

III. **Project Evaluation and Siting Criteria.**

The WRAP Committee has developed Capital Improvements Decision Criteria and a Site Selection Matrix by which to objectively measure the readiness of projects and suitability of sites for specific projects. Two Worksheets present categories and questions by which to measure proposed projects. They are:

Worksheet 1 – (Exhibit III-A) which lists four major criteria and the factors that are associated with each criterion;

Worksheet 2 – (Exhibit III-B) which presents questions that assist in weighing the criteria and factors and in understanding the cost implications of a project;

One Worksheet focuses on evaluating the proposed project at a specific location; this is:

Worksheet 3 – (Exhibit III-C) lists the criteria and factors to evaluate the suitability of each site.

Project Evaluation - Prioritization

The four criteria of Worksheet 1 that are measured when considering a specific project include:

- Public Health and Safety
- Compliance with Mandates or Other Legal Requirements
- Stated Community Goals and Policies
- Public Perception of Need

These criteria are listed in order of importance in determining need for projects. Each criteria may be scored from 0 to 5. The criteria are listed in order of importance and are weighed accordingly. The total aggregate score will have a maximum value of 50.

The first two criteria measure ways in which a project is responsive to public health and/or safety or compliance with legal requirements. These two criteria carry more weight than the criteria relating to community goals, policies, needs, and wishes. It is incumbent for the project proponents to convey to the community whether a project is addressing a need versus a want. This increases in importance during periods where there may be projects competing for limited resources.

Public Health and Safety is considered the highest priority when determining the need for a proposed project. If this is a rationale for the proposed project the evaluation should address how the project would correct imminent and or continuing safety hazards, public health deficiencies, or other safety needs (of concern but not rising to an imminent hazard condition). Examples of such conditions include unsafe or unsanitary occupied spaces; older occupied spaces not meeting current building codes for fire sprinklers, etc.

Compliance with Mandates or Other Legal Requirements is often a driver for large projects. Such projects may be proposed in order to bring an existing facility into compliance with local, state or federal laws/regulations. Other projects may be related to a court order, judgement or inter-municipal agreement. Examples of this include the recent mechanical and safety upgrades to the town owned water well chemical feed buildings, or design and construction of the Wayland-Sudbury Septage Facility.

Stated Community Goals and Policies as found in documents such as the town Master Plan, or the long range capital plans maintained by the Department of Public Works and Facilities Department drive many proposed projects. These projects typically arise due to a desire for:

- Conformance to adopted program, policy or plan;
- Asset preservation (fiscal impact of new investment including a life-cycle plan with cost of operation & maintenance);
- Maintenance of an acceptable standard of service;
- Providing of a more efficient or improved standard of service

An example of such projects are the various municipal and school building replacement projects for windows, flooring and roofs.

Public Perception of Need may drive proposed projects based on a strong emotional argument from a specific group of proponents. These projects may arise to address a sustained change in demographics (school age children or the elderly); to improve sustainability of the environment; or to improve desirability of community.

There is substantial gray area between the last two criteria which will certainly led to differences in opinion on how proposed projects are categorized and evaluated. Upcoming projects such as the proposed Library, Community Center, and Council on Aging will rely heavily on their proponents to explain to the community, and ultimately to Town Meeting voters, why their projects are “needs” and the projects’ importance to Wayland.

Project Evaluation - Characterization

The set of questions on Worksheet 2 helps to illuminate the need for and the impact of a project as well as potential synergies with other projects. These questions and factors help to measure each project and how it fits into long range planning. The evaluation worksheet asks the proposer to address the following:

Describe any relationships, synergies, complementary uses, or impacts to other projects. Does the project address multiple needs / multiple stakeholders? This takes into account any synergies with other projects, such as whether services and space needs can be combined. It is critical to understand whether a proposed project address a single proponents need, or if it may be envisioned to address multiple needs. In the simplest of terms, space costs money – money that must be borrowed for design and construction, money to light, heat and cool the space,

money for administrative and custodial services, and money for ongoing maintenance and replacement costs. Meeting rooms, activity rooms, performance spaces, and similar spaces are candidates for shared use among different stakeholders. Sharing of such amenities will provide the town with effective use of its facilities while making the most efficient use of town funds.

Whether or not there are alternatives to a specific project is an important point. One alternative to the voters is a “no” vote on a specific project; having an alternative that may be explored during the process may lead to higher probability of a successful outcome.

The fiscal impact is realized by knowing what the capital costs will be, the year in which project funding is requested, and the availability of potential grants is critical in determining when to schedule certain projects.

Additional information desired include whether there is an annual operating and maintenance increased cost associated with the project such as a need for additional staffing, utilities or other costs. Finally, the projected fiscal impact of the capital expenditure per household helps residents understand the direct fiscal impact of the proposed project to their tax bill.

Site Selection Criteria

Site selection worksheets have been developed for a number of capital projects in recent years; including the siting worksheets for the Salt Shed (2004), Highway / Parks & Recreation Study (2006), and for the New DPW Facility (2011). Typically once sites with fatal flaws are eliminated (too small; within a wetland; etc.) the worksheets are used to rank the remaining potential sites based on numerical values assigned to relevant criteria. The site with the highest aggregate score would be considered to have the highest potential for development.

