

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE_23_T 898_PRJ - 04373572_Process
CMPA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/21051
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 04373572
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:	10/24/2023
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	9/12/2023
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	PROCESS RETROFITNEW-WASTE WATER-AERATORS-EFFICIENT UNIT
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	This application entails the replacement of six 6 secondary treatment 150 HP existing surface aerators with 8 55 kW submersible mixers at a wastewater treatment facility
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	293.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	2,456,150.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	0.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$327,355.20
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	293.0
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	2,456,150.0
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	0.0
Project Documentation Incentive \$ (to Customer)	327,355.2
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Verdant Associates
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:	Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted
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	Please correct the savings calculation to reflect a baseline annual kWh value that incorporates the average metered kW of the existing aerators. Cell Z7 of the "Customer Baseline" tab in "PFS Calculations_rev2" currently incorporates the peak kW only (cell Z8). This revision will slightly decrease the kWh savings estimate.	Analysis assumptions		
2	PFS page 15 mentions the possibility of indirect impacts from the associated aeration blowers: "Trend data of the blowers are available and will be compared to baseline data to verify if any load increase is observed." However, the M&V plan does not include a more detailed measurement and analysis approach related to blower impacts.	M&V plan		
3	Please revise the M&V plan to include an assessment of the 8 proposed mixers' ability to meet the mixing needs of the wastewater treatment system. PFS page 14 suggests that the power requirement and associated location of the proposed mixers is uncertain: "The required mixing in the oxidation basin is expected to be able to be met with the mixer quantity specified, but the power requirements will ultimately be determined by the location of the submersible mixers within the oxidation ditches. If optimal locations initially identified become unsuitable when the ditches are assessed in further detail, the power requirement may be increased to provide the necessary flow."	M&V plan		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	The project address ([REDACTED]) differs slightly from the address listed in bimonthly upload data ([REDACTED]).	Other 1		
2	The project incentive exceeds \$100k and therefore warrants full rigor treatment for preponderance of evidence documentation. Resolution E-5115 pages 21-23 require the project developer to collect responses from the customer on ten questions related to equipment viability and program influence. While the submission generally included this information in various separate documents, future submittals should include these questions and responses in a single document to provide the narrative necessary for compliance with E-5115.	ER preponderance of evidence		

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.