

## **Alaska Renewable Energy Fund Round V**

### **Methods for Proposal Evaluation and Grant Recommendation**

January 16, 2012

#### **Overview of Review Process**

Renewable Energy Fund Round V 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 (REF) webpage [http://www.akenergyauthority.org/RE\\_Fund.html](http://www.akenergyauthority.org/RE_Fund.html).

The Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) received a total of 99 proposals for round V of the REF. AEA combined 4 of the proposals into two. Two of the proposers withdrew their applications early in the process. This left 95 proposals for review.

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

The second stage evaluated the technical and economic feasibility of the 87 remaining 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 fy2013 or afterwards. That is, funds would be tied up unreasonably.
- There were competing projects for which planning is desirable
- AEA believed that proposed costs were excessive for the work proposed for completion.
- 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.

Following AEA staff recommendations of no funding for 50 projects, the AEA Executive Director received requests for reconsideration from nine applicants. In response to the reconsideration requests, the Executive Director directed staff to score five of the nine proposals. Staff review

of one of reconsidered proposals resulted in a score of less than the minimum stage 2 score of 45. As a result AEA recommended 41 projects for partial or full funding. 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. Based on input from the REF advisory committee the weighting for cost of energy was adjusted upward by 10% points and the weighting for matching and readiness were adjusted downward each by 5% points. The resulting weighting were as follows:

1. Cost of Energy (35%)
2. Matching Funds (15%)
3. Economic and Technical Feasibility (20%): score from stage 2
4. Project Readiness (5%)
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 6, 2011 to discuss issues including the schedule of the upcoming RFA, progress on funded projects, the regional energy planning process, changing funding caps in the next RFA, ways to stimulate proposals for beneficial projects especially heating, performance monitoring, and requiring minimum benefit/cost ratios.

Midway through review of the applications AEA staff and the Committee met on November 22 to discuss progress on review, application of funding caps, and involvement of AEA staff in advancing proposals through other programs.

Following AEA evaluation of all applications, AEA staff and the Committee met on January 13, 2012 to address requirements for achieving a statewide balance of funds. Based on this discussion AEA finalized its recommendations. The meeting also included an update on an independent evaluation of the REF program.

On January 27, 2012, AEA recommendations for funding Renewable Energy Fund Round V projects will be submitted to the legislature for review and approval.

## Appendix A

### Guidelines for Renewable Energy Fund Application Evaluation

#### Table of Contents

<b>General:</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Stage 1 Review Process:</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Reviewers - .....	2
Criteria.....	2
Process.....	3
<b>Stage 2 Review Process:</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Reviewers - .....	3
Criteria.....	4
Process.....	5
<b>Stage 3 Review Process:</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Reviewers - .....	6
Criteria.....	6
Process.....	7
Funding Limitations on Recommendations Sec 1.14.....	7
Recommendation Guidelines .....	7
<b>Stage 4 Ranking of Applications for Funding Recommendations</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Reviewers - .....	8
Process.....	9
<b>Scoring Criteria</b> .....	<b>10</b>
General Scoring Criteria.....	10
Stage 2, Criterion 4 (a) Economic Benefit Cost Ratio .....	11
Stage 2, Criterion 4 (b) Financing Plan .....	11
Stage 2, Criterion 4 (c) Public Benefit Review Guidelines .....	12
Stage 3 Criterion - Match .....	12
Stage 3 Criterion Local Support.....	13
Stage 3 Criterion Project Readiness.....	13
Stage 3 Criterion Public Benefit.....	14
Stage 3 Sustainability .....	14
Stage 3 Criteria Statewide Regional Balance .....	14
Stage 3 Criteria Compliance with Other Awards .....	14
Stage 3 Criterion Cost of Energy.....	14

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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposed schedule is clear, realistic, and described in adequate detail.</li> <li>b. The cost savings estimates for project development, operation, maintenance, fuel, and other project items are realistic,</li> <li>c. The project team’s method of communicating, monitoring, and reporting development progress is described in adequate detail.</li> <li>d. Logistical, business, and financial arrangements for operating and selling energy from the completed project are reasonable and described in adequate detail.</li> </ul>	20%
2. Qualifications and Experience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Applicant, partners, and contractors have sufficient knowledge and experience to successfully complete and operate the project.</li> <li>b. The project team has staffing, time, and other resources to successfully complete and operate the project.</li> <li>c. The project team is able to understand and address technical, economic, and environmental barriers to successful project completion and operation.</li> <li>d. The project uses local labor and trains a local labor workforce.</li> </ul>	20%
3. Technical Feasibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The renewable energy resource is available on a sustainable basis, and project permits and other authorizations can reasonably be obtained.</li> <li>b. A site is available and suitable for the proposed energy system.</li> <li>c. Project technical and environmental risks are reasonable.</li> <li>d. The proposed energy system can reliably produce and deliver energy as planned.</li> <li>e. If a demonstration project is being proposed:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application in other areas of the state, or another specific benefit of the proposed project, is likely:</li> <li>• need for this project is shown (vs. the ability to use existing technology); and</li> <li>• the risks of the proposed system are reasonable and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	20%

