

**Report to the
Mayor and
Common Council
of
The City of Middletown
From the
Police Building Committee**

Paul Rebot, Chairman
Claudia DeFrance, Vice Chairman
Tony Fazzino
Hal Kaplan
Armand LaPointe
Larry McHugh
George Souto
Ernie Stevens
Louis Tosto

Staff:
Jeter Cook & Jepson
Leach Mounce Associates
George Aylward
Bill Kuehn

March 3, 1995

Middletown Police Headquarters
Site Selection Study

Site Comparison Analysis

Progress Information

March 3, 1995

Jeter, Cook & Jepson Architects, Inc.

Leach Mounce Architects

I. PROJECT TEAM

David Jepson and Peter Stevens, Principals with Jeter, Cook & Jepson Architects, Inc., and Howard Leach, senior principal of Leach Mounce Architects visited each of the sites, met with Owner's representatives and conferred with Amadon & Associates, real estate appraisers; Fuss & O'Neill, traffic engineering; and EnviroScience Consultants, environmental analyst to prepare the following analysis and recommendations. Numerous meetings have been held with the Building Committee and its designated subcommittee in developing this analysis.

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Introduction

This section describes the criteria used to evaluate potential project sites and provides the basis for a site specific ranking described in Section III.

Criteria

a. Zoning

It is desirable that current zoning of the property allow office use, holding, and storage including a moderate amount of hazardous materials such as ammunition, volatile liquids and biological evidence. Site coverage, height and setback requirements should allow a three level main building and the potential for two level stacked parking. There should be no access problems in conflict with ADA. There should be no structures with "Historic Buildings" designation. The zones most favorable for the higher density development required are B1 and Transitional Development.

b. Site Geometry

The size, shape, topography and physical attributes of the site should be able to accommodate the total gross floor area of the building on not more than three levels. Staff and visitor parking would preferably be accommodated as surface parking. There should be no easements, covenants, conditions or restrictions of record that would limit development of the site as required for the programmed needs. It is more difficult to achieve ideal plan forms and optimum adjacencies with irregular and triangular shaped parcels.

c. Distance to Service Areas

Easy access to main arterials and the highway system and/or proximity to the courts prevents unnecessary movement of arrestees through adjacent neighborhoods and residential areas. Proximity to the highway system also reduces employee traffic in the adjacent neighborhoods. Convenient accessibility to support facilities such as public works, vehicle maintenance, city administration, pretrial detention, the courts and restaurants is also desirable. The facility should also be reasonably near the center of the service area in terms of service response time.

II. *EVALUATION CRITERIA, continued*

d. **Access & Parking**

Site access should be from two streets with adequate separation between points of ingress and egress to allow access in case one street or entry gets blocked and to provide safe on-site circulation. The site should allow separation of visitor and service traffic from official vehicle, prisoner transport and staff parking. The latter three should be in secure yard with two ways in and out and not overlooked by taller buildings in close proximity. The site should accommodate all official vehicles, staff at change of shift, special SWAT or command vehicles, discrete prisoner transport, visitor parking and service vehicles. Official vehicles and motors should be accommodated with covered parking. Helicopter access is not an issue in this analysis because all sites are reasonably close to Middlesex Memorial Hospital where the helicopter landing pad is presently maintained.

e. **Building Accommodation**

The building size projected would be ideally accommodated in not more than two levels with surface parking. It is likely that due to the relatively small size of all the sites that a three level structure will be more realistic. Public access and image are important in making visitors feel welcome and in creating a positive civic architectural statement in Middletown's urban fabric.

Sites that slope down from the principal public exposure are usually easier to work with in this regard because visitors can enter at a mid or upper level to public and administration oriented spaces while patrol functions and prisoner transportation can occur at grade behind the building at a lower level. Conversely, sites that slope up from the primary public exposure require either placing the public entry behind the building at the upper level and screening the patrol and prisoner transport spaces from public view or planning for the public to enter the front at the lower level and placing the patrol and holding facilities behind the building at the upper level. Six of the seven sites have enough grade change to provide grade access at two levels. Two sites, D and E, are of the more difficult configuration sloping up from the most prominent public exposure. One site, C slopes down and site F has the slope parallel along the public exposure. Site A is L-shaped with the lower side on Main Street. Site B is relatively level. Site G slopes up from Broad Street.

