

January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary

## 1. Review Homeless Strategies Workgroup Scope and Information Resources

The Homeless Strategies Workgroup (HSW) was formed by [Whatcom County Resolution 2017-055](#) on October 24, 2017 by action the Whatcom County Council.<sup>1</sup>

Chairperson, Whatcom County Councilman Barry Buchanan welcomed the appointed members and public participants, see Meeting 3 Attendance Roster on page 8. Chair Buchanan and the facilitator, Mary Dumas, stated the focus for Meeting 3 of the HSW:

***Continue ranking Sites E, F and G from the City of Bellingham's (COB) Initial Criteria Analysis<sup>2</sup> and discuss new sites suggested by HSW members located within the COB/LMM analysis area.***

***Review next steps for identifying two to three alternative solutions to living unsheltered in Whatcom County, with priority given to solutions that can be initiated to prevent people from having no other option than to sleep outside as the weather gets cold.***

An information update was distributed by Hans Erchinger-Davis, Lighthouse Mission Ministries (LMM) in response to member questions regarding the COB-LMM partnership concept for an easy-access emergency shelter, Draft Location Criteria 1-8 (see box on below) and services for a 200-bed easy-access shelter. See HSW website January 18, 2018 [Meeting 3: Handouts](#) for LMM handout.

This HSW Meeting 3 summary (i) documents presentations and materials provided to the HSW, (ii) highlights the workgroup's key discussion points, clarifying questions and action items and (iii) provides a roster of attendees. An audio recording of the meeting proceedings can be found on the webpage established for this Whatcom County Council ad hoc committee along with electronic copies of all presentations and handouts

<http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/2747/Homeless-Strategies-Workgroup>.

### Easy-Access Shelter DRAFT Location Criteria

- 1) 5-10 minute walk from Lighthouse Mission
- 2) 5-10 minute walk from downtown core
- 3) Away from residential
- 4) Permitted by current zoning
- 5) Compatible with City of Bellingham current plans and regulations
- 6) Access to transit
- 7) Potential available for use (vacant or under-developed public land)
- 8) Meets required criteria for vacant site and/or building.

\*2017 Draft Location Criteria prepared by COB, with LMM

## 2. Continue Ranking of Identified Potential Sites and Initial Pros and Cons

The objective of HSW Meeting 3 was to complete review of the COB and the LMM work conducted in a [joint effort](#) to identify a suitable site for an easy-access shelter in Bellingham.

<sup>1</sup> Full Resolution 2017-055 available on the Homeless Strategies Workgroup webpage at url:

<http://documents.whatcomcounty.us/weblink8/0/doc/4207806/Page1.aspx?searchid=6aa5b93b-9368-4909-a0b1-a00f962c1733>

<sup>2</sup> See HSW Meeting 2 Summary for pros/cons identified for Sites A-D available at HSW webpage.

Summary of key topics, questions and materials discussed.

## January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary

Chris Behee, COB Planning provided an overview of City's Criteria Analysis and Tier 2 Sites E and F prior to the initial ranking. HSW members raised questions and discussed potential impacts that could arise due to current or future adjacent uses, physical characteristics of the site or compatibility of use with the neighborhood for Sites E and F.

An additional Whatcom County-owned site was added to the list for HSW review, Site G: York parking lot that is tied to zoning with the State Street Health Department (10 parking spaces). HSW questions, responses and discussion points on Site E, F and G are highlighted below. A table summarizing the initial pros and cons for each site follows. See HSW website [Meeting 3: Handout 1](#) for a map-based analysis of Sites E, F and G, which includes HSW Meeting 2 discussion points on Sites A-D's pros, cons and hidden impacts.