The WRAP committee selected what it believed to be the most useful criteria from prior efforts, developed new criteria, and assembled 10 broad categories for evaluation. The highest aggregate score possible is 100. The ten site selection criteria on Worksheet 3 by which to measure a development project include:

Location – with two subcategories: accessibility to roadways; and adjacency to what could be considered sensitive neighbors (schools, daycare, elderly uses, healthcare facilities). It should be noted that this adjacency could be considered a positive or a negative depending on the proposal project.

Physical Site Features – with six subcategories: the condition of an access roadways, the size of the site for the specific project, the shape of the parcel, the soil suitability, depth to groundwater, and potential for future expansion.

Site History – with three subcategories: past and existing uses that may be favorable or unfavorable to redevelopment, and the potential for impacts from the presence of hazardous materials.

Zoning Consistency– is the use allowed, disallowed, or a special permit required.

Environmental Impacts – with five subcategories: whether or not there is a designated Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program (NHESP) area, an Area of Critical Environmental Concerns (ACEC), a Zone II area, or Wetlands area, and whether or not there are any historical or archaeological sensitivities on or near the site.

Access to Utilities – with five subcategories: availability of sewer or septic, electricity, telecommunications, water, and natural gas service.

Permitting/Other Regulatory – whether or not there are specialty permits required.

Traffic Impacts – the estimate of the impact of the potential increased traffic.

Cost of Site Development – with three subcategories: whether cut and fill, clearing, and installation of site utilities will require minimal, normal or excessive costs.

Cost of Construction – whether or not there are restrictions relative to the site that will impact the cost of construction.

Discussion

It is anticipated that the mechanics of scoring criteria and factors will assist a recommended future Capital Facilities Committee in objectively analyzing need for projects, and suitability of sites for specific projects.

The Forums and Charette that were held by the WRAP Committee during September 2015 and January 2017 were instrumental in collecting input that assisted the WRAP Committee in refining the worksheets. Suggestions and comments were also provided by the Permanent Municipal Building Committee with regard to the Site Selection Worksheet.

WRAP Committee members realized many similarities in the development plans and programming of the Library Trustees, the Council on Aging, the Council on Aging/Community Center Advisory Committee and the Recreation Commission. The COA and Recreation Commission have joined forces in considering development of a community center that will accommodate programs for both organizations. In addition the COA/CC anticipates that it will also provide space for the Historical Commission to store and exhibit the many artifacts in its stewardship, space for the Veterans Affairs (office and meeting) and possibly for Boy and Girl Scouts. The COA/CC is considering the so called Municipal Pad at the new town center development. We have included in Exhibit III-D our evaluation of these proposed projects during the development of the worksheets to illustrate their use.

The Library Trustees used a complementary version of the matrix (Exhibit III-E) similar to that developed by WRAP by which each site was scored using the same criteria. Their evaluation and scoring process led them to rank the former DPW site at 195 / 207 Main Street above the other sites at 5 Concord Rd (existing library) and at 202 Old Connecticut Path (municipal parcel at Greenways).

| | Factors | Applicable to Project? | Factor weighting |
|--|--|------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Public Health & Safety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project addresses an immediate, continual safety hazard or public health and/or safety need | | 4 x ____ = ____ |
| 2. Compliance with Mandates or Other Legal Requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project required for compliance with local, state, or federal laws/regulations b. Project required by court order, judgment, [or inter-municipal agreement] | | 3 x ____ = ____ |
| 3. Stated Community Goals & Policies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project conforms to adopted program, policy, or plan b. Asset preservation c. Required to maintain acceptable standard of service d. More efficient/improved standard of service | | 2 x ____ = ____ |
| 4. Public Perception of Need | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sustained change in demographics b. Improve sustainability of the environment c. Does it make the community desirable? | | 1 x ____ = ____ |
| | | Total = | |

Instructions to Preparer – Decision Criteria Worksheet 1

Decision Criteria Worksheet 1 lists four categories in order of importance. For each category there are factors to consider that may contribute to understanding how each of the four is affected by the proposed project.

| | Factors | Instructions |
|--|---|---|
| 1. Public Health & Safety | <p>a. Project addresses an immediate, continual safety hazard or public health and/or safety need</p> | <p>a. <i>A specific reason(s) must be cited along with identification of the cognizant Town Official (Facilities Director, Building Inspector, DPW Director, Health Director, Police Chief, Fire Chief) confirming the need.</i></p> |
| 2. Compliance with Mandates or Other Legal Requirements | <p>a. Project required for compliance with local, state, or federal laws/regulations</p> <p>b. Project required by court order, judgment, [or inter-municipal agreement]</p> | <p><i>For Factors “a.” and “b.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identify the statute, law or regulation requiring compliance.</i> • <i>Identify the document (order, specific regulation, etc.) requiring performance and attach a copy hereto.</i> |
| 3. Stated Community Goals & Policies | <p>a. Project conforms to adopted program, policy, or plan</p> <p>b. Asset preservation</p> <p>c. Required to maintain acceptable standard of service</p> <p>d. More efficient/improved standard of service</p> | <p>a. <i>Identify the program, policy or plan and attach specific section or citation</i></p> <p>b. <i>Describe the asset and state the reasoning that it is appropriate to maintain and preserve the asset</i></p> <p>c. <i>Explain the “acceptable standard of service” and how the project will maintain the “acceptable standard”</i></p> <p>d. <i>Describe the current baseline standard of service, and quantify how the project will increase efficiencies, or improve on the baseline standard.</i></p> |
| 4. Public Perception of Need | <p>a. Sustained change in demographics</p> <p>b. Improve sustainability of the environment</p> <p>c. Does it make the community desirable?</p> | <p>a. <i>Describe the demographic(s) the project is to address. Provide a description of the trend that has been identified as a need. Identify the source data and analysis methodology.</i></p> <p>b. <i>Describe the sustainability characteristic addressed by the project. Quantify the projected improvement. Cite source data and analysis methodology.</i></p> <p>c. <i>Identify how and/or why it makes the community more desirable. Identify the segment of the community desirous of the project.</i></p> |

