

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Beverly Jones Heydinger
David C. Boyd
Nancy Lange
Dan Lipschultz
Betsy Wergin

Chair
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner

In the Matter of Xcel's Request to Issue
Renewable Development Fund Cycle 4
Requests for Proposals and Petition for
Approval of a Standard Grant Contract

ISSUE DATE: March 11, 2014

DOCKET NO. E-002/M-12-1278

ORDER APPROVING RDF GRANT
RECOMMENDATIONS,
ESTABLISHING FUNDING
PROCEDURES, AND REQUIRING
COMPLIANCE FILINGS

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 29, 2012, Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy (Xcel or the Company) filed a notice of its intent to proceed with the fourth funding cycle of its Renewable Development Fund (RDF) program and a petition for approval of standard grant contracts for certain RDF projects.

On February 6, 2013, the Commission issued an order approving Xcel's request for proposals (RFP) and standard grant contracts. The Commission's order set several requirements for the RFP process and required Xcel to submit its final project selections to the Commission for approval.

Xcel issued its RFP on February 15, 2013, and accepted proposals through April 15, 2013. The Company received 67 qualifying proposals with a combined funding request of \$133.5 million, more than four times the available funding.

On July 29, 2013, Xcel filed its RDF Cycle 4 selection report, recommending 20 projects with a total price tag of \$30 million. Xcel requested that the Commission approve its recommended grant awards and list of reserve projects. Xcel also requested authority to terminate contract negotiations that the Company reasonably believes have reached an impasse and to move forward with a reserve project.

On August 9, 2013, Xcel filed a supplement to its selection report, providing additional details about the selection process.

On August 13, 2013, the Commission issued a notice soliciting comments on the selection report. Between August 13 and December 31, 2013, the Commission received written comments from the following grant applicants, legislators, and other stakeholders:

- The Metropolitan Council
- The City of Hutchinson
- PowerWorks Wind Turbines LLC
- The Region Five Development Commission
- AF Energy Corporation
- Dragonfly Solar, LLC
- Minnesota Go Solar LLC
- Senator Tom Saxhaug
- Representative John Ward
- Representative John Persell
- Interphases Solar
- The City of Red Wing
- EcoCorp
- Gustavus Adolphus College
- The Minnesota Renewable Energy Society
- Alan Muller
- Minnesota Agricultural Interpretive Center - Farmamerica
- Brick Development
- Senator Scott Newman
- Representative Dean Urdahl
- Representative Glenn Gruenhagen
- Natural Systems Utilities, LLC
- Bergey Wind Power Co.
- Mimi Jennings

On September 13, 2013, Xcel filed a second supplement to its selection report correcting several scoring errors.

On September 27, 2013, the Minnesota Department of Commerce (the Department) filed comments requesting that Xcel combine its selection report and supplements into one document to facilitate Commission review of the selection process. The Department also requested that Xcel further explain its biomass project selections and clarify the process it intends to use to fund reserve projects.

On December 12, 2013, Xcel filed reply comments providing a full record of the selection process, a scoring audit, and a response to comments by the Department and other stakeholders.

On January 20, 2014, Xcel filed a letter stating that additional funds had accumulated in the RDF account during 2013 and recommending that the Commission approve another \$12 million to fund reserve projects and increase higher-education grants.

On January 23, 2014, the matter came before the Commission. A number of stakeholders, most of whom had previously submitted written comments, appeared at the public meeting and made oral presentations.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

I. Background

Minnesota Statutes section 116C.779 directs Xcel, as the owner of the Prairie Island and Monticello nuclear power plants, to maintain a renewable development fund (RDF) as a condition

of storing spent nuclear fuel at those facilities. Xcel is entitled to recover the costs of the RDF from its ratepayers through an automatic adjustment to the rates the Company charges for electricity.¹

With the Commission's approval, Xcel solicits proposals for projects to fund through the RDF. Projects must satisfy at least one of the RDF's purposes:

- to increase the market penetration within Minnesota of renewable electric energy resources at reasonable costs;
- to promote the start-up, expansion, and attraction of renewable electric energy projects and companies within Minnesota;
- to stimulate research and development within Minnesota into renewable electric energy technologies; and
- to develop near-commercial and demonstration-scale renewable electric projects or electric infrastructure delivery projects that enhance the delivery of renewable electric energy.²

Xcel must consult with an advisory group that includes representatives of its ratepayers³ and must also retain an independent third-party expert to evaluate the proposals.⁴ In evaluating proposals, Xcel must "strongly consider . . . potential benefit to Minnesota citizens and businesses and the utility's ratepayers."⁵ The RDF statute directs Xcel to attempt to reach agreement with the advisory group but gives the Company ultimate authority to determine the projects that it recommends for approval.⁶ Xcel's project selections are subject to the Commission's approval.⁷

Xcel has administered three rounds of funding from the RDF since 2001, awarding a total of \$78 million to fund renewable energy research and production projects in Minnesota.

