

## Rating ideas

1. Scale of 1-10, one being worst, ten best.
2. A CREZ begins w/ zero (0) points, positive attributes award (+) points, negative attributes subtract (-) points. After each CREZ has a total, they are ranked, and given a “environmental rank” compared to the other CREZs.
3. Apply points in increasing number for
  - a. Ratio of impacted acres of Land/MWh in the CREZ (this is basically an land “efficiency” score. For instance, a solar CREZ w/ better solar insolation would receive a better score, because less land is used)
    - i. Lower ratio gets better (more positive) score
  - b. [We also asked B&V to do an air pollution quantification for technologies. Do we want to address this in the CREZ ranking? Similar to land use, this would be per MWh I think]
  - c. Percentage of or number of acres land in sensitive “yellow” categories
    - i. ACECs
    - ii. DWMAAs
    - iii. Mitigation bank lands
    - iv. Public –private transfer lands (BLM)
    - v. Other [critical habitat for endangered species?]
    - vi. [“softline” conservation reserves in HCPs?]
    - vii. [globally and continentally important bird areas?]
      1. The higher percentage of these lands in a CREZ the worse the ranking.
  - d. Miles of new road needed
    - i. Use of existing roads gets a good score
    - ii. New roads past a certain point get worst
  - e. Miles of new ROW and transmission needed
    - i. Use of existing transmission gets best score
    - ii. Use of existing ROW gets second best score
    - iii. New ROW over a certain amount gets worst score
  - f. Water consumption [do we want to tie this to depleted aquifers?]
    - i. Groundwater usage gets worst score
    - ii. Treated wastewater gets good score
    - iii. No water usage gets best score
  - g. Lands in already disturbed sites or sites with low ecological value.
    - i. Acres or percentage.
      1. the more acres or higher percentage in this category the better the score.
        - a. Ex: 60% or more +10
        - b. 50% or less + 9
        - c. 40% or less + 8
        - d. 30% or less + 7
        - e. 20% or less + 6
        - f. 10% or less... etc.
  - h. CREZs that contain projects on private lands, DOD lands, ...others?

- i. Acres or percentage.
    - 1. similar to (e) above
- 4. Mike Skuja has an interesting suggestion...
  - a. Use a scale that begins with a set “ideal” score and deduct points for the amount of the “yellow” categories it contains.
  - b. [ I think that coming up with a “best practices” list is very useful and we should do this in the future of the EWG, but I don’t think that we can look at whether a CREZ has anticipated mitigation...that falls into the prejudging CEQA category I think. Likewise, B&V said they wont be able to include a \$ cost estimate for mitigation in their economic model.]