

Framework for Prioritization

Pathways → Strategies → Actions

- **Pathways and Strategies**

- All will be included in Initial CAP

- **Actions** are the “operational” tasks that are needed to implement the pathways and strategies. Actions may be written around existing, or propose new, policies, programs, projects, initiatives, plans, etc.

- Prioritization will happen for all actions using a step-wise approach
- Individual actions - actions that do not have a clear implementing authority and those that involve personal choices - should be screened out before prioritization. These will be considered by cross-cutting Councilor task leads to compile in a discrete section in the CAP around individual actions to speak to their collective power
- Synthesis of impact, cost-effectiveness and co-benefits, with acknowledgement that the actions are technologically feasible, will direct high priority actions to implement
- These prioritized actions will be priority for equity screening
- All Low and most Medium priority actions will be shown in appendix

Criteria Definitions

- Five criteria inform prioritization:

- **Impact**
- **Cost-Effectiveness**
- **Co-Benefits**
- Equity

Application of scoring rubric with support from equity consultant.

- Technical Feasibility

This speaks to the degree to which the required technologies are developed and reasonably available. As this is called out in the GWSA, it is important to simply answer yes or no to ensure the action is implementable.

- Will consider specifically for Cross-Sector Mitigation vs. Rural Resilience and Adaption and Agriculture and Ecosystems where needed

Criteria Definitions

Impact – Cross-Sector Mitigation

Consideration of actions' contribution to achieving 2025, 2030 and 2050 emission reduction requirements. Actions will be ranked as HIGH, MODERATE or LOW. The following scale will be used:

- **High** impact recommendations are those that can reasonably be expected to get Vermont more than 10 percent of the way towards either our 2025 and/or 2030 emissions reduction requirements.
- **Moderate** impact recommendations are those that can reasonably be expected to get Vermont between 2.5 percent and 10 percent of the way towards either our 2025 and/or 2030 emissions reduction requirements.
- **Low** impact recommendations are those that can reasonably be expected to get Vermont less than 2.5 percent of the way towards our 2025 and/or 2030 emissions reduction requirements.

Criteria Definitions

Impact – Rural Resilience and Adaptation and Agriculture and Ecosystems

- **High** impact actions are those actions that significantly improve the ability of [the built and/or natural environment OR people/vulnerable populations OR the economy] to adapt to or build resilience to climate change impacts. These actions may also significantly increase the ability to sequester and store carbon. High impact actions are actions that would affect broad scale change at the municipal, regional, or statewide level.
- **Moderate** impact actions are those actions that moderately improve the ability of [the built and/or natural environment OR people/vulnerable populations OR the economy] to adapt to or build resilience to climate change impacts. These actions may also moderately increase the ability to sequester and store carbon. Moderate impact actions are actions that would affect moderate scale change at the municipal, regional, or statewide level.
- **Low** impact actions are those actions that marginally improve the ability of [the built and/or natural environment OR people/vulnerable populations OR the economy] to adapt to or build resilience to climate change impacts. These actions may also slightly increase the ability to sequester and store carbon. Low impact actions are actions that would affect small scale change at the municipal, regional, or statewide level.

Criteria Definitions

Cost – Effectiveness - Cross Sector Mitigation

For evaluation of mitigation actions, cost-effectiveness shall refer to the lifetime net cost per ton of GHG emissions avoided (acknowledging that some mitigation measures do not generate net costs and actually save money). Cost-effectiveness shall also be understood to account for lifetime or dynamic costs, not merely up-front or static costs. The following HIGH, MODERATE and LOW definitions will be used for prioritization:

- Highly cost-effective are actions that have a net savings per ton of GHG emissions reduced
- Moderately cost effective are actions that essentially break even per ton of GHG emissions reduced
- Least cost-effective actions are ones that will have a net cost per ton of GHG emissions reduced

Criteria Definitions

Cost – Effectiveness – Rural Resilience and Adaptation and Agriculture and Ecosystems

Cost-effectiveness shall refer to the relative lifetime net cost* of the action compared to the desired outcome or impact. As such, the action will first receive an impact ranking of high, medium and low in the prioritization framework (as discussed in Section I). From there, the action's cost should be considered as significant, moderate or low. Significant will be defined as an ongoing cost or a more than ten-year investment to Vermonters which will need to be raised from new revenues. Moderate will be defined as an ongoing or more than ten-year investment from Vermonters that has an existing revenue source OR an action that needs a new revenue source for a short-term period (less than ten years). Low will be defined as an action that has an existing revenue identified to utilize over a short-term period (less than ten years). Overall cost-effectiveness will be compiled by considering the actions impact (high, medium, low) relative then to its cost (Significant, moderate, low). The cumulative summation of overall ranking will be as follows:

HIGH - High/Moderate, High/Low, Medium/low

MEDIUM - High/Significant, Medium/Moderate, Low/Low

LOW - Medium/Significant, Low/Significant, Low/Moderate

Criteria Definitions

Co-Benefits - ALL

Comprehensive climate policy will advance actions that work to mitigate climate pollution, while also building resilience, adaptation and storing and sequestering carbon. Actions will also seek to advance broader societal benefits such as public health, equity (specific focus on impacted communities), economic prosperity, biodiversity conservation, workforce opportunities and other benefits that improve the quality of life in Vermont broadly. Identifying actions that address co-benefits and elevating them will be key to ensuring our actions are working for all Vermonters. Co-benefits will be evaluated based on **HIGH, MEDIUM, LOW RANKING** using the following guidance:

HIGH – an action that can easily be communicated with broad and varied benefits to Vermonters and Vermont itself.

MEDIUM – an action that clearly addresses multiple climate action buckets (mitigation, resilience, adaptation and sequestration/storage) but its broader societal benefits are harder to measure and speak to.

LOW – an action that advances mitigation, resilience, adaptation or sequestration/storage but does not clearly advance other benefits.