Qualitative Assessment

Providing information for comprehensive multi-criteria analysis

December 2019

Background

The Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan will include a list of communitywide actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in order to meet the adopted emissions reduction target. The full list of actions (developed with input from the Climate Advisory Workgroup, Steering Committee, and the public) will be evaluated by the consultant team to help identify the most promising actions. Their evaluation will involve estimating how actions meet the criteria *GHG reduction potential*, *speed of deployment*, *control* and *co-benefits*.

Objective

We are seeking input of the Advisory Workgroup sector focus groups to conduct a high-level prioritization and evaluation of proposed actions. Specifically, objectives of this meeting are to:

- For each action:
    - Review the action language and the consultant team's ranking and rationale for the *GHG reduction potential* criterion.
    - Provide qualitative information for the following criteria: *speed of deployment*, *control.*
- For all actions:
    - Review all actions and identify highest- and lowest-priority actions within the focus area.

These assessments will be reviewed by the consultant team and taken into consideration when arriving at the final comprehensive action list and associated quanitative rankings.

Preparation

1. The consultant team made an initial qualitative evaluation for one criterion: *GHG reduction potential*.

2. Prior to this activity, the consultant team reviewed and edited the list of actions for multi-criteria analysis. In some cases, similar actions were consolidated. Actions with anticipated very low GHG reduction potential were marked for exclusion from the multi-criteria analysis.

3. Actions that are excluded from multi-criteria analysis will be included in an appendix to the final Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan; they will not be lost.

Sector Focus Group Tasks

1. Assign one person in the group to record rankings, thoughts, comments, and questions for each action.

2. Read through the entire list of your subgroup's actions once together, to gain a high-level picture of the proposed strategies and actions.

3. For each action, do the following as a group:

   i. Review the action language and the consultant team's ranking and rationale for the GHG reduction potential criterion (see below). Provide any comments in the "GHG reduction ranking: Subgroup comments" column.

   ii. Provide a qualitative ranking for the following two criteria: *speed of deployment*, *control.* Ranking definitions are provided below. Provide a brief rationale for the ranking in the corresponding "…rationale" column.

Try to limit each action to no more than five minutes of discussion and ranking.

4. Once you have finished reviewing all the actions, do the following individually (you MUST use ALL your stickers!):

   i. Using your **green** stickers, indicate the three actions that you think MUST be in the final list of actions no matter what in the "Sticker" column. (5 minutes)

   ii. Using your **red** stickers, indicate the three actions that you would be most comfortable leaving out of plan, if needed. Please write the rationale for your decision in the "Sticker rationale" column. (5 minutes)

Criteria Definitions

"GHG Reduction Potential": The annual quantity of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) an action will avoid or sequester as of 2030.

		GHG Impact		
		Low/High Emissions Sector	**Low/High Emissions Subsector**	**Confidence/Probability of Impact**
Ranking	**1**	**Low** (e.g., water/waste and land carbon sequestration)	**Low** (e.g., industrial, municipal)	**Low** (voluntary education/outreach; limited ability to scale)
	2	**Low** (e.g., water/waste and land carbon sequestration)	**Low/ High** (e.g., industrial, municipal, residential, commercial)	**Medium/High** (monetary incentives, regulation, or capital project; or voluntary with ability to scale)
	3	**High** (e.g., transportation/land use and buildings)	**Low** (e.g., industrial, municipal)	**Low/Medium/High**
	4	**High** (e.g., transportation/land use and buildings)	**High** (e.g., residential, commercial)	**Low/Medium** (voluntary with monetary incentives or education/outreach with ability to scale)
	5	**High** (e.g., transportation/land use and buildings)	**High** (e.g., residential, commercial)	**High** (large-scale capital project or regulation/policy)

"Control": One or more of the four project partners can likely influence the implementing party(ies), or can create the necessary regulatory structure.

		Control
		Anticipated Jurisdiction Role
Ranking	**1**	Advocate at a non-TCMP entity
	2	Voluntary partner with a non-TCMP entity
	3	Official partner (e.g., MOU) with non-TCMP entity
	4	Funder of non-TCMP entity
	5	TCMP entity is implementor or regulator

* If more than one project partner is collaborating on the effort, then move ranking up by 1 level.

"Speed of Deployment": Minimum time possible between decision to recommend an action, and achievement of the annual GHG reduction potential.

		Speed of Deployment		
		Requires legislative action	Technology exists	Funding mechanism exists
Ranking	1	Yes	No	No
	2	Yes	No	Yes
	2	Yes	Yes	No
	3	Yes	Yes	Yes
	4	No	No	Yes
	4	No	Yes	No
	5	No	Yes	Yes

"Co-benefits": Supports one or more of the following regional goals:

- *Ecosystem Health*

- *Social Equity*

- *Economic Benefit*

- *Climate Adaptation*

- *Other Regional Goals, as approved August 29, 2019*

		Co-benefits
Ranking	1	Supports 0-1 co-benefits
	2	Supports 2 co-benefits
	3	Supports 3 co-benefits
	4	Supports 4 co-benefits
	5	Supports 5 or more co-benefits