

**FAIRFAX COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
October 18, 2016**

REVISED

**ADDENDUM
AGENDA**

ACTION ITEMS

- 7 [Acceptance of the Public Financial Management, Inc. \(PFM\) Public Safety Review, Dated September 20, 2016, and Endorsement of the General Recommendations](#)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 5:30 [Public Hearing on Proposed Plan Amendment 2016-CW-1CP, Countywide Policy Plan](#)

Board Agenda Item
October 18, 2016

ACTION - 7

Acceptance of the Public Financial Management, Inc. (PFM) Public Safety Review, Dated September 20, 2016, and Endorsement of the General Recommendations

ISSUE:

Board acceptance of the Public Financial Management, Inc. (PFM) Public Safety Review report as presented to the Personnel and Reorganization Committee on October 4, 2016, and endorsement of its general recommendations. The Board of Supervisors had directed the engagement of a consultant to perform an organizational and compensation review for the Fairfax County Police Department (FCPD) and a compensation review for the Sheriff's Office.

In its report, PFM made 11 total recommendations. Six (6) recommendations deal with Police organizational structure, three (3) with Police compensation and two (2) with Deputy Sheriff compensation and Police-Sheriff pay parity.

RECOMMENDATION:

The County Executive recommends the Board of Supervisors accept the Public Financial Management, Inc. (PFM) Public Safety Review report and endorse its general recommendations. The County Executive and senior staff will work with staff from the Police Department, Sheriff's Office, Department of Management and Budget, and the Department of Human Resources to develop a phased, multi-year implementation plan for consideration of the PFM recommendations in the FY 2018 Advertised Budget Plan and future fiscal years.

TIMING:

Board action is requested at the October 18, 2016, Board meeting.

BACKGROUND:

As part of the Budget Guidelines approved with the FY 2016 Adopted Budget Plan, direction was given to the County Executive and County staff to work with public safety agencies and employee groups, with the assistance of an outside consultant, to provide analysis and develop recommendations regarding: the reorganization of the operational and administrative structure of the Police Department, to include, but not limited to, possible changes to the current rank structure, the organizational structure, and pay for police officers. Additionally, the consultant studied the organization of the Animal Services Division and possible pay parity between uniformed Sheriff and Police employees. PFM was awarded the contract to conduct this scope of work and the portions of the study concerning the organizational and

Board Agenda Item
October 18, 2016

compensation structure of the Police Department was presented to the Board of Supervisors at the October 4, 2016, Personnel and Reorganization Committee. The PFM review proposed 11 areas of organizational and compensation changes to improve the Police Department's management of operations and to ensure it continues to attract the best candidates by offering a competitive compensation package.

PFM's core change proposals also align with similar recommendations for the improvement of both the organizational structure and recruitment as related to compensation submitted to the County by the Ad Hoc Police Practices Review Commission and in the Use of Force Review conducted by the Police Executive Research Forum.

The complete study conducted by PFM is attached for reference. The study also includes a compensation review of the Fairfax County Office of the Sheriff. On these matters, PFM made 11 total recommendations. Six (6) recommendations deal with Police organizational structure, three (3) with Police compensation and two (2) with Deputy Sheriff compensation and Police-Sheriff pay parity.

If approved, the County Executive and senior staff will continue to work with staff from the Police Department, Sheriff's Office, Department of Management and Budget, and the Department of Human Resources to develop a phased, multi-year implementation plan for consideration of the PFM recommendations in the FY 2018 Advertised Budget Plan and future fiscal years.

County staff, primarily from the Department of Human Resources and the Sheriff's Office, will also use data collected to continue a review of work that was outside of the scope of the PFM study. Specifically, staff will analyze the organization of the operational and administrative structure of the Sheriff's Office, to include, but not limited to, possible changes to the current rank structure, the organizational structure, and the appropriate pay structure for staff in the Sheriff's Office.

FISCAL IMPACT:

It should be noted that any funding decisions will come back before the Board of Supervisors for final approval. As discussed at the October 4, 2016, Personnel and Reorganization Committee meeting, there is a significant range in the potential fiscal impact of the PFM recommendations depending primarily on implementation decisions. The estimate provided was between \$14.27 million and \$22.87 million to be phased in over multiple years. These figures will be refined by the implementation teams and presented at a future Personnel and Reorganization Committee meeting, in time so that consideration of funding the first phase can be discussed as part of the FY 2018 budget process.

