

SECTION ONE

Project Name	Solar Reserve (Rice Solar)
Scorer (Name, LAN ID, Phone)	
Date	11-Feb-10
Database Contract ID	
CPUC ID	0
IOU ID	0
IOU Contact Person	0
Contract Type	0
Max Capacity (MW)	0

INSTRUCTIONS

- 1 Provide project, scorer, date, and database contract ID information in section ONE above
- 2 Modify ONLY Areas in Sections ONE, TWO, and THREE (outlined by a green border in column A). All other fields are self-populating
- 3 Provide background / supporting information for ALL scores in 'Notes:' section
- 4 Any deviations from the scoring guidelines must be described in detail in the 'Notes:' section
- 5 Intermediate scores (values not specifically defined) are not allowed in Section Two
- 6 Scores provided in template are just placeholders and should be overridden with actual project scores

SUMMARY RESULTS

Project Development Experience	EPC Experience	Ownership / O&M Experience	Technical Feasibility	Resource Quality	Manufacturing Supply Chain	Site Control	Permitting Status	Project Financing Status	Interconnection Progress	Transmission Requirements	Reasonableness of COD
8	3	8	2	10	2	10	5	5	8	6	10

	FINAL PVC	MODIFIED PVC
Weighted Team	20.00	16.88
Weighted Technology	13.22	7.50
Weighted Development	29.09	35.88
Total Weighted Score	62.31	60.26

SECTION THREE - SCORING NOTES (TO BE COMPLETED AFTER SCORING IN SECTION TWO)

Scorer 1

Describe project and any characteristics of note (e.g. 50MW solar PV project using CdTe thin film. Major permitting issues include xyz..., etc.)

SECTION TWO - INTERMEDIATE SCORES ARE NOT ALLOWED

Criteria: Scoring Guidelines

- Project Score -
- Scale -

Company / Development Team

Project Development Experience Notes: This development team has completed close to 100 projects globally in a variety of generation technologies sizee between 20 and 500 MW.	8	10	The company and/or the development team has completed 2 or more projects of similar technology and capacity (e.g., 20 MW photovoltaic facility (thin-film)).
		8	The company and/or the development team has completed 2 or more projects of any technology and capacity (wholesale generation).
		7	Either (i) the company and/or the development team has completed at least one project of similar technology and capacity; or (ii) begun construction of at least one other similar project.
		5	Either (i) the company and/or the development team has completed at least one project of any technology and capacity (wholesale generation); or (ii) begun construction of at least one other similar project.
		0	None of the above.

EPC Experience Notes: Built Solar Two (molten salt power tower) with Bechtel. For this project Pratt and Whitney Power Systems is the EPC, they've built many conventional generation projects up to 60MW worldwide.	3	10	Multiple previous projects with same EPC supplier with same technology
		8	Multiple previous projects with same EPC supplier using different technology
		5	Some EPC experience with same technology
		3	Some EPC experience with different technology
		1	Minimal experience / established relationship with EPC supplier
	0	None of the above.	

Ownership / O&M Experience Notes: This development team has experience from Enron, Semptra, Invenergy, etc. in ownership and O&M.	8	10	The company, development team or subcontractor has experience with 2 or more projects of similar technology and capacity. (e.g., 20 MW photovoltaic facility (thin-film))
		8	The company, development team or subcontractor has experience with 2 or more projects of any technology and capacity (wholesale generation).
		7	The company, development team or subcontractor has experience with at least 1 project with similar technology.
		5	The company, development team or subcontractor has experience with at least 1 project of any technology and capacity (wholesale generation).
		0	None of the above.

Technology

Technical Feasibility Notes: This development team demonstrated 10MW Solar Two molten salt power tower, Abengoa has 10MW and 20MW power towers, Andasol has molten salt storage system.	2	10	Project will use commercialized technology that is currently in use at a minimum of 2 operating facilities of similar capacity (worldwide).
		5	Project will use commercialized technology that is currently in use at a minimum of 2 operating facilities, but at first-of-its-kind scale. For example, existing projects do not exceed 20 MW and the proposed project is for greater than 50 MW.
		2	Either (i) the project will use key components of commercialized technology, but in an application that has not yet been commercially proven; or (ii) project feasibility is supported by third party, independent engineer's report that verifies the cost and performance. (Technology is not commercially proven)
		0	None of the above.

