

## CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 21 C A 640 PRJ - 02724720 Lighting
CMPA Directory Link	<a href="https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/19063">https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/19063</a>
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 02724720
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	PGE21031
PA Program Name	Agricultural Calculated Incentives - Customized Incentive Program
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	8/31/2022
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	6/8/2021
Second PA Upload	6/29/2021
Third PA Upload	8/5/2022
Fourth PA Upload	
Fifth PA Upload	
Sixth PA Upload	
Seventh PA Upload	
Eighth PA Upload	
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	LIGHTING RETROFIT/NEW-INT LED HORTICULTURAL
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	0
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	655.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	2,790,677.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	0.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$413,771.40
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	252.4
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	2,033,040.0
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	0.0
Project Documentation Incentive \$ (to Customer)	413,771.4
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	DNV
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	DNV
PA Primary Reviewer Name	
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	
CPUC Staff Project Manager	
CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)	
CPUC Staff Recommendation:	Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted
For rejection, action required:	N/A
M&V Review:	Post M&V Review NOT Required

Action Number:	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Action Category	PA Response	ED Resolution (8/31/2022)
1	Final savings included in the project documentation (629.5kW and 2,741,886kWh) are less than savings included in the bi-monthly submission (655kW and 2,790,677) due to an error that double counted HVAC interactive savings. In response to our SDR, the PA confirmed that the bi-monthly savings are incorrect and should be reduced to the values included in the project documentation. Please update savings in the next quarterly submission.	Calculation method	Final Post Install savings have been updated. Bi-Monthly Savings are pulled from project automatically.	Savings in the project files were correctly recalculated for the new fixtures, but the numbers in the quarterly submission do not match these. Final savings values are 2,033,040 kWh and 252.4 kW. The quarterly submission for this project number shows 3,815,657 kWh and 497 kW with incentive if \$521, 432.57. Please update for next quarterly submission.
2	Please resubmit the project after post-installation savings have been estimated. We will review final savings, assumptions and costs of the project. When you resubmit the project, please also include an update regarding the DLC process for testing LED fixtures that are being installed at this site. According to the manufacturer, DLC is in the process of creating a procedure for testing this type of fixtures, and this procedure may be ready later this year.	Continue Document Upload	The installed fixture is now listed on the DLC. The DLC process for testing Horticultural products is available on the DLC Horticultural QPL, <a href="https://www.designlights.org/news-events/news/new-dlc-policy-horticultural-technical-requirements-v1-2/">https://www.designlights.org/news-events/news/new-dlc-policy-horticultural-technical-requirements-v1-2/</a> . This was the version of the QPL in place at the time of project approval.	Final savings reflect the updated project parameters. Lighting fixture specifications in the final version of the calculator match the DLC listing. Post M&V data was implemented into the calculator to estimate annual hours of use. Consumption data included in the project files does not match the data referenced in the post-install report (footnote 14). Perhaps there is a missing documentation for the meters. Please review documentation and upload any missing meter data.

ED Resolution


Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	This project is going through RP2.0 assessment	Self generation	Yes this project went throught the RP2.0 pilot . It was assigned a default NTGR. Pilot projects have been uploaded to the CPUC CMPA folder "PGE RP2.0 Pilot 2021".	No further action

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. <u>There will not be conditional approval.</u>
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 before signed agreement with customer. 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>
Advisory.	The PA is not formally required to follow instructions or recommendations given in an Advisory review. However, issues found will affect ESPI scoring and may come up again in Ex-Post review.