in the eQuest program build number. No further action required.</b>	Analysis assumptions	N/A
3	Gas impacts were not updated by the Technical Reviewer. Please revise the gas impacts to incorporate model changes made during Technical Review. <b>Response dated 3/3/2020 included revised gas impacts in the Technical Review. Note gas impacts varied by 72% from the results obtained from an independent run of the submitted eQuest model. The absolute value of the gas impacts is small, and can be attributed to differences in the eQuest program build number. No further action required.</b>	Analysis assumptions	N/A

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date
1	EUL increase to 15 yr based on 15 yr full material and labor warranty is approved.	EUL/RUL	N/A
2	Please provide eQuest output files along with the input files to verify eQuest program version and build number in future submittals. Please also review simulation results for hours not met during project Technical Review. The subitted model showed > 40% of hours not met, in conflict with the consultant assertion of <4% of hours not met.	Analysis assumptions	N/A
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

CPUC Staff Recommendation Definitions	
CPUC Staff Recommendation	Definition
Application ready to proceed without exception	The PA will continue to upload application documents to the CMPA directory through the implementation and claims phases of the project. The PA may proceed to approve the project without waiting for CPUC Staff response. A project is waived from further review at the post-installation stage by CPUC staff, but the PA is responsible for post-installation (IR) review. There will not be conditional approval.
Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted	<p>The PA must make revisions or changes as noted in CPUC Staff's review comments. The PA will continue to upload application documents to the CMPA directory through the implementation and claims phases of the project. The PA may proceed to approve the project without waiting for CPUC Staff response. If CPUC Staff decides to perform IR review of a project, CPUC Staff will notify the PA. The scope will be limited to determine if the project was carried out consistent with the application and notes provided during pre-installation review and to obtain information pertaining to whether the eligibility criteria or metrics should be revised.</p> <p>Unless the scope of work presented in project application has changed at IR review, the project will not be reviewed again in the areas specified below. Scope change is defined by substantial changes include significant modifications to the proposed equipment type, size, quantity, configuration, the expansion of a project to include additional retrofits, or the splitting of a project into multiple phases.</p> <p>The following areas will not be reviewed again by CPUC Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calculation Tool</li> <li>• Calculation Methodology</li> <li>• M&amp;V Plan</li> <li>• Baseline</li> <li>• Eligibility</li> <li>• EUL/RUL</li> <li>• Measure Type</li> <li>• Program Influence</li> </ul>
Application rejected.	<p>The application is rejected as submitted. The PA shall promptly inform the applicant as to the reasons why the project was rejected and the specific recommendations for the conditions under which the project would be approved. CPUC Staff shall provide the reasons for the rejection or request for modification, including each basis as to why the project is rejected, or modification is requested. In addition, CPUC Staff shall provide specific recommendations for the conditions under which the project would be approved.</p> <p>If any party to the project is unsatisfied with the Commission's directions for the project, a dispute resolution process may be initiated by that party. The Commission shall adopt rules for the conduct of the dispute resolution process. – Section 381.2 (g) (3) (F)</p>
Application not ready for review, revised and resubmit as noted	The application has deficiency in the supporting documentation and the PA has provided incomplete documentation. The complete documentation has been defined in the Statewide Custom Projects Guidance Document. Please note that this is not a final recommendation from CPUC staff. This recommendation is limited to two requests per application.