

Evaluation of Proposal shall be based on the following criteria:

- (a) Total offering price including contribution toward site servicing, and potential tax revenue generated by the proposed development (20%);

Purchase price - is formula based, highest offer receives 15 points and next bid receives proportionately less points. 15 point

Tax revenue – largest proposed facility receives 5 points and next bid receives proportionately less. 5 points

- (b) Evidence of significant funding from the Province of Manitoba and/or Federal Government (10%);

signed commitment from Province and Federal Gov't (10 points)

signed commitment from Province or Federal Gov't (8 points)

signed support from Province or Federal Gov't (5 points)

no evidence (0 points)

- (c) Full description of the proposed development, including servicing requirements for water, sewer, transportation and electricity (20%).

Description of the building size, construction timeline and value of construction (5 points)

Water

- Detailed description of water needs (5 points)
- Partial description of water needs (0.5 to 4.5 points)
- No description of water needs (0 points)

Sewer

- Detailed description of sewer needs (5 points)
- Partial description of sewer needs (0.5 to 4.5 points)
- No description of sewer needs (0 points)

Electricity

- Detailed description of electricity needs (5 points)
- Partial description of electricity needs (0.5 to 4.5 points)
- No description of electricity needs (0 points)

- (d) Estimated number of jobs created per acre and number of jobs created per year until full build out (25%);

Jobs/acre – 15 job/employees per acre (20 points), 10 jobs per acre (15 points), 5 jobs per acre (10 points), 2.5 jobs per acre (5 points), less than 2.5 jobs/per acre (0 points).

Jobs/year – All jobs/acre in 3 three years (5 points), all jobs/acre in five years (3 points), all job/acre in more than five years (1 point)

- (e) Experience and/or history of successful projects and endeavors carried out by the Proponent (10%);

Proponent has provided evidence of their experience and history to complete comparable projects / endeavors. The reviewer believes that based on this information the Proponent can complete their proposal. (10 points)

Proponent has provided some evidence of their experience and history to complete comparable projects / endeavors. The reviewer does not believe that based on this information the Proponent can complete their proposal. (5 points)

Proponent has not provided evidence of their experience and history to complete comparable projects / endeavors. The reviewer does not believe that the Proponent can complete their proposal. (0 points)

- (f) Proposed development being in alignment with the Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0, Section B1 Goals 4.9 & 4.10, Section E1 Goals 4.5 & 4.6 and the Winnipeg Climate Action Plan (15%);

CCDS B1

- The proposal is in alignment with updated City infrastructure priorities;
- Technical limitations prevent higher priority sites from proceeding;
- The proponent of a higher priority site is not able to advance local area planning
- Requirements for City funded growth-enabling and growth-supportive infrastructure and its costs relative to those of alternative greenfield sites, as well as the City's ability to finance this infrastructure;
- The site's readiness for development, including the scope of the site's remaining enabling work;
- The sequencing of linear infrastructure extensions;
- How the proposal will promote a reasonably equitable distribution of vacant serviced greenfield land between different City quadrants;
- The extent to which the site promotes Complete Communities principles, including but not limited to its proximity to employment, its ability to leverage existing capacities of nearby schools, and its ability to promote sustainable modes of transportation, relative to other alternative greenfield sites.

(receives one point for each criteria addressed up to 5 points)

CCDS E1

- The proposed use would not adversely affect the overall viability or desirability of the larger employment area and/or other surrounding existing and future land uses;
- The proposed use will not result in land use conflicts; and
- There is existing or planned infrastructure to accommodate the proposed use(s).
- There is a demonstrated need for the proposed use(s) and there are no other sites that could accommodate the proposed use;
- The lands are not required over the time horizon of this By-law for their designated purpose or the subject lands are deemed unsuitable for employment uses within and beyond this By-law's time horizon;
- The immediate and cumulative impact on the city-wide supply of vacant serviced Employment Lands. Supply considerations shall include site size, marketability, and implications on the City's capital budget; and
- City capital investments necessary to enable the proposed development.

(receives one point for each criteria addressed up to 5 points)

WCAP

- Corporate Leadership
- Empower Community Leaders and Collaborate with Stakeholders
- Advance Sustainable Transportation
- Facilitate Compact, Complete Development and Increase Density
- Low Carbon and Energy Efficient Buildings
- Waste Reduction and Diversion
- Community Climate Resiliency

(receives one point for each criteria addressed up to 5 points)