CRITERIA # 1 (Official Plan Designation) Weight: 2

Assessment Definition: An official plan describes upper, lower or single-tier municipal council's policies on how land should be used. An official plan deals mainly with issues such as: where new housing, industry, offices, etc. should be located, what services are needed to support new development, and where the urban boundary is. The Importance of the Official Plan Designation is whether the subject property's regulations permits a hospital. The Official Plan has specific policies surrounding institutional uses and the Vendor must demonstrate that the policies have been met. Should the land use not be an institutional designation within the Official Plan then an Official Plan Amendment would be required which would result in additional time and resources. It is also important to examine the compatibility of adjacent land uses (existing and future, if known) so one can be aware if the hospital will be adjacent to a compatible land use and that the majority of the land is in a designation that is not constrained by environmental features.

Scale Factors: Parcel is partially or wholly within lands designated to permit hospital development:

- "10": Wholly within designated lands
- "7": Not designated, but an amendment has a strong possibility of support
- "5": Not designated, but an amendment has a fair possibility of support
- "3": Not designated, but an amendment has minimal possibility of support
 "0": Not designated, but an amendment has a poor possibility of support (e.g. designated "greenland" or "environmental protection")

	Site																					- Distriction
Response #	А В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	Ĭ	J	К		M M	4 0	P	Q	R	S	Т	U	V	W	!
1	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	6.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	10.0	8.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	1.0	4.0	8.0	2.0	8.0	
2	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	
3	4.0	4.0	8.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	10.0	0.0	3.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	
4	8.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	6.0	3.0	9.0	-
5	7.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	
6	8.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	4.0	8.0	1.0	6.0	8.0	1.0	9.0	
7	6.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	6.0	4.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	4.0	6.0	0.0	6.0	6.0	4.0	7.0	
8	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	7.0	
9	6.0	3.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	2.0	6.0	!
10	7.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	5
Augustus Calleria S.						1	***************************************	Ī			1	:										
Average Criteria 1															ļ							
·	6.2	3.2	5.7	4.5	4.8	2.5	5.8	6.9	1.5	3.0	2.0	7.4	7.1	6.3	2.3	6.4	0.4	5.0	6.3	2.0	7.1	
Veighted Score Criteria 1	12.4	6.4	11.4	al	9.61	ςl	11.6	13.8	3	6	4	14.8	14.2	12.6	4.6	12.8	0.8	10	12.6	4	14.2	UVIII O

CRITERIA # 2 (Zoning) Weight: 2

Assessment Definition: A Zoning By-law provides specific provisions and regulations for all development. Zoning By-laws regulate the use of land, buildings and other structures. The zoning of a site regulates the uses that are allowed on a property as well as where buildings can be located on a site, the lot sizes, dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street. The importance of zoning is whether or not the proposed use is permitted within the Zoning By-Law as well as whether the proposed building footprint and site layout fits within the requirements of the By-Law. A Zoning By-Law Amendment can be applied for (e.g. if a use is not permitted or a building height exceeds the maximum requirement) if required, however, this also adds additional time and resources. In most cases, an amendment will be required; however, heavy industrial zones, prime agricultural lands, protected employment lands and environmental lands, may not be appropriate.

Scale Factors: It is assumed most sites will require site-specific zoning for a hospital and ancillary uses.

- "10": No zoning restrictions exist
- "7": Not zoned, but an amendment has a strong possibility of support
- "5": Not zoned, but an amendment has a fair possibility of support
- "3": Not zoned, but an amendment has a minimal possibility of support
- "O": Not zoned, but an amendment has a poor possibility of support (e.g. zoned "greenland" or "environmental protection")

One 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Site										(about)		······································									
esponse #	А	В	C D	į	E F	G	H	1	J	К	٨	1 N	0	Р		Σ R	<u> </u>	T	U	<u> </u>	W	
1	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	6.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	9.0	6.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	5.0	1.0	8.0	
2	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	
3	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	
. 4	5.0	3.0	6.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	6.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	6.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	6.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	
5	3.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	7.0	
6	5.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	6.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	8.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	
7	5.0	3.0	6.0	7.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	3,0	6.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	
8	3.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	
9	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	6.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	
10	7.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	minary management
				······································					and the state of t									***************************************			:-hunes	***************************************
With a state of the state of th				1																		
				- 1				1							1							
verage Criteria 2	4.8	2.3	5.0	4.8	2.3	2.2	5.5	5.6	1.6	2.4	2.5	9.9	5.6	2.2	1.9	2.5	0.8	5.2	5.4	2.1	5.8	and the same of th
	the transport of the second of	I					and the second s	······································	ann an aide an													
eighted Score Criteria 2	9.6	4.6	10	9.6	4.6	4.4	11	11.2	3.2	4.8	5	19.8	11.2	4.4	3.8	5	1.6	10.4	10.8	4.2	11.6	1

CRITERIA # 3 (Impact of Restrictions (By-laws, Rights-of-Way, Easements, etc.)) Weight: 4

Assessment Definition: There should be no restrictions on the use of the property, including below grade services easements. In essence, the property should have clear title. Particular attention should also be paid to municipal drains.

Scale Factors: Potential for adverse impact on the development process which could require mitigating or removing restrictions:

- "10": No restrictions on the lands
- "7": Minor restrictions that will not impact developable areas
- "5": Some restrictions that can be moved or accommodated
- "3": Restrictions that impact a portion of the developable area
- "0": Restrictions that impact the majority of developable area

	Site					SCHOOL STATE OF THE SCHOOL					and the second second		property and the second	and the same of th				arminal de la company de la co	Action of the second	America Marie America	evininess several management of the several	4	
Response #	A	В	C	[0)	E F	G		Н	J	K		M	N 0	F)	Q F	3	T	U	<u> </u>	V	<u> </u>
1		3.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	9.0	0.0	7.0	3.0	8.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	8.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	1.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	9.0	5
2		3.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	9.0	3
3		3.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	8.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7
4		5.0	10.0	4.0	9.0	10.0	0.0	6.0	3.0	7.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	3
5		3.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	
6		5.0	10.0	2.0	9.0	10.0	3.0	9.0	3.0	9.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	2.0	10.0	4.0	8.0	10.0	
7		4.0	10.0	2.0	9.0	10.0	2.0	7.0	4.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	9.0	6.0	2.0	9.0	8
8		5.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	3
9		4.0	10.0	3.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	4.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	6.0	9.0	2.0	9.0	6.0	7.0	10.0	6
10		3.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	10.0	0.0	7.0		7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3,0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5
						AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY O		Section of the sectio		<u></u>		***************************************			14 mm			and the Control of Particular Control of Control				***	
	gramatuutegagatuu gagagatta <u>uu poogo</u> o Madanduumattattaattadama gatamattika gadag								g and deal court accorded deal court and debut a cold deal from the conditions of the cold deal from the conditions of the cold deal from the conditions of the cold deal from the cold	1			The Control of the Co		Mary and Advantage of the State			HANNIE DE LE	Annahur Januar Angering and State Control of the St				
			ŀ							44	į							ļ					
Average Criteria 3		3.8	10.0	1 7	7.1	9.9	1.2	7.8	3,5	7.9	1.7	2.0	3.2	8.9	4.2	4.1	4.9	1.1	8.1	3.9	6.5	8.6	5
Average criteria 3		3,0]	10.0				212				***************************************	endergy property and the second				and any count of the format of the second by		Andrews (Andrews Control of the Cont	//////////////////////////////////////	artitement (passent Pysystem) artistem (artistem)		addition of the same of the same	2
NAZ-i-land Coore Critoria 2		15 2	401	60	28.4	39.6	4.8	31.2	14	31.6	6.81	8	12.8	35.6	16.8	16.4	19.6	4.4	32.4	15.6	26	34.4	20.
Weighted Score Criteria 3		15.2	40	0.0	20.4	35.0	4.0	31.2	14	31.0	0,0			~ J.0							حساب سبنين		•

CRITERIA # 4 (Parcel (Shape and Geometry)) Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: The parcel size must plan for potential physical and site needs of the Facility over a 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 year timeframe that ensures best use of significant and long term government commitment. It should provide flexibility to accommodate major changes in health care delivery and/or program requirements. The parcel shape should allow for a development pad that would accommodate a hospital. The pad should generally be rectangular and sized to allow maximum ground floor coverage. The shape and geometry should be such as to accommodate the hospital itself, ancillary buildings, along with parking.