warrant demonstration.	
4. Economic Feasibility	25%
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.	
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.
- A minimum score of 35 is required for stage 2 in order to pass to stage 3.
- 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)	35
The type and amount of matching funds and other resources an applicant will commit to the project. (See formula)	15
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.	5
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.

<b>Project Type/Phase</b>	<b>Grant Limits</b>
Construction projects on the Railbelt and SE Alaskan communities that have a low cost of power.	\$4 Million per project
Construction in all other areas of the State not mentioned above.	\$8 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 1-4, 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 projects AEA forwards 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 be 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 in a 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.

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

## **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
<i>Support of any kind referenced but not given a specific value IE housing offered to outside workers, administration of</i>	<b>1</b>		<i>.01% - &lt;5% of Grant =</i>	<b>1</b>		<i>&gt; \$1 - &lt; \$15K</i>	<b>1</b>

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

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

### **Stage 3 Criterion Local Support**

**Total of 5 Points Available**

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

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)

<b>Criteria</b>	
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)

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Legislative Grant</b>	<b>Alternative Energy Solicitation (Round O)</b>	<b>Round I-IV</b>
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 of power for each community using available data, primarily the annual averages of residential rates reported in the Alaska Energy Statistics 1960-2010 Preliminary Data [Workbook](#), prepared by ISER in collaboration with the Alaska Energy Authority September, 2011.

Scores are assigned for each community using the following formula:

$$\text{Score} = (\text{cost of power}) / 0.80 \times 10, \text{ Score cannot be greater than } 10.$$

Communities with a residential cost of power above \$0.80/kWh are assigned a score of 10. Communities with the highest cost of electrical energy are 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	Residential Rate (\$/kWh)	REF5 Score
Aleutians	Adak	City of Adak	0.82	10.00
Low Yuk-Kusk	Akiachak	Akiachak Native Community Electric Co	0.61	7.59
Low Yuk-Kusk	Akiak	City of Akiak	0.63	7.88
Aleutians	Akutan	Akutan Electric Utility	0.32	4.04
Low Yuk-Kusk	Alakanuk	AVEC	0.52	6.49
Bristol Bay	Aleknagik	Nushagak Electric Coop	0.36	4.54
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Allakaket/Alatna	Alaska Power Company	0.73	9.14
Northwest Arctic	Ambler	AVEC	0.55	6.90
North Slope	Anaktuvuk Pass	North Slope Borough	0.15	1.88
Railbelt	Anchor Point	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Railbelt	Anchorage, Municipality of	Chugach Electric Association, Inc.	0.13	1.66
Railbelt	Anchorage, Municipality of	Anchorage Municipal Light & Power	0.10	1.25
Railbelt	Anderson	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Southeast	Angoon	Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.55	6.89
Low Yuk-Kusk	Aniak	Aniak Light & Power Company	0.64	8.03
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Anvik	AVEC	0.65	8.16
Aleutians	Atka	Andreanof Electric Corporation	0.61	7.63
Low Yuk-Kusk	Atmautluak	Atmautluak Joint Utilities	0.70	8.73
North Slope	Atkasuk	North Slope Borough	0.15	1.88
North Slope	Barrow	Barrow Utilities & Electric Coop	0.12	1.45
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Beaver	Beaver Joint Utilities	0.55	6.90
Low Yuk-Kusk	Bethel /Oscarville	Bethel Utilities Corporation, Inc.	0.44	5.50
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Bettles	Alaska Power Company	0.62	7.81
Railbelt	Big Lake	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Bering Straits	Brevig Mission	AVEC	0.52	6.50
Northwest Arctic	Buckland	City of Buckland	0.48	6.03
Railbelt	Cantwell	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Central	Central Electric, Inc.	0.70	8.73
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Chalkyitsik	Chalkyitsik Village Energy System	0.95	10.00
Low Yuk-Kusk	Chefornak	Naterkaq Light Plant	0.46	5.70
CopRiv/Chug	Chenega Bay	Chenega Bay IRA Village Council	0.44	5.44
Low Yuk-Kusk	Chevak	AVEC	0.55	6.90
Railbelt	Chickaloon	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Bristol Bay	Chignik	Chignik Electric	0.45	5.60
Bristol Bay	Chignik Lagoon	Chignik Lagoon Power Utility	0.40	5.00
Bristol Bay	Chignik Lake	Chignik Lake Electric Utility, Inc.	0.58	7.27
Southeast	Chilkat Valley	Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.55	6.89
Kodiak	Chiniak	Kodiak Electric Association	0.18	2.21
CopRiv/Chug	Chistochina	Alaska Power Company	0.60	7.55

