

SECTION 10: PROJECT SCORING

10.1 MRIF Funding Priority Matrix Score		
Based on the information provided, indicated the MRIF funding priority and explain this rating below.	Score	
	Funding Priority Points (out of 10)	Weighted Points (out of 35)
	9.6	33.6
<p>Comment:</p> <p>This project receives a 9.6 for not meeting the Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality (GCDWQ).</p> <p>According to a Water Quality Study - <i>Bradbury Report – CHR March 1999</i> Attachment # 5 in the application package the regional Public Health Engineer Murray Sexton is of the opinion that "the groundwater in the Senanus Drive area should not be considered potable, is not palatable and should not be used for drinking water."</p> <p>The report identifies that the water exceeds the GCDWQ for hardness, sodium, manganese, chromium, pH and microbial parameters.</p> <p>A supporting letter from VIHA's Chief Medical Health Officer, Richard Stanwick dated January 17, 2007 states that if he were to provide comment on the quality of this water for a new subdivision approval he would recommend against the approval as the water quality is not fit for domestic purposes.</p> <p>This is not consistent with the rating given in 2002 when this project was first applied for by the Central Saanich West Voters Association in the CBCIP application #596. The score given at that time was 7, as it was believed that public health had not been clearly identified as at risk and that there was not sufficient supporting evidence to identify such risks and the rate of well failure.</p>		

2. Inter-jurisdictional and Regional Impacts		Max Points Available	Points Awarded
10.2a.	Does the project involve a partnership between two or more parties (e.g. public-private partnerships, inter-agency partnerships, NGO partnerships, or local government partnerships)? See the MRIF application bottom of Section II – Project information. 2 partners – 0.5 point, for each additional partner 0.5 point each Comment:	2.5	0
10.2b.	Does this project directly impact more than one community? 2 communities – 1 point, for each additional community 1 point each Comment:	5	0
10.2c.	GTA ONLY The degree to which the project is larger in financial scale with respect to the size of the community (extract per capita costs in comment section) Comment:	2.5	
Maximum Total Points		Maximum MRIF - 7.5 GTA - 10	
Maximum Points for each Program Weighting Factor		MRIF (1)	GSPF (10) IF (5)
		0.133	1 0.5
Total Interjurisdictional and Regional Impacts Score		0	

10.3. Environmental Considerations and Sustainability		Max Points Available	Score
10.3a.	Has reduced resource consumption (e.g. energy, materials, water, and land) been incorporated in the design, construction and/or technology of the project? See MRIF application – Schedule B – B9. Comment: each connection will have a water meter. The project proposes to only supply enough water for the existing development, even fire flows and agriculture will not be accommodated.	1	1
10.3b.	Has reduced ecological loading (greenhouse gas emissions, ozone-depleting substances, solid and liquid wastes) been incorporated in the design and construction of the project? See the MRIF application – Schedule B – B9. Comment:	1	0
10.3c.	Has ecological consideration been incorporated in the construction of the project? (e.g. directional drilling). See the MRIF application – Schedule B – B9. Comment: The project proposes to put the pipe in the middle of the road so as not to disturb the existing trees on the road edge (the area has many old Douglas firs) which the community wishes to keep.	1	1