

[Transmittal Letter]

Draft

Table of Contents

PART 1. REPORT

- I. Members of the Task Force
- II. Acknowledgments
- III. Background on the Formation of the Task Force
- IV. Charge
- V. Methodology
- VI. Findings
- VII. Sites Evaluated
- VIII. Pros & Cons Options Matrix
- IX. Site and Other Recommendations

PART 2. APPENDICES

Draft

I. Members of the Task Force

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Mr. Noah Simon – Chair

Ms. Alisa Cowen – Old Dominion Civic Association

Mr. Michael Hogan – Old Dominion Civic Association

Ms. Marguarite Gooden — John M. Langston Civic Association

Mr. Rodney Turner – John M. Langston Civic Association

Ms. Anne Wilson – Donaldson Run Civic Association

Mr. Frank McDermott — Bellevue Forest Civic Association

Mr. Richard Samp – Old Glebe Civic Association

Mr. Jim Pebley – Emergency Preparedness Advisory Commission

Mr. Christopher Essig – Emergency Preparedness Advisory Commission
(*appointed April 26*)

Mr. Patrick Bogenberger – Fiscal Affairs Advisory Commission

Mr. James Schroll – Planning Commission

Ms. Terri Prell – Arlington County Civic Federation

II. Acknowledgments

A sincere thank you to each Task Force member for their dedication, effort and service during the six months of existence of this group. Their open-mindedness, willingness to learn and listen, collegiality and thoughtfulness are truly appreciated.

We wish to express our appreciation to Arlington County staff for their responsiveness, hard work, insight, patience and collaborative approach to our collective work. Specifically we thank June Locker, George May and Michelle Kotula Congdon from the Department of Environmental Services; Acting Fire Chief Joseph Reshetar, Acting Deputy Chief John Warren, John Snyder (ACFD Ret.), Catherine Matthews, Sadia Sattar, Karin Talley, Brandon Harris, Mark Schwartz, Carol Mitten, Michelle Cowen and Jim Schwartz.

We offer genuine thanks to the community members who took time to attend our meetings, provide presentations, feedback, public comment and engage in thoughtful discussion on difficult issues. Specifically we thank Richard Lolich, Alexandra Bocian, Kitty Clark Stevenson, Nancy Williams, Scott Wilson, Lydia Cole, Donald Reed, Dale Smith, Ginger Brown, Edith Gravely, Nancy Iacomini, Scott McCaffrey and Eden Brown.

We'd like to thank our meeting hosts Langston-Brown Community & Senior Center, Aurora Hills Community & Senior Center and Marymount University.

Finally we want to make clear that our analysis of the difficult issues associated with response time, location and history are in no way a criticism of the brave men and women in the emergency preparedness and response professions. Our firefighters, EMS personnel and call center operators are heroes who work each day to save lives. For that we admire and thank you.

III. Background on the Formation of the Task Force

Arlington County has studied response times across the County twice. The two independent studies of Arlington's fire service (the 1999 Routley study and the 2012 TriData study) both identified travel time to areas in far North Arlington as a problem, and both recommended that one fire station be moved northward to address the problem.

In response to the TriData report, the 2015-2024 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) identified the need to relocate Arlington County Fire Station # 8 to a location further north in order to increase the number of households reachable within the County's fire and EMS response time target of 4-6 minutes. While the County Manager's proposed CIP identified the corner of Old Dominion Drive and 26th Street North as staff's preferred site, in July 2014 as part of its CIP adoption, the County Board committed to conducting a public siting process to evaluate that site along with others to determine how best to meet this need.

Staff conducted a community engagement process through a series of public meetings in the summer of 2015 to present overall issues and approach, clarify constraints and criteria, discuss the decision making process and timelines and obtain public feedback. The meetings offered participants the opportunity to suggest alternative sites and outlined a process for reviewing these sites. In July 2015 the County produced a matrix listing approximately twenty possible locations for a replacement Fire Station #8.

While the Manager's 2015-2024 CIP proposed that 10,000 square feet of space be provided for the Office of Emergency Operations at the 26th/Old Dominion location in addition to the fire station, the County Board removed that project from the Fire Station #8 siting process.

Following the summer public meetings, there was a strong desire from the broader community for more intense civic engagement before making a final siting decision for Fire Station #8. In October 2015 the County Board approved the charge for a task force to review viable sites for constructing an upgraded and expanded Fire Station #8, including its current location at Lee Highway and North Culpepper Street. In December the Board created the eleven member Task Force and approved an amended timeline for the group's work (extending it to May 2016). The Task Force held its first meeting on January 14, 2016 at the Langston-Brown Community & Senior Center.