Another aspect of this criteria is the feasibility of remodeling, expanding or demolishing existing buildings on the site. It has been the Building Committee's position that a new construction approach to the proposed Police Headquarters is preferred to the renovation of an existing building.

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA, continued

f. Future Expansion

The prudent approach, if funds are available, is to plan and build a facility that will accommodate 10-20 years of growth and the community's future population. Middletown's Plan of Development states a desired ultimate population of 65,000 versus its approximate current population of 45,000. Expansion at a future date can be much more expensive due to the remodeling and alterations required throughout when the building is occupied. The disruption of operations caused by remodeling is also very difficult to contend with. If it is necessary to build the structure in phases, it should be designed to expand outward in at least two directions. Future additions should not be made by adding another level as this would be more disruptive to ongoing operations and might require temporary relocation of the Department's functions during construction.

This site criteria for future expansion evaluates the sites' capacity to accommodate or phase building and parking to service a population of 65,000.

g. Utilities

Each site must be evaluated for adequacy, accessibility and vulnerability of all public utility services, including sewer, water, gas, electrical, telephone, radio communications and storm drainage systems. If financially feasible, it would be prudent to have redundant connections to two different service lines so that service can be easily switched over if one line is disabled.

h. Environmental

The available environmental history for each site will be examined for known problems such as buried tanks, or structures requiring expensive demolition, asbestos, PCB and other hazardous wastes. The highest ranked one or two sites, should have further tests to determine subsurface conditions related to hazardous waste and a geotechnical investigation to determine structural suitability and seismic safeguards. A Phase 1 Environmental Assessment for the two highest ranked sites is part of this study.

i. Traffic Impact

Each site will be evaluated for its ability to avoid traffic jams or gridlock from the surrounding neighborhood and for its ability to not cause traffic jams during peak loads such as change of shift during the afternoon rush hour. Being on a regularly scheduled bus line with an adjacent stop would mitigate the traffic impact. Also convenient access to the highway system as described would minimize the traffic impact. Off-site road improvements will be identified and included in the cost comparisons and preliminary project budgets.

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA, continued

j. Facility Hardening Capability

This criteria is related to a site's characteristics that either help to protect the facility or make it more vulnerable to natural disaster or man-made threats. These include but are not limited to flood, fire, explosion, hazardous materials, earthquakes, civil disturbance, drive-by shootings, sniper vantage points, sabotage, bombing or vehicle invasion. Some sites are more exposed to these threats than others due to topography, street exposure, high crime area, nearby hazardous materials, utility vulnerability, radio interference, water courses that flood and adverse soils or landslide conditions. Each of the adjacent properties, including those across the street should also be evaluated for these potential threats, either natural or man-made.

k. Crisis Conditions

A police headquarters must be capable of much more than a defensive posture against various threats. During disasters and times of crises, it is the essential facility that protects the people, systems and equipment required to cope with the crisis and assist the community. When everything else has succumbed to a disaster, the police facility must remain operational and handle new demands imposed by additional personnel, equipment, communication needs and the demands imposed by the crisis itself.

The site must be easily accessible but out of harms way or defensible. Other departments, agencies and community leaders with their vehicles and equipment may converge at the site to assist in handling a crisis. The site and surrounding streets should be able to handle this increased demand.

l. Neighborhood Impact

This criteria is sensitive to avoiding conflicting uses adjacent or nearby such as schools, churches, or single family residences. The release of prisoners or attraction of informants and witnesses into a residential neighborhood would not be desirable. An adjacent bus stop would be very desirable in helping prisoners and suspects who are released to get back to their home or work without having to walk or travel through the neighborhood.

