COMMUNITY ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting #2
August 8, 2019 | 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
3700 South Four Mile Run
Working Agenda

INTRODUCTIONS – 20 minutes
I. Welcome
II. Introductions
III. Remarks from County Board Member Katie Cristol

LEVEL SETTING – 5 minutes
IV. Ground Rules, Expectations & Responsibilities
V. Review of Project Scope & Work Plan

MOVING FORWARD – 85 minutes
VI. Overview of Tools & Models
VII. Subcommittee Report Out
   Scene Shop/Costume Lab; Joint Use; Mobile Stage – 5 minutes per subcommittee
      a. Summary of discussions (including rubric)
      b. Information required
      c. Next meeting date
VIII. Criteria Evaluation & Model Building
      a. Introduction of template – including rubric evaluation tool and model building
      b. Agreement on overarching goals, success criteria and measures for each service

WRAP-UP – 5 minutes
## Initial Proposal of Rubric of Evaluation Criteria for Options for Scene Shop, Costume Lab and Mobile Stage

Column A contains the criteria by which an option will be assessed; Columns B through D are examples of the kinds of measures and indicators that could be applied for each criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EXAMPLES - MEASURES &amp; INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost sharing</strong></td>
<td>Cost to County is X%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Usage is at X% by, 2021, and increases by n% annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity of Access</strong></td>
<td>All Users have equitable access to service area/agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Facility/Service</strong></td>
<td>Equipment is up-to-date and maintained to required standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Increase in the number of theater/performance groups in County accessing facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description of Service</td>
<td>Direct Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD Tech director works with facility managers at the two schools and with the relevant arts organizations to negotiate available facilities, dates and times. Procedure: each arts organization submits its proposed dates to CAD Tech Director. After the schools set their calendars, CAD Tech Director works with schools to find availability for the arts organizations. In April of each year, the arts organizations receive a paper calendar with their schedule of facility use. Typically, the schedule is within one month of the dates requested by the arts organizations. Challenges: Rarely, a school change has impacted the arts calendar. There is one time where an arts organization had no space in the two middle schools and had to use the CAD Black Box which was not ideal.</td>
<td>All Space &amp; Services Grantees (The Arlington Players, ArlingtonChorus, Potomac Harmony Chorus, Encore Stage &amp; Studio, Jane Franklin Dance, WSC Avant Bard, Dominion Stage...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current State</td>
<td>Digital calendar system where each arts organization uploads its dates. These are pending until reviewed and approved by CAD/APS. These would be in view-only mode so that arts groups can see on a high-level what conflicts there are in the calendar. If school and other emergencies/events occur and demand changes, the changes would be made digitally and alert all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal State</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arlington County Community Arts Advisory Committee

Generating Alternative Management and Service Delivery Proposals

A Suggested Framework

Name of Arts Service (e.g. the Scene Shop):

Step one: Define the service

Please define the object of the sub-committee’s work, for example, the scene shop, in terms of a service delivered, as well as its main dimensions.

Step Two: Describe the overarching goal for the future state of the service

Please express this in terms of outcomes for the community wherever and if at all possible. For example, in the case of the Mobile Stage, ‘Sustainable and equitable access for community groups to a high quality stage, which enhances their work in placemaking and community bridgebuilding.’
Step Three: Define the factors that will determine the achievement of this overarching goal (criteria,) how these will be measured and what you consider the ‘optimal state’ indicators for these measures

Please start with the generic criteria that have been agreed to apply to all three types of service. Then identify any other criteria that apply specifically to the service for which the sub-committee is responsible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>(Examples of) measures</th>
<th>Optimal Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>▪ Usage by a target date, with increases to follow year-by-year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Visibility and market penetration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of Access</td>
<td>▪ % of groups representing different parts of the community that access each year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of high levels of awareness of how to access the service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Facility/Service</td>
<td>▪ Quality of space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Functionality of equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ How it compares with optimal Health and Safety standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Extent of match with users’ needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness</td>
<td>▪ Increase in overall numbers using the service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Satisfaction ratings of users and other key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost sharing</td>
<td>▪ Who pays what proportion of the costs of the service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 7</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 8</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanatory notes:
**Step Four: Generate ideas/scenarios for the service**

