

Page 5 of the Reply Form was NOT included  
 III - A/E . NOT INCLUDED -

I - 21  
 II - 23  
 III - 9  
 IV - 11.5  
 V - 22  
 86.5

## Proposed Whatcom County Jail Facility Site Selection Check List

Proposed Property Address: 4996 Samish Way  
 Property Site #: # 9

Reviewer Information:  
 Name: Michael Russell Phone: 676-6746

Please score each evaluation criteria for the proposed candidate site:

| I. CANDIDATE SITE COMMUNITY IMPACT ISSUES   | REVIEWER SCORE  |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| <p><b>A. Distance from schools</b><br/>           (Without natural or manmade barriers)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">Excellent</td> <td>1 mile or more</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above Average</td> <td>¾ - 1 mile</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory</td> <td>½ to ¾ of a mile</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less than Satisfactory</td> <td>½ mile or less</td> </tr> </table>     | Excellent   | 1 mile or more  | Above Average | ¾ - 1 mile                         | Satisfactory | ½ to ¾ of a mile            | Less than Satisfactory                                   | ½ mile or less | <p>(1-4, 4 being the highest)</p> <p>Score: <u>4</u></p> |
| Excellent   | 1 mile or more  |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| Above Average   | ¾ - 1 mile  |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| Satisfactory  | ½ to ¾ of a mile  |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| Less than Satisfactory  | ½ mile or less  |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| <p><b>B. Distance from high density residential area</b><br/>           (Without natural or manmade barriers)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">Excellent</td> <td>1 mile or more</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above Average</td> <td>¾ - 1 mile</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory</td> <td>½ to ¾ of a mile</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>½ mile or less</td> </tr> </table> | Excellent   | 1 mile or more  | Above Average | ¾ - 1 mile                         | Satisfactory | ½ to ¾ of a mile            | Poor   | ½ mile or less | <p>(1-4, 4 being the highest)</p> <p>Score: <u>4</u></p> |
| Excellent   | 1 mile or more  |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| Above Average   | ¾ - 1 mile  |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| Satisfactory  | ½ to ¾ of a mile  |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| Poor  | ½ mile or less  |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| <p><b>C. Compatibility with Neighboring Uses</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">Above Average</td> <td>Non-developed space use adjacencies,<br/>Commercial / industrial</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory</td> <td>Abutting large acreage residential</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>Abutting school occupancies</td> </tr> </table>                               | Above Average   | Non-developed space use adjacencies,<br>Commercial / industrial | Satisfactory  | Abutting large acreage residential | Poor         | Abutting school occupancies | <p>(1-3, 3 being the highest)</p> <p>Score: <u>3</u></p> |                |  |
| Above Average   | Non-developed space use adjacencies,<br>Commercial / industrial |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| Satisfactory  | Abutting large acreage residential                              |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |
| Poor  | Abutting school occupancies                                     |   |               |                                    |              |                             |  |                |  |

