# Alaska Renewable Energy Fund

**Methods for Proposal Evaluation and Grant Recommendation**

January 24, 2011

**Overview of Review Process**

Renewable Energy Fund applications were evaluated in four stages. For more detail please refer to Evaluation Guidelines in the appendices and to documents posted on the Renewable Energy Fund webpage http://www.akenergyauthority.org/RE_Fund.html.

Conducted by Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) staff, the first stage of review evaluated each application for completeness, eligibility, and responsiveness to the request for applications (RFA). AEA rejected four proposals that did not meet these threshold criteria.

The second stage evaluated the technical and economic feasibility of the proposed projects. In addition to numerical scores, the second stage resulted in project-specific recommendations for full, partial, or no funding, as well as recommendations for special provisions for grant awards should the Legislature approve funding. The second stage was conducted by AEA staff with the assistance of Alaska Department of Natural Resources staff, Institute of Social Economic Research (ISER) staff, and private economists under contract to AEA under the coordination of ISER. Projects may have been recommended for partial or no funding if they were viable but:

- Documentation submitted with the application was not sufficient to justify full funding for more than one phase of a project.
- Funding for proposed project development phases would not be used until late fy2012 or afterwards. That is, funds would be tied up unreasonably.
- There were competing projects for which planning is desirable
- The applicant requested AEA to manage the project and the AEA program manager could confidently estimate a lower cost.
- The proposal included operating costs, ineligible costs, unreasonably high costs, or other costs not recommended for funding.

AEA recommended no funding for 27 projects following stage 2 review while one project was withdrawn by the applicant and was therefore also not recommended

The third stage was a final scoring based on the specific guidelines in the RFA that was conducted by AEA staff. The scoring was done based on a number of matrices and pre-established weighting for each of the criteria.

1. Cost of Energy (25%):
2. Matching Funds (20%)
3. Economic and Technical Feasibility (20%): score from stage 2

4. Project Readiness (10%)
5. Economic and Other Alaska Benefit (15%)
6. Sustainability (5%)
7. Local Support (5%)

In the fourth stage all applications were ranked by region with the final funding recommendation being made based on the number and rank of applications with each region, the cost of energy, and a balance of statewide funding.

Where AEA recommended less than the requested amount and the Legislature funds the project, AEA will work with grantees to assure that the revised scope of the final grant award is consistent with the grantee's proposal and meets the public purposes of the program.

**Roles of AEA Staff and the Renewable Energy Fund Advisory Committee**
AEA staff requested and received input from the Renewable Energy Fund Advisory Committee regarding the process and final funding recommendations. Following is a summary of Committee involvement.

AEA staff and the Committee met on June 8, 2010 and again on August 13, 2010 to discuss issues including the schedule of the upcoming RFA, progress on funded projects, ways to stimulate proposals for beneficial projects, and requiring minimum benefit/cost ratios.

Midway through review of the applications AEA staff and the Committee met on November 9, 2010 to discuss the economic firms and AEA, DNR and ISER staff involved with the proposal evaluation, progress on review, a slight change on the Readiness criterion to address consistency with the state Energy Pathway, a public request for additional review of proposals by ADF&G, how to address letters from legislators in the Local Support criterion score, update on construction project progress and round 3 grants, and grant report frequency.

Following AEA evaluation of all applications, AEA staff and the Committee met on January 7, 2011 to address requirements for achieving a statewide balance of funds. Based on this discussion and the outcome of appeals due January 10 AEA finalized its recommendations.

# Appendix A
# Guidelines for Renewable Energy Fund Application Evaluation

## Table of Contents



These are the Evaluation Guidelines and instructions for Evaluation of The Round 4 RFA for Renewable Energy Fund Grant Projects

- Applications that do not comply with AS 42.45.45 and all of the material and substantial terms, conditions, and requirements of the RFA may be rejected.

- If an application is rejected the applicant will be notified in writing that its application has been rejected and the basis for rejection.
- The Authority may waive minor requirements of the RFA that do not result in a material change in the requirements of the RFA and do not give an applicant an unfair advantage in the review process.
- Upon submission of the final recommendations to the Legislature the Authority will make all applications available for review on the Authority's web site.

## General:

- All communications with applicants during the evaluation process will go through the Grant Administrator.
- The Executive Director is the Executive Director of AEA, Program Managers are those Management Personal in AEA who have program oversight for AEA programs, Project Managers are the subject matter technical experts, and the Grant Manager is the person responsible for overseeing the grant process for the Authority.
- All applications will be reviewed using the same process and criteria established in the RFA.
- Decisions made in each stage of the review process will be documented in writing and made a part of the grant file.
- If reviewers think they may have a potential conflict of interest, (financial or personal interest, such as friend or family members) they should inform their supervisor immediately of the potential nature of the conflict.
- Reviewers should make notes of any questions they may have about an application. Reviewers should not contact applicants directly.
- If reviewers have questions about an application or process contact they should contact the Grant Administrator. If reviewers have technical questions they should contact the Program Managers.
- If an application is rejected or not recommended the applicants will be sent a letter from the Grant Administrator explaining why their application has been rejected or not recommended. Reviewers will be required to provide to the Grant Administrator the reasons for why the application is being rejected
- Notes should be made directly into the database on line. All written notes should be kept with the application file.
- All notes are considered public records and subject to Alaska public records act disclosure requirements.
- Any appeals from rejected applicants in Stage 1 or Stage 2 reviews will be directed to the Grant Administrator. The Grant Administrator will review the appeal with the Executive Director, Program Manager, and Legal staff as required to determine an appropriate course of action.

**Stage 1 Review Process:**

All applications received by the deadline will initially be reviewed by the Authority staff to assess if the application is complete, meets the minimum submission requirements, and has adequate information to proceed to Stage 2 – Technical Evaluation.

***Reviewers –***

Grant Administrator and at least one Program Manager

***Criteria***

- All criteria are scored pass/fail. Failure to meet any of these criteria results in rejection of the Application.