II. RDF Cycle 4 Selection Process

The Cycle 4 proposals showed an increased interest in energy production compared to previous cycles, with 46 of the 67 grant applicants (nearly 70%) proposing to produce energy using solar, wind, biomass, or some other renewable technology. There was also a high level of interest in solar technology vis-à-vis other renewable technologies. Of the 46 energy production proposals, 36 (nearly 80%) involved solar technology. The 18 research-and-development (R&D) proposals

¹ Minn. Stat. § 216B.1645, subd. 2.

² Minn. Stat. § 116C.779, subd. 1(d). Proposals may include requests by Minnesota higher-education institutions for a block grant to fund multiple research and development projects. *Id.*, subd. 1(f).

³ *Id.*, subd. 1(f).

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.*, subd. 1(e).

were more evenly distributed technology-wise, with five solar projects, five wind projects, five biomass projects, two combined solar/wind projects, and one micro-grid project.

Xcel retained Sargent & Lundy as independent evaluator to score the energy-production and R&D proposals.⁸ Under the terms of the RFP, Sargent & Lundy was authorized to award each proposal up to 200 points for the “core criteria” of completeness, technical feasibility, technical and financial risk, benefits to Xcel ratepayers, and, for energy-production proposals, cost per kilowatt hour (kWh). Sargent & Lundy was also authorized to award each proposal up to 30 bonus points based on the following preferences:

- Projects supported by the Prairie Island Indian Community,
- Projects located within the “Energy Innovation Corridor,”⁹
- Projects structured to receive RDF grant payment as a lump-sum amount upon completion,
- Projects located within Xcel Energy’s service territory in Minnesota and Wisconsin,
- R&D projects that demonstrate a high likelihood of royalty return and propose a larger royalty ratio,
- Projects sponsored by a K-12 school or local unit of government to construct a solar photovoltaic facility, and
- For anaerobic digester systems, projects that propose to use non-agricultural residue for a feedstock.

Sargent & Lundy produced a ranked list of qualifying proposals within each major category (energy production and R&D). The technical scores ranged from 187.45 at the high end to 63 at the low end.

Next, an advisory group consisting of ratepayer and Company representatives reviewed each proposal. The Advisory Group considered not only technical scores but also qualitative factors, such as innovativeness, uniqueness, and visibility to the public, with an eye toward ensuring a diverse mix of projects and maximizing the benefits to Minnesota and Xcel’s ratepayers. The Advisory Group recommended a total of \$30,122,346 in grant awards for 20 projects, including 13 energy production projects, four R&D projects, and three higher-education block grants. The Advisory Group also provided a ranked list of 15 reserve projects to be funded in the event that one or more of the recommended projects do not come to fruition. For each project, the Advisory Group provided its reasons for recommending the project, holding it in reserve, or rejecting it.

⁸ Xcel designated the Advisory Group as independent evaluator for the higher-education block grant proposals.

⁹ The Energy Innovation Corridor is a half-mile-wide strip of land extending 11 miles along the Central Corridor light rail route from downtown Saint Paul to Target Field in Minneapolis.

After reviewing the Advisory Group’s recommendations, Xcel generally concurred in its funding decisions. Xcel accepted the Advisory Group’s recommended projects¹⁰ as well as its list of 15 reserve projects.¹¹ Xcel’s final funding recommendation broke down as follows:

- \$6,030,221 for seven solar projects to be used for self-generation;
- \$3,825,250 for three solar projects with the output to be sold to Xcel;
- \$1,106,600 for one small wind project with the output to be used for self-generation;
- \$7,000,000 for two biomass projects with the output to be used for self-generation or sold to Xcel;
- \$3,160,275 for four R&D projects; and
- \$9,000,000 for three higher-education block grants.

