

UT Austin

Campus - Final Review Report

Re-certification Level: Platinum April 24, 2020

CERTIFICATION

The PEER v2 Rating System consists of five required prerequisites and 31 credits totaling 110 points. The PEER Rating System is framework for identifying, implementing, and measuring sustainable power delivery and environmental impact reduction. The five prerequisites within the rating system are required and therefore are not assigned a point value. Credits are optional which provide projects flexibility in selecting a target certification level that is appropriate and achievable. Certification under the PEER v2 Rating System is awarded according to the following scale:

| PEER V2 CERTIFICATION LEVELS | TOTAL POINTS - 110 |
|------------------------------|--------------------|
| Certified | 40-49 points |
| Silver | 50- 59 points |
| Gold | 60 - 79 points |
| Platinum | 80 or more points |

REVIEW REPORT

This report contains the results of the technical review of an application for PEER certification submitted for the specified project. PEER certification is an official recognition that a project complies with the requirements prescribed within the PEER v2 rating system. The PEER certification program is administered by the Green Business Certification Inc. (GBCI). Each prerequisite and credit will be evaluated twice, a preliminary and final review.

HOW TO INTERPRET THIS REPORT

Each prerequisite and attempted credit will have a ruling listed adjacent to each review comment.

- Awarded: The project has provided the required documentation to demonstrate compliance with a prerequisite or a credit, achieving the associated points.
- Not Awarded: The project has attempted a prerequisite or credit but have documentation requirements that have not been met.
- Not Attempted: The project has not attempted a prerequisite or credit.
- Possible: The maximum achievable points under each credit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1. | RELIABILITY AND RESILIENCE | 5 |
|----|--------------------------------------|------|
| 2. | ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND ENVIRONMENT | 7 |
| 3. | OPERATIONS, MANAGEMENT AND SAFETY | .10 |
| 4. | GRID SERVICES | . 12 |
| 5. | INNOVATION AND EXEMPLARY PERFORMANCE | .14 |
| 6. | REGIONAL PRIORITY | .16 |

PEER SCORECARD FOR PROJECT: UT Austin

Project ID 1000105438

Project Type Campus

Project Registration Date 11/03/2015

PBER

PEER V2 : Campus

| NOT ATTEMPTED | 16 | NOT | 12 | AWARDED | 82 | OF 110 POINTS |
|---------------|----|---------|----|---------|----|---------------|
| | | AWARDED | | | | |

| | | Awarded | Not Awarded / Not Attempted | Possible |
|------------|--|---------|--------------------------------------|----------|
| - | Reliability and Resiliency | 23 | 7 | 30 |
| Prereq | Reliability Performance Monitoring | Υ | - | Req |
| Credit | Reliability Performance Assessment | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Credit | Momentary Interruption Tracking | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Credit | Damage and Exposure Prevention | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Credit | Distribution Redundancy and Auto Restoration | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Credit | Alternative Source of Supply | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Credit | Power Surety and Resiliency | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Credit | Power Quality Capabilities | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| all . | Energy Efficiency and Environment | 17 | 10 | 27 |
| Prereq | Environmental Performance Disclosure | Υ | - | Req |
| Prereq | System Energy Efficiency Coefficient Disclosure | Υ | - | Req |
| Credit | Environmental Performance Improvement | 7 | 3 | 10 |
| Credit | System Energy Efficiency Coefficient Improvement | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Credit | Renewable Power and Carbon Offset | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Credit | Distributed Energy Resources | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Credit | Environmental Impacts Assessment, Disclosure and Management | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| \bigcirc | Operations, Management and | 00 | | مما |
| | Safety | 20 | 3 | 23 |
| Prereq | Triple Bottom Line Analysis | Υ | - | Req |
| Credit | Risk Assessment and Mitigation | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Credit | Emergency Response Planning | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Credit | Safety Review Process | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Credit | Operational Processes | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Credit | Advanced Metering Infrastructure | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Credit | Master Controller | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Credit | Communication Network and Information Processing | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Credit | Energy Management System | 0 | 2 | 2 |

