

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE_19_C_C_330 [REDACTED] WholeBldg
CMPA Directory Link	[REDACTED]
PA	SDGE
PA Application ID	[REDACTED]
PA Application Executed Date	2/25/2019
PA Program ID	SDGE3222
PA Program Name	SW-COM-Calculated Incentives-Savings by Design
PA Program Year	2019
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	2/19/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	11/26/2019
Second PA Upload	12/24/2019
Third PA Upload	N/A
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:	Education - Primary Campus
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	[REDACTED]
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
	<p>NOTE: This disposition has been issued as a prospective review.</p>	N/A	N/A
1	<p>A number of EnergyPro errors were notes by the reviewer. The reviewer ran a test model that corrected the majority of these errors, and savings increased.</p> <p>Reviewer notes: There are (4) models; 1 for each of the buildings A,B,C,&D. The errors are common to most of the models:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roof Aged solar reflectance is 0.63 according to the specifications No. CZ19-0971-42 Roofing 07 54 19-1 part 2.2.D. 2. Skylights are not made with SolarBan glass. Skylight spes are in SpecificationsNo. CZ19-0971-42 Metal Framed Skylights 08 63 00-6 part 2.3. EPro input should be updated and select Site-Built, Center Of Glass values and Fenestration Type Skylight w/Curb Plastic. 3. For window glazing select the proper Fenestration Type for each application, such as, "Curtainwall/Storefront". Type "Window" should be used only for single individual windows. 4. Verify the construction and insulation of the walls and be sure the JA4 tab results match the Layers tab. 5. Verify the construction and insulation of the roofs and be sure the JA4 tab results match the Layers tab. 6. Confirm if Demand Control Ventilation is being used or not. 7. Include doors on exterior walls. 8. Change the system Distribution to Ductless for all wall-mounted and ceiling-cassette ductless split units. 9. For systems under the Cooling tab check the Fan Heat Included, as it applies. 10. The conditioned area totals do not match between the lighting compliance calc and the whole building model calc, so the User Input LPD will not be accurate. 11. Solarban ratings are for Center-of-Glass, not overall NFRC. Glazing should be input as Curtainwall/Storefront, COG, Site-Built. 12. Confirm there is no domestic hot water being used in these buildings, or if it is used then input the water heater specs. 13. Confirm HVAC equipment ratings at the construction phase. Verify SEER, EER, IEER, HSPF, and COP values of all equipment. 	Calculation method	N/A

2	<p>The reviewer indicated that the following measure components do not exceed code:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fenestration Solarban 60 is COG rated. Which results in overall product ratings that are over the prescriptive max ratings for U-factor and SHGC. 2. The wall with R-19 in 6" metal framing and R-2.5 rigid is 0.13 U-factor, but prescriptive max is 0.069 U-factor. 	Analysis assumptions	N/A
3	A savings weighted EUL was not provided. Please provide this for future SBD projects.	EUL/RUL	N/A

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.
--	---