

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: City Hall Site Selection Scoring Matrix
DEPARTMENT: City Manager's Office
PRESENTED BY: Steve Burkett, City Manager
Jesus Sanchez, Operations Manager

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

On March 21, 2005, the City Council authorized the City Manager to terminate the Purchase and Sale Agreement for the Echo Lake site as the site for the construction of the new City Hall. With this authorization, the Council also instructed the City Manager to further evaluate new sites.

Earlier in 2002, a number of sites were evaluated using a site selection scoring matrix for the location of a new City Hall (Attachment A – Shoreline City Hall Site Selection Scoring Matrix). This matrix was developed with selection criteria paramount to the placement of a City Hall. The scoring matrix included the following criteria supported by drivers important to each criterion:

- Location
- Site Characteristics
- Sustainability/Environmental
- Infrastructure
- Real Estate

We are seeking the Council's confirmation in adopting the criteria outlined in the City Hall Site Selection Scoring Matrix as we proceed to further evaluate new sites for the new City Hall.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The cost of the site for City Hall could range from \$0 - \$5 million. The proposed land acquisition at the Echo Lake site for City Hall and a City park was \$4.7 million.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council adopt the criteria outlined in the City Hall Site Selection Scoring Matrix and authorize the City Manager to evaluate new sites under this matrix.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney 

Attachment A – Shoreline City Hall Site Selection Scoring Matrix

This page intentionally left blank.

Shoreline City Hall Site Selection Scoring Matrix

SELECTION CRITERIA		QUAL. NOTES	AVG WT. 1-10	OPTION 1		OPTION 2		OPTION 3		OPTION 4		OPTION 5		OPTION 6	
				Score 1-5	Wtd. Score	Score 1-5	Wtd. Score	Score 1-5	Wtd. Score	Score 1-5	Wtd. Score	Score 1-5	Wtd. Score	Score 1-5	Wtd. Score
Scored between 1 - 5 with 5 being the highest rating; weighted between 1 - 10 with 10 being the greatest value.															
LOCATION	Overall centrality & "civic heart" Economic development catalyst potential Transportation access Neighborhood/Adjacency to services Citizenry access to City services	Weighted Average	1 2 3 4 5	0 0 0 0 0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 1 1 1 1	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	3 2 3 2 2	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Parcel size & shape relative to needs Expansion potential Quality of site Traffic access and parking	Weighted Average	6 7 8 9	0 0 0 0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 1 1 1	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 3 2 3	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
SUSTAINABILITY/ ENVIRONMENTAL	Site Impact Remediation required Stormwater management Open space pres/restoration	Weighted Average	10 11 12 13	0 0 0 0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 1 1 1	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 3 2 3	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
INFRASTRUCTURE	Street frontage Traffic mitigation Communications system Utilities	Weighted Average	14 15 16 17	0 0 0 0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 1 1 1	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 3 2 3	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
REAL ESTATE	Available for acquisition Condemnation required Cost Potential for partnership/joint tenancy R/E transaction relationship	Weighted Average	18 19 20 21 22	0 0 0 0 0	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 1 1 1 1	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 3 2 3 3	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
TOTAL WEIGHTED AVERAGE SCORE			0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
Best Possible Score			0												
QUALITATIVE SCORE					0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%

Shoreline City Hall

Site Selection Scoring Matrix

Qualitative Notes:

1. The overall centrality to Shoreline's central business district, arterials, city gateway, etc. and potential to enhance Shoreline's "civic heart", the higher the rating.
2. The potential for catalyzing economic development and acting as an anchor for attracting future development, the higher the rating.
3. The more convenient the access to public transportation, bike paths, main arterials and I-5, the higher the rating.
4. The nature and quality of the neighborhood and the ease of access to amenities and services for City staff, the higher the rating.
5. The ease of access by citizens to the property, the higher the rating.
6. The more suitable the property is for meeting the parcel size, shape and layout requirements of the project, the higher the rating.
7. The more suitable the property is for accommodating future expansion, the higher the rating.
8. The higher the overall quality of the site relative to condition, environment, neighborhood, views, amenities, etc., the higher the rating.
9. The more suitable the property is for meeting the parking requirements and traffic access, the higher the rating.
10. The higher the potential for limiting site environmental damage and limiting the development footprint, the higher the score.
11. The lower the potential for remediation of environmental pollution/contaminants, the higher the rating.
12. The greater the potential for limiting disruption of natural water flows and for on-site, low impact stormwater management, the higher the rating.
13. The greater the potential for preservation and/or restoration of natural features and environmental qualities, the higher the rating.
14. The more that the street frontage enhances the presence and access to the property and future developments, the higher the rating.
15. The less traffic mitigation requirements required to meet the anticipated trip generation, the higher the score.
16. The greater the access to and the higher the quality of the communications infrastructure, the higher the score.
17. The less improvements required to the utilities infrastructure to meet the development needs, the higher the score.
18. The lower the barriers to acquisition, the higher the score.
19. The less likely that condemnation would be required to acquire the property, the higher the score.
20. The lower the cost, the higher the score.
21. The greater the potential for a development partnership and/or joint tenancy that would enhance the project, the higher the score.