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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CPUC Comment | PA Response |
| The “Unit Energy Savings Calculation” paragraph on page 6, references the greenhouse heat curtain, should this be IR film? | Yes, this must have been accidentally carried over from the other workpaper. It has been corrected.  CPUC Accepted |
| In the Life Cycle section, heat curtain is mentioned instead of IR film. | This must have been accidentally carried over from the other workpaper. It has been corrected.  CPUC Accepted |
| Comment 10/19/2021: Using Virtual Grower 3 and the inputs provided, we were unable to recreate the savings in the workpaper. We tested three climate zones for the offering with gas unit heater HVAC and all showed less unit savings than the workpaper, by about 20-30%. (see attached) | When modeling the different HVAC types, our consultant noticed the virtual grower outputs were the same. We reached out to USDA and they informed us that the outputs of virtual grower are just for the system heating load and do not take into account system performance. In order to determine system performance, you need to divide the heating load by the system efficiency.  The outputs of virtual grower should be compared to the “Heat Load” tabs in the newly attached Simulation results reference file.  A section was added in the workpaper to describe the post processing calculations that were done to the data. |
| Comment 10/19/2021: Please provide models, secondary calculations, and backup documentation in the .zip file. | See Appendix B. Heat load Conversion in the newly attached reference file. |

