



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

July 3, 2012

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

ADOPTED

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

13 July 24, 2012

Sachi A. Hamai
SACHI A. HAMAI
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

FACILITY LOCATION SELECTION APPROVE POLICY REVISION (ALL DISTRICTS) (3 VOTES)

SUBJECT

The recommended actions will revise the County's existing Facility Location Selection Policy to broaden the criteria and analytical process utilized in the development of facility location recommendations to provide the Board with clearer, better balanced, and more consistent facility location recommendations.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD:

Approve the Revised Facility Location Selection Policy and Process, as described herein, and to be managed by the Chief Executive Office.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

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 (CEO) 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.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

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 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 Revised Policy will be administered by the CEO.

Current Location Selection Policy

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 co-location 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 Policy redefines the categories of service functions, yet continues 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.

Consideration of these additional factors, or “Location Selection Criteria”, is intended to enhance the analysis of potential facility locations and provide the County Board of Supervisors with greater clarity and consistency in its decision-making process. It should also provide a more comprehensive and better balanced perspective of a facility’s ability to service a targeted area, its compatibility with local communities, and the fiscal costs. The proposed criteria and analytical process would be applied on a facility-by-facility basis and is outlined below.

a. Establish service function categories

- Central general government functions: e.g., Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors, CEO, Auditor-Controller, County Counsel, Human Resources, and Chief Information Office.
- Countywide general government service functions: e.g., Assessor, Internal Services, Regional Planning, Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk, and Treasurer and Tax Collector.

- Regional and local public service functions: e.g., Agricultural Commissioner/Weights and Measures, Animal Care and Control, Beaches and Harbors, Children and Family Services, Community and Senior Services, Chief Medical Examiner-Coroner, District Attorney, Fire, Health, Mental Health, Military and Veterans Affairs, Museum of Art, Museum of Natural History, Parks and Recreation, Probation, Public Defender, Public Health, Public Library, Public Social Services, Public Works, and Sheriff.

- b. Determine service area(s) for each department.
- c. Apply Location Selection Criteria to service area data:
 - Need for proximity to service area and population.
 - Need for proximity to existing County facilities.
 - Need for proximity to Los Angeles Civic Center.
 - 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.
 - Estimated acquisition/construction and ongoing operational costs.
- d. Analyze results and identify location alternatives.
- e. Determine benefits and drawbacks of each alternative based upon functional needs, service area, cost, and other Location Selection Criteria.
- f. Formulate location recommendations to Board of Supervisors for final location selection decision.

This Revised Policy and Process will be implemented immediately upon approval by the Board.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

The recommended actions will support the Board-approved County Strategic Plan Goals of Operational Effectiveness (Goal 1) by maximizing the effectiveness of process, structure, and operations to support timely delivery of customer-oriented and efficient public service.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
July 3, 2012
Page 5

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Approval of the Revised Policy and Process is intended to decrease long-term operational costs by enhancing service support and optimizing operational efficiencies. There will be no short-term impact on the General Fund fiscal position.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The Revised Policy is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it is an activity that is excluded from the definition of a project by Section 15378(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines. The proposed actions are administrative activities of government that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes to the environment.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES OR PROJECTS

The recommended actions will not have an adverse impact on County services or projects.

CONCLUSION

Please return one adopted copy of this Board letter to the Chief Executive Office, Capital Projects Division.

Respectfully submitted,



WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

WTF:RLR
DJT:cvb

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS

July 24, 2012

Relates to Item 9 on the July 17, 2012 Agenda
Updated Facility Relocation Policy

Agenda Item 9 on today’s agenda is a board letter that describes the framework for an updated Facility Selection Policy, per the Board of Supervisor’s (Board) direction on September 7, 2010. The core opportunity of updating the Facility Selection Policy is to provide staff with a clearer framework and criteria for evaluating potential locations for the placement of Los Angeles County’s (County) various leased buildings and capital projects.

The proposal thoughtfully incorporates some of the criteria utilized by the Federal, State and Los Angeles City governments, which will provide a more comprehensive framework for weighing the variety of elements that should be considered when placing a municipal building.

