

Major District Initiative Funding Policy

(Adopted 19 December 2006)

1.1. Available Resources

- a) The West Coast Development Trust will make \$400,000 available per annum to each West Coast District Council for approved Major District Initiative projects.
- b) The availability of these Major District Initiative resources each year will be subject to the West Coast Development Trust receiving returns in excess of its minimum growth targets.
- c) The resources will be made available from 1st July 2005.
- d) The resources will accrue or be paid at the rate of \$100,000 on a quarterly basis for each of the District's projects.
- e) Approved funding will be paid out on an invoice basis.
- f) Interest on accrued resources will not be paid out to applicants.

1.2. Criteria

- a) All projects must meet the objects of the Trust Deed and demonstrate sustainability and self sufficiency.
- b) Capital projects only are eligible for consideration as MDI projects.
- c) The following capital projects are eligible for inclusion as MDI projects:
Public/community -
 - . Sport and recreational facilities and buildings
 - . Community halls
 - . Theatres
 - . Museums; and
 - . Art galleries
- d) All eligible community projects **will be** identified through the local planning process and prioritised as an MDI project in the local Council's LTCCP or Annual Plan.
- e) All eligible MDI identified and prioritised community projects **will not be eligible** for other Trust community funding.
- f) Development West Coast will consider funding up to a maximum of 65% of the total project costs.
- g) Development West Coast will support any one project for a maximum term of 15 years.

1.3. Application Process

- a) Prior to submitting any application, district local authorities will need to have completed a planning / research process to identify and prioritise potential Major District Initiative projects in line with the "Local Planning Process" details.
- b) There will be no specific closing dates for the consideration of Major District Initiative applications.

- c) All Major District Initiative projects will be required to go through the normal Trust application processes. The outcome from this process will determine the approval or otherwise of the project in respect to receipt of MDI funding.

1.4. General

- a) District Local Authorities will manage their approved district projects and will be responsible for compliance with all KPI's, conditions and benchmarks.
- b) MDI funding on an ongoing basis will be subject to the Local Authority meeting all agreed KPI's, benchmarks and conditions associated with any approved projects.
- c) The West Coast Development Trust reserves the right to stop funding to all or any projects should KPI's, conditions and benchmarks not be met by the Local Authority.
- d) The West Coast Development Trust reserves the right to consider applications at its discretion which, through exceptional circumstances, may not have received support through the Major District Initiative process.
- e) Only the capital costs plus associated project costs up to the completion of the construction phase of any Major District Initiative project will be taken into account in ascertaining the Trust's 65% contribution.
- f) It must be noted this is a new initiative and policy will evolve over time. The Trust will make every endeavour to keep Councils informed in a timely manner of any proposed or actual policy changes.

1.5. Local Planning Process

1.5.1. Information for applicants and Local Authorities:

Before any request is considered by the West Coast Development Trust for Major District Initiative Community facilities the District Local Authority will have to demonstrate that they have completed the following information gathering and prioritising of facility needs within their respective districts. This is in addition to the completion of the Community Funding application form.

1.5.2. Process Requirements

The applicant will need to collect the following information:

- A) From Associations, major clubs and other recreational organisations (Key information required)
 - Membership numbers (trends) back 5 years
 - Issues around membership, financial and facility
 - Facilities used and limitations
 - Special facility features / needs for activity
 - Future plans and limitations
 - Partnership opportunities, compatibility with other activities.
- B) From facility owners/ management
Local inventory- classification information
 - Indoor facilities pools stadia etc:
 - Description;
 - Costs to users;
 - Age/cost of facility;
 - Ownership;
 - Management;
 - Access system;
 - Level of services and amenities available;

- . Technical features;
 - . Level of use;
 - . Type of use and standard (i.e. local, regional, national, etc.
- Outdoor facility courts grounds etc:
 - . Description;
 - . Ownership;
 - . Age / cost of facility;
 - . Technical features, eg seating, surface, lighting;
 - . Level of use; and
 - . Competition standard.
- C) Consultation around needs and issues with:
- Community and community organisations
 - Local authorities
 - Sport West Coast
 - Sport Buller
 - Educational institutes
 - Any other key stakeholders.
- D) This process must also include a review of any prior work/research carried out in respect to the provision of and need for recreational facilities.

