

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 21 T A 645 PRJ - 02674596 Refrig
CMPA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/19078
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 02674596
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	PGE_Ag_001
PA Program Name	TRC - Agricultural Energy Savings Action Plan (AESAP) (Ag) - Customized Retrofit
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	7/7/2021
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	5/18/2021
Second PA Upload	6/8/2021
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	REFRIGERATION RETROFIT/NEW-SYSTEM-ADD/MODIFY EQUIPMENT (IMPROVE COP)
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	0.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	58,520.3
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	0.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$16,970.89
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	0.0
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	58,520.3
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	0.0
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Energy 350
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:	Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted
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 resubmit the project for post-installation review after true-up savings have been estimate. We will review final savings analysis after post-installation M&V data has been collected.	Continue Document Upload		
2	According to the PA, the project developer determined Industry Standard Practice (ISP) in the agricultural industry relating to VFDs on refrigeration compressors earlier in a 2020 project. Based on this study, agricultural customers always choose the less expensive install cost which is a constant speed drive compressor. The CPUC staff asked for a copy of this study and the PA provided a reference to a single interview with one vendor. This level of effort is not adequate for an informal ISP study. We are approving the proposed baseline for this project but requesting the PA to conduct additional ISP research on this type of measure for future projects. Please also provide additional data on the level of savings that this measure will achieve per program cycle in the PA portfolio.	Baseline		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	<p>In an earlier iteration (Rev 0) of the project with a more extensive scope, the incentive rate was increased from \$0.12/kWh to \$0.29/kWh to bring the payback closer to the customer internal threshold of 3 years. The customer did not approve installation of suggested measures because they exceeded the customer internal payback threshold. Subsequent revisions reduced the savings and it was decided to hold the incentive rate at \$0.29/kWh. With this incentive the updated project payback (8.5 years) is much higher than the customer internal threshold. According to the PA, the customer is aware of the long payback calculated using 2020 harvest year but 2021 harvest year data will result in better payback at Post-install true-up. The pre-install savings analysis is based on actual data from 2020 and it was a much lighter production year than a typical year. The 2021 harvest is expected to be in a higher utilization rate due to more production contracts and new tanks coming online.</p>	Incentive calculation		

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"> • Calculation Tool • Calculation Methodology • M&V Plan • Baseline • Eligibility • EUL/RUL • Measure Type • Program Influence
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>