Scale Factors: Parcel has a regular shape and is of good proportion:

- "10": A rectangular shape that has a test area of 400m x 400 m
- "7": A rectangular "test" area 300M x 400M fits within the parcel
- "5": A rectangular "test" area 300M x 300M fits within the parcel
- "3": A rectangular "test" area 300M x 200M fits within the parcel
- "1": A rectangular "test" area 200M x 200M fits within the parcel
- · "O"· Less than a rectangular "test" area 200M x 200M fits within the parc

- "0": Less than a rectangular "test" area 200M x		arcer																				
Page 1	Site		· 1	<u> </u>		le	I L	Ti	Tı .	k		и In	i In		e lo		R S	Т	It	ı İv	lw.	1
Response #	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	7.0	0.0	8.0	3,0
7	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	3.0
3	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	1.
7	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	2.0
5	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	2,0
6	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	3,0	10.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	4.0
7	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	4.0	10.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	2,0
8	ol	10.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	1.0
9	0.5	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	2.5	10.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	2.0
10	1.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	3.0
					t and the second se	erane proportion and the second	e og for at transmit til framer annat at for har area.				May to the second secon		And the second of the second o									
															1							
Average Criteria 4	1.0	9.9	9.4	10.0	6.7	2.1	10.0	9,9	6.7	10.0	2.9	10.0	10.0	10.0	3.9	10.0	1.9	10.0	8.5	0.0	7.5	2.3
	aktisearraarraarraarraarraarraarraarraarraar	**************************************		ara-Murasanna amin'ny		Annual (1997) 1997								Verball Approximation and Appr	[2:74]	12 mar 2		101111-111111-1111111-111111-11111-11111-1111				Construction of the Constr
Weighted Score Criteria 4	2.85	29.7	28.2	30	20.1	6.3	30	29.7	20.1	30	8.55	30	30	30	11.7	30	5.7	30	25.5	0	22.5	6.9

CRITERIA # 5 Parking potential Weight: 5

Assessment Definition: Parking is generally defined by two criteria: the Municipal Zoning By-law and anticipated use. Hospital uses are often 1 space per bed. The second criterion is typical patient usage and need. A range of 1 space per 45 m² to 60 m² Gross Floor Area is suggested to be optimal for a long term build out scenario. Surface parking will be preferred. Parking is to be calculated on the basis of 139,354 m² GFA.

Scale Factors: The site achieves a parking ratio of:

- "10": Greater than 1 space per 45 m² (3096 spaces)
- "7": Greater than 1 space per 50 m² (2787 spaces)
- "5": Greater than 1 space per 60 m² (2322 spaces)
- "3": Greater than 1 space per 70 m² (1990 spaces)
- "1": Less than 1 space per 80 m² (1740 spaces)

	Site												annual franchist and Antagonal in the latest and any and an annual franchist and any and an annual franchist and an annual fra		market market market market to the same of		Aller Aller			~~ <u></u>	for the transmitted of the Proceedings of the Association of the Contract of t	
Response #	A	в с])	E	F G	Н		J	ŀ	(N		N C	P		Q	R S	Т	U	V	W	
1	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	3
2	3.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	1.0	9.0	1.0	9.0	9.0	1.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	1.0	9.0	9.0	1.0	10.0	10
3	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10,0	0.0	10.0	3
4	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	8
5	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	1
6	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	9.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1,0	10.0	7
7	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	2
8	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	5
9	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10
10	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10
	THE RESERVE THE PROPERTY OF TH	***************************************	NAME OF THE OWNER, THE	- PAPETITA QUARTE - MILITARIA DE CONTRA DE CON		***************************************	Marie Communication of the Com		**************************************		**************************************				TO THE RESERVE TO THE PARTY OF							
		·			<u> </u>			T														
Average Criteria 5	2.3	9.9	9.9	9,9	9.9	2.0	9,9	5.1	9.9	9.9	0.8	9.8	6.2	9.9	9.9	9.9	0.8	9.9	9.9	0.8	10.0	5
Welge circulas						Contraction of the Contraction o				and and the first of the formation of the same of the				erromer erromonopposite erromer erromer	mileted mileteres (1), seed of more	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH						
Weighted Score Criteria 5	11.5	49.5	49.5	49.5	49.5	10	49.5	25.5	49.5	49.5	1	101	31	49.5	49.5	49.5	4	49,5	49.5	4	50	29

CRITERIA # 6 Flexible Site Development/Campus Planning Scenarios Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: The site should be large enough to accommodate the proposed uses as well as future buildings, structures, parking, landscaped garden areas, etc., including allied services and potential research uses.

Scale Factors: Potential for multiple planning and design solutions:

- "10": is Excellent
- "7": is Good
- "5": is Fair
- "3": is Minimal
- "1": is Poor

	Site																					
Response #	Α	в С	D)	E	F	H		J	Į.	М	1	N () P		Q	R S	ľ	ſ	J V	W	
1	2.0	7.0	4.0	5.0	10.0	4.0	9.0	8.0	5.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	9.0	5.
2	1.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	1.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	9.
3	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	7.
4	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	8.0	1.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	8.0	1.0	4.0	3.
5	1.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	7.0	7.
6	1.0	3.0	1.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	9.0	7.0	3.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	6.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	9.0	7.
7	6.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	10.0	4.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	3.0	9.0	9.0	4.0	8,0	9.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	9.0	8.
8	3.0	3.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	7.0	1.
9	1.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	6.0	5,0	9.0	0.0	9.0	9.0	0.0	10.0	6.
10	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	7.0	10.0
Average Criteria 6	2.6	4.3	3.3	6.4	8.7	3.4	8.9	6.0	5.2	7.9	4.4	6.8	9.3	4.6	5.4	8.9	1.1	9.6	9.4	0.5	8.2	6.
Weighted Score Criteria 6	7.8	12.9	9.9	19.2	26.1	10.2	26.7	18	15.6	23.7	13.2	20.4	27.9	13.8	16.2	26.7	3.3	28.8	28.2	1.5	24.6	18.9

CRITERIA # 7 Expansion Scenarios Weight: 4

Assessment Definition: The site should be large enough that future expansions can occur within the property to accommodate future projected population growth. A full regeneration of the proposed hospital should be accommodated on the site by having enough land access.

Scale Factors: Potential for future expansion:

- "10": is Excellent

- "7": Is Good

- "5": is Fair

- "3": is Minimal

- "1": is Poor

	Site					M-N/24/4/11/02/12/02/11/11/11/11/11				ggaridilinangan digipan an addigan garungan an		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			Market and Market Commence of the Commence of					~~~		and the second s
Response #	A I	В	c [D	E	F	G	H [I	J		<	М	N O	Р		Q	R S	T	U	V	٧	J
1	2.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	3.0
2	1.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	5.0
3	1.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	3.0
4	3.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	10.0	1.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	8.0	10.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	1.0	10.0	8.0	0.0	7.0	3.0
5	1.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	3.0
6	3.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
7	4.0	7.0	6.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	1.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	3.0
8	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	3.0
9	2.0	9.0	4.0	8.0	9.0	2.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	9.0	1.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	0.0	9.0	9.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
10	3.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	10.0	10.0
		iiteeeeettuuroonnaa-manaanaankiin								aladell de gant feld de le le Leannach alambeil (al			ales (Constitution (Constituti									
							i i															
							1															
Average Criteria 7	2.5	8.8	4.0	9.0	9.6	2.4	9.4	8.3	8.6	9.0	2.0	9.3	8.7	9.3	9.2	9.3	0.6	9,6	9.4	0.3	9.7	4.3
	ALI SANTA KANDA TALI ILI SANTA KARISTA (MANDA) ILI AMBASA TALI SANTA BANDA	шингин компенсия (при 1946)	California de la constitución de		/////		to the state of th				7,1											**************************************
Weighted Score Criteria 7	10	35,2	16	36	38.4	9.6	37.6	33.2	34.4	36	8	37.2	34.8	37.2	36.8	37.2	2.4	38.4	37.6	1.2	38.8	17.2

CRITERIA # 8 Parcel Size (including future growth) Weight: 5

Assessment Definition: The parcel size must plan for potential physical and site needs of the Facility over a 5,10, 20, 50 and 100 year timeframe that ensures best use of significant and long term government commitment. It should provide flexibility to accommodate major changes in health care delivery and/or program requirements. For future expansions to accommodate growth and future replacement/renewal, the Ministry favours a minimum area of 40 acres of developable land (i.e. not constrained with environmental features) with 50 acres being preferred. Nevertheless, property less than this favoured or preferred parcel size will be considered.

Scale Factors: The parcel size must plan for potential physical and site needs of the Facility over a 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 year timeframe that ensures best use of significant and long term government commitment.

