

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE_22_C_C_832_PRJ - 03621782_Lighting
CMPA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/20682
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 03621782
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	PGE210911
PA Program Name	On-Bill Financing Alternative Pathway
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	1/10/2023
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	11/29/2022
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 RETROFITNEW-EXT-LED-POLE MOUNTED
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	31484 cobra heads throughout the City ██████████ A preliminary schedule inventory review of the streetlights in August 2019 with estimated starting installation in Q1 2020
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	0.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	324,441.2
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	0.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$0.00
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	0.0
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	324,441.2
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	0.0
Project Documentation Incentive \$ (to Customer)	3,244.4
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:	Advisory
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	The review team recognizes that this project was originally intended for PGE's On-Bill Financing Alternative Pathways Program (OBF-AP) but was redirected to custom. To assess the reasonableness of the OBF savings claim, the review team sought to compare the original OBF savings analysis with the Modified Lighting Calculator (MLC) savings analysis from which the custom savings claim is derived. However, the review team was unable to match fixture line items in the original analysis with their equivalents in the MLC. For common fixture designations between the two files, the review team identified various differences in wattage assumptions for both pre-existing and proposed fixtures. For future OBF-AP projects redirected to custom, the review team requests additional clarity on mapping fixture line items among different analysis files to allow more comprehensive assessment of the original savings estimate.	Analysis assumptions		

2	The MLC's Inputs tab column AX indicates a change in lumens between pre-existing and proposed fixtures. However, the submitted files did not include customer approval of the change in lumens.	Missing documents		
---	---	-------------------	--	--

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution

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>
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.