

2018 SCREW-IN LED SAVINGS METHODS DISPOSITION – CORRECTED A-LAMP WATTAGE REDUCTIONS REVISION 1

California Public Utilities Commission, Energy Division

May 1, 2018

Corrections:

This is a correction to Table 1 in the Phase 1 disposition “2018ScrewInLampSavingsMethods-1March2018.pdf.” Wattage reductions in the original Phase 1 disposition are corrected according to the following table, column Titled “ Watts (Corrected)”:

EISA Bin	LPW	ΔWatts (Original Phase 1 Disposition Table 1)	ΔWatts (XL workbook) (note 1)	ΔWatts (Corrected)
40	80	0.7	0.8	<u>0.8</u>
	90	0.8	1.0	<u>1.0</u>
	100	1.0	1.1	<u>1.1</u>
	110	1.1	1.0	<u>1.2 (note 2)</u>
	120	1.5	1.5	1.5
60	90	1.3	1.3	1.3
	100	1.3	1.3	1.4
	110	1.5	1.5	1.5
	120	1.8	1.8	1.8
75	90	1.5	1.5	1.5
	100	1.7	1.7	1.7
	110	1.9	1.9	1.9
	120	2.3	2.3	2.3
100	90	1.7	2.0	<u>2.0</u>
	100	2.0	2.4	<u>2.4</u>
	110	2.4	2.6	<u>2.6</u>
	120	2.6	3.3	<u>3.3</u>

Notes:

1. Values from backup workbook issued with original Phase 1 disposition. See sheet “Product Analysis” in workbook “2018ScrewInLampDispositionBackup-21Dec2017-1.xlsm”
2. This value adjusted so that savings of the 110 lpw lamp are slightly larger than the 100 lpw lamp.

Given the timing of notice for the above corrections to A-Lamp savings, staff directs that all program administrators either remove the affected products from their offerings or update associated workpapers no later than 46 days (two week extension from the previous deadline) prior to the effective date of this correction, 7/1/2018.

Ex Ante Data and Use in Workpapers

Correct ex ante measure definitions and impacts are available in the Preliminary Ex Ante Review Database (PEARdb). The IDs for these measure definitions may be referenced in short form workpapers. Exact Measure IDs are required to be used in an individual PA's implementation records.

Background:

PG&E notified CPUC staff of the potential errors in the email repeated below. CPUC staff agrees that these are errors in Table 1 of the original disposition:

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: A Lamp Measure ID mismatch and potential savings difference
Date: Fri, 27 Apr 2018 20:45:01 +0000
From: Damodaran, Mini <S3DW@pge.com>
To: 'Pena, Bryan' <Bryan.Pena@cpuc.ca.gov>, Kevin Madison <kevinmadisonmeps@gmail.com>
CC: Liu, Henry <HFL3@pge.com>, Kwok, Randolph <RxKt@pge.com>, Wan, Linda <L2WE@pge.com>

Hello Commission Staff,

We noticed a discrepancy in the some of the new measure IDs in the stated delta watts:

For example: R-In-LED-A19(EISA-Bin-40w-80LPW)-dWP0p7

) We were planning to propose "Proposed: R-In-LED-A19(EISA-Bin-40w-80LPW)-dWP0p8". When calculating the energy using given wattage of 9w base case and 5.94w measure case from the tab "Product Analysis" in the 2018ScrewInLampDispositionBackup-21Dec2017-1.xlsm, the delta watt is

$$[(0.25*9w + 0.75*5.94w) - (5.94w)] = 0.8w$$
, which does not match the delta watt value of 0.7w in the measure ID.

) It also appears that the measure IDs matched what we were planning to propose but shifted up by a row for EISA-Bin-40w and EISA-Bin-100w as indicated in the red font in the yellow highlights in column O of the Product Analysis.

The "Product Analysis" tab has the table extracted from the 2018ScrewInLampDispositionBackup-21Dec2017-1.xlsm in the attached spreadsheet. Please confirm to us if our findings are correct.

Thank you,
Mini Damodaran, CEM, CDSM
Program Engineer
Deemed Product Support, PG&E
245 Market, 6th floor 620A