

CLEAN AIR HAMILTON CRITERIA SCORING MATRIX - NEW PROJECTS

Criterion	Score	Notes
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, and contact information	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	0	
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	0	
<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		
<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	
<i>Community Representation</i>	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	
<i>Current Leadership</i>	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	
<i>History</i>	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	
<i>Risk Management</i>	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	
<i>Health & Safety Management</i>	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	30	
<i>Demonstrated impact in increasing community knowledge about AQ</i>	10	
#participants predicted	5	
>100	5	
50-100	3	
not measured	0	
Predicted knowledge gains from program participation, plus plan for evaluated knowledge gains	5	
applicant predicts significant gains and proposes to use post-program survey instrument	5	
applicant can demonstrate some knowledge gains, with follow-up survey instrument	3	
applicant cannot demonstrate post-program knowledge gains	0	
<i>Demonstrated impact in increasing community capacity to positively affect Hamilton AQ</i>	20	
#participants predicted to alter future behaviour in order to reduce emissions	7	
applicant predicts non-negligible air quality impact from program participants with post-program measurement instrument	7	
applicant predicts 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	7	
majority of program participants predicted to remain involved with ongoing monitoring activities, with post-program measurement instruments	7	
minority of program participants predicted to remain involved with ongoing monitoring activities, with post-program measurement instruments	5	
applicant cannot demonstrate that program participants will remain involved with monitoring activities	0	
<i>Geographical Impact</i>	6	
Impact entire City of Hamilton and surrounding areas	6	
Benefits city as a whole, with greater impact in certain priority wards	5	
Benefits city as a whole, with greater impact in certain non-priority wards	3	
Benefits only one specific ward or neighbourhood	2	
No impacts	0	
Section 5.0 Air Quality Impact	35	

Predicted impact on air quality	10 max.	This section should allow adjudicators to evaluate the need for the project on a quantitative basis.
Reduction in air pollution generating activities quality emission levels	10	
Proposal clearly quantifies the predicted reduction of air pollution generating activities including clear indicators and how those indicators will be measured throughout the city.	10	Mid-range scores to be evaluated based on cost-effectiveness of proposal
Proposal clearly quantifies the predicted reduction of air pollution generating activities including clear indicators and how those indicators will be measured throughout certain priority wards.	8	
Proposal clearly quantifies the predicted reduction of air pollution generating activities including clear indicators and how those indicators will be measured throughout non-priority wards.	6	Mid-range scores to be evaluated based on cost-effectiveness of proposal
Proposal quantifies the predicted reduction of air pollution, however it is unclear how and what indicators will be measured.	4	
No plan to measure air pollution generating activities	0	
<i>Predicted impact on air quality knowledge (scientific)</i>	25	<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 max	Max 10 points for this section.

Proposal can quantify the expected pollutant and a clear metric for estimated concentration reduction (i.e percent reduction, ug/m ³ etc.) for high priority pollutants with high quality references. Two points for each high priority pollutant type, up to a maximum of 8 (2 additional points scored based on scientific rigour of references)		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). High Priority Pollutants include: PM2.5, PM10, NOx, O3, SO2, Benzene, Benzo[a]pyrene.
Quality of scientific data that form the basis for the proposal	5	
None	0	
Some, moderate quality	2	
Some, high quality	3	
Lots, moderate quality	4	
<i>Lots, high quality</i>	5	
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	
Section 6.0	5	<i>Points to be awarded for additional funding sources</i>
Additional Funding sources	5 max	
Two points for each Confirmed Funding Source		
One point for each Pending Funding Source.		

TOTAL POTENTIAL SCORING POINTS

100