1. The application is submitted by an Eligible Applicant (sec 1.2).
2. The project meets the definition of an Eligible Project (sec 1.3).
3. A resolution or other formal authorization of the Applicant's governing body is included with the application to demonstrate the Applicant's commitment to the project and any proposed use of matching resources (sec 1.2).
4. The application provides a detailed description of the phase(s) of project proposed, i.e. reconnaissance study, conceptual design/feasibility study, final design/permitting, and/or construction (sec 2.1).
5. The application is complete in that the information provided is sufficiently responsive to the RFA to allow AEA to consider the application in the next stage of evaluation.
6. The Applicant demonstrates that they will take ownership of the project; own, lease, or otherwise control the site upon which the project is located; and upon completion of the project operate and maintain it for its economic life for the benefit of the public. (sec 1.2)

***Process***

- The Grant Administrator will evaluate criteria 1-3 & 6 above.
- The Program Managers will evaluate criteria 4-5 above.
- If it appears that the application could be complete with a clarification or minor additional data the Program Managers (PM) may make a recommendation to the Grant Manager for additional information. The Grant Administrator will request clarifying information from the applicant. The applicant will have a specified amount of time to provide the requested information. Failure of the applicant to respond timely or provide information that completes their application will result in the application being rejected.
- Applications that are determined by the Grant Administrator and Program Managers and determined to be incomplete or fail to meet the minimum requirements will be reviewed by the Executive Director with the assistance of Legal or procurement staff prior to being rejected at Stage 1.
- Applications that fail to pass will be provided written notice as to why their application failed stage 1.
- Any requests for reconsideration from rejected applicants in Stage 1 will be directed to the Grant Administrator. The Grant Administrator will review the request with the Executive Director, Program Manager, and Legal staff as required to determine an appropriate course of action.

## Stage 2 Review Process:

All applications that pass Stage 1 will be reviewed for feasibility in accordance with the criteria below.

***Reviewers –***

- Project Managers – the AEA technical subject matter experts.

- Staff from Department of Natural Resources – technical experts providing specific review and comment on projects that may have issues related to permitting and natural resource development.
- Economists - Contracted economist who will review cost benefit and other cost and pricing information provided for each application submitted for the purpose of providing the authority and independent assessment of the economics of the proposed project.
- ISER – University of Alaska Institute of Social and Economic Research – is providing coordination and Quality Assurance review of economic analysis work for selected projects.
- Program Managers – Overseers of the work of the Project Managers

***Criteria***

- Each of the numbered criteria below will be scored with a numerical score 1-10 and weighted per the percentages below.

| Criteria | Weight |
|---|---|
| 1. Project Management, Development, and Operation<br>a. The proposed schedule is clear, realistic, and described in adequate detail.<br>b. The cost savings estimates for project development, operation, maintenance, fuel, and other project items are realistic,<br>c. The project team's method of communicating, monitoring, and reporting development progress is described in adequate detail.<br>d. Logistical, business, and financial arrangements for operating and selling energy from the completed project are reasonable and described in adequate detail. | 20% |
| 2. Qualifications and Experience<br>a. The Applicant, partners, and contractors have sufficient knowledge and experience to successfully complete and operate the project.<br>b. The project team has staffing, time, and other resources to successfully complete and operate the project.<br>c. The project team is able to understand and address technical, economic, and environmental barriers to successful project completion and operation.<br>d. The project uses local labor and trains a local labor workforce. | 20% |
| 3. Technical Feasibility<br>a. The renewable energy resource is available on a sustainable basis, and project permits and other authorizations can reasonably be obtained.<br>b. A site is available and suitable for the proposed energy system.<br>c. Project technical and environmental risks are reasonable.<br>d. The proposed energy system can reliably produce and deliver energy as planned.<br>e. If a demonstration project is being proposed:<br>• Application in other areas of the state, or another specific benefit of the proposed project, is likely: | 20% |

| | |
|---|---|
| • need for this project is shown (vs. the ability to use existing technology); and<br>• the risks of the proposed system are reasonable and warrant demonstration. | |
| 4. Economic Feasibility<br>a. The project is shown to be economically feasible (net savings in fuel, operation and maintenance, and capital costs over the life of the proposed project). In determining economic feasibility and benefits applications a will be evaluated anticipating the grantee will use cost-based rates. | 25% |
| b. The project has an adequate financing plan for completion of the grant-funded phase and has considered options for financing subsequent phases of the project. | 5% |
| c. Other benefits to the Alaska public are demonstrated. Avoided cost rates alone will not be presumed to be in the best interest of the public. | 10% |

***Process***

- Project Managers will carefully review the proposals for their assigned technology group and provide an initial feasibility score on all criteria and a funding recommendation.
- An economist hired by AEA will review the economic information and provide an independent analysis of cost and benefits of each project. The reviewers will consider the independent analysis when scoring the economic feasibility and benefits criteria.
- Reviewers will use the formula and criteria in the attached Scoring Matrix Guide - for designated criteria in Stage 2.
- If the Project Manager believes they need additional information they will coordinate their request for follow-up information with the Grant Administrator. The purpose of follow-up is for clarification and to help the Project Manager gain a sufficient understanding of the project proposed.
- Any requests for additional information will be made by the Grant Administrator to the applicant by e-mail, Bcc to project manager, with a response time of 7 days or less.
- Applicants that fail to respond to requests for information or to adequately address the criteria in the technical review will be rejected in Stage 2.
- The Program Managers will meet with the project managers to review the applications and discuss final Stage 2 scoring. Scoring per the stage 2 criteria may be adjusted based on final discussions between the Project Manager, Program Managers, Economists, and Executive Director.
- A final weighted “feasibility” score will be given for each application reviewed and will be used to calculate the Phase 3 feasibility score.
- Applications that fail to adequately address the criteria in the technical review may not be recommended for funding or further review.
- Applications that fail to pass will be provided written notice as to why their application failed Stage 2.
- The Authority will develop a preliminary list of feasible applications based on the Stage 2 review with AEA recommendations on technical and economic feasibility and a recommended funding level to be considered in the Stage 3 review.

**Stage 3 Review Process:**

All applications that pass the technical review will be evaluated for the purpose of ranking applications and making recommendations to the Legislature based on the following criteria which include criteria required by 3 AAC 107.655 and AS 42.45.045.

The Feasibility score from Stage 2 will be automatically weighted and scored in Stage three.

The average of the Economic and Public Benefit score of stage 2 will be used for initial scoring of Economic and Other Public Benefit Score. This score will be reviewed by the Program Managers.

The Grant Administrator, with staff assistance, will score the cost of energy, type and amount of matching funds, and local support, using the formulas and methods outlined in Appendix A.

Two Program Managers will review the scoring of the Project Managers and Grant Manager and provide a score for readiness and previous success, and sustainability.

AEA will develop a regional ranking of applications and a draft ranking of all projects for the Advisory committee to review.

The Advisory Committee will review the final Stage 3 scores regional ranking recommendations of the Authority. The Committee may make recommendations to assist in achieving a statewide balance but will not be rescoring based on the criteria.

