

## CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 20 P C 461 PRJ - 02260932 Lighting				
CMPA Directory Link	<a href="https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/">https://deeresources.info/cmpa/projects/</a>				
PA	PGE				
PA Application ID	PRJ - 02260932				
PA Application Executed Date	0				
PA Program ID	PGE211009				
PA Program Name	East Bay Energy Watch LGEAR				
PA Program Year	1900				
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	5/28/2020				
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:					
First PA Upload	4/14/2020				
Second PA Upload	N/A				
Third PA Upload	N/A				
PA Measure Description(s):					
Measure 1	Lighting Retrofit/New-Interior LED Highbay				
Measure 2	Lighting Retrofit/New-Interior LED Highbay				
Measure 3					
Measure 4					
Measure 5					
Measure 6					
Measure 7					
Measure 8					
Measure 9					
Measure 10					
PA Project Description:	0				
PA Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	4.3				
PA Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	34,293.4				
PA Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	-388.4				
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$4,760.05				
PA Proposed Total Payment to Implementer \$ (not to include the above incentive to customer)	0				
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					
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	Energy 350				
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name					
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	SBW Consulting				
PA Primary Reviewer Name					
PA Primary Reviewer Firm					
CPUC Staff Project Manager					
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
1	Manufacturing Light Industrial (MLI) building type is used in submitted calculations, however, this seems to be a storage facility. Please explain why MLI building type is more appropriate than SCn or SUN building types.	Analysis assumptions	within one month of this disposition	In response to the exception in the approved disposition for this project, our 3P implementer provided a response to the request as follows: "The customer receives wine (with fork lift) from various wineries, repackages them on site, then uses fork lift again when shipping out to sell to restaurants and retail. Staff is working continuously inside the facility during business hours. So the facility is not a storage, but a light industrial process site	Application ready to proceed without exception

Note or Instruction Number:	CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions:	Instruction Category	Due Date		
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

