

CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	SCE 20 P C 430a [REDACTED]
CMPA Directory Link	#N/A
PA	SCE
PA Application ID	[REDACTED]
PA Application Executed Date	0
PA Program ID	SCE-13-L-003A
PA Program Name	[REDACTED]
PA Program Year	2019
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	9/17/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	8/4/2020
Second PA Upload	#N/A
Third PA Upload	#N/A
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	New Construction - Above Code Comprehensive Design - Overall Building Performance
Measure 2	
Measure 3	
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	New construction of two (2) high efficiency boilers, four (4) custom built-up VAV multi-zone air handling units, high efficiency LED, and new window glazing at college building
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)	
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	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Primary Reviewer Firm	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Name	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Review Supervisor Firm	[REDACTED]
PA Primary Reviewer Name	[REDACTED]
PA Primary Reviewer Firm	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Project Manager	[REDACTED]
CPUC Staff Policy Authorization (as needed)	
CPUC Staff Recommendation Marked "X":	
	Application ready to proceed without exception
	Application ready to proceed with exception(s), as noted
x	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	<p>Review found the following EnergyPro model input errors. Please correct before resubmitting the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *chiller system is incorrectly entered as "new." Building is connected to central plant loop which is a combination of new and existing chillers. Model building with existing central plant using the combined efficiency of new and existing equipment. *Submit chiller plant upgrade as a separate SBD project. 	Input assumptions	Prior to project re-submittal
2	<p>Review of EnergyPro DOE-2 input (*.doe) files from the non-compliance (Performance) runs found the following issues with the standard building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * EPro Proposed model has VAV system AHU without heat; standard model has VAV system with gas furnace at the air handler and ZONE-HEAT-SOURCE = HOT-WATER. The air handler furnace will not likely be used since zone level heating occurs at the VAV boxes. EPro defined a central boiler and a hot water loop with a HCIRC-HEAD = [REDACTED]; effectively setting the heating loop pumping energy to near zero. Apparent bug in EPro. Correct the standard building model to remove the air handler furnaces from the VAV systems and use the same HCIRC-HEAD as the Proposed building. * Standard building airflow << proposed building airflow, but cooling capacity is the same in all but one air handler. ACM requires airflow in the standard building on the order of 400 cfm/ton based on sizing run. Apparent EPro bug. Correct the standard building air flow to meet ACM requirements. * Reduced LPD and high performance glazing should reduce peak cooling loads, but cooling capacity is identical in all but one air handle in the Standard and Proposed buildings. Apparent bug in EPro sizing calculations. Conduct a sizing run for the standard building and correct sizing as necessary. 	Calculation Method	Prior to project re-submittal

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	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.