***Reviewers –***

- Grant Administrator (Local Support and Match Criteria)
- Two Program Managers
- Executive Director of AEA.
- Advisory Committee (Review of Regional Ranking and Funding Recommendations)

***Criteria***

- Criteria noted below will be scored and weighted as noted.

| Criteria | Round 4 Weight |
|---|---|
| Cost of energy per resident in the affected project area relative to other areas (From Worksheet) | 25 |
| The type and amount of matching funds and other resources an applicant will commit to the project. (See formula) | 20 |
| Project feasibility (Score from Stage 2 weighted) | 20 |
| Project readiness. How quickly the proposed work can begin and be accomplished and/or success in previous phases of project development. | 10 |
| Public benefits including economic benefit to the Alaska Public. | 15 |
| Sustainability – the ability of the application to finance, operate and maintain the project for the life of the project | 5 |
| Local Support (See formula) | 5 |
| Statewide Balance of Funds (Evaluated as a pass fail if there are similar projects in the same community. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Statewide Balance is done in Stage 4.) | |
| Compliance with Previous Grant Awards and progress in previous phases of project development. (Evaluated as a pass fail) | |

***Process***

- Reviewers will use the Scoring Matrix Guides for designated criteria in Stage 2.
- Each application will be given a single weighted score.
- Where more than one evaluator is scoring a given criteria the scores of all evaluators for that criteria will be averaged.
- Any requests for additional information will be made by the Grant Administrator by e-mail, Bcc to project manager, with a response time of 7 days or less.
- The evaluation team may conduct interviews of applicants to determine a more complete understanding of the technical or financial aspects of their application.

***Funding Limitations on Recommendations Sec 1.14***

Evaluators should take these limits into account when making recommendations as the applicants were instructed that they would be responsible for any project costs beyond the grant funds available to complete the project.

| **Project Type/Phase** | **Grant Limits** |
|---|---|
| Construction projects on the Railbelt and SE Alaskan communities that have a low cost of power. | $2. Million per project |
| Construction in all other areas of the State not mentioned above. | $4. Million per project |

***Recommendation Guidelines***

- The final recommendations will be one of the following:
  - Recommend – Full funding per application
  - Recommend – Partial funding with a recommended funding amount
  - Do not recommend for grant funding – (basis for not recommending to be explained)
- Final AEA recommendations may also suggest specific terms or conditions be imposed on the grantee to assure the project is successful and the public receives value for the funds to be expended
- Multi-phase funding guidelines
  - Fund multiple phases: Multiple phases can be completed in 2011/12, and project is well-defined, relatively inexpensive, and low-risk.
  - Fund limited phases: Project construction would be 2012+, not well-defined, expensive, higher risk, or there are competing projects for which planning is desirable.
- Competing or interactive projects guidelines
  - If AEA is aware of the potential for substantial interaction among proposed and/or other known projects, then recommend planning with appropriate level of analysis and public input before committing substantial funding to one or more alternatives.
- Partial Funding Guidelines

    - Partial funding levels will correspond to amount proposed in phases that are recommended.
    - Exception 1: If AEA believes project can be built for less, then lower figure can be recommended. AEA will provide justification for lower figure in its recommendations.
    - Exception 2: Proposal requests funding for operating expense (labor, fuel) or non-renewable energy components (e.g. a diesel generator) not recommended for funding.
    - Exception 3 – If limiting funding to a maximum dollar limit for specific areas groups, or types of projects would provide the best statewide balance of funds AEA may do that.
- Guidelines for recommendations for bio-fuels Projects (RFA 1.14)
    - Bio-fuel projects where the Applicant does not intend to generate electricity or heat for sale to the public will be limited to reconnaissance and feasibility phases only
- Consideration of Resources Assessment Projects
    - Resource assessment associated with one or more site-specific projects is eligible for phase 2 funding. General regional or statewide assessment, not tied to particular proposed projects, is not eligible, and more appropriately done through the DNR/AEA Alaska Energy Inventory Data project.
- Recommendation Guidelines will be documented and a part of the grant file.

**Stage 4 Ranking of Applications for Funding Recommendations**

All applications recommended for grants as a result the Stage 3 evaluation will be ranked in accordance with 3 AAC 107.660.

To establish a statewide balance of recommended projects, the Authority will provide to the advisory committee a statewide and regional ranking of all applications recommended for grants in Stage 3.

In consultation with the advisory committee the Authority will make a final prioritized list of all recommended projects giving significant weight to providing a statewide balance for grant money, and taking into consideration the amount of money that may be available, the number and types of project within each region, regional rank, and statewide rank of each application.

In its final decision on an application the Authority may recommend a grant in an amount for the project phases different from what the Applicant requested. In recommending a grant for phases different from what the Applicant requested, the authority may limit its recommendation to a grant for one or more preliminary project phases before recommending a grant for project construction.

***Reviewers –***

- Grant Administrator
- Program Manager
- Executive Director of AEA.
- Advisory Committee (Review of Regional Ranking and Funding Recommendations)

***Process***

- Upon completion of scoring and specific project recommendations by AEA all applications will be grouped within geographical regions,
- Each group of applications will be ranked within their geographical region based on the final stage three score.
- Each application will have stage three score and regional rank.
- A draft recommendation of projects for funding, (based on available funds) will be presented to the Advisory Committee for Review along with the complete list of all projects.
- Consistent with the process established in rounds 1,2, and 3, AEA will prepare a summary of the draft recommendations by energy region that will compare potential allocations of funding by 1) population, 2) an even split for each region, and 3) the average cost of power in each region that takes into account populations of each community in each region.
- Stage 4 revised allocations in each region should be at least 50% of the allocation based on 3) cost of power. In order to attain this goal AEA will refer to the stage 3 statewide ranking list, identify the next highest-ranked project in regions that do not meet the 50% goal, and add that recommendation to the stage 4 list. In order to meet total funding limits AEA will refer to the stage 3 statewide ranking list and remove the lowest-ranked recommendation.
- The Advisory committee may provide additional recommendations as to the funding level of individual projects, the final ranking of projects, and the total amount of funding and number of project AEA forward to the legislature.
- The final list of recommended projects for funding will provide a reasonable statewide balance of funds taking into consideration the overall score, the cost of energy, the rank of projects within a region.

**Recommendations to the Legislature**

The final recommendation to the legislature will include:

- A list of recommended Applications for fy2012 funding.
- A list of applications recommended if additional funds may be available.
- A list of applications not recommended for funding.
- A list of applications rejected as ineligible.

