

COMMUNITY BENEFITS AGREEMENTS PRIORITY SCREENING & SCORING

Disqualify only what must be disqualified. **Score and rank everything else.**
A narrow program that changes forty lives can outrank a broad one that changes none.

1 DISQUALIFY

Three gates. Any YES ends it. Nothing else is a kill switch.

1 Is this already required by law or permit
at the level being requested?

YES ►

STOP

Not a benefit. The developer owes it regardless. **Capacity above code still passes** — stormwater sized beyond the standard is a real concession.

▼ NO not required, or the ask exceeds what is required

2 Could the outcome be measured
against a baseline, even in principle?

NO ►

STOP

Unenforceable by nature. This asks whether a metric *could* exist. How strong the reporting regime is gets scored in stage 2.

▼ YES a metric is possible

3 Can an accountable entity be identified
to receive funds, deliver, and report?

NO ►

STOP

No owner exists or can be named. **A signed MOU is not required here** — only before the ask reaches a developer.

▼ YES an owner can be named

2 SCORE

Rate each category 0 to 5. Weighted total, not pass/fail.

WEIGHTED CATEGORIES

WEIGHT

Depth of Benefit	15%	Durability Beyond Payment Period	15%
Workforce & Talent Retention	15%	Enforceability & Measurability	15%
Countywide Reach	10%	Maintenance & Operating Funding	10%
Layering Potential	10%	Community Identity & Rural Character	10%

Weighted score × 20 = score out of 100

TOTAL 100%

Weights shown are a starting proposal. The 15% on workforce reflects current nuclear context and means a library or bridge cannot structurally reach Tier 1. **The Board should adopt its own weights by resolution.**

Reach and cultural tie are scored, never gated. A reactor operator pipeline serving forty students a year reaches under one percent of the county and ties to no farming or heritage theme. Under a pass/fail chain it is eliminated twice over. Weighted, it scores 76 and ranks Tier 2, and the model names enforceability and maintenance funding as the two terms to strengthen to reach Tier 1.

3 RANK

Four outcomes. Low scores are refined, not discarded.

80-100 TIER 1

Lead ask. Present on the largest projects and negotiate hardest here.

60-79 TIER 2

Secondary or layered ask. Pair with a Tier 1 item across two agreements.

40-59 TIER 3

Refine first. Usually enforceability or maintenance funding is the weak point.

<40

DO NOT ADVANCE

Not in current form. Rebuild the ask or replace it in the inventory.

Scope. This ranks what the county should ask for. It does not evaluate what a developer offers back, because it carries no cost dimension: a \$50,000 program and a \$5 million program can score the same. Judging an offer needs a second step weighing benefit value against project scale. **Tier bands are a starting point** — recalibrate after scoring twelve to fifteen real priorities.

Why this replaced a seven-gate chain. Sequential kill gates require a priority to survive every test, so the narrowest and most valuable asks die first. Weighting keeps them in the inventory, ranks them honestly against one another, and shows a negotiator exactly which term to strengthen. It also keeps the county from publishing criteria a developer can quote back as grounds for refusal.

Disqualify what the law already requires. Score everything else.