### Questions, comments and discussion regarding Sites E, F and G:

- The Mayor clarified that the objective of siting a 200-bed easy access shelter in the community is more than a project of COB and LMM. A shelter is a need addressed by both the City of Bellingham and Whatcom County, each with different roles.
- The question was raised regarding how the shelter fits into the bigger problems of homelessness. *Is a 200-bed shelter an immediate step to advance in the big picture of needs and resources?*
- *How does siting of an easy-access shelter work with individuals who have sexual offenses? Does that affect someone's ability to get served at the Drop-in Center or siting requirements, e.g., 1000ft away from a school?* The LMM Drop-in Center policy allows sex offenders with Level 1 status into the Drop-in Center on a case by case basis; Level 2 and 3 status are not.
- The idea of repurposing sites that allow for existing buildings to be used should be considered in the recommendation discussion.
- Concentrating too many LMM services and shelters in one area could happen if LMM sites were repurposed or expanded on properties adjacent to existing facilities.
- Factor in the cost of putting a structure on the site as opposed to re-use of an existing one.
- *What are the costs for redevelopment of parking lots Sites E, F and G related to risks of capped brownfields and mitigation costs?* This is something to consider in site ranking.
- *How will transport between LMM site be handled, e.g., walking between locations or van?* LMM noted the Easy-Access Shelter is a standalone shelter, though meals could get van transported.
- *Can LMM clarify the Drop-in Center function and hours of use versus the Easy-Access Shelter?* These are the same thing. The goal of the new facility is to have showers, storage, office space for other agencies to meet with Drop-in Center guests. Hours of service aim to be open 24 hours, 3 meals a day. As far as clients walking between LMM sites and shelters, the Drop-in Center guests tend to stay for the day.

## January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary

Tier Two Sites: - Owner, Location	Questions	Pros - Possible positive impacts	Cons - Possible negative impacts
<b>SITE E. COB</b> <b>- Municipal Court Parking Lot</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Could proximity to school impact shelter access for those with sexual offense charges or records?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Easy site to construct upon (no demolition)</li> <li>● Not too many cars dislocated</li> <li>● Ready for development</li> <li>● Civic core adjacency could be helpful for some services</li> <li>● Utilities on site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Too close to school, playing fields which may attract loitering</li> <li>● Outside area needed for shelter clients not compatible with neighboring uses</li> <li>● Two vulnerable populations close to each other not wise</li> <li>● Residential proximity</li> <li>● Adjacent to Police Department, (may concern for some clients)</li> <li>● Not aligned with COB long-term goals for urban village in area</li> <li>● Rezone may be required</li> <li>● This site more suitable to other types of housing, work/life with parking (even rent out), so close to downtown core</li> </ul>
<b>SITE F. COB</b> <b>- Employee Parking Lot</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Easy site to construct on</li> <li>● Surrounded on three sides by civic and commercial uses</li> <li>● Farther away from school</li> <li>● Could use partial lot for walled outdoor garden to separate from neighboring use</li> <li>● Ready for development</li> <li>● Could build two-stories on site to use less of the lot area</li> <li>● No long-term plan for this parking lot area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Adjacent to Police Department (may concern for some clients)</li> <li>● Not much distance from school</li> <li>● Closer to Senior Center and vulnerable adults</li> <li>● Site is suitable for different housing types ( long-term plan)</li> <li>● Displaced COB employee parking would be moved to the Site C.</li> <li>● This site more suitable to other types of housing, work/life with parking (even rent out), so close to downtown core</li> </ul>
Additional Site: - Owner, Location	Questions <i>Site identified using Criteria 2-8</i>	Pros - Possible positive impacts	Cons - Possible negative impacts
<b>SITE G. WC</b> <b>- York Parking Lot</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Is Walton Place a secure facility with key cards?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Only a portion of site needed</li> <li>● Size of lot allows for outdoor spaces</li> <li>● More urban feeling to area rather than industrial</li> <li>● Further distance from the elementary school</li> <li>● Somewhat private space (Walton should not be impacted by outdoor area)</li> <li>● Close to Unity Care and WTA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● York side of site has residential</li> <li>● Zoned downtown core commercial</li> <li>● A lot of small businesses in the adjacent area could be impacted</li> <li>● Further away from LMM</li> <li>● By siting closer to the downtown core, impacts will be on businesses</li> <li>● Rainbow Center moved from this very area</li> <li>● This parking lot is a capped site for Environmental remediation (a no further action letter was sent to the County in 2016)</li> </ul>

## January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary

- *How will proximity to the Police Department play in the siting of the shelter?* One thing expressed at the City Hall camp protest this winter was that many people were able to sleep and felt safe. This was interesting as the Police Department is only one block away, like so many of these sites (Sites: C, D, E and the Whatcom County Health Department).
- Additional sites the HSW could review: H: Whatcom County Health Department and Site I-K: Reconfigure and expand current LMM properties with willing partners and adjacent sites.

