

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 20 C R 495 PRJ - 02370256 WholeBldg
CMPA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/17241
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 02370256
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:	7/13/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	5/26/2020
Second PA Upload	6/16/2020
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	1.6
Bi-Monthly Upload Annual kWh Impacts	250,121.0
Bi-Monthly Upload Therm Impacts	16,556.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$315,000.00
Project Documentation kW Demand Reduction	
Project Documentation Annual kWh Impacts	
Project Documentation Annual Therm Impacts	
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:	Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted
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
----------------	--	-----------------	----------	-------------	---------------

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Submitted ECON-2, Epro models, and Savings Calculations spreadsheet do not have corresponding existing numbers. We ran the Epro models in version 7.2.7 and the numbers were closer but still off. Please correct discrepancies. •The only difference between the "existing conditions" between the two E-pro models appears to be LPD which starts at .22 w/sf and goes down to .09 W/sf. These are just the numbers of the common area lighting (per the savings calculation spreadsheet) and do not take into account the apartment LPD pre and post numbers, but they are applied to the total building sf, since they are not delineated in the Epro models. Please calculate the total LPD (common and apartments) and apply the pre and post # to the Epro models and then only count one row for lighting savings in the savings calculation spreadsheet. •The LPD numbers pre and post look too low to provide adequate lighting (especially the common areas). Please verify the LPD numbers are correct. •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. Due to the savings calculations not having corresponding numbers it is unclear if the savings calculated in Epro were not used. Verify these savings were only counted once. •The savings calculated from the pool and spa pumps are unrelated to the building energy use calculated with Epro. To get accurate savings the pre kWh and Therms need to be added to the baseline building energy use before the actual savings can be calculated. Please correct this in the savings spreadsheet. •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. Verify this is an acceptable savings calculation for apartments. •Submitted ECON-2 forms do not show any energy use for building heating. When the models were ran in version 7 heating energy is shown on the ECON-2 form. Please verify that the submitted ECON-2 results include building heating energy. 	Analysis assumptions	Model true-up		

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date	PA Response	ED Resolution

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>