

## CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE_19_C_C_303 [REDACTED] WholeBldg
CMPA Directory Link	[REDACTED]
PA	SDGE
PA Application ID	[REDACTED]
PA Application Executed Date	7/10/2017
PA Program ID	SDGE3222
PA Program Name	SW-COM-Calculated Incentives-Savings by Design
PA Program Year	2017
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	2/25/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	10/29/2019
Second PA Upload	11/12/2019
Third PA Upload	N/A
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	Whole Building Incentive, Institutional Partnerships kWh Adder
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	Academic Office/Classroom
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)	
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	
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)	
CPUC Staff Recommendation Marked "X":	
x	Application ready to proceed without exception
	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

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date
1	NOTE: This disposition has been issued as a prospective review.	N/A	N/A
2	<p>There were errors found in the Epro file. Corrections were made and the model calc run again to get the following savings:</p> <p>██████  ██████  ██████  therms</p> <p>Corrections included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Proper assignment of AHU1-10-1.</li> <li>* Set CUP boiler efficiency to 1.0 to negate effect of CUP but count the energy the building takes from the CUP. Results give building energy use, not CUP energy use.</li> <li>* Several VAV zones had the wrong Occupancy setting. Matched up the correct occupancy type and occupant density.</li> <li>* Many of the zones of multiple floors had the wrong story identifier and did not create multiple levels.</li> </ul>	Analysis assumptions	N/A
3	Please provide a savings-weighted EUL for future SBD projects once CS has approved the savings-weighted EUL calculation methodology.	EUL/RUL	N/A
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"> <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>

<b>Application not ready for review, revised and resubmit as noted</b>	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.
--	---