**The Final recommendation to the legislature will also contain specific information for each project as requested by the legislature and a summary of each project.**

**Applicants may be required to provide additional information to the Legislature upon request.**

# Scoring Criteria

## *General Scoring Criteria*

- Pass/Fail scoring means either the criteria are met or they are not.
- A weighted score for each of the criteria will calculated and each complete application will be given a total score at the end of the Stage 2 and Stage 3 review process unless the application is determined not to meet the requirements of the RFA.
- Reviewers should use the following weighted scoring of criteria as a guide in addition to the specific formula scoring matrices for some criteria defined in Appendix A of these procedures.

| **Score** | **Guidelines (Intent is to provide a range)** | |
|---|---|---|
| 10 | A+ | The application demonstrates a thorough understanding of the criteria requirements and completely addresses them thoughtful manner. The application addresses the criteria in a manner clearly superior to other applications received. There is no need for additional follow-up with the applicant to understand how they meet the requirements of the criteria |
| 7 | B | The application provides information that is generally complete and well-supported. Evaluators may still have a few questions regarding how the applicant meets the criterion but it is clear the applicant understands what is required. |
| 5 | C | The application addresses the criteria in an adequate way. Meets minimum requirements under each of the criteria. Some issues may still need to be clarified prior to awarding a grant. |
| 3 | D | The application information is incomplete or fails to fully address what is needed for the project or information has errors. The Authority may need more info to be able to complete the evaluation or need to resolve issues before recommending or awarding a grant. |
| 0 | F | The application fails to demonstrate understanding of the criteria requirements or project proposed. Required information is poor or absent in the proposal. |

## *Stage 2, Criterion 4 (a) Economic Benefit Cost Ratio*

**(Maximum Stage Two points 25)**

AEA staff will consider the economist evaluation when scoring this criterion. They will compare the economists and any Applicant proposed B/C and determine which of the B/C ranges may be most appropriate. If there is wide discrepancy between the two B/C ratios they will use their best judgment based on their understanding of the technical aspects of the proposal to assign a score.

A project will be scored at 0 if the Benefit Cost ratio value is < 0.90 or if no or insufficient information is provided by the applicant to do an economic analysis.

| Benefit / Cost (B/C) Ratio Value | Score |
|---|---|
| Less than 0.90<br>(This indicates that there is relatively low economic benefit or economic analysis cannot be conducted.) | **0** |
| >0.90 – =<1.00 | **1** |
| >1.00 – =<1.10 | **3** |
| >1.10 – =<1.20 | **4** |
| >1.20 – =<1.30 | **5** |
| >1.30 – =<1.40 | **6** |
| >1.40 - < 1.50 | **7** |
| >1.50 - < 1.60 | **8** |
| >1.60 - < 1.70 | **9** |
| =>1.7 | **10** |

## *Stage 2, Criterion 4 (b) Financing Plan*

**(Maximum Stage Two points 5)**

The Financing plan score will be subjectively scored based on the applicant's intent and level of detail described in the application on how the applicant proposes to fund the project.

Questions to be considered under these criteria:

- If recommended, are funds needed to complete the work identified in the application available and adequate to complete all the work in the Grant?
- If additional funds are needed does the applicant specifically identify where they will come from?
- Are these additional funds secured, or are they pending future approvals?
- Is there a reasonable plan for covering potential cost increases or shortfalls in funding?
- What impact, if any, would the timing of availability of additional funds have on the ability to proceed with the grant?

If the above questions are addressed in the application and there is an adequate plan this will be given a point score of 5. If the plan is not adequate it will be scored lower based on the likelihood of funding being available to complete the project or additional commitments that may need to be made by the applicant prior to award of a grant.

For example, an applicant may request construction funding above the RFA cap but does not indicate how the additional funding will be obtained. They may receive a lower score than an

applicant who can demonstrate they have all the financial resources in place to complete the grant work proposed in the application.

## *Stage 2, Criterion 4 (c) Public Benefit Review Guidelines*

**(Maximum Stage two points 10)**

The score for this criterion will be provided by AEA reviewers during the Stage 2 evaluation. For the purpose of evaluating this criterion, public benefits are those benefits that would be considered unique to a given project and not generic to any renewable resource. i.e. decreased greenhouse gas emission, stable pricing of fuel source, won't be considered under this category.

Project review economists will provide a qualitative assessment of potential public benefits in their project review summary for each project they review. Economists will not provide scores for the criteria.

Each category may be scored 0-2 with the maximum total public benefit weight being no more than 10 points.

0. no documented benefit
1 some benefit / not well documented
2 good benefit / well documented

| | Score |
|---|---|
| Will the project result in developing infrastructure such as roads that can be used for other purposes? | 0 - 2 |
| Will the project result in a direct long-term increase in jobs such as for operating or supplying fuel to the facility? | 0 - 2 |
| Will the project solve other problems for the community, such as waste disposal? | 0 -2 |
| Will the project generate useful information that could be used by the public in other parts of the State? | 0 - 2 |
| Will this project either promote or sustain long-term commercial economic development for the community? | 0 - 2 |
| Are there other public benefits identified by the applicant? | 0 - 2 |

## *Stage 3 Criterion – Match*

Total of 20 points will be calculated as follows: The scoring matrix for the total amount of match may be adjusted by the Grant Administrator after the initial review of applications based on a reasonable threshold for each level based on the applicants match in all applications.

| **Type of Match** | **5 Pts** | **+** | **Percentage of Match to total Grant Request** | **10 Pts** | **+** | **Total Amount of Match (1)** | **5 Pts** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Support of any kind referenced but not given a specific value IE housing offered to outside workers, administration of* | ***1*** | | *.01% - <5% of Grant =* | ***1*** | | *> $1 - < $15K* | ***1*** |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *project without compensation* | | | | | | | |
| *Previous investment towards project completion* | ***2*** | | *=>5% - =<10% of Grant =* | ***2*** | | *$15K - <$100K* | ***2*** |
| *Another grant [State] as Match* | ***3*** | | *>10% - =<15% of Grant =* | ***4*** | | *$100K <$1 mil* | ***3*** |
| *Other (Grant Fed) Or private* | ***4*** | | *>15% - =<30% of Grant* | ***6*** | | *$1 mil - <$6 mil* | ***4*** |
| *Loan or Local Cash or any documented In-kind Match* | ***5*** | | *>30% - =<49% of Grant =* | ***8*** | | *> $6 mil* | ***5*** |
| | | | *> 49% of Grant* | ***10*** | | | |

***(1) If there are multiple types of Match that with highest value is scored.***

## *Stage 3 Criterion Local Support*

**Total of 5 Points Available**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Documented unresolved issues concerning the application no points will be given if these exist regardless of demonstrated support* | *0 points* |
| *Resolution from city or village council* | *2 points* |
| *Support demonstrated by local entity other than applicant* | *3 points* |
| *Support demonstrated by two local entities other than the applicant* | *4 points* |
| *Support demonstrated by three or more local entities other than the applicant* | *5 points* |

Letters of support from legislators do not count toward this criterion.