- This step relies on the completion of any information gathering necessary to inform the brainstorming and creative thinking that the step requires.
- Please adopt a generative, ambitious approach. The spectrum of types of arrangement in the table below may help you ensure you consider a wide range of possibilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Public Partnership</th>
<th>Public Contracted</th>
<th>Public Private Partnership</th>
<th>Private Consortium</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC + APS</td>
<td>AC Contracts w/ Vendor</td>
<td>AC (+ APS) + Private Groups</td>
<td>Private Groups</td>
<td>Private Entity (Vendor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- You will likely make use of flip charts and other tools to aid this step in the process. You can then use this part of the template to summarize each of the ideas generated:
Step Five: Evaluate the ideas/scenarios

1. From the full list of ideas and scenarios generated, please sift out those that, on the basis of common sense and using your agreed criteria, measures and indicators as points of reference, seem completely impractical, inappropriate or unacceptable.

2. Build out the remaining ideas and make sure that each is as fully described as possible, to make sure that you can properly evaluate them (and as required by the County Manager.) Include, for example the kinds of operational dimensions in the example table below. Please start the table (this one or whatever amended version you would like to use,) with the current state of the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brief Description of Service</th>
<th>Direct Users</th>
<th>Percentage of use by each user</th>
<th>Funding streams</th>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Other main costs</th>
<th>Critical processes</th>
<th>Marketing Strategy and roles</th>
<th>County support required (other than $)</th>
<th>Other factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations/commentary
3. Please evaluate the current state and the alternatives you have generated, using the criteria, measures and indicators you have agreed. The table below is meant to be a guide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA and MEASURES</th>
<th>Optimal indicators</th>
<th>Current state indicators</th>
<th>Alternative One indicators</th>
<th>Alternative Two indicators</th>
<th>Alternative Three indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Usage by a target date, with increases to follow year-by-year</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Visibility and market penetration</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ % of groups representing different parts of the community that access each year.</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evidence of high levels of awareness of how to access the service</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Facility/Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Quality of space</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Functionality of equipment</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How it compares with optimal Health and Safety standards</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Extent of match with users’ needs</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Increase in overall numbers using the service</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Satisfaction ratings of users and other key stakeholders</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Who pays what proportion of the costs of the service</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
<td>▪</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Please summarize the results of your evaluation
COMMUNITY ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting

6:30 PM, Monday, July 15, 2019
3700 South Four Mile Run Drive
Arlington, VA  22206

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Boland (MB)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Kopenhaver (JK)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava Boston (Ava)</td>
<td>Via phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmina Mansour (YM)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Bryce (AB)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy McWilliams (AM)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Cadby (CC)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Peterson (LP)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Duke (SD)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Prewitt (TP)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Farrell (PF)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Randall (MR)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Franklin (JF)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat Williams (KW)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pryalal Karmakar (PK)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Yates (SY)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAIR: Anika Kwinana (AK)
FACILITATOR: Richard Brewster (RB)
STAFF PRESENT: Jill Hunger (JH), Shannon Flanagan-Watson (SFW), Cindy Richmond (CR)

INTRODUCTIONS

I. Welcome
   - The meeting was called to order by AK at 6:40 pm; quorum present.
   - Shannon Flanagan-Watson, Deputy County Manager, highlighted WHY the committee was formed. SFW reiterated the value of the arts in the community – and that they are fundamentally important to the County Manager (CM), the County Board (CB) and Arlington Economic Development (AED).
   - Anika Kwinana (AK), Chair of the Committee, reviewed the agenda and stressed HOW the arts groups worked together to start this specific conversation is important.

II. Introductions
   - AK introduced herself and asked committee members to introduce themselves, identifying their organization and the community arts services they use.

