

PCAPCD Review Checklist and Report for GHG Project Submittals

PCAPCD Primary Reviewer Name: Heather kuklo
PCAPCD Secondary Review Name: Yushuo Chang

Project Applicant/Developer Information

1. Date application Received: 12/5/14
2. Project applicant's Name: Bruce Springsteen Email: bsprings@placer.ca.gov Phone: 530.745.2337
3. Project developer's name and address: PCAPCD, 110 Maple St., Auburn, CA 95603
4. Project developer type:
 Trader Broker Private Individual Commercial Organization Non-Profit Organization Public Agency Other (please list):
5. Does the project developer have the legal right to the project and credits? Explain:
yes

Project Description

6. Protocol used:
 Biomass to Energy Boiler Efficiency Forestry 1 Forestry 2 Forestry 3
 Organic Waste Case by Case, project type:
7. Where is the project location (s)? TNF, American River Ranger District near Gorman Ranch
8. Do the emission reductions result from a project already required by regulation, law, contract, policy, standard, or any other general agreement? yes no
If yes, explain:

Project Application Completeness

9. Is the project consistent with CAPCOA's GHG Rx Administrative Guidelines: yes no
a. If not, then explain:
10. Project report submitted? yes no
11. Project Verification Statement submitted? yes no
12. Is the project application complete? yes no
a. If not, explain:

Project Verification Information

13. Has the project been verified by a third party? yes no
a. If not, explain:
14. Verification Body name:
South Coast AQMD
15. Is the verification body qualified to conduct a verification? Please explain:
Yes, the verification body and verifiers have received training from ARB's offset credit verification certification course.

16. Is there a conflict of interest between the verification body and the project developer?

yes no

a. If yes, explain how the determination was made and what the conflict of interest is and if it can be mitigated:

17. Is there a conflict of interest between the PCAPCD and the project developer?

yes no

a. If yes, explain how the determination was made and what the conflict of interest is and if it can be mitigated:

Verification Results

18. What are the results of the verification? The project was verified to be consistent with the applicable protocol and resulted in a positive verification.

19. Does the verification report appear to be sound, meeting the requirements of due diligence, including an appropriate verification and sampling plan?

yes no

20. Does the project appear to support the finding that the emission reductions are real, quantifiable, additional, enforceable, verifiable, and permanent?

yes no

21. The amount of GHG emissions verified, in metric tons: 2,156

22. The year(s) the emission reductions were achieved: 2008

23. Will there be future years in which emission reductions will continue to be achieved associated with this project? If so, explain:

no

24. Does the project appear to be consistent with the applicable protocol? yes no

a. If not, then explain:

District Review Statement

25. Does the reviewer agree with the findings of the verification body? yes no

If not, explain:

26. The number of credits the reviewer recommends for the issuing of credits: 2,156

The individuals below attest that to they have determined that the Project Developer's report, application, and verification statement are free of material misstatement, conform to CAPCOA's GHG Rx Administrative Guidelines, and applicable protocol.

Primary Reviewer's signature: Alfredo Date: 12/17/14

Second reviewer's signature: Hu Shu Chang Date: 12/17/14

Legally Binding Instrument Certificate Number: 124-PL-[1-2156]-1

Serial numbers of Credits issued: 124-PL-PL-BM-08-2156

APCO's signature of Approval for the authorization and issuance of credits: T. Chang

Date: 12-17-14