- "10": 46 or more acres preferred
- "7": 41-45 acres of developable land
- "5": 36-40 acres of developable land
- "3": 30-35 acres of developable land
- "1": less than 30 acres of developable land

	Site											22.02.04.00.00.00.04.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.00.	an ann an aige an an an aige an an an aige an an aige an an aige an aige an aige an aige an aige an aige an ai								***************************************	
Response #	Α	в с) [F	:	G	H I		K		М	N	O F)	Q R	S	,	T U		<u>'</u>	W
1	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	9.0	0.0	10.0	
2	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10
3	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	
4	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	
5	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10
6	9.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	
7	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	
8	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	
9	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10
10	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	10
		**************************************			***************************************				10 <u>7-1111111111111111111111111111111</u>			t demail (let a grad a set grad a let grammed et a seu let f										
and the second s																						
			1					1					-									
Average Criteria 8	9.9	9.5	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.6	10.0	9.5	10.0	10.0	4.1	10.0	9.9	10.0	10.0	10.0	1.3	10.0	9.9	0.3	10.0	
	correct distance de la company		17	######################################	THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NAM			teratas in latinas exercises in terminal exercises in the second exercises in	X. III. WALLES		A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	**************************************	***************************************					Anna San (13 San			,	XXX
Weighted Score Criteria 8	49.5	47.5	50	50	50	38	50	47.5	50	50	20.5	50	49.5	50	50	50	6.5	50	49.5	1.5	50	

CRITERIA # 9 Service Catchment Area Weight: 5

Assessment Definition: Consideration should be given to the surrounding population (current and future) numbers as an area with a higher density would be more desirable for a variety of reasons (e.g. distance of travel, services a greater number of people within a smaller area). Future population within an area should be considered to ensure that proper services will be available.

Scale Factors: Centrally located to the population within a 5km drive (current and to 2031):

- "10": 80% of Region's population within a 10km radius
- "7": 70% of the Region's population within a 15km radius
- "5": 80% of the Region's population within a 20km radius
- "3": 70% of the Region's population within a 20km radius
- "1": less than 60% of the Region's population is within 20km

	Site											20V2		1.1888.11.1888.11888.11888.11888.11888.11888.11888.11888.11888.11888.11888.11888						town New York State about the Park State and the State and		1-6
esponse #	A	ВС	D	E	E F	G		H	J	k	. N	<u> </u>	V C	Р		Q R	S	Т	U	V	W	
1	7.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	8.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	8.0	
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	9.0	
3	7.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	2.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	7.0	
4	7.0	5.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	4.0	6.0	8.0	
5	7.0	5.0	7.0	2.0	8.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	
6	5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	4.0	9.0	- 4
7	7.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	8.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	6.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	7.0	
8	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	5.0	3
9	7.0	4.0	7.0	2.0	8.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	7.0	7.0	7,0	5.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	7.5	3
10	5.0	5.0	5,0	1.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	
10	3.0	3.01	3.0	1.0]	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.01										
	No. of the Control of																					
Average Criteria 9	6.3	4.0	5.8	1 2	6.7	3.9	6.1	5.9	2.8	1 9	3.5	5.8	6,7	6.3	5.2	6,2	0.3	2.1	2.7	3.9	7.5	
Average Citteria J		7.7	310	1.01							resimental programming the street of the second		Standard Control of State of S		L	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	******************				F1-F11111	at at facilities and a
Weighted Score Criteria 9	31.5	24.5	29	٩l	33.5	19.5	30.5	29.5	14	9.5	17.25	29	33.5	31.5	26	31	1,5	10.5	13.5	19.5	37.25	19

CRITERIA # 10 Provisions for any Allied Services -- on site or adjacent to site (e.g. Long Term Care, Pharmacy, Office) Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: Consideration should be given as to whether it would be desirable to bring allied facility such as commercial pharmacy, restaurants or other retail outlets. These facilities should be accommodated on site, but may also spur similar development in the neighbourhood.

Scale Factors: Potential for multiple planning and design solutions for future allied services:

- "10": is Excellent
- "7": is Good
- "5": is Fair
- "3": Is Minimal
- "1": ls Poor

	Site															A 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			**************************************				
Response #	A	В	C	D	E		F G		H	l J	-	K M		V 0	Р	Q		₹ S	Т	Į.	J V		J
1		.0	10.0 3.	.0	5.0	10.0	2.0	3.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	8.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	1.0	4.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	6
2	1	.0	5.0 1.	.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	10.0	8
3		.0	7.0 5.	.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	3
4		.0	9.0 5.	.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	9.0	6
5		.0	10.0 5.	.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	1.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	5
6	3	.0	8.0 3.	.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	0.0	7.0	8.0	1.0	10.0	6
7	- 6	0.0	8.0 6.	.0	7.0	9.0	4.0	7.0	6.0	9.0	9.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	5.0	9.0	
8	1	.0	5.0 1.	.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	5.0	7.0	1.0	7.0	7
9		.0	7.0 5.	.0	7.0	8.0	4.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	10.0	7
10	5	.0	7.0 5.	.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	6.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	1.0	7.0	5
	ettetistet maainet metet semantet maatet met semantet metet senset metet senset senset senset senset senset se					······································				and the second s													
								·															
Average Criteria 10		.7	7.6 3.	.9	6.0	7.7	2.7	5.1	6.1	6.3	6.3	7.0	7.0	6.9	6.3	6.0	6.5	1.7	5.9	7.9	2.4	8.9	5
Remarks the second seco		/minter / june / i / insufficient					(4)											t de la company de la comp			11 mm 201 n m 201 m 202 n m 202 n m 100 m 202 n m 100 m 1		The annual and the annual and the second and the se
Veighted Score Criteria 10	11	.1	22.8 11.	.7	18	23.1	8.1	15.3	18.3	18.9	18.9	21	21	20.7	18.9	18	19.5	5.1	17.7	23.7	7.2	26.7	17

CRITERIA # 11 Relationship to other supportive Institutions (Research or Education) Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: The Facility should locate in an area where other supporting institutions are within reasonable proximity, such as houses of worship, long term care facilities, hotels, medical, clinical and allied health education and research facilities, etc.

Scale Factors: Site is located within:

- "10": Within 5 km of other supportive institutions
- "7": Within 6-10 km of other supportive institutions
- "5": Within 11-15 km of other supportive institutions
- "3": Within 16-20 km of other supportive institutions
- "1": Further than 20 km away from other supportive institutions

	Site			·····																		
Response #	A B	l	с Б	le le	<u> </u>	: lo	H	1	IJ			м II	N lo	Р		Q I	₹ Is	T	į	u v	[w	(
1	7.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	4.0	2.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	6.
2	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	4.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	3
3	7.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	3
4	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	9.0	3.0	2.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	3
5	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	2.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	5
6	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	4.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	3.
7	8.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	9,0	4.0	5.0	6.0	2.0	2.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	1.0	3.0	9.0	8.0	7.0	5.
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	5.
9	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.
10	7.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	3.
	27-2-22-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2									·····												
																			1			
Average Criteria 11	7.1	7.0	7.1	4.2	7.2	3.1	4.7	4.0	3.7	3.7	9.7	7.7	7.6	7.3	4.3	7.3	4.3	4.0	7.2	8.8	7.0	3.9
Veighted Score Criteria 11	21,3	21	21.3	12.6	21.6	9.3	14.1	12	11.1	11.1	29.1	23,1	22,8	21.9	12.9	21.9	12.9	12	21.6	26.4	21	11.

CRITERIA # 12 Neighbourhood Compatibility Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: The image of the hospital and the acceptance of the community are important parameters in acceptance of the hospital in the community. The Facility and location must present a welcoming public image from the point of health care access. The site must be located in an area where the hospital would be compatible with existing uses, now and within future policy directions.

Scale Factors: The Facility must be in an area that is compatible with hospital uses.

- "10": Highly compatible
- "7": Compatibility is good
- "5": Compatibility is fair
- "3": Compatibility is minimal
- "0": Non-compatible

	Site																~~~					and a constraint a constraint of
Response #	Α	В	C [) E	Ti	G	H		J	K	М	I	۷ O	P	Q	R	S	Т	U	V	W	J
1	8.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	2.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	8.0	10.0	6.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	1.0	9.0	
2	9.0	3.0	9.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	10.0	7.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	9.0	
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	9.0	5.0	9.0	
4	7.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	0.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	
5	10.0	7.0	8.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	7.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	
6	9.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	4.0	9.0	8.0	6.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	0.0	9.0	
7	9.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	4.0	9.0	
8	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	0.0	7.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	0,0	
9	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	7.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5,0	3.0	7.0	
10	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	
					to destruction and the second		······································	······································														
verage Criteria 12	7.5	5.6	7.1	6.4	3.0	1.9	7.1	5.8	2.2	3.3	3.1	6.2	9.0	6.3	1.8	7.5	7.7	3.7	8,3	3.2	6.9	A
Jeighted Score Criteria 12	22.5	16.8	21.3		on the comment of the control of the	5.7				Stations and management and are an about	***************************************	18.6	27	18,9	5.4	22.5	23.1	11.1	24.9	9.6	20.7	**************

CRITERIA # 13 Site Amenities (trails, parks, restaurants, shopping) Weight: 2

Assessment Definition: Nearby amenities to the site can enhance a person's experience. The site should have trails and walkways within the site that connect to the bigger municipal system. Nearby commercial uses add to the location of a hospital for visitor and employee convenience.

