Community Energy and Sustainability Master Plan Final Evaluation Criteria Prince William County

BACKGROUND: The initial list of CESMP actions has been drafted and is current under review and refinement by all stakeholders. Part of the evaluation of the CESMP draft actions requires stakeholders to communicate which actions should be ultimately selected and prioritized over others. The evaluation criteria presented below provides potential rationale to be used by stakeholders to select the final section of CESMP actions.

Evaluation Criteria Definitions

| Category | Definition |
|------------------|--|
| Primary Benefits | An estimate of GHG reduction and climate hazard risk reduction resulting from the actions (note: these two evaluation criteria will be included in the analysis) |
| Co-Benefits | Benefits generated by climate actions beyond the primary benefits of emissions reduction and risk reduction |
| Feasibility | How easy or difficult it will be to implement the action |

Co-Benefit Criteria

| <u>Co-Benefit</u> | Draft Definition |
|---|--|
| Organizational Diversity, Equity and Inclusion | Impact on social, environmental, or economic disparities such as disproportionate levels of air quality, health impacts, access to transit, flood risk, energy burden etc. |
| Resource Conservation | Impact on natural resources, such as air, water, raw materials, and the natural environment. |
| Cost to Residents and Businesses | Additional costs or savings to residents and businesses. |
| Local Employment | Impact on the employment rate, physical access to jobs, income and social mobility, and/or total number of jobs. |

Community Energy and Sustainability Master Plan Final Evaluation Criteria Prince William County

Feasibility Criteria

| Feasibility Criterion | Draft Definition |
|---|--|
| Funding Source Identified or Secured | Has full or partial public funding for this action been secured, or has a potential funding source been identified? Example rating scale: No Funding Identified/Secured, Funding Identified but Unlikely to Obtain, Funding Identified, Funding Partially Secured, Funding Secured |
| Cost to the County | What is the magnitude of upfront, operational, and staffing costs to the County from the implementation year to 2030? <i>Example rating scale: 0-100K, 100k-500k, 500k-\$1M+</i> |
| Cost Savings to County | An initial investment that lowers costs paid by the County such that cost savings could be used to fund other climate change/adaptation programs. |