



Joint Facility Advisory Commission Buck and Carlin Springs Subcommittee Phase 1 Status Report

Introduction

The newly established Joint Facilities Advisory Commission (JFAC) was created to provide input to the County Board and School Board on capital facilities needs assessment, capital improvement plans and long range facility planning. The Boards may also jointly direct the Commission to undertake additional projects consistent with the JFAC mission.

It was as a part of this mission that the Boards tasked the Commission with recommending potential uses for the Buck site on North Quincy Street. The Boards also tasked the Commission with recommending whether the County should take cash, Virginia Hospital Center (VHC) property on Carlin Springs Road, or other VHC-owned properties, or a combination of the two as compensation for the County-owned Edison site. To achieve this objective, the Commission piloted the first execution of the Use Determination Process recommended by the Community Facilities Study (CFS). These potential uses that result from this process will help inform the County Board's decision-making process related to the potential use of these two sites.

For these sites, the Commission created two subcommittees of the whole: the Buck Subcommittee and the Carlin Springs Subcommittee. The Commission and its subcommittees worked to complement and coordinate with other processes and commissions. The Commission and support staff monitored the Plan for Our Places and Spaces; the Four Mile Run Valley initiative; the Lee Highway Planning Initiative, and ongoing work of the Advisory Committee on Facilities and Capital Programs. Additionally, the JFAC Chairs met with the Chairs of key advisory bodies for the County and Schools to clarify roles and responsibilities. To date, the Buck Subcommittee has met four times, the Carlin Springs Subcommittee has met four times, and the full Commission has met three times.

The Commission subcommittees have completed Phase 1 of the Use Determination Process, and we are pleased to provide this interim status report as we move on to Phase 2.



Civic Engagement and Communications Plan Summary

Civic engagement and communications is a key element of the Buck and Carlin Springs Use Determination Process. The Commission has worked and will continue to work with County and APS staff to develop engagement and communication strategies that: (1) ensure a steady drumbeat of information is being shared with the community; and (2) create multiple opportunities and methods for residents to share their thoughts and ideas with the commission. The following is a summary of the JFAC Civic Engagement and Communications Plan.

Phase I

Phase I of the plan focuses on educating the public about the facility needs of the County and Arlington Public Schools – focusing on essential operations and support functions. Key components of phase I included:

- *Bus Tour:* The JFAC hosted a bus tour of key sites on February 11, which included commissioners and members of the public.
 - The tour included stops at all of the properties currently under consideration, as well as a stop at the Trades Center, home to many of the County’s essential operations and support functions.
 - Arlington TV created a video recap of the bus tour, which has been pushed out through County and APS communications tools.
- *Creating Informational Materials:*
 - *Graphics/Fact Sheets:* A series of graphics with the theme “Arlington Working for You” has been created to help the community better understand the scale of the behind the scenes effort required to support community needs. Elements of the graphics highlight parking and service needs for ART and APS bus fleets, equipment and resources needed to maintain roads and infrastructure, and many other essential operations and support functions. These are being rolled out on Arlington TV and scheduled to rotate on the television screens prominent in many County buildings.
 - *Video:* Arlington TV created a behind the scenes look at the Trades Center, hosted by JFAC member Rodney Turner, in March, which highlighted essential operations and support functions and is being pushed out through County and APS communications tools.
- *Social Media and Outreach:* While the above are important elements of the ongoing civic engagement and communications plan, there are many other elements supplementing the steady drumbeat of JFAC activities. These include:
 - Sharing information on projected needs for the next 10 years through multiple methods (e.g., at commission meetings and online).

- An e-mail list of 1,500 residents who receive a weekly communication that highlights upcoming commission and subcommittee meetings and other news and information.
- Inclusion of JFAC information in multiple County and APS communications vehicles.
- Heavy outreach via County social media channels (Facebook, Twitter), website, TV programming, etc.
- Articles in The Citizen and the insider, County-published newsletters.

Phase II

Phase II of the engagement and communications plan focuses on gathering community insights and ideas.

Open JFAC Meetings: The JFAC meetings and subcommittee meetings are open to the public, with a section of the meeting identified for gathering public comment.