This criteria involves social considerations, aesthetic judgment, economic impact, environmental issues and community attitude. The questions must be asked: Do the sites have a better use as commercial or residential for the community in its particular location? Will the use by the Police Department deprive the community of a more appropriate use or result in an unacceptable loss of property tax revenue?

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA, continued

m. Cost Analysis

Quite often cost considerations override all other site selection criteria. In making a decision based on cost, it is important that the total project costs be considered. These include estimated costs for site acquisition off-site development, on-site development, demolition, building, and other project related costs. These costs will be presented in detail in the Final Report.

Only when all costs for each site are considered can an objective comparison be made based on cost. The comparative cost analysis can then be weighted against the other site evaluation criteria to determine whether it is justified to pay more for a site that better satisfies the selection criteria and provides the City with the overall best value.

n. Tax Revenue Impact

It is important to evaluate the tax revenue impact of each site. Several sites under consideration have existing business and/or residential buildings, thus generating tax revenue. Each site will be graded and ranked by the amount of tax revenue removed from the tax rolls when the property is converted to public use.

o. Business/Relocation

In order for several of the sites to be developed for the proposed facility, existing structures and their occupants will be removed and/or relocated. This criteria relates to the adverse effects on business and cost of their relocation, and the time cost and difficulties of residential relocation. Rankings for this criteria are based upon the types of business and/or residences located on each site and are evaluated relative to each other.

III. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION

Methodology

The method used for evaluating each of the seven initial sites involved information gathering and research of each of the evaluation criteria and their specific elements as illustrated on the Site Evaluation form. Based upon this information, each site was ranked for each criteria from 1 to 7, with "7" being the best. Values were also assigned to the "weight" of each evaluation criteria according to their perceived level of importance. These weighted values ranged from a low of 5 to a high of 10 (see Site Evaluation form). Certain criteria such as "access and parking", "building accommodations" and "utilities" were judged to be of more importance than others because they are absolutely essential while the others have some flexibility in coping with their negative aspects. Two criteria were left unscored, Utilities and Environmental. Each of these have a weighted value of 10. Utilities were not included in the calculation because all sites had the necessary utility requirements, thus would not impact the final ranking. Environmental was not scored because of the lack of information submitted by some of the owners. This criteria will be scored after additional information is received and Phase I Environmental Assessments are conducted on the final two sites.

Scoring and ranking of the sites were done on a weighted and unweighted basis. The weighted score is calculated by taking the relative rank of the site (1 to 7) for each criteria, multiplying that rank by each criteria's weighted value (5 to 10) and adding the total weighted values for all criteria for each site. This method takes into consideration the relative importance of each criteria. The unweighted score simply adds the unweighted rankings (1 to 7) for each criteria for each site and is not sensitive to the relative importance given to each criteria.

The initial evaluation of the seven sites were completed without including the Tax Revenue Impact and Business/Economic Dislocation. For the four sites shortlisted (Sites C, E, F, and G), these criteria were added to the evaluation and ranking and included in the shortlist process for the final two sites, Sites C and G.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

Site Analysis

This section explores the problems, challenges, opportunities, advantages and disadvantages of each site, leading to the ranking for each of the evaluation criteria and recommendations to the Police Headquarters Site Selection Committee for more in-depth analysis of the top two ranked sites. The City presented the Consultant with seven sites, all located in or near the downtown area of Middletown. Even the largest sites will not accommodate the projected building and parking needs with a one or two story building and all surface parking. This would require a site of approximately 120,000 s.f. and would probably be the most economical development and optimum functional arrangement for a facility of the size projected. All sites also have existing buildings, some designated historical, many with tenants requiring relocation. The positive trade-offs for working with developed sites that are smaller than ideal are that the street and utility infrastructure are in place, the location is near the center of population and the new facility will be a positive influence on public safety in the downtown area, as well as a catalyst for further public and private development to assist in reversing any urban decay in the downtown area. The advantages and disadvantages are discussed in reference to the evaluation criteria. Criteria not mentioned are considered neutral.

