

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE_19_C_C_304 [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:	12/24/2019			
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:				
First PA Upload	10/25/2019			
Second PA Upload	11/8/2019			
Third PA Upload	11/25/2019			
PA Measure Description(s):	Whole Building Incentive, Institutional Partnerships kWh Adder, Systems [REDACTED] (N=150)			
Measure 1				
Measure 2				
Measure 3				
Measure 4				
Measure 5				
Measure 6				
Measure 7				
Measure 8				
Measure 9				
Measure 10				
PA Project Description:	Dining Hall			
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 Fickle			
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Sugar Pine Engineering			
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	Pete Jacobs			
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	BMI			
PA Primary Reviewer Name	Kenny L			
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	SDGE			
CPUC Staff Project Manager	Peter Lai CPUC/Energy Division			
CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)				
CPUC Staff Recommendation Marked "X":				
	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	EnergyPro model based on 50% CD plans. Several details were not available for review. The CPUC reviewer noted several errors in the EnergyPro model. Please submit the final post-construction EnergyPro model for review.	Analysis assumptions	Upon completion of the post-construction model	We will comply with the comment.
2	Please provide savings weighted EUL for the project	EUL/RUL	Upon completion of post construction final model.	This item will need further discussion on the upcoming biweekly call to identify the importance of this information.

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date	PA Response
1	Along with Epro input (.bld) file, please also include the output (.sim) and input (.doe) files that correspond to the UTIL-1 report	EnergyPro model submittal	N/A. Please include in future submittals	Will comply on future projects with Standard and Proposed NC DOE and sim files.
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.