

JFAC USE CONSIDERATIONS
WHAT FITS - PART 3 EVALUATION

13-May-17



Buck Scenario A: North Side Safety Campus w/ Bus Depot

| Tier 2 - Important (Phase 2c-2e UDP) | | Scenario 1 (Notes) | Score |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|-------|
| General: | | | |
| | Urgency of Use--Needed within 10 years | Four facilities: ART bus, police emergency and mobile equipment, OEM building, as well as police impound lot/forensics building are identified on 10-Year+ List. | |
| Min | Greatest urgency of Use--time to meet need | ART Bus parking decision required by 2018. Police emergency needed by 2019, Police mobile equipment and impound lot/forensics building needed by 2023-2025, OEM needed by 2019. Addresses three top priority urgent needs and one lower priority need. | |
| Max | Promotes greatest efficiency of service delivery (based on what facility needs to operate efficiently, apart from proximity) | Re-use of two buildings and allows for adequate site circulation. Condition of buildings requires additional investment in order to implement scheme. Low investment compared to new construction. | |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|
| Future Use: | | | |
| Max | Greatest potential for site expansion (both expansion of the use and expansion of the site) | ART Bus parking can be repurposed for a future use if a new location is found within the County. The re-use of both the warehouse and office building allows for redevelopment in the future. While site could potentially be expanded west toward N. Quincy St. and north by decking over I66, both of these options have varying levels of physical, cost and/or legal/ownership constraints. | |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| Equity: | | | |
| Max | Greatest geographic equity (spread uses throughout County) | Currently ART and police equipment located in south Arlington. OEM currently housed in central Arlington. Proposed use places three facilities in north Arlington. North Arlington currently has limited essential operational and support services. | |
| Max | Greatest demographic equity (spread uses, both positive and negative impact fairly among neighborhoods) | Evaluation is based on neighborhood demographics (ethnic background, age, and household income) of existing facility location compared to proposed location. | |

| County Policies & Regulations (Land Use): | | | |
|---|--|--|----|
| Yes/No | Compatibility with existing GLUP (Yes/No) | No. GLUP is "Low Residential" | |
| Max | If no above, greatest likelihood of being able to amend to compatible GLUP | Relatively low, although perhaps there is a GLUP solution that includes a buffer or transition between the neighborhood and operational uses in the north of the site, or alternatively a long term solution that expands uses across I66. | |
| Yes/No | Compatibility with existing zoning (Yes/No) | Yes. Any playground in the R-5 portion of the site, or any park/playground/playfield in the C-O-1.0 area needs a use permit. | |
| Max | If no above, greatest likelihood of being able to amend to compatible zoning | | NA |
| Max | Most compatibility with other existing County policies & plans | Comprehensive Plan elements: GLUP No, other elements need more research. Virginia Square Sector Plan--Buck site not included in plan area. Neighborhood Conservation Plan (not a County Board adopted plan--No.) | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Site Suitability: | | | |
| Max | Appropriate locations/quantity site ingress/egress (i.e. single versus multiple access points, access to arterial v. local street) | OEM/Police Mobile and Emergency Vehicles are low impact to travel unless thier is a emergency and the EOC is activated. ART Bus traffic is limited to specific times throughout the day. | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Environmental: | | | |
| Min | Smallest extent of environmental contamination (existing site) | Some anticipated contamination due to historic light-industrial and rail use. | |
| Min | Least surface water issues (i.e. flooding, wetlands, stormwater runoff) | Stormwater runoff for ART Bus parking | |
| Min | Least impact to Natural Resources (i.e. trees, animal and/or rare plant habitat, wildlife corridors) | Scheme reuses built environment. No existing rare plant or animal habitat. No significant tree impact. | |
| Max | Level of effort/mitigation required to comply with environmental regulations | Minimum impact since two building that are existing remain and most of the site is already parking. | |

"Best" Score Importance Level and Consideration

| Tier 3 - Desirable (Phase 2c-2e UDP) | | Scenario 1 (Notes) | Score |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|-------|
| General: | | | |
| Max | Site maximizes colocation of like facility elements (i.e. police impound lot and forensics lab) | Located police mobile equipment and police emergency vehicles in one building. Rating light green because only one colocation of like facility elements in a building with bus parking with similar light industrial uses. If building is used for APS swing space, students would need to be separate from OEM staff. | |
| Max | Maximizes proximity to public transportation (to support users of site) | Employees driving the 90 ART buses and OEM employees will have access to Ballston Virginia Square metro. Employees access police emergency vehicle and police mobile equipment less frequently and typically by patrol car. If office used for APS swing space, safe bus, parent drop off and pedestrian path. | |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|--|
| Future Use: | | | |
| Max | Maximizes building reusability--existing buildings | Reuses 2 out of 4 buildings. If building used for APS swing space, would need to determine if safe for students including air quality analysis and MEP/HVAC. | |
| Max | Maximizes building reusability--future buildings | ART Bus parking can be repurposed for a future use if a new location is found within the County. The re-use of both the warehouse and office building allows for redevelopment in the future. | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Land Use Compatibility | | | |
| 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) | Intermittent noise, possible lights, particularly for buses. Potential mitigation with heavy landscape buffer. Reuse of buildings maintains existing development massing/impact. | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|-----|
| Site Suitability: | | | |
| Min | Smallest extent of topography variation (extent of elevation changes--desired: relatively flat site) | Grading will be required to accommodate bus parking, green buffer area, and playground. No grading need for reuse of existing buildings. If building used for APS swing space, ADA path would be required to connect through Hayes Park to ASF. | |
| Min | Existing site infrastructure that causes the least amount of conflict with potential uses (i.e. surface and/or below ground materials, structures) | Reuse of existing building and bus parking have little impact on existing infrastructure and will not require major infrastructure relocation. | |
| Min | Fewest historic / archeological issues | TBD | TBD |
| Max | Greatest adaptability to meet security requirements | ART Bus parking will require fencing. If building used for APS swing space, students must be kept separate from other uses they will have to walk by every day. | |
| Min | Least need for demolition / waste removal | 2 building will be razed. | |
| Min | Least grading or fill required | Grading will be required to accommodate bus parking, green buffer area, and playground. No grading need for reuse of existing buildings. If building used for APS swing space, additional grading required for bus and parent drop off plus connection through Hayes Park. | |
| Min | Least displacement of existing uses needed (public and private) | Dynamic gymnastics, jumping joeys, and martial arts studio will be displaced. | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Legal Constraints: | | | |
| Min | Fewest and least extensive easements (utility, private, public, etc) | No anticipated constraints with existing easements. | |
| Min | Fewest and least extensive restrictions or covenants | No anticipated impacts due to the existing covenant. | |
| Min | Fewest and least extensive existing tenancies | None. | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----|
| Cost: (Order of Magnitude) | | | |
| Min | Lowest site preparation cost (demo, moving, supply/connect utilities, transportation) | Reuse of existing building and bus parking have little impact on existing infrastructure and will not require major infrastructure relocation. 2 building will be razed. | |
| Min | Lowest facility cost (adding or rehabbing building or site) | There will be a cost to fitout and update base building infrastructure to reuse 2 buildings. If APS swing space fitout costs will be higher. | |
| Min | Lowest operating and maintenance costs | Lower cost since only 2 buildings remain. If APS swing space, operating costs will be higher associated with MEP/HVAC and possible after hours use. | |
| Min | Lowest costs of any existing tenancies (property maintenance/management, relocation costs) | N/A | N/A |