## **CPUC Staff Ex Ante Review**

CPUC Staff Project ID Number	PGE 19 C C 348 PRJ - 01983209 HVAC
CMPA Directory Link	https://deeresources.info/accounts/login?next=/cmpa/projects/15857
PA	PGE
PA Application ID	PRJ - 01983209
PA Application Executed Date	10/01/2019
PA Program ID	PGE211025
PA Program Name	Savings by Design (SBD) - Savings by Design Whole Building
PA Program Year	2019
Date of CPUC Staff Review:	4/7/2020
PA CMPA Upload Dates Included in this review:	
First PA Upload	12/31/2019
Second PA Upload	3/5/2020
Third PA Upload	N/A
PA Measure Description(s):	
Measure 1	INTEGRATED BUILDING-NONRES/RES-DESIGN TEAM-INITIAL PAYMENT
Measure 2	INTEGRATED BUILDING-NONRES/RES-DESIGN TEAM-FINAL PAYMENT
Measure 3	INTEGRATED BUILDING-NONRES-WHOLE BUILDING APPROACH
Measure 4	
Measure 5	
Measure 6	
Measure 7	
Measure 8	
Measure 9	
Measure 10	
PA Project Description:	New Construction Middle school of 117,520 sf which includes 5 buildings.
PA Ex Ante kW Demand Reduction	59.9
PA Ex Ante Annual kWh Impacts	174,769.0
PA Ex Ante Annual Therm Impacts	5,539.0
PA Proposed Incentive \$ (to Customer)	\$46,862.32
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	
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 Marked "X":		
х	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
	A review of the EnergyPro model found the following concerns:  1. Some rooms are missing the lights. Some rooms have lights that are still undefined.  2. Many of the Zones, under the Lighting tab have the wrong checkbox	
	for Proposed Lighting. These should all be marked "Use Installed LPD".  3. The roof construction should be "Metal Framed Rafter" not "Metal Building". Metal Building components are reserved for pre-fab metal buildings only.	
1	1 Inculation values need to be undated based on as-huilts as soon as	Analysis assumntions

	available (note that we do not necessarily expect as-builts to be available during CPR, but are noting this here to ensure this is done during model true-up).  5. Solarban 70 U-factor and SHGC ratings are center of glass, not NFRC product ratings. The fenestration Product Type is Site-Built, Center of Glass ratings, Frame type = Metal, Fenestration Type is either Window or Curtainwall, depending on how they're installed.	Anteryala essentificionia
2	The reviewer indicated that the envelope portion of the project does not appear to exceed code. Reviewer concerns: "The EEM for envelope included wall with metal stud and R-25 batt resulting in 0.144 U-factor. Prescriptive is 0.062 U-factor. Also the roof EEM is "R-30 Roofing", with no other description of the construction. The SDR for wall and roof construction was not provided, so there is no way to know if the R-30 is Batt or Rigid. Batt would fail by a lot, Rigid would be slightly better than prescriptive. The model also was using "Metal Building" components instead of the proper "Metal Framing" components. That greatly changes the standard model."	Analysis assumptions

3	Since the total percent savings are 11% (only slightly above the 10% eligibility threshold), we are requesting the model be updated and savings percentage re-checked to ensure the 10% savings threshold is still met after these concerns are addressed.	Eligibility
---	--	-------------

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