IV. Charge

FIRE STATION #8 TASK FORCE CHARGE

*Review viable sites for a replacement Fire Station #8 (currently located at Lee Highway and North Culpepper Street)

*Identify potential sites that meet the fire department's operational criteria to include:

- Improve fire/EMS response times

- Location(s) that does not adversely affect response elsewhere in the County

- A site that is able to accommodate a 3 or 4 bay station with drive-through access and parking for 12 personal vehicles

- A site on, or in close proximity to, an arterial street

*Balance service needs with cost (operating and capital)

*Recommend a site based on the consensus of the Task Force membership; if no consensus can be reached, provide 2-3 sites with justifications for each

V. Methodology

Meeting Structure and Content

In order to meet the County Board's charge the Task Force met twice monthly, in open session, beginning January 14, 2016 and concluding May 26, 2016. The Task Force met only once in January and three times in February to accommodate for a snowstorm.

Each meeting began with opening comments and announcements of relevant community meetings the chair had attended or was scheduled to attend; each meeting ended with a period of public comment. During public comment community members who had come to observe the Task Force's proceedings, addressed the Task Force for approximately two to three minutes. In total, the Task Force heard ___xxx___ comments from ___xxx___ different people.

Meeting Presentations

A list of meetings and their topics can be found in Appendix _____. Three meetings were held at Langston-Brown Community & Senior Center, six at Marymount University and one at the Aurora Hills Community & Senior Center. Following two of the meetings, Task Force members toured Fire Stations #8 and #5. For the first six meetings, a variety of presenters provided information on the Task Force's charge and associated timelines, the County's planning process, CIP and budget, Lee Highway planning, the Public Facilities Review Committee's report, the TriData study and the history/legacy of Fire Station #8. Following each presentation Task Force members engaged in a facilitated question and answer session. Questions that could not be readily answered were taken for the record and provided at a later point. Meeting materials to include agendas, presentations, data collection, citizen statements and contact information were posted to a dedicated Task Force website along with other written information considered by the Task Force. The final four meetings were presentations given by, and facilitated discussions among, Task Force members.

Data Collection

The Task Force undertook an extensive data collection effort. Specific topics requested included but were not limited to response time, fire box maps, land values, architectural drawings, sector plans, history, mutual aid, operational requirements, staffing and budget. Task Force members and the public submitted the questions during and in between meetings. Once the answers were shared with Task Force members they were posted on the public website. Throughout the process the Task Force remained committed to the idea that whatever information it had, the public had. All data provided to the Task Force remains available on the public website. The data was used to inform discussion, understand emergency preparedness and response operations, and inform Task Force meeting agendas and decision-making.

Guiding Principles

The Task Force recognized early in the process that a vote by the County Board to create the group was not enough to bind it together. Therefore, the Task Force created, discussed and ultimately adopted a set of Guiding Principles. The Principles:

- Guided what the Task Force did and to some degree how it did it;
- Expressed to the public how deliberations would occur and what would guide decision-making;
- Helped the Task Force stay within the charge and scope;
- Were not intended to constrain decision-making;
- Were not independent, but overlap in many ways;
- Served as the foundation of a solution set(s) and consensus building.

The adopted Guiding Principles are below.

**Guiding Principles
Fire Station #8 Task Force**

GUIDING PRINCIPLE	WHAT IT MEANS	WHY IT IS IMPORTANT
The Task Force will honor the historical significance of Fire Station #8 while deliberating and drafting our report.	We will focus on what the fire station's establishment and presence has meant to the Arlington community.	As an inclusive, diverse community our work requires us to understand and appropriately honor the past.
The Task Force will evaluate the capabilities of, and impact on, emergency preparedness and response systems and personnel both for the present and the future while deliberating and drafting our report.	We will work to understand programmatic requirements, the risks to the community of various solutions and the impact of each solution on the capabilities of emergency responders.	We owe it to Arlington residents to assess and recommend a site(s) that maximizes public safety, provides equitable service and meets current and future needs of the community.
The Task Force will evaluate operating and capital costs, including loss of opportunity costs, while deliberating and drafting our report.	The cost of a new fire station must be considered within the context of overall expenditures of a government with finite resources.	Fiscally irresponsible recommendations run the risk of unfavorable consideration by the County Board.
The Task Force will actively and constructively communicate and work with one another, County government and the public in a civil, respectful and reasonable manner.	Everyone participating in this process is acting in what he or she believes is in the best interests of the County, so while there may be disagreements all views deserve respectful consideration.	Task Force work will be more effective if our business is conducted in an open, civil and consensus-building manner.