Site A: Salvation Army St. Aloysius Fisk Properties

This site is located in the heart of the old downtown retail district. It is an L-shaped parcel of 65,000 sq. ft., fronting the west side of Main Street and the north side of Washington Street. There is a moderate slope of approximately 8 ft. from Main Street up to the west property line.

The property is zoned B1 allowing 100% lot coverage, zero setbacks and 12-story height limit. Existing buildings, include the Fisk House, facing Washington Street, a two-story wood frame structure designated "historically significant" and currently used for offices. Facing Main Street is a three story brick structure designated "historically noteworthy" with offices on the lower floor and vacant above. Also facing Main Street is the one story Salvation Army structure with no historical designation.

Commercial retail buildings are located immediately adjacent and across the street to the south and across Main Street to the east. A City Fire Station is adjacent on the north and single family residences are adjacent on the west. A cemetery borders the rear portion of the northern boundary.

Advantages:

Zoning The property is zoned B1 favorable to the high density development required in order to accommodate the building and parking needs.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

- Distance to Service Areas Site A is closest to the center of the service area.
- Crisis Conditions Site A is well located for handling crisis conditions due to its proximity to the adjacent City Fire Station to the north. This relationship could facilitate joint operations during a disaster.

Disadvantages:

- Site Geometry Although the site has enough slope to take advantage of two level access. The L-shaped geometry is difficult to work with.
- Access & Parking The site has exposure on two streets; however, Washington Street becomes gridlocked during rush hour, blocking access which would force staff and official vehicles to enter and leave the site on Main Street at mid-block. Parking can be accommodated in a two-level structure, however, the shape of the site would make it difficult to appropriately locate the parking in relationship to the building and to the streets. Security of the parking lot could be compromised due to windows from an adjacent building on the property line overlooking the site.
- Traffic Impact Blockage of the site by rush hour traffic is only one side of the traffic problem. Cars leaving and entering the site at change of shift during the afternoon rush hour will contribute to the congestion and make a bad situation worse.
- Neighborhood Impact When evaluated by this criteria, there are a number of concerns: The police headquarters would be a use inconsistent with the Main Street retail. It would break the continuity of what could be a very attractive sequence of retail shops in buildings with architecture of the classic American Main Street.
- Cost This site could be more expensive than average due to the problems of grading and construction with adjacent buildings on the property line.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

- Tax Revenue Impact The City would lose the property tax revenue from a highly assessed property if it were removed from the tax rolls.

- Business/Relocation Relocating or working around the Fisk House, a structure considered too important historically to demolish would be required.

Site B: North Side of Court Street

This site is located in the downtown area of the north side of Court Street and west side of Columbus Plaza. Across the street to the south is the Court Building and Parking Arcade and immediately adjacent to the north is the Middletown Transit's main bus station.

This site consists of three parcels totaling 33,200 sq. ft. and an additional option of two more totaling 10,200 sq. ft. for a total of 43,400 sq. ft. The L-shaped property is zoned B1 and is relatively flat. The existing buildings contain a restaurant, offices, social hall and retail and are partially vacant.

Advantages:

- Zoning The property is zoned B1 favorable to high density development and police use.

- Distance to Service Areas This site is close to the center of the service area and to arterials, the highway system and the courts.

- Traffic Impact The site is located favorably so that it has access on two streets and will not adversely affect traffic to any significant extent nor will it be subject to blockage by rush hour traffic. It is also located conveniently next to the main bus station.

- Neighborhood Impact The site is located in the downtown City and government area of compatible land uses.

Disadvantages:

- Site Geometry The small size and L-shape make it difficult to accommodate all the facility requirements economically.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

Building Accommodation .	Due to the size of the site, the main building would have to be four stories and a parking structure would be required even for the first phase 40,000 sq. ft. main building.
Future expansion	Very difficult in the tight site.
Cost	Due to the tightness, adjacent buildings and high rise construction required, this site will require higher than normal development costs.
Tax Revenue Impact	This site has the highest assessed valuation of all seven sites.
Business/Relocation	Several existing commercial business would have to be relocated.

