Table 3: Comparison of Approach 2 Tiered Threshold Options

Threshold	GHG Emission Threshold (metric tons/year)	Future Development Captured by GHG Threshold
2.1: Zero Threshold	0 tons/year	All
2.2: Quantitative Threshold Based on Market Capture	~900 tons/year	Residential development > 50 dwelling units Office space > 36,000 ft^2 Retail space >11,000 ft^2 Supermarkets >6.300 ft^2 small, medium, large industrial
2.3: CARB GHG Mandatory Reporting Threshold OR Potential Cap and Trade Entry Level	25,000 metric tons/year OR 10,000 metric tons/year	Residential development >1,400 dwelling units OR 550 dwelling units Office space >1 million ft^2 OR 400,000 ft^2 Retail space >300,000 ft^2 OR 120,000 ft^2 Supermarkets >175,000 ft^2 OR 70,000 ft^2 medium/larger industrial
2.4: Regulated Inventory Capture	40,000 – 50,000 metric tons/year	Residential development >2,200 to 2,600 dwelling units Office space >1.5 to 1.8 million ft^2 Retail space >470,000 to 560,000 ft^2 Supermarkets >270,000 to 320,000 ft^2 medium/larger industrial
2.5: Unit-Based Threshold Based on Market Capture	Not applicable.	Residential development >50 dwelling units Commercial space >50,000 ft^2 > small, medium, large industrial (with GHG emissions > 900 tonsCO2e)
2.6: Projects of Statewide, Regional, or Areawide Significance	Not applicable.	Residential development >500 dwelling units Office space >250,000 ft^2 Retail space >500,000 ft^2 Hotels >500 units Industrial project >1,000 employees Industrial project >40 acre or 650,000 ft^2
2.7: Efficiency-Based Thresholds	TBD tons/year/person TBD tons/year/unit	Depends on the efficiency measure selected.

Table 4: Non-Zero Threshold Evaluation Matrix – Approach 1

Approach 1	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4
	28% - 33% Reduction from BAU by 2020 by Project	**50% Reduction from BAU by 2020 by Project**	**28% - 33% Reduction by 2020 by Sector**	**28% - 33% Reduction by 2020 by Region**
GHG Emissions Reduction Effectiveness	**Low** - Captures all new projects but relies on a high level of reductions from the existing economy.	**Medium** - Captures all new projects and has a more realistic level of reductions from the existing economy.	**Low** - Captures all new projects but relies on a high level of reductions from the existing economy.	**Low** - Captures all new projects but relies on a high level of reductions from the existing economy.
Economic Feasibility	**Low** - Some projects will not be able to afford this level of reduction without effective market-based mechanisms like offsets.	**Low** - Some projects will not be able to afford this level of reduction without effective market-based mechanisms like offsets.	**Medium** - Sectors as a whole will be better able to achieve reductions than individual projects.	**Low** - Some regions and newly developed areas may not be able to afford this level of reduction without effective market-based mechanisms like offsets.
Technical Feasibility	**Medium** - Some projects will not be able to achieve this level of reduction without effective market-based mechanisms like offsets	**Low** - Relatively larger set of projects will not be able to achieve this level of reduction without effective market-based mechanisms like offsets	**High** - Some projects will not be able to achieve this level of reduction without effective market-based mechanisms like offsets	**Medium** - Some regions and newly developed areas may not be able to afford this level of reduction without effective market-based mechanisms like offsets.
Logistical Feasibility	**Low** - Absent broader reductions strategies, each project may reinvent the wheel each time to achieve mandated reductions.	**Low** - Absent broader reductions strategies, each project may reinvent the wheel each time to achieve mandated reductions.	**Low** - Absent broader reductions strategies, each project may reinvent the wheel each time to achieve mandated reductions.	**Low** - Absent broader reductions strategies, each project may reinvent the wheel each time to achieve mandated reductions.
Consistency with AB-32 and S-03-05	**Medium** - Would require heavy reliance on command and control gains.	**High**	**Medium-High** - Would rely on command and control gains, but would allow sectoral flexibility.	**Medium-High** - Would rely on command and control gains, but would allow regional flexibility.
Cost Effectiveness	**Low** - Will require all types of projects to reduce the same regardless of the cost/ton of GHG reductions.	**Low** - Will require all types of projects to reduce the same regardless of the cost/ton of GHG reductions.	**Low/Medium** - Allows tradeoffs within sector between high and low cost reduction possibilities but not between sectors.	**Low/Medium** - Allows tradeoffs within region between high and low cost reduction possibilities, but not between regions.
Uncertainties	**High** - BAU changes over time. Ability to reduce GHG emissions from existing economy will take years to demonstrate. Ability to limit GHG emissions from other new development will take years to demonstrate.	**Medium/High** - BAU changes over time. Ability to limit GHG emissions from other new development will take years to demonstrate.	**High** - BAU changes over time. Ability to reduce GHG emissions from existing economy will take years to demonstrate. Ability to limit GHG emissions from other new development will take years to demonstrate.	**High** - BAU changes over time. Ability to reduce GHG emissions from existing economy will take years to demonstrate. Ability to limit GHG emissions from other new development will take years to demonstrate.
Other Advantages	Simple/easy to explain.	Simple/easy to explain.	Spreads mitigation broadly	Spreads mitigation broadly
Other Disadvantages	Requires all projects to quantify emissions.	Requires all projects to quantify emissions.	Requires all projects to quantify emissions.	Requires all projects to quantify emissions.

