| | REFINED CHALLENGES | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| DDELIMINIADY CHALLENGES | S trengthening the Community Dialogue | S us taining Arlington's E conomic | Land- Arlington's S carcest | Planning for Change | E mbracing Diversity |
| PRELIMINARY CHALLENGES Economic Sustainability Subcommitte | | Model | Resource | | |
| 1. Sustaining Arlington's Economic Model | e Challenges. | | | | |
| • Shrinking Federal presence | | | | | |
| • S hift in the way businesses use office space | | X | | | |
| • Growing competitiveness in the region (value of "proximity" is diminished now that other Metro | | X | | | |
| options have emerged, such as Tyson's) | | | | | |
| 2. Sustaining Housing & Affordability | | | | | |
| Lack of market rate housing for those earning between 60% and 120% of AMI | | | | | |
| • Losing supply of market rate affordable housing and "starter homes" particularly impacting | | X | | X | Х |
| millennials, seniors over 65, and workforce housing | | | | | |
| 3. Ease of Doing Business | | Х | | | |
| Demographics Subcommittee Cha | allenges: | | | | |
| 4. Projecting growth in Arlington Public Schools | | | | Х | |
| 5. Planning for diverse age groups as they evolve: Baby Boomers & Millennials | | | | Х | |
| 6. Increasing income disparity and decreasing diversity | | | | | |
| • Income disparity concentrates low-income students in a few schools; APS continues to struggle | | | | | |
| with providing effective academic programs and support for low-income families | | | | | |
| • Coordination between Schools & County is not systematic or consistent to address needs for after- | | Χ | | X | X |
| school activities and transportation | | | | | |
| • S chools are not included in any of the planning elements of the Comp Plan | | | | | |
| Comp Plan does not include an impact analysis on income disparity | | | | | |
| 7. Finding new ways to communicate | | | | | |
| Communicating with different segments of the population (neighborhood character; age groups; | ADD | | | | Х |
| cultural segments; housing & lifestyle preferences); | ADD | | | | X |
| • Equitable access to information and opportunities for engagement | | | | | |
| 8. Comprehensive planning | | | | | |
| • Comp Plan Elements developed at different cycles; different stakeholders w/o broad perspective; | | | | | |
| creates competing objectives and no clear process for reconciliation | | | | | |
| • Comp Plan Elements may address future growth quantitatively, but insufficient detail to population | | | | X | |
| growth characteristics | | | | | |
| • Facility needs addressed through CIP Process, which does not adequately engage public & | | | | | |
| commissions | | | | | |
| • Facility needs are not specifically addressed in any existing Comp Plan Element | | | | | |
| Facilities Subcommittee Challe | enges: | | W. | | |
| 9. Limited Land | | | X | | |
| 10. Limited Resources – making better use of existing resources | | | X | | |
| 11. Meeting "back of house" needs | | | X | - | |
| 12. Setting Priorities | | | X | | |