## *Stage 3 Criterion Project Readiness*

Up to ten points are available and may be assigned as follows. If evaluators believe there are other readiness criteria that should be considered they may adjust the score that when awarding points for this criteria

| Criteria | Up to 10 points available |
|---|---|
| Proposed work is reconnaissance level and is consistent with specific recommendations under the Alaska Energy Pathway | 4 points |
| Project is currently underway with feasibility or reconnaissance work, design work related to the project, or actual construction of the project and the applicant is using their own funds or funds from another eligible source to finance the activity. | 4 points |
| Applicant has completed previous phase(s) of proposed project and desires additional funding to complete the next phase of project. | 2 points |
| Applicant has completed required feasibility and/or design work for project and is prepared to place an order for necessary equipment for the project; such as an item with a 'long lead time' to procure. | 2 points |
| Applicant has obtained all necessary permits, met all permit requirements, and addressed all regulatory agency stipulations. | 2 points |

## *Stage 3 Criterion Public Benefit*

This criteria will be scored using a weighted calculation from the Phase 2 Economic (4.a) and Public Benefit score (4.b).

## *Stage 3 Sustainability*

This criteria will be scored from 0 to 5 based on the evaluators' assessment of the 1) capability of the grantee to demonstrate the capacity, both administratively and financially, to provide for the long-term operation and maintenance of the proposed project, 2) likelihood of the resource being available over the life of the project, 3) likelihood of market for energy produced over the life of the project.

## *Stage 3 Criteria Statewide Regional Balance*

Rated as Pass, Fail, or Not Applicable (NA)

| **Criteria** | |
|---|---|
| If there is more than one project from the same community or area, which project has received an overall higher score during the review and/or has demonstrated that local residents are in favor of the project. | |
| Project funding will provide balance to the number and/or amount to a specific area of the State. | |

## *Stage 3 Criteria Compliance with Other Awards*

Rated as Pass, Fail, or Not Applicable (NA)

| **Criteria** | **Legislative Grant** | **Alternative Energy Solicitation (Round O)** | **Round I,II, or III** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Has grantee provided all necessary information for grant preparation for grants awarded from previous solicitations? | | | |
| Is grantee making verifiable and adequate progress using previous grant funds; for this or another project? | | | |
| Has grantee provided all required financial and progress reports, per the terms of any previous grants? | | | |

## *Stage 3 Criterion Cost of Energy*

This score is based on the residential cost power for each community using available data from 2009. Scores are assigned for each community using the following formula:

Score = (cost of power) / 0.80 x 10, Score cannot be greater than 10.

Communities with a residential cost of power above $0.80/kWh are assigned a score of 10. Communities are with the highest cost of electrical energy getting the most points for this criterion. All other applications will be scored as a percentage of the highest costs against an established matrix.

