

Evaluation Criteria

This attachment provides an overview of the evaluation criteria to inform decision making for potential capital profiles and operating service packages as part of the 2027-2030 budget development process.

Impact to Council Priorities

Priority Scoring: The funding request is scored based on the scale of its impact on all of the Council Priority outcomes:

3 (Significant)	Provides comprehensive, city-wide advancement of the outcome.
2 (Moderate)	Provides meaningful progress, though targeted to specific areas or groups.
1 (Minor)	Offers localized or foundational support.
0 (Neutral)	Maintains the status quo with no measurable impact.
-1 (Negative)	Acts as a critical safeguard to flag initiatives that might degrade the current environment, actively decreases satisfaction or exacerbates vulnerabilities

Averaging and Justification: Each priority has its outcome scores averaged, and the average priority scores are summed together to calculate a total score.

Guiding Principles Impact: Narrative summary detailing how the package will positively or negatively impact the three guiding principles.

Basic Program Attributes

In addition to evaluating the impact on Council priorities, basic program attributes will also inform decision making. These include: mandate to provide service, reliance on the City to provide the service, portion of community or organization served, change in demand for service, and cost recovery of service. Capital decisions will also consider critical safety requirements, service level impacts, and opportunities to leverage external funding.

Basic Program Attribute Scoring:

While each Basic Program Attribute has its own guidelines, all are scored from 4 to 0 with 4 being the highest alignment and 0 being no alignment at all.

Attachment 4

4	Most significantly demonstrates attribute
3	Moderately demonstrates attribute
2	Partially demonstrates attribute
1	Minimal demonstration of attribute
0	No demonstration of attribute