

Facility Location Selection Policy

The County's current Facility Location Selection Policy (Policy) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1998 and assigns priority to aligning the location of County facilities with programmatic service areas/populations and long-term cost efficiency. On September 7, 2010, the Board directed the Chief Executive Office to draft revisions to the current Policy to include consideration of proximity to a central business district, economic development potential, access to public transportation and affordable housing, and existing buildings.

In response to the Board's direction, the CEO has reviewed the facility location policies of the Federal and State government and the City of Los Angeles and has prepared revised criteria and process for the preparation and presentation of facility location recommendations for consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

It is intended that the proposed revisions to the Policy will apply to new General Fund leases and new capital construction projects. The Policy will be administered by the Chief Executive Office.

Current Location Selection Criteria

Under the County's current Policy, priority is placed on centralized locations for central service departments, proximity of regional service departments to service areas/populations, and the collocation of departments that serve overlapping service populations. Access to public transportation is an important factor, although it is not explicitly stated in the current Policy. Finally, priority is also placed on one-time acquisition and construction costs, ongoing operational costs, and long-term cost mitigation opportunities.

The primary goals underlying the facility location policies utilized by the Federal and State governments and the City of Los Angeles vary slightly based upon the nature and breadth of their functional and operational perspectives. The Federal government, for instance, primarily focuses on the development and redevelopment of the nation's cities and assigns priorities to the conservation of resources and improvement of social, economic, environmental, and cultural conditions of urban communities. The Federal policy also stresses conformity with State and local development objectives as well as a preference for centralized business areas.

The State's facility location policy is designed to support sound growth patterns in the State's local jurisdictions by minimizing the impact of State-owned assets through utilization of existing State-owned assets, improving accessibility, and reducing environmental impacts. The City of Los Angeles has placed a priority on consolidating departments that provide city-wide services in the Civic Center and those that serve specific regions or communities at its regional and community centers. Such a consolidation is intended to support the conservation of existing urban infrastructure and resources.

All three entities support their primary goals by placing further emphasis on consideration of the potential impact on a region's or community's social, economic, historic, and cultural

fabric; the availability of affordable housing for its employees; and accessibility to public transportation.

The current location selection criteria of the Federal, State, and City governments, as well as the County, are summarized in the following table.

Selection Criteria	Federal	California	City of L.A.	County
Central Business Area	❖	❖	❖	
Proximity to Specified Service Area			❖	❖
Economic Development Potential	❖	❖	❖	
Accessibility to Public Transportation	❖	❖	❖	
Availability of Affordable Housing for Employees	❖	❖	❖	
Reuse of Historic Buildings	❖	❖	❖	
Availability of Existing Buildings	❖	❖	❖	
Consistency with Local Land Use Plans	❖	❖		
Cost		❖		❖

Revised Selection Criteria and Process

The Revised Facility Location Selection Policy would redefine the categories of service functions and continue to give priority to aligning service functions with client populations. Other factors that contribute to the analysis of potential facility locations, however, would be expanded to include criteria that are also considered by the Federal government, State of California, and City of Los Angeles.

The inclusion of these additional criteria is intended to enhance the analysis of potential facility locations and provide the County Board of Supervisors with greater flexibility in its decision-making process. The proposed criteria and analytical process would be applied on a facility-by-facility basis and is outlined below.

a. Establishment of service function categories

- Central general government functions: e.g. Board of Supervisors, Executive Officer, CEO, Auditor-Controller, County Counsel, Human Resources, and Chief Information Office.
- Countywide general government service functions: e.g. Assessor, Coroner, Internal Services, Regional Planning, Registrar-Recorder, and Treasurer.
- Regional and local public service functions: e.g. Agricultural Commissioner, Animal Care, Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Libraries, Community and Senior Services, Public Social Services, Community and Family Services, Sheriff, Probation, District Attorney, Public Defender, Fire, Health, Public Health, Mental Health, and Military and Veterans Affairs.

b. Identification of service populations for each functional category

- Central government services
- Internal central service functions
- Countywide general public services
- Social, Health, and Mental Health services
- Public safety services
- Cultural and Recreation services

c. Determination of service areas for each department

d. Identification of overlapping service areas and populations

e. Application of Location Selection Criteria to service population and service area data

- Need for proximity to central business area (L.A. civic center)
- Need for proximity to service area and population
- Need for proximity to existing County facilities
- Economic development potential
- Proximity to public transportation
- Availability of affordable housing for County employees
- Use of historic buildings
- Availability and compatibility of existing buildings
- Compatibility with local land use plans
- One-time acquisition/construction and ongoing operational costs

f. Analyze results and identify location alternatives

g. Determine benefits and drawbacks of each alternative based upon functional needs

h. Formulate location recommendations to Board of Supervisors

- Option that is most proximate to service area and population
- Option that provides highest economic development potential
- Option that maximizes use of existing or historic buildings
- Option that is the most cost effective
- Option that best balances the positive aspects of the previous options

All options will consider access to public transportation and availability of affordable housing