Site C: Former North & Judd Foundry

The site is oriented to Highland Avenue in the west, Pameacha on the South and has a small frontage on Warwick Street on the north. There is a change in grade of approximately 18 feet total with about 10 feet of it occurring within the building pad. The 82,000 sq. ft. site is irregular in shape; however the largest portion is simple in shape and large enough to accommodate the building and some parking.

The property is zoned Mix Use allowing 30% site coverage, 3 stories or 36 ft. height limit and setbacks of 25 ft. and 10 ft. Residential use is across the street to the North and West and commercial/industrial to the south and east.

Advantages:

Site Geometry	The shape provides ideal zoning of building, secure parking and visitor parking. The slope allows at-grade access for patrol and prisoner transport at the lower level and visitor access at the second level.
Site Access & Parking . . .	Access from two streets, good separation of visitor and secure parking and ample size for adequate parking.
Building Accommodation .	Patrol functions can be concealed at a lower level off the principal street. Ample visitor parking separated from the official parking and building nicely located at the corner without structured parking can be accommodated.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

- Crisis Conditions The site can accommodate additional vehicular and equipment without disrupting the neighborhood or traffic floor. Pameacha Avenue could be closed under crisis conditions for additional equipment and added security without major adverse impact.
- Cost This site is estimated to require the lowest total development cost including acquisition.
- Tax Revenue Impact With the lowest appraised value, this site will leave the least impact on removal from the tax roles.
- Business/Relocation There is no active business on the site nor any historically significant structure. The owner has offered to sell the site clean with the old vacant foundry building removed.

Disadvantages:

- Zoning The mixed use zoning could present a problem with height setbacks and lot coverage requiring a zone change to Transitional Development.
- Facility Hardening
Capability There are conflicting statements in the available documents about the proximity's exposure to the 100 year flood level. This must be resolved prior to final evaluation. If there is no exposure, this disadvantage is removed; however, if there is exposure it may also increase development cost to mitigate the problem to the extent that this site may not be feasible from a cost perspective.

Site D: 326, 330, 346 South Main Street and 33 Birdsey Avenue

This site contains four parcels totaling 56,000 sq. ft. Commercial office buildings are on each of the three lots facing South Main Street at the west boundary of the site, and a single family residence is on the lot bordering Birdsey on the east. Commercial uses are across South Main Street and adjacent to the property on the north and south. The second access to the site is from Birdsey Avenue, a narrow residential street to the east.

Advantages: There are no apparent advantages to this site.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

Disadvantages:

Zoning	Mixed Use, R-1, B1 zoning would have to be changed to Transitional Development to accommodate the building and parking.
Site Geometry	The relatively small size combined with the stubby L-shape makes it difficult to fit the facility and parking. Some structured parking will be required to accommodate even the current needs of 136 spaces. The property slopes up from the street making the building stacking more difficult in achieving logical separation of patrol and jail functions from the office functions.
Site Access & Parking . . .	Access through Birdsey Avenue, a narrow residential street could be easily blocked. Site will not accommodate all surface parking.
Traffic Impact	Congestion on Birdsey Avenue.
Neighborhood Impact . . .	Residential area to the east would be relatively impacted by added traffic.
Cost	Relatively high due to third highest appraised value and costs to build structured parking and widen Birdsey Avenue.
Tax Revenue Impact	Third highest in assessed valuation.
Business/Relocation	Commercial and residential tenants would have to be relocated.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

Site E: Formation Area

This site is bordered by Main Street on the west, East Main Street on the east and Cooley Avenue on the south. It is the largest site with approximately 118,000 sq. ft. and has a slope of approximately 10 ft. up from the northwest corner on Main Street. The site contains two duplex family residences, one designated historically significant, a gas service station, the Formation building designated historically significant and a large commercial building. Commercial property is across Main Street to the west and residential property to the north, east, and south. The Route 17 connector is approximately 200 ft. north.