Resource Quality Notes: This proposed site has NREL data concluding that this is an excellent solar site.	10	10	Bidder demonstrated that the resource can support the production profile. For example: - Geothermal: Based on results of test wells, verified third party resource assessment or comparable facilities in the region. - Wind: Based on meteorological tower data, verified third party resource assessment or comparable facilities in the region. - Biomass: Sufficient quantities of fuel stock under control or contract for a minimum of five years. - Solar: Based on verified third party resource assessment or comparable facilities in the region.
		5	The resource appears sufficient to support the project's production profile. Assumptions are reasonable but not supported by data or assessment in section above.
		0	None of the above.

Manufacturing Supply Chain Notes: This development team has demonstrated 10MW Solar Two molten salt power tower, Abengoa has 10MW and 20MW power towers, Andasol has molten salt storage system. Receiver is main proprietary component.	2	10	There are no known or anticipated supply chain constraints.
		5	Project scored within the top two tiers in the Technical Feasibility category, but project development is dependent on new manufacturing capacity.
		2	Project will rely on proprietary technical design for its key component(s), not currently in use commercially, and project development is dependent on new manufacturing capacity.
	0	None of the above.	

Site Control 10 <i>Notes: The option agreement for this project is in place with purchase and sale agreement for private land, and does not involve use of BLM land for the site.</i>	10 Project has 100% site control through either (i) direct ownership; (ii) a lease; or (iii) an option to lease or purchase. 8 The project will be sited on BLM land and the bidder has achieved "Site Exclusivity," pursuant to California Independent System Operator (CAISO) guidelines. (http://www.caiso.com/1f42/1f42c00d28c30.html) 0 None of the above.
Permitting Status 5 <i>Notes: The AFC for this project at the CEC was deemed data adequate on Dec 2, 2009</i>	10 At a minimum, bidder has received its Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or Application for Certification (AFC). 5 Bidder has applied for its CUP or AFC, the application has been deemed data adequate and/or the designated agency has initiated its review. No fatal flaws have been identified (e.g., protected species and/or land, high land mitigation requirement). 2 Bidder has not initiated permitting, but bidder has successfully permitted a facility of similar technology and capacity. No fatal flaws have been identified (e.g., protected species and/or land, high land mitigation requirement). 0 None of the above.
Project Financing Status 5 <i>Notes: Project finance team has financed \$5B+ of energy projects worldwide</i>	10 Either (i) the project will be "balance sheet" financed; or (ii) the project will rely on a power purchase agreement (PPA) for its financing and bidder can verify that such financing has been secured. 6 Project will rely on PPA financing. The bidder has obtained financing for at least 1 project of similar technology and capacity (e.g., 20 MW photovoltaic facility (thin-film)). 5 Project will rely on PPA financing. The bidder has obtained financing for at least 1 project of any technology and capacity (wholesale generation). 0 None of the above.
Interconnection Progress 8 <i>Notes: This project has received Transitional Cluster Phase 1 results and has posted its deposit for Phase 2 studies.</i>	10 The project has obtained its Interconnection Agreement. 8 Either (i) the project is in Phase II of the CAISO's Large Generator Interconnection Process (LGIP), has posted its Letter of Credit and is in compliance with all CAISO requirements for maintaining queue position, or (ii) the project is in the Serial Study Group and has initiated its Facilities Study. 8 The project can interconnect through CAISO Small Generator Interconnection Procedures. 5 Either (i) the project is in Phase I of the CAISO's LGIP and is in compliance with all CAISO requirements for maintaining queue position; or (ii) the project is in the Serial Study Group and has initiated its System Impact Study. 3 The project has submitted its Interconnection Request. 0 None of the above.
Transmission Requirements 6 <i>Notes: Transmission access expected 2012 online.</i>	10 No transmission system upgrades required. 8 Transmission access expected in less than 2 years. 6 Transmission access expected in less than 3 years. 4 Transmission access expected in less than 5 years. 2 Transmission access expected in greater than 5 years. 0 None of the above.
Reasonableness of COD 10 Utility should validate the reasonableness of project's commercial online date (COD) based on the scores given for criteria above. <i>Notes: We have no knowledge that would lead us to believe that the developer's proposed schedule cannot be met.</i>	10 Utility reasonably expects project's COD to occur within 12 months of the proposed online date. 8 Utility reasonably expects project's COD to occur within 12 - 24 months of the proposed online date. 6 Utility reasonably expects project's COD to occur within 24 - 36 months of the proposed online date. 2 Utility reasonably expects project's COD to occur within 36 - 48 months of the proposed online date. 0 Utility reasonably expects project's COD to occur more than 48 months after the proposed online date.