| | Information about the project's characteristics |
|--|---|
| Describe any relationships, synergies, complementary uses, or impacts to other projects. | |
| Does the project address multiple needs / multiple stakeholders ? | |
| Are there alternatives to the project? | |
| Year requested to be on-line | |
| Projected capital cost of project | |
| Availability of grants / other funding | |
| Annual fiscal O&M impact (increase / decrease including staffing) | |
| Projected tax impact of capital expenditure (on a per \$1,000 valuation basis) | |

Instructions to Preparer– Decision Criteria Worksheet 2

Decision Criteria Worksheet 2 is the place to provide information about the project's characteristics – needs vs wants – and costs. The responses are in narrative form and tend to be subjective in interpretation.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Describe any relationships, synergies, complementary uses, or impacts to other projects.</p> | <p><i>Does the proposed project have a relationship to another planned or existing use or project? Would you characterize the relationship as weak, medium, or strong?</i></p> <p><i>Are any synergies anticipated between this project and other planned or existing projects? Are they able to be quantified?</i></p> <p><i>Please describe any multiple needs or stakeholders that may be addressed and/or benefited by your proposed project.</i></p> |
| <p>Does the project address multiple needs / multiple stakeholders?</p> | <p><i>Please list any alternatives including no-action. What would the impact be of selecting the no-action option?</i></p> |
| <p>Are there alternatives to the project?</p> | <p><i>Please identify the Fiscal Year in which you anticipate the project being complete for the proposed use. (Note: our Fiscal Year runs from July 1 to June 30)</i></p> |
| <p>Year requested to be on-line</p> | <p><i>Please provide an estimate of the capital cost to complete the project. How was this cost developed?</i></p> |
| <p>Projected capital cost of project</p> | <p><i>Please describe the estimated amount and source of grants or funds. Is the availability dependent on any specific actions to be taken by the Town (land taking, easement, vote of Town Meeting, etc.)?</i></p> |
| <p>Availability of grants / other funding</p> | <p><i>What are the estimated annual Operation & Maintenance Costs? Describe the methodology used to calculate the O&M costs. Describe the source of funds (Town taxation, revolving fund, user fees, etc.). If this is a replacement project, please describe how O&M will differ from existing conditions.</i></p> |
| <p>Annual fiscal O&M impact (increase / decrease including staffing)</p> | <p><i>Please consult and discuss your estimate and assumptions with the Town's Finance Director.</i></p> |
| <p>Projected tax impact of capital expenditure (on a per \$1,000 valuation basis)</p> | |

Exhibit III-C

Site Selection Matrix

Project: _____

Worksheet 3

| Criteria | Factors | Weighing Factors | Score |
|---|--|------------------|-------|
| 1. Location (Max 8 Points) | Easily accessible to service area via major roadway | 5 | |
| | Reasonably accessible to service area via secondary roadway | 3 | |
| | Poor accessibility via local roadway | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | Favorable to adjacent schools, daycare, elderly uses, healthcare | 3 | |
| | Unfavorable to adjacent schools, daycare, elderly uses, healthcare | 0 | |
| 2. Physical Site Features (Max 18 points) | Condition of access roadway favorable | 3 | |
| | Condition of access roadway poor | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | Size of site adequate | 3 | |
| | Size of site limiting | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | Shape of site adequate | 3 | |
| | Shape of site limiting | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | Soils suitable | 3 | |
| | Soils limiting | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | Groundwater deep | 3 | |
| | Groundwater shallow | 0 | |
| | | | |
| Potential for Future Expansion favorable | 3 | | |
| Potential for Future Expansion unfavorable | 0 | | |
| 3.Site History (Max 10 points) | Past use favorable | 3 | |
| | Past use unfavorable | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | Existing use favorable | 3 | |
| | Existing use unfavorable | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | No hazardous materials issues | 4 | |
| Unresolved hazardous materials issues | 0 | | |
| 4. Zoning Consistency (Max 5 points) | Approved use or special permit in place | 5 | |
| | Special permit required | 3 | |
| | Use not allowed | 0 | |
| 5. Environmental Impacts (Max 20 points) | No NHESP area | 3 | |
| | NHESP area on or adjacent to site - | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | No ACEC area | 3 | |
| | ACEC on or adjacent to site | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | No Zone II area | 4 | |
| | Zone II on or adjacent to site | 0 | |
| | | | |
| | No wetland area | 5 | |
| | Wetland area on or adjacent to site | 0 | |
| | | | |
| No Historic/Archaeological Sensitivity | 5 | | |
| Suspected Historic/Archaeological Sensitivity | 3 | | |
| Confirmed Historic/Archaeological Sensitivity | 0 | | |