Board Agenda Item
October 18, 2016

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS:

Attachment 1 - Public Financial Management, Inc. (PFM) Public Safety Review, dated September 20, 2016 is available online at:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/hr/organizational-compensation-studies.htm>

STAFF:

David M. Rohrer, Deputy County Executive

Colonel Edwin C. Roessler Jr., Chief of Police

Sheriff Stacey A. Kincaid, Sheriff's Office

Catherine Spage, Director, Department of Human Resources

Board Agenda Item
October 18, 2016

5:30 p.m.

<p>REVISED PC Verbatim Attachment 1</p>
--

Public Hearing on Proposed Plan Amendment 2016-CW-1CP, Countywide Policy Plan

ISSUE:

Plan Amendment (PA) 2016-CW-1CP proposes to amend the locational and character criteria for public school facilities in the Public Facilities section of the Policy Plan element of the County's Comprehensive Plan.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

On Thursday, September 29, 2016 the Planning Commission voted 10 – 0 (Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting) to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the approval of the Planning Commission Schools Committee's recommendation for Plan Amendment 2016-CW-1CP found in the proposed text dated September 14, 2016.

RECOMMENDATION:

The County Executive recommends that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Planning Commission recommendation.

TIMING:

Planning Commission public hearing – July 28, 2016
Planning Commission decision – September 29, 2016
Board of Supervisors' public hearing – October 18, 2016

BACKGROUND:

On March 1, 2016, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors authorized Plan Amendment (PA) 2016-CW-1CP to direct staff to update location and character criteria for public school facilities in the Public Facilities section of the Policy Plan element of the County's Comprehensive Plan. This Plan Amendment was authorized by the Board in response to Fairfax County's growth strategy, which encourages development in the County's activity centers. The probable lack of available sites in activity centers that can be developed at a low intensity for public schools requires the consideration of smaller sites developed at a higher intensity. Additionally, the lack of available sites for new

Board Agenda Item
October 18, 2016

schools and education facilities may require the co-location of these facilities, and the repurposing of buildings planned for other uses to schools and education facilities. The existing Policy Plan language does not provide the needed flexibility for schools and education facilities in activity centers and urbanized areas of the County, necessitating an update of the policy plan. Staff coordinated with the Planning Commission Schools Committee and the appointed School Boards members over seven (7) meetings to develop the proposed Plan Amendment language.

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS:

Attachment I: Revised - Planning Commission Verbatim and Recommendation
Attachment II: Planning Commission Handout
Attachment III: Proposed Plan Text

Staff Report for PA 2016-CW-1CP, previously furnished and available online at:
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/amendments/staff_report_2016-cw-1cp.pdf

STAFF:

Fred Selden, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
Marianne Gardner, Director, Planning Division, DPZ
Chris Caperton, Branch Chief, Planning Division, DPZ
David Stinson, Planner II, Planning Division, DPZ

Planning Commission Meeting
September 29, 2016
Revised Verbatim Excerpt

PA 2016-CW-1CP – PUBLIC SCHOOLS POLICY PLAN AMENDMENT

Decision Only During Commission Matters
(Public Hearing held on July 28, 2016)