Advantages:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Zoning | Transitional Development zoning accommodates building and parking. |
| Site Geometry | Relatively large size and moderate slope accommodate the project well. |
| Distance to Service Areas | Proximity to Route 17 interchange provides easy access to the highway system. |
| Site Access & Parking | Three street exposure provides multiple access and good separation of visitor parking from secure parking. |
| Traffic Impact | No potential blockage of access due to multiple street exposure. Public transportation is available from the MAT route on both Main and East Main Streets. |
| Crisis Condition | Cooley Avenue could be closed off to accommodate additional vehicles and equipment for crisis conditions. |

Disadvantages:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Neighborhood Impact | Two historically significant structures and residential development on three sides are potential problems. |
| Cost | The site has the second highest acquisition cost and high demolition and relocation costs. |
| Tax Revenue Impact | The site has the highest loss of tax revenue upon conversion to public use. |

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

Business/Relocation The site requires significant relocation of both business and residential occupants involving families and commercial operations.

Site F: Main Street Extension and East Main Street

The site containing 63,000 sq. ft. shaped with a rounded apex on the north side of the intersection of Main Street Extension and East Main Street. Existing buildings on the site are seven occupied residential dwellings, the owner's auto body and repair shop and a church in the corner. Mixed residential and commercial development occurs on all sides of the site.

The site had been previously filled to build it up; however, a large portion still remains in the 100 year flood plan. There is a large easement in question resulting from a taking by the State. This may have been later turned over to the City but should be verified if this property is selected for future consideration.

Advantages:

Zoning Transitional Development zoning accommodate building and parking.

Site Access & Parking Site access is good from two streets providing multiple access and separation of visitor and secure parking.

Traffic Impact No potential blockages and MAT transportation is available.

Disadvantages:

Site Geometry The irregular triangular shape is difficult to work with and usable land is potentially reduced by easements.

Facility Hardening Potential flooding and questionable fill make this site risky, especially for an essential services facility.

Cost The cost of mitigating the 100 year flow problem and questionable fill would make an otherwise economical site one of the most expensive in total cost of development.

Business/Relocation Seven dwellings and two businesses would have to be relocated.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

Site G: Existing Police Headquarters

This site on the northwest corner of Church and Broad Streets would require acquisition of the property fronting Broad Street containing three multi-family dwellings that are described as being Notably Historic. Approximately two-thirds of the 53,500 sq. ft. site is City owned property containing the existing two story police headquarters and parking. Adjacent to the property at the north and west is residential development. The Housing Authority project is on the west with their parking lot adjacent to the west property line. Across Church Street is a high density residential development and mixed commercial and residential area across Broad Street to the east.

Development of this site for the new police headquarters would require phased construction and temporary relocation of the parking while the new building and site improvements are under construction. Phasing would most likely occur as follows: first, in order to maintain operations in the old building while the new one is constructed, the existing parking would be relocated to another site; second, the new building would be constructed on the corner; third, the police force would move into the new building, fourth the old building would be demolished; and fifth, the parking lot would be completed and parking relocated back on to the site.

The site has an eight foot slope up from Broad Street on the east to the west property line. By careful design of ramping to the front entry, dual grade entry can be achieved.

Advantages:

Site Geometry	Although relatively small, the site is shaped almost as a square. The regular shape and moderate slope contribute to efficient planning.
Distance to Service Areas	The site is close to the center of the service area and has fairly good access to the highway system.
Site Access & Parking	Although the site is very tight and barely accommodates parking to meet the immediate needs, the two sheet exposure provides good access and separation of visitor from secure parking.
Traffic Impact	No potential blockages are apparent and the MAT line is less than a block to the north and west.
Cost	This site has one of the best assessed valuations.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, continued

Tax Revenue Impact Less than most because less property is being removed from the tax roll.

