

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 20 C R 493 PRJ - 02370030 WholeBldg
CPUC Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/17237
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 02370030
PA Application Executed Date	NA
PA Program ID	a0n3p000008fyAf
PA Program Name	Energy Upgrade California - Custom - Multifamily Upgrade
PA Program Year	
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	8/7/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	5/26/2020
Second PA Upload	6/30/2020
Third PA Upload	N/A
Fourth PA Upload	
Fifth PA Upload	
Sixth PA Upload	
Seventh PA Upload	
Eighth PA Upload	
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	NA
Bi-Monthly Upload kW Demand Reduction	17.1
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	325,162.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	20,138.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$149,036.00
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	17.1
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	325,162.0
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	20,138.0
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Name	
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Sugarpine
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	SBW
PA Primary Reviewer Name	
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	
CPUC Staff Project Manager	
CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)	
CPUC Staff Recommendation:	Prospective review disposition
For rejection, action required:	N/A
M&V Review:	Post M&V Review NOT Required

Action Number:	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action by the PA:	Action Category	Due Date	PA Response	ED Resolution

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date	PA Response	ED Resolution
1	Note: This disposition is being issued as a prospective review and is therefore advisory only.				
2	-We were unable to verify the existing windows were metal, single pane clear. Recommend verifying or correcting the baseline EnergyPro model.				
3	-All of the existing A19 fixtures are counted as containing 60 watt incandescent bulbs. It is very likely that, over the past 10+ years, many of those bulbs had been replaced with lower watt CFL or LED A19 bulbs. Existing CFLS or LEDs would produce a much lower pre kWh number resulting in a lower savings calculation. Recommend verifying the average existing bulb wattages in these A19 fixtures.				
4	-The savings from the wall insulation, windows, custom (low flow aerators, smart thermostats, and hw recirc) included in the Epro model and the software lumps their combined savings in the submitted ECON-2 report. They are then included as individual line items in the calculation spreadsheet. If the EneryPro model was run several times with each measure checked to determine the savings that is acceptable, however it is not apparent with the documentation submitted. Recommend verifying how the savings from individual measures was determined.				
5	-Due to the existing walls containing R-11 insulation Batts it is unlikely that the wall insulation will be upgraded. This would entail removing all the sheetrock in each apartment which does not look included in the scope of work. Recommend verifying insulation is being upgraded before awarding those savings credits.				
6	-The savings from the low flow aerators, smart thermostats, and pool recirc pumps are included in the Epro model as a Custom savings measure and are also added to the Savings Calculation spreadsheet separately. It is unclear if the savings calculated in Epro were used. Recommend verifying these savings were only counted once.				
7	-The working paper calculating energy savings by smart thermostats appears to be geared toward single family homes. It does not include per square foot savings calculations, so it is likely overestimating the savings achieved in apartments. Recommend verifying this is an acceptable savings calculation for apartments.				

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>