Scale Factors: Potential for on site or adjacent site amenities:

- "10": is Excellent

- "7": Is Good

- "5": is Fair

- "3": is Minimal

- "1": is Poor

		Site																					
Response #	Mary - Human Amarika (Principal Amarika (Principal Amarika (Principal Amarika (Principal Amarika (Principal Am	Α	В	С	D	E	F G		-1		J K		М	N	0	P .	Q	R S	7	r U	٧	W	
	1	3.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	4.0	2.0	9.0	3.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	3.0
	2	1.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	1.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	1.0
	3	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	0.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	9.0	0.0
	4	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	3.0
	5	5.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	1.0
	6	3.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	6.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	4.0
	7	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	4.0	6.0	4.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	4.0	7.0	3.0
	8	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	1.0
	9	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	5.0	7.0	1.0	7.5	3.0
1	0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	1.0
	mik magantagi kakee padakan padka magayaa ta kataa daamaad aa madaa mada mada mada ka maga ka da ka maga ka da	Control of State of the State o	instant (2 mart at 1 tant 2 at a m 2 mart a mart a	e gant gant et getanna and annotation and annotation and a	and Salada Cad Ad Sanah dan massaria	familia kangantan (12 kilo 12 k	***************************************		A grade and the trade of the contract of a comment and and	trad II (2 tamban I am Patrian) (2 til tahun 1 am Pam Pam Pam													
									1														
Average Criteria 13		3.4	8.3	8.3	8.4	5.3	1.6	6.8	4.0	6.5	6.5	7.4	5.1	4.9	5.3	4.5	5.2	4.5	4.8	7.9	4.5	8.8	2.0
Weighted Score Criteria 13		6.8	16.6	16.6	16.8	10.6	3.2	13.6	8	13	13	14.8	10.2	9.8	10.6	9	10.4	9	9.6	15.8	9	17.5	4

CRITERIA # 14 Visibility Weight: 2

Assessment Definition: The Facility must have good visibility from major thoroughfares.

Scale Factors: Potential for a significant portion of main hospital building to be visible from Highway

- "10": Excellent potential
- "7": Good potential
- "5": Fair potential
- "3": Minimal potential
- "1": Limited potential

	Site													, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						hardoutholdent platematical acts to a visit and AV	2005.247.000.0017.00.22.1100.22.2100.22.2	
ponse #	АВ	Proceed Cultural and action of actions	C D	E		*	G H	[1	J	K	. N	N		O P	a		R S	Т	Ų	V	W	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
, 1	4.0	6.0	8.0	4.0	4.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	
2	7.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	7.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	1
3	3.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	
4	7.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	1
5	5.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	
6	7.0	8.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	5.0	6.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	10
7	7.0	5.0	9.0	6.0	6.0	9.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	9.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.5	7.0	8.0	
8	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	
9	6.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	6.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	5.5	8.0	8.5	7.5	8.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	1
10	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	e jakohoholuloloon
											······										1	

rage Criteria 14	5.8	5.0	8.4	4.3	5,2	7.5	7.0	7.3	5.0	6.0	5.2	7.3	8.0	7.4	7.8	7.5	4.8	5.1	6.4	7.1	6.6	
ghted Score Criteria 14	11.6	10	16.8	8.6	10.4	15	14	14.5	10	12	10.3	14.6	15.9	14.7	15.6	15	9.6	10.2	12.7	14.2	13,2	1

CRITERIA # 15 Proximity to existing EMS/Police/Patient Transfer Sites/Disaster Preparedness Weight: 4

Assessment Definition: Access to the Facility must be well delineated and acceptable to emergency service providers. The routes and the Facility location must be convenient to the geographic region, with alternative pathways identified should primary ones be obstructed. Travel time for existing and proposed emergency services sites to the hospital is a factor in the location of the hospital (i.e. EMS response times). Location should be in an area that would support disaster preparedness planning by EMS, Police and Fire services.

Scale Factors: Site has:

- "10": clear travel routes and travel time is less than current response times
- "7": clear travel routes and travel time meets response times
- "5": clear travel routes and travel time almost meets current response times
- · "3": not ideal travel routes and travel time does not meet response times
- "1": not ideal travel routes and travel time is not acceptable

NOTE: Fire Response Time is 5 min., EMS response time for cardiac is 6 min. (most restrictive)

	Site										way of the state o		and the second s				W. W					
Response #	ĪA	В	C D	[8	E F	(3 H	l l	I J	K		<u> </u>	۷ () P		Q [3 5	T	U	V	W	
1	4.0	8.0	3.0	9.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	9.0	2.0	9.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	2.0	5.0	1.0
2	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	8.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	1.0
3	3.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	3.0
4	5.0	9.0	4.0	10.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	9.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	3.0
5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5,0	5.0
6	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	8.0	3.0
7	6.0	8.0	6.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	4.0	4.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	3.0
8	3.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
9	3,5	8.0	4.0	7.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	8.5	5.0	7.5	7.5	8.0	8.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.5	8.0	7.5	6.0	10.0	1.0
10	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	5.0
					<u>.</u>			- I														
															•			Ì				
Average Criteria 15	4.5	7.1	4,3	6.8	3.9	3.4	4.0	8.1	3.8	5.9	5.9	7.4	7.6	3.7	3.1	3.8	7.2	7.1	6.1	4.1	6.1	2.8
Weighted Score Criteria 15	17.8	28.4	17.2	27.2	15.6	13.6	16	32.2	15.2	23.4	23.4	29.6	30.4	14.8	12.4	15.2	28.6	28.4	24.2	16.4	24.4	11.2

CRITERIA # 16 Roadway capacity Weight: 5

Assessment Definition: The road network must be able to support or add capacity to support the existing average daily trips in addition to those anticipated as the population grows. Road networks currently operating at a level 'd' or greater may have long term congestion issues. If a roadway is planned for expansion, this may not be an issue.

Scale Factors: Roadway capacity (planned or existing) to handle existing and proposed traffic as well as population growth.

- "10": Two lanes each direction for both primary roads
- "7": Two lanes each direction for at least one primary road
- "5": One lane in each direction operating at less than 60% capacity
- "3": One lane each direction operating at greater than 60% capacity
- "0": One lane each direction operating at greater than 80% capacity

	Site																	and the second				
esponse #	A	В	C D		E F	G	i H) K	I	V N	0	Р		Q R	S	T	U	V	W	٧
1	6.1	8.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	4.0	6.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	
2	7.1	10.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	
3	5.1	5.0	0.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	
4	7.1	8.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	8.0	
5	7.1	7.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	
6	6.1	9.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	
7	8.1	9.0	2.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5,0	4.0	5.0	3,0	7.0	6.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	
8	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	
9	6.0	8.0	3.0	4.0	6.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	0.0	8.0	5.0	7.5	5.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	
10	5.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	
	z ne zwożny wniej new z wież se szymine z wiej niej wiej niej wieke z zwie bez z zwiej nezwewniej szy eż				***************************************		#\$1##\$\$##\$1##\$1#\$1#\$1###\$1##\$1#\$2#\$2##						normal at the second for the second second second second second	germania en la contra d'en demánda de la contra del la contra del la contra del la contra de la contra del		***************************************		Jan 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
	annotational transfer and trans																					
																-						
verage Criteria 16	6.0	7.1	2.9	4.8	6.1	5.5	3.4	5.1	3.5	3.0	7.4	4.4	6.3	3.8	6.4	3.8	3.4	4.8	6.7	7.9	7.5	
	the state of the s	and an arrangement of the second of the seco	Leaven de la companya		and the same of th	A Control Comment of the Comment of		and the state of t	and in the second s		**************************************	and the second s		and framework and an arrangement of the second	***************************************							
eighted Score Criteria 16	31	35.5	14.5	24	30.5	27.5	17	25.5	17.5	15	37	22	31.5	19	31.75	19	17	24	33.5	39.5	37.5	3

CRITERIA # 17 Arterial / Collector Road Access Weight: 4

Assessment Definition: In keeping with the goal of situating the Facility in close proximity to population, the Facility should be located with close access to major transportation corridors within the tributary region. Typically, most hospitals have an address on an arterial road or equivalent. They also should have close access to major roadways for connectivity to Regional communities.