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, on March 1st, 2016, the Board of Supervisors authorized Policy Plan Amendment 2016-CW-1CP. The authorization directed staff, working with the Planning Commission's Schools Committee, Fairfax County Public Schools, and the Fairfax County School Board, to consider development of revised locational and character track criteria for public school facilities in the public facilities section of the Policy Plan element of the County's Comprehensive Plan. Through a series of seven public meetings, the Schools Committee, with input from staff, Fairfax County Public Schools, and the School Board, revised the Policy Plan text addressing the Board's authorization. This initiative is part of the County's effort to plan for future educational facilities. The policy language takes transit-oriented, higher-density development into consideration with the addition of vertical design guidelines for schools and other educational facilities. It provides for innovative and creative uses of space in new forms and structure. No, we are not abandoning the traditional school design that continue to serve as the hallmark and central core of so many of our communities. They will always have their place and value in our county. What we are doing, instead, is creating a new tool in the toolbox, an additional and contemporary design element for educational facilities that is in sync with the way many of our current and future citizens will go to school. One very positive outcome of this process is a very positive and collaborative working relationship between members of the School Board and Facilities Planning and the Planning Commission and County staff. This collaboration resulted in a positive update of the Schools Policy Plan and a foundation for teamwork as collectively – as we collectively tackle future issues in support of our school system. I'd like to thank several people for the effort and the tremendous achievement that we have. One is School Board Chairman, Sandy Evans, from the Mason District. And another friend, who is here tonight, is a Mount Vernon School District Board Member, Karen Corbett Sanders, who joins us for this final vote. She served as the School Board's liaison to the School Committee, along with Chairman Evans. They provided invaluable insight and guidance, not to mention the commitment of time to our committee meetings, as well as all the other meetings they attend. It was invaluable to have them here. The same can be said for Jeff Platenburg and Kevin Sneed, with School Systems Facilities Planning Department. They helped us better understand the guidelines for good schools and design and helped us understand the vision for designing future schools. My gratitude, as well, to Chris Caperton and David Stinson from County's planning staff for their guidance in keeping us focused on our mission for the Board of Supervisors. You not only found the right words and policy text, gentlemen, to describe a new vision for educational facilities. You kept us on the straight and narrow when it comes to our adherence to and support of the Comprehensive Plan and its policies. I'd like to ask a couple of questions, if I could, with that before I make my motion, Mr. Chairman. And I'd like to ask Mr. Stinson just a couple of questions, if I may. There was extensive discussion regarding before and after school child care facilities and programs. And, in addition to the fact that the policy document does not impinge – and should not – on the School Board's authority, the draft language regarding school-age child care does **not** preclude or prohibit or discourage their placement. Is that correct?

David Stinson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Yes, that is correct.

Commissioner Sargeant: And we had a review through the County Attorney's Office to ensure that our language was not impinging in that fashion in any way. Correct?

Mr. Stinson: Yes. That was the determination of the County Attorney's Office.

Commissioner Sargeant: And also, there was a contractual relationship too between the School Board and the Board of Supervisors when it comes to after school child care. Correct?

Mr. Stinson: Correct. Yes.

Commissioner Sargeant: And that does not – what we are doing here does not impinge on that relationship, contractually or anything else. Correct?

Mr. Stinson: Correct.

Commissioner Sargeant: I think we've managed to strike a positive and appropriate balance, Mr. Chairman. And with that, I'd like to go ahead and make my motion. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE APPROVAL OF THE SCHOOLS COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2016-CW-1CP FOUND IN THE PROPOSED PLAN TEXT DATED SEPTEMBER 14TH, 2016. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioners Migliaccio and Strandlie: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio and...

Commissioner Sargeant: I think Ms. Strandlie is...

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Strandlie?

Commissioner Strandlie: And then I have a statement.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Please. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Sargeant: What? I think she was seconding and making a statement with her motion – with her second.

Commissioner Strandlie: Yes. I was seconding and then I was going to make a statement.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Discussion? Go ahead.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Sargeant. This has been a very thorough review of the School's Policy Plan. We appreciate the direct involvement of the School Board members, Karen Corbett Sanders and School Board Chair, Sandy Evans. During the public hearing process, we heard from constituents. I think they were all from the Mason

District. The decision was deferred while the Schools Committee and the Commission considered resident comments. Many changes were incorporated in the document that we will vote on tonight. The committee spent a great deal of time crafting the wording of this revised policy. We worked with Ms. Corbett Sanders and Ms. Evans and the FCPS staff to provide design and program – programming flexibility for future school sites. And Ms. Corbett Sanders is here tonight and we thank you very much for – for taking time out tonight to be with us. The policy language related to Fairfax County’s Office of Children and Family Services, who allay child care – SACC Program – also provide some flexibility for excitant circumstances, such as providing SACC services at the two campus – Upper Bailey’s and Bailey’s Elementary, located in the Mason District. However, we note that the SACC language in the proposed Policy Plan does not suggest, nor endorse altering SACC’s in-school dedicated space requirements, as they exist today. And I want to thank everyone again, following Commissioner Sargeant’s comments, and I think we have struck a good balance.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Is there further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, as articulated by Mr. Sargeant, say aye.

Commissioner Sargeant: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

//

(The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.)