| Criteria | Factors | Weighing Factors | Score | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|-------|--|
| 6. Access to Utilities (Max 15 points) | Sewer or septic available | 3 | | |
| | No sewer or septic available | 0 | | |
| | Electric available | 3 | | |
| | No electric available | 0 | | |
| | Telecom / data cable available | 3 | | |
| | No telecom / data cable available | 0 | | |
| | Water available | 3 | | |
| | No water available | 0 | | |
| | Gas service available | 3 | | |
| | No gas service available | 0 | | |
| | 7. Permitting (Max 5 points) | No specialty permits required | 5 | |
| | | Minimal specialty permitting required | 3 | |
| Excessive specialty permitting required | | 0 | | |
| 8. Traffic Impacts (Max 5 points) | No negative impacts | 5 | | |
| | Minimal impacts | 3 | | |
| | Excessive impacts | 0 | | |
| 9. Cost of Site Development (Max 9 points) | Minimal cut and fill | 3 | | |
| | Excessive cut and fill | 0 | | |
| | Minimal clearing | 3 | | |
| | Excessive clearing | 0 | | |
| | Minimal Utilities Costs | 3 | | |
| | Excessive Utilities Costs | 0 | | |
| 10. Cost of Construction (Max 5 points) | No restrictions impacting cost | 5 | | |
| | Some restrictions impacting cost | 3 | | |
| | Significant restrictions impacting cost | 0 | | |

TOTAL SCORE (maximum is 100):

Scoring Notes:

Site Selection Matrix – Scoring Instructions

It is strongly recommended that the evaluator(s), individual or committee, seek input from appropriate Town Departments and other subject matter experts during the evaluation process and assignment of values for various categories.

It is further recommended that the evaluator(s) keep notes on how each element was scored – this contemporaneous record will provide clarifications when questions arise on the scoring process.

1. Location Max 8 Points

Location may be assigned a set value as shown on the sheet. The two matrix descriptors provide a range of examples to illustrate how point assignments may be made – e.g. from a 5 for easy access to a major roadway (defined as Rt 20, 27, 30, or 126), to a 0 for poor access to local roads. The user is allowed to make a judgement-based value assignment and should seek input from the DPW, Police, Fire, and Planning Departments.

2. Physical Site Features Max 18 points

Physical Site Features may be assigned a value of 0 or 3 points for each of the six descriptors. Five of the six matrix descriptors need to be evaluated against specific project requirements and may require input from planning and engineering professionals based on the characteristics of the proposed facility. The ability to allow for future expansion is also to be considered. The user is allowed to make a judgement-based value assignment for condition of access roadway item. Size of site and shape of site are to be evaluated using Planning and Building Dept requirements. Soils suitability and depth to groundwater are to be evaluated as a function of both proposed construction type (foundation vs slab) and need for septic disposal and / or possible potable water well development.

3. Site History Max 10 points

Site History may be assigned a set value as shown on the sheet. Two of the three matrix descriptors need to be evaluated against specific project requirements and may require input from planning and engineering professionals based on the characteristics of the proposed facility. The user is allowed to make a judgement-based value assignment for these items; however, Hazardous Materials issue determinations should be coordinated with the Health Department or other cognizant Town Department.

4. Zoning Consistency Max 5 points

Zoning Consistency may be assigned a value of 0, 3 or 5 points based on the three conditions indicated.

5. Environmental Impacts Max 20 points

Environmental Impacts descriptors may be assigned a set value as shown on the sheet. Four of the five matrix descriptors are essentially yes / no responses and should have input from the Conservation Administrator. The user is allowed to make a judgement-based value assignment for evaluation of Historic / Archaeological Sensitivity; this should be done with fact-based input from the Historical Commission.

Site Selection Matrix – Scoring Instructions

6. Access to Utilities

Max 15 points

Access to Utilities descriptors may be assigned a set value of 0 or 3 points. The five matrix descriptors need to be evaluated against specific project requirements of the proposed facility and may require fact-based input from the Building Department. The user is allowed to make a judgement-based value assignment for distance to the point of connection (such as frontage vs site interior), available capacity (such as pressure, volume, kVA availability, etc.), and other considerations. The cost of utilities should not be included in this category, but below under “9. Cost of Site Development”.

7. Permitting

Max 5 points

Permitting may be assigned a value of 0, 3 or 5 points. The three matrix descriptors provide a range of examples to illustrate how the point assignments may be made – from a 5 if no specialty permit(s) are required, to a 0 if excessive permitting is required. The user is allowed to make a judgement-based value assignment and should seek fact-based input from the cognizant local, state, or federal agency.

8. Traffic Impacts

Max 5 points

Traffic Impacts may be assigned a value of 0, 3 or 5 points. The three matrix descriptors provide a range of examples to illustrate how the point assignments may be made – from a 5 if no negative impacts, to a 0 if there are excessive impacts. The user is allowed to make a judgement-based value assignment and should seek fact-based input from the DPW, Police, Fire, and Planning Departments.

