

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 21 T C 618 PRJ - 02805930 Lighting
CMIPA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/18979
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 02805930
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	PGE210143
PA Program Name	Hospitality Program - Custom Direct Install
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	3/23/2021
PA CIPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	2/16/2021
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	LIGHTING RETROFIT/NEW-INT LED HIGHBAY
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	38.8
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	229,456.5
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	-703.6
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$31,154.10
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	38.8
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	229,513.0
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	-703.6
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	E350
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	SBW
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
1	kWh savings included in the bi-monthly upload is slightly lower than kWh savings estimated in the MLC. This is a recurring issue for MLC projects and the PA has been notified about this issue via past dispositions. Please update savings for the quarterly submission to use the correct savings values and fix this issue for all MLC projects.	Did not follow previous CPUC guidance		
2	RUL of existing equipment (HID lamps) is estimated based on 1/3 of the EUL of the installed equipment (LEDs) instead of existing equipment. This is a recurring issue for MLC projects and the PA has been notified about this issue via past dispositions and responses to EO requests.	Did not follow previous CPUC guidance		
3	The values in the MLC standard practice baseline lookup table for the measure code CLA22 (Lighting Retrofit/New-Interior LED Highbay) do not match the values in Resolution E-5009. Please refer to this resolution or current Highbay workpaper (SWLG011-03) for correct baseline values and update savings accordingly.	Baseline		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	Total incentives combined with project 617 (the same customer) is within the Medium Rigor threshold.	ER preponderance of evidence		

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>