LEVEL SETTING

III. Review of Project Scope & Work Plan
   - Jill Hunger (JH), Project Manager for the Committee, reviewed the scope of work with the Committee. She stated that it was very narrow in focus and highlighted the four tasks.
   - SFW reiterated the defined scope and charge. She spoke briefly about the newly adopted arts strategy – Enriching Lives: Arlington Art and Culture Strategy. SFW stated that recommendations from the committee would be more helpful if comprehensive. Potentially the recommendations could be a series of options. The CMO has no preconceived notions but clarified that the one option NOT on the table is the status quo.
   - Steven Yates (SY) ask about the issues with the status quo.
   - SFW clarified that the CMO wants to determine “what is the role of the government?”
• There was general conversation around this topic. JH stated that government looks to efficiencies & effectiveness of service delivery. Cindy Richmond (CR) stated that the world has changed over these last 30 years. The Internet! Operations have changed in those resulting years. APS is now at the table for these discussions. SFW asked the committee to think about the broader audience. AK followed up on JH’s two “E”s (efficiencies and effectiveness) with EQUITY. How is access provided and how to evaluate this access?
• Several members of the committee pressed on the question: “what is the status quo?”
• SFW explained that status quo is how it is currently operating. She related that this doesn’t mean the county won’t have a role moving forward. She provided an example – CostumeLab – where only a handful of groups are using the inventory/low numbers/pieces.
• Matthew Ryan (MR) affirmed that the CostumeLab is underutilized. He suggested that we need to understand why, what are changes to increase usage. It is the committee’s job to discuss the fixes. AK added that this will help to inform strategies.
• Pam Farrell (PF) asked about the use & cost to maintain? CR stated that much is found in the notebook.

IV. Ground Rules
• AK provided an overview of initial ground rules and asked the committee to add. RB stated that this list could be updated over time.
• PF – added agree to disagree/positive intent. Use name card to signal intent to speak.
• Sara Duke (SD) – Think creatively.
• MR – Stay positive. RB stated that this is good as there is still lots of negativity. Janet Kopenhaver (JK) suggested that it was more of discouragement. Agreed that the committee should be positive & forward looking.
• AK added speak for yourselves, not on behalf of others. Identify personal v. group.
• Maggie Boland (MB) – respect differences of opinion.

V. Expectations & Responsibilities
• JH reviewed the consensus prime.
• AK clarified there are several resources in the room (RB, JH, CR, SFW) and reminded that this is a committee of the County Manager.
• RB stated that “can live with it” as an agreement can be powerful.
• MR asked if decisions should be unanimous or majority? RB stated his experience suggests the group aim for “can live with it” and not have a vote.
• PF thought that taking the status quo off the table helps to get to the harder discussions.

VI. Background & Resources
• JH provided an overview of resources (plus the notebook). Links are on the web page and within the presentation.

MOVING FORWARD
VII. Story Circle
• AK led the Story Circle and asked each person in the room for a word that described the arts in Arlington to them. There was much similarity. AK collected the words and created a graphic (shared at the end of the meeting).

VIII. Interview Findings
• RB went through the presentation slides and discussed his findings from the interviews.
• There were questions raised by the committee about the joint use agreements.
• MR stated thoughts about the accessibility of the CostumeLab. He stated that, because it is within the school, there was limited (to no) access to a sewing machine, washer, dryer, dyeing, or other resources.
• RB stated that one question was about the use of APS – specifically the community use of the schools when schools not in use.
• MR asked for clarification about the mobile stage. KW and AM confirmed it was truly mobile. Must be towed, but can go anywhere provided clearance isn’t an issue.
• AK referenced that she knows many committee members have already met and are thinking collaboratively e.g. “The Four Families”.
• TP asked about the joint agreement. SFW stated that there is an old MOU.
• PF explained that these agreements were part of an older system when developed. Schools didn’t have theater programs at the time. Practices changed over time. APS contracts with Artistic Concepts. APS faces changing enrollment & programs. How well does the agreement work now...what are the needs of APS and the groups?
• MR asked if Signature has a scene shop? MB answered yes, but it is small....many sets are built on site requiring the theater to go dark.

IX. Planning the Work

• Calendaring the meetings
  o AK informed the committee that at least 4 more meetings of the whole were required and suggested meeting every 3 weeks. The following dates were agreed upon by the committee:
    Thursday, August 8 @ 6:30
    Thursday, August 29 @ 6:30
    Thursday, September 19 @ 6:30
    Thursday, October 10 @ 6:30
    Thursday, October 17 @ 6:30

• Homework/subcommittees - RB (5 minutes)
  o RB stated that the homework included a couple of items: review the material and start asking questions and determining if additional data is required; and subcommittee work. There are three subcommittees: Scene Shop/Costume Lab. Mobile Stage, and Joint Use. The subcommittees will meet between the full committee meetings. RB & JH will be involved in all the subcommittee meetings.
  o The committee reviewed the proposed subcommittees (see Meeting #1 Presentation). One change was made: shift SY from Scene Shop/Costume Lab to the Joint Use Agreement. [NOTE: post meeting discussions suggest retaining SY in Scene Shop/Costume Lab and add SD to Joint Use Agreement.]
  o RB & JH will provide templates to the groups which may include criteria.