9. Cost of Site Development

Max 9 points

Cost of Site Development descriptors may be assigned 0 or 3 points for each of the three descriptors. The three matrix descriptors provide a range of examples to illustrate how point assignments may be made – from minimal activity to excessive activity. In all cases, proportionality should be considered based on the overall size and estimated cost of the project. Utility-related costs should include installation, connection fees, etc. The user is allowed to make a judgement-based value assignment and should seek fact-based input from the DPW, Permanent Municipal Building Committee, Facilities Director, and/or Building Department.

10. Cost of Construction

Max 5 points

Cost of Construction may be assigned a value of 0, 3 or 5 points. The three matrix descriptors provide a range of examples to illustrate how the point assignments may be made – from a 5 for no special construction costs, to a 0 for significant special construction costs. Such special costs could include waterproofing, special foundation work, unusual architectural costs or other. The user is allowed to make a judgement-based value assignment and should seek fact-based input from the DPW, Permanent Municipal Building Committee, Facilities Director, and/or Building Department.

Attachment
3/31/16 minutes

Worksheet 1

Capital Improvements – Decision Criteria Matrix Project: COA/CC

| | Factors | Applicable to Project? | Factor weighting |
|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Public Health & Safety | a. Project addresses an immediate, continual safety hazard or public health and/or safety need | | 4 x <u> </u> = <u>0</u> |
| 2. Compliance with Mandates or Other Legal Requirements | a. Project required for compliance with local, state, or federal laws/regulations b. Project required by court order, judgment, [or inter-municipal agreement] | | 3 x <u> </u> = <u>0</u> |
| 3. Stated Community Goals & Policies | a. Project conforms to adopted program, policy, or plan b. Asset preservation c. Required to maintain acceptable standard of service d. More efficient/improved standard of service | yes no yes (COA) yes | 2 x <u>3</u> = <u>6</u> |
| 4. Public Perception of Need | a. Sustained change in demographics b. Improve sustainability of the environment c. Does it make the community desirable? | yes no yes | 1 x <u>2</u> = <u>2</u> |
| | | Total = | 8 |

Project: COA/CC

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Describe any relationships and / or impacts to other projects.</p> | <p>overlaps in programming of wb. / events w/ schools / Rec / COA</p> |
| <p>Does the project address multiple needs / multiple stakeholders ?</p> | <p>yes - need coordination</p> |
| <p>Are there alternatives to the project?</p> | <p>combine w/ other programming.</p> |
| <p>Year requested to be on-line</p> | <p>2017 / online 2018</p> |
| <p>Projected capital cost of project</p> | <p>0.7 million</p> |
| <p>Availability of grants / other non-local tax dollar funds</p> | <p>None</p> |
| <p>Annual fiscal O&M impact (increase / decrease including staffing)</p> | <p>1-3 FTEs.</p> |
| <p>Projected fiscal impact per household of capital expenditure (per \$1,000 valuation)</p> | <p></p> |

Attachment
3/3/16 Minutes

Capital Improvements – Decision Criteria Matrix **Project: Library Expansion**

Worksheet 1

| | Factors | Applicable to Project? | Factor weighting |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1. Public Health & Safety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project addresses an immediate, continual safety hazard or public health and/or safety need | Traffic configuration - Access to entry Flooding Pkg. | $4 \times \underline{1}$ $= \underline{4}$ |
| 2. Compliance with Mandates or Other Legal Requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project required for compliance with local, state, or federal laws/regulations b. Project required by court order, judgment, [or inter-municipal agreement] | | $3 \times \underline{0}$ $= \underline{0}$ |
| 3. Stated Community Goals & Policies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project conforms to adopted program, policy, or plan b. Asset preservation c. Required to maintain acceptable standard of service d. More efficient/improved standard of service | yes yes or no yes. yes. | $2 \times \underline{3}$ $= \underline{6}$ |
| 4. Public Perception of Need | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sustained change in demographics b. Improve sustainability of the environment c. Does it make the community desirable? | yes yes | $1 \times \underline{2}$ $= \underline{2}$ |
| | | Total = | 12 |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Describe any relationships and / or impacts to other projects.</p> | <p>Overlaps in programming COA / Rec / schools / community center. culture</p> |
| <p>Does the project address multiple needs / multiple stakeholders ?</p> | <p>yes; however not efficiently – not coordinated. requires administrative</p> |
| <p>Are there alternatives to the project?</p> | <p>no action provide programming elsewhere</p> |
| <p>Year requested to be on-line</p> | <p>2019 → Fund 2018 Online 2020</p> |
| <p>Projected capital cost of project</p> | <p>16 million</p> |
| <p>Availability of grants / other non-local tax dollar funds</p> | <p>yes \$6.3M.11m</p> |
| <p>Annual fiscal O&M impact (increase / decrease including staffing)</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Projected fiscal impact per household of capital expenditure (per \$1,000 valuation)</p> | <p></p> |