| | | Awarded | Not Awarded / Not Attempted | Possible |
|----------|---|---------|--------------------------------------|----------|
| ∞ | Grid Services | 15 | 5 | 20 |
| Prereq | Customer and Load Survey | Υ | - | Req |
| Credit | Load Duration Curve Optimization | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Credit | Data Privacy and Cybersecurity | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Credit | Access to Energy Usage Data | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Credit | Supply Choice | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Credit | Demand-side Management | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Credit | Demand Response | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Credit | Other Tools and Financial Incentives | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Credit | Aggregation | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Credit | Advanced External Interface | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| ď | Innovation and Exemplary Performance | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Credit | Innovation 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Credit | Innovation 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Credit | Education | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Credit | Damage Exposure and Prevention: Option 3 : Undergrounding (Exemplary) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Credit | Risk Assessment and Mitigation (Exemplary) | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Credit | Exemplary Performance 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| ٥ | Regional Priority | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Credit | Distribution Redundancy and Auto Restoration. | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Credit | Emergency Response Planning | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Credit | Demand Response | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Credit | Environmental Performance Improvement | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL S | SCORE | 82 | 28 | 110 |

-W- RELIABILITY AND RESILIENCY

| | AWARDED | NOT AWARDED/ NOT ATTEMPTED | POSSIBLE |
|---|---------|----------------------------------|----------|
| RELIABILITY AND RESILIENCY | 23 | 7 | 30 |
| Prerequisite: Reliability Performance Monitoring | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. | | | |
| The documentation confirms that the existing infrastructure can continuously monitor and record interruptions as per the standard database structure. | Υ | - | Required |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. | | | |
| Credit: Reliability Performance Assessment | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (4 Points) | | | |
| The project metrics for SAIDI – 11.1 minutes, SAIFI- 0.09 meets the threshold level required to achieve 4 points. | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Not Attempted. (2 Points) | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (4 Points) | | | |
| Not Attempted. (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Momentary Interruption Tracking | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Report Momentary Interruptions (1 Point) | 1 | | 1 |
| The project's momentary interruptions metric MAIFI is 0 minutes. | 1 | - | I |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Report Momentary Interruptions (1 Point) | | | |
| Credit: Damage and Exposure Prevention | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. Option 1: External Damage Prevention (1 Point) | | | |
| The supporting documentation does not demonstrate that the project has implemented preventive measures for avoiding infrastructure damage and service interruption from external risks such as tree contact, animal, vehicular, fire and weather. | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Provide the documents for the preventive measures implemented for avoiding infrastructure damage and service interruption due to external risks. | | | |
| Not Awarded. Option 2: Power System Hardening (3 Points) | | | |

| The supporting documentation does not demonstrate any design considerations and/or infrastructure to harden power systems against flooding, storms, and other extreme events. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Provide the documents/ specifications for the design strategies and/or infrastructure implemented to harden the power system from flooding, storm, and earthquakes. | | | |
| Awarded. Option 3: Undergrounding (2 Points) | | | |
| The documentation demonstrates that 100 % of project's electrical distribution network (cabling) is underground. | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: External Damage Prevention (1 Point) | | | |
| The documentation demonstrates that the project has implemented preventive measures for avoiding infrastructure damage and service interruption from external risks. | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Power System Hardening (2 Points) | | | |
| The documentation demonstrates that the project has considered the design strategies to harden the power system from flooding, and storm. | | | |
| Not Awarded. Option 2: Power System Hardening (1 Point) - Seismic Protection. | | | |
| The supporting documentation does not demonstrate any design considerations and/or infrastructure to harden power systems against earthquakes. | | | |
| Awarded. Option 3: Undergrounding (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Distribution Redundancy and Auto Restoration | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| The supporting documentation demonstrates compliance by achieving circuit protection threshold of 100%. | 2 | - | 2 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Alternative Source of Supply | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Alternative Supply (2 Points) | | | |
| The supporting documentation demonstrates compliance by achieving the maximum threshold limit of 81% for the alternate supply provision. | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Transfer Controls (3 Points) | 5 | _ | 5 |
| The documentation confirms that the project has advance capabilities of seamless transfer and ride-through to transfer control from grid-connected mode to complete or partial island mode and start again. | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Alternative Supply (2 Points) | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Transfer Controls (3 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Power Surety and Resilience | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | _ | |

| Awarded. (3 Points) The documentation demonstrates that the project has identified critical & emergency services and complied with Step 1 and Step 2 requirements. Not Awarded Step 3. (1 Point) The supporting documentation does not provide the fuel storage |
|--|
| emergency services and complied with Step 1 and Step 2 requirements. Not Awarded Step 3. (1 Point) The supporting documentation does not provide the fuel storage |
| The supporting documentation does not provide the fuel storage |
| |
| calculations to meet the minimum daily runtime for 1 week or greater for essential services/ loads. |
| Provide the documents/ calculations for fuel storage to meet minimum daily runtime for 1 week or greater for essential services/ loads. |
| Not Attempted. Step 4 (1 Point) |
| Final Review Comment: |
| Awarded. (3 Points) |
| Not Awarded Step 3. (1 Point) |
| The supporting documentation does not provide sufficient details on the fuel storage calculations to meet the minimum daily runtime for 1 week or greater for essential services/ loads. |
| Not Attempted. Step 4 (1 Point) |
| Credit: Power Quality Capabilities |
| Preliminary Review Comment: |
| Awarded. Option 1: Power Quality Assessment (1 Point) |
| The documentation confirms that the project has performed the power quality audit as per the requirements. |
| Not Awarded. Option 2: Continuous Power Quality Monitoring (2 Points) |
| The supporting documentation does not provide details on the power quality monitoring capability at all points of utility connection, and network locations identified in power quality audit report. |
| Provide the documentation/ specifications for locations of power quality monitoring infrastructure (at all points of utility connection, and network locations identified in power quality audit), and the specification /data sheet for the equipment used for continually monitoring the power quality events. |
| Awarded. Option 3: Power Quality Improvement (2 Points). |
| The documentation demonstrates that the project has the infrastructure for power quality improvement. |
| Final Review Comment: |
| Awarded. Option 1: Power Quality Assessment (1 Point) |
| Not Awarded. Option 2: Continuous Power Quality Monitoring (2 Points) |
| Awarded. Option 3: Power Quality Improvement (2 Points). |



| | AWARDED | NOT AWARDED/ NOT ATTEMPTED | POSSIBLE |
|---|---------|----------------------------------|----------|
| ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND ENVIRONMENT | 17 | 10 | 27 |
| Prerequisite: Environmental Performance Disclosure | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. | | | |
| The supporting documentation does not provide the emission testing reports for local CHP generation system. | | | |
| Provide the stack emission test / emissions testing report with the CO_2 , NO_x , and SO_2 emission values for the CHP generation system. | Y | - | Required |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. | | | |
| The data, methodology, and calculations for Environmental Performance were disclosed. | | | |
| Prerequisite: System Energy Efficiency Coefficient Disclosure | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. | | | |
| The supporting documentation does not provide detailed break up for the values considered for the SEEC calculator. | | | |
| Provide the data / documentation for the monthly consumption, local generation along with the break-up of customer electricity loads, customer cooling (electricity used for chillers), and customer heating (steam generated). | Y | - | Required |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. | | | |
| The data, methodology, and calculations for System Energy Efficiency Coefficient were disclosed. | | | |
| Credit: Environmental Performance Improvement | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. (7 Points) | | | |
| The supporting documentation does not provide the emission testing reports for local CHP generation system. | 7 | 3 | 10 |
| Provide the stack emission test / emissions testing report with the CO ₂ , NO _x , and SO ₂ emission values for the CHP generation system. | | | 10 |
| Not Attempted. (3 Points) | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (7 Points) | | | |