• Other
  o TP asked about the relationship with APS & arts groups. Several groups work with students. This is outside of the scope and will be part of the “PARKING LOT” discussion.
  o RB clarified that all general questions should be emailed to JH. Staff will discuss how best to provide answers to the questions.
  o Staff will investigate the best ways to share documents.
  o There were numerous questions and it was reiterated that the committee members need to review all the background information found in their notebooks.

ADJOURN

• The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.
COMMUNITY ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Subcommittee Meeting
Scene Shop & Costume Lab

7:00 PM, Monday, July 15, 2019
3700 South Four Mile Run Drive
Arlington, VA  22206

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Boland (MB)</td>
<td>Via phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Franklin (JF)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Bryce (AB)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Prewitt (TP)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Duke (SD)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Yates (SY)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAIR: Anika Kwinana (AK) – not available
FACILITATOR: Richard Brewster (RB) – not available
STAFF PRESENT: Jill Hunger (JH)

Proposed Agenda Topics – the focus of this first subcommittee meeting is more administrative in nature with initial discussion around the criteria rubric.

Administrative: roles (timekeeper, note taker (Jill), document manager, etc.)
Chair Person – Steven Yates (cat hearder & report out)
Document Management – Steven Yates

Administrative: discuss scheduling future subcommittee meetings (could be done online, post meeting, if this takes too long)

Review of information: did everyone understand the information?

Question about data from the Costume Lab.

Other organizations doing scenery but question about the costume rentals.

Nomenclature. CostumeLab, Costume Shop? Scenic Shop, Scene Shop? CONSISTENT BRANDING.

References to workshops via CostumeLab. What were the topics? Locations? Attendance? How attended?

Professional evaluation of the costume inventory? Has this ever been done?

Barcoding – when implemented? Costs.
Costs -amortized?

Has anything changed since 2014 report (strategic plan)? Implementation, etc.

Question about a Maker Space?

Broader view – what is the problem? Trying to fix? Use? SERVICE DELIVERY?

Other threats? APS? Space needs? COMMUNITY SPACES

Are the scene shop & costume lab shared spaces? No APS users per se. Transportation/insurance/non-school faculty/etc.

Promotion of the scene shop. Part of the grants program.


Turnkey. Signature Theater much larger scale. Signature...insurance as recommended by the broker (exceeds the County). Requires other groups to have insurance too. Utilities? Maintenance? Etc?

**Discuss Rubric for Evaluation:** this will be the subject of discussion at the August 8th full committee meeting. We want to have feedback from all of the subcommittees on the 8th.

Seems to cover everything.

Equity to access. Arts Commission allows the access...the users don’t determine who uses it. Grants program. Application. Some of the requirements are burdensome.... physical address. Lots of groups have left. Eliminated many heritage groups. No rental per se. Ballet Nova – rented the theater @ TJ from APS directly. What does EQUITABLE mean?

DEFINE the criteria. Brief statement.

| Cost sharing – question about sharing? Should this just be costs? Just the rentals? Tickets? Overtime? Value? Space & services grant...in kind & cash. |
| Equity of Access – Arts Commission |
| Quality of Facility/Service |
| Overall Effectiveness |

Start with criteria. Needs to evolve over time as discussions.

Is there a VALUE PROPOSITION?

Arlington Commission for the Arts – administers the grants. Validating the intrinsic value of what is being provided & the arts groups.

