

**Davis Climate Action Plan – Climate Action Team
Project/Program Analysis Worksheet – Community GHG Reduction Measures**

Project Name:	
Project Category:	
Primary Impact (Municipal/Community):	
Project Description:	
Implementation Timeframe	Short term (less than 2 years) Mid term (2-5 years) Long term (more than 5 years)
Overall Ranking:	
1. Qualitative	
2. Score	

Criteria	Weight (relative importance) 3 High 2 Moderate 1 Low	Rating Scale (1-6) 6 Very Favorable 5 Favorable 4 Moderately Favorable 3 Unfavorable 2 Very Unfavorable 1 Negative effect	Description	Score
Potential GHG reduction	3	6. High 5. Moderate/High 4. Moderate 3. Moderate/Low 2. Low 1. None	Favors measures with high GHG reduction potential.	
Cost	2	6. Insignificant 5. Low 4. Moderate/Low 3. Moderate 2. Moderate/High 1. High	General assessment of implementation and on-going costs. Favors low cost projects. Price/Ton CO2 Equivalent reduction	
Ease of implementation	2	6. Strong public support w/involvement of community groups that support policy/program w/no organized opposition 5. Public support w/no organized opposition 4. Split public support and opposition 3. Public indifference 2. Public opposition w/o organized opposition 1. Public opposition w/organized opposition	Degree of expected public support/opposition to the measure.	

Criteria	Weight (relative importance) 3 High 2 Moderate 1 Low	Rating Scale (1-6) 6 Very Favorable 5 Favorable 4 Moderately Favorable 3 Unfavorable 2 Very Unfavorable 1 Negative effect	Description	Score
Visibility	1	6. High 5. Moderate/High 4. Moderate 3. Moderate/Low 2. Low 1. None	Degree measure supports public outreach efforts. Favors projects that increase public awareness/support of GHG reduction measures.	
Social Justice	2	6. Measure has direct and significant benefits for lower income/under represented residents and/or groups; with strong support/involvement of affected residents/groups. 5. Measure has direct and general benefits for lower income/under represented residents and/or groups; with general support/involvement of affected residents/groups. 4. Measure has indirect benefits for lower income/under represented residents and/or groups; with some support/involvement of affected residents/groups. 3. Measure has limited benefits for lower income/under represented residents and/or groups; with general support/involvement of affected residents/groups. 2. Measure has no benefits for lower income/under represented residents and/or groups; with no support/involvement of affected residents/groups. 1. Measure has negative impact on lower income/under represented residents and/or groups.	Degree measure benefits, is supported, and involves lower income/under represented residents and/or groups. Favors measures that have direct and significant benefits and involves these residents and/or groups in implementation.	

Narrative Evaluation
Information in this section should include assessment of social justice issues, positive and negative side effects, need for additional research, primary stakeholders, and adoption/implementation of similar measures by other jurisdictions.

Recommendation

COMMENTS:

- People aren't putting up enough red dots—it would be nice to “green-dot” everything, but can we afford it, how practical is it?
- Create audit form for person/home and professional climate impacts.
- (on above comment) I like this one too, create audit form.
- Ease of implementation could be better stated as public support.
- Suggest raising “cost” weight from 2 to 3. It is important. Suggest raising “visibility” weight from 1 to 2. Solving problem will take mass action by many individuals. They need to be encouraged and prodded, comforted by visible projects. Get the ideas into everyday thinking.
- Establish a speakers bureau for community, neighborhood groups, clubs, and schools.
- For developing a “portfolio”, consider uncertainty or “probability of success” e.g. technical and social feasibility. Consider low-tech solutions as more sustainable, likely to succeed.
- Technical feasibility, e.g., current technologies vs. promising technologies
- Create a “model city” program to export our GHG reduction program to other local municipalities.
- The red dots are hard to decide upon—some of the ideas seem unlikely or not completely developed, and are also not objectionable.
- What community groups are available to implement. Which programs?
- Will the climate action committee do outreach/seek input from underrepresented groups during this phase of “developing and action” plan?
- Cost needs to be LCC, include energy savings and non-energy benefits.
- Include auxiliary/other benefits such as better indoor or outdoor air quality, less resource use (water, energy, minerals, etc) public health (not just certain SES groups).
- Omit weighting for the moment. Too arbitrary.
- Good program –lots of opportunity for public input and communication.
- Education on how to conserve our resources (in this case water and energy) is vital. Let people know how to conserve and conserve. Repeat it, and repeat it using all the media possible. Use the same strategy of the current administration but this time it is not a lag
- Implementation: political vs. technical.