Xcel recommended one significant modification to the Advisory Group’s higher-education block grant awards. The Advisory Group recommended a total of \$9 million in higher-education funding, allocated as shown in the following table:

**The Advisory Group’s Recommended
Higher-Education Block Grant Awards**

ID Number	Applicant	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended
HE4-1	Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU)	\$5,500,000	\$4,500,000
HE4-2	University of St. Thomas	\$2,157,215	\$1,500,000
HE4-3	University of Minnesota	\$6,900,300	\$3,000,000
Total			\$9,000,000

Xcel recommended that MnSCU’s proposal be fully funded at \$5.5 million. Xcel proposed to keep the overall level of block grant funding at \$9 million by simultaneously reducing the University of Minnesota’s award to \$2 million. Finally, Xcel recommended that the funds earmarked for the University of Minnesota and the University of Saint Thomas be held in abeyance while the Company works to resolve contract issues with those institutions.

III. Stakeholder Comments

While some commenters voiced support for the RDF Cycle 4 selection process, the majority of the commenters were critical of the process or the results. Many critical comments came from unsuccessful grant applicants, while others were submitted by stakeholders writing in support of a rejected project or against a recommended project. The Commission has carefully considered each comment and summarizes the overarching themes below.

¹⁰ See Attachments A (energy-production projects) and B (R&D projects).

¹¹ See Attachment C (reserve list).

A. Concerns with the Selection Process

Many commenters expressed concern that the selection process lacked transparency or relied too heavily on subjective criteria at the expense of the technical scores. Power Works Wind Turbines LLC was one of several applicants whose projects received high technical scores but were not recommended for funding. PowerWorks argued that Xcel failed to include a detailed explanation of why it deviated from Sargent & Lundy's rankings, as required by the Commission's prior order approving the RFP. Other applicants, including AF Energy Corporation, EcoCorp, and Minnesota Go Solar LLC, argued that the qualitative criteria that Xcel and the Advisory Group relied on were not identified in the RFP, so that they were unable to adequately address those criteria in their proposals.

There were also questions as to how Xcel and the Advisory Group weighed the qualitative criteria they used to evaluate proposals. For example, AF Energy Corporation argued that the criteria considered by the Advisory Group duplicated some of the criteria used by Sargent & Lundy to calculate the technical scores, resulting in double-weighting of criteria such as cost, practicality, royalty sharing, and benefit to Xcel ratepayers.

Finally, several commenters highlighted potential errors in Sargent & Lundy's technical scores. For example, the City of Hutchinson pointed out that its proposal to install solar panels on a capped landfill should have received bonus points for being sponsored by a local unit of government. After these errors were pointed out, Xcel and Sargent & Lundy separately reviewed the technical scores and identified several other discrepancies. Xcel also obtained an independent audit of Sargent & Lundy's scoring. The errors affected the rankings of a handful of projects on the reserve list, but did not change the Advisory Group's recommended projects.

B. Disagreement with the Outcome

A number of commenters took issue with Xcel and the Advisory Group's reasons for deviating from the technical scores. Unsuccessful applicants such as Minnesota Go Solar, PowerWorks, and AF Energy argued that Xcel and the Advisory Group's stated reasons for rejecting their projects were inadequate or inconsistently applied. Other applicants, including Minnesota Go Solar, EcoCorp, PowerWorks, and Dragonfly Solar LLC, argued that their projects were more cost-effective than selected projects.

Finally, several stakeholders wrote in support of, or against, particular projects and asked the Commission to consider modifying Xcel's recommendations. For example, three state legislators wrote in support of the Region Five Development Commission's proposal to install solar panels on the roofs of eight public schools, stating that the project would save school districts a significant portion of their energy bills and encourage students to excel in math and science. Alan Muller, Carol Overland, and Mimi Jennings, residents of Red Wing, argued that a proposal by the city to produce refuse-derived fuel for Xcel's Red Wing Generating Station should be removed from the reserve list for environmental reasons.

C. Requests for a Contested-Case Proceeding

PowerWorks and Minnesota Go Solar requested a contested-case proceeding under Minn. R. 7829.1400, subp. 9, claiming that the following issues were contested:

1. Whether Xcel violated its fiduciary duties in administering the RDF;
2. Whether Xcel followed the criteria provided for in the RDF statute and Commission rulings; and
3. Whether any bias entered into Xcel's decision, the decisions of Xcel representatives in the Advisory Group, or any discussions regarding the RDF proposals.