Subgroups

To further execute on the charge and build consensus, five subgroups were created:

- Framework
- Response Time
- Financial
- Siting
- Historical/Legacy

The subgroups were comprised of Task Force members with no member serving on more than one group. The subgroups met in open session and appropriately advertised their meetings through public notice. In fact, community members attended at least two subgroup meetings. Each subgroup gave report ours with a corresponding PowerPoint presentation. The Historical/Legacy report was given orally with no presentation. Subgroup presentations can be found under Appendix _____

Framework for Building Consensus

The Task Force created a Framework as an additional building block to reach consensus. The Framework, a set of specific questions, was developed by the Framework Subgroup and approved by the full membership. The Framework:

- Pinpointed the challenges at hand and key elements to inform the Task Force's recommendation(s);
- Helped to find consensus on identified problems;
- Helped determine what constituted a solution; and
- Identified functional requirements needed to make decisions

The adopted Framework questions are below.

**Fire Station 8 Task Force
Framework Questions**

- 1) Do you think that the fire station should only be built on County-owned property?
- 2) Would you advocate that the County Board spend money to acquire private land to build a new fire station?
- 3) Would you advocate that the County build a fire station with 1, 2, 3, or 4 bays?
- 4) How would the construction of a 1, 2, 3, or 4-bay fire station meet the County Board charge to balance capital and operating costs?
- 5) Would you support the costs (capital and operating) for a temporary fire station and/or the expense to move the fuel pumps?
- 6) County Staff has indicated that the fire station would cost approximately \$14 million for capital expenses. Are you willing to support the County Board expand the budget? If yes, by how much?
- 7) To what extent does density – existing and anticipated – within the Fire Station #8 service area and elsewhere in the County, weigh in the determining a location for Fire Station #8?
- 8) To what extent does the historically Black community’s experiences of segregation, discrimination, and denied access to public fire safety services for decades as compared to all other communities in Arlington, weigh in the consideration of elements outlined in the County Board charge?
- 9) The charge says that the Task Force should consider sites that improve fire/EMS response times, but the charge does not establish a specific level of improvement. How do you define improved response times? Is it response within a specified range of time, improvement by a certain percentage, or another measure?
- 10) Are there additional factors the Task Force should consider that impact response times other than location of a fire station? If so, what are those?
- 11) The charge says that the Task Force should consider (a) site(s) that do “not adversely affect response elsewhere in the County.” How do you define adverse impact?

VI. Findings

The April 28 meeting was dedicated to a facilitated discussion designed to answer the Framework questions. The discussion and members’ responses were in large part informed by the other subgroup report outs. The following results from the Framework discussion are the **consensus** findings of the Task Force:

Response Time

- Uniform response time is unachievable.
- Instead of uniform response time, the County should provide adequate service to the greatest number of people.
- Adequate is defined as the greatest number of people in the four to six minute response time.
- When considering a location, Fire Station #8 (and future new fire stations) should be sited where the maximum number of people are within a four to six minute response time.
- Adversely affecting response time means that within Fire Station #8's first due more people would be removed from a four to six minute response time than are brought within a four to six minute response time.

Demand and Density

- Overall demand should be a consideration in siting a fire station. As the TriData report states, "To reduce loss and be efficient a best practice is to place resources close to where they can do the most good—not treat every area the same."
- Nobody should have totally inadequate service, but the County should not focus on providing "equal" service to outlying areas where demand is low at expense of service in high demand/heavily populated areas.
- A significant increase in density should be expected along Lee Highway including in Fire Station #8's first due service area.
- Future growth in Arlington is projected to be greater along the Lee Highway corridor than in the residential areas of far North Arlington.
- While density and demand should be considered when assessing where to locate a fire station, neither is determinative.

Cost

- The Task Force recommendations assume that the cost of a new fire station must be considered within the context of overall expenditures of a government with finite resources and bond authority.
- The Task Force urges the County Board to use fiscal responsibility when considering the location of Fire Station #8.

- Regardless of location, the Task Force believes building a four bay station, rather than a three bay station, is more cost effective.
- The Task Force believes the station's construction will play a significant role in maintaining the health and safety of Arlington residents, workers and visitors and views the replacement of Station #8, regardless of location, as a worthwhile financial investment.
- The Task Force urges the Board to look at strategic savings and efficiencies related to the project, specifically the stated cost of a temporary fire station. The County should consider creative approaches to reduce the temporary station's cost estimate to include leasing versus purchasing options and considering vacant properties within Fire Station #8's service area as a temporary station location.

