

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.]
- 5. Alternative Rating system: [Note this may seem a little complex but the general idea is simple and I think this rating system addresses the EWG’s desires in a rating system, I feel we want to use clear data determine the rank the environmental impact of a CREZ in comparison to each other in an unbiased transparent way.]
 - a. I think we should limit the environmental data to numerical inputs. With that we could then determine the average and standard deviation for each data category and CREZ reviewed.
 - b. Then I propose to give or take away points for CREZs that stand out from average. The number of points and when (how far from average in terms of SD) they are awarded is negotiable. The advantage to this system is that it standardizes the points system across the different categories, while not comparing apples to oranges. The categories could later be giving a value rating by the EWG if one category is viewed as more worthy of points than another.