Scale Factors: Consideration of direct potential or established access to an existing Highway:

- "10": Less than 1/2 km from arterial/collector
- "7": 1/2 to 1 km from arterial/collector
- "5": 1 to 1 1/2 km from arterial/collector
- "3": 1/2 to 2 km from arterial/collector
- "1": More than 2 km from arterial/collector

	Site												***************************************							***************************************	at and the section of the territories to constituting the section of the section		-
esponse #	A	В	ĺ	C	D E		F G	;	+	l	J	(M	1	N C) P	(Q	R S	S T	Ų	V	W	/
1		6.0	10.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	
2		10.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	3.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	
3		5.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	
4	<u></u>	9.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	
5		10.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	
6		8.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	
7		10.0	10.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	7.0	6.0	10.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	
8		5.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	
9		8.0	9.0	2.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	3.0	8.0	1.0	1.0	6.0	6.0	7.5	1.0	8.0	1.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	
10		7.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	
	erentem temperatura per propries propries de la companya de la companya de la companya de la companya de la co		de totale and the second tendent				de de la company			Suit format it to district the destruction and Suit	Fundadagatillittigthis med jumelet min	<u> Santago esperante de la constante de l'accesso de l'accesso de l'accesso de l'accesso de l'accesso de l'acces</u>	1117;-t(t	meneral energy energy en	***************************************							- Control of the Cont	A STATE OF THE STA
					1									į.									
verage Criteria 17		7.8	9.0	4.7	7.7	8.3	8.1	6.2	6.0	4.7	4.7	7.2	6.8	7.5	6.4	7.6	6.4	6.2	6.8	8.1	8.2	8.0	
	ann a tha ann an an t-airean an a					armetel america (for front for for fifty	and the second of the second s		// / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /														
eighted Score Criteria 17	50 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (1	31.2	36	18.8	30.8	33.2	32.4	24.8	24	18.8	18.8	28.8	27.2	29.8	25.6	30.4	25.6	24.8	27.2	32.4	32.8	32	

CRITERIA # 18 User Access (roadway, drop-off, loading) Weight: 4

Assessment Definition: Access, drop off requirements and shipping and receiving are inevitably linked to a site layout. Functionally it is assumed there will need to be reasonable access for wheel-trans, patient transfer vehicles, emergency vehicles and the like with protected drop-off at main and secondary entrances. A reasonable assumption would be three loading bays plus any refuse/recycling holding. Wherever possible truck and transfer vehicles should be separated from ambulatory visitor drop-off. Overall a site area ratio may be in the range of 15-25%. Control of signalization and other traffic planning aspects may be required.

Scale Factors: Multiple points of access to the parcel and a minimum frontage on municipal road(s) to locate access roads are desirable:

- "10": Frontage on at least 2 roads and a minimum frontage of 300M on at least one arterial road and a drop off area
- "7": Frontage on at least 2 roads and a minimum frontage of 250M on at least one arterial road and a drop off area
- "5": Frontage on at least 2 roads and a minimum frontage of 200M on at least one arterial road and a drop off area
- "3": Frontage on at least 1 road and a minimum frontage of 250M on at least one arterial road and a drop off area
- "1": Frontage on at least f 1 road and a minimum frontage of 200M on at least one arterial road and no drop off area

	Site																					
esponse #	A E	3	C D	I	E F	G	Н	I	J	К		M N	۷ 0	F)	Q R	S	T	U	٧	W	<i>i</i>
1	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	8.0	3.0	4.0	6.0	3.0	6.0	8.0	10.0	1.0	7.0	1.0	6.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	10.0	
2	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	9.0	9.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	
3	3.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	8.0	
4	0.0	10.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	4.0	0.0	1.0	
5	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	
6	1.0	9.0	3.0	1.0	10.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	2.0	9.0	1.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	
7	2.0	7.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	9.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	1.0	4.0	10
8	1.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	7.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1
9	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	8.0	3.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	3.5	0.5	8.0	3
10	1.0	7.0	3.0	1.0	7.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	1.0	7.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	1.0	10.0	10
		······································						**************************************	et met et transmit gest en met et en me											·		
verage Criteria 18	0.8	8.4	1.8	0.3	8.8	5.0	3.7	4.0	5.2	2.9	7.8	2.8	9.2	1.7	6.6	1.6	5.7	7.6	3.6	0.7	6.8	
eighted Score Criteria 18	3.2	33.6	7.2	1 2	35.2	20	14.8	16	20.8	11.6	31.2	11.2	36.8	6.8	26.4	6.4	22.8	30.4	14.2	2.6	27.2	2

CRITERIA # 19 Transit Route (Established or Potential) to and on the site Weight: 5

Assessment Definition: The user access area should front a local transit route in order to best serve the entire population and to encourage staff, visitors and patients to use public transit when appropriate. A site could also have potential for a transit route which could be found in the Transportation Master Plan.

Scale Factors: Transit route:

- "10": Established by opening day on two roads
- "7": Established by opening day on one road
- "5":To be established in the future on two roads
- "3":To be established in the future on one road
- "0": Not in the plans presently

	Site				······································																	
Response #	Α	В	C)		F G	H	1	J	k	(N	1 N	() P	· Q		R	S T	Γ U	V	W	
1	4.0	9.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	0.0
2	2.0	9.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	0.0
3	3.0	7.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	0.0
4	3.0	9.0	7.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	0.0
5	7.0	10.0	7.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	0.0
6	3.0	8.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	0.0
7	7.0	10.0	9.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	7.0	6.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	0.0	1.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	2.0
8	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
9	2.0	7.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	9.5	0.0
10	7.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	0.0
																						<u> </u>
Average Criteria 19	3.8	8.6	7.5	0.1	1.3	0.2	3.2	4.6	0.1	0.1	9.0	5.0	5.9	1.4	0.2	1.4	0.0	0.1	7.2	6.3	9.2	0.2
Weighted Score Criteria 19	19	43	37.5	0.5	6.5	1	16	23	0.5	0.5	45	25	29.5	7	1	7	0	0.5	36	31.5	45.75	1

CRITERIA # 20 Safe and convenient access for pedestrians / bicycles / e-bikes Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: Municipal sidewalks should be available or planned for the roads leading to the site and in particular to the user access points. Bike routes should be safe and the preference is for dedicated on road bike lanes.

Scale Factors: Street bike lanes existing or proposed and sidewalk existing or proposed

- "10": Established both bike and sidewalk
- "7": Established one of bike and sidewalk with the other in the future
- "5":To be established in the future both bike and sidewalk
- "3": Only one to be established in the future
- "0": No bike or sidewalk and nothing proposed in the future

	Site																Pundshilitatatiliastiliastiliastilias	tabili attabili ili kabahan ya ya ka			No.	
Response #	A	В	C	D	E	F	G I	-		J K		M	N O	Р		Q	R S	1	ſ	J A	/ V	٧
1	3.0	9.0	6.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	3.0
2	3.0	10.0	6.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	1.0
3	3.0	7.0	3.0	3,0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0
4	6.0	10.0	6.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	6.0	3.0
5	3.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	3.0
6	0.0	9.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	9.0	3.0
7	8.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	8.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	2.0
8	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	7.0	0.0
9	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	0.0
10	0.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0
	· I		ſ			······································	T				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					———				
Average Criteria 20	2.9	8.7	4.2	3.0	3.6	2.0	1.8	2.4	0.9	1.4	7.7	4.0	4.2	4.2	2,1	4.1	2.5	1.8	4.8	5.2	8.8	1.5
Weighted Score Criteria 20	8.7	26.1	12.6	9	10.8	6	5.4	7.2	2.7	4.2	23.1	12	12.6	12.6	6.3	12.3	7.5	5.4	14.4	15.6	26.4	4.5

CRITERIA # 21 Two Road Frontage (Established or Potential) Weight: 4

Assessment Definition: Site must have more than one main entrance route in case a secondary access route is required.