Alan Muller also requested a contested-case proceeding, claiming lack of transparency and a potential conflict of interest. These parties urged the Commission to find, under Minn. R. 7829.1000, that there are significant issues that have not been resolved to the Commission's satisfaction and can only be resolved through a contested hearing.

IV. Commission Action

A. Contested-Case Request Denied

If a matter “involves contested material facts and there is a right to a hearing under statute or rule, or if the commission finds that all significant issues have not been resolved to its satisfaction,” the Commission must refer the matter to the Office of Administrative Hearings for a contest-case proceeding.¹² However, in this case, no party has identified a disputed material fact that warrants a contested case. The Commission will therefore deny parties' request for a contested-case proceeding.

The salient issue is whether Xcel has complied with the requirements of the RDF statute and Commission orders in making its project selections—and whether those selections are in the public interest. The Commission finds that it can resolve these issues on the record before it. Xcel has provided a voluminous selection report, two supplements, and reply comments setting forth in detail the process it followed to reach its recommendations. Further factual development would not be helpful to the Commission in making its decision.

B. Recommended and Reserve Projects Approved

Having decided that a contested-case proceeding is not warranted, the Commission will approve Xcel's recommended energy production projects, R&D projects, higher-education block grants, and reserve-project list, as set forth in the Company's December 12, 2013 reply comments.

The Commission finds that the Cycle 4 selection process meets the requirements of section 116C.779 and the Commission's February 6, 2013 order approving the RFP. Xcel followed the statutory procedures by retaining an independent evaluator and consulting with an advisory group including ratepayer representatives. Where Xcel's recommendations deviated from the Independent Evaluator's rankings, Xcel explained its choices in sufficient detail.

Finally, the proposed projects are likely to further the goals of the RDF by increasing the market penetration of renewable energy at reasonable costs; promoting the startup, expansion, and attraction of renewable projects and companies in Minnesota; stimulating research and

¹² Minn. R. 7829.1000.

development into renewable technologies; and developing near-commercial and demonstration-scale renewable electric generation projects.

Xcel's reliance on qualitative criteria led several parties to comment that the selection process was too subjective and lacked transparency. With Cycle 4 grant requests far exceeding the available funding, not every meritorious proposal could receive an award. Xcel thus faced a difficult task in choosing a set of projects that would provide the greatest possible benefit to Minnesota and its ratepayers.

Xcel and the Advisory Group used the Independent Evaluator's technical scores as a starting point but also placed considerable weight on qualitative factors. Xcel's RFP notified bidders that the final selections would be based both on technical score and subjective recommendations from the Advisory Group. This approach was reasonable because it gave Xcel the necessary leeway to select a diverse mix of unique and innovative projects.

The Commission is nonetheless sensitive to concerns about the transparency of the RDF selection process. Transparency in the selection process will help to ensure that Xcel continues to receive an adequate number of proposals, which serves the public policy of advancing renewable technology. Further, ensuring that bidders have maximum notice of the criteria by which their proposals will be judged serves the public interest by increasing the quality of the proposals and, ultimately, Xcel's recommendations. The Commission will therefore require Xcel to make a compliance filing with proposals for how to improve the transparency of the RDF selection process based on parties' comments and lessons learned in the Cycle 4 RFP and selection process.

C. Allocation of Additional Funding

Shortly before the Commission meeting in this case, Xcel filed a letter stating that additional funds had accumulated in the RDF account during 2013. Xcel recommended that the Commission approve another \$12 million in RDF expenditures to fund reserve projects and increase the higher-education block grants. This proposal would bring the total Cycle 4 expenditures to \$42 million.

The Commission concurs with Xcel's recommendation and will direct the Company to apply the additional \$12 million as follows. Xcel should first increase the higher-education block grant award amount to be held in abeyance for the University of Minnesota by \$1 million, resulting in a total grant of \$3 million as initially recommended by the Advisory Group. Xcel should then apply the remaining money to fund the first nine projects on the reserve list. These are projects that Xcel and the Advisory Group have already found to be worthy of funding, and the Commission concludes that the best course of action is to fund these projects immediately, rather than wait until the next RDF cycle to disburse the additional money.

University of Saint Thomas professor Greg Mowry appeared at the Commission meeting and requested that Saint Thomas's block grant be fully funded in light of the additional RDF funds. Saint Thomas had requested \$2,157,215 to construct a micro grid but was awarded only \$1.5 million. Xcel estimated that the RDF account would contain enough money to fully fund the Saint Thomas proposal even after Xcel increases the University of Minnesota grant and funds the first nine reserve projects.