Community Roundtables: The centerpiece of this effort has been a series of 12 community roundtables and 250 participants at locations throughout the County, each hosted by JFAC commissioners. Each session followed a strategically developed format designed to gather insights from members of the public to help inform the JFAC's recommendations for the County and School boards. Roundtable highlights:

- A number of methods were used to promote the roundtables. These included social media, e-mail, electronic newsletter (Arlington Insider), APS communications vehicles, posters placed throughout the community, outreach to civic associations, listed on calendars, etc.
- Hosts provided an overview of the JFAC's role and outlined challenges and opportunities at the beginning of the roundtables and followed a series of consistent discussion points in each Roundtable.
- Using a standardized discussion guide, JFAC members facilitated an interactive conversation with participations. Questions included:
 - *Buck/Shirlington:* As the JFAC puts together a framework for evaluating potential uses for the Buck and Shirlington Site, what considerations would you like for Commissioners to explore? What are the key challenges and concerns that you would like for them to be aware of as they evaluate potential uses?
 - *Virginia Hospital Center:* As JFAC explores the opportunities for the County regarding the Virginia Hospital Center—what suggestions do you have regarding the exchange of cash, land, or some combination of the two? What do you think the County should do with the cash and/or land to further address the challenges associated with siting essential operational and support services?
 - *Essential Operations and Support Functions:* What is the best way to ensure equitable distribution of space for essential operational and support needs across the County? Given the limited space, in the County, do you have creative suggestions for JFAC to consider?

Community Forum: The next major element of phase two is a community forum scheduled for May 24 at Wakefield High School.

Use Determination Process

The Community Facilities Study defined both a Siting Process and a complementary Use Determination Process. These processes have four phases, and the Commission has finished the first phase of the Use Determination Process. Below is the work that the Commission has done for the eight steps outlined for the first phase of the Use Determination Process.

- 1. Demonstrate and communicate why the property is available for a new use—** County staff, Tim O’Hora and Aaron Shriber, briefed the Buck Subcommittee on 2/27/17 and the Carlin Springs Subcommittee on 2/23/17. For the Buck site located on N. Quincy Street, this included the specifics of the County’s option to purchase the site as well as the proposal from Arcland to swap 3.53 acres of light industrial land on Shirlington Road for 2.3 acres of the Buck site. For the Carlin Springs site, the Subcommittee reviewed the County Option Agreement with VHC which gives VHC the option to acquire County owned property located at 1800 N. Edison Street (“The Edison Site”) using some combination of cash and property, which could include the Carlin Springs site or other VHC owned properties.
- 2. Identify civic engagement process and communications plan –** The Commission launched a robust public engagement and communications plan. The centerpiece of this effort has been a series of 12 community roundtables on “*Tackling Big Needs Within Limited Space.*” These roundtables were hosted by commission members across the County and resulted in 250 residents having a conversation over a month-long period with two key objectives: (1) provide education and awareness about the challenges and opportunities facing the County regarding facility and space needs; and (2) gather insights from members of the public to help inform the Commission’s recommendations to the Boards. The next major element of the plan is a community forum scheduled for May 24 at Wakefield High School.
- 3. Analyze significant characteristics of site –** There were two elements to the Subcommittees’ review of the sites. The first element was a bus tour where Commission members as well as the public had the chance to see all the sites under consideration (the Buck site on North Quincy Street, the four VHC properties on Lee Highway, the two VHC properties on 16th Street North, the VHC Carlin Springs site, and the Arcland site on Shirlington Road) as well as the Trades Center at 2700 South Taylor Street.

The second element was the briefings noted in Step 1 above. These briefings included detailed information on important site characteristics.

(Note that this step in the Use Determination Process replaces the “determine siting requirements” step in the Siting Process. Because this is not a siting process, there is no need to determine the siting requirements.)

4. **Determine and prioritize use considerations** – This effort was accomplished using a structured exercise to list and review the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and constraints for each of the sites. The goal of this kind of “SWOC” analysis is to capitalize on the strengths, overcome the weaknesses, explore the opportunities, and be cognizant of the constraints. The results of this effort also informed the parallel effort to develop the evaluation framework described below.
5. **Develop evaluation framework** – The Subcommittees started with a draft evaluation framework created from considerations documented in the Community Facilities Study. Because this is the first use of the Use Determination Process, the Commission has planned that the use of the evaluation framework would be iterative. That is, the Subcommittees would evaluate and update the framework as it uses the framework to evaluate potential uses. Another key element of the framework is that it is tiered. That means that certain evaluation factors – those in the first tiers – would be used first, and could rule out potential uses early in the evaluation. Factors in later tiers would be used to further refine the selection of the various uses. To help guide the application of the use considerations, the Subcommittees also created a purpose statement for phase 2 of the Use Determination and Evaluation Process.
6. **Consider potential complementary uses and partnership opportunities** – The Commission decided that it would be more effective to consider complementary uses and partnership opportunities as a part of phase 2 for the Use Determination Process.
7. **Outline project schedule and budget** – The Commission determined that the Use Determination Process would not need a generalized schedule and budget since it is not focused on a specific facility requirement.
8. **Develop use process timeline** – The goal of the current work is to have phase 2 of the Use Determinate Process complete in June. This would ensure that the set of potential site uses are documented and available prior to the joint Board work session on June 27th, 2017.

