

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	[This project information not available; not uploaded to bi-monthly list at time of review]		
CMPA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/15778		
PA	PGE		
PA Application ID			
PA Application Executed Date			
PA Program ID			
PA Program Name			
PA Program Year	2019		
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	2/5/2020		
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:			
First PA Upload	12/17/2019		
Second PA Upload	N/A		
Third PA Upload	N/A		
PA Measure Description(s):			
Measure 1	463772: Retrocommissioning - Monitoring Based Retrocommissioning - REA (Option C)		
Measure 2			
Measure 3			
Measure 4			
Measure 5			
Measure 6			
Measure 7			
Measure 8			
Measure 9			
Measure 10			
PA Project Description:	RCx of central plant, air handlers, controls and EMS system		
PA Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	0.0		
PA Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	495,763.0		
PA Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	3,524.0		
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$10,000.00		
PA Proposed Total Payment to Implementer \$ (not to include the above incentive to customer)			
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	0.0		
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	478,866.0		
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	-4,211.0		
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 Marked "X":			
	Application ready to proceed without exception		
x	Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted		
	Application rejected.		
	Application not ready for review, revised and resubmit as noted		
Action Number:	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Action Category	Due Date

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date
1	The gas model does not meet the R squared criterium. R squared should be ≥ 0.75 . The reviewer believes the model could still be used to represent the facility's energy consumption since the CV(RMSE) is very low.		
2	The electric model does not meet the R squared criterium. R squared should be ≥ 0.75 . The reviewer believes the model could still be used to represent the facility's energy consumption since the CV(RMSE) is very low.		
3	The implementer should calculate the FSU for both the gas and electric models. The reviewer will provide a formula for guidance on the calculation.		
4	Please confirm your NRE values. When the evaluator calculated the correction factor as described, it was found to be 1193 therms/day instead of 1181 therms/day.		
6	The scoping report only shows 2 electric meters, but states there is 3 meters. The completion report only shows 1 meter. They all have the same SA ID, so maybe this should be used. If not, ALL meters used to obtain the 32 million kWh should be included in the Completion Report. See pages 6-7 of scoping report vs page 30 of SEM Completion Report.		
7	For the gas NRE occurring in October 2018, the site should determine which day within October 2018 the gas adjustment should be implemented. It appears the first was chosen, but the emails between Nate and the site do not specify a date. If the site were to implement the measure on October 1 vs October 31, this would be a 35,430 therm difference. Describe conditions pre and post change and make sure they retain the current conditions to make sure the correction applies.		
8	The Gas NRE must be further detailed with specific before and after setpoints. The email provided is too vague. Without this data documented model maintenance in the future is not possible. In the future these setpoints must be monitored and if they are again changed, the NRE would either be removed, modified or an additional NRE added to account for the changes.		
9	On Page 21 of the M&V Report the PI discusses details pertaining to an independent variable, "edge tape board count". This paragraph is not relevevant to this SEM site and should be deleted.		
10	On Page 35 of the M&V Report the PI refers to multiple NREs. Holidays and weekends are an indicator variable used within the model, not an NRE.		

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. 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>
Application not ready for review, revised and resubmit as noted	The application has deficiency in the supporting documentation and the PA has provided incomplete documentation. The complete documentation has been defined in the Statewide Custom Projects Guidance Document. Please note that this is not a final recommendation from CPUC staff. This recommendation is limited to two requests per application.