Professor Mowry addressed the Advisory Group's concern over intellectual property rights, stating that Xcel would own any intellectual property associated with the micro-grid project. Professor Mowry also addressed the Advisory Group's other major concern, which related to the location of the micro grid. Saint Thomas had initially proposed a location outside of Xcel's service territory, but Professor Mowry stated that a benefactor had provided land within Xcel's service territory on which to construct the project. In light of this new information about the Saint Thomas project, the Commission will direct Xcel to confer with the Advisory Group and determine whether to use the remaining RDF funds to grant the University of Saint Thomas up to \$2,157,215 for its micro grid.

D. Contract-Negotiation Impasse Procedures

A number of grant recipients have proposed special conditions that are not in the Commission-approved RDF grant contract and will need to be negotiated with Xcel. Xcel has requested explicit authority from the Commission to terminate contract negotiations and proceed with a reserve project if it reasonably believes that negotiations have reached an impasse.

The public interest will not be served if reserve projects must wait for recommended-project proposers to negotiate contracts without any definite deadline. At the same time, the Commission wishes to assure that negotiations have truly reached an impasse before Xcel is able to walk away from approved projects.

Therefore, if Xcel believes it has reached an impasse in grant contract negotiations for either an energy-production or an R&D project, the Commission will require Xcel to file a written notice for review by the Executive Secretary. Xcel should not move on to the next project on the reserve list until the Executive Secretary has determined that there is a sufficient impasse. The Executive Secretary may seek comments on the filing if necessary to make this determination.

With respect to higher-education grants, the Commission will require Xcel to file a status report on negotiations with the University of Minnesota and the University of Saint Thomas within 120 days of the date of this Order. If these negotiations fail to result in a grant for either institution, Xcel should seek the Commission's approval before reallocating funds to projects on the reserve list.

E. Reserve-List Procedures

Xcel proposes to fund reserve projects in ranked order, regardless of whether the unsuccessful project is of the same type as the next-in-line reserve project. The Company further proposes to hold funds from abandoned projects for six months to a year before attempting to fund a project on the reserve list. If available funds are not sufficient to fund the highest-ranked proposal on the reserve list, Xcel would allocate the available funds to the highest-ranked proposal that has a funding request less than or equal to the funds available. In other words, no reserve project will be funded if there are not sufficient unobligated funds to provide a full grant award.

The Commission concludes that Xcel's proposal presents a reasonable approach to funding reserve projects numbers 10-15 and will therefore adopt it.

ORDER

1. The Commission hereby denies parties' request for a contested-case proceeding in this matter.
2. The Commission hereby approves Xcel's December 12, 2013 selection of energy production and R&D projects, recommendation for block grant awards to institutions of higher education, and reserve list.
3. Xcel shall apply the additional funding proposed in Xcel's January 20, 2014 letter as follows:
 - a. Increase the higher-education block grant award to be held in abeyance for the University of Minnesota by \$1 million, resulting in a total award of \$3 million as initially recommended by the Advisory Group.
 - b. Allocate the remaining additional funding to fund the projects numbered 1-9 on Xcel's reserve list.
4. Xcel shall confer with the Advisory Group and determine whether to grant up to \$2,157,215 for the University of Saint Thomas higher-education block grant.
5. Within 30 days of this Order, Xcel shall make a compliance filing with proposals for how to improve the transparency of the RDF selection process based on parties' comments and lessons learned in the Cycle 4 RFP and selection process.
6. Xcel shall file a written notice with the Commission if Xcel declares an impasse in grant contract negotiations for either an energy-production or an R&D project. Xcel shall not move on to the next project on the reserve list until the Executive Secretary has determined that in fact there is sufficient impasse. The Executive Secretary may seek comments on the filing if necessary to make this determination.
7. Within 120 days of the date of this Order, Xcel shall file a status report on negotiations with the University of Minnesota and the University of Saint Thomas for higher-education block grant funding. If these negotiations fail to result in grant proposals for either the University of Minnesota or the University of Saint Thomas, Xcel should seek approval from the Commission before reallocating funds to projects on the reserve list.
8. The Commission adopts the process proposed by Xcel for using available funds to fund projects on the reserve list, as follows:
 - a. Use the Commission-approved numerical ranking of the projects on the list to select projects for funding;
 - b. Use the "next in line" method regardless of whether the next project is an energy-production or R&D project;

- c. If after 6-12 months available funds are not sufficient to fund the highest-ranked proposal, move to the next project on the list that can be funded in full; and
 - d. No reserve-list project is to be funded if there are not sufficient unobligated funds to provide a full grant award.
9. This Order shall become effective immediately.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

Burl W. Haar
Executive Secretary



This document can be made available in alternative formats (e.g., large print or audio) by calling 651.296.0406 (voice). Persons with hearing loss or speech disabilities may call us through their preferred Telecommunications Relay Service.