Each area/district will need to establish a Project Control Group (PCG), representative of the key community stakeholders in respect to Major District Initiative projects plus the Local Authority. The Representatives will manage the process and make decisions in respect to the weightings and criteria to be used to prioritise proposals in their area.

Once the information identified in clauses A – D above is gathered for each area, the PCG will prioritise their facility needs. It must be understood that the area priorities may not be the same priorities as those for the Local Authority).

Minimum criteria for the assessment of local proposals has been established by the Trust. (Appendix A)

Project Control Groups may wish to add additional criteria for their area.

The Trust has also adopted an assessment tool (Appendix B) for prioritising the various proposals from within each local authority area. Project Control Groups will need to establish weightings for the criteria for their area to be included in the assessment tool.

1. Economic Benefits

a) Will the facility contribute to the local and/or regional economy?

- Is the operation of the proposed facility sustainable?
- What if any is the level of subsidy required?
- How many FTE's will be employed?
- Is there further potential for additional employment?
- Does the proposed facility have the ability to host events and attract visitors to the area?
- What are the probable opportunities in terms of events and what is the likely visitor impact?
- What is the proposed retail spend for the facility?
- Have detailed operational budgets been prepared for a minimum 5year period.

2. Community Need/Support

a) Is there a significant level of unmet need in the area?

- This could be evident through requests to Council's for additional facilities, and through your own knowledge of supply and demand for unmet need.

b) Has there been a long-standing need with some ongoing momentum for the facility?

- Has there been public debate through the media? For how long?
- Has there been any formal requests to Council's? For how long?
- Has there been any increase in pressure to resolve the issue?
- Has the issue had any previous attention from Council's (ie. strength of lobbying)?
- Is it a regional body or club driven issue? If a club one, is it endorsed by the regional body?
- Has the Local Authority identified the provision of or support for the facility in their LTCCP?

3. Participation

a) What are the estimated participation levels in the activity or activities to be undertaken at the proposed facility?

- Is there any information showing an increase in participation for key users?
- Does this proposed facility have the potential to service the West Coast Region as well as the local area?

b) Does the proposal address the participation levels of key identified groups?

- How well does the proposal match up to any Council's or other organisations target groups? (i.e. people with disabilities, older people, ethnic groups, parents with small children etc).

c) Does the proposal have the potential to enhance active participation?

- As well as how much enhancement, this question should be considered in relation to both the general population and for target groups. In other words, the quality and/or quantity of the potential to enhance.

4. Contextual Assessment

a) Does the proposal take into account trends in recreation?

Some trends directly affecting recreation provision and delivery are:

- Changing family and employment patterns
- A focus on individualism and self-interest
- Consumerism and expectations of high levels of service

- More sedentary lifestyles
- An ageing population
- More awareness of minimising risk and injury

b) Does the proposal take into account the area / regions demographic and growth trends?

Wider societal trends that need to be taken into account include:

- More diverse employment patterns
- The more diverse nature of families and households
- An ageing population
- Increasing income inequality
- A more ethnically diverse and increasing population
- Future urban growth

c) Does the organisation / owner have the infra-structural capability to sustain and manage the facility?

- Does the organisation have a professional structure?
- What is the organisational knowledge like? Points to consider could include coaching and development programmes, quality and stability of leadership.
- Is there any planning evident, such as a published strategic plan and Business Plan?
- How well developed in the competitive structure? Does it cater to all levels of ability?
- Is there a record of flexibility and innovation?

d) Operational Capabilities

- Does the proposed facility have the operational flexibility to meet a range of existing needs?
- Does the proposed facility have the operational potential to meet a range of future needs?

