

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 23 C 891 SEM - Site Specific Comprehensive - 46968
CPMA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/21002
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	SEM - Site Specific Comprehensive - 46968
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	FPSEMPGE21
PA Program Name	SEM Food Processing - NMEC
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	9/21/2023, 4/29/2024 (post)
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	8/11/2023
Second PA Upload	12/21/2023
Third PA Upload	
Fourth PA Upload	
Fifth PA Upload	
Sixth PA Upload	
Seventh PA Upload	
Eighth PA Upload	
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	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 produces tomato paste located in █████ CA
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	14.1
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	100,600.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	100,000.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$23,018.00
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	DNV
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	██████████
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	DNV
PA Primary Reviewer Name	0.0
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	0.0
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
1	Given the relatively short production season and savings being a percent of consumption, the reviewers are not convinced the weekly model provide more accuracy over the daily model.	Calculation method		

2	The reviewers recommend providing more information on the relationship between "System A Production" and "System B Rework". This will be a key question in evaluation to understand what this data represents and how it interacts. Why is it appropriate to remove Rework from Production? Why is it appropriate to combine A and B together.	Calculation method		
3	The first week of the performance period contains one day of minimal production. As a result the model's intercept term sets a high baseline estimate that is incorrect for this week. The reviewers determined that an adjustment would be necessary for this item. The reviewers recommend not including this week in the savings calculation. This will significantly reduce estimated savings; however, will accurately be representative of the actual SEM projects associated savings.	Calculation method		
4	There are multiple non production days in the final week of the performance period. The reviewers determined these should be removed from the model. If the first week and last week of the performance period are removed, the site's energy consumption would increase over the performance period (negative savings). These weeks require significant review and documentation for why they should be included.	Calculation method		
5	The overall documentation of the electric savings using bottom-up calculations is sufficient. However, the reviewers recommend the following: (1) Include a picture of the air compressor nameplate. (2) Expect further review and possibly -metering- of the air leaks measures if the project is selected for evaluation. Air leaks measures are often found to need continuous monitoring and tracking to maintain their savings.	Calculation method		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	The provided project files included the live model; however, the model included only the data from the baseline period and not the reporting period. Hence, no savings were calculated. The evaluators expect the final model to include the data for the reporting period along with installed measure descriptions. The final model must include a description of all measures completed with dates and if available, their estimated impact. Please provide Y1 completion report when available.	Continue Document Upload		Resolved
1	Please identify this as a SEM project on your next upload. This is not an NMEC project.	Missing required information		Resolved

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.