Disadvantages:

Zoning The property would have to be rezoned from Mixed Use and R4-15 to Transitional Development in order to accommodate the new police headquarters.

Neighborhood Impact Three multi-family dwellings in the historical district would have to be relocated or demolished. The fact that the police have been accepted in this neighborhood for many years should help to mitigate this disadvantage.

Business/Relocation Families from three dwellings would have to be relocated and the police parking would have to be temporarily relocated during construction.

SITE EVALUATION

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Weight	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D	Site E	Site F	Site G
h. Environmental	9							
Hazardous Waste		Unknown	Unknown	Yes	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Flora/fauna		No	No	Potential	No	No	Unknown	No
Soils/geology		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
i. Traffic Impact	6							
Access to and from		Poor	Fair	Good	Poor	Excellent	Good	Good
Potential blockages		Yes	Yes	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Public transportation		Yes	Yes	1 Block	Yes	Yes	Yes	.5 Block
j. Facility Hardening Capability	9							
Flood/Erosion		Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Poor	Good
Fire/Explosion		Vulnerable	Fair	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Earthquake		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Civil disturbance		Vulnerable	Vulnerable	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
k. Crisis Conditions (EOC)	8							
Accommodate other agencies		Excellent	Good	Good	Poor	Good	Good	Fair
Maintain operations		Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Good	Good
l. Neighborhood Impact	9							
Historical District		Fisk Bldg.	None	Adjacent	Fair	2 Inventoried	None	3 Inventoried
Aesthetics		Poor	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Good	Good
Economics		Poor	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Good
Social		Fair	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
Environmental		Fair	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
Community Acceptance		Fair	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Good
m. Cost Analysis	10			4		1	2	3
Estimated Acquisition Price				2		1	3	4
Estimated Off-Site Cost				1		2	3	4
Estimated Site Development Cost				1		2	3	4
Estimated Demolition				3		2	4	1
Estimated Building Cost				3		4	1	2
Other Project Costs				4		1	2	3
n. Tax Revenue Impact	10			4		1	3	2
o. Business/Economic Dislocation	10			4		1	2	3

Note: Numerical ranking of the Evaluation Criteria m, n and o for each site from 4 to 1 is based on "4" being the best/most favorable and "1" being the worst/least favorable.

SITE EVALUATION

SUMMARY SITE RANKING

	Wght.	Site C		Site E		Site F		Site G	
		Wght.	UnWght.	Wght.	UnWght.	Wght.	UnWght.	Wght.	UnWght.
a.Zoning	5	10	2	20	4	15	3	10	1
b.Site-Geometry	7	28	4	21	3	7	1	28	2
c.Access to Service Areas	6	6	1	24	4	12	2	30	3
d.Site Access/Parking	10	30	23	40	4	10	1	40	2
e.Building Accommodation	10	30	3	40	4	20	2	20	1
f.Future Expansion	8	24	3	32	4	16	2	24	1
g.Utilities	-10								
h.Environmental	-9								
i.Traffic Impact	6	12	2	24	4	18	3	24	1
j.Facility Hardening Capability	9	27	3	36	4	9	1	54	2
k.Crisis Conditions (EOC)	8	24	3	32	4	8	1	48	2
l.Neighborhood Impact	9	18	2	27	3	9	1	54	4
m.Cost Analysis	10	40	4	10	1	20	2	50	3
n.Tax Revenue Impact	10	40	4	10	1	30	3	20	21
o. Business/Economic Dislocation	10	40	4	10	1	20	2	30	3

Note: Unweighted ranking of the Evaluation Criteria for each site from 4 to 1 is based on "4" being the best/most favorable and "1" being worst/least favorable. Weighted ranking is calculated by multiplying the unweighted ranking by the weighted value for that specific criteria.

SUMMARY OF RANKING Points/Rank

	Site C	Site E	Site F	Site G
WEIGHTED				
Points	329	326	194	211
Rank	4	3	1	2
UNWEIGHTED				
Points	33	41	22	24
Rank	3	4	1	2