Scale Factors: Local conditions include:

- "10": Two road frontage currently established
- "7": Two road frontage proposed
- "5": One road frontage established
- "3": One road frontage proposed
- "O": Not in an area with a planned street network

	Site																			delenales al abel al al amount dest 2024 de communication		
Response #	A	в С		D	E F	G	l l	1 1	J	К	М		N O	F) Q	F	R S	Т		J V	W	<u> </u>
1	5.0	10.0	2.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	4.0	10.0	7.0	9.0	4.0	9.0	4.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	7.0
2	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	2.0
3	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	10,0	9.0	10.0	10.0	5.0
4	5.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	6.0	8.0
5	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	5.0
6	6.0	10.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0
7	6.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	4.0	9.0	4.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	7.0
8	0.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0
9	3.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	5.0
10	7.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10,0	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	10,0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	3.0
				On the left of the second of the land and the second left on the left left left.	2000	alemand of the state of the sta	**************************************															
																			1	1		
	***************************************	1					l					1		1		1						
Average Criteria 21	4.7	9.5	3.8	9.6	10.0	5.5	5.5	5.2	9.6	4.8	10.0	4.9	9.8	5.0	9.8	5.0	4.9	9.7	9.5	9.4	8.1	5.0
			- and a constant	CHARLES CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY									2712222714000000000000000000000000000000		-Authorities and a second seco							
Weighted Score Criteria 21	18.8	38	15.2	38.4	40	22	22	20.8	38.4	19.2	40	19.6	39.2	20	39.2	20	19.6	38.8	38	37.6	32.4	20

CRITERIA # 22 Distance Route to United States Border Crossing Weight: 1

Assessment Definition: Patient transfers occur at various border crossings. Routes and travel times need to ensure ease of access.

Scale Factors: The distance to the nearest border crossing

- "10": within 5 km of the border
- "7": within 6-10 km of the border
- "5": within 11-15 km of the border
- "3": within 16-20 km of the border
- "1": greater than 20 km of the border

	Site																					
Response #	ÎA	В	C C) E	F	G	H	F	Ĵ	К		М	N C)	Р	Q	R S	Т	U	V	W	/
1	5.0	7.0	3.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3
2	5.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5
3	5.0	7.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	3
4	5.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3
5	5.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3
6	5.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3
7	6.0	7.0	6.0	1.0	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	0.0	1.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	3
8	5.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3
9	5.0	7.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3
10	3.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3
						rated and 20 to 12 control of the land of the control of the 2																
Average Criteria 22	4.9	6.6	4,9	0.9	5.1	2,9	4.8	3.3	0.8	0.8	9.6	3.3	4.7	3.2	2.9	5.0	0.8	0.9	7.1	7.1	6.6	3
Weighted Score Criteria 22	1 4.9	6.6	4.9	0.9	5.1	2.9	4.8	3.3	0.8	0.8	9.6	3.3	4.7	3.2	2,9	5	0,8	0.9	7.1	7.1	6.6	January Company of the Company of th

CRITERIA # 23 Helicopter Flight Potential / Proximity / Access to Fixed Wing Aircraft Landing Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: The site should be able to accommodate a helicopter landing area. As a result, the site must be free from adjacent tall buildings greater than 30m in height and out of the air path of the Windsor airport. Accessibility to the airport with effective travel routes is also required for patient transfers in order to accommodate all-condition (all-weather) navigation.

Scale Factors: Restrictions on flight path elevations (existing structures higher than 30M, within ½ km of parcel will limit directions for flight path / final approach or limit options to locate helipad on-site)

- "10": No structures higher than 30m within 1/2 km and direct access to airport (1 arterial/collector)
- "7": No structures higher than 30m within 1/2 km and indirect access to airport (2 arterial/collectors)
- "5": No structures higher than 30m within 1/2 km and with indirect access to the airport (1 or 2 arterial/collector and 1 local road)
- "3": No structures higher than 30m within 1/2 km and with indirect access to the airport (1 or 2 arterial/collector and more than 1 local road)
- "0": Existing structures higher than 30M within ½ km of parcel

	Site														~~~					anning gang side of the state of		Probability and a Company
Response #	A	в с	D		E I	F G	Н		J	k		М	٧	O P		Q F	S	Т	U	V	W	1
1	7.0	8.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	8.0	6.0	2.0	2.0	7.0	1.0	8.0	
2	10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	0.0	10.0	7.0	0.0	10.0	
3	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	
4	7.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	4.0	8.0	7
5	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	?
6	5.0	4.0	8.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	7.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	8.0	5.0	7.0	1.0	4.0	6.0	5.0	10.0	
7	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	0.0	8.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	
8	10.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	(
9	9.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	4.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	7
10	10.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	7
**************************************	ad ad beilg had beilgigad b beilgi aad gabs, by de jaar kenaan ja beilgig by george by de legis gad bebyelg aad	ek kirin kirin kantan kantan kirin manak kalaman mengana kantan kantan kantan kantan kantan kantan kantan kant Pangan kirin kantan		///	ned and red control of the trade of the consecution and the trade of the control of the trade of the control of	tropication and a superior to the superior such	**************************************	***************************************	tte en transfer	and the second second	the second of the processing of comments of the second of	and the state of t		Af A common from from from the front of A construct front of A construct front of A construct from the front of A construct front of A con			2000					

Average Criteria 23	8.8	7.7	8.4	6.1	8.3	4.0	8.5	3.6	1.4	1.4	2.2	5.6	8.4	8.8	8.7	8.5	1.5	6.5	7.4	1.6	8.2	5
			***************************************							······································		ting the second contract and the second contract and the second contract and the second contract and the second	**************************************									
Weighted Score Criteria 23	26.4	23.1	25.2	18.3	24.9	12	25.5	10.8	4.2	4.2	6.6	16.8	25.2	26.4	26.1	25.5	4.5	19.5	22.2	4.8	24.6	17

CRITERIA # 24 Topography Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: The site should be relatively flat without too many grade changes in order to reduce the amount of cut and fill grading activities that would occur during construction.

Scale Factors: Topography:

- "10": Good topography gentle to no fluctuations of relief
- "7": Site is mostly level and can accommodate all anticipated uses
- "5": Site is not level, but can still accommodate all anticipated uses
- "3": Site is not level and can only accommodate a limited number of anticipated uses
- "1": Poor topography extreme fluctuations of relief and cannot accommodate anticipated uses

	Site																					
Response #	A	В	C C)	E F	G	Н	***************************************].	J K	ļ.	M N	0	P) (ì	R S	-	T L	J V	/ V	N
1	10,	0 10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1
2	10.0	0 10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	1
3	10.0	0 10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1
4	10.0	0 10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1
5	10.	0 10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1
6	10.0	0 10.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	10.0	1
7	10,	0 10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1
8	10.0	0 10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	1
9	10.	0 10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10
10	9.1	0 9.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10
taminentinentinentinentinentinentinentinen		er frankliken in der state der franklike in franklike in franklike in franklike in franklike in franklike in f			de territoria de la describito de la describición de la describición de la describición de la describición de l	12/m/d	***************************************	10000110020000 Andendanded Judaneles		mand from the state of the state of from the first of the state of the	**************************************			ANN	KO-MINI TORON	////	25000000000000000000000000000000000000			7000000		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
																					1	
Average Criteria 24	9.5	9.9	9.6	9.5	9.9	9.9	9.7	9.8	9.9	9.9	9.6	9.7	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.5	9.6	9.3	9.1	10.0	1
		All Commence of the Commence o	and the second section of the sectio	##Z#\$\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	and the second s	***																
Weighted Score Criteria 24	29.	7 29.7	28.8	28.5	29.7	29.7	29.1	29.4	29.7	29.7	28.8	29.1	29.7	29.7	29.7	29.7	28.5	28.8	27.9	27.3	30	

CRITERIA # 25 Servicing (Established or Potential, Redundant Services for Electrical and Water required) Weight: 4

Assessment Definition: The site should have capacity to support the Facility. Electrical, water, sewer, gas and other services should be in place now or by the time construction is scheduled to start. There are special considerations for plumbing and electrical systems in health care facilities. Access to two feeds for electrical and water should be available to the site.

