

## CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE_21_C_C_725_Site Specific Comprehensive - 7580_NMEC
CMPA Directory Link	<a href="https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/19346">https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/19346</a>
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	Site Specific Comprehensive - 7580
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	GPNMCUCC19
PA Program Name	University of California/California State University - NMEC Whole Building
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	12/21/2021
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	11/9/2021
Second PA Upload	N/A
Third PA Upload	N/A
Fourth PA Upload	
Fifth PA Upload	
Sixth PA Upload	
Seventh PA Upload	
Eighth PA Upload	
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	NMEC Whole Building
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	200,000 sqft building composed of a vivarium, laboratories, offices, classrooms and auditoriums with retrofit, retrocommissioning and operational improvement opportunities.
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	125.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	1,234,191.3
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	0.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$206,682.00
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	125.0
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	1,234,191.3
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	0.0
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	SBW Consulting
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	SBW Consulting
PA Primary Reviewer Name	
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	
CPUC Staff Project Manager	
CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)	
CPUC Staff Recommendation:	Advisory
For rejection, action required:	N/A
M&V Review:	Post M&V Review (M&V Results and Final Calculations) Required

Action Number:	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Action Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	Please submit first year performance report at the conclusion of the first year performance period.	Continue Document Upload		
2	Please update the M&V plan to include details on how final peak demand savings will be calculated.	M&V plan		
3	Total incentive values varies between various project documentation and the bi-monthly upload. Bi-monthly upload shows a total incentive amount of \$206,682 but the Technical Review document shows a total incentive amount of \$173,102. Please address this discrepancy in future submissions of this project. If the incentive value reported in the bi-monthly report is incorrect, please update that value in the next quarterly submission.	Other 1		

4	<p>The baseline model for this project covers April of 2020 through April of 2021. The project concluded that there are no NREs and that the project is not impacted by COVID. According to the influence documentation, a new MRI machine was "recently installed", along with supporting air conditioning units and chilled water cooling pumps, but it's not clear when this happened. In our independent analysis of residuals in a model using the same baseline year (4/2020-4/2021), we found that energy consumption over the baseline year increased by 1.4%. This increase appears to have been driven by a step-change in energy consumption beginning in December 2020. Please provide additional details to explain this change in future submissions of this project. Could this be the result of a change to occupancy due to COVID (e.g., return-to-normal occupancy) or the installation of the new MRI?</p>	Analysis assumptions		
5	<p>The program influence documentation is missing some key information such as what the customer would have done absent the program, customer implementation barriers, customer resource constraints and customer's motivating factors for the project development. Please provide this information for future submissions of this project.</p>	Program influence		
6	<p>The PA estimated the payback of this project to be 3.3 years assuming that all energy cost savings is the IOU savings. We recalculated this value to be 10.2 years using IOU's energy cost savings. This means that the payback of the project is greater than savings-weighted EUL of the project (3.6 years). According to the Statewide Custom Project Guidance Document, if a custom project's simple payback period exceeds its effective useful life, the PA's review and approval is required on a case-by-case basis. Please provide this information as part of future submissions of the project.</p>	Missing required information		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	The project used metered electrical data from a customer-owned meter not a utility meter. This customer-owned meter is not as accurate as the NMEC rulebook requires. This issue is being evaluated under an EO request and CPUC staff will provide additional directions on this issue via the EO response. In general, the PA is required to combine metering uncertainty with the modeling uncertainty when reporting overall savings uncertainty. Note that overall savings uncertainty will need to comply with any future CPUC guidance on fractional savings uncertainty for site level projects.	Calculation method		

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 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>