Climate Action Plan – Draft Prioritization Criteria to Design and Evaluate Actions

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	CRITERIA SCALE
GHG Mitigation	Impact of the action on GHG reductions and carbon sequestration measured as the total tons of CO_2e reductions	Scaled from • <1% of needed GHG reduction from 2018 levels, • 1-5%, of needed GHG reduction from 2018 levels • 5-10%, of needed GHG reduction from 2018 levels • 10-15% (may add more if any action is more than 15% of reduction
Resilience	Ability of the action to increase preparedness to adapt and reduce vulnerability to a wide variety of environmental, economic, and social impacts from climate change	• Negligible benefits in reduced vulnerability, • Modest benefits in reduced vulnerability, • Substantial benefits in reduced vulnerability, • Major benefits in reduced vulnerability,
Financial Impacts	The net magnitude and timing of costs or savings community-wide	• Net cost • Break even • Net savings in the short term • Net savings in the long term
Available Technology	Availability of technology or techniques necessary to implement actions	• Available and accessible now, • likely available within time horizon of target, • unlikely to be available within time needed, or • not available/needs to be created
Equity Impacts	Degree to which the action increases equitable access to resources and opportunities	Communities most vulnerable to negative impacts of climate change (first and worst) are: • indirectly or directly harmed • neither harmed nor helped, • modestly helped, but indirectly, or • prioritized and explicitly helped

Associated benefits and harm (Co-benefits / co-harms)	Impact on public health (e.g. air quality, chronic conditions) Impact on land and environment (e.g soil and water quality, biodiversity, and ecosystems) Impact on jobs and employment	• Anticipated harms that would need to be mitigated or accepted, • no noted benefits or harms, • moderate benefits, • substantial benefits anticipated
County Influence over Implementation	County-level ability to influence the implementation	• depending on others - County has no direct or advocacy role – could educate or endorse • Policy advocacy - County has no direct role, but can advocate to the body with authority • Partnership - County plays a key role, but cannot act independently • Direct - County has authority to act independently
Compatibility with other initiatives	Synergies and conflicts with existing State or National policies in the near-term	• Conflict with known initiatives, • no known conflicts or synergies, • modest synergies, • significant synergies with known initiatives
Expected timeline	The expected timeline given the order of operations necessary to achieve the action	• Long and rigid timeline, • Some limitations on timeline/phasing (must align with other actions/circumstances) • Provides key early action (significant impact or enables other actions) • flexible timing
Breadth of support	The level of support that exists from local experts, policy makers, business owners, community members and other stakeholders needed for success.	• little/no support, • neutral/mixed, • modest support, • extensive support