History and Legacy

- The history of Fire Station #8 and its legacy to the Halls Hill/High View Park and overall Arlington community must be considered to a large degree when determining the location of Fire Station #8. However, the history and legacy of Fire Station #8 should not be the sole determinate factor in locating a site.

VII. Sites Evaluated

Prior to listing sites for consideration, the ACFD and County staff worked with Task Force members to explain specific fire station program requirements and their value. As noted earlier in this report, Task Force members toured Fire Stations #8 and #5 to understand the needs of the current station and the requirements in place at a recently built station. The Task Force evaluated a number of locations consistent with the County Board charge. In its evaluation, the Task Force considered areas in an established neighborhood park or in a resource protected area disqualifying factors in site selection. The Task Force strongly recommends against the County Board using eminent domain to acquire any site for all or part of replacing Fire Station #8.

The Task Force first analyzed the list of twenty-one sites compiled by the County following the Summer 2015 public meetings. The County's list can be found under Appendix _____. From that list the Task Force developed a narrower list of "focus sites." The sites are outlined below with the Task Force's determination of feasibility.

- Saint Mary's Episcopal Church Residential Properties
Church leadership communicated its desire for the properties to be removed from consideration because the Church's discernment process will continue well past the decision to site a fire station.
- Rock Spring Park (5012 Little Falls Road)
The site is in Resource Protection Area (RPA) and an established neighborhood park. The Task Force rejected construction of a fire station in any RPA or currently identified neighborhood park.
- Washington Golf and Country Club Land
The county club's leadership transmitted a letter stating it is not interested in the sale of any of its land for the purposes of a fire station. The letter can be found under attachment ____
- Glebe Road and Yorktown Boulevard
The Task Force rejected this location because it would displace three homes at an assessed value of approximately \$3.14 million. Further, the homeowners have not been approached to sell and there was, to our knowledge, no indication they would want to sell. Operationally, exiting onto Yorktown Blvd. would limit quick access to Glebe Road and exiting onto Old Dominion near a busy intersection would cause considerable challenges.
- 26th Street and Old Dominion
The Task Force deemed this location a viable site as it meets all operational requirements defined in the charge.
- Current Fire Station 8 Site and Adjacent Properties
In April the Task Force was presented architectural drawings showing a three or four bay station could be built at the current location with no land acquisition. The drawings also showed a rendering that included buying the adjacent property (xxxxxxx) to accommodate the construction of a three or four bay station at the current site. The Task Force deemed this location a viable site as it meets all operational requirements, with or without the land acquisition, defined in the charge.
- Satellite/Substation
The Task Force considered the construction of a satellite (also referred to as a substation) to serve the far northern neighborhoods -- an option not detailed in the Summer 2015 County list. The Task Force requested, and received, information on a standalone one or two bay station that could accommodate an itinerate medic unit attached to Fire Station #8. The rationale for exploring such an option was to locate a substation closer to the need identified in the far northern neighborhoods and to reduce response times. The water pump station at Old Glebe Road and Military Road or somewhere closer to the Madison Community Center were locations the

group discussed. The \$7.6 million cost for a single bay and \$10.1 million for a two bay station made the option cost prohibitive, therefore the Task Force rejected proposing construction of a satellite/substation.

Cost Matrix

A cost matrix based on the two viable station replacement locations is below. The matrix outlines three options—one to relocate the station to 26th Street & Old Dominion; one to replace Station #8 at the current location with purchase of the adjacent property and keep the fuel pumps on site (but relocated to accommodate for parking); and one to replace Station #8 at the current location with no land acquisition, which would required relocating the fuel pumps off site. Rebuilding at the current site would require a temporary fire station. While the matrix does list three bay construction costs, the Task Force is unanimous in its position that building a four bay station is more cost effective.

