



# Service/Facility Prioritization Framework

## Nelson & District Recreation Commission #5

### Purpose

From time to time, community-borne initiatives, public and private, intended to provide opportunities for recreation infrastructure development, are presented to RDCK staff, municipal councils, recreation commissions, and/or the RDCK Board. This project prioritization framework is one tool to assist these bodies with informed decision making around creating new facilities or adopting new services. (See Nelson and District Community Facilities, Recreation & Leisure Service Establishment Bylaw No. 2865 for current facilities and services.) This framework outlines criteria to help identify use of public resources, and lead to the greatest possible community benefits.

The weighting scale should be reviewed on a regular basis.

### Definitions

#### ***“General Public Demand Indicators”***

The degree to which the service/facility supports the identified services demands of the public. Demand should be validated through processes that involve a high degree of public input to support confidence in decision making.

#### ***“User group and stakeholder demand indicators”***

The degree of demonstrated support and anticipated sustainability of key stakeholders and user groups. The higher degree of public benefit that can be demonstrated across various user groups, the higher the score.

#### ***“Community accessibility”***

The degree to which the Service/facility is able to be accessed by members of the public with a wide range of abilities, disabilities, and other characteristics. <sup>1</sup>

#### ***“Financial accessibility”***

The degree to which the service/facility aligns with grants, fee subsidy programs or other initiatives to support barrier free recreation services related to a users financial ability to pay.

#### ***“Financial impact on taxpayers”***

The degree to which each household’s recreation requisition will increase in order to design, build, maintain, and operate the new service/facility.

#### ***“Alignment with expected trends and demographic/population shift”***

The degree the service/facility is inline with anticipated public trends, can evolve with population shifts or trend shifts, and can be repurposed for various uses to ensure long term use of the service or facility.

---

1

<https://bcaccessibilityhub.ca/resources/glossary/#::~:~:text=process%20of%20creating%20services%20and,abilities%2C%20disabilities%2C%20and%20other%20characteristics>

When identifying trends, information from publically available sources, provincial/national endorsed guiding documents and recreation professional associations should be considered.

***“Alignment with Master Plan foundations”***

The number of outcomes identified in the community’s Master Plan document the service/amenity meets: 1) Strengthen the community throughout the region, 2) Motivate individuals and families to be healthy and active, 3) Serve as stewards of the environment, 4) Contribute to a diverse and sustainable economy.<sup>2</sup>

***“Current provision in the Region”***

The degree to which the service/facility is creating a new recreational opportunity not otherwise available within a reasonable service area.

***“Cost savings through partnerships or grants”***

The degree of funding that is or is expected to be secured through partnerships with user groups and/or stakeholders to decrease the level of taxation required to support the service/facility on an ongoing and/or temporary basis. Project alignment with known key funder objectives (i.e. CBT, provincial and federal funding priorities, etc) would be seen as a project benefit.

***“Economic impact”***

The degree the service/facility is anticipated to draw, could be utilized to draw, or will on an ongoing basis draw people in from outside of the region promoting spending a local businesses. A service/project identified by local economic development organizations would be seen as a benefit.

---

<sup>2</sup> Nelson & District Master Plan

<https://www.rdck.ca/assets/Administration/Documents/NDCC%20Final%20Master%20Plan%20.pdf> page 15 & 16

## Service/Amenity Prioritization Framework

| CRITERIA  | METRICS   |   |  |   | WEIGHT |
|---|---|---|--|---|--------|
| <b>General public demand indicators</b>             | 3 points — for top "#1-3" household survey amenity priorities   | 2 points — for "#4-6" household survey amenity priorities   | 1 point — for "#7-10" household survey amenity priorities  | 0 points — for amenity priorities that are beyond the top #10 and/or not in scope                       | 4.6    |
| <b>User group and stakeholder demand indicators</b> | 3 points — for projects that have strong indications of support from the majority of user groups and stakeholders                   | 2 points — for projects that have moderate indications of support from the majority of user groups and stakeholders   | 1 point — for projects that have strong indications of support from one or two user groups or interest areas   | 0 points — for projects that have no indications of support from user groups and stakeholders           | 3.1    |
| <b>Community accessibility</b>                      | 3 points — the project would be <b>completely</b> accessible to all residents despite ability, disability, or other characteristic. | 2 points — the project would <b>primarily</b> be physically accessible to the majority of residents   | 1 point — the project would be accessible to residents only through structured use such as programs or rentals | 0 points — the project would not be accessible to the residents through a public service delivery model | 3.7    |
| <b>Financial Accessibility</b>                      | 3 points – the project would be barrier free from a user financial accessibility perspective  | 2 points – the project would be financially accessible to the majority of the population due to its low user costs and/or the number of grants or initiatives available to support fee subsidy options. | 1 point – the project would be deemed financially accessible to a limited population.                          |   | 4      |
| <b>Financial impact on taxpayers</b>                | 3 points — the project has a low overall taxation impact  | 2 points — the project has a moderate overall taxation impact   | 1 point — the project has a high overall taxation impact   | 0 points — the project is not likely to be feasible   | 3.9    |
| <b>Alignment with expected trends and</b>           | 3 points — for projects that are positioned to respond to three or more observed  | 2 points — for projects that are positioned to respond to two observed trends   | 1 point — for projects that are positioned to  | 0 points — for projects that are not positioned to respond to observed                                  | 3.2    |

|  |  |   |  |   |     |
|--|--|---|--|---|-----|
| <b>demographic/population shift</b>                | trends and expected shifts in demographics/ population   | or expected shifts in demographics/ population  | respond to one observed trend or expected shift in demographics/ population  | trends or expected shifts in demographics/ population                                   |     |
| <b>Alignment with Master Plan foundations</b>      | 3 points — the project achieves three of the intended outcomes   | 2 points — the project achieves two of the intended outcomes  | 1 point — the project achieves one of the intended outcomes  | 0 points — the project does not achieve any intended outcomes                           | 3.9 |
| <b>Current provision in the Region</b>             | 3 points — the project would add completely new activity to recreation in the Region   | 2 points — the project would significantly improve provision of existing recreation activity in the Region  | 1 point — the project would moderately improve provision of existing recreation activity in the Region   | 0 points — the project is already adequately provided in the Region                     | 3.8 |
| <b>Cost savings through partnerships or grants</b> | 3 points — partnership and/or grant opportunities exist in development and/ or operating that equate to 50% or more of the overall amenity cost  | 2 points — partnership and/or grant opportunities exist in development and/ or operating that equate to 25%–49% or more of the overall amenity cost | 1 point — partnership and/or grant opportunities exist in development and/ or operating that equate to 10%–24% or more of the overall amenity cost | 0 points — no potential partnership or grant opportunities exist at this point in time  | 2.5 |
| <b>Economic Impact</b>                             | 3 points — the amenity will draw significant non-local spending into the Region and catalyze provincial, national and/ or international exposure | 2 points — the amenity will draw significant non-local spending into the Region   | 1 point — the amenity will draw moderate nonlocal spending into the Region   | 0 points — the amenity will not draw any significant non-local spending into the Region | 1.3 |