

CLEAN AIR HAMILTON CRITERIA SCORING MATRIX - EXISTING PROJECTS

Criterion	Score
Section 1.0 Organizational Information	5
<i>Board of Directors / Governing Body</i>	3
Board of Directors positions, specialization, and contact information included	3
Governing Body positions, specialization, <u>and</u> 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 provided	0
No Board of Directors or Governing Body	0
<i>Profit / Non-Profit</i>	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 <u>not</u> fit the definition of Non-Profit from guidelines glossary	DNQ
Section 2.0 Organizational Capacity	15
<i>Mission / Mandate</i>	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
<i>Strategic Plan</i>	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
<i>Implementation Team Experience</i>	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, <u>but no</u> information regarding how their skills of expertise will help the project be successful	2

	List of team members <u>does not</u> include the skills of each <u>and</u> 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
	<u>Three lines below plus:</u> Has Working/Steering Committees/Groups that oversee	2
	<u>Two lines below plus:</u> Governing body is a skill-set based board and finds Best Practices ongoing	1
	<u>Line below plus:</u> 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
	>100	5
	50-100	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
<i>Demonstrated impact in increasing community capacity to positively affect Hamilton AQ</i>		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
<i>Geographical Impact</i>		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
<i>Demonstrated impact on air quality in previous project years</i>		15 max.
	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
	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
	Future pollutant reductions are explained and verified.	5*
	No post-project data showing measurable decreases in pollutant levels	0
<i>Demonstrated impact on air quality knowledge (scientific) in previous project years</i>		30
	Geographic areas covered	5
	Gain in scientific air-quality knowledge is city-wide	5
	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	
	Three points for each high priority pollutant type, up to a maximum of 9	
	Time period covered	5
	An entire year	5
	Three seasons	4
	Two seasons	3

	One season	2
	Less than one season	0
	<i>Quality of scientific data that form the basis for the proposal</i>	5
	Lots, high quality	5
	Lots, moderate quality	4
	Some, high quality	3
	Some, moderate quality	2
	None	0
	<i>Quality and reasonable ability of initiative to fill identified gaps in existing knowledge</i>	5
	Lots, high quality	5
	Lots, moderate quality	4
	Some, high quality	3
	Some, moderate quality	2
	None	0
Section 6.0		
	Additional Funding sources	5 max
	Two points for each Confirmed Funding Source	
	One point for each Pending Funding Source.	

TOTAL POTENTIAL POINTS

100