

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 23 T 904 SEM - Site Specific Comprehensive - 54449
CPMA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/21075
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	SEM - Site Specific Comprehensive - 54449
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	MFSEMPGE21
PA Program Name	SEM - Manufacturing - NMEC
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	11/14/2023
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	9/27/2023
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	NMEC Whole Building
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	SEM Year 1 engagement period for an SEM program participant that manufactures [REDACTED]
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	0.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	0.0
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	0.0
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	0.0
Project Documentation Incentive \$ (to Customer)	0.0
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Kerri-Ann Richard
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	0
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 (M&V Results and Final Calculations) Required

Action Number:	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Action Category	PA Response	ED Resolution	Due Date

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	The provided project files included the hypothesis model to calculate electric savings; however, the model included data only for the baseline period. Hence, no savings were calculated or claimed in the model. The reviewers expect the final model to include the data for the reporting period along with the installed measures descriptions. The final model must include a description of all measures completed with dates and their estimated impact, if available.	Continue Document Upload		
2	The project files documented that bottom-up savings calculation approach will be used to calculate the gas savings from implemented SEM measures. However, no bottom-up savings calculation have been provided as it's most likely too early to calculate those. The reviewers recommend thorough documentations for those measures in terms of quantities, specifications, hours of operation, references, and any calculation formulas or equations used to determine those savings.	Continue Document Upload		
3	The listed relevant variables used in the hypothesis model are only weather-related variables. The project files documented that a production-based model was deemed inappropriate due the long delay between when production energy costs are spent and when the production is reported. However, given this is an industrial facility, the reviewers still recommend the production data be made available to reviewers and any ex-post evaluation.	Calculation method		
4	Upload the YR1 completion report upon completion of YR1.	Continue Document Upload		
5	The project files documented that the electric savings will be assessed for the facility's two buildings combined (impacting 4 different electric meters). The reviewers recommend documenting in the opportunity register which meters are being impacted by each specific completed measure. The reviewers understand this could be difficult for some measures; however, such documentation could be helpful understanding the energy consumption changes for each meter as measures are being installed. This documentation will also be helpful for the evaluators in ex-post evaluations.	Continue Document Upload		

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.