| The data, methodology, and calculations provided for Environmental Performance are complete and accurate. The project has achieved an EE Index score of 72. | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Not Attempted. (3 Points) | | | |
| Credit: System Energy Efficiency Coefficient Improvement | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. (3 Points) | | | |
| The supporting documentation does not provide detailed break up for the values considered for the SEEC calculator. | | | |
| Provide the data / documentation for the monthly consumption, local generation along with the break-up of customer electricity loads, customer cooling (electricity used for chillers), and customer heating (steam generated). | - | 3 | 3 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. (3 Points) | | | |
| The supporting documentation provided - consisting of electricity generation values mentioned in the document "Nick Data Request and Turbine" and electricity consumption values in the document "Consumption Analysis for PEER" - do not match. | | | |
| Credit: Renewable Energy and Carbon Offsets | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Attempted. (4 Points) | - | 4 | 4 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Attempted. (4 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Distributed Energy Resources | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Local Renewables and Clean Generation (2 points). | | | |
| The supporting documentation demonstrates compliance by achieving the maximum threshold limit of 100 % for the clean generation. | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Local Energy Storage (1 Point). | | | |
| The documentation demonstrates that the project has a thermal energy storage (for storing the chilled water) of 9.1 million gallons for distributing the chilled water to customers. | 5 | _ | 5 |
| Awarded. Option 4: District Energy System (2 Points) | | | |
| The supporting documentation demonstrates compliance by achieving the maximum threshold limit of 300% for supplying project's electrical load, cooling load, and heating loads through District Energy System. | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Local Renewables and Clean Generation (2 points). | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Local Energy Storage (1 Point). | | | |
| Awarded. Option 4: District Energy System (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Environmental Impact Disclosure and Management | 5 | _ | 5 |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | _ | 5 |

Awarded. (2 Points)

The submitted documentation demonstrates that the project has tracking mechanisms in place for recording the number of trees cut or trimmed, and wildlife disturbed during project construction and operation. Also provided the details on type and total land used.

Not Awarded. (3 Points)

The submitted documentation does not provide the programs and policies in place for tree trimming and animal protection. Additionally, no details on testing, and tracking mechanisms for noise levels from the local generation.

To achieve additional points provide the documentation on tree trimming and animal protection policies, and noise level testing report for the local generation.

Final Review Comment:

Awarded. (5 Points)

The submitted documentation provides details on the programs and policies in place for tree trimming and animal protection and for testing and tracking mechanisms of noise levels from the local generation.

OPERATIONS, MANAGEMENT AND SAFETY

| | AWARDED | NOT AWARDED/ NOT ATTEMPTED | POSSIBLE |
|--|---------|----------------------------------|----------|
| OPERATIONS, MANAGEMENT AND SAFETY | 20 | 3 | 23 |
| Prerequisite: Triple-Bottom-Line Analysis | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that the project has performed the TBL analysis for the below systems. | | | |
| Onsite Generation and Storage Systems- Thermal energy storage Asset Maintenance System - Retrofitting the chiller 3. Demand Side Management - Installing the VFDs and implementing optimum energy loop control strategy on chilling station 3 & 5. | Y | - | Required |
| Implementation of above strategies the project has reduced annual energy cost by \$ 882,891, and the strategies helped the project in mitigating 9,519 tons of carbon emissions annually. | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. | | | |
| Credit: Risk Assessment and Mitigation | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (4 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation confirms that the project has performed risk assessment and mitigation plans for the critical assets. | 4 | - | 4 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (4 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Emergency Response Planning | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (3 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with the emergency response plan credit requirements. | 3 | - | 3 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (3 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Safety Review Process | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation confirms that the project has ensured the generation and distribution systems are built and operated safely. | 2 | - | 2 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |

