

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE_19_C_C_358_WholeBldg
CMPA Directory Link	#N/A
PA	SDGE
PA Application ID	
PA Application Executed Date	06/15/2018
PA Program ID	SDGE3222
PA Program Name	SW-COM-Calculated Incentives-Savings by Design
PA Program Year	2018
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	4/7/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	12/17/2019
Second PA Upload	1/14/2020
Third PA Upload	3/20/2020
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	Whole Building Incentive
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	Medical Office 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 Fickel
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Sugarpine
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	Jeremy Stapp
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	SBW
PA Primary Reviewer Name	Kenny Lijestrom
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	0.0
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	PA Response	CPUC Response
	<p>The reviewer noted a number of modeling errors in the EnergyPro model. These errors need to be addressed before the project can be accepted. Please address and then re-check the project for eligibility.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The AHU/RTU ratings do not match the construction plans. 2. VAV ratings and capacities do not match the plans. 3. The domestic water heater is not UEF rated and is missing the standby loss value. Since per Title 20 a packaged boiler >300,000 Btuh has a required minimum rating of 82% efficiency, the specified boiler is not an EEM. 4. The Roof element in the model does not match the plans. It's not even the same type of construction. Also, the JA4 tab values must match the Layers tab values. 5. The Proposed Building Measures and Inspection Checklist call for a wood framed roof with R-30 roof attic and initial solar reflectance of 0.30. Per 2016 CEC section 140.3, none of those requested ratings meet the minimum prescriptive requirements. This is not an EEM. 6. The Slab-on-Grade elements are missing the Ext Perimeter lengths. 7. The rooms of the second and third floors have thier floor elements as raised floors, instead of Interior Surface floors. 8. The exterior wall elements do not match the plans. The JA4 tab values do not match the Lyaers tab values. The Inspection Checklist U-factor values for both wall types do not meet minimum prescriptive requirements for 2016 CEC 140.3. These are not EEMs. 9. The rooms have Interior Surfaces to link zones, but the Adjacent To spaces are not specified. The Floor Elevation is also not specified. 10. The model lists the Restroom/Janitor zone as unconditioned. Per 	Analysis assumptions	N/A	See 'Project 358 Disposition Response.pdf' for PA responses.	<p>Reviewer note:</p> <p>"PA submitted a response to the above notes on 3-30-2020 and has addressed most of the items appropriately. The energy model must be updated when as-built plans and submittals are available. The PA requested clarification on item 9, which is that when the energy model is being input it normally takes only a few seconds to input the Adjacent To link and it is a requirement for this input to be done in order to have a viable model. This can be done during the next update with as-built."</p>

	<p>2016 CEC 110.1 these areas are Indirectly Conditioned and must be counted as conditioned floor area. Enter the correct Zone Type on the Zone level.</p> <p>11. The AC/CU systems have the Distribution input as Ducted, instead of Ductless.</p> <p>12. The Inspection Checklist indicates glazing with 0.28 U-factor and 0.27 SHGC. The Preliminary Project Review indicates glazing as Solarban 60 & 70. The model input is Manufacturereed Product Type with NFRC Labeled 0.28 U-factor and 0.27 SHGC. Solarban 60 and 70 are actually listed with NFRC center-of-glass values and do not meet 2016 CEC 140.3 prescriptive minimums.</p>				<p>Based on reviewer findings, we are approving this project to move forward with the understanding that all outstanding issues are addressed at model true-up.</p>
	<p>A savings-weighted EUL needs to be provided for this project. Please provide once CS has agreed to the savings-weighted EUL calculation methodology.</p>	<p>EUL/RUL</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>We are removing this as a requirement until a savings-weighted EUL calculation methodology is established.</p>

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"> • 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.