|   |  |                            |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| <b>D. Proximity to Life Safety Facilities: Fire Stations, Emergency Aid</b>                               |  | (1-4, 4 being the highest) |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor  | Site location within 5 min or less for services response<br>Site location within 5 to 10 min for services response<br>Site located within 10 to 15 min for services response<br>Site located with greater than 15 min for service response | Score: <u>4</u>            |
| <b>E. Proximity to Sensitive Uses (Recreation Areas, Places of Worship, Historic Community Amenities)</b> |  | (1-4, 4 being the highest) |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor  | 1 mile or more<br>½ - 1 mile<br>¼ to ½ of a mile<br>adjacent to  | Score: <u>3</u>            |
| <b>F. Site Development Aesthetic Impact On Community Character</b>  |  | (1-3, 3 being the highest) |
| Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor   | Development works well with existing community character<br>Development conforms with existing community character<br>Development does not enhance existing community character  | Score: <u>3</u>            |
| <b>COMMUNITY IMPACT ISSUES:</b>   |  | Total Score: <u>21</u>     |
| <b>II. CANDIDATE SITE PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS</b>  |  | <b>REVIEWER SCORE</b>      |
| <b>A. Site Area Size (Developable Acreage)</b><br>(As verified with data from Jail Planner)               |  | (1-3, 3 being the highest) |
| Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor   | 30 acres and above<br>20 acres and above<br>Less than 20 acres   | Score: <u>3</u>            |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>B. Site Configuration</b><br/>(Must accommodate design of new facility)</p> <p>Satisfactory<br/>Poor</p> <p>Accommodates design of new facility<br/>Does not accommodate design of new facility</p>   | <p>(1-2, 2 being the highest)</p> <p>Score: <u>2</u></p> |
| <p><b>C. Site Topography (est.)</b></p> <p>Excellent<br/>Above Average<br/>Satisfactory<br/>Poor</p> <p>Flat - 0-1% slope across site<br/>Mild slopes - 2% - 3% slope across site<br/>Moderate slopes 3% - 7% slope across site<br/>Severe slopes above 8% slope across site</p>  | <p>(1-4, 4 being the highest)</p> <p>Score: <u>3</u></p> |
| <p><b>D. Site Geotechnical (Soil Conditions)</b></p> <p>Excellent<br/>Above Average<br/>Satisfactory<br/>Poor</p> <p>Stiff glacial till near surface / low water table<br/>Sandy gravels at or near surface / low water table<br/>Silty clay soils requiring preload for consolidation<br/>Deep organic peat requiring removal and replacement and preload fill and/or piling</p>   | <p>(1-4, 4 being the highest)</p> <p>Score: <u>4</u></p> |
| <p><b>E. Site Area Surface and Subsurface Drainage Conditions</b></p> <p>Excellent<br/>Above Average<br/>Satisfactory<br/>Poor<br/>Unacceptable</p> <p>Site drainage readily accomplished directly adjacent to site<br/>Site drainage requires transport to receiving system within ¼ mile of site<br/>Site drainage requires transport to receiving system within ½ mile of site<br/>High surface water table and site subsurface improvements and transport to receiving system 1 mile or greater from site<br/>Site location in 100-year flood plain</p> | <p>(1-5, 5 being the highest)</p> <p>Score: <u>4</u></p> |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>F. Site Easements/Encumbrances</b>                                 |  |   |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor<br>Unacceptable    | No onsite easements or encumbrances<br>No onsite easements, some minor site encumbrances<br>Limited easements on periphery<br>Easements on site<br>Easements which prevent development | (1-5, 5 being the highest)<br><br>Score: <u>5</u> |
| <b>G. Buildable Site Adequate Distance From Gas Line</b>              |  |   |
| Excellent<br>Poor   | More than 500 feet from pipeline<br>Less than 500 feet from pipeline   | (1-2, 2 being the highest)<br><br>Score: <u>2</u> |
| <i>PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS:</i>                                      |  | <b>Total Score:</b> <u>2.3</u>                    |
| <b>III. CANDIDATE SITE INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICE REQUIREMENTS</b>        |  |   |
| <b>A. Proximity to Required Public Water Supply</b>                   |  |   |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor                    | Municipal water at site<br>Municipal water within .25 mile<br>Municipal water within .50 mile<br>Municipal water greater than or equal to 1 mile                                       | (1-4, 4 being the highest)<br><br>Score: _____    |
| <b>B. Proximity to Required Public Sewer Service (Sanitary Sewer)</b> |  |   |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor                    | Municipal sewer at site<br>Municipal sewer within .25 mile<br>Municipal sewer within .50 mile<br>Municipal sewer greater than or equal to 1 mile or less                               | (1-4, 4 being the highest)<br><br>Score: _____    |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>C. Proximity to Required Power Supply</b>               |   |   |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor         | Three phase service adjacent site<br>Three phase service within 0.5 miles<br>Three phase service within 1.0 miles<br>Three phase service 1.5 miles or over  | (1-4, 4 being the highest)<br><br>Score: _____    |
| <b>D. Proximity to Gas Supply</b>                          |   |   |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor         | Natural Gas at Site<br>Natural gas within .25 mile<br>Natural gas within .50 mile<br>Natural gas 1 mile or more   | (1-4, 4 being the highest)<br><br>Score: _____    |
| <b>E. Proximity to I-5 Corridor Interchanges from Site</b> |   |   |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor         | Multiple routes – All weather roads within ½ mile<br>Multiple routes – All weather roads within 1 mile<br>Single routes – All weather roads within 2 miles<br>Multiple low capacity roads more than 2 miles | (1-4, 4 being the highest)<br><br>Score: _____    |
| <b>F. Arterial Roadway Access to Site</b>                  |   |   |
| Satisfactory<br>Poor                                       | Direct route – All weather roads<br>Multiple low capacity roads through residential neighborhoods   | (1-2, 2 being the highest)<br><br>Score: <u>2</u> |
| <b>G. Concurrency / Road Capacity</b>                      |   |   |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor         | Current level of service A-B and multiple roadway access to site<br>Current level of service C to site<br>Current level of service D to site<br>Current level of service E-F to site                        | (1-4, 4 being the highest)<br><br>Score: <u>3</u> |