Table 5: Non-Zero Threshold Evaluation Matrix – Approach 2

Approach 2	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6
	Zero Threshold	**Quantitative (900 tons)**	**Quantitative CARB Reporting Threshold/Cap and Trade (25,000 tons/ 10,000 tons)**	**Quantitative Regulated Inventory Capture (~40,000 - 50,000 tons)**	**Qualitative Unit-Based Thresholds**	**Statewide, Regional or Areawide (CEQA Guidelines 15206(b)).**
GHG Emissions Reduction Effectiveness	**High** - Captures all sources.	**High** - Market capture at >90%. Captures diverse sources.	**Medium** - Moderate market capture.	**Low** - Low market capture.	**High** - Market capture at ~90%. Captures diverse sources; excl. smallest proj.	**Medium** - Moderate market capture. Excludes small and med. projects.
Economic Feasibility	**Low** - Early phases will be substantial change in BAU, esp. for smaller projects; may be infeasible to mitigate.	**Medium** - Early phases will be substantial change in BAU, esp. for smaller projects; may be infeasible to mitigate.	**High** - Large projects have greater ability to absorb cost.	**High** - Large projects have greater ability to absorb cost.	**Medium** - Early phases will be substantial change in BAU, esp. for smaller projects; may be infeasible to mitigate.	**High** - Large projects have greater ability to absorb cost.
Technical Feasibility	**Low** - Early phases will be substantial change in BAU, esp. for smaller projects; may be infeasible to mitigate.	**Medium** - Early phases will be substantial change in BAU, esp. for smaller projects; may be inefficient to mitigate.	**High** - Greater opportunities for multiple reduction approaches.	**High** - Greater opportunities for multiple reduction approaches.	**Medium** - Early phases will be substantial change in BAU, particularly for smaller projects may be inefficient to mitigate.	**High** - Greater opportunities for multiple reduction approaches.
Logistical Feasibility	**Low** - Unless fee or offset basis,very difficult to mitigate all projects.	**Medium** - BMPs broadly written to allow diversity; new req. will take time to integrate into new dev.	**High** - Less mitigation.	**High** - Less mitigation.	**Medium** - BMPs broadly written to allow diversity; new req. will take time to integrate into new dev.	**High** - Less mitigation.
Consistency with AB-32 and S-03-05	**High** - Market capture.	**High** - Market capture at >90%.	**Low** - Would rely on command and control success heavily.	**Low** - Would rely on command and control success heavily.	**Medium** - Need to demonstrate adequate market capture over time.	**Low** - Would rely on command and control success heavily.
Cost Effectiveness	**Low** - Will result in inefficient mitigation approaches. Efficiency will improve in time.	**Medium** - Emphasis is on new dev., req. for mitigation will result in inefficient mitigation approaches in early phases. Efficiency will improve in time.	**Medium** - Relies on command and control reductions for existing economy more heavily. With focus on larger projects, eff. of mitigation for new dev. high.	**Medium** - Relies on command and control reductions for existing economy more heavily. With focus on larger projects, eff. of mitigation for new dev. high.	**Medium** - Emphasis is on new dev.; req. for mitigation will result in inefficient mitigation approaches in early phases. Efficiency will improve in time.	**Medium** - Relies on command and control reductions for existing economy more heavily. With focus on larger projects, eff. of mitigation for new dev. high.
Uncertainties	**High** - Time to adapt for res. and comm.. sectors. Ability to mitigate without market-based mechanism for smaller projects unlikely.	**Medium/High** - Time to adapt for res. and comm.. sectors. Ability to mitigate without market-based mechanism for smaller projects uncertain.	**High** - Gains from command and control likely longer to be realized.	**High** - Gains from command and control likely longer to be realized.	**Medium/High** - Time to adapt for res. and comm.. sectors. Ability to mitigate without market-based mechanism for smaller projects uncertain.	**High** - Gains from command and control likely longer to be realized.
Other Advantages	Single threshold.	Single threshold. BMPs can be updated. Greenlist can be updated.	Single threshold. Does not change CEQA processing for most projects. CARB inventory = project inv.. All projects treated same.	Single threshold. Does not change CEQA processing for most projects. Follows established SIP practice.	BMPs can be updated. Greenlist can be updated. Unit-Based thresholds can be updated.	Existing guideline. Does not change CEQA processing for most projects. Endorsed by Cal. Chapter of the APA.
Other Disadvantages	Requires all projects to quantify emissions.	Requires nearly all projects to quantify emissions.			Sectoral projects have different GHG emis. Only largest projects to quantify emis.	Sectoral projects have different GHG emissions.