

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE 19_C_C_272	WholeBldg
COMPA Directory Link	[Redacted]	
PA	SDGE	
PA Application ID	[Redacted]	
PA Application Executed Date	10/5/2018	
PA Program ID	SDGE3222	
PA Program Name	SW-COM-Calculated Incentives-Savings by Design	
PA Program Year	2018	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	3/26/2020	
PA COMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	[Redacted]	
First PA Upload	10/8/2019	
Second PA Upload	11/5/2019	
Third PA Upload	2/13/2020	
PA Measure Description(s):	[Redacted]	
Measure 1	Whole Building Incentive	
Measure 2		
Measure 3		
Measure 4		
Measure 5		
Measure 6		
Measure 7		
Measure 8		
Measure 9		
Measure 10		
PA Project Description:	Facilities Management Building	
PA Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	[Redacted]	
PA Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	[Redacted]	
PA Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	[Redacted]	
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$ [Redacted]	
PA Proposed Total Payment to Implementer \$ (not to include the above incentive to customer)	[Redacted]	
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	[Redacted]	
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	[Redacted]	
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	[Redacted]	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	Weld Fickel	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Sugarpine	
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	Jeremy Stapp	
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	SBW	
PA Primary Reviewer Name	NA	
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	NA	
CPUC Staff Project Manager	Peter Lai	
CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)	[Redacted]	
CPUC Staff Recommendation Marked "X":	[Redacted]	
	Application ready to proceed without exception	
x	Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted	
	Application rejected.	
	Application not ready for review, revised and resubmit as noted	
Action Number:	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Action Category
		Due Date
		PA Response

1	<p>The reviewer noted a minor issue with the EnergyPro model. From the reviewer: "the EPro model is missing the interior surfaces that connect conditioned zones with adjoining unconditioned zones. I did one of the larger zones as a test to see what effect it had on the final results. This cased showed only a minor effect, less than a 10% difference. So I noted there were minor EPro errors and left it for the SBD Team to properly complete their work."</p> <p>Please update the model as necessary to correc the issue. Thank you.</p>	Eligibility	N/A	<p>Barriers were added to the EnergyPro model to segregate the conditioned and unconditioned spaces in the model.</p> <p>Savings impact is negligilbe.</p>
2	<p>The roof insulation in the Epro model and noted on the Measures Inspection Checklist is R-19 batt and R-6 rigid. That matches sheet A-A714-B System Assembly List -Roof Assembly Type1, but not General Note #4 (R-30 batt) or detail 1 on sheet A-A811-B (R-11 batt). Can you specify what batt insulation will be installed on the roof? The model may need to be revised if incorrect and this would affect project percent energy savings relative to the 10% threshold required by SBD rules. If the proposed insulation value is R-11 as shown on one of the drawings, this could potentially drop the savings below the 10% threshold and render the project inelligible. This will need to be resolved before the project can proceed.</p>	Eligibility	N/A	<p>We reached out to the design team to verify the contradicting statements in the building plans. Since our initial review, there were updates to the building plans which clarified the insulation assemblies.</p> <p>The energypro models have been updated to reflect the updated building plans. As a result of the update, the energy savings and incentive values changed.</p>
	<p>The reviewer noted some additional model issues but does not believe addressing these issues would affect project eligibility. Please address these issues as part of model true-up post-construction. From the reviewer:</p> <p>A review of the resubmitted EnergyPro model found the following errors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the conditioned zones of this building are partially or wholly inside of an unconditioned superstructure. All zones must be edited to include necessary interior surfaces of walls and ceilings. The inputs for 			

3

interior surfaces (walls and ceilings) must be completed correctly. There were no "barriers" found in the model separating conditioned and unconditioned space. The proper element to separate conditioned and unconditioned spaces is Interior Surface, with properly identified Adjacent To assignments.

2. All unconditioned spaces must have the appropriate inputs for average seasonal temperatures for the Winter Indoor Temp and Summer Indoor Temp.
3. All elements of walls, ceilings, roof, and etc must have the values of the Layers tab match the JA4 tab.
4. The roof elements are not modeled properly as Metal Building, Standing Seam, R-30.
5. The ductless indoor units need to have the Distribution definitions corrected to ductless, where applicable. Example is FC-01.
6. The conditioned and unconditioned floor areas do not match between the PowerLogic lighting calc and the Epro model used for UTIL-1; therefore, the installed LPD results can't be used globally in the EPro model as "User Input LPD". The inputs should be changed to "Use Installed LPD".

Errors need to be corrected and the model reviewed before the final incentive is calculated.

input assumptions

Post-construction

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date
1	The resubmitted model has been reviewed. Based on updated results and documentation, the disposition has been changed to proceed with exceptions. The exceptions are based on issues with the resubmitted model discovered by the reviewer (see item (3) above). The project can proceed and these items should be addressed at model true-up.		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

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. 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>
Application not ready for review, revised and resubmit as noted	The application has deficiency in the supporting documentation and the PA has provided incomplete documentation. The complete documentation has been defined in the Statewide Custom Projects Guidance Document. Please note that this is not a final recommendation from CPUC staff. This recommendation is limited to two requests per application.