

<i>Evaluation of Accounting for Growth Policy Options</i>					
Policy Option	Equitable Allocation Across Sectors <sup>1</sup>	Align with Existing Policies <sup>2</sup>	Compatible with Public Objectives <sup>3</sup>	Empower Local Governments <sup>4</sup>	Simple, Practical, etc. <sup>5</sup>
OSDS & Forest Conversion Option	1) Requires Limits – Y/N/TBD 2) Requires Extent – Y/N/TBD 3) Equitable Demands –Y/N/TBD	Well/ Part/ Least	Y/N/TBD	Y/N/TBD	Y/N/TBD
Phase I & II Per Capita Loading Option	1) Requires Limits – Y/N/TBD 2) Requires Extent – Y/N/TBD 3) Equitable Demands –Y/N/TBD	Well/ Part/ Least	Y/N/TBD	Y/N/TBD	Y/N/TBD

<sup>1</sup> Consider 1) Does the option require the *Limits of Technology and Management* per allocations to other source sectors? Y = Yes, equivalent or greater limits, N = No, substantially lesser limits, TBD = relative limits not clear. 2) Does the option require the *Necessary Extent* of implementation similar to other sectors: Y = Yes, equivalent or greater extent, No, = substantially lesser extent, TBD = relative extent not clear. 3) Does the option impose *Equitable Demands* on OSDS & Stormwater growth sectors compared to other sectors, considering both *Limits & Extent*? Y = Yes, similar or equivalent demands, N = No or substantially lesser demands, and TBD = somewhat or not clear.

<sup>2</sup> Does the option take advantage of existing programs that already minimize loads, encourage growth where effects of those programs are greatest, and discourage growth where they are least effective? Well = likely to take effective advantage, Part = likely to take some advantage, Least = likely to take relatively little or no advantage.

<sup>3</sup> Does the option as much as possible support, complement, or at a minimum avoid undermining other important public policies and objectives that may be affected by AfG Policy? Y = Yes, for all policy objectives of concern identified, N = No, will significantly undermine one or more policy objectives, TBD = unclear.

<sup>4</sup> Can the option give local governments a role in Policy implementation that provides the ability to use land use decisions and AfG Policy to mutually support the TMDL and their own land use plans and objectives? Y = Yes, the two policy arenas will be mutually supportive. N = No, AfG policy adds little or nothing to existing ability of land use policy to achieve goals or may compromise it. TBD = unclear.

<sup>5</sup> Can the process to implement the policy be simple and streamlined enough to follow; create clear obligations and practicable means to meet them for affected parties; maximize flexibility for participants in the offset market; minimize complexity and costs to affected parties; and maximize accountability and transparency? Y = Yes, for all or most considerations, N = No, for many considerations, and TBD = unclear without more details