### 3. Initial Rankings of Identified Potential Sites within the COB-LMM Study Area

At HSW Meeting 2 HSW members proposed continued ranking of (i) sites identified using the COB-LMM criteria (Tier 2 Sites: E and F), (ii) additional properties identified by HSW members within the COB-LMM study area) and (iii) additional properties identified using proposed adaptations to the COB-LMM location criteria (Site G, identified using Draft Criteria 2-8, see page 1).

COB planning staff prepared a site ranking exercise to support the HSW activity. See HSW website [Meeting 3: Packet](#) for the Homeless Strategies Workgroup Site Ranking Exercise Worksheet. The packet was distributed prior to the January 18, 2018 HSW Meeting with instructions and an invitation to add ranking criteria to the exercise. Two additional criteria were recommended and approved by HSW members: d) *perceived cost of redevelopment is low*, and e) *perceived cost for operations is low*.

Initial Ranking Results for Sites A-G are provided below. Tara Sundin and Chris Behee reviewed the ranking instructions. HSW members completed the rankings individually. The facilitator conducted an oral tally of responses. The COB planning staff calculated the scoring during the meeting. Following the meeting the initial ranking tallies were confirmed by meeting audio review, the totals were recalculated, with corrections shown below. Note a higher number equals a higher ranking.<sup>3</sup>

Site	Ranking Total
Site A: COB - Bellingham Police Department Site	133* (127)
Site B: Whatcom - 401 Grand Parking Lot	160* (162)
Site C: Whatcom - Court House Parking Lot	152* (150)
Site D: COB - 600 West Holly	162* (157)
Site E: COB - Municipal Court Parking Lot	130* (156)
Site F: COB - Employee Parking Lot	155* (152)
Site G: Whatcom - York, Champion, Railroad, State	165

\* Ranking total figure corrected from Jan. 18, 2018 (calculation error) using meeting audio.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix A on pages 8-11 for a brief explanation of the ranking method and worksheet tally totals by Site. Summary of key topics, questions and materials discussed.

January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary

#### 4. Next Steps for HSW Site Recommendation

HSW members requested time to discuss the big picture of the City and County's long-term facilities needs and explore ways to leverage available funds by building a facility with multiple functions. Permanent housing and services to get there are also part of the shared work of the City and County. There are a lot of people working on this issue.

It was noted that the City and County need to work very closely beyond site ranking. The start of the HSW's work focused on the 200-bed shelter because of the properties that the City and County own. Additional strategies will be identified and discussed by the HSW members.

#### Other properties within the City of Bellingham's Initial Criteria Analysis Area

- *Can HSW fully consider the Whatcom County Health Department lot across the street from Site A and Site F? Could this site be repurposed to include the easy access shelter? This location is a better placement than the downtown core and has a pleasant outdoor space. This is part of an ongoing discussion at the Whatcom County Administrative branch about the whole Health Department operation (this site and the State Street building location). That is an opportunity the County has suggested to the City of Bellingham.*

#### Features to consider

- Property is 30,000 square foot (2/3<sup>rd</sup> acre, shorelines rules and footprint limitations).
  - Adjacent parcel is owned by the City of Bellingham.
  - On the creek side the shelter could have pleasant outdoor space.
  - This site could be cheaper to redevelop, as some could be a rebuild.
  - The site selection and building and construction needs (expected lifespan of building temp/permanent) should be considered
  - Building of the shelter should be considered
  - This site is very equivalent to the Site A. Police Department.
  - 12,000 square foot building currently in use on this site.
- *Siting a drop in shelter in a new location will be a challenging task in any neighborhood. Is it possible to solve the need for drop-in shelter by consolidating the LMM existing Drop-In Center building, adjacent LMM and publically owned properties and reconfiguring the site to get the access into the center off the street? practically speaking. Areas of the current LMM sites could be used for small apartments and transitional program and housing for 50-100, a multi-story building for offices and services. This gets people off Holly Street yet keeps solution on site where it is at rather than bringing services into downtown core?*
  - *Some of these ideas might be a good fit for service coordination and reduced neighborhood impacts. There is some appeal to keeping the Drop-in Center in proximity to other service providers, which may be helpful to others.*
  - *Concerned about a high concentration a demographic of homeless in one area, e.g. Old Town.*