Scale Factors: Water, sanitary, sewer, power (2 feeds required):

- "10": is established services
- "7": is good potential to service
- "5": is fair potential to service
- "3": is minimal potential to service
- "1"; is poor potential to service

		Site										A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR						25 m 1 8 2 m 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 2 2 2 2 2 2		······································		-	
Response #	Para Caraca de La caraca de 1990 de 19	Α	В	C D		E	F G	Н	I	J	K	N	1	N	O P	C)	R S	1		U V	W	J
1		5.0	9.0	6.0	9.0	6.0	3.0	4.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	8.0	6,0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7.0
2		9.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	4.0	4.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	4.0	8.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	6.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	2.0
3		7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0
4		7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	10.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0
5		5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.0
6		7.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	3.0
7		10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	4.0
8		5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0
9		7.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	4.0	6.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	5.0
10		5,0	7.0	7.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	7.0
		1	1	1	··· I		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·											· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	······		T		
								,											, _	0.1	0.5	0.7	4 7
Average Criteria 25		6.	7 9.2	8.2	9.5	6.7	4.3	4.8	6.9	6.3	6.3	9.4	5.8	7.3	3.3	4.0	3,5	6.8	6./	9.1	8.5	9.7	4.7
Weighted Score Criteria 25	en e	26.	36.8	32.8	38	26.8	17.2	19.2	27.6	25.2	25.2	37.6	23.2	29.2	13.2	16	14	27.2	26.8	36.4	34	38.8	18.8

CRITERIA # 26 Drainage Weight: 2

Assessment Definition: The site must have the ability to provide for storm water retention on site or in a nearby storm pond or in municipal storm water pipes.

Scale Factors: Potential for surface drainage:

- "10": Excellent potential

- "7": Good potential

- "5": Fair potential

- "3": Minimal potential - "0": Limited potential

	Site															d						dulld2ddmd2md10
Response #	А	В	C D	Action Not and Action Control of	E F	1	G [i	Н		J K		M N	1 0	P	C) R	S	Т	L) <u>V</u>	W	
1	5.0	8.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	6.0	4.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	6.0	7.0	2.0	9.0	8.0	1.0	9.0	5
2	6.0	7.0	3.0	6.0	6.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	9.0	4.0	3.0	10.0	3
3	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10
4	7.0	9.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	9.0	4
5	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	1.0	7.0	7.0	1,0	7.0	3
6	8.0	8.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	4.0	6.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	1.0	9.0	5
7	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	7
8	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	3
9	7.0	9.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	4.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	3.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	9.0	7
10	5.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	3.0	7.0	7.
						- 1		·····				T	·····						— т			
Was										***************************************												
Average Criteria 26	6.8	8.5	5.2	6.8	6.6	2.7	6.0	5.5	8.6	8.6	8.0	6.5	6.1	5.4	6.0	6.1	3.1	8.2	8.0	3.5	8.2	5
Weighted Score Criteria 26	13.6	17	10.4	13.6	13.2	5.4	12	11	17.2	17.2	16	13	12.2	10.8	12	12.2	6.2	16.4	16	7	16.4	10

CRITERIA # 27 Heritage and Environmental Features (Rivers / Streams) / Archaeological Weight: 4

Assessment Definition: The site should have no heritage or environmental features, unless the site exceeds the minimum size requirement. These types of features require additional study prior to site plan approvals, and may involve setbacks from the feature and well as flooding concerns in some areas. An archaeological impact assessment could be required where potential impacts to archaeological resources are identified.

Scale Factors: Presence of surface water, and natural and heritage features located on site:

- "10": No presence of any on site
- "7": Presence of one feature that does not impact the development site
- "5": Presence of one feature that does impact the development site
- "3": Presence of both features with minimal impact on development site
- "0": Presence of both features with impacts on development site

	Site																					
Response #	Α	В	C [t	D E		F G	l+	- †	J	ŀ	(M	N	0	Р		Q R	S	Т	Ų	J V		W
1	3.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	6.0	2.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	1.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	9.0	3,0
2	3.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	6.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	5.0
3	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	9.0
4	6.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	6.0	4.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	4.0	10.0	4.0
5	0.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	5.0
6	3.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	2.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	10.0	5.0
7	3.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	2.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	2.0	10.0	2.0	6.0	2.0	6.0	10.0	6.0
8	3.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	3.0
9	3.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	8.0	0.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	4.0	9.0	2.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	9.0	5.0
10	5.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	9.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	10.0
	and full training and a fill of the control of the fill of the full of the full of the full of the control of the full of the	migrael de andered a modelle de la produce de la grap de mé	HHI AKÇadari Falandari Fasani Amadania			2000 A A A STORY A STO	de (Carden) de la Carde (Carden) de la constanció (Carde)			d y referendige de fil de grade de consendence de la franció de consendence de la filosoficia de la decida de c	der for for the State of the State Annal of State Annal of State of the State of Sta	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH				****						
													İ									
Average Criteria 27	3.4	9.9	9.9	4.2	6.8	1.8	9.9	6.4	9.8	9.8	9,8	6.0	7.4	5.9	2.5	9.7	2.1	5.7	2.3	5.4	9.8	5.5
				and the first of the second second second second second second second second second second second second second			·		and produced and the second state of the secon			and the second s		man manage particular de la companya del companya del companya de la companya de	·		umana noonayoona					
Weighted Score Criteria 27	13.6	39.6	39.6	16.8	27.2	7.2	39.6	25.6	39.2	39.2	39.2	24	29.6	23.6	10	38.8	8.4	22.8	9.2	21.6	39.2	22

CRITERIA # 28 Vegetation Weight: 2

Assessment Definition: The site should not impinge on native wooded areas. A vegetation management plan would be required if there are trees that provide linkages to wildlife corridors, contain significant species, or provide breeding habitat for migratory birds. Vegetation also limits the season in which work on site can be done if it is found to be habitat for breeding birds. Replacement tree programs may be required if proposing to remove any species greater than 10 cm in diameter.

Scale Factors: Presence of wooded areas on site:

- "10": No vegetation on site
- "7": Low vegetation (hedgerow, scrub)
- "5": Young plantation
- "3": Mature plantation
- "0": Significant species (e.g. butternuts)

	Site															789227111464717172727AUUSSA		**************************************			No account of the field the state of the foundation of the sufference of the suffere		
Response #	A	В	19.002.002.002.002.002.002.0002.0002.000	C D	E	F	G	Н	1		J K	ji	И N	() P	(λ	R S	T	U	V	W	
1		5.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	3.0	6.0	2.0	5.0	7.0	2.0	7.0	
2		3.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	3.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	3.0	9.0	1.0	2.0	6.0	1.0	7.0	3
3		3.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9
4		3.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	4.0	8.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	6.0	3
5	······	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	3
6		3.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	4.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	3.0	8.0	4
7		6.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	6.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	1.0	8.0	8.0	2.0	6.0	7
8		3.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	3
9		3.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	2.0	9.0	9.0	3.0	7.0	4
10		7.0	9,0	9.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	5.0	9.0	10.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	5
	y tenggan tenggan salah di dan di dan di dan di dan di dan di dan di dan di dan di dan di dan di dan di dan dan					8. 7. 4 1 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 1 1 1 1							and a first of the feet of the first and the feet and the	erment de ermet mit ment et flomet 2 mil figur		at an indifferent individual at the little test and indi							
1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -						X_X		Ī															
									}											***************************************			
verage Criteria 28	Walland	3.9	8.3	8.4	7.4	7.6	5.2	6.7	8.8	9.3	6.8	9.8	8.0	7.8	8.9	4.8	8.3	3.9	6.3	6.8	3.4	7.2	4
	en en en en en en en en en en en en en e	/11./14.ha/11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.					HANDS OF FINE STATE			Conference of the state of the	Service Service Service Service (Service Service Servi			AND THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PA							4450mmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmmm		
Veighted Score Criteria 28		7.8	16.6	16.8	14.8	15.2	10.4	13.4	17.6	18.6	13.6	19.6	16	15.6	17.8	9.6	16.6	7.8	12.6	13.6	6.8	14.4	

CRITERIA # 29 Protected Wetlands Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: Wetlands are often regulated in the municipal policy documents and through the local conservation authority. Depending on the type of wetland, development of any kind may be prohibited and thus that area of land will not be available for hospital use. The size of the wetland area will impact the suitability of the site. It would be negative if the site was majority wetland (i.e. there would be no room to build). A positive would be if there was a small wetland which would create a natural feature and/or a visual enhancement on site.