| Energy Region | Community | Utility | Cost of Power ($/kWh) | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aleutians | Adak | City of Adak | 0.713 | 8.91 |
| Kodiak | Afognak | Kodiak Electric Association | 0.153 | 1.91 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Akiachak | Akiachak Native Community Electric Co | 0.63 | 7.88 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Akiak | City of Akiak | 0.63 | 7.88 |
| Aleutians | Akutan | Akutan Electric Utility | 0.323 | 4.04 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Alakanuk | AVEC | 0.635 | 7.94 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Alatna | Alaska Power Company | 0.667 | 8.34 |
| Bristol Bay | Aleknagik | Nushagak Electric Coop | 0.463 | 5.79 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Allakaket | Alaska Power Company | 0.667 | 8.34 |
| Northwest Arctic | Ambler | AVEC | 0.796 | 9.96 |
| North Slope | Anaktuvuk Pass | North Slope Borough | 0.15 | 1.88 |
| Railbelt | Anchor Point (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Railbelt | Anchorage, Municipality of | Chugach Electric Association, Inc. | 0.126 | 1.57 |
| Railbelt | Anchorage, Municipality of | Municipal Light & Power Department d/b/a Municipality of Anchorage | 0.176 | 2.2 |
| Railbelt | Anderson | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Andreafsky | AVEC | 0.594 | 7.43 |
| Southeast | Angoon | Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.422 | 5.27 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Aniak | Aniak Light & Power Company | 0.761 | 9.51 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Anvik | AVEC | 0.656 | 8.2 |
| Aleutians | Atka | Andreanof Electric Corporation | 0.767 | 9.58 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Atmautluak | Atmautluak Joint Utilities | 0.774 | 9.68 |
| North Slope | Atqasuk | North Slope Borough | 0.15 | 1.88 |
| North Slope | Barrow | Barrow Utilities & Electric Coop | 0.132 | 1.65 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Beaver | Beaver Joint Utilities | 0.55 | 6.88 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Bethel | Bethel Utilities Corporation, Inc. | 0.537 | 6.71 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Bettles | Alaska Power Company | 0.584 | 7.31 |
| Railbelt | Big Lake | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Bering Straits | Brevig Mission | AVEC | 0.603 | 7.53 |
| Northwest Arctic | Buckland | City of Buckland | 0.519 | 6.48 |
| Railbelt | Cantwell | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Central | Central Electric, Inc. | 0.509 | 6.36 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Chalkyitsik | Chalkyitsik Village Energy System | 0.95 | 10 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Chuathbaluk | Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.343 | 4.28 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Chefornak | Naterkaq Light Plant | 0.65 | 8.13 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CopRiv/Chug | Chenega Bay | Chenega Bay IRA Village Council | 0.435 | 5.44 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Chevak | AVEC | 0.665 | 8.31 |
| Railbelt | Chickaloon | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Bristol Bay | Chignik | Chignik Electric | 0.51 | 6.38 |
| Bristol Bay | Chignik Lagoon | Chignik Lagoon Power Utility | 0.5 | 6.25 |
| Bristol Bay | Chignik Lake | Chignik Lake Electric Utility, Inc. | 0.582 | 7.27 |
| Southeast | Chilkat Valley | Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.422 | 5.27 |
| Kodiak | Chiniak | Kodiak Electric Association | 0.153 | 1.91 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Chistochina | Alaska Power Company | 0.459 | 5.74 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Chitina | Chitina Electric Inc. | 0.53 | 6.63 |
| Railbelt | Chugiak | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Circle Hot Springs (Central) | Central Electric, Inc. | 0.67 | 8.38 |
| Railbelt | Clam Gulch (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Southeast | Coffman Cove | Alaska Power Company | 0.343 | 4.28 |
| Aleutians | Cold Bay | G & K, Inc. | 0.644 | 8.05 |
| Railbelt | College | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Railbelt | Cooper Landing | Chugach Electric Association, Inc. | 0.176 | 2.2 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Copper Center | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Copperville | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Cordova | Cordova Electric Cooperative Inc. | 0.331 | 4.14 |
| Southeast | Craig | Alaska Power Company | 0.197 | 2.46 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Crooked Creek | Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.987 | 10 |
| North Slope | Deadhorse | TDX North Slope Generating, Inc. | 0.277 | 3.46 |
| Northwest Arctic | Deering | Ipnatchiaq Electric Company | 0.774 | 9.67 |
| Railbelt | Delta Junction | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Bristol Bay | Dillingham | Nushagak Electric Coop | 0.463 | 5.79 |
| Bering Straits | Diomede (Little Diomede) | Diomede Joint Utilities | 0.6 | 7.5 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Dot Lake | Alaska Power Company | 0.295 | 3.69 |
| Southeast | Douglas | Alaska Electric Light & Power | 0.111 | 1.39 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Eagle | Alaska Power Company | 0.643 | 8.04 |
| Railbelt | Eagle River | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Eagle Village | Alaska Power Company | 0.702 | 8.78 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Eek | AVEC | 0.702 | 8.78 |
| Bristol Bay | Egegik | Egegik Light & Power Company | 0.886 | 10 |
| Railbelt | Eklutna | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Bristol Bay | Ekwok | Ekwok Electric | 0.5 | 6.25 |
| Southeast | Elfin Cove | Elfin Cove Utility Commission | 0.523 | 6.54 |
| Bering Straits | Elim | AVEC | 0.598 | 7.48 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Emmonak | AVEC | 0.648 | 8.1 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Evansville | Alaska Power Company | 0.584 | 7.31 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Eyak | Cordova Electric Cooperative Inc. | 0.331 | 4.14 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Railbelt | Fairbanks | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Aleutians | False Pass | False Pass Electric Assoc | 0.52 | 6.5 |
| Railbelt | Fort Greely | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Railbelt | Fort Wainwright | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Fort Yukon | Gwitchyaa Zhee Utility Company | 0.536 | 6.7 |
| Railbelt | Fox | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Gakona | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Galena | City of Galena | 0.563 | 7.04 |
| Bering Straits | Gambell | AVEC | 0.62 | 7.74 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Glennallen | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Bering Straits | Golovin | Golovin Power Utilities | 0.7 | 8.75 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Goodnews Bay | AVEC | 0.663 | 8.29 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Grayling | AVEC | 0.732 | 9.15 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Gulkana | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Southeast | Gustavus | Gustavus Electric Company, Inc. | 0.428 | 5.36 |
| Southeast | Haines | Alaska Power Company | 0.212 | 2.65 |
| Railbelt | Halibut Cove (HEA 2) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.201 | 2.51 |
| Railbelt | Healy | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Healy Lake | Alaska Power Company | 0.609 | 7.61 |
| Southeast | Hollis | Alaska Power Company | 0.197 | 2.46 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Holy Cross | AVEC | 0.681 | 8.51 |
| Railbelt | Homer (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Southeast | Hoonah | Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.422 | 5.27 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Hooper Bay | AVEC | 0.611 | 7.64 |
| Railbelt | Hope | Chugach Electric Association, Inc. | 0.176 | 2.2 |
| Railbelt | Houston | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Hughes | Hughes Light & Power | 0.71 | 8.88 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Huslia | AVEC | 0.647 | 8.09 |
| Southeast | Hydaburg | Alaska Power Company | 0.197 | 2.46 |
| Southeast | Hyder/Stewart B.C. | BC Hydro | 0.087 | 1.09 |
| Bristol Bay | Igiugig | Igiugig Electric Company | 0.803 | 10 |
| Bristol Bay | Iliamna | I-N-N Electric Coop | 0.513 | 6.42 |
| Southeast | Juneau, City & Borough of | Alaska Electric Light & Power | 0.111 | 1.39 |
| Railbelt | Kachemak (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Southeast | Kake | Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.422 | 5.27 |
| North Slope | Kaktovik | North Slope Borough | 0.15 | 1.88 |
| Railbelt | Kalifornsky (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Kaltag | AVEC | 0.63 | 7.87 |
| Kodiak | Karluk | Alutiiq Power Company | 0.6 | 7.5 |
| Southeast | Kasaan | Alaska Power Company | 0.197 | 2.46 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Kasigluk | AVEC | 0.526 | 6.57 |
| Railbelt | Kasilof (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Railbelt | Kenai (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Kenny Lake | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Southeast | Ketchikan | Ketchikan Public Utilities | 0.096 | 1.2 |
| Northwest Arctic | Kiana | AVEC | 0.687 | 8.59 |
| Aleutians | King Cove | City of King Cove | 0.24 | 3 |
| Bristol Bay | King Salmon | Naknek Electric Assn | 0.416 | 5.2 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Kipnuk | Kipnuk Light Plant | 0.653 | 8.16 |
| Northwest Arctic | Kivalina | AVEC | 0.725 | 9.06 |
| Southeast | Klawock | Alaska Power Company | 0.197 | 2.46 |
| Southeastt | Klukwan | Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.422 | 5.27 |
| Railbelt | Knik-Fairview | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Northwest Arctic | Kobuk | Kobuk Valley Elect Coop | 0.87 | 10 |
| Kodiak | Kodiak | Kodiak Electric Association | 0.153 | 1.91 |
| Kodaik | Kodiak Station | Kodiak Electric Association | 0.153 | 1.91 |
| Bristol Bay | Kokhanok | Kokhanok Village Council | 0.9 | 10 |
| Bristol Bay | Koliganek | New Koliganek Village Council | 0.5 | 6.25 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Kongiganak | Puvurnaq Power Company | 0.55 | 6.88 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Kotlik | AVEC | 0.592 | 7.4 |
