

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE_22_T_C_820_PRJ - 03733408_Process Heat
CPMA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/20640
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 03733408
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	PGE_Pub_010
PA Program Name	AESC - RAPIDS - Water Wastewater Optimization
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	2/28/2023
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	12/22/2022
Second PA Upload	1/13/2023
Third PA Upload	
Fourth PA Upload	
Fifth PA Upload	
Sixth PA Upload	
Seventh PA Upload	
Eighth PA Upload	
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	PROCESS RETROFITNEW-WASTE WATER-OTHER
Measure 2	PROCESS RETROFITNEW-WASTE WATER-AERATORS-EFFICIENT UNIT
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	<p>The facility is a biological secondary level treatment plant serving [REDACTED]. The facility produces recycled water that meets Title 22 California Code of Regulations. This application entails the installation of high efficiency diffusers 405 standard oxygen transfer efficiency-SOTE in Train A B and C of the activated sludge process replacing existing fine bubble disc type ceramic diffusers 314 SOTE in Train A and B and fine bubble membrane diffusers 334 SOTE in Train C. This application also entails installing iris valves to replace the existing butterfly valves BFV in Trains B and C aeration distribution headers High efficiency diffusers with higher oxygen transfer rate will need less air for aeration in activated sludge process and thus saves blower energy Iris valves will reduce flow resistance and help the blowers to operate at reduced pressure setpoint. This project was developed as part of the Pacific Gas and Electric PGE sponsored RAPIDS third-party program and identified by the Alternative Energy Systems Consulting Inc AESC team AESC identified the proposed measure as an opportunity to accomplish the goals of the individual processes more efficiently. The savings impact of these two measures combined is estimated as 3759000 kWhyr in energy savings and 4644 kW in peak demand reduction. The estimated cost of the project is 383400000.</p>
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	464.5
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	3,759,000.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	0.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$520,746.36
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	784.0
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	6,322,816.8
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	0.0
Project Documentation Incentive \$ (to Customer)	876,333.5
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Verdant
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 without exception
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
----------------	--	-----------------	-------------	---------------

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	<p>During the course of review, CPUC staff expressed concerns over the efficiency of proposed equipment compared to the existing equipment (this issue was discussed with the PA in a call on 12/1/2022, and follow up memos). Based on comments received from CPUC staff, implementer contacted the design engineering firm, updated the proposed equipment, and adjusted the calculations based on updated proposed equipment. This resulted in a significant change to savings, costs and incentives (see above for the original and updated values). The updated project package was submitted by PG&E on 12/15/2022. This triggered a resubmission and the SB1131 review timeline was reset.</p> <p>Please update savings and incentives in the next quarterly submission.</p>	Other 1		
2	<p>The PA did not explain why an EUL of 13 years was selected for the valve replacement measure. Please review this value before finalizing the project.</p>	EUL/RUL		

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. 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.