Project Viability Calculator

Category and Criteria Weighting

Category	Criteria	Priority	Weight
Company / Development	Project Development Experience	VH	4
	Ownership / O&M Experience	L	1
Weight	25%		
Technology	Technical Feasibility	VH	4
	Resource Quality	M	2
	Manufacturing Supply Chain	H	3
Weight	35%		
Development Milestones	Site Control	VH	4
	Permitting Status	VH	4
	Project Financing Status	VH	4
	Interconnection Progress	VH	4
	Transmission Requirements	H	3
	Reasonableness of COD	H	3
Weight	40%		
<i>must equal 100% --> 100%</i>			

Criteria Ranking				
Priority	VH	H	M	L
Weight	4	3	2	1

Project Scoring range 0 -10 - score card - Utility Comments

weight

Category	Criteria	Score	Weighted Score
25% Company / Development Team	4 Project Development Experience	8	
	1 Ownership / O&M Experience	8	
<i>Total Category</i>		16	
<i>Weighted Criteria</i>		40	
<i>Normalized Category</i>		80.00	
Weighted Category		20.00	

Category	Criteria	Score	Weighted Score
35% Technology	4 Technical Feasibility	2	
	2 Resource Quality	10	
	3 Manufacturing Supply Chain	2	
<i>Total Category</i>		14	
<i>Weighted Criteria</i>		34	
<i>Normalized Category</i>		37.78	
Weighted Category		13.22	

Category	Criteria	Score	Weighted Score
40% Development Milestones	4 Site Control	10	
	4 Permitting Status	5	
	4 Project Financing Status	5	
	4 Interconnection Progress	8	
	3 Transmission Requirements	6	
	3 Reasonableness of COD	10	
<i>Total Category</i>		44	
<i>Weighted Criteria</i>		160	
<i>Normalized Category</i>		72.73	
Weighted Category		29.09	

Total Weighted Score 62.31

Category and Criteria Weighting

Category	Criteria	Priority	Weight
Company / Development	Project Development Experience	VH	4
	EPC Experience	M	2
	Ownership / O&M Experience	M	2
Weight	25%		
Technology	Technical Feasibility	VH	4
	Resource Quality	L	1
	Manufacturing Supply Chain	H	3
Weight	25%		
Development Milestones	Site Control	VH	4
	Permitting Status	VH	4
	Project Financing Status	M	2
	Interconnection Progress	H	3
	Transmission Requirements	H	3
	Reasonableness of COD	L	1
Weight	50%		

must equal 100% --> 100%

Criteria Ranking				
Priority	VH	H	M	L
Weight	4	3	2	1

Project Scoring range 0 -10 - score card - Utility

Comments

weight

Weight	Criteria	Score	Utility	Comments
25%	Company / Development Team			
4	Project Development Experience	8		
2	EPC Experience	3		
2	Ownership / O&M Experience	8		
	Total Category	19		
	Weighted Criteria	54		
	Normalized Category	67.50		
	Weighted Category	16.88		

Weight	Criteria	Score	Utility	Comments
25%	Technology			
4	Technical Feasibility	2		
1	Resource Quality	10		
3	Manufacturing Supply Chain	2		
	Total Category	14		
	Weighted Criteria	24		
	Normalized Category	30.00		
	Weighted Category	7.50		

Weight	Criteria	Score	Utility	Comments
50%	Development Milestones			
4	Site Control	10		
4	Permitting Status	5		
2	Project Financing Status	5		
3	Interconnection Progress	8		
3	Transmission Requirements	6		
1	Reasonableness of COD	10		
	Total Category	44		
	Weighted Criteria	122		
	Normalized Category	71.76		
	Weighted Category	35.88		

Total Weighted Score 60.26

To use for PDSR Report Template to CPUC

Solar Reserve (Ric		Project Name
0		CPUC ID
0		IOU ID
62.31		Total Weighted Score
8		Project Development Experience
8		Ownership / O&M Experience
2		Technical Feasibility
10		Resource Quality
2		Manufacturing Supply Chain
10		Site Control
5		Permitting Status

To use for PG&E RPS Database

0	Database Contract ID
Reserve (Ric	Project Name
0	CPUC ID
0	IOU ID
0	IOU Contact Person
0	0
3	EPC Experience
8	Project Development Experience
8	Ownership / O&M Experience
2	Technical Feasibility
10	Resource Quality

