

CLEAN AIR HAMILTON CRITERIA SCORING MATRIX - EXISTING PROJECTS

Criterion	Score	Notes
Section 1.0 Organizational Information	5	
Board of Directors / Governing Body	3	
Board of Directors positions, specialization, and contact information included	3	
Governing Body positions, specialization, and contact information included	2	
Claims Board of Directors or Governing Body exists, but information is incomplete	1	
Claims Board of Directors or Governing Body exists, but no supporting information	0	
No Board of Directors or Governing Body	0	
Profit / Non-Profit	2	
The organization is a registered non-profit organization OR a for-profit organization partnering with a non-profit organization (charitable number optional)	2	
The organization suggests it is non-profit or for-profit partnering with a non-profit and provides supporting information	1	
The organization suggests it is non-profit but no supporting information is supplied	1	
The organization is for-profit that does not have partnering non-profit or does not fit the definition of Non-Profit from guidelines glossary	DNQ	
Section 2.0 Organizational Capacity	15	
Mission / Mandate	3	
The organization has a clear, focused, and comprehensive mission / mandate	3	
The organization has a satisfactory mission / mandate vision or values statement	2	
Incomplete or not clearly stated mission / mandate	1	
The organization does not have a mission / mandate	0	
The mission / mandate of the organization does NOT fit with the definition of Environmental Organization from the guidelines glossary	DNQ	
Strategic Plan	3	
Submitted a complete Strategic Plan that fits the mandate of the organization and was developed / revised within the last 5 years	3	
Submitted a complete Strategic Plan that fits the mandate of the organization and was not developed / revised within the last 5 years	2	
Has no formal document in place, but provided a summary or outline of the key strategic directions of the organization	1	
Strategic plan does not meet the stated mandate / mission of the organization	0	
No strategic plan information provided	DNQ	
Implementation Team Experience	3	
Comprehensive team list that clearly identifies project team members and how their skills / expertise will help the project be successful	3	
Partial list of team members list that includes the skills of each, but no information regarding how their skills of expertise will help the project be successful	2	
List of team members does not include the skills of each and includes no information regarding how their skills of expertise will help the project be successful	1	
Community Representation	2	
Response provides comprehensive and succinct information on how their leadership represents the community	2	
Response provides satisfactory information on how their leadership represents the community	1	
Incomplete / unclear response	0	
Current Leadership	2	
Three lines below plus: Has Working/Steering Committees/Groups that oversee	2	
Two lines below plus: Governing body is a skill-set based board and finds Best Practices ongoing	1	
Line below plus: Financial Information is reviewed on a regular basis	1	
Meets at least 4 times per year as a Board (or group)	1	
Incomplete / unclear response	0	
History	2	
Comprehensive and succinct response that clearly describes the history of the organization and indicates important milestones / changes	2	
Satisfactory response that describes the history of the organization and indicates important milestones / changes	1	
Incomplete / unclear response	0	
Section 3.0 Project Management Details	10	
Risk Management	5	
Barriers have been identified, and there are plans in place to mitigate	5	
Barriers have been identified, but there are no mitigation plans	3	
No barriers have been identified	0	
Health & Safety Management	5	
A Health & Safety Plan has been developed for this project and there are implementation strategies	5	
A Plan has been developed, or there is a generic Health & Safety Policy for the organization	3	
No Plan has been identified and there is no Health & Safety Policy for the organization	0	
Section 4.0 Community/Capacity Impact	25	
Demonstrated impact in increasing community knowledge about AQ	10	
Number of participants in previous years	5	
measured in thousands	5	
measured in hundreds	3	
not measured	0	
Measured follow-up on impacts of prior program/project years (gains in knowledge)	5	
applicant can demonstrate significant knowledge gains from post-monitoring program (e.x surveys etc.)	5	
applicant can demonstrate some knowledge gains from post-program surveys etc.	3	
applicant cannot demonstrate post-program knowledge gains	0	

Demonstrated impact in increasing community capacity to positively affect Hamilton AQ		15	
	#participants who alter future behaviour in order to reduce emissions	7	
	applicant can demonstrate non-negligible air quality impact from program participants	7	
	applicant can demonstrate air quality impact from program participants, but hard to quantify	3	
	applicant cannot demonstrate air quality impact from program participants	0	
	#participants who participate in ongoing fashion with AQ monitoring activities	3	
	majority of program participants remain involved with ongoing monitoring activities	3	
	minority of program participants remain involved with ongoing monitoring activities	2	
	applicant cannot demonstrate that program participants remain involved with monitoring activities	0	
	Geographical Impact	5	
	Impact entire City of Hamilton and surrounding areas	5	
	Benefits city as a whole, with greater impact in certain wards	3	
	Benefits only one specific ward or neighbourhood	2	
	No impacts	0	
Section 5.0 Air Quality Impact		45	
Demonstrated impact on air quality in previous project years		15	<i>This section should allow adjudicators to evaluate the need for the project on a quantitative basis.</i>
	Reduction in air quality emission levels	15	
	Post-project data show a measurable decrease in pollutant levels throughout city of high-priority pollutants	15	
	Post-project data show a measurable decrease in pollutant levels throughout city of lower-priority pollutants	12	Mid-range scores to be evaluated based on cost-effectiveness of proposal
	Post-project data show a measurable decrease in pollutant levels in defined neighbourhoods of high-priority pollutants	10	
	Post-project data show a measurable decrease in pollutant levels in defined neighbourhoods of lower-priority pollutants	5	Mid-range scores to be evaluated based on cost-effectiveness of proposal
	No post-project data showing measurable decreases in pollutant levels	0	
Demonstrated impact on air quality knowledge (scientific) in previous project years		30	<i>This section should allow adjudicators to evaluate the need for the project on a quantitative basis. If the project/program is gathering knowledge rather than addressing known issues, must be able to propose a scenario in which the gain in knowledge would lead to a program/project that can reduce air quality health impacts</i>
	Geographic areas covered	5	
	Gain in scientific air-quality knowledge is city-wide	5	Scores in-between defined ranges should be awarded based on the cost-effectiveness of the knowledge gains (eg. City-wide knowledge gain for \$10k would be scored lower than city-wide knowledge gains for \$8k).
	Gain in scientific air-quality knowledge covers multiple wards	3	
	Gain in scientific air-quality knowledge cannot be quantified geographically	0	
	Pollutants covered	10	
	One point for each priority pollutant type, up to a maximum of 10		What constitutes high vs. low priority can change annually to reflect changing knowledge and issues of concern in the city. Also, scores can be modified based on the cost-effectiveness of the proposal (eg. 5 pollutant types for \$10k receives a higher score than 5 pollutant types for \$15k).
	Two points for each high priority pollutant type, up to a maximum of 5		
	Time period covered	5	
	An entire year	5	
	Three seasons	4	
	Two seasons	3	
	One season	2	
	Less than one season	0	
	Quality of scientific data that form the basis for the proposal	5	
	Lots, high quality	5	
	Lots, moderate quality	4	
	Some, high quality	3	
	Some, moderate quality	2	
	None	0	
	Quality and reasonable ability of initiative to fill identified gaps in existing knowledge	5	
	Lots, high quality	5	
	Lots, moderate quality	4	
	Some, high quality	3	
	Some, moderate quality	2	
	None	0	

TOTAL POTENTIAL POINTS

100