5. Social Benefits

a) Will the proposed facility enhance community and individual well-being?

- Are there any other people or groups that could benefit apart from direct users?
- Is there any informal use potential?
- Is there a public good potential, eg. How available and accessible is the proposal for public use?

6. Negative Impacts

a) Does the project have negative impacts?

- Is there possible displacement from existing facilities, ie. that they become redundant?
- If there is displacement of users, are there alternative users for the redundant facility?
- How much previous investment is at stake in any potentially redundant facilities?
- Are there any likely negative impacts on existing commercial operations / facilities?

1.5.4. Appendix B Regional Recreation Facility Review: How the Assessment Tool Will Work

Each criterion listed in the assessment tool (twelve criteria) is measured to give the weighting and reliability ratings for the information supplied by or related to the proposal or facility issue, as well as an overall criterion score.

The **weightings** given to each of the criteria (by Project Control Groups) are on a scale of 0 to 5.

The **reliability** rating is given to reflect the accuracy of the information supplied or known about the facility proposal. This is measured on a scale of 1 to 4.

The **score** is a rating of how well the proposal fulfils or meets each criterion in addition to, and possibly independent of, how well it may do on the weighting and

reliability ratings. The score mark for each criterion is measured on a scale of 0 to 5.

To determine how well the criteria “stack up” when measured against these three factors, scoring scales are provided in the table below. To assist thinking on the criteria, refer also to the Facility Assessment Tool Criteria. It is of course quite possible that these three factors may rate quite differently to each other for particular criteria.

Not all points will be applicable to every facility issue, but most of the criteria should be able to be addressed.

Weighting:	What relative priority does each factor have in relation to the areas LTCCP and other relevant strategic documents.	
	Not relevant	0
	Exceptionally low importance	1
	Below average importance	2
	Moderate or average	3
	Above average importance	4
	Exceptionally high importance	5
Reliability:	Is the data provided reliable? Can it be verified or supported by other sources?	
	Information that is mainly objective fact and has been (or at the very least can easily be) verified by sources independent to the applicant or supplied by independent sources	4
	Information that is mainly subjective and has been (or at the very least can easily be) verified by sources independent to the applicant	3
	Information that is mainly objective fact and is not easily verifiable by sources independent to the applicant	2
	Information that is mainly subjective opinion and is not easily verifiable by sources independent to the applicant	1
Score:	How well does the proposal rate on these criterion?	
	Not relevant	0
	Exceptionally poor or low	1
	Below average	2
	Moderate or average	3
	Above average	4
	Exceptionally good or high	5

The weight, reliability and score are **multiplied across** each row, and that sum is added in the ‘total’ column to a final score. Proposals will be ranked according to their scores. The intention is to group issues into high, medium and low bands.

Facility Proposal Assessment Tool		Weight	Reliability	Score	Total
1. Economic Benefit					
a)	Will the facility contribute to the local and/or regional economy?				
2. Community Need/ Support					
a)	Is there a significant level of unmet need in the city?				
b)	Has there been a long-standing need with some ongoing momentum for the facility?				
3. Participation					
a)	What are the estimated participation levels in the activity or activities to be undertaken at the proposed facility?				
b)	Does the proposal address the participation levels of key identified groups?				
c)	Does the proposal have the potential to enhance active participation?				
4. Contextual Assessment					
a)	Does the proposal take into account trends in recreation?				
b)	Does the proposal take into account the city's demographic and growth trends?				
c)	Does the organisation have the infra-structural capability to sustain and manage the facility?				
d)	Does the proposal have flexible operational capabilities?				
5. Social Benefits					
a)	Will the proposed facility enhance community and individual well-being?				
SUB TOTAL					
6. Negative Impacts (subtraction from sub total)					
a)	Does the project have negative impacts?				
TOTAL SCORE					