CopRiv/Chug	Chitina	Chitina Electric Inc.	0.58	7.19
Low Yuk-Kusk	Chuathbaluk	Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.84	10.00
Railbelt	Chugiak	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Circle Hot Springs (Central)	Central Electric, Inc.	0.70	8.73
Railbelt	Clam Gulch	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Southeast	Coffman Cove	Alaska Power Company	0.49	6.07
Aleutians	Cold Bay	G & K, Inc.	0.63	7.86
Railbelt	College	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Railbelt	Cooper Landing	Chugach Electric Association, Inc.	0.13	1.66
CopRiv/Chug	Copper Center	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
CopRiv/Chug	Copporville	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
CopRiv/Chug	Cordova / Eyak	Cordova Electric Cooperative Inc.	0.35	4.32
Southeast	Craig	Alaska Power Company	0.21	2.68
Low Yuk-Kusk	Crooked Creek	Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.93	10.00
North Slope	Deadhorse	TDX North Slope Generating, Inc.	0.28	3.46
Northwest Arctic	Deering	Ipnachiaq Electric Company	0.77	9.67
Railbelt	Delta Junction	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Bristol Bay	Dillingham	Nushagak Electric Coop	0.36	4.54
Bering Straits	Diomede (Little Diomede)	Diomede Joint Utilities	0.60	7.50
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Dot Lake	Alaska Power Company	0.39	4.89
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Eagle / Eagle Village	Alaska Power Company	0.57	7.09
Railbelt	Eagle River	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Low Yuk-Kusk	Eek	AVEC	0.54	6.69
Bristol Bay	Egegik	Egegik Light & Power Company	0.69	8.57
Railbelt	Eklutna	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Bristol Bay	Ekwok	Ekwok Electric	0.61	7.64
Southeast	Elfin Cove	Elfin Cove Utility Commission	0.53	6.62
Bering Straits	Elim	AVEC	0.54	6.78
Low Yuk-Kusk	Emmonak	AVEC	0.51	6.42
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Evansville	Alaska Power Company	0.62	7.81
Railbelt	Fairbanks	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Aleutians	False Pass	False Pass Electric Assoc	0.53	6.68
Railbelt	Ft Greely / Ft Wainwright	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Fort Yukon	Gwitchyaa Zhee Utility Company	0.57	7.19
Railbelt	Fox	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
CopRiv/Chug	Gakona	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Galena	City of Galena	0.56	7.04
Bering Straits	Gambell	AVEC	0.53	6.60
CopRiv/Chug	Glennallen	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Bering Straits	Golovin	Golovin Power Utilities	0.57	7.11
Low Yuk-Kusk	Goodnews Bay	AVEC	0.47	5.93
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Grayling	AVEC	0.54	6.80
CopRiv/Chug	Gulkana	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Southeast	Gustavus	Gustavus Electric Company, Inc.	0.37	4.62
Southeast	Haines	Alaska Power Company	0.22	2.73
Railbelt	Halibut Cove	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Railbelt	Healy	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Healy Lake	Alaska Power Company	0.65	8.12
Southeast	Hollis	Alaska Power Company	0.21	2.68
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Holy Cross	AVEC	0.57	7.16
Railbelt	Homer	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Southeast	Hoonah	Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.55	6.89
Low Yuk-Kusk	Hooper Bay	AVEC	0.55	6.87