**HOMEWORK** – defining the criteria. Work holistically. Googledocs – Steven to put it up.
COMMUNITY ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Subcommittee Meeting
Joint Uses

7:00 PM, Thursday, August 1, 2019
Conference Call

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ava Boston (Ava)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Kopenhafer (JK)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Cadby (CC)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yasmina Mansour (YM)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Duke (SD)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie Peterson (LP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Farrell (PF)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Randall (MR)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAIR: Anika Kwinana (AK) – in attendance
FACILITATOR: Richard Brewster (RB) – not available
STAFF PRESENT: Jill Hunger (JH) – in attendance

Proposed Agenda Topics – the focus of this first subcommittee meeting is more administrative in nature with initial discussion around the criteria rubric.

Administrative: AK – level set with the charge by the County Manager. It is about SCHEDULING and less about the JOINT USE. CAD/APS Theater Use Scheduling

Review of information:
Discussion and questions about scheduling process and positions.
Positions
- Toni – scheduling. Question. Position ending within the year. Schedules the rehearsal space (3700) – effects the use. PARKING LOT.

How is the space specifically scheduled? Hal contacts to find out what space is available via APS.

MR – Multiple forms. Form filled out for rehearsal space. Separate form filled out for stage. Informed of the stage space in April – Groups Meeting. Schools have until April 15 for APS for the following year.
Part of issue are the various calendars used in scheduling:
- APS – Sept – May.

PF clarified APS Joint Use is with APS & ACG for TJ & Gunston. Theater groups can coordinate individually with other schools. HBW, Yorktown, Wakefield –activities coordinator. Kenmore, W-L – facilities manager.

Toni assists with scheduling re surcharge. Arlington (APS) has a tiered rental facility system. Facilities Managers – should be doing the scheduling. Might be a work around to assist arts groups.
MR – Asked about TOTR. Not a joint use.

JK – Toni. Scheduling of the TOTR. All combined uses.

MR – the current system is confusing & clunky. Understand that resources need to be available for the schools. Everyone needs to better understand the process.

AK – reiterated the charge: develop a NEW SCHEDULING PROCESS for joint use theaters.

**Administrative:** roles (timekeeper, note taker (Jill), document manager, etc.)
Sara willing to coordinate.

**Administrative:** discuss scheduling future subcommittee meetings
Sara to send out a doodle pool. Week prior to the committee meeting.

**Discuss Rubric for Evaluation:** this will be the subject of discussion at the August 8th full committee meeting. We want to have feedback from all the subcommittees on the 8th.

MR – question about the application of the rubric. Clarity around how the evaluation tool can/should be use?

MR – example. Reduction in the incidents of theater bumped by back to school night, etc. Positive outcomes. More robust information on the calendars. System should have a checklist. Has happened numerous times.

SD – currently a paper calendar every spring. Nothing electronic. EMS Web – can view. Not certain if this is public.

AK – question about the calendar. Does the calendar reflect the dates requested? This is often after shows announced to the public.

SD – space & services. Can request. But dates aren’t always the same. Off by a week to a month. Sometimes don’t get shows requested. Larger shows…. Encore had to drop.

Pam asking about Encore – TJ but to Gunston 1 & 2.

Theater 2 @ Gunston is CAD only.

MR - 1 year no space @ Gunston 2 for Dominion. All shows at TOTR. Can’t make $ in BBT. Only happened once.

AK – Happening right now. Future state. What do options for a new scheduling look like if there is not a staff person to support

Rough season outline with dates outlined. Hal negotiates when multiple groups request the same dates. Lots of process & negotiating on the behalf of groups. How does this get facilitated?
MR – An idea could be a visible calendar with all stakeholders. Can block out what is requested. Colors for requests. NOT APPROVED. Everyone can see. Current system isn’t as transparent. The April [Arts] Groups meeting can be very contentious.

PF – someone will still have to make the decision as to who gets to use the space. Who makes the decision? Gunston & TJ – all APS calendars in by April 15. Calendar opened to others AFTER the April 15 date. Check to see what is available. Viewable.

MR – can be confusing when working through many dates for both rehearsal & theater spaces. Errors occur. Electronic calendar would be easier and limit the potential for errors.

Use the technology we have.

JH – helpful conversation and see how this can tie back to the criteria (efficiency, equity, effectiveness, etc.)

MR – As we define, we should use positive language.

Ava – online calendar – does make sense. Agrees with MR.

AK – technology seems like it is available and very easy. She was easily able to overlay the APS calendar onto her Google Calendar.

MR – yoga studio calendar example as well.

