****

**25 km**

**15 km**

**37 km**

**Scoring Guide**

* Use the following as a guideline when scoring:
  + Score on a scale from 0-4.
  + No half points.
  + One aggregate score will be calculated for each candidate site.
* The quality of previous data, if any, must be considered:
  + How recent is the data?
  + Were the correct/same parameters measured?
  + Proximity to other continuous sites?
* Passives data is not considered in the scoring of data gaps.

To determine the appropriate score, not all bullets under a score for a given criterion may apply, or be known. Use any or all the bullets that apply to determine a score. Where stations may serve multiple purposes, place the appropriate score in each criteria. Non-applicable rows merit a score of 0.

NOTE: The scores for each of the Spatial Data Gap, Temporal Data Gap and Transboundary criteria will be multiplied by 1/3 prior to inclusion in the final total. Population Exposure, Public and PRAMP identified issues will be applied at full weight.

**WOODLAND CREE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score**  **Criteria** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| Spatial data Gap | Data exists from that location | Data exists from a location <5km away | Data exists from location nearby:  5 to 10 km away | Data exists from location nearby: 10 to 20km | **No continuous data exists from a nearby location** |
| Temporal data gap | Recent data exists  < 1yrs ago | Recent data exists  < 3yrs ago | Data exists but is dated 3-5 yrs. ago | Data exists but is dated >5 yrs. ago | **No continuous data exists at location** |
| Transboundary | * Not near a PRAMP boundary ~25km * Significant local sources present * Site not representative of incoming air mass | Not representative of a boundary, i.e. **localized sources will likely confound the data** | * Within 20 km of a PRAMP boundary * Limited local sources, low impact or moderate frequency expected | * Within 10 km of a PRAMP boundary * Very representative of a boundary air mass * Possibility of occasional impact from local sources | * Within 5 km of a PRAMP boundary * No significant local sources |
| Population exposure | No one lives within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring site or identified source | One or 2 families live within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring site or identified source | 2 to 10 families live within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring site or identified source | 10-40 families line within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring site or identified source | **>50 families live within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring** site or identified source |
| Respond to issues identified by “public” (not a member of PRAMP) | * No issue identified * Capability to address the issues identified cannot be addressed with current capability/analyzer complement or realistically added. * No action can be taken regardless of monitoring findings (i.e. PRAMP has no influence on decision makers) | * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with significant cost to PRAMP or funding is unlikely from other sources for additional parameters | * Identified by some residents (i.e. one family) * Relatively new Issue with minimal impact, has only recently appeared on PRAMP radar * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with some cost to PRAMP * Some consequences to not addressing it * If source is identified, some likely hood action will be taken | * **Issue identified by group of residents** or several **complaints to** AEP, **local councils** * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with likely or promised funding from other sources | * Issue identified by an NGO, government body * Has been ongoing for some time, PRAMP has previously not been able to address it or it has escalated recently * Potentially serious, concerning/damaging * Damaging to public perception if not addressed * Issue can be directly addressed once monitoring data is available |
| Response to Issues identified by PRAMP | * No issue identified * Capability to address the issues identified cannot be addressed with current capability/analyzer complement or realistically added. * No action can be taken regardless of monitoring findings (i.e. PRAMP has no influence on decision makers) | * PRAMP is pre-emptive and thinks this may become an issue * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with significant cost to PRAMP or funding is unlikely from other sources for additional parameters | * Relatively new Issue with minimal impact, has only recently appeared on PRAMP radar * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with some cost to PRAMP * Some consequences to not addressing it * If source is identified, likely hood action will be taken | * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with likely or promised funding from other sources | * **Has been ongoing for some time,** **PRAMP has previously not been able to address** it or it has escalated recently * Potentially serious, concerning/damaging * Damaging to public perception if not addressed * Issue can be directly addressed once monitoring data is available |

**Score = [(4 + 4 + 1) ÷ 3] + 4 + 3 + 4 = 14.00**

**NAMPA (EAST RIDGE ROAD)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score**  **Criteria** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| Spatial data Gap | Data exists from that location | Data exists from a location <5km away | Data exists from location nearby:  5 to 10 km away | Data exists from location nearby: 10 to **20km** | No continuous data exists from a nearby location |
| Temporal data gap | Recent data exists  < 1yrs ago | Recent data exists  < 3yrs ago | Data exists but is dated 3-5 yrs. ago | Data exists but is dated >5 yrs. ago | **No continuous data exists at location** |
| Transboundary | * Not near a PRAMP boundary ~25km * Significant local sources present * Site not representative of incoming air mass | Not representative of a boundary, i.e. **localized sources will likely confound the data** | * Within 20 km of a PRAMP boundary * Limited local sources, low impact or moderate frequency expected | * Within 10 km of a PRAMP boundary * Very representative of a boundary air mass * Possibility of occasional impact from local sources | * Within 5 km of a PRAMP boundary * No significant local sources |
| Population exposure | No one lives within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring site or identified source | One or 2 families live within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring site or identified source | **2 to 10 families live within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring site** or identified source | 10-40 families line within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring site or identified source | >50 families live within 0.5 km of proposed monitoring site or identified source |
| Respond to issues identified by “public” (not a member of PRAMP) | * No issue identified * Capability to address the issues identified cannot be addressed with current capability/analyzer complement or realistically added. * No action can be taken regardless of monitoring findings (i.e. PRAMP has no influence on decision makers) | * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with significant cost to PRAMP or funding is unlikely from other sources for additional parameters | * Identified by some residents (i.e. one family) * Relatively new Issue with minimal impact, has only recently appeared on PRAMP radar * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with some cost to PRAMP * Some consequences to not addressing it * If source is identified, some likely hood action will be taken | * Issue identified by group of residents or several complaints to AEP, local councils * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with likely or promised funding from other sources | * **Issue identified** by an NGO, **government body** * Has been ongoing for some time, PRAMP has previously not been able to address it or it has escalated recently * Potentially serious, concerning/damaging * Damaging to public perception if not addressed * Issue can be directly addressed once monitoring data is available |
| Response to Issues identified by PRAMP | * No issue identified * Capability to address the issues identified cannot be addressed with current capability/analyzer complement or realistically added. * No action can be taken regardless of monitoring findings (i.e. PRAMP has no influence on decision makers) | * PRAMP is pre-emptive and thinks this may become an issue * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with significant cost to PRAMP or funding is unlikely from other sources for additional parameters | * Relatively new Issue with minimal impact, **has only recently appeared on PRAMP radar** * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with some cost to PRAMP * Some consequences to not addressing it * If source is identified, likely hood action will be taken | * Other parameters needed to address issue can be added with likely or promised funding from other sources | * Has been ongoing for some time, PRAMP has previously not been able to address it or it has escalated recently * Potentially serious, concerning/damaging * Damaging to public perception if not addressed * Issue can be directly addressed once monitoring data is available |

**Score = [(3 + 4 + 1) ÷ 3] + 2 + 4 + 2 = 10.67**