Process Outcomes

In addition to eight identified steps, the Use Determination Process lists eight outcomes for the first phase, which includes this status report to decision-makers and the community. We have attached to this letter documents related to five of the seven other outcomes listed below.

1. Common understanding of identified site and existing uses
2. Civic engagement process and communications plan
3. Site analysis and considerations
4. Evaluation framework
5. Use process timeline

(Note: Two outcomes have not been included. The potential complementary uses and partnership opportunities has been moved to phase 2 as mentioned above. And, the facility project schedule and budget has not been completed because that is specific to the Siting Process, not the Use Determination Process.)

DRAFT



Purpose Statement – Phase 2 of the Use Determination Process

JFAC Mission

The overall mission of the JFAC is to provide input to the Boards on capital facilities needs assessment, capital improvement plans and long range facility planning for both the Arlington County Government (the “County”) and Arlington Public Schools (“APS”).

The County and APS will each develop their own capital facilities needs assessments and capital improvement plans over the course of a two-year cycle. The capital facilities needs assessments are comprehensive reviews of the current facility capacity for County and APS services and projected service demand that will affect facility capacity. The County’s needs assessment report is the Arlington Capital Facilities Needs Assessment, and APS’ needs assessment report is the Arlington Facilities and Student Accommodation Plan. These reports are presented one year in advance of the adoption of the capital improvement plans. The County and APS capital improvement plans (CIPs) identify capital projects, their timing, and their funding sources over a ten-year period – and represent a prioritization of the projected service demands included in the needs assessment reports.

Buck Subcommittee

To develop up to three scenarios (one or more uses per scenario) that addresses Arlington’s near term public facility needs on the Buck site. Recommend these near-term uses to the County Board and School Board while considering how to meet the community’s changing long-term facility needs.

Carlin Springs (Virginia Hospital Center sites) Subcommittee

Through the agreement with Virginia Hospital Center in which the County can elect to take cash, a combination of cash and/or use of one or more of the Carlin Springs Road, Lee Highway, or the 16th Street North properties, develop up to three scenarios for uses of one or more of the sites (one or more uses per scenario) that addresses Arlington’s near-term public facility needs.¹ Recommend these near-term uses, cash, or a combination of the two to the County Board and School Board while considering how to meet the community’s changing long-term facility needs.

¹ County and APS 10-Year+ List of Needs, April 2017

JFAC DRAFT USE CONSIDERATIONS

3-Apr-17



Importance Level and Consideration

"Best" Score

Tier 1 - Pass/Fail (Phase 2b UDP)		Scenario 1		Scenario 2	
		(Notes)	Score	(Notes)	Score
Yes/No	Solves an identified County/APS facility need				
Yes/No	Acceptable to meet service demand (i.e. fire/emergency response time or snow removal facilities/equipment travel time)				
Yes/No	Accommodates (does not preclude) identified or contemplated future uses				
Yes/No	Sufficient acreage to meet need				
Yes/No	Use fits within dimensions/shape of site				

Note: UDP: Use Determination Plan

"Best" Score Importance Level and Consideration

Tier 2 - Important (Phase 2c-2e UDP)		Scenario 1		Scenario 2	
		(Notes)	Score	(Notes)	Score
General:					
Yes/No	Urgency of Use--Needed within 10 years				
Min	Greatest urgency of Use--time to meet need				
Max	Promotes greatest efficiency of service delivery (based on what facility needs to operate efficiently, apart from proximity)				
Future Use:					
Max	Greatest potential for site expansion (both expansion of the use and expansion of the site)				
Equity:					
Max	Greatest geographic equity (spread uses throughout County)				
Max	Greatest demographic equity (spread uses, both positive and negative impact fairly among neighborhoods)				
County Policies & Regulations (Land Use):					
Yes/No	Compatibility with existing GLUP (Yes/No)				
Max	If no above, greatest likelihood of being able to amend to compatible GLUP				
Yes/No	Compatibility with existing zoning (Yes/No)				
Max	If no above, greatest likelihood of being able to amend to compatible zoning				
Max	Most compatibility with other existing County policies & plans				
Max	Compliance with environmental regulations				
Site Suitability:					
Max	Appropriate locations/quantity site ingress/egress (i.e. single versus multiple access points, access to arterial v. local street)				
Environmental:					
Min	Smallest extent of environmental contamination				
Min	Least surface water issues (i.e. flooding, wetlands, stormwater runoff)				