| Northwest Arctic | Kotzebue | Kotzebue Electric Assn | 0.464 | 5.81 |
| Bering Straits | Koyuk | AVEC | 0.631 | 7.89 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Koyukuk | City of Koyukuk | 0.45 | 5.63 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Kwethluk | Kwethluk Inc | 0.52 | 6.5 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Kwigillingok | Kwig Power Company | 0.5 | 6.25 |
| Kodiak | Larsen Bay | Larsen Bay Utility Company | 0.44 | 5.5 |
| Bristol Bay | Levelock | Levelock Electric Coop | 0.7 | 8.75 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Lime Village | Lime Village Traditional Council | 1.17 | 10 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Lower Kalskag | AVEC | 0.597 | 7.46 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Manley Hot Springs | Manley Utility Company, Inc. | 0.998 | 10 |
| Bristol Bay | Manokotak | Manokotak Power Company | 0.45 | 5.63 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Marshall | AVEC | 0.625 | 7.81 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | McGrath | McGrath Light & Power Company | 0.608 | 7.6 |
| Railbelt | McKinley Park | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Mekoryuk | AVEC | 0.646 | 8.08 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Mendeltna | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Mentasta | Alaska Power Company | 0.478 | 5.98 |
| Southeast | Metlakatla | Metlakatla Power & Light | 0.092 | 1.15 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Minto | AVEC | 0.614 | 7.68 |
| Railbelt | Moose Pass | Chugach Electric Association, Inc. | 0.176 | 2.2 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Mountain Village | AVEC | 0.606 | 7.57 |
| Bristol Bay | Naknek | Naknek Electric Assn | 0.416 | 5.2 |
| Railbelt | Nanwalek (HEA 2) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.201 | 2.51 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Napakiak | Napakiak Ircinraq Power Company | 1.08 | 10 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Napaskiak | Napaskiak Electric Utility | 0.6 | 7.5 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Southeast | Naukati Bay | Alaska Power Company | 0.37 | 4.63 |
| Railbelt | Nelchina | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Aleutians | Nelson Lagoon | Nelson Lagoon Electric Coop | 0.74 | 9.25 |
| Railbelt | Nenana | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Bristol Bay | New Stuyahok | AVEC | 0.63 | 7.87 |
| Bristol Bay | Newhalen | I-N-N Electric Coop | 0.513 | 6.42 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Newtok | Ungusrag Power Company | 0.8 | 10 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Nightmute | AVEC | 0.531 | 6.64 |
| Railbelt | Nikiski (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Nikolai | Nikolai Light & Power Utility | 0.804 | 10 |
| Aleutians | Nikolski | Umnak Power Company | 0.6 | 7.5 |
| Railbelt | Ninilchik (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Northwest Arctic | Noatak | AVEC | 0.726 | 9.08 |
| Bering Straits | Nome | Nome Joint Utility Systems | 0.368 | 4.6 |
| Northwest Arctic | Nondalton | I-N-N Electric Coop | 0.513 | 6.42 |
| Northwest Arctic | Noorvik | AVEC | 0.714 | 8.92 |
| Railbelt | North Pole | Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc. | 0.168 | 2.1 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Northway | Alaska Power Company | 0.424 | 5.3 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Northway Village | Alaska Power Company | 0.424 | 5.3 |
| North Slope | Nuiqsut | North Slope Borough | 0.15 | 1.88 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Nulato | AVEC | 0.631 | 7.89 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Nunam Iqua (Sheldon Point) | Nunam Iqua Electric Co. | 0.53 | 6.63 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Nunapitchuk | AVEC | 0.526 | 6.57 |
| Kodiak | Old Harbor | AVEC | 0.624 | 7.8 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Oscarville | Bethel Utilities Corporation, Inc. | 0.537 | 6.71 |
| Kodiak | Ouzinkie | City of Ouzinkie | 0.365 | 4.56 |
| Railbelt | Palmer | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Southeast | Pedro Bay | Pedro Bay Village Council | 0.91 | 10 |
| Southeast | Pelican | Kake Tribal Corporation | 0.434 | 5.43 |
| Bristol Bay | Perryville | Native Village of Perryville | 0.6 | 7.5 |
| Southeast | Petersburg | Petersburg Municipal Power & Light | 0.135 | 1.68 |
| Bristol Bay | Pilot Point | Pilot Point Electrical Utility | 0.5 | 6.25 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Pilot Station | AVEC | 0.632 | 7.9 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Pitkas Point | AVEC | 0.594 | 7.43 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Platinum | City of Platinum | 0.5 | 6.25 |
| North Slope | Point Hope | North Slope Borough | 0.15 | 1.88 |
| North Slope | Point Lay | North Slope Borough | 0.15 | 1.88 |
| Bristol Bay | Port Alsworth | Tanalian Electric Coop | 0.638 | 7.97 |
| Railbelt | Port Graham (HEA 2) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.201 | 2.51 |
| Bristol Bay | Port Heiden (Meshik) | Port Heiden Utilities | 0.57 | 7.13 |
| Kodiak | Port Lions | Kodiak Electric Association | 0.153 | 1.91 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Quinhagak | AVEC | 0.668 | 8.36 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Red Devil | Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.987 | 10 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Ruby | City of Ruby | 0.98 | 10 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Russian Mission | AVEC | 0.637 | 7.97 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Saint Mary's | AVEC | 0.594 | 7.43 |
| Bering Straits | Saint Michael | AVEC | 0.632 | 7.9 |
| Aleutians | Saint Paul | St. Paul Municipal Electric Utility | 0.46 | 5.75 |
| Railbelt | Salamatof (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Aleutians | Sand Point | TDX Sand Point Generating, Inc. | 0.521 | 6.51 |
| Bering Straits | Savoonga | AVEC | 0.614 | 7.67 |
| Southeast | Saxman | Ketchikan Public Utilities | 0.096 | 1.2 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Scammon Bay | AVEC | 0.621 | 7.77 |
| Northwest Arctic | Selawik | AVEC | 0.655 | 8.18 |
| Railbelt | Seldovia (HEA 2) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.201 | 2.51 |
| Railbelt | Seward | Seward Electric System | 0.126 | 1.58 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Shageluk | AVEC | 0.769 | 9.61 |
| Bering Straits | Shaktoolik | AVEC | 0.602 | 7.53 |
| Bering Straits | Shishmaref | AVEC | 0.568 | 7.1 |
| Northwest Arctic | Shungnak | AVEC | 0.732 | 9.15 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Silver Springs | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Southeast | Sitka (Mt. Edgecumbe) | Sitka Electric Department | 0.092 | 1.15 |
| Southeast | Skagway | Alaska Power Company | 0.212 | 2.65 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Slana | Alaska Power Company | 0.522 | 6.52 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Sleetmute | Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.987 | 10 |
| Railbelt | Soldotna (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Bristol Bay | South Naknek | Naknek Electric Assn | 0.416 | 5.2 |
| Bering Straits | Stebbins | AVEC | 0.609 | 7.61 |
| Railbelt | Sterling (HEA 1) | Homer Electric Association, Inc. | 0.198 | 2.47 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Stevens Village | Stevens Village Energy Systems | 1.07 | 10 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Stony River | Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc. | 0.987 | 10 |
| Railbelt | Sutton-Alpine | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Takotna | Takotna Community Assoc. Utilities | 1.25 | 10 |
| Railbelt | Talkeetna | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Tanacross | Alaska Power Company | 0.531 | 6.64 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Tanana PCE | Tanana Power Company, Inc. | 0.664 | 8.3 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Tatitlek PCE | Tatitlek Electric Utility | 0.76 | 9.5 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Tazlina | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Bering Straits | Teller | AVEC | 0.715 | 8.94 |
| Southeast | Tenakee Springs | City of Tenakee Springs | 0.295 | 3.69 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Tetlin | Alaska Power Company | 0.197 | 2.46 |
| Southeast | Thorne Bay | Alaska Power Company | 0.594 | 7.42 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bristol Bay | Togiak (Twin Hills) | AVEC | 0.295 | 3.69 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Tok | Alaska Power Company | 0.531 | 6.64 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Toksook Bay | AVEC | 0.6 | 7.5 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Tolsona | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Tonsina | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Tuluksak | Tuluksak Traditional Power Utility | 0.65 | 8.13 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Tuntutuliak | Tuntutuliak Community Service Assoc | 0.531 | 6.64 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Tununak | AVEC | 0.55 | 6.88 |
| Bristol Bay | Twin Hills | Twin Hills Village Council | 0.492 | 6.15 |
| Railbelt | Tyonek | Chugach Electric Association, Inc. | 0.176 | 2.2 |
| Bering Straits | Unalakleet | Unalakleet Valley Electric Cooperative/ Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.264 | 3.3 |
| Aleutians | Unalaska (Dutch Harbor) | Unalaska Electric Utility | 0.597 | 7.46 |
| Low Yuk-Kusk | Upper Kalskag | AVEC | 0.597 | 7.46 |
| CopRiv/Chug | Valdez | Copper Valley Electric Assn. | 0.198 | 2.48 |
| Yuk-Koy/UpTan | Venetie | Venetie Village Electric | 0.75 | 9.38 |
| North Slope | Wainwright | North Slope Borough | 0.15 | 1.88 |
| Bering Straits | Wales | AVEC | 0.648 | 8.1 |
| Railbelt | Wasilla | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Southeast | Whale Pass | Alaska Power Company | 0.435 | 5.44 |
| Bering Straits | White Mountain | White Mountain Utilities | 1.08 | 10 |
| Railbelt | Whittier | Chugach Electric Association, Inc. | 0.176 | 2.2 |
| Railbelt | Willow | Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. | 0.169 | 2.12 |
| Kodiak | Women's Bay | Kodiak Electric Association | 0.153 | 1.91 |
| Southeast | Wrangell | Wrangell Municipal Light & Power | 0.132 | 1.66 |
| Southeast | Yakutat | Yakutat Power | 0.347 | 4.34 |

