

## CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 21 T I 724 PRJ - 02913894 CompAir
CMPA Directory Link	<a href="https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/19343">https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/19343</a>
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 02913894
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	PGE_Ind_002
PA Program Name	CLEAResult - Business Energy Performance (Ind) - Customized Retrofit
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	2/1/2022
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	10/26/2021
Second PA Upload	11/16/2021
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	PROCESS RETROFIT/NEW-COMPRESSED AIR-MODIFY SYSTEM/CONFIGURATION
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	Replace (1017 quantity) Diaphragm Pulse valves and solenoids with
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	143.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	1,153,559.5
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	0.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$164,216.56
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	136.7
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	1,008,685.0
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	The PA reduced savings and incentives in response to our SDRs. Please make sure updated savings and incentives are included in the next quarterly submission.	Other 1		
2	The site address provided in the Project Feasibility Study differs from the site address provided in the bi-monthly upload. Please included the correct address in the next quarterly submission.	Other 2		
3	Project participated in the RP2.0 pilot program. The final assigned net to gross ratio (NTGR) for this project is 0.85. Please calculate final savings claims, incentives and contractor performance payments using the Final Assigned NTGR according to the RP.20 Pilot Program Implementation Plan.	Program influence		

4	Please resubmit the project for our review after post-installation data has been collected, assumptions have been trued up and final savings are estimated.	Continue Document Upload		
5	For the M&V data collection, air flow and compressor power should be measured at 15 second intervals recording one minute averages. Run time and all baseline and proposed valve specifications (CVs) should also be verified in the post M&V analysis.	M&V plan		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	<p>Project savings are estimated based on rough assumptions (e.g., flow coefficients of baseline valves, % savings, etc.) that can change savings significantly after verification. One of these assumptions is the PA using a 20% reduction in pulsation time compared to 40%-50% expectation from other projects with similar measures. In response to our SDR asking about this assumption, the PA provided an article showing the same customer's out-of-state pilot program for the similar measure. According to the article, savings can go up to 40%. Although, PA's assumption of 20% savings may appear conservative on the surface, it impacts program influence. Using PA's estimated savings, the project pays back in 2.4 years without incentives. The customer indicated that they have a simple payback requirement of 3 years but prioritize projects with simple paybacks less than 2 years. Using higher % savings assumptions could easily bring the project payback below 2 years. Given the customer has already installed this measure at other facilities and proposed this measure to the PA/project developer (i.e., low technical influence), it is important for the PA to show strong financial influence. This is not something that was provided for this project.</p>	Program influence		
2	<p>The PA did not provide a complete response to our 2nd SDR. Baseline valve specifications are still missing.</p>	Missing required information		

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>