

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE_20_C_C_395 [REDACTED] Process
CPMPA Directory Link	[REDACTED]
PA	SDGE
PA Application ID	[REDACTED]
PA Application Executed Date	12/18/2019
PA Program ID	SDGE3220
PA Program Name	3220 - SW-COM-Calculated Incentives-Calc (EEBI)
PA Program Year	2019
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	5/12/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	2/6/2020
Second PA Upload	2/25/2020
Third PA Upload	#N/A
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	466416: Retrocommissioning - RCx (Building retro-commissioning)
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	Whole Building RCX
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)	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Approved Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	Dan Bertini
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	SBW Consulting
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	Pete Jacobs
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	BMI
PA Primary Reviewer Name	Gibson, James
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	SDG&E
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
1	Revise M&V plan to include: 1) how to handle NRE's, bad data, outliers, 2) how to track/identify participation in concurrent programs. 3) the sources and format for meter data and independent variables 4) GOF and FSU criteria. Several of these issues were addressed in the response to the supplemental data request, but please also include a discussion of these topics in the M&V plan.	M&V Plan	Prior to first year performance report
2	Please upload the results of the savings calculations for review at the conclusion of the first year performance period	Continue Document Upload	At conclusion of first year performance period
3	Project SPB with incentives > EUL. Add this test to the project review and provide documentation of an exception to the SPB eligibility rule. Note SPB incentives only < EUL.	Missing required information	Within 30 days of this disposition
4	Calculations to support the EEM-1 savings were not provided. Please include documentation of the upfront engineering estimates of savings for EEM-1	Missing required information	Within 30 days of this disposition
5	Gas impacts of kWh savings at the cogen plant accounted for but not documented. Please include the "Net Utility Savings Workbook" document.	Missing required information	Within 30 days of this disposition

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date
1	<p>Project uses a proprietary NMEC model. An independent analysis using ECAM provided similar MBE, CV(RMSE) and R^2 statistics for the baseline kWh model. The ECAM daily gas model provided higher CV(RMSE) of 29% v. 18% for the proprietary model. Both are within the GOF criteria established in the LBNL NMEC M&V Guidance document. Consider double-checking the gas CV(RMSE) calculations. Note: Engineering estimates of savings combined with ECAM GOF statistics predict an FSU of 2.6% for kWh and 37% for gas at 90% confidence.</p>	Other - FYI	N/A
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.