JLC

MOTION
September 29, 2016
Commissioner Timothy Sargeant, At-Large
Plan Amendment 2016-CW-1CP

Background:

On March 1, 2016 the Board of Supervisors authorized Policy Plan amendment 2016-CW-1CP. The authorization directed staff, working with the Planning Commission Schools Committee, Fairfax County Public Schools and the Fairfax County School Board, to consider development of revised locational and character criteria for public school facilities in the Public Facilities section of the Policy Plan element of the County's Comprehensive Plan. Through a series of seven public meetings, the Schools Committee, with input from staff, Fairfax County Public Schools and the Fairfax County School Board, revised the Policy Plan text addressing the Board's authorization.

Motion to approve:

Therefore Mr. Chairman, I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors the approval of the Schools Committee's recommendation for Plan Amendment 2016-CW-1CP, found in the Proposed Plan Text dated September 14, 2016.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman

End of Motion

Fairfax County Policy Plan, 2013 Edition, Public Facilities Element, as amended through 3-4-2014, pages 5 – 9:

“PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) is the major provider of education in the county. ~~FCPS This system~~, which has been nationally recognized for excellence and is one of the largest school systems in the nation, has a wide range of educational facilities that accommodate instructional programs for county students from kindergarten through grade 12. In addition to accommodating educational programs, school facilities are used to meet the county’s recreational and cultural needs ~~of the county~~ through programming by the Department of ~~Recreation~~ Neighborhood and Community Services. Generally, separate facilities are provided to serve up to three levels of education:

- Elementary ~~_____~~ kindergarten to grade 5/6
- ~~Middle-Intermediate~~ ~~_____~~ grades 6/7 and 8
- ~~Secondary~~ ~~_____~~ grades 7 through 12
- High ~~_____~~ grades 9 through 12

Additionally, FCPS has an extensive adult education program, and many specialized educational programs. Special education programs serve mentally and physically handicapped students, ranging in age from 18 months ~~2~~ to 22 years. The Family and Early Childhood Education Program (FECEP), formerly known as Head Start, is a preschool program operated primarily in elementary schools for children ages 4 and 5.

The Constitution of Virginia delegates the supervision of public schools to the school board of each locality. Virginia school boards are not county agencies. The Virginia Supreme Court consistently has acknowledged that the power to select school sites and to determine the manner in which school properties shall be used is essential to the school board's supervisory role.

Pursuant to Virginia Code annotated Section 15.2-2232 when a proposed public school facility is not featured in the Comprehensive Plan, the School Board must submit the proposed facility to the Planning Commission for a determination of whether the general, or approximate location, character, and extent of the proposed facility is substantially in accord with the Comprehensive Plan. The text, objectives, and policies appearing in this portion of the Policy Plan are planning guidelines and are not intended to negate the School Board's constitutionally vested authority for school site selection, school design, or the most appropriate method to house and accommodate Fairfax County public school students. On the other hand, to the extent that the text, objectives, and policies of this section reflect land use rather than programmatic concerns, they will be implemented by the Planning Commission, as required by Virginia Code, Section 15.2-2232.

The fundamental element in capital facility planning for public schools is determining future memberships, a complex procedure which continues to be refined. The school system employs ~~a combination of two statistical multiple methodologies, a modified cohort survival model, and the cohort component model~~, for projecting student populations. ~~The cohort survival model is based on expected birth and migration rates and the cohort component model modifies survival ratio projections to account for special events that effect projections, such as students generated by new housing. The latter model employs housing student generation yields using a computer-assisted geographic planning model, which aggregates estimates to attendance area~~

~~level. These estimates are then incorporated into the cohort survival generated attendance area estimates. These models are only effective with current data. Therefore, thorough knowledge of housing starts and use of appropriate dwelling unit multipliers are essential. In addition to obtaining current housing start information, FCPS staff conduct both windshield surveys, to determine construction progress, and mail out surveys, to determine current household composition. Enrollment is frequently projected to within a 1% level of accuracy.~~

Planning for schools is particularly difficult in areas with transient populations, such as Northern Virginia. This problem is compounded in Fairfax County by rapid housing development, and a multitude of variables which alter enrollment levels, such as transfers to and from private schools, in and out migration rates, and changing family compositions in existing housing stock.