Attachment A

EP Award Recommendations					
Independent Evaluator Rank	ID Number	Applicant	Type	Amount Recommended [1]	Total Project Cost
2	EP4-20	Target Corporation	Solar (350 kW)	\$583,513	\$1,060,933
5	EP4-43	Cornerstone Group	Solar (152 kW)	\$310,310	\$705,250
7	EP4-13	Metropolitan Airport Commission	Solar (1,180 kW)	\$2,022,507	\$4,189,000
9	EP4-39	Goodwill Solar, LLC	Solar (700 kW)	\$1,075,250	\$1,525,250
10	EP4-11	Innovative Power Systems, Inc.	Solar (967 kW)	\$1,850,000	\$2,698,200
12	EP4-42	Aurora St. Anthony, LLC	Solar (252 kW)	\$398,000	\$911,798
15	EP4-7	Anoka Ramsey Community College	Solar (458 kW)	\$828,900	\$1,825,976
17	EP4-5	Best Power Int'l, LLC	Solar (907 kW)	\$900,000	\$1,811,857
20	EP4-3	Minneapolis Public School	Solar (485 kW)	\$917,250	\$1,949,002
23	EP4-9	Mondovi Energy Systems	Biomass (2,000 kW)	\$2,000,000	\$13,220,683
26	EP4-24	Bergey Windpower Co	Wind (500 kW)	\$1,106,600	\$3,191,745
27	EP4-4	SGE Partners, LLC	Biomass (1,100 kW)	\$5,000,000	\$14,847,764
30	EP4-22	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board	Solar (200 kw)	\$969,741	\$1,119,133
Total				\$17,962,071	\$49,056,591

[1] The RDF advisory group and the Company recommend fully funding the amounts requested for projects instead of only a portion of the requested funding.

Attachment B

RD Award Recommendations					
Rank	ID Number	Applicant	Type	Amount Recommended	Total Project Cost
4	RD4-13	U. of Minnesota	Wind	\$1,391,684	\$1,391,684
6	RD4-12	U. of Minnesota	Wind	\$625,102	\$625,102
7	RD4-2	U. of Minnesota	Wind/Solar	\$982,408	\$982,408
18	RD4-14	Barr Engineering	Wind	\$161,081	\$161,081
Total				\$3,160,275	\$3,160,275

Attachment C

Reserve Projects					
Funding Priority	Proposal ID	Applicant	Technology	Grant Award	S & L Score
1	EP4-34	City of St. Paul (Saints Stadium)	Solar	\$555,750	117.97
2	EP4-48	Oak Leaf Energy Partners Ohio, LLC	Solar	\$2,000,000	180.17
3	EP4-15	MN Renewable Energy Society	Solar	\$2,661,320	90.66
4	EP4-29	Dragonfly Solar, LLC (Dodge Center)	Solar	\$1,650,000	156.78
5	RD4-11	U of M - NRRI (Torrefaction)	Biomass	\$1,899,499	136.37
6	EP4-21	Farmamerica	Solar/Wind	\$600,000	106.28
7	RD4-4	Xcel Energy Business Systems	Solar	\$390,000	103.92
8	EP4-41	City of Hutchinson	Solar	\$958,369	126.50
9	EP4-6	Best Power, Int'l, LLC (St. John's)	Solar	\$172,213	162.15
10	EP4-36	City of Austin	Biomass	\$3,565,000	164.25
11	EP4-44	Region Five Development Commission	Solar	\$1,993,659	158.50
12	RD4-8	City of Red Wing	Biomass	\$1,999,500	113.75
13	RD4-5	University of Florida	Biomass	\$1,109,538	136.37
14	RD4-7	Interphases Solar	Solar	\$1,000,000	156.83
15	RD4-1	U of M (Gasification)	Biomass	\$999,999	113.37