

## CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE_19_C_C_305	WholeBldg
COMPA Directory Link		
PA	SDGE	
PA Application ID		
PA Application Executed Date	9/11/2017	
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 COMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:		
First PA Upload	10/23/2019	
Second PA Upload	11/6/2019	
Third PA Upload	11/18/2019	
PA Measure Description(s):		
Measure 1	Systems - Exterior (LED) Lighting, Whole Building Incentive	
Measure 2		
Measure 3		
Measure 4		
Measure 5		
Measure 6		
Measure 7		
Measure 8		
Measure 9		
Measure 10		
PA Project Description:	Theater/ Administration/ Classroom Building	
PA Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction		
PA Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts		
PA Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts		
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$	
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	Sugarpine 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	<p>Review of the EnergyPro model revealed several modeling errors which were corrected by the CPUC reviewer. Updates to the model included: added missing exterior perimeter length to slab on grade elements; changed fully interior spaces from unconditioned to conditioned area; fixed several 2nd &amp; 3rd levels that mistakenly had exterior floors listed. The recalculated savings resulting from these corrections are [REDACTED] kWh, [REDACTED] kW and [REDACTED] therms. Note: not all rooms were included in the submitted model. Please make these corrections to the final post construction model and resubmit the final post-construction package for review.</p>	Analysis assumptions	Upon completion of post construction final model.	<p>We will need the updated EnergyPro model to validate the savings in the comment and obtain the incentive and percent better than Title-24 values.</p> <p>We agree with the changes made to the model and will contract with the changes made by the reviewers.</p>
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.
3	Estimated incremental cost data supplied for lighting system only. Please provide updated incremental measure costs based on post-installation review	Measure cost	Upon completion of post construction final review	Outdoor lighting line item will be removed from review which nullifies the comment.

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	Please include IEER along with the EER specs for packaged HVAC systems on the Proposed Building Measures and Inspection Checklist	Project review	N/A. Please include in future submittals	We are welcoming to the change; however this item will need further discussion on the upcoming biweekly call to identify the importance of this information.  We collect mechanical submittals at post and reconcile savings with updated efficiency values at that time.
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"> <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>
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.