

Suggestions About Inputting Your Weights

Your task with the weights is to apply a 9-point scale—*Critical* to *Not Salient*—to your 30 criteria. 13 of those criteria are A/B criteria, meaning you have to weigh the same criterion in the A world (starting now, knowing less, having experienced relatively little curtailment) *and* in the hypothetical B world (starting later, having tried and—hypothetically—failed at A, being in a perhaps changed political and regulatory landscape). This definitely requires concentration!

Subcriterion	Plan A	Plan B
Technical Feasibility: Plan A	9 Super Critical	4
Time to Demonstrate Tech Feasibility: Plan A	9 Super Critical	3
Time to Full Scale Production: Plan A	8	8
Adaptive Flexibility: Plan A	7	8
Supply Reliability: Plan A	6	4
Supply Diversity: Portfolio	5	
Energy Profile: Plan A	4	
Environmental Profile: Plan A	3	7
Regulatory Feasibility: Plan A	2	5
Legal Feasibility: Plan A	1 Not Salient	6
Administrative Feasibility: Plan A	9 Super Critical	5
Grants and Low Interest Loans: Plan A	8	1 Not Salient
Political Feasibility: Plan A	2	2
Annualized Unit Cost \$/mg: Plan A	1 Not Salient	7
Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	9 Super Critical	3
Avoid Negative Consequences: Trigger	1 Not Salient	
Flexible Trigger	5	
	8	

Here are some suggestions for managing the weights exercise:

1. Use paper and pencil. Tweaking things on paper will not only help you think this through, but it will mean a lot less back-and-forth on the website.

2. **Start with A.** Leaving room for B, map the A criteria on your paper from the ones that are most critical to you down to the ones that matter least. Look at them. Imagine yourself comparing all the Plan As. Gut check. Erase. Fix.

3. Now decide how you feel about the **A world versus the hypothetical post-trigger B world.** Do issues matter to you about the same? Then just copy B along next to A. Does B matter less? Put the B's alongside A but down a notch or two. Generally speaking, does B matter more? Boost the B criteria up relative to A.

Satisfied? Then go ahead to step 5. (Step 4 is not for the faint of heart.)

4. **Does the order of your priorities change when you move to the B world?** For instance, maybe *cost* doesn't matter to you and your constituency that much the first time around, but if A fails, *cost* will matter a lot when it comes to the second try. In that case, whereas *cost* might have been a 'moderate' for A, it might be 'critical' for B, leaping ahead in the line.

Thinking about weights in different contexts is very advanced. It is so tempting to confabulate with ratings or uncertainty! To help you keep your head in the weights world when you are doing weights, we've put a table at the end of this section, giving examples.

Weights—How much each criterion matters to you in making a decision, relative to the other criteria.

Ratings—How well a Portfolio (or a Plan within a Portfolio) will actually perform in accomplishing a particular criterion.

Uncertainty—How confident you are in your predictions about the ratings.

5. Use your sketch when you go to **put in all your weights** on the website.

6. **Check your weights portrait.** There you'll see the percentage allocation you have overall. There's also table showing an allocation for Plan A's, triggers and Plan B's. These are meant to help you gut check your weights. If these don't seem right, your sketch is handy to use. Make annotations on the paper and then go back to the weights input page and make changes according to your sketch.

7. You may also want to come back and change your weights after you do the ratings and see your output graphs. That's normal and desirable.

Some examples to go with step 4: Avoiding straying into ratings or uncertainty

Criterion	Argument	Wandered off topic or not?
Technical Feasibility	Weigh <i>Tech Feasibility</i> lower in Plan B because the Plan B's are all pretty good for this criterion.	Tsk Tsk Tsk those are <i>ratings</i> .
	Weigh <i>Tech Feasibility</i> higher because technical issues will have been resolved better by then, so who cares?	Nope. That's still a <i>rating</i> of technical feasibility. Weighing is about 'does it matter to you' not 'does it worry you'
	Bump up <i>Tech Feasibility</i> because if A fails, then Santa Cruz cannot afford another hiccup.	Yes! Whether or not you are moved by this argument, that reasoning is solidly 'weights' reasoning.
Grants	Want to lower <i>Grants</i> because they will be dried up by the time B happens	That's a <i>rating</i> issue!
Cost	Want to lower <i>Cost</i> because it is so hard to predict future cost.	Nope. That's about <i>uncertainty</i> , not how much <i>Cost</i> matters.
	Want to raise <i>Cost</i> because city's pockets will be sore if they have to go to plan B.	Yes, that <i>is</i> about a tip in how much <i>Cost</i> matters. You are thinking in weights terms.
	Want to lower <i>Cost's</i> priority because if plan A fails people will be much more concerned about getting something done than about <i>cost</i> .	Yup, this is an argument in the opposite direction from the one above, and it is solidly in the weights category.