|   |   |                            |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| <b>J. Access to Broadband Telecommunications</b>  |   | (1-4, 4 being the highest) |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor  | I-Net adjacent to site<br>I-Net within ½ mile from site<br>I-Net within 1 mile from site<br>I-Net further than 1 mile from site   | Score: <u>4</u>            |
| <i>INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICE REQUIREMENTS:</i>   |   | Total Score: <u>9</u>      |
| <b>IV. CANDIDATE SITE LAND USE ISSUES</b>   |   |                            |
| <b>A. Site Zoning Compatible w/ New Main Jail Development</b>   |   | (1-3, 3 being the highest) |
| Excellent<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor   | Development of New Jail Conforms to Existing Zoning<br>Development requires Conditional Use Permit<br>Development requires a Revision to the Zoning Code  | Score: <u>2</u>            |
| <b>B. Site Development Impact on Surrounding Properties</b>   |   | (1-3, 3 being the highest) |
| Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor   | Site development of New Jail blends with surrounding properties<br>Site development of New Jail works well with surrounding properties<br>Site development of New Jail is detrimental to surrounding properties                     | Score: <u>3</u>            |
| <b>C. Site Use Conformity with Whatcom County Essential Public Facilities Provisions and/or City Comprehensive Plan for Site Vicinity</b> |   | (1-3, 3 being the highest) |
| Excellent<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor   | Site use as New Jail is conforming use within existing Comprehensive plan<br>Site use as New Jail will require minor revisions to Comprehensive plan<br>Site use as New Jail will require extensive revisions to Comprehensive plan | Score: <u>2</u>            |

|   |  |                                 |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| <b>D. Site Conformity with State of Washington's Growth Management Act</b>    |  |                                 |
| Excellent   | Site is located within existing City or Urban Growth Area boundary   | (1-2, 2 being the highest)      |
| Unsatisfactory  | Site is located outside of existing Urban Growth Area boundary and does not conform to Growth Management Act | Score: <u>2 1.5</u>             |
| <b>E. Candidate Site Availability to be Utilized for New Jail Development</b> |  |                                 |
| Above Average   | Site is currently up for sale at fair market value   | (1-3, 3 being the highest)      |
| Satisfactory  | Site is currently not being utilized and should be available at fair market value                            | Score: <u>3</u>                 |
| Unsatisfactory  | Site is currently being utilized and will not be readily Available (i.e. potential need for condemnation)    |                                 |
| <b>LAND USE ISSUES</b>  |  | <b>Total Score: <u>11.5</u></b> |
| <b>V. CANDIDATE SITE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</b>                                 |  |                                 |
| <b>A. Site Area Wetlands</b>  |  |                                 |
| Excellent   | No wetlands on/or adjacent to site   | (1-3, 3 being the highest)      |
| Above Average   | Wetlands on site, minimal mitigation required, does not effect design criteria                               | Score: <u>2</u>                 |
| Poor  | Wetlands on site, significant mitigation required, will impact design criteria                               |                                 |
| <b>B. Site Area Fisheries</b>   |  |                                 |
| Excellent   | No fisheries habitat on/or adjacent to site  | (1-4, 4 being the highest)      |
| Above Average   | No fisheries habitat on site, but on perimeter or immediately adjacent to site                               | Score: <u>4</u>                 |
| Satisfactory  | Fisheries habitat on site, but impacts minor   |                                 |
| Poor  | Fisheries habitat on site, impacts likely to be significant  |                                 |

|  |  |                               |
|--|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>C. Site Area Potential for Archeological Significance</b>                                   |  | (1-4, 4 being the highest)    |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor   | No resources on site<br>Potential for resources on site, but none known<br>Resources on site, but not likely to impact<br>Resources on site, variable impacts probable   | Score: <u>4</u>               |
| <b>D. Site Area Potential for Contamination from Previous Uses</b>                             |  | (1-5, 5 being the highest)    |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor<br>Unsatisfactory                           | No known contamination, present and past use of site not likely to cause contamination<br>No known contamination on site, but past site use may have caused contamination<br>Partially contaminated but cleaned up / isolated<br>Significant contamination present, but Brownfield candidate<br>Severe contamination present – site listed as Superfund site | Score: <u>5</u>               |
| <b>E. Site Area Potential to Impact Endangered or Threatened Species</b>                       |  | (1-4, 4 being the highest)    |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor   | No ESA species present<br>ESA species present, but no impact likely<br>ESA species present, but impacts mitigable<br>ESA species present, unmitigable impacts  | Score: <u>4</u>               |
| <b>F. Adjacent Properties Sensitivity to Construction Impacts (Noise, Traffic, Dust, etc.)</b> |  | (1-4, 4 being the highest)    |
| Excellent<br>Above Average<br>Satisfactory<br>Poor   | No sensitive receptor present<br>Receptors present, but impacts minor<br>Receptors present, impacts mitigable<br>Receptors present, impacts likely and unmitigable   | Score: <u>3</u>               |
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</b>  |  | <b>Total Score:</b> <u>22</u> |