

MAF Selection Criteria – Waterfront Parks

The criteria below will be used by staff to evaluate the top projects identified through the MAF Round 2 engagement process. The results will form the basis of staff’s recommendations to Council for allocation of the funding.

Criteria	Project A	
	Score	Notes
1. Strategic alignment <i>Score: 0=contributes to 0% of the priorities, 1=20%, 2=40%, 3=60%, 4=80% , 5=100%</i> Aligned with the Township’s Strategic Priorities (draft 2019-2022)		
2. Addresses diverse community needs now and into the future <i>Score: 0=not at all, 5=completely</i> Benefits the entire community (i.e. all ages, abilities, incomes, ethnicities, etc.), meets diverse community needs or achieves multiple purposes and uses (i.e. enables a mix of cultural, recreation, sport, ecosystem, commemoration and aesthetic benefits)		
3. Environmental impact <i>Score: 0= significant negative impact, 5= no negative impact</i> Environmental impacts could include alterations or emissions to land, air or water habitat/resources, resulting in negative impacts to human, ecosystem and/or wildlife health.		
4. Project connections/efficiencies <i>Score: 0=does not ‘dovetails’ with other projects, 5= ‘dovetails’ with 5 other projects</i> Can incorporate at least one other improvement project that received high votes in the Round 2 engagement report		
5. Cost-Benefit analysis <i>Score: 0=high cost/low benefit, 5=low cost/high benefit</i> Projects that deliver high benefits for lower costs are ideal and will help the MAF funds go further and deliver more benefit to the community. Note: Potential operational cost implications – where an initial rough estimate or explanation is possible – are included in the notes column.		
6. Public support (resident votes only) <i>Score (1=0-25 votes, 2=26-50,3=51-75,4=76-100,5=greater than 101)</i> Number of votes received through round 2 engagement from Esquimalt residents		
7. Funding implications <i>Score: 5= 100% eligible for funding, 4=80%, 3=60%, 2=40%, 1=20%+, 0=0% of the project is eligible for funding</i> Eligible for funding according to the Community Impact Agreement (February 2017), meeting all three requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievable within remaining spending timeframe • Costs less than the spending limit for the category • Is not a commercial space/venture 		
Total	0	

MAF Selection Criteria – Downtown Recreational Facilities

The criteria below will be used by staff to evaluate the top projects identified through the MAF Round 2 engagement process. The results will form the basis of staff's recommendations to Council for allocation of the funding.

Criteria	Project A	
	Score	Notes
1. Strategic alignment <i>Score: 0=contributes to 0% of the priorities, 1=20%, 2=40%, 3=60%, 4=80% , 5=100%</i> Aligned with the Township's Strategic Priorities (draft 2019-2022)		
2. Addresses diverse community needs now and into the future <i>Score: 0=not at all, 5=completely</i> Benefits the entire community (i.e. all ages, abilities, incomes, ethnicities, etc.), meets diverse community needs or achieves multiple purposes and uses (i.e. enables a mix of cultural, recreation, sport, ecosystem, commemoration and aesthetic benefits)		
3. Environmental impact <i>Score: 0= significant negative impact, 5= no negative impact</i> Environmental impacts could include alterations or emissions to land, air or water habitat/resources, resulting in negative impacts to human, ecosystem and/or wildlife health.		
4. Project connections/efficiencies <i>Score: 0=does not 'dovetails' with other projects, 5= 'dovetails' with 5 other projects</i> Can incorporate at least one other improvement project that received high votes in the Round 2 engagement report		
5. Cost-Benefit analysis <i>Score: 0=high cost/low benefit, 5=low cost/high benefit</i> Projects that deliver high benefits for lower costs are ideal and will help the MAF funds go further and deliver more benefit to the community. Note: Potential operational cost implications – where an initial rough estimate or explanation is possible – are included in the notes column.		
6. Public support (resident votes only) <i>Score (1=0-60 votes, 2=61-120,3=121-180,4=181-240,5=greater than 241)</i> Number of votes received through round 2 engagement from Esquimalt residents		
7. Funding implications <i>Score: 5= 100% eligible for funding, 4=80%, 3=60%, 2=40%, 1=20%+, 0=0% of the project is eligible for funding</i> Eligible for funding according to the Community Impact Agreement (February 2017), meeting all three requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievable within remaining spending timeframe • Costs less than the spending limit for the category • Is not a commercial space/venture 		
Total	0	

MAF Selection Criteria – Downtown Emergency Services and Public Safety Facilities

The criteria below will be used by staff to evaluate the top projects identified through the MAF Round 2 engagement process. The results will form the basis of staff's recommendations to Council for allocation of the funding.

Criteria	Project A	
	Score	Notes
1. Strategic alignment <i>Score: 0=contributes to 0% of the priorities, 1=20%, 2=40%, 3=60%, 4=80% , 5=100%</i> Aligned with the Township's Strategic Priorities (draft 2019-2022)		
2. Addresses diverse community needs now and into the future <i>Score: 0=not at all, 5=completely</i> Benefits the entire community (i.e. all ages, abilities, incomes, ethnicities, etc.), meets diverse community needs or achieves multiple purposes and uses (i.e. enables a mix of cultural, recreation, sport, ecosystem, commemoration and aesthetic benefits)		
3. Environmental impact <i>Score: 0= significant negative impact, 5= no negative impact</i> Environmental impacts could include alterations or emissions to land, air or water habitat/resources, resulting in negative impacts to human, ecosystem and/or wildlife health.		
4. Project connections/efficiencies <i>Score: 0=does not 'dovetails' with other projects, 5= 'dovetails' with 5 other projects</i> Can incorporate at least one other improvement project that received high votes in the Round 2 engagement report		
5. Cost-Benefit analysis <i>Score: 0=high cost/low benefit, 5=low cost/high benefit</i> Projects that deliver high benefits for lower costs are ideal and will help the MAF funds go further and deliver more benefit to the community. Note: Potential operational cost implications – where an initial rough estimate or explanation is possible – are included in the notes column.		
6. Public support (resident votes only) <i>Score (1=0-75 votes, 2=76-150,3=151-225,4=225-300,5=greater than 301)</i> Number of votes received through round 2 engagement from Esquimalt residents		
7. Funding implications <i>Score: 5= 100% eligible for funding, 4=80%, 3=60%, 2=40%, 1=20%+, 0=0% of the project is eligible for funding</i> Eligible for funding according to the Community Impact Agreement (February 2017), meeting all three requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievable within remaining spending timeframe • Costs less than the spending limit for the category • Is not a commercial space/venture 		
Total	0	