

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE_24_T_I_939_SEM - Site Specific Comprehensive - 54153
CMPA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/15264
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	SEM - Site Specific Comprehensive - 54153
PA Application Executed Date	
PA Program ID	MFSEMPGE21
PA Program Name	SEM - Manufacturing - NMEC
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	4/30/2024
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	3/26/2024
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	SEM Whole Building
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	SEM Cycle 1 Year 1 Midyear
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	0.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	0.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	371,674.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$482,359.00
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 (M&V Results and Final Calculations) Required

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

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	Please upload the Year 1 Completion Report.	Continue Document Upload		
2	What is the implementer's rationale for modeling each boiler separately instead of as one or two systems? The reviewers calculated significantly different results when combining boilers into one system.	Calculation method		
3	Provide more documentation on the reason for the increase in the independent variable from baseline to performance period. The "Total Energy Leaving [REDACTED] (MMBTU)" is significantly higher over the performance period than the baseline period. Documentation should state why this increase occurred and why the baseline period remains valid for modeling performance period consumption	Continue Document Upload		
4	More detailed documentation of the reasoning for the Baseline adjustments for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The reviewers understand that the steam quality was allowed to be lower and quality part of the "Total Energy Leaving [REDACTED] (MMBTU)" calculation. However, since "Total Energy Leaving [REDACTED] (MMBTU)" is the product produced by this process, the documentation should state why higher production would have occurred in the baseline (typically energy savings are calculated with equal production in the baseline and installed conditions). Significant savings are estimated after this adjustment is made. The reviewers believe additional documentation on the reasoning and methodology here is appropriate. It would be especially helpful to know what the boiler operators are controlling the system to do.	Continue Document Upload		
5	The reviewers reviewed the calculations and conversion factors used to develop the inputs in the model and deemed them to be appropriate.	Calculation method		
6	Why was the OAT variable used as an independent variable for this site? The reviewers did not see evidence in the data that gas usage is dependent on OAT. The reviewers generated regressions without OAT which produced comparable statistical significance, but different savings estimates. The reviewers believe removing OAT will improve the model.	Calculation method		
7	What is the implementer's rationale for modeling each boiler separately instead of as one or two systems? The reviewers calculated significantly different results when combining boilers into one system.	Calculation method		

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.