| Criteria | Factors | Weighing Factors | Score | |
|---|---|---|-------|---|
| 1. Location (Max 10 Points) | Easily accessible to service area via major roadway | 10 | 10 | |
| | Reasonably accessible to service area via secondary roadway | 5 | | |
| | Poor accessibility via local roadway | 0 | | |
| 2. Physical Site Features (Max 15 points) | Condition of access roadway favorable | 3 | | |
| | Condition of access roadway poor | 0 | 0 | |
| | Size of site adequate | 3 | | |
| | Size of site limiting | 0 | 0 | |
| | Shape of site adequate | 3 | | |
| | Shape of site limiting | 0 | 0 | |
| | Soils suitable | 3 | | |
| | Soils limiting | 0 | 0 | |
| | Groundwater deep | 3 | | |
| | Groundwater shallow | 0 | 0 | |
| | 3. Site History (Max 15 points) | Past use favorable | 2 | 2 |
| | | Past use unfavorable | 0 | |
| Existing use favorable | | 3 | 3 | |
| Existing use unfavorable | | 0 | | |
| No hazardous materials issues | | 5 | | |
| Further study of hazardous materials needed | | 3 | 3 | |
| Further action needed | | 0 | | |
| No legal conditions / use restrictions | | 5 | | |
| Unresolved legal conditions /use restrictions | | 0 | 0 | |
| 4. Zoning Consistency (Max 5 points) | | Approved use or special permit in place | 5 | 5 |
| | Special permit required | 3 | | |
| | Use not permitted | 0 | | |
| 5. Environmental Impacts (Max 25 points) | No increased impact to sensitive receptors | 4/3 | 3 | |
| | Sensitive receptors present | 0 | | |
| | No NHESP area | 4/3 | 3 | |
| | NHESP area on or adjacent to site - | 0 | | |
| | No ACEC area | 4/3 | 3 | |
| | ACEC on or adjacent to site | 0 | | |
| | No Zone II area | 4 | 4 | |
| | Zone II on or adjacent to site | 0 | | |
| | No wetland area | 4 | | |
| | Wetland area on or adjacent to site | 0 | 0 | |
| | No Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity | 5/4 | 4 | |
| | Suspected Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity | 3/2 | | |
| | Confirmed Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity | 0 | | |

Flood Plan - NO
" " - yes

4
0 0

| Criteria | Factors | Weighing Factors | Score |
|---|---|------------------|-------|
| 6. Access to Utilities (Max 10 points) | Sewer or septic available | 2 | 2 |
| | No sewer or septic available | 0 | |
| | Electric available | 2 | 2 |
| | No electric available | 0 | |
| | Telecom available | 2 | 2 |
| | No telecom available | 0 | |
| | Water available | 2 | 2 |
| | No water available | 0 | |
| | Gas service available | 2 | 2 |
| | No gas service available | 0 | |
| 7. Permitting / Other Regulatory (Max 5 points) | No specialty permits required | 5 | 5 |
| | Minimal specialty permitting required | 3 | |
| | Excessive specialty permitting required | 0 | |
| 8. Traffic Impacts (Max 5 points) | No negative impacts | 5 | |
| | Minimal impacts | 3 | 3 |
| | Excessive impacts | 0 | |
| 9. Cost of Site Development (Max 10 points) | Minimal cut and fill / earthwork | 5 | |
| | Normal cut and fill " | 3 | 3 |
| | Excessive cut and fill " | 0 | |
| | Minimal clearing | 5 | 5 |
| | Normal clearing | 3 | |
| | Excessive clearing | 0 | |
| 10. Cost of Construction (Max 10 points) | No restrictions impacting cost | 10 | |
| | Some restrictions impacting cost | 5 | 5 |
| | Significant restrictions impacting cost | 0 | |

TOTAL SCORE: 72

Site Selection Matrix

Project: Library / 193-195 Main

Worksheet 3

| Criteria | Factors | Weighing Factors | Score |
|---|---|--------------------|-------|
| 1. Location (Max 10 Points) | Easily accessible to service area via major roadway | 10 | 10 |
| | Reasonably accessible to service area via secondary roadway | 5 | |
| | Poor accessibility via local roadway | 0 | |
| 2. Physical Site Features (Max 15 points) | Condition of access roadway favorable | 3 | 3 |
| | Condition of access roadway poor | 0 | |
| | Size of site adequate | 3 | 3 |
| | Size of site limiting | 0 | |
| | Shape of site adequate | 3 | 3 |
| | Shape of site limiting | 0 | |
| | Soils suitable | 3 | |
| | Soils limiting | 0 | 0 |
| | Groundwater deep | 3 | |
| | Groundwater shallow | 0 | 0 |
| | 3. Site History (Max 15 points) | Past use favorable | 2 |
| Past use unfavorable | | 0 | |
| Existing use favorable | | 3 | 3 |
| Existing use unfavorable | | 0 | |
| No hazardous materials issues | | 5 | 3 |
| Unresolved hazardous materials issues | | 0 | |
| No legal conditions / use restrictions | | 5 | 5 |
| Unresolved legal conditions /use restrictions | | 0 | |
| 4. Zoning Consistency (Max 5 points) | Approved use or special permit in place | 5 | 5 |
| | Special permit required | 3 | |
| | Use not permitted | 0 | |
| 5. Environmental Impacts (Max 25 points) | No increased impact to sensitive receptors | 4 | 4 |
| | Sensitive receptors present | 0 | |
| | No NHESP area | 4 | 4 |
| | NHESP area on or adjacent to site - | 0 | |
| | No ACEC area | 4 | 4 |
| | ACEC on or adjacent to site | 0 | |
| | No Zone II area | 4 | |
| | Zone II on or adjacent to site | 0 | 0 |
| | No wetland area | 4 | 4 |
| | Wetland area on or adjacent to site | 0 | |
| | No Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity | 5 | |
| | Suspected Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity | 3 | 3 |
| | Confirmed Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity | 0 | |

Site Selection Matrix

Project: Library / 193-195 Main St.

