

Rochester DPW Facility Study
Site Selection Matrix

August 11, 2014
Updated December 04, 2017

Site 1	45 Old Dover Road (Existing DPW Site)
Site 2	22 Phillips Lane
Site 3	58 Pickering Road
Site 4	442 Pickering Road
Site 5	163 Haven Hill Road
Site 6	162 Chestnut Hill Road

Criteria	Site 1 45 Old Dover Road	Site 2 22 Phillips Lane	Site 3 58 Pickering Road	Site 4 442 Pickering Road	Site 5 163 Haven Hill Road	Site 6 162 Chestnut Hill Road	Site 7 72 Lafayette Street
1. Location (15 points)	Score: 12 out of 15 Distance to center of city is good (1.5 miles) Neighborhood is partially residential Access to site is good because of length of street frontage	Score: 8 out of 15 Distance to center of city is moderate (2.3 miles) Neighborhood is mix of rural, residential and commercial Access to site is poor because of shape of site and poor road access	Score: 8 out of 15 Distance to center of city is moderate (2.3 miles) Neighborhood is mix of residential and industrial Access to site is moderate to good - See also 8. Traffic Impacts <i>Update: Score for site access has been reduced upon further analysis due to limited sight lines on Pickering Rd</i>	Score: 6 out of 15 Distance to center of city is poor (4.7 miles) Neighborhood is mix of rural and residential Access to site is poor to moderate because of environmental impacts - See 5.	Score: 6 out of 15 Distance to center of city is poor (4.7 miles) Neighborhood is rural Access to site is moderate because of street frontage	Score: 9 out of 15 Distance to center of city is moderate (2.2 miles) Neighborhood is mix of residential and industrial Site has had previous truck traffic Access to site is moderate to good - See also 8. Traffic Impacts	Score: 10 out of 15 Distance to center of city is good (0.9 miles) Neighborhood is majority residential Access to site is through smaller residential streets - Residential streets are planned to be improved
	Score: 4 out of 15	Score: 13 out of 15	Score: 13 out of 15	Score: 13 out of 15	Score: 7 out of 15	Score: 14 out of 15	Score: 12 out of 15
	Site is less than min recommended for new facility of 7 acres (5.3 acres) Shape of site is moderate to good for use as DPW site	Site is 17.0 acres Shape of site is moderate for use as DPW site	Site is 17.6 acres Shape of site is moderate to good for use as DPW site <i>Update: Score for shape of site reduced due to clarification of location of force main through site</i>	Site is 30.16 acres Shape of site is moderate for use as DPW site - Environmental impacts on site limit use	Site is 15.0 acres Shape of site is moderate for use as DPW site - Environmental impacts on site limit use	Site is 46 acres Shape of site is moderate to good for use as DPW site - Environmental impacts on site limit use- Well Protection Area	Site is adequate at 11 acres (note portion proposed to be acquired from Fair grounds site) Shape of site is good for use as DPW site
3. Site History (15 points)	Score: 7 out of 15 Past and current use as DPW site suggests possibility of contamination or other factors is high	Score: 11 out of 15 Past and current rural character suggests possibility of contamination or other factors is low	Score: 6 out of 15 Past and current use as industrial site suggests possibility of contamination or other factors is high	Score: 12 out of 15 Past and current rural/agricultural character suggests possibility of contamination or other factors is low	Score: 12 out of 15 Past and current rural/agricultural character suggests possibility of contamination or other factors is low	Score: 12 out of 15 Past and current rural/agricultural character suggests possibility of contamination or other factors is low	Score: 10 out of 15 Past and current fairground use suggests possibility of contamination or other factors is moderate. Some anecdotal information suggests possible limited use of rear of site.
	Score: 13 out of 15	Score: 12 out of 15	Score: 15 out of 15	Score: 13 out of 15	Score: 10 out of 15	Score: 11 out of 15	Score: 12 out of 15
	Proposed use is consistent with zoning for site (Industrial III)	Proposed use is somewhat inconsistent with zoning for site (Agricultural)	Proposed use is consistent with zoning for site (Industrial II)	Proposed use is somewhat inconsistent with zoning for site (Agricultural)	Proposed use is somewhat inconsistent with zoning for site (Agricultural) Site size/shape	Proposed use is somewhat inconsistent with zoning for site (Agricultural)	Proposed use is somewhat inconsistent with zoning for site (residential)
5. Environmental Impacts (15 points)	Score: 8 out of 10 No known significant environmental receptors	Score: 3 out of 10 Wetland area (wooded marsh) on site - Impact to be determined	Score: 1 out of 10 No known significant environmental receptors <i>Update: Score for environmental receptors lowered significantly after completion of phase I report</i>	Score: 2 out of 10 Wetland area (wooded marsh) and pond on site - Potential for significant impact	Score: 6 out of 10 Site adjacent to Somersworth well site - Impact to be determined	Score: 4 out of 10 Wetland area Cocheco River on site - Impact to be determined, Existing Well Site	Score: 6 out of 10 There does not appear to be major receptors affecting the site Wetlands at edges of site does not effect usability
	Score: 15 out of 15	Score: 8 out of 15	Score: 15 out of 15	Score: 6 out of 15	Score: 3 out of 15	Score: 5 out of 15	Score: 14 out of 15
	Utilities currently available at site (availability of gas service to be confirmed)	Utilities currently available nearby, but some extension would be necessary to bring on site (availability of gas service to be confirmed)	Utilities currently available nearby or immediately adjacent - some extension may be necessary to bring on site	Power and Telephone available (need to confirm availability of 3-phase power) Does not appear to have sewer, water or gas service available	Power and Telephone appear to be available but needs to be confirmed Does not appear to have sewer, water or gas service available	Power and Telephone appear to be available but needs to be confirmed Does not appear to have sewer, water or gas service available	All utilities appear to be available. Gas is available on adjacent street, will need to be extended on site.
6. Access to utilities (15 points)	Score: 15 out of 15	Score: 8 out of 15	Score: 15 out of 15	Score: 6 out of 15	Score: 3 out of 15	Score: 5 out of 15	Score: 14 out of 15
	Utilities currently available at site (availability of gas service to be confirmed)	Utilities currently available nearby, but some extension would be necessary to bring on site (availability of gas service to be confirmed)	Utilities currently available nearby or immediately adjacent - some extension may be necessary to bring on site	Power and Telephone available (need to confirm availability of 3-phase power) Does not appear to have sewer, water or gas service available	Power and Telephone appear to be available but needs to be confirmed Does not appear to have sewer, water or gas service available	Power and Telephone appear to be available but needs to be confirmed Does not appear to have sewer, water or gas service available	All utilities appear to be available. Gas is available on adjacent street, will need to be extended on site.
	Score: 15 out of 15	Score: 8 out of 15	Score: 15 out of 15	Score: 6 out of 15	Score: 3 out of 15	Score: 5 out of 15	Score: 14 out of 15