Fire Station - Rough Order of Magnitude Cost Matrix						
Options	Land Acquisition	Demolition	Design & Construction Cost	Total Capital Cost	Annual operating Cost	Notes
Existing Lee Hwy site - 3-bay	\$-	\$325,000	\$13,572,000	\$13,897,000	\$60,000	Demo building; no fuel pump; includes cost for removal of fuel pump only. Excludes cost of temporary station.
Existing Lee Hwy site 4 - bay	\$-	\$325,000	\$13,900,000	\$14,225,000	\$70,000	Demo building; no fuel pump; includes cost for removal of fuel pump only. Excludes cost of temporary station.
Existing Lee Hwy site - 3-bay with adjacent property	\$800,000	\$375,000	\$14,072,000	\$15,247,000	\$60,000	Demo building; can accommodate a fuel pump on site but would need to relocate from current location onsite; cost for removal and relocation of fuel pump onsite included. Excludes cost of temporary station.
Existing Lee Hwy site 4 - bay with adjacent property	\$800,000	\$375,000	\$14,400,000	\$15,575,000	\$70,000	Demo building; can accommodate a fuel pump on site but would need to relocate from current location onsite; cost for removal and relocation of fuel pump onsite included. Excludes cost of temporary station.
26th & OD site - 3 bay	\$-	\$-	\$13,572,000	\$13,572,000	\$60,000	No temporary station needed.
26th & OD site - 4 bay	\$-	\$-	\$13,900,000	\$13,900,000	\$70,000	No temporary station needed.
Temporary Station during FS#8 construction at current site	TBD	\$-	\$3,750,000	\$3,750,000	\$20,000	Site TBD
Removal and relocation of fuel pumps	TBD	\$100,000	\$900,000	\$1,000,000	N/A	Site TBD
Operation cost - PM/CM - \$500K for all 10 stations, Utilities range from \$10K for 2 bay & 3 bay to \$20k for 4 bay						

VIII. Pros & Cons Options Matrix

The County Board requested the Task Force delineate “pros” and “cons” for a replacement fire station at a particular location(s). Please find the options matrix below:

	Pros	Cons
Current Location 4845 Lee Highway	The current footprint meets the minimum size requirements to build a three or four bay station.	Response times to the far northern neighborhoods would not improve. ¹
	Exits onto a four-lane road, which meets the charge’s requirement for exiting onto an arterial street.	The buffer and driving apron are smaller than operational requirements although smaller sizes would not negatively impact mission readiness or capabilities.
Current Location 4845 Lee Highway	Meets the charge’s requirement for construction of drive thru apparatus bays. Meets charge’s requirement for sufficient parking.	To rebuild on the existing footprint the fuel pumps located at Station #8 would need to relocate off site at a cost of \$1 million.
	Meets the charge’s requirement to balance service needs with costs (operating and capital).	Keeping the fuel pumps on site would require the purchase of the adjacent residential property for ~\$800,000 and \$500,000 to move the pumps to another location at the current site to accommodate for parking.
	The site is on county owned land.	A temporary station would be required to rebuild at the current location at a cost of \$3.7 million.
Current Location 4845 Lee Highway	Environmental benefit that no usable green space would be	

¹ Later in the report, the Task Force will provide recommendations outside the scope of the charge that would likely reduce total response times regardless of where the station is built.

Current Location 4845 Lee Highway	eliminated.	
	Overall demand for fire and EMS services from Fire Station #8 are closer to the current location and to its south than to its north closer to 26 th & Old Dominion.	
	Future growth in Arlington is projected to be greater along the Lee Highway corridor than in the residential areas of far North Arlington.	
	Station # 8 has been located on its current site since 1963. For more than fifty years, service has been provided throughout its first due areas with no indication from the public of either dissatisfaction, or systemic failure to deliver adequate service.	
	The original Station #8 building was located at the current site and was the first officially African American run and operated fire station south of the Mason-Dixon line.	
Current Location 4845 Lee Highway		

	Pros	Cons
26th Street & Old Dominion	Meets the charge's requirement to improve response times. ²	26 th Street is a minor arterial street, which could present operational problems if the station were sited there.
	The available land meets the minimum size requirements for a three or four bay station to include space for an adequate buffer and driving apron.	Overall demand for fire and EMS services from Fire Station #8 are closer to the current location and to its south than to its north closer to 26 th & Old Dominion.
	Meets charge's requirement for exiting onto an arterial street.	Significantly more density will occur south of the proposed Old Dominion and 26 th Street site than to its north.
26th Street & Old Dominion	Meets charge's requirement for drive thru apparatus bays.	Reduces existing green space.
	Meets charge's requirement for sufficient parking.	Time required for master planning of this location could delay construction leading to building cost escalation.
	Meets the charge's requirement to balance service needs with costs (operating and capital).	
26th Street & Old Dominion	Relocating Station #8 would not result in inadequate service, as defined by the Task Force, for any sections of the County that currently receives adequate service.	

² Later in the report, the Task Force will provide recommendations outside the scope of the charge that would likely reduce total response times regardless of where the station is built.

	The site is on County owned land.	

IX. Site and Other Recommendations
[To be written by the May 26 Task Force Meeting]

Draft