## January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary

- Adjacent properties might be redeveloped to accommodate parking needs and housing needs, and some of the adjacent buildings to LMM properties are not structural appropriate for an open-space designed shelter with clear line of sight (dormitory style).
- *How much administration office is needed by LMM and how much space does this free up for beds and service areas?* Top floor of the two-story Life Center building is used for LMM administrative offices. LMM's front door is wide open with the Drop-in Center and the limiting factor is space and program support for more people who want to move from the Drop-in Center to shelter program, and from shelter into the addiction recovery. Ideally, a location with room for the Drop-in Center and other LMM shelter-based programs would be ideal. A place with 75,000 square feet would allow for many programs to expand number of beds. To be in one place reduces costs to staff.
- *Could temporary structures be used on site with reduced costs on sites like these? What are we intending to build, e.g., temporary uses or 100-year permanent building standards?*
- *What areas won't have neighbor issues?* Some places site shelters and day-use drop-in locations near light industrial, but not near store fronts and residential typically.
- *Right now we've only be looking at sites owned by COB and Whatcom County. There are many other locations in and around the downtown core with vacant buildings and parking lots sizable to accommodate a shelter, though many people in the downtown core are already concerned with the idea of drop-in shelter and clients impacting business.*

### **ACTIONS:**

- HSW members will discuss considerations and questions about the highest ranked Sites at the HSW Meeting 4.
- Other properties identified by HSW members that are within the City of Bellingham's Initial Criteria Analysis Area will be presented to the HSW for review, discussion and ranking prior to recommendation development.
- HSW members will review HSW Meeting Summaries 1 , 2 and 3 and provide edits or additions to HSW Chair, Barry Buchanan and facilitator, Mary Dumas prior to HSW Meeting 4.

### **5. Alternative Solutions for Those Sleeping Outside in Whatcom County**

It was noted that the HSW will review and add to the list of alternatives solutions raised thus far at HSW meetings. The list is provided in the HSW Meeting 2 Summary and provided below for the ease of the reader.

- Permitted camping area.
- Dumpsters for homeless community to discard their belongings when needed.
- Stop clean ups of homeless peoples' belongings at camps and RV parking areas.
- Bathroom facilities with 24 hour access for those who work shifts.
- Shower facility with 24 hour access for those who work shifts.
- Lockers for storages of valuables with 24 hour access.
- Laundry facilities.

## January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary

### ACTION:

- HSW will review the [City of Bellingham Community Solutions Work Group](#) November 2017 - Continuum of Housing Implementation Matrix summarizing key strategies they have identified for addressing gaps in the homelessness continuum of services and facilities.

### 6. Public Comment

No public comment was offered during Meeting 3.

### January 18 Meeting 3 Attendance Roster

#### Present:

Barry Buchanan, Whatcom County Councilmember (WC)  
 Rud Browne, Whatcom County Councilmember (WC)  
 Jack Louws, Whatcom County Executive (WC)  
 Michael Lilliquist, City of Bellingham Councilmember (WC)  
 Dan Hammill, City of Bellingham Councilmember (COB)  
 Kelli Linville, City of Bellingham Mayor (COB)  
 Alice Clark, Downtown Network (DN)  
 Guy Occhiogrosso, Bellingham/Whatcom Chamber of Commerce (BWCC)  
 Hans Erchinger-Davis, Lighthouse Mission Ministries (LMM), Lighthouse Mission Ministries (LMM)  
 Mike Parker, Opportunity Council (OC)  
 Robin Meyer, Northwest Youth Services (NWYS)

#### Public:

Cindy Louws, Sara Nuckolls,

#### Support Staff:

Tara J. Sundin, Christopher Behee, City of Bellingham Planning  
 Tyler Schroeder, Whatcom County Administration  
 Bridgett Reeves, Lighthouse Mission Ministries  
 Mary Dumas, Dumas & Associates, Inc., Facilitation Support