AK – Kennedy Center space calendaring has a process: Reserve. Pending. Confirmed.

CC – Speaking as a teacher. Snow Days. Sometimes events must be rescheduled. Area of difficulty. APS has the priority for the space. Lock down, accident, etc. Rescheduling must happen.

MR – Agreed. Easier with the shared calendar?

CC – The important this is to understand what takes precedence. Opening Night? Rescheduled Back to School Night. Schools are erratic. Middle Schools especially so....

MR – Unfortunately, theater groups can’t afford to be erratic. Pay for the rights to shows, advertising, etc.

PF - When a conflict arises – what is the priority. Spell this out. Address it. Person needs to understand. Likely CAD but coordinate with APS.

MR – clarified that scheduling hiccups don’t happen frequently but VERY disruptive when it does.

AK – reminded the subcommittee that this scheduling position would likely not be an FTE. Part time. Foreshadow the next step(s).

AK – Suggested thinking about cost sharing with the arts groups to fund scheduling (tech)? Part time? Think around what the arts groups might be willing to do.

SD – Clarified that scheduling is not the only responsibility for Hal. Not a FTE. Part of a job. Don’t add another cost associated with requesting space.

CC – broader question of what is the county going to offer the groups to have quality arts in the county? Scheduling should come from the County.

MR – CAD would have a scheduler to work with APS people. But with transparent shared calendar....approvals through CAD with APS. Need at least a portion of another position. More administrative.

AK – have groups/APS been receiving technical assistance from CAD?

**Questions to staff – what does this mean? Do we still have tech?**

Scheduling – what is still needed [time] if much is electronic?

CC – limited number of users for the spaces. Groups have gone away.

Though we have a tight piece to deal with – ripple effect. Scene shop & costume lab – might have to look at other groups for equity. Or does the number of users have to be capped?

MR – perhaps not role to set a max in advance. Might have to happen in the future.

CC – hard for Hal to schedule many years ago because of so many groups. This may be an Issue for CAD & ACA to resolve.

MR – statement – can’t keep adding groups because there isn’t enough time or space. Not scalable forever. Scalable to a point. As long as feasible & scalable.

AK – model is based on X. As APS numbers increase. List the number of factors in the recommendation. All of these variables effect change.

MR – thinking that scheduling is a constant on-going process; rather scheduling happens on own. Then it is placed on the calendar. Just need to react to the one-offs. Doesn’t need constant nurturing.

CC - # of students grows each year; more students = more events; multiple nights for the events. Moving target.

AK – other events may happen too. Can’t account for but will have an impact. Reiterate it will be important to have a listing of concerns/challenges/future

SD – wrap-up. Huddle prior to the full meeting. Meet at 6 pm on the 8th. Think about the rubric. AK to clarify.

Shared documents via SD.
COMMUNITY ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Subcommittee Meeting
Mobile Stage

7:00 PM, Monday, August 5, 2019
CPR0 Offices

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pryalal Karmakar (PK)</td>
<td></td>
<td>via phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy McWilliams</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat Williams</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAIR: Anika Kwinana (AK) – via phone
FACILITATOR: Richard Brewster (RB)
STAFF PRESENT: Jill Hunger (JH)

Proposed Agenda Topics – the focus of this first subcommittee meeting is more administrative in nature with initial discussion around the criteria rubric.

Administrative: roles (timekeeper, note taker (Jill), document manager, etc.)

Chair Person – Amy McWilliams (cat header & report out)

Administrative: discuss scheduling future subcommittee meetings (could be done online, post meeting, if this takes too long)

Review of information: did everyone understand the information? questions?

Previous situation – process to get the stage – permitting process. Mobile Stage booked through DPR Special Events. Hal Crawford to work with those groups that want the stage.

All currently have access to the stage this year. Question about the following year. 2021 – might be different. Amy – after FY 2020 – stage decommissioned.

NEED TO DETERMINE LONGEVITY OF THE STAGE. Decommissioned?

COST TO REPLACE?

NUMBER OF COUNTY EMPLOYEES THAT OPERATE THE STAGE. Two technicians. Who staffs this? Will this go away?

LIST OF EVENTS & ORGANIZERS THAT USE THE STAGE. Some are arts/cultural groups. What about the other groups? Decision to decommission...
COUNTY USE OF THE STAGE – what is the County’s plan for the future? Who operates?

