

Organizing Categories for Site Evaluation Factors:

1. Social and Land Use Factors
2. Construction Cost Factors
3. Long Term Cost Factors (operations and maintenance)

Each site evaluation factor is weighted for relative importance.

Weighting Multipliers:

- 1 = Not very important
- 2 = Some what important
- 3 = Important
- 4 = Very Important
- 5 = Essential

Each site evaluation factor is ranked for each site.

Ranking Scores:

- 0 = Unacceptable (least desirable)
- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Excellent (most desirable)

Social and Land Use Factors:

Site size Weight: 5

Establish the standard useable site size; rank in accordance with % larger or smaller than standard.

Proximity to Elementary School – distance Weight: 5

Establish reasonable walking distance as the standard, rank relative to the standard.

Proximity to Elementary School – traffic hazards Weight: 5

Rank relative to # of crosswalks required and traffic intensity

Proximity to Middle/High School – distance Weight: 4

Establish reasonable walking distance as the standard, rank relative to the standard.

Proximity to Middle/High School – traffic hazards Weight: 4

Rank relative to # of crosswalks required and traffic intensity

Proximity to community center Weight: 5

Determine where “community center” zone is, establish rank criteria for sites outside of zone

Proximity to fire department Weight: 2

Establish the standard distance to hydrants / fire department and rank relative to standard.

Proximity to other community facilities – police, harbor public areas, etc Weight: 2

Determine what other facilities are important and in what order

Fit with zoning Weight 4

Either yes or no

Fit with community planning (other facility needs, i.e. school, town office, etc) Weight: 5

Visibility of site

Rank visual prominence from Rte 11 and Main St

Proximity to hazards Weight: 3

Susceptibility to damage from flooding, washouts, other?

Property deed restrictions Weight: 3

Any restrictions and would they be deleterious to developing the library?

Access by pedestrians Weight: 4

Is site served by sidewalks? Is site on or near major existing pedestrian routes?

Access by cars Weight: 4

Rank frontage on major or minor road, safe vehicular site turning distances, other intersections

Aesthetic value of site Weight: 3

Establish aesthetic criteria considering views, topo, vegetation, surroundings, enhancement effort

Outdoor use potential Weight: 3

Site has or is near attractive natural features and nature areas

Sun orientation and exposure Weight: 3

- Slope orientation, vegetation density, shadowing, sun and prevailing wind exposure
- Topography Weight: 3**
More slope, more impact on building design
- Site drainage Weight: 3**
Soils well-draining, boggy, low lying, higher ground?
- Wetlands Weight: 3**
Adverse impact on useable site area, ecology, costs, schedule, rate from none, little, to major.
- Flooding potential Weight: 4**
Rank from site flooding, near infrequent, possible, not in flood plain, no nearby water
- Existing site disturbance – Green Design Weight: 5**
Vacant undisturbed land is worse – recycling a disturbed site is best
- Existing site development – demolition / hazardous materials potential Weight: 5**
Assess likelihood of presence from known site history, relative impact on cost and schedule

Construction Cost Factors

- Topography (earthwork, retaining walls) Weight: 3**
Low or sloping sites increase site costs, flat is best
- Ledge / Unsuitable soils potential Weight: 4**
Presence decreases suitability of site, increasing construction costs
- Municipal Water Weight: 5**
Existing municipal water to site best – nearby middle - none worst (also impacts min site size).
- Municipal Sewer Weight: 5**
Existing municipal sewer to site best – nearby middle - none worst (also impacts min site size).
- Electric / Communications Utilities Weight: 3**
Existing 3 phase power, CTV service at site best – none worst.
- Site Drainage / Erosion Weight: 3**
Relative erosion potential in construction and later from slopes or water course banks
- Wetlands Weight: 4**
Impacts cost and schedule, assess none, to little, to significant
- Off-site improvements (road, sidewalk, upgrades) Weight: 3**
None required, best – upgrade required, worst
- On-site improvements (access road, sidewalks) Weight: 3**
Establish standard for length of driveway from street to building and rank if more or less
- Existing site development – reuse Weight: 4**
Rank on amount of existing resource reuse potential to reduce costs.
- Existing site development – demolition Weight: 3**
No demolition, least costly, best – complete building removal, most expensive, worst
- Potential for hazardous materials Weight: 4**
Assess likelihood of presence from known site history, relative impact on cost and schedule
- Site Availability Weight: 3**
Clear title, easements, agreeable owner, multiple owners, town owned. Definite? Possible?
- Site Cost Weight: 4**
Rank from no cost/nominal cost, at/above/below market value, to cost prohibitive
- Possible grant money because waterfront or green design features weight: 3**

Long Term Cost Factors (Operations and Maintenance)

- Existing resource reuse – Green Design Weight: 4**
Rank on amount of existing resource reuse potential to reduce long-term costs
- Site Drainage / Erosion / Flooding Weight: 4**
Rank site features that may cause long-term maintenance costs
- Site Improvements maintenance (Access drive, sidewalks) Weight: 2**
Drives and walks more or less than standard increase/decrease costs
- Current tax role status Weight: 2**
Town property not on tax role best – private property currently taxed worse.