

## CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE_19_C_C_318 [REDACTED] WholeBldg
CMPA Directory Link	[REDACTED]
PA	SDGE
PA Application ID	[REDACTED]
PA Application Executed Date	10/18/2018
PA Program ID	SDGE3222
PA Program Name	SW-COM-Calculated Incentives-Savings by Design
PA Program Year	2018
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	1/7/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	[REDACTED]
First PA Upload	11/14/2019
Second PA Upload	#N/A
Third PA Upload	#N/A
PA Measure Description(s):	[REDACTED]
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:	Office
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	Revise simulation model as directed below
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	Revise simulation model as directed below
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	Revise simulation model as directed below
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	Erik Kolderup
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Kolderup Engineering
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	Pete Jacobs
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	BMI
PA Primary Reviewer Name	Jessie Wang
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":	[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
1	Note in file indicates PV system will be installed prior to project completion. Conduct non-IOU fuel analysis as part of post installation inspection before finalizing incentive.	Self generation	
2	Conduct a savings weighted EUL calculation and simple payback analysis to verify SPB < EUL	Missing required information	
3	EnergyPro simulation of VRF system does not follow the SBD Simulation Protocol Guidance: "Variable refrigerant flow (VRF) HVAC systems shall be modeled as a minimally-compliant heat pump in both the Baseline Case and the Proposed Case, for both the SBD Eligibility Simulation and SBD Performance Simulation." System efficiency in the proposed building exceeds the standard building, causing an incorrect simulation of energy savings. Correct the software or input file to model minimally code compliant systems in both the proposed and standard buildings.	Calculation method	
4	EnergyPro is using the identical HVAC airflow and capacity in the standard building model as in the proposed building model. The SBD guidance states that standard building HVAC system should be re-sized based on specific sizing rules. Please resize the standard building HVAC system according to the SBD Simulation Protocol Guidance before finalizing incentives.	Calculation method	
5	Cost was claimed for roof insulation above deck, which is not included in plans. Remove \$288,486 cost attributed to roof insulation from project incremental cost.	Measure cost	
6	An error in window performance inputs to EnergyPro was noted. The SHGC should be changed from 0.39 to 0.30 and the U-factor should be changed from 0.29 overall to 0.29 center of glass. Please correct this error and re-run the model before finalizing incentives.	Analysis assumptions	

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date
1			
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"> <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.
------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------