Worksheet 3

| Criteria | Factors | Weighing Factors | Score |
|---|---|------------------|-------|
| 6. Access to Utilities (Max 10 points) | Sewer or septic available | 2 | 2 |
| | No sewer or septic available | 0 | |
| | Electric available | 2 | 2 |
| | No electric available | 0 | |
| | Telecom available | 2 | 2 |
| | No telecom available | 0 | |
| | Water available | 2 | 2 |
| | No water available | 0 | |
| | Gas service available | 2 | 2 |
| | No gas service available | 0 | |
| 7. Permitting / Other Regulatory (Max 5 points) | No specialty permits required | 5 | 5 |
| | Minimal specialty permitting required | 3 | |
| | Excessive specialty permitting required | 0 | |
| 8. Traffic Impacts (Max 5 points) | No negative impacts | 5 | |
| | Minimal impacts | 3 | 3 |
| | Excessive impacts | 0 | |
| 9. Cost of Site Development (Max 10 points) | Minimal cut and fill | 5 | 5 |
| | Normal cut and fill | 3 | |
| | Excessive cut and fill | 0 | |
| | Minimal clearing | 5 | 5 |
| | Normal clearing | 3 | |
| | Excessive clearing | 0 | |
| 10. Cost of Construction (Max 10 points) | No restrictions impacting cost | 10 | |
| | Some restrictions impacting cost | 5 | 5 |
| | Significant restrictions impacting cost | 0 | |

TOTAL SCORE: 89

Site Selection Matrix

Project: Library 202 Old Connecticut Path

Worksheet 3

| Criteria | Factors | Weighing Factors | Score |
|---|---|--------------------|-------|
| 1. Location (Max 10 Points) | Easily accessible to service area via major roadway | 10 | 10 |
| | Reasonably accessible to service area via secondary roadway | 5 | |
| | Poor accessibility via local roadway | 0 | |
| 2. Physical Site Features (Max 15 points) | Condition of access roadway favorable | 3 | 3 |
| | Condition of access roadway poor | 0 | |
| | Size of site adequate | 3 | 3 |
| | Size of site limiting | 0 | |
| | Shape of site adequate | 3 | 3 |
| | Shape of site limiting | 0 | |
| | Soils suitable | 3 | 3 |
| | Soils limiting | 0 | |
| | Groundwater deep | 3 | 3 |
| | Groundwater shallow | 0 | |
| | 3. Site History (Max 15 points) | Past use favorable | 2 |
| Past use unfavorable | | 0 | |
| Existing use favorable | | 3 | 3 |
| Existing use unfavorable | | 0 | |
| No hazardous materials issues <i>Need category</i> | | 5 | 3 |
| Unresolved hazardous materials issues | | 0 | |
| No legal conditions / use restrictions | | 5 | 5 |
| Unresolved legal conditions /use restrictions | | 0 | |
| 4. Zoning Consistency (Max 5 points) | Approved use or special permit in place | 5 | 5 |
| | Special permit required | 3 | |
| | Use not permitted | 0 | |
| 5. Environmental Impacts (Max 25 points) | No increased impact to sensitive receptors | 4 | 4 |
| | Sensitive receptors present | 0 | |
| | No NHESP area | 4 | 0 |
| | NHESP area on or adjacent to site - | 0 | |
| | No ACEC area | 4 | 4 |
| | ACEC on or adjacent to site | 0 | |
| | No Zone II area | 4 | 4 |
| | Zone II on or adjacent to site | 0 | |
| | No wetland area | 4 | 0 |
| | Wetland area on or adjacent to site | 0 | |
| | No Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity | 5 | 3 |
| | Suspected Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity | 3 | |
| | Confirmed Historical/Archaeological Sensitivity | 0 | |

2-12-16

Site Selection Matrix

Project: Library | 202 OH Commercial Park

Worksheet 3

| Criteria | Factors | Weighing Factors | Score |
|---|---|------------------|-------|
| 6. Access to Utilities (Max 10 points) | Sewer or septic available | 2 | |
| | No sewer or septic available | 0 | 0 |
| | Electric available | 2 | 2 |
| | No electric available | 0 | |
| | Telecom available | 2 | 2 |
| | No telecom available | 0 | |
| | Water available | 2 | 2 |
| | No water available | 0 | |
| | Gas service available | 2 | 2 |
| | No gas service available | 0 | |
| 7. Permitting / Other Regulatory (Max 5 points) | No specialty permits required | 5 | 5 |
| | Minimal specialty permitting required | 3 | |
| | Excessive specialty permitting required | 0 | |
| 8. Traffic Impacts (Max 5 points) | No negative impacts | 5 | |
| | Minimal impacts | 3 | 3 |
| | Excessive impacts | 0 | |
| 9. Cost of Site Development (Max 10 points) | Minimal cut and fill | 5 | |
| | Normal cut and fill | 3 | |
| | Excessive cut and fill | 0 | 0 |
| | Minimal clearing | 5 | |
| | Normal clearing | 3 | 3 |
| 10. Cost of Construction (Max 10 points) | Excessive clearing | 0 | |
| | No restrictions impacting cost | 10 | |
| | Some restrictions impacting cost | 5 | 5 |
| | Significant restrictions impacting cost | 0 | |

