

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SDGE_20_C_C_421 [REDACTED] WholeBldg
CMPA Directory Link	[REDACTED]
PA	SDGE
PA Application ID	[REDACTED]
PA Application Executed Date	02/22/2017
PA Program ID	SDGE3222
PA Program Name	SW-COM-Calculated Incentives-Savings by Design
PA Program Year	2017
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	4/16/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	[REDACTED]
First PA Upload	3/3/2020
Second PA Upload	N/A
Third PA Upload	N/A
PA Measure Description(s):	[REDACTED]
Measure 1	Systems - HVAC, Systems - Interior (LED) Lighting, Systems - Low SHGC Glass Systems, Natural Gas Water Heating, Whole Building Envelope
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	9-12 Education Center
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)	
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	Louis Van Blarigan
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Sugarpine
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	Jeremy Stapp
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	SBW
PA Primary Reviewer Name	0.0
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	0.0
CPUC Staff Project Manager	Peter Lai
CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)	
CPUC Staff Recommendation Marked "X":	[REDACTED]
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
	<p>Note that the disposition due date of 4/15/20 has been exceeded, and therefore we are issuing this as a prospective disposition. Direction is advisory only but does apply to all future projects.</p>		N/A
	<p>This site is made up of seven different buildings, each using their own energy model. The PV impact analysis was done at the individual building level, but because all seven buildings are on the same meter the correct approach is to do this at the site level. This will likely yield better results.</p>		N/A
	<p>The reviewer noted a number of issues with the EnergyPro models. Given that the % savings above T24 is higher for this project (24.6%), we feel there is a low risk of falling below the 10% savings threshold once the model issues addressed. These issues may be addressed at the model true-up stage.</p> <p>From the reviewer: Several fundamental errors have been identified that are pervasive through all models: *roof 2" deck w/ 2" LW concrete+3" insulation: location of the foam layer is on the inside on the "layers" description, and on the outside in the JA4 description. Moreover, the claimed amount of insulative value is different between the layers and JA4 descriptions. Both layers and JA4 descriptions of the assembly need to be consistent with the actual assembly. *slab exterior perimeters have been neglected in many rooms *orientation has been neglected on many walls and should be double checked *window glass has been provided as "Center of Glass" values, but has been entered into the model as "NFRC listed" assembly values. The glazing should be indicated as "Center of Glass" *exhaust fans have been neglected and need to be added to model *When unknown or unspecified, IEER should be entered as equal to the EER, not the SEER *kitchen hood needs to be added to model in building F, room 104.</p>	<p>Issue with parameter assumptions</p>	N/A



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	<p>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.</p>
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.
--	---