"Best" Score Importance Level and Consideration

		Scenario 1		Scenario 2	
		(Notes)	Score	(Notes)	Score
Tier 3 - Desirable (Phase 2c-2e UDP)					



General:

Max	Site maximizes colocation of like facility elements (i.e. police impound lot and forensics lab)				
Max	Maximizes proximity to public transportation (to support users of site)				

Future Use:

Max	Maximizes building reusability—existing buildings				
Max	Maximizes building reusability—future buildings				

Land Use Compatability

Max	Greatest land use compatibility with that of nearby parcels--physical (i.e. types and intensity of uses, building location and massing, noise, light, smell, hours of use, seasonality)				
-----	---	--	--	--	--

Site Suitability:

Min	Smallest extent of topography variation (extent of elevation changes--desired: relatively flat site)				
Min	Existing site infrastructure that causes the least amount of conflict with potential uses (i.e. surface and/or below ground materials, structures)				
Min	Fewest historic / archeological issues				
Max	Greatest adaptability to meet security requirements				
Min	Least need for demolition / waste removal				
Min	Least grading or fill required				
Min	Least displacement of existing uses needed (public and private)				

Environmental:

Min	Least impact to Natural Resources (i.e.trees, animal and/or rare plant habitat, wildlife corridors)				
Max	Compliance with environmental regulations				

Legal Constraints:

Min	Fewest and least extensive easements (utility, private, public, etc)				
Min	Fewest and least extensive restrictions or covenants				
Min	Fewest and least extensive existing tenancies				

Cost: (Order of Magnitude)

Min	Lowest site preparation cost (demo, moving, supply/connect utilities, transportation)				
Min	Lowest facility cost (adding or rehabbing building or site)				
Min	Lowest operating and maintenance costs				
Min	Lowest costs of any existing tenancies (property maintenance/management, relocation costs)				

"Best" Score Importance Level and Consideration

Tier 4 - (Phase 3 UDP) - To Be Developed During Phase 2		Scenario 1 (Notes)	Score	Scenario 2 (Notes)	Score
--	--	-------------------------------	--------------	-------------------------------	--------------



General:

PLACEHOLDER

Future Use:

PLACEHOLDER

Neighborhood Characteristics:

Min	Future neighborhood traffic impact on use and vice versa				
-----	--	--	--	--	--

County Policies & Regulations (Land Use)

PLACEHOLDER

Site Suitability:

Min	Impact of potential uses for local traffic and parking				
-----	--	--	--	--	--

Utility Access:

Max	Adequate water/sewer capacity and proximity/accessibility				
Max	Adequate storm sewer capacity and proximity/accessibility				
Max	Adequate electricity/telecommunications capacity and proximity/accessibility				
Max	Adequate gas capacity and proximity/accessibility				

Environmental:

Min	Least adverse climate and energy impacts (increasing heat island effect)				
Max	Best site conditions for sustainable energy projects (e.g., shading for solar, geothermal (area available for wells – no roots, utilities, streams, etc), energy efficiency of existing buildings)				
Max	Greatest geotechnical compatibility				

Legal Constraints:

PLACEHOLDER

Cost:

Min	Lowest site preparation cost (demo, moving, supply/connect utilities, transportation)				
Min	Lowest facility cost (adding or rehabbing building or site)				
Min	Lowest operating and maintenance costs				
Min	Lowest costs of any existing tenancies (property maintenance/management, relocation costs)				

Other Considerations (Applies to Tiers 2-4, but will not be scored)		Scenario 1 (Notes Only)	Scenario 2 (Notes Only)
--	--	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Community Input

	Community input collected during use determination process				
	Other documented community input (i.e. formal letters to the County Board; adopted plans; etc)				

Other

	Availability of alternative land to meet the needs				
--	--	--	--	--	--