TOTAL SCORE: 82

| Site Selection Matrix | | (Assign numerical rank 0-Max under each criterion.) | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|-------|-------------------|--|
| | | | | 5 Concord Rd. | | 207-195 Main St. | | 202 Old Con. Path | |
| Criteria | Factors | Weighing Factors | Score | | Score | | Score | | |
| 1. Location & Traffic (Max 12 Points/Site) | Centrally accessible | 6 | 5.1 | 7.43 | 2.76 | 6 | 2.52 | 6.04 | |
| | Not Central | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | No negative traffic impacts | 6 | 2.33 | | 3.24 | | 3.52 | | |
| | Substantial impacts | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Creates a prominent visual impact from the street | 4 | 1.76 | | 3.24 | | 2.9 | | |
| Forces reduction in prominent impact from main streets | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Site characteristics (Max 20 points/Site) | Existing driveway access adequate | 3 | 0.52 | 4.41 | 2.52 | 17.07 | 0.5 | 16.8 | |
| | Existing driveway access inadequate | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Size & shape of site adequate | 5 | 0.95 | | 4.7 | | 4.95 | | |
| | Size & shape of site limiting | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Soils appear suitable for building/bearing; require verification | 3 | 2.19 | | 2 | | 2.5 | | |
| | Soils limiting for building/bearing | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Adequate Parking is easy to accommodate | 4 | 0.5 | | 3.7 | | 3.95 | | |
| | Adequate Parking is NOT easy to accommodate | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Allows for future expansion | 5 | 0.25 | | 4.15 | | 4.9 | | |
| | Does not allow for future expansion | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 3. Community Sentiment / Considerations (Max 18 points/Site) | Does have Architecturally Significant context | 6 | 5.53 | 12.83 | 3 | 13.31 | 3 | 12 | |
| | Does not have Architecturally Significant context | 3 | | | | | | | |
| | Meets space needs per Library Building Program | 6 | 2.63 | | 5.6 | | 5.95 | | |
| | Does not meet space needs per Library Building Program | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Supports Synergy with other Community Uses/Activities | 6 | 4.67 | | 4.71 | | 3.05 | | |
| Doesn't Support Synergy with other Community Uses/Activities | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Existing Utilities / Infrastructure (Max 10 points/Site) | Sewer or septic service | 2 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 2 | |
| | No sewer or septic service | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Electric service | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | 0 | | |
| | No electric service | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Telecom/fiber service | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | 0 | | |
| | No telecom/fiber service | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Water service | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | 0 | | |
| | No water service | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Gas service | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | 0 | | |
| | No gas service | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 5. Environmental Impacts (Max 16 points/Site) | No Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program (NHESP) area on or adjacent to site | 2 | 2 | 4.67 | 2 | 10.6 | 2 | 10 | |
| | Has NHESP area on or adjacent to site | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | No Zone II area on or adjacent to site | 4 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| | Has Zone II area on or adjacent to site | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | No wetland area on or adjacent to site | 3 | 0 | | 3 | | 3 | | |
| | Has wetland area on or adjacent to site | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | No known risk of flooding | 4 | 0 | | 3 | | 4 | | |
| | Has known risk of flooding | 0 | | | | | | | |
| No Archaeological Survey required | 3 | 2.67 | 2.6 | 1 | | | | | |
| Suspect Archaeological Survey required | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Permitting / Other Regulatory (Max 15 points/Site) | No variance required | 4 | 0.4 | 4.68 | 3.41 | 10.52 | 3.24 | 13.34 | |
| | Minimal variance required | 2 | | | | | | | |
| | Significant variance required | 0 | 2 | | 1 | | 3.88 | | |
| | No hazardous materials issues | 4 | | | | | | | |
| | Further study of hazardous materials needed | 2 | 0.78 | | 3.38 | | 3.41 | | |
| | Further action needed | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Special permit is not required | 4 | 1.5 | | 2.73 | | 2.81 | | |
| | Special permit required | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | No legal conditions / use restrictions | 3 | 0.47 | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| | Unresolved legal conditions / use restrictions | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 7. Cost of Site Development & Construction (Max 16 points/Site) | Building Cost are likely lower | 4 | 0.47 | 3.47 | 2 | 10.76 | 2 | 7.24 | |
| | Building Cost are likely higher | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Zone II area compliance easy | 2 | 0 | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| | Zone II area compliance difficult | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | Site Cost are likely lower | 4 | 1 | | 2.19 | | 0.61 | | |
| | Site Cost are likely higher | 0 | | | | | | | |
| | NO Temporary facilities cost | 2 | 0 | | 2 | | 2 | | |
| | Requires Temporary facility cost | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Ineligible site cost are likely lower | 4 | 2 | 2.57 | 0.63 | | | | | |
| Ineligible site cost are likely higher | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL SCORE: | | | 47.49 | 78.26 | 67.42 | | | | |