Rochester DPW Facility Study
Site Selection Matrix

August 11, 2014
Updated December 04, 2017

Site 1	45 Old Dover Road (Existing DPW Site)
Site 2	22 Phillips Lane
Site 3	58 Pickering Road
Site 4	442 Pickering Road
Site 5	163 Haven Hill Road
Site 6	162 Chestnut Hill Road

Criteria	Site 1 45 Old Dover Road	Site 2 22 Phillips Lane	Site 3 58 Pickering Road	Site 4 442 Pickering Road	Site 5 163 Haven Hill Road	Site 6 162 Chestnut Hill Road	Site 7 72 Lafayette Street
	Score: 4 out of 5	Score: 2 out of 5	Score: 3 out of 5	Score: 2 out of 5	Score: 2 out of 5	Score: 2 out of 5	Score: 2 out of 5
7. Permitting (5 points)	Permitting appears to conventional given existing use of DPW - Needs to be confirmed	Permitting may be difficult because of zoning and site environmental issues (wetlands)	Permitting may have some complexities because of known contamination on site	Permitting may be difficult because of zoning and site environmental issues (wetlands)	Permitting may be difficult because of zoning and site environmental issues (adjacent to well site)	Permitting may be difficult because of zoning and site environmental issues (wetlands & well site)	Permitting may be difficult because of zoning allowed use. Municipal use not listed in Zoning Regs
	Score: 5 out of 5	Score: 3 out of 5	Score: 2 out of 5	Score: 3 out of 5	Score: 4 out of 5	Score: 3 out of 5	Score: 2 out of 5
8. Traffic Impacts (5 points)	Traffic impact low because there is no change in use	Traffic impact moderate - access to main road can be at intersection	Traffic impact on Pickering - Some mitigation may be necessary	Some traffic impact on Pickering - Traffic is moderately light in area	Some traffic impact on Haven Hill Road - Traffic is moderately light in area	Some traffic impact on Chestnut Hill Road - Traffic is moderately light in area	Some traffic impact on residential area is expected
	Score: 13 out of 15	Score: 4 out of 15	Score: 15 out of 15	Score: 4 out of 15	Score: 6 out of 15	Score: 10 out of 15	Score: 13 out of 15
9. Cost of site development (15 points)	Flat site, but existing buildings will need to be demolished	Site is relatively flat, but is heavily wooded. Site has possibly significant wet soils/high water table	Site is relatively flat Site has some wooded areas that may need to be cleared Site has some wet areas, but is big enough to build away from	Site appears to have some hilly area Site is heavily wooded Site has some wet areas/small pond - impacts large portion of the site	Site is relatively flat Site is partially cleared Site may have high water table - adjacent to well site	Site is relatively flat Site is partially cleared Site may have high water table - adjacent to well site	Site is relatively flat Site is fully cleared
	Score: 2 out of 5	Score: 4 out of 5	Score: 2 out of 5	Score: 3 out of 5	Score: 3 out of 5	Score: 3 out of 5	Score: 4 out of 5
10. Cost of construction (5 points)	Temporary facilities or phasing of project will be necessary	Site has minimal restrictions that affect cost of building construction	Site has high water table - significant impact on building foundation	Site may have high water table - may have some impact on building foundation	Site may have high water table - may have some impact on building foundation	Site may have high water table - may have some impact on building foundation	Site is privately owned and will have to be subdivided and acquired Site has buildings that will have to be demolished <i>Note: Site acquisition costs to be separate from project costs and therefore are removed as factors - Scoring increased as a result</i>