| Credit: Operational Processes | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Waste Identification and Elimination (2 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that the project has preventive maintenance, predictive maintenance programs, and performed the life cycle cost approach for critical assets. | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Failure Identification and Elimination process (2 Points) | 4 | - | 4 |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that the project has a formal process for identifying and reducing failures. | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Waste Identification and Elimination (2 Points) | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Failure Identification and Elimination process (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Advanced Metering Infrastructure | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation does not demonstrate the advanced metering infrastructure requirements. | | | |
| Provide the data sheets and locations of the advanced meters and provide the missing file in the Dropbox: <u>ELV. Missions</u> mentioned in the reference section. | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Not Attempted. (1 Point) | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| Not Attempted. (1 Point) - Net-Metering requirement. | | | |
| Credit: Master Controller | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded (3 Points). | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that the Master Controller capabilities are in compliance with the requirements. | 3 | - | 3 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded (3 Points). | | | |
| Credit: Communication Network and Information Processing | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that the Communication network and data acquisition systems are in compliance with the requirements. | 2 | - | 2 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Energy Management System | - | 2 | 2 |
| | | | |

| Preliminary Review Comment: | | |
|---|--|--|
| Not Awarded (2 Points). | | |
| The documentation submission for this credit is missing. Kindly provide a narrative on the percentage of buildings with BAS/EMS with percentage of break up for type A, B, C & D. | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | |
| Not Awarded (2 Points). | | |

∞ GRID SERVICES

| | AWARDED | NOT AWARDED/ NOT ATTEMPTED | POSSIBLE |
|---|---------|----------------------------------|----------|
| GRID SERVICES | 15 | 5 | 20 |
| Prerequisite: Customer and Load Survey | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. Load Survey | | | |
| The submitted documentation does not provide detailed information about the Load survey as per the guidelines and methodology. | | | |
| Provide the narrative / documentation for "HanAra Prism" Historian. | | | |
| Not Awarded. Customer Survey | | | |
| The submitted documentation does not provide detailed information about the customer survey framework. | ., | | |
| Provide the narrative for the customer survey frame work, sample questionnaire shared with customer, and the overall customer satisfactory index. | Y | - | Required |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Load Survey | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with load survey guidelines and methodology. | | | |
| Awarded. Customer Survey | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with customer survey guidelines and methodology. | | | |
| Credit: Load Duration Curve Optimization | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that the project's annual load duration percentage of peak is 62%. | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Not Attempted. (2 Points) | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| Not Attempted. (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Data Privacy and Cybersecurity | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Cybersecurity (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that cyber security policy measures are in place to address cybersecurity threats. | 1 | - | 1 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Cybersecurity (1 Point) | | | |

| Credit: Access to Energy Usage Data | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (4 Points) | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Effective Data Sharing Practices (2 points) | | | |
| The documentation demonstrates that the project's online platform is effectively sharing the energy usage data. | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Energy Usage Feedback Quality (2 points)-Level 2 | 4 | - | 4 |
| The documentation demonstrates that the project's online platform is providing near real-time energy usage data with the customers. | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (4 Points) | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Effective Data Sharing Practices (2 points) | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Energy Usage Feedback Quality (2 points)-Level 2 | | | |
| Credit: Supply Choice | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Case 1: Supply Choice Available (2 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation confirms that the project offers supply choice by providing more than one power supplier to all tenants. | 2 | - | 2 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Case 1: Supply Choice Available (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Demand-Side Management | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Energy Conservation (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that the project has implemented energy conservation measures for reducing energy consumption. | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Load Management (2 Points) | 3 | - | 3 |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that the project has infrastructure which supports both dynamic tariff scheme offered by utility, and load management programs (Energy storage and Load shifting). | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Option 1: Energy Conservation (1 Point) | | | |
| Awarded. Option 2: Load Management (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Demand Response | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Case 1: Demand Response Available (2 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates that the project has infrastructure with a demand response program in place. | 2 | _ | 2 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Case 1: Demand Response Available (2 Points) | | | |
| Credit: Other Tools and Financial Incentives | 1 | - | 1 |
| | | | |

| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Awarded. (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with the Other Tools and Financial Incentives credit requirements. | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. (1 Point) | | | |
| Credit: Aggregation | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation does not demonstrate compliance with the Aggregation credit requirements. | _ | 1 | 1 |
| Provide the percentage of customers covered by aggregation options, with a narrative explaining how the values were determined. | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. (1 Point) | | | |
| Credit: Advanced External Interface | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| The submitted documentation does not demonstrate minimum capability of the master controller for receiving a remote dispatch signal or a demand response signal from local utility or ISO or RTO. | - | 2 | 2 |
| Provide the narrative of Information exchange interface functions and capabilities in compliance with the advanced external interface credit requirements. | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Awarded. (2 Points) | | | |
| | | | |

INNOVATION AND EXEMPLARY PERFORMANCE

| | AWARDED | NOT AWARDED/ NOT ATTEMPTED | POSSIBLE |
|--|---------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| INNOVATION AND EXEMPLARY PERFORMANCE | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Innovation 1: | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Attempted. (1 Point) | - | 1 | 1 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Attempted. (1 Point) | | | |
| Innovation 2: | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Attempted. (1 Point) | - | 1 | 1 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Attempted. (1 Point) | | | |
| Education: Participation in Workshop | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. | 1 | _ | 1 |
| The project team has participated in the PEER introduction workshop. | ' | | ' |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. | | | |
| Exemplary performance 1: | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Damage & Exposure Prevention: Option 3: Undergrounding (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with the requirements. The project has achieved an extra point for the exceptional performance of achieving 100% of distribution cables undergrounded. | 1 | - | 1 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Damage & Exposure Prevention: Option 3: Undergrounding (1 Point) | | | |

| Exemplary performance 2: | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Risk Assessment and Mitigation: (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with the requirement. The project has achieved an extra point for exceptional performance by achieving eight risk events across four criteria. | 1 | - | 1 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Risk Assessment and Mitigation: (1 Point) | | | |
| Exemplary performance 3: | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Attempted. (1 Point) | - | 1 | 1 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Attempted. (1 Point) | | | |

PREGIONAL PRIORITY

| | AWARDED | NOT AWARDED/ NOT ATTEMPTED | POSSIBLE |
|--|---------|----------------------------------|----------|
| REGIONAL PRIORITY | 4 | o | 4 |
| Regional Priority 1: | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Distribution Redundancy and Auto Restoration: (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with the requirement. The project has achieved an extra point for addressing the geographically specific priority. | 1 | - | 1 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Distribution Redundancy and Auto Restoration: (1 Point) | | | |
| Regional Priority 2: | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Emergency Response Planning: (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with the requirement. The project has achieved an extra point for addressing the geographically specific priority. | 1 | - | 1 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Emergency Response Planning: (1 Point) | | | |
| Regional Priority 3: | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Demand Response: (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with the requirement. The project has achieved an extra point for addressing the geographically specific priority. | 1 | - | 1 |
| Final Review Comment: | | | |
| Awarded. Demand Response: (1 Point) | | | |
| Regional Priority 4: | | | |
| Preliminary Review Comment: | | | |
| Not Attempted. (1 Point) | | | |
| Final Review Comment: | 1 | _ | 1 |
| Awarded. Environmental Performance Improvement: (1 Point) | | | |
| The submitted documentation demonstrates compliance with the requirement. The project has achieved an extra point for addressing the geographically specific priority. | | | |
| TOTAL POINTS | 82 | 28 | 110 |
| | | | |

NOT AWARDED/