### January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Information

Presentations and Handouts	Source	Webpage Location
HSW Workgroup Meeting 3 Agenda	Tara Sundin, COB	January 18, 2018 - Meeting 3: Agenda
Presentation: Ranking Results for Easy-Access Shelter DRAFT Location Criteria	Chris Behee, COB	January 18, 2018 - Meeting 3: Presentation 1
Homeless Strategies Workgroup Site Ranking Exercise Worksheet		January 18, 2018 - Meeting 3: Packet
Community Solutions Workgroup - Continuum of Housing Implementation Matrix	Tara Sundin, COB	January 18, 2018 - Meeting 3: Handout
Resources cited in Meeting 3 Presentation	Source	link or <filename>
Community Solutions Workgroup - Continuum of Housing Implementation Matrix	Tara Sundin	Link <a href="https://www.cob.org/Documents/mayor/community-solutions-workgroup/csw-housing-report-of-recommendations.pdf">https://www.cob.org/Documents/mayor/community-solutions-workgroup/csw-housing-report-of-recommendations.pdf</a>

## January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary Appendix A

### Initial Ranking Worksheet for Potential Sites within the COB-LMM Study Area

Purpose: At Homeless Strategies Workgroup (HSW) Meeting 2, HSW members proposed continued ranking of  
 (i) sites identified using the COB-LMM criteria (Tier 2 Sites: E and F),  
 (ii) additional properties identified by HSW members within the COB-LMM study area) and  
 (iii) additional properties identified using proposed adaptations to the COB-LMM location criteria (Site G, identified using Draft Criteria 2-8, see page 1).

This Appendix presents the HSW Meeting 3 Initial Ranking Exercise tally results for Sites A-G.

Method: City of Bellingham (COB) Planning staff prepared a site ranking worksheet to support the ranking activity. The Homeless Strategies Workgroup Site Ranking Exercise Worksheet is available on the HSW website January 18, 2018, [Meeting 3: Packet](#). Ranking exercise steps are outlined below.

1. The Ranking Exercise worksheet and instructions were distributed by email to HSW members prior to the January 18, 2018 HSW Meeting.
2. HSW members were invited to add ranking criteria to the exercise at HSW Meeting 3.
3. At the January 18, 2018 Meeting 3, HSW members added two additional criteria to the ranking exercise: d) *perceived cost of redevelopment is low*, and e) *perceived cost for operations is low (factors include: distance from LMM, one-story vs two-story)*.
4. Prior to ranking, each Site A-G was reviewed using the map-based handouts and worksheet.
5. Tara Sundin and Chris Behee reviewed the ranking instructions with the HSW.
6. HSW members individually completed their rankings for Sites A-G.
7. The facilitator conducted an oral tally of HSW responses so HSW members and public attendees could see each other's views on the initial ranking.
8. All members voted on all criteria for all sites.
9. COB Planning staff compiled the tally results and calculated the weighted scoring to prepare total ranking numbers for each site.
10. Higher total ranking number equals higher ranking.
11. \* During preparation of the Meeting 3 Summary the audio file was reviewed by the facilitator to confirm tallies for each Site. Mathematical calculations for the weighted totals were checked by the facilitator and COB planning Staff. Corrected ranking totals are noted with an asterisk\*. The initial ranking Jan. 18 meeting calculations totals are provided in ( ).

Ranking Results for Sites A-G are provided below.

Potential Site	Ranking Total
Site A: COB - Bellingham Police Department Site	133* (127)
Site B: Whatcom - 401 Grand Parking Lot	160* (162)
Site C: Whatcom - Court House Parking Lot	152* (150)
Site D: COB - 600 West Holly	162* (157)
Site E: COB - Municipal Court Parking Lot	130* (156)
Site F: COB - Employee Parking Lot	155* (152)
Site G: Whatcom - York, Champion, Railroad, State	165

\* Ranking total figures corrected from Jan. 18, 2018 calculation error using meeting audio.