FCPS strives for precise facility planning, in order to mitigate costs associated with over-estimates and yet ensure adequate physical space for students and programs. The need for new facilities and additions is determined by comparing available capacity in an area and the projected students for that area. Capacity is an estimate of the number of student spaces available within an educational facility which takes into account the following factors: educational specifications for elementary, intermediate middle and high schools; or elementary and secondary schools; program requirements; and appropriate student-teacher ratios. For example, program requirements can alter space allocations within a building if they utilize additional space, such as the addition of a room for computer training. Changes in student-teacher ratios can alter the number of classrooms required for a given number of students by modifying how they are organized into classes and scheduled into rooms.

Student membership forecasts, coupled with capacity estimates and facility standards, provide the framework for capital facility planning. Locational criteria assists in site planning, identification and selection.

The next 20 years will prove a significant challenge in maintaining and improving the county's high standards for educational facilities. In addition to keeping pace with technological advances and demographic fluctuations, FCPS must acquire schools sites or buildings in an ever-tightening real estate market. Land and building acquisition and construction of schools or lease of buildings will compete with other community facilities for available land and funding resources. While providing for new facilities is expected to be a major focus for FCPS, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the rehabilitation of existing facilities will compete for limited facility funding. Therefore, every effort should be made to ensure that projects cost-effectively meet FCPS requirements.

~~The Constitution of Virginia delegates the supervision of public schools to the school board of each locality. Virginia school boards are not county agencies. The Virginia Supreme Court consistently has acknowledged that the power to select school sites and to determine the manner in which school properties shall be used is essential to the school board's supervisory role.~~

~~Pursuant to Virginia Code annotated Section 15.2-2232 when a proposed public school facility is not featured in the Comprehensive Plan, the School Board must submit the proposed facility to the Planning Commission for a determination of whether the general, or approximate location, character, and extent of the proposed facility is substantially in accord with the Comprehensive Plan. The text, objectives, and policies appearing in this portion of the Policy Plan are planning guidelines and are not intended to negate the School Board's constitutionally vested authority for school site selection, school design, or the most appropriate method to house and accommodate Fairfax County public school students. On the other hand, to the extent that the text, objectives, and policies of this section reflect land use rather than programmatic concerns, they will be implemented by the Planning Commission, as required by Virginia Code, Section~~

~~15.2-2232.~~
Location

Objective 6: Acquire sites for ~~future building~~ schools or educational facilities through negotiation, dedication, or condemnation, ~~which best provide efficiently located schools.~~ This may include the siting of schools or facilities in high density areas or on parcels of limited size.

- Policy a. Place schools on parcels meeting the optimum number of general locational criteria. Sites should be evaluated by the following factors:
- Safe and convenient accessibility to pedestrian and road networks, and transit where available.
 - Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.) Acreage to accommodate expansion, when the school is originally sized below the maximum efficiency standard for that type of school.
 - Compatibility with adjoining planned and existing development and with the Comprehensive Plan.
 - Aesthetically pleasing physical qualities with appropriate engineering features (e.g. soils, topography).
 - Proximity to other public facilities, such as ~~P~~olice and ~~F~~ire and ~~R~~escue services, public parks and libraries.
 - ~~Proximity of schools to commercial areas should be avoided, if possible.~~
- Policy b. Locate school sites, when situated in areas conducive to pedestrian traffic, to take advantage of maximum walking distances of one mile for elementary schools and one and a half miles for middle schools, intermediate and high schools, and secondary schools.
- Policy c. Locate middle schools, intermediate and high schools, and secondary schools, and when possible, elementary schools, where they can be served by public water and sewer. When elementary schools must be located in non-sewered areas in order to serve their target student population, well and septic can be utilized if no other alternative is available.
- Policy d. ~~Purchase~~ Acquire school sites, when land dedications cannot be obtained, as far in advance of construction as possible, to ensure availability of both the preferred location and the necessary site features. ~~Implement a land Plan for acquisitions plan~~ through the Capital Improvement Program.
- Policy e. Encourage site dedications which provide sufficient F.A.R. ~~usable acreage~~ to meet locational criteria.
- Policy f. Coordinate the acquisition and design of the site's active recreation areas with the Fairfax County Park Authority and other agencies, as required to meet recreational standards and where feasible. This will ensure maximum opportunities for co-location and efficient use of recreational and other facilities.
- Policy g. ~~Encourage a~~ As part of the development and redevelopment process, ~~commitments encourage commitments for school renewals and additions~~ renovations and additional capacity where permissible.

Objective 7: Distribute administration and maintenance facilities to conveniently serve the areas they support where feasible.

