

## CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 22 T A 742 PRJ - 03047518 Lighting
CMPA Directory Link	<a href="https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/20172">https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/20172</a>
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 03047518
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:	4/12/2022
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	3/1/2022
Second PA Upload	
Third PA Upload	
Fourth PA Upload	
Fifth PA Upload	
Sixth PA Upload	
Seventh PA Upload	
Eighth PA Upload	
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	LIGHTING RETROFITNEW-INT LED HORTICULTURAL
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	This is an accelerated replacement AR project and the applicable
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	0.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	762,899.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	0.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$84,256.09
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	0.0
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	762,899.0
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	0.0
Project Documentation Incentive \$ (to Customer)	84,256.1
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	DNV
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	Quantum
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 used the office-large building type as the primary building type for this project. This facility is used for growing cannabis. Please use the correct building type.	Other 1		
2	According to the project feasibility study, the customer was initially contacted by ERI on 3/25/2021 via phone outreach, as part of a direct outreach program for TRC's AESAP program. However, the application was signed on 4/23/2020. Please clarify the project development process in future submission of this project.	Program influence		

3	Please resubmit the project for our review after post-installation savings have been estimated.	Continue Document Upload		
	PA's project description included in the bi-monthly upload is incorrect. Please correct the measure description in the next quarterly submission.	Other 1		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	<p>There are several conflicting statements about the program influencing the installation of LEDs at this site. According to the project feasibility study (PFS), the customer is already using LED in a vegetative room and is happy with the performance of the LEDs. When the customer was asked about the pain points with their current equipment, they indicated that they are satisfied with the existing lighting system and that the only pain point noted was the high cost of LED fixtures. In the same document (PFS), the PA indicated that the head cultivator was not comfortable changing to LEDs for the facilities flowering rooms. The cultivator has used various LEDs for testing and R&amp;D over the past decade but was never satisfied by the products results. The cultivators' major concerns were light penetration, effects on product quality, and bulkiness of the LEDs.</p>	Program influence		

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>
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.