CAN THE STAGE BE USED OUTSIDE OF THE COUNTY? Risk management? Users outside the County?

Richard – what can others do to access the same service/result to everyone’s satisfaction? What does success look like? Brainstorm & establish the criteria. Expand awareness, charge the amounts, etc.

Kat – subsidies to assist/offset. Sponsors.

Amy – what do other jurisdictions do? Do others have stages to rent? Amy to check in with Ffx & Alexandria.

Anika – what are the other BIDs using for stages? Rosslyn & CC BID – just rent. Kat to follow-up with BIDs.

Other groups that have events...check with other groups that have such events. Prio

Amy – CPRO changed the sound provider to build relationship as they have a mobile stage too.

MARKET RESEARCH – other groups, BIDs, internal County departments

MARKET RESEARCH – Kat to pull together spreadsheet at looking at other options – including all elements & staffing

Discuss Rubric for Evaluation: this will be the subject of discussion at the August 8th full committee meeting. We want to have feedback from all of the subcommittees on the 8th.

Anika – between the quality, effectiveness – QUALITY OF LIFE which is unique to the stage. Placemaking piece...building community.

Richard – overarching goal of Placemaking/Community Building

Ability to bring people together. Number of people that are reached due to the

NUMBER OF PEOPLE THAT ATTEND THE EVENTS. Kat to email Leslie for the information.

Signature – 8,000 people; etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Impact: Placemaking &amp; Community Building – understand the value of the mobile stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost sharing – (more evaluation tool &amp; less criteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Facility/Service – define the full service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness (relates to Impact)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clarify the status of the CAD Transition Plan. Everything has been implemented.
This construct flips the conversation a bit - what is the service and how is it delivered. The SERVICE becomes the EVENT & the MOBILE STAGE is the TOOL. The public good is the event.

Operational elements.

Success criteria.

Spectrum.

Richard – groups could be bold.

Short term & long term recommendations.
Subject: AED – Cultural Affairs Proposed Transition Plan

FY 2020 Proposed Budget

Budget Work Session Follow-up

3/29/2019

The following information is provided as follow-up to a discussion with the County Board at the work session on 3/27/2019, regarding the proposed reductions to Cultural Affairs.

*****************************************************************************
Cultural Affairs Follow-up

In developing the proposed FY 2020 budget, I am most interested in exploring the question of what the appropriate role of local government is in supporting the arts and having a broader community conversation on this important issue. As I mentioned during the recent budget work session on this topic, the intention of the proposed reductions in Cultural Affairs is not to debate the value of the arts. There is much value in the arts which enrich the lives of many Arlingtonians, create a sense of place and belonging, and contribute to the health of the local economy.

Rather, as we spend funds on the arts, we must determine whether the dollars spent make sense for the services delivered and to make investments which can be delivered to a broader audience. Spending on new and innovative programs, such as the Arlington Art Truck, a platform that brings art to all people in the County, and our upcoming collaboration with WMATA as part of the Digital Engagement Initiative, are examples of efforts that increase accessibility and visibility of the arts at relatively modest costs.

As we continue to look at ways of bringing innovative, efficient and cost-effective arts programs to more people, there are several long-standing legacy programs including the CostumeLab, Scenic Studio and Mobile Stage which are rarely, if ever, provided directly by a local government. In Arlington, these services in some instances are used sparingly and episodically throughout the year, but still require intensive staff resources to operate under the current service delivery model. My proposal does not recommend removing the space or assets of these functions, but rather a re-evaluation of how the functions are being supported by the County.

The CostumeLab is significantly underutilized with a total of 24 rentals in FY 2018 averaging 5 hours per week. There are 13 total user groups, including 4 supported local arts organizations (Encore, Avant Bard, The Arlington Players, and Opera NOVA), 8 outside organizations, and Arlington County Historic Preservation. Additionally, two-thirds of the approximately 23,000 costumes in the inventory have never been rented. The fees collected equal approximately $3,400 in FY 2018, of which 33% are from supported arts groups.

The Scenic Studio is used primarily, and nearly exclusively, by five arts organizations (Encore, Avant Bard, The Arlington Players, Dominion Stage, and Jane Franklin Dance) that have been operating for more than 27 years in Arlington. The fees paid by these organizations are very low (approximately $2,700 in FY 2018) and do not begin to recover costs for the services provided.