Railbelt	Hope	Chugach Electric Association, Inc.	0.13	1.66
Railbelt	Houston	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Hughes	Hughes Light & Power	0.71	8.88
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Huslia	AVEC	0.52	6.45
Southeast	Hydaburg	Alaska Power Company	0.21	2.68
Southeast	Hyder/Stewart B.C.	BC Hydro	0.09	1.09
Bristol Bay	Igiugig	Igiugig Electric Company	0.80	10.00
Bristol Bay	Iliamna	I-N-N Electric Coop	0.57	7.11
Southeast	Juneau, City & Borough of	Alaska Electric Light & Power	0.11	1.34
Railbelt	Kachemak	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Southeast	Kake	Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.55	6.89
North Slope	Kaktovik	North Slope Borough	0.15	1.92
Railbelt	Kalifornsky	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Kaltag	AVEC	0.56	6.96
Kodiak	Karluk	Alutiiq Power Company	0.60	7.50
Low Yuk-Kusk	Kasigluk	AVEC	0.53	6.57
Railbelt	Kasilof	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Railbelt	Kenai	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
CopRiv/Chug	Kenny Lake	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Southeast	Ketchikan	Ketchikan Public Utilities	0.10	1.27
Northwest Arctic	Kiana	AVEC	0.61	7.65
Aleutians	King Cove	City of King Cove	0.26	3.25
Bristol Bay	King Salmon	Naknek Electric Assn	0.45	5.65
Low Yuk-Kusk	Kipnuk	Kipnuk Light Plant	0.50	6.31
Northwest Arctic	Kivalina	AVEC	0.56	7.02
Southeast	Klawock	Alaska Power Company	0.21	2.68
Southeastt	Klukwan	Inside Passage Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.55	6.87
Railbelt	Knik-Fairview	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Northwest Arctic	Kobuk	Kobuk Valley Elect Coop	0.87	10.00
Kodiak	Kodiak	Kodiak Electric Association	0.18	2.21
Kodaik	Kodiak Station	Kodiak Electric Association	0.18	2.21
Bristol Bay	Kokhanok	Kokhanok Village Council	0.90	10.00
Bristol Bay	Koliganek	New Koliganek Village Council	0.50	6.25
Low Yuk-Kusk	Kongiganak	Puvurnaq Power Company	0.55	6.88
Low Yuk-Kusk	Kotlik	AVEC	0.51	6.43
Northwest Arctic	Kotzebue	Kotzebue Electric Assn	0.43	5.37
Bering Straits	Koyuk	AVEC	0.55	6.82
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Koyukuk	City of Koyukuk	0.45	5.63
Low Yuk-Kusk	Kwethluk	Kwethluk Inc	0.52	6.50
Low Yuk-Kusk	Kwigillingok	Kwig Power Company	0.56	6.94
Kodiak	Larsen Bay	Larsen Bay Utility Company	0.41	5.13
Bristol Bay	Levelock	Levelock Electric Coop	1.27	10.00
Low Yuk-Kusk	Lime Village	Lime Village Traditional Council	1.52	10.00
Low Yuk-Kusk	Lower Kalskag	AVEC	0.51	6.35
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Manley Hot Springs	Manley Utility Company, Inc.	1.02	10.00
Bristol Bay	Manokotak	Manokotak Power Company	0.55	6.88
Low Yuk-Kusk	Marshall	AVEC	0.54	6.80
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	McGrath	McGrath Light & Power Company	0.60	7.48
Railbelt	McKinley Park	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Low Yuk-Kusk	Mekoryuk	AVEC	0.59	7.42
CopRiv/Chug	Mendeltna	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Low Yuk-Kusk	Mentasta	Alaska Power Company	0.62	7.72
Southeast	Metlakatla	Metlakatla Power & Light	0.09	1.12

Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Minto	AVEC	0.45	5.65
Railbelt	Moose Pass	Chugach Electric Association, Inc.	0.13	1.66
Low Yuk-Kusk	Mountain Village	AVEC	0.51	6.39
Bristol Bay	Naknek	Naknek Electric Assn	0.45	5.65
Railbelt	Nanwalek	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.13
Low Yuk-Kusk	Napakiak	Napakiak Ircinraq Power Company	0.60	7.48
Low Yuk-Kusk	Napaskiak	Napaskiak Electric Utility	0.60	7.50
Southeast	Naukati Bay	Alaska Power Company	0.51	6.32
CopRiv/Chug	Nelchina	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Aleutians	Nelson Lagoon	Nelson Lagoon Electric Coop	0.74	9.25
Railbelt	Nenana	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Bristol Bay	New Stuyahok	AVEC	0.57	7.16
Bristol Bay	Newhalen	I-N-N Electric Coop	0.57	7.11
Low Yuk-Kusk	Newtok	Ungusrag Power Company	0.80	10.00
Low Yuk-Kusk	Nightmute	AVEC	0.51	6.36
Railbelt	Nikiski	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Nikolai	Nikolai Light & Power Utility	0.80	10.00
Aleutians	Nikolski	Umnak Power Company	0.60	7.50
Railbelt	Nililchik	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Northwest Arctic	Noatak	AVEC	0.87	10.00
Bering Straits	Nome	Nome Joint Utility Systems	0.36	4.49
Northwest Arctic	Nondalton	I-N-N Electric Coop	0.57	7.11
Northwest Arctic	Noorvik	AVEC	0.58	7.28
Railbelt	North Pole	Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.	0.20	2.53
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Northway / Northway Village	Alaska Power Company	0.58	7.27
North Slope	Nuiqsut	North Slope Borough	0.12	1.44
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Nulato	AVEC	0.52	6.51
Low Yuk-Kusk	Nunam Iqua (Sheldon Point)	Nunam Iqua Electric Co.	0.53	6.63
Low Yuk-Kusk	Nunapitchuk	AVEC	0.53	6.57
Kodiak	Old Harbor	AVEC	0.50	6.29
Kodiak	Ouzinkie	City of Ouzinkie	0.39	4.87
Railbelt	Palmer	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Southeast	Pedro Bay	Pedro Bay Village Council	0.91	10.00
Southeast	Pelican	Kake Tribal Corporation	0.40	5.04
Bristol Bay	Perryville	Native Village of Perryville	0.80	10.00
Southeast	Petersburg	Petersburg Municipal Power & Light	0.10	1.25
Bristol Bay	Pilot Point	Pilot Point Electrical Utility	0.50	6.25
Low Yuk-Kusk	Pilot Station	AVEC	0.53	6.60
Low Yuk-Kusk	Pitkas Point	AVEC	0.58	7.19
Low Yuk-Kusk	Platinum	City of Platinum	0.50	6.25
North Slope	Point Hope	North Slope Borough	0.17	2.07
North Slope	Point Lay	North Slope Borough	0.16	2.00
Bristol Bay	Port Alsworth	Tanalian Electric Coop	0.64	8.01
Railbelt	Port Graham	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.13
Bristol Bay	Port Heiden (Meshik)	Port Heiden Utilities	0.68	8.48
Kodiak	Port Lions	Kodiak Electric Association	0.18	2.21
Low Yuk-Kusk	Quinhagak	AVEC	0.51	6.36
Low Yuk-Kusk	Red Devil	Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.92	10.00
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Ruby	City of Ruby	0.80	10.00
Low Yuk-Kusk	Russian Mission	AVEC	0.50	6.29
Aleutians	Saint George	St. George Municipal Electric Utility	No data	
Low Yuk-Kusk	Saint Mary's /Andreadfsky	AVEC	0.58	7.19
Bering Straits	Saint Michael	AVEC	0.48	5.97