2	Manufacturing Supply Chain
10	Site Control
5	Permitting Status
5	Project Financing Status
8	Interconnection Progress
6	Transmission Requirements
10	Reasonableness of COD
20.00	Weighted Team (Final PVC)
13.22	Weighted Technology (Final PVC)
29.09	Weighted Development (Final PVC)
62.31	Total Weighted Score (Final PVC)
16.88	Weighted Team (Modified PVC)

5	Project Financing Status
8	Interconnection Progress
6	Transmission Requirements
10	Reasonableness of COD
20.00	Weighted Team
13.22	Weighted Technology
29.09	Weighted Development
	Vintage
	Project Status

7.50	Weighted Technology (Modified PVC)
35.88	Weighted Development (Modified PVC)
60.26	Total Weighted Score (Modified PVC)
Describe pNotes: ThiNotes: BuNotes: ThNotes: ThNotes: ThNotes: ThNotes: ThNotes: ThNotes: Th	Scorer 1
	Project Development Experience
	EPC Experience
	Ownership / O&M Experience
	Technical Feasibility
	Resource Quality
	Manufacturing Supply Chain
	Site Control
	Permitting Status

Notes

Project Financing Status
Interconnection Progress
Transmission Requirements
Reasonableness of COD

Receiver is main proprietary component.

Project Viability Scoring Worksheet

Notes

<u>Date</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Changes Made By</u>	<u>Follow-up Needed?</u>
8-Feb-10	Switched scorer for Sand Ridge Wind Project from Joe Lawlor to Jon Forrester. Per Esfandiar's request.	{Redacted}	Done
8-Feb-10	Switched IOU ID for Topaz Solar Farms, LLC (OptiSolar) from 33R046 to 33R056, as Contract Management changed the log number. Per Mike Gonzales' request		Done
8-Feb-10	Terrance Robertson says Albiassa doesn't need to be scored. Claims Sempra Boulder City will not have to be scored, as he hasn't started working on that transaction.		Done (made blank sheet for Alb
8-Feb-10	Beth states that we do not need to score any facilities that are already online (>1 year)		Note: don't need to score any fa
9-Feb-10	Nacimiento Hydro Dam switches from Heather Kellman to Hugh Merriam. Per Esfandiar		Done
9-Feb-10	Alta Rock Energy Corral Creek Geothermal; Geysers Power (Units 25 & 27); PV - 03 (Antelope 1 Solar Array); PV-12 (Monte Vista Solar Array); Radiant Energy No.1; Salton Sea PV; and World Waste Tech. Gonzales are all unassigned (no active discussion). Per Esfandiar.		Need to make blank score sheet
9-Feb-10	Powerex doesn't need to be scored. Created a blank score sheet.		Done
9-Feb-10	POSDEF actual name is "DTE Stockton (fka POSDEF)." No changes made. Nick Abrams labeled the POSDEF worksheet as DTE Stockton.		Need to change name
9-Feb-10	Switched scorer for Pacific Renewables from Hugh Merriam to Rich Miram. Per Hugh Merriam and Esfandiar.		Done
9-Feb-10	Switched scorer for Tessera Solar from Hugh Merriam to Rich Miram. Per Hugh Merriam and Esfandiar.		Done
9-Feb-10	Jessica Hilgart said that HFI Silvan and Calpine Geysers (250/425 MW) don't need scores. Asked her to complete blank templates.		Check if she made blank sheets
10-Feb-10	Changed name of POSDEF to DTE Stockton (fka POSDEF) on the template, the project assignment sheet, and Nick's score sheet. Per Nick Abrams.		Done
10-Feb-10	Neha Patel says she doesn't need to score Abengoa (should be eliminated), Desert Claim (haven't engaged in negotiations with yet), or Solucar (executed and filed). Pacific wind (Martin Wyspianski is negotiating) hasn't gotten far enough to be scored. Asked Neha to make blank sheets for the ones she doesn't need to score.		Check if she made blank sheets
10-Feb-10	Made blank sheets for Alta Rock, Geysers 25 & 27, PV-03, PV-12, Radiant, Salton Sea, and World Waste Tech. These are all unassigned and don't need to be scored. Per Esfandiar.		Done
10-Feb-10	Updated list of projects to be scored. Per Beth.		Done
10-Feb-10	Beth states that NextLight Boulder City DOES need to be scored. Emailed Terrance to tell him to score the project.		Done

asa and Sempra Boulder City)

ilities online > 1 year

s for these