The Mobile Stage is currently used for 15 events per year (5 County Events, 8 Non-County Events, of which 3 are supported arts organizations). Use for Arlington County purposes is free, Arlington based non-profit users pay $500 per day, others pay $1,000 per day. Staff must be certified to operate the stage. Two staff are required for operations.

Proposed Transition Plan

Upon further consideration based on this information and feedback received from the arts community, we believe more time is needed to have a thoughtful conversation with the community. In doing so, I am proposing a transition plan over the next year to move us forward from the current situation to one
where services provided are scaled to the demand and where arts organizations potentially bear more responsibility for their ongoing technical and space needs.

**CostumeLab:**
- Eliminate CostumeLab Manager position (1.0 FTE). (Reduction of $70,761)
- Serve existing organizations by appointment only; reduce available days and hours. Facility Manager will staff up to 0.12 FTE.
- **User Experience:** There will be limited inconvenience, since long lead times for theater production will allow all organizations to plan accordingly.

**Scenic Studio:**
- Provide one-time funding for Scenic Studio Tech (1.0 FTE) (Add back $108,621)
- Provide level of service consistent with demand – more hours available in peak season (Sept, Dec-Feb), less in off-peak. This will free up staff to assist with mobile stage, summer concerts and festivals.
- **User Experience:** User groups will continue to have access to the studio year-round. During off-season user groups will have to schedule according to staff availability.

**Mobile Stage:**
- Serve existing organizations and outside users will pay for $350 towing fee incurred by towing company.
- Provide one-time funding for towing services for County Government users. (Add back $4,550)
- **User Experience:** No change. Existing Technical Service staff that are certified to operate the stage will provide the service.

**County Facility 3700 S. Four Mile Run:**
- Provide one-time funding for Facility Manager (1.0 FTE) (Add back $96,663)
- Facility Manager will be needed to continue existing operations as a cost recovery model is being developed in the Spring/Summer 2019. The manager will be a resource when the Arts & Industry District is implemented, and will provide the 0.12 FTE to support the CostumeLab.
- **User Experience:** Most users will not be affected. Major users may have rehearsal time capped depending on other programming needs.

**Audio Tech Services:**
- Eliminate 1.0 FTE (currently vacant) (Reduction of $83,143)
- Contract with vendor for sound engineering services ($25,000 ongoing funding in proposed base budget)
- **User Experience:** No significant change. Contract services will meet the user needs.

**Arts Grant Program:**
- Fully fund FY 2020 Grants Program ($215,810) as proposed in the base budget.
- Application process is conducted in FY 2019. Applications are currently under review by the Arts Commission and recommendations will come before the County Board in July.
- For FY 2021, consider reconfiguration of the grants program in consultation with the Arts Commission.
During this transition period in preparation for the FY 2021 budget development, I propose that there be further community conversations about the role of government in terms of scope and costs with the provision of community arts services.

Also, I recommend that the current Art Policy adopted in 1990 be revised to align with the Enriching Lives Arts and Culture Strategy, and completion of a cost recovery study of user fees in Cultural Affairs with a recommendation for the Board’s consideration.

In addition, the Facility Technology Services Director manages the full and part-time technical staff for 3700 S. Four Mile Run facilities, the Scenic Studio, and joint-use spaces at Gunston and Thomas Jefferson (TJ) Middle Schools. As proposed in my budget, this position’s funding will be replaced with one-time funds for the duration of the incumbent employee’s participation in the County’s Deferred Retirement Option Plan (DROP). In FY 2020, we will explore a new model for facilities usage and look to implement a new scheduling process. We will work with Arlington Public Schools (APS) to develop a joint-use facility scheduling process. The current process is not transparent, relies on permission from individual school principals, and does not provide the assurances needed for arts organizations who need to schedule months in advance.

We will also work with Arlington Public Schools to update the joint-use policy and agreement for our mutual benefit regarding shared facilities. The current joint-use policy for Use of School Facilities dated, October 6, 1994, is 25 years old and the Memorandum of Agreement dated, March 31, 1988, is 31 years old for TJ Middle School and Community Center.