**For Round IV Projects addressing multiple communities or the nearest community, the following cost of power ($/kWh) and scores were used:**

614 NWAB_School Alternate Energy Solar Awareness Project
Average of 11 NWAB communities:
K-0.4644, A-0.7964, K-0.87, S-0.7317, K-0.6545, N-0.5185, S-0.7737, B-0.7248, D-0.7737, K-0.7248, N-0.7263 (average is 0.696 /kWh) – score 8.7

615 CEA_Transmission Line to Renewable Energy Resources
Anchorage CEA - 0.126, ML&P - 0.176 (average 0.151 /kWh) – score 1.89

616 GVEA_Eva Creek Wind Turbine Purchase
Fairbanks and all GVEA communities all 0.168 /kWh – score 2.1

618 CVEA_Silver Lake Feasibility
CEA on-grid communities - 0.198, Cordova - 0.333, Tatitlek - 0.760 (average 0.430/kWh) – score 5.38

629 AkPowerCo_Reynolds Creek Hydro Project Transmission Line
Hydaburg - 0.197, Hollis- 0.197, Klawock- 0.197, Craig - , 0.197 Thorne Bay - 0.594, South Thorne Bay 0.594??, Kasaan- 0.197, and soon both Coffman Cove - 0.343 and Naukati - 0.370 (average 0.320667 /kWh) – score 4.01

632 IPEC_Tenakee Inlet Geothermal Reconn Study
Hoonah- 0.422, Tenakee Springs 0.295, Pelican - 0.434 (Average 0.384 /kWh) – score 4.8

637 IRHA_Feas Assessments for Wood Heating in Interior Alaska Communities
(Hughes, Ruby, Koyukuk, Nulato, Kaltag, Nikolai, Anvik, and Holy Cross)
H-0.71,R-0.98,K-0.45,N-0.631,K-0.63,N-0.804,A-0.656,H-0.681 (average is 0.693 /kWh) – score 8.66

652 Ormat_Mt. Spurr Geothermal Project
Anchorage CEA - 0.126, ML&P - 0.176 (average 0.151 /kWh) – score 1.89

654 UAF_Pilgrim Hot Springs Geothermal Resource Project
Nome - 0.368 /kWh– score 4.6

658 UAF_ACEP_Organic Rankine Cycle Field Testing
For the purposes of this proposal, Galena will be used - 0.563 /kWh– score 7.04

660 ORPC_Cook Inlet TidGen Project
Anchorage CEA - 0.126, ML&P - 0.176 (average 0.151 /kWh) – score 1.89

661 TATEC_Turnagain Arm Tidal Electrical Generation Project
Anchorage CEA - 0.126, ML&P - 0.176 (average 0.151 /kWh) – score 1.89

668 NW Inupiat Housing Authority_Upper Kobuk River Biomass Project
Kobuk - 0.870 Shungnak- 0.732, Ambler - 0.796 (average 0.799 /kWh) – score 9.99

681 Lake & Peninsula Wood Boilers
Igiugig - 0.803, Illiamna-0.513, Kokhanok-0.900, and Port Alsworth. -0.683 (average is 0.725) – score 9.06

683 BH_Cook Inlet Tidal Hydrokinetic Power Generation
Anchorage CEA - 0.126, ML&P - 0.176 (average 0.151 /kWh) – score 1.89

690 Eklutna_Hunter Creek Hydroelectric Project
MEA 0.169 /kWh – score 2.11

691 Glacier Fork Hydroelectric Project
MEA - 0.169, ML&P - 0.176, CEA - 0.126 (average 0.157 /kWh ) – score 1.96

696 MOA_Merrill Field Landfill Gas Heating Energy Project
Anchorage CEA - 0.126, ML&P - 0.176 (average 0.151 /kWh) – score 1.89