However, one issue that is critically missing from this framework is a clear cut mandate to place central government functions, including the headquarters of Departments, in locations that are centrally located downtown or have excellent public transit access, and are thereby accessible to the variety of constituents and County staff that may need to travel to and from anywhere throughout the 4,000 square miles of the County to access services. This also reinforces the Board’s substantial investment in the County’s public transit network and commitment to sustainability.

- MORE -

MOTION

MOLINA _____

RIDLEY-THOMAS _____

KNABE _____

ANTONOVICH _____

YAROSLAVSKY _____

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
July 24, 2012
PAGE 2

The attached amended Facility Selection Policy incorporates much of the framework of the Chief Executive Officer's original proposal, while specifying the importance of cost and budget considerations, as well as a clear policy for placing central and regional government functions. Specifically, instead of differentiating facilities by "service function categories", this updated framework categorizes facilities by service area (i.e. facilities which serve the entire County, facilities which serve a specific sub-region of the County, and facilities which serve a site-specific location need). The changes from the original policy are underlined.

I THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

Adopt the attached alternative Facility Selection Policy for the Chief Executive Officer to use a guideline for the process and criteria in evaluating potential placements for facilities that are leased and owned by the County of Los Angeles.

###

Facilities Location Policy **County of Los Angeles**

This Facilities Location Policy provides guidelines to County staff in their identification and evaluation of alternative sites for County facilities, including public facilities such as libraries and fire stations, office space, warehouses, service yards and other buildings and land necessary to support County services. This policy applies to both leased facilities and capital projects.

The process described below is intended to provide clarity and transparency in the evaluation of alternative sites. County evaluation processes for facility locations should consider 1) the effective delivery of County services, 2) control of costs, and 3) support of other important public policy goals.

The evaluation and recommendation process will be conducted by the Chief Executive Office. Final decisions will be made by the Board of Supervisors.

Steps for identifying location alternatives, evaluating alternatives, and preparing a recommendation to the Board of Supervisor shall be as follows:

A. Establish a Service Area for each facility requirement.

County facilities generally fall into three categories:

1. Facilities which serve the entire County

These facilities include central government functions such as the Board of Supervisors, CEO, Auditor-Controller, County Counsel, Human Resources, and Chief Information Office, as well as Headquarters for Departments, and other operations for which there is only one facility.

Where feasible, facilities in this category should be located near to the center of Los Angeles County, preferably within a 10-minute walk of the Hall of Administration, or at a convenient subway, light rail portal or dedicated busway service.

This will enable equitable access to the facility by constituents and employees from all portions of the County. It will also promote use of the region's expanding public transportation infrastructure.

2. Facilities which serve a specific sub-region of the County

These facilities include branch offices of departments such as libraries, public social services, the Sheriff and others with multiple facilities scattered in local communities.

For facilities in this category, the County should identify a specific regional Service Area for each facility.

These facilities should be located near to the center of their Service Areas, at locations that will promote the use of public transit.

3. **Facilities with a site-specific locational need**

These facilities house operations at the beaches, Marina del Rey, performance venues, museums and other sites where facility locations are established by specific service or geographic needs.

Facilities in this category will be located where required by their program.

B. Identify Location Alternatives within the identified Service Area for each requirement, and give consideration to the following Location Selection Criteria in evaluating the alternatives.

1. **Suitability for County program and operations**

2. **Estimated acquisition or construction cost, and future operational costs**

3. **Apply Location Selection Criteria**, with specific consideration of the following:

- a) Proximity to public transportation
- b) Economic development potential
- c) Availability of suitable existing buildings (as opposed to new construction), especially existing County-owned buildings
- d) Availability of suitable historic buildings
- e) Availability and proximity of affordable housing for County employees
- f) Compatibility with local land use plans and policies
- g) Suitability for future expansion
- h) Sustainability

C. Summarize the benefits and drawbacks of each Location Alternative, based on County operational needs, cost, and other Location Selection Criteria.

D. Submit a location recommendation for each facility to the Board of Supervisors for final location selection.