## January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary Appendix A

Site Name	Criteria	Strongly Disagree 1	2	Somewhat Agree 3	4	Strongly Agree 5
<b>TIER ONE SITES</b>						
<b>Site A: COB - Bellingham Police Department Site</b>	a. This site is compatible with existing adjacent uses.	0	6	4	1	0
	b. This site is ready for development of a low-barrier shelter.	1	7	3	0	0
	c. This use at this site is aligned with long-term community plans/goals.	1	4	5	0	1
	d. <i>Perceived cost of redevelopment is low.</i>	5	3	3	0	0
	e. <i>Perceived cost for LMM operations is low.</i>	0	4	7	0	0
<b>Site A Score: 133</b>	<b>Comments/Notes: Total corrected from Jan. 18 live meeting calculation of 127</b>					
<b>Site B: Whatcom - 401 Grand Parking Lot</b>	a. This site is compatible with existing adjacent uses.	0	2	4	3	2
	b. This site is ready for development of a low-barrier shelter.	1	3	2	2	3
	c. This use at this site is aligned with long-term community plans/goals.	1	3	5	2	0
	d. <i>Perceived cost of redevelopment is low.</i>	2	2	7	0	0
	e. <i>Perceived cost for operations is low.</i>	0	4	7	0	0
<b>Site B Score: 160</b>	<b>Comments/Notes: Total corrected from Jan. 18 live meeting calculation of 162</b>					
<b>Site C: Whatcom - Court House Parking Lot</b>	a. This site is compatible with existing adjacent uses.	5	4	3	0	0
	b. This site is ready for development of a low-barrier shelter.	0	1	3	5	2
	c. This use at this site is aligned with long-term community plans/goals.	2	7	2	0	0

## January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary Appendix A

Site Name	Criteria	Strongly Disagree 1	2	Somewhat Agree 3	4	Strongly Agree 5
	d. <i>Perceived cost of redevelopment is low.</i>	0	1	7	3	0
	e. <i>Perceived cost for operations is low.</i>	0	3	6	2	0
<b>Site C Score: 152</b>		Comments/Notes: Total corrected from Jan. 18 live meeting calculation of 150				
<b>Site D: COB - 600 West Holly</b>	a. This site is compatible with existing adjacent uses.	2	1	4	1	3
	b. This site is ready for development of a low-barrier shelter.	2	0	6	2	1
	c. This use at this site is aligned with long-term community plans/goals.	6	4	0	0	1
	d. <i>Perceived cost of redevelopment is low.</i>	2	1	5	2	1
	e. <i>Perceived cost for operations is low.</i>	0	0	4	4	3
<b>Site D Score: 162</b>		Comments/Notes: Total corrected from Jan. 18 live meeting calculation of 157				
TIERTWO SITE						
<b>Site E: COB - Municipal Court Parking Lot</b>	a. This site is compatible with existing adjacent uses.	7	3	1	0	0
	b. This site is ready for development of a low-barrier shelter.	0	1	3	7	0
	c. This use at this site is aligned with long-term community plans/goals.	9	2	0	0	0
	d. <i>Perceived cost of redevelopment is low.</i>	0	1	8	2	0
	e. <i>Perceived cost for operations is low.</i>	0	5	6	0	0
<b>Site E Score: 130</b>		Comments/Notes: Total corrected from Jan. 18 live meeting calculation of 156				

## January 18, 2018 Meeting 3 Summary Appendix A

Site Name	Criteria	Strongly Disagree 1	2	Somewhat Agree 3	4	Strongly Agree 5
Site F: COB - Employee Parking Lot	a. This site is compatible with existing adjacent uses.	1	7	3	0	0
	b. This site is ready for development of a low-barrier shelter.	0	0	4	7	0
	c. This use at this site is aligned with long-term community plans/goals.	2	6	4	0	0
	d. <i>Perceived cost of redevelopment is low.</i>	1	0	7	3	0
	e. <i>Perceived cost for operations is low.</i>	0	3	7	1	0
<b>Site F Score:</b> <b>155</b>	<b>Comments/Notes:</b> <i>Total corrected from Jan. 18 live meeting calculation of 152</i>					
<b>Site G:</b> <b>Whatcom</b> <b>- York,</b> <b>Champion,</b> <b>Railroad,</b> <b>State</b>	a. This site is compatible with existing adjacent uses.	1	2	6	1	1
	b. This site is ready for development of a low-barrier shelter.	0	2	2	4	3
	c. This use at this site is aligned with long-term community plans/goals.	2	3	3	3	0
	d. <i>Perceived cost of redevelopment is low.</i>	1	0	7	3	0
	e. <i>Perceived cost for operations is low.</i>	1	2	8	0	0
<b>Site G Score:</b> <b>165</b>	<b>Comments/Notes:</b>					