Scale Factors: Presence of the following located on the site that impact development:

- "10": No wetlands
- "7": Some of the site is classified as wetlands, little or no impact to developable area
- "5": Some of the site is classified as wetlands; some impact to building likely
- "3": Most of the site is wetlands; considerable impact to building likely
- "0": Classified Wetlands (MNR), significant impact to building

	Site																						del for a final del formation de la constantina
esponse #	Α	В	T	C D	E	F	G	Н			J K		M	N () F	· Q		R S	T	Ų	J \	/ W	
1		8.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	8.0	6.0	5.0	10.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	(
2		8.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	5.0	10.0	2.0	6.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	9
3		8.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	ć
4		9.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9
5		7.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5
6		8.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	8
7		8.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	5.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	8
8		7.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	7
9		9.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	7
10		7.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	9.0	5.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	10.0	7
	atendrat t annärtet tistemat til systemat til sennik t sätterket til symmettemat at annän år annändet at annär		and the state of t		**************************************	weepsportenmeenengmeenenenenenenenen				\$1.1848149454444444444444444444444444444444			9-18-18-1-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-18-1			et general at at at at at at a t and t annual at and t and t annual at a at t and t annual at an at t and t annual at an at t and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a annual at a and t annual at a annual at a and t annual at a and t annual at a annual at a and t annual at a			ter te de la transferit de la transferit de la transferit de la transferit de la transferit de la transferit d	ere processor and the second			2
	Deliteratura del del 2000 e estato e el Unividida e estato del Constitución del Constitució								1														
									-														
verage Criteria 29		7.9	9.9	9.9	7.8	7.9	6.9	9.9	7.8	9.9	9.9	9.9	6.8	8.1	7.7	6.5	9.9	5.0	6.4	7.7	9.9	9.6	7
Same and the same		1600 Same of Contract of Contr			enteres anno como en estado en	Pallatendel Pendelaladendellande Salle	tinini-matrixxxiipiy-matrixatal			National Participant of and annothing and and annothing to the second and an ordinary and of the second and an ordinary and of the second and an ordinary and of the second and an ordinary and an ordinary and ordin	aladonig (Andrigg) (1964—Smill demois) (1964—1964)	an an an an an an an an an an an an an a		And a few many few field of the few few few few few few few few few fe	***************************************	**************************************	PM and do And advantage and former forth	error and the same of the same	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		e de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la co	marana a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	
/eighted Score Criteria 29	2	23.7	29.7	29.7	23.4	23.7	20.7	29.7	23.4	29.7	29.7	29.7	20.4	24.3	23.1	19.5	29.7	15	19.2	23,1	29.7	28.8	22

CRITERIA # 30 Wind Weight: 2

Assessment Definition: The user access area should be free of downward draft from adjacent buildings or structures. Avoidance of north entrances which offer little winter sunlight, and exposure to cold northern winds. The site must also consider any required setbacks from existing wind farms.

Scale Factors: Impact of local conditions:

- "10": Low Impact
- "7": Little impact
- "5": Moderate Impact
- "3": High Impact
- "0": Significant impact

		Site																	V000-200000-2000000-2000000000000000000				
Response #	2-a Bakarkan berkan kerkan kerkan berkan	Α	В	С	D	E ·	F G	ŀ	1		J K		M N		O P	C)	R S]-	r U	\	W	
1		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10
2		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10
3		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10
4		10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10
5		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.
6		10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.
7		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.
8	- 1 mil 3 mil 1 mi	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.
9		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.
10		10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	10.0
	KOMIKANI MIRAKKINI MINIMININI MINIMININI MINIMININI KAKIMIKANI MINIMININI MINIMININI MINIMININI MINIMINI	year on the second state of the second secon	V-7-40			auro-auro-auro-auro-auro-auro-auro-auro-	erunyoseyttärpinenuunya eisäytäättä ensisi Assistantiiniise	odnik Wiscons process mare militare i			«местония»	(magazini da sana da sana da sana da sana da sana da sana da sana da sana da sana da sana da sana da sana da s			ATR.	////							
	akandennakhadennakadeh dakided (matifunat jada kadad jade akadada akada anada anamad bi danam								· I	***************************************						Ī							
Windersta				1																			
Average Criteria 30		10.0	10.0	10.0	9.5	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.5	9.5	6.9	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	9.2	10.0	10.0
																, untra manufacture 2000 may 2000 may 2000 may 2000 may 2000 may 2000 may 2000 may 2000 may 2000 may 2000 may							Vennetanten da tartenten V
Weighted Score Criteria 30		20	20	20	19	20	20	20	20	19	19	13.8	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	18.4	20	20

CRITERIA # 31 Noise Weight: 2

Assessment Definition: The site should not be adjacent to any generator of noise that may impact the quality of experience for patients and staff within the hospital or on the grounds.

Scale Factors: Impact of local conditions:

- "10": Low Impact
- "7": Little impact
- "5": Moderate Impact
- "3": High Impact
- "0": Significant Impact

		Site						~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~			and the second s						and the standard and and add and and and and and and an	armeter and the second			namenda and Sand (Sand (Sand (Sand Sand (Sand Sand Sand Sand Sand Sand Sand Sand		
Response #		Α	В С) E		F G	i H		J	K	١	<i>/</i> (N	O P	Q	I	R S	Т	U	V	\W	/
1		9.0	8.0	6.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0
2		10.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	4.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
3		10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	9.0	9.0
4		10.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	10.0	7.0	6.0	4.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	3.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	6.0	7.0	10.0	6.0	6.0	4.0	7.0
S		10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0
6		9.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	6.0	4.0	10.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	7.0	7.0
7		10.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	9.0
8		10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	10.0
9	// 1 100 W. 1 1 100 W. 1 100 W	10.0	8.0	6.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	8.0	3.0	5.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	5.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	10.0
10		9.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0
CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	ayar yara kiyan iyar qara iya yara iya yarani 2000 animada iya ingili kuba ika ba ba ani iyan badaiyan di da yan yad		***************************************		11175-11011-11011-11011-11175-11175-1117	nanigatitika mustamaran masaka		tender und stade del de consent de la deconstruction de la deconstructio	ndendadkar medeledend lider inn dek	THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE		//////////////////////////////////////				Annual St. St. St. St. St. St. St. St. St. St.			ALL PARTY OF THE SECOND OF THE	Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Marie Ma	A Particular Part Part of the Assessment and AssessMan Part Part Particular Assessment	/ad//////////////	
	retriktuuttittuutiisjanhuttyttämitäittä <u>s</u> yntyämituttionuteteisä Littä Littä Littä kultisia kastioinuttioid				T .													-	T				
										İ								***************************************			ŀ		
Average Criteria 31		9.7	6.2	5.6	7.2	9.9	7.8	7.5	6.7	9.9	6.8	5.5	5.1	8.7	8.0	9.7	7.2	8.1	9.4	7.8	6.8	6.3	7.8
	mentents at extended space in the second specific med segment and new second specific specific medical specific medical specific specific medical specific s			e;										nde zek en kod zonk el zik al zek el kommunik ez z z z				***************************************	A	45555			
Weighted Score Criteria 31	ga and the second section of the section of the sectio	19.4	12.4	11.2	14,4	19.8	15.6	15	13.4	19.8	13.6	11	10.2	17.4	16	19.4	14.4	16.2	18.8	15.6	13.6	12.6	15.6

CRITERIA # 32 Air Quality Weight: 3

Assessment Definition: The Facility should not be downwind of any noxious fume generator or subject to other flows of effluent. The site should be free of designated substances.

Scale Factors: Impact of local conditions:

- "10": Low Impact
- "7": Little impact
- "5": Moderate Impact
- "3": High Impact
- "0": Significant Impact

	Site	?													40.00								
Response #	A	E	3 (C	D E		F G	ŀ	ł	J	K	М	N	O	P	I	Q F	₹ 5	Т	į	J V	٧	٧
1		7.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	8,0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	2.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	4.0	7.0	2.0	2.0	9.0	6
2		7.0	3.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	9
3		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	9
4		8.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	8.0	3.0	3.0	9.0	8
5	30000	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	7
6		9.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	6.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	4.0	9.0	9
7		8.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	10.0	8
8		10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	3.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	10
9		7.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	4.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	9
10		7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	3.0	10.0	7.
eminen minen m				99.07.64m359.64(140)57.64(145,057.0).44mmin.	y and a state of the control of the	marin marin marin de la companya de la companya de la companya de la companya de la companya de la companya de	and the state of t	all the state of t	49-149.469.499.484.464.464.469.469.469.469.469.469.469.46		······································	THE STATE OF THE S	atem and on the parties of the parti	7-7-7-7-11-7	area and a second	And and the second of the seco	Andread of the Personal Street Person Person Person Person Person Person Person Person Person Person Person Pe	agent of the state	The second of th		The second secon		
			1													1							
Average Criteria 32		8.0	5.9	6.9	6.8	8.7	8.3	8.4	8.5	8.5	8.5	4.5	5.6	8.1	8.4	8.7	8.4	6.9	8.6	4.1	3.4	9.7	8
						***************************************	<u> </u>					and all the desired from the second of the s			664	202200000000000000000000000000000000000							
Weighted Score Criteria 32		24	17.7	20.7	20.4	26.1	24.9	25.2	25.5	25.5	25.5	13.5	16.8	24.3	25.2	26.1	25.2	20.7	25,8	12.3	10.2	29.1	24