Aleutians	Saint Paul	St. Paul Municipal Electric Utility	0.47	5.89
Railbelt	Salamatof	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Aleutians	Sand Point	TDX Sand Point Generating, Inc.	0.51	6.42
Bering Straits	Savoonga	AVEC	0.44	5.45
Southeast	Saxman	Ketchikan Public Utilities	0.10	1.27
Low Yuk-Kusk	Scammon Bay	AVEC	0.55	6.88
Northwest Arctic	Selawik	AVEC	0.59	7.38
Railbelt	Seldovia	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.13
Railbelt	Seward	Seward Electric System	0.17	2.15
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Shageluk	AVEC	0.59	7.32
Bering Straits	Shaktoolik	AVEC	0.55	6.88
Bering Straits	Shishmaref	AVEC	0.60	7.56
Northwest Arctic	Shungnak	AVEC	0.59	7.33
CopRiv/Chug	Silver Springs	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Southeast	Sitka (Mt. Edgecumbe)	Sitka Electric Department	0.10	1.19
Southeast	Skagway	Alaska Power Company	0.22	2.73
CopRiv/Chug	Slana	Alaska Power Company	0.61	7.57
Low Yuk-Kusk	Sleetmute	Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.92	10.00
Railbelt	Soldotna	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Bristol Bay	South Naknek	Naknek Electric Assn	0.45	5.65
Bering Straits	Stebbins	AVEC	0.54	6.81
Railbelt	Sterling	Homer Electric Association, Inc.	0.17	2.10
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Stevens Village	Stevens Village Energy Systems	1.07	10.00
Low Yuk-Kusk	Stony River	Middle Kuskokwim Electric Cooperative, Inc.	0.92	10.00
Railbelt	Sutton-Alpine	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Takotna	Takotna Community Assoc. Utilities	1.02	10.00
Railbelt	Talkeetna	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Tanana PCE	Tanana Power Company, Inc.	0.67	8.38
CopRiv/Chug	Tatitlek PCE	Tatitlek Electric Utility	0.55	6.88
CopRiv/Chug	Tazlina	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Bering Straits	Teller	AVEC	0.58	7.25
Southeast	Tenakee Springs	City of Tenakee Springs	0.64	8.00
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Tetlin	Alaska Power Company	0.39	4.89
Southeast	Thorne Bay / Kasaan	Alaska Power Company	0.21	2.68
Bristol Bay	Togiak (Twin Hills)	AVEC	0.58	7.19
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Tok / Tanacross	Alaska Power Company	0.39	4.89
Low Yuk-Kusk	Toksook Bay	AVEC	0.51	6.36
CopRiv/Chug	Tolsona	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
CopRiv/Chug	Tonsina	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Low Yuk-Kusk	Tuluksak	Tuluksak Traditional Power Utility	0.60	7.50
Low Yuk-Kusk	Tuntutuliak	Tuntutuliak Community Service Assoc	0.65	8.13
Low Yuk-Kusk	Tununak	AVEC	0.51	6.36
Bristol Bay	Twin Hills	Twin Hills Village Council	0.55	6.88
Railbelt	Tyonek	Chugach Electric Association, Inc.	0.13	1.66
Bering Straits	Unalakleet	Unalakleet Valley Electric Cooperative	0.39	4.82
Aleutians	Unalaska (Dutch Harbor)	Unalaska Electric Utility	0.38	4.81
Low Yuk-Kusk	Upper Kalskag	AVEC	0.51	6.35
CopRiv/Chug	Valdez	Copper Valley Electric Assn.	0.22	2.74
Yuk-Koy/UpTan	Venetie	Venetie Village Electric	0.75	9.38
North Slope	Wainwright	North Slope Borough	0.15	1.89
Bering Straits	Wales	AVEC	0.62	7.74
Railbelt	Wasilla	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Southeast	Whale Pass	Alaska Power Company	0.54	6.76

Bering Straits	White Mountain	White Mountain Utilities	0.72	9.00
Railbelt	Whittier	Chugach Electric Association, Inc.	0.13	1.66
Railbelt	Willow	Matanuska Electric Association, Inc.	0.14	1.74
Kodiak	Women's Bay	Kodiak Electric Association	0.18	2.21
Southeast	Wrangell	Wrangell Municipal Light & Power	0.11	1.35
Southeast	Yakutat	Yakutat Power	0.45	5.57

**For Round V Projects addressing multiple communities, the following average cost of power (\$/kWh) and scores were used:**

Application #805 *Black Bear Lake Hydro Project Storage Increase* and Application #808 *Reynolds Creek Hydro Transmission Line* by Alaska Power & Telephone for the benefit of the Prince of Wales Island communities including: Coffman Cove, Craig, Hollis, Hydaburg, Kasaan, Klawock, Naukatik Bay, and Thorne Bay (average cost \$/kWh: 0.28, score: 3.50)

Application #806 *Upper Tanana Area Intertie Project* by Alaska Power Company for the benefit of connecting the communities of Slana, Chistochina, Mentasta Lake, Northway, Northway Junction & Northway Village with Tok (average cost \$/kWh: 0.56, score: 7.00)

Application #807 *Connelly Lake Hydroelectric Project* by Alaska Power Co. and Application #829 *Walker Lake Feasibility Study* by Inside Passage Electric Cooperative for the benefit of the Klukwan, Chilkat Valley, Haines, and Skagway communities (average cost \$/kWh: 0.39, score: 4.88)

Application #811 *Kake-Petersburg Inter-Connection Engineering* by Southeast Alaska Power Agency for the benefit of Kake and Petersburg (average cost \$/kWh: 0.28, score: 3.50)

Application #820 *Design & Construction of Wood Heating Projects in Interior Alaska Communities* by Interior Regional Housing Authority for the benefit of Hughes, Ruby, Koyukuk, Nulato, Kaltag, Nikolai, Anvik, and Holy Cross (average cost \$/kWh 0.63, score: 7.88)