

**CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review**

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 23 T 905 Site Specific Comprehensive - 61640
CMPA Directory Link	<a href="https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/21078">https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/21078</a>
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	Site Specific Comprehensive - 61640
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	COWBGCRX20
PA Program Name	CoolSave Grocery - Whole Building
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	11/21/2023
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	10/6/2023
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	NMEC Whole Building
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
PA Project Description:	Grocery store energy efficiency project with one comprehensive measure including compressor retrofit condenser retrofit new EMS replace cases and replace walk-ins
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	31.4
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	214,785.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	0.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	525,774.20
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	31.4
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	214,785.0
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	0.0
Project Documentation Incentive \$ (to Customer)	25,774.0
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	Due Date
1	The project submittal does not sufficiently examine if each submeasure meets or exceeds Title 24 requirements. The PFS includes references to applicable sections in Title 24 but does not compare the characteristics of the proposed measures with Title 24's minimum required efficiency for such systems.	Baseline			

2	The project submittal does not include a calculation of the weighted average effective useful life (EUL) across the project's five submeasures as required by NMEC Rulebook page 16. Instead, the project developer assumed a 15-year EUL for a single measure ("full refrigeration system replacement") encompassing the five submeasures.	EUL/RUL		
3	The project submittal does not address measure application type (MAT) and EUL for all five submeasures. The submitted calculation file includes this information for ten submeasures originally identified as part of project scoping activities. However, this list does not address the MAT or EUL for the EMS submeasure.	Missing required information		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	According to the submitted calculation file, the EMS submeasure appears to encompass three of the project's originally identified ten measures: floating head controls, floating suction pressure, and schedule case lighting. Each of the three submeasures is classified as BRO-RCx in the spreadsheet. If BRO measures are ultimately part of the project scope, please include a 3-year maintenance plan signed by the customer at the time of project implementation.	Missing documents		

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.