- Policy a. Locate Area Administration buildings in the school areas they are intended to serve.
- Policy b. Locate maintenance and operation facilities to afford greater convenience, efficiency and reduction of travel time.

Character and Extent

Objective 8: Locate schools on sites which meet or exceed minimum state size ~~standards~~ guidelines where feasible.

- Policy a. Ensure that minimum site size conforms to the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance F.A.R. requirements. This may ~~require~~ result in the acquisition of sites acreage that do not conform ~~in addition to the state suggested minimum requirements~~ guidelines.

Objective 9: Design schools and educational facilities to allow for ~~maximum~~ optimal site utilization while providing optimum service to, and compatibility with, the local community.

- Policy a. Design schools to maximize a site's utility, while providing for safety and aesthetics. Provide for possible future expansion and allow for efficient flow of traffic. Provide adequate stacking space and circulation for school buses, student drop off, and offstreet parking, as required. The impact of school traffic on local road networks should, to the extent possible, be minimized.
- Policy b. Design and construct schools with appreciation for, and attention to, environmentally sensitive lands.
- Policy c. Locate ~~elementary, intermediate and high~~ schools in relation to residential or mixed-use areas, the road network, ~~and~~ traffic patterns and transit where available to optimize the resulting safety and convenience for students, residents, and commuters. When possible, elementary schools should be located in, or on the periphery of, residential or mixed-use areas to ensure proximity and convenience for students and the local community.
- Policy d. Provide for compatibility between schools and adjacent properties with appropriate screening and fencing, in accordance with the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. When designing and constructing schools, preserve as much mature natural vegetation as possible.
- Policy e. Design buildings for educational purposes so that intensity and character are compatible with surrounding planned and existing development.
- Policy f. Consider Area Plan design guidelines, as appropriate, for schools and buildings for educational purposes.
- Policy g. Consider co-location of different levels of education and other types of programs, with the option of shared facilities such as cafeteria, gymnasium,

auditorium, library, and administrative offices.

Policy h. Consider co-location of schools with other public uses such as a library or a recreational center.

Objective 10: Consider adaptive reuse of buildings for public schools and educational purposes.

Policy a. Consider properties such as office, commercial, or other buildings for conversion to education facilities.

Policy b. Consider commercial sites to offer programs such as Transitional High Schools, Family and Early Childhood Education Program (FECEP)/Head Start and distance learning. These sites could also provide services to the community.

Policy c. Consider alternative spaces for outdoor recreation, such as converted rooftops and underutilized surface parking lots. Coordinate with the Fairfax County Park Authority or other organizations for efficient use of recreational facilities for both school and community use.

Other

Objective 1110: Encourage full utilization optimization of existing schools and other facilities, whenever possible and reasonable, to support educational and community objectives.

Policy a. Build additions, when appropriate, to minimize the need for new facilities. Analyze carefully the costs and benefits associated with construction of an addition as compared to a new facility.

Policy b. Consider the expansion of existing school facilities identified on the Comprehensive Plan map, as a feature shown of the Comprehensive Plan provided the proposed expansion has received prior approval by a public bond referendum, is included in the county's currently adopted Capital Improvement Program, and does not significantly impact ~~on~~ the character of the existing facility and its compatibility with the surrounding area.

Policy c. Provide temporary facilities as required to respond to short term student population accommodation needs.

Policy d. ~~Promote~~ Encourage equity parity between older and newer schools and facilities through ~~the Renewal Program~~ renovation. Apply the same educational specifications used as a guide in the construction of new schools facilities for planning the renewal renovation of old ones existing facilities. Consider expected future utilization rates when proposing ~~renewal~~ renovation projects.

Policy e. Continue the practice of serving local communities, for scouting, senior citizen programs, and other neighborhood based activities, through the use of school facilities. Provide access to school grounds for community use of recreational facilities. ~~Cooperate in the use of schools space for the School Age Children~~

~~Child Care (SACC) program.~~

- Policy f. Continue the practice of working in collaboration with the Fairfax County Office for Children and other organizations for the provision of space for before and after-school child care services.
- Policy ~~f~~ g. Continue the practice of allowing the Park Authority and other organizations to utilize sites before school construction begins.
- Policy ~~g~~ h. Provide space for other public service needs, when possible and reasonable, in underutilized schools.
- Policy i. Consider co-location of multiple education facilities on school sites.”