

COMMUNITY ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting (#4)

6:30 PM, Thursday, September 19, 2019
3700 South Four Mile Run Drive
Arlington, VA 22206

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

MEMBERS:

| | Present | Absent | | Present | Absent |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------|----------------------|-----------|--------|
| Maggie Boland (MB) | x | | Yasmina Mansour (YM) | via phone | |
| Ava Boston (AB) | via phone | | Amy McWilliams (AM) | | x |
| Carol Cadby (CC) | x | | Leslie Peterson (LP) | | x |
| Sara Duke (SD) | x | | Tom Prewitt (TP) | x | |
| Pam Farrell (PF) | | x | Matthew Randall (MR) | x | |
| Jane Franklin (JF) | x | | Kat Williams (KW) | x | |
| Pryalal Karmakar (PK) | | x | Steven Yates (SY) | x | |
| Janet Kopenhaver (JK) | x | | | | |

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 6:45 pm; quorum present.
- II. Agenda Review
 - AK quickly reviewed the agenda.

LEVEL SETTING

- III. Ground Rules, Ground Rules, Expectations & Responsibilities
 - JH reviewed and reminded everyone to be certain to clarify the “hat” they are wearing when providing feedback.
- IV. Review of Project Scope & Work Plan
 - JH reviewed the scope and the work plan and informed the committee of the status and the next steps. Clarified that the October 15th date was not a meeting date but a draft report date.
- V. *Enriching Lives* Implementation
 - JH clarified the term “community” to mean the whole Arlington community.
 - Presented the 1-page document that summarizes goals & strategies.
 - CR explained how CAD aligns its workplan to the goals & strategies.
 - CR and AK discussed the listening sessions that the ACA is hosting. TP and JK were in attendance and provided some additional context.

MOVING FORWARD

- VI. Ideas Generated by Subcommittees: RB – review of the various alternatives developed by the subcommittees per the “Generating Alternative Management & Service Delivery Proposals” handout.

Although discussed later in the meeting, it is apt now to highlight conversation about the process. In reviewing the alternatives, the preferred outcome will generate several options and have a specific recommendation. Showing the work, listing pros and cons for the options, providing considerations for transitional planning, and tying recommendations back to *Enriching Lives* will allow the CAAC to have a strategic recommendation.

Scenic Studio

Review and Clarifying Questions on Alternatives

Alternative 1. RB stated that members within the subcommittee wanted to confirm that money saved would be re-invested in the arts.

Alternative 2. Clarified that the County would manage the contract. MB stated that Signature would operate in addition to Signature’s scene shop.

Alternative 3. RB stated that the scheduling and needs would be evaluated with a lens toward the public good. SFW wanted to understand what the term “expansion” means; RB stated that it was an expansion to the number of users. SD and CR stated that “enhanced service” would be with additional fees – the process to access the studio and services would not be like the previous space and services grant. The committee determined that this alternative was most similar to status quo.

Alternative 4. MR asked if there could be mix and match with the alternatives – could Signature operate this? Yes. SY suggested that this alternative would require phasing – time to get the new space constructed and interim conditions.

Alternative 5. This has more of a maker space component. JF suggested that this should have an educational component: classes and the ability to just experience the space. SFW confirmed that this is like a maker space – of which the County has one at Central Library.

Alternative 6. RB stated that this alternative was based on models elsewhere (Philadelphia). MB clarified that she has not discussed this alternative with her board and this was a new concept.

Issues?

SY – asked if there was anything that was “comically unrealistic.” The County doesn’t want to prematurely judge or inadvertently influence alternatives. Some alternatives may be aspirational but working through them may provide bits and pieces towards a transitional plan.

SY – think about removing #1; it would save the County money, but the Arts Community did not support this action when it was initially proposed and is counter to 2.1 in *Enriching Lives*. CR – suggest leaving it in because with Pros & Cons it would be ideal to have a baseline. MR – show that it was considered. CR – considerations from CAAC and then consideration from the County. Have a control.

JF – certain thoughts about Signature awarded another large contract. MB – from an optics standpoint it might not be well-received. Need to articulate in the description. MR – question about the awards for set design. OPTICS. AK – more about the regional marketing perspective. JF – question as to who makes the decisions within the contract? MB – the “brand” might be more with the CostumeLab. RB – clarify that there are four items being discussed: Optics from organization; optics for WATCH awards; fear of inappropriate artistic control; Arlington brand & reputation. Use & leverage the strengths but presentation of the Pros & Cons could be detailed. KW – funding and/or fundraising could be beneficial with the name.

SD – As Arlington resident – love #5. More or less a wood shop – perhaps frame this for the “hobby” piece of a community good.

AK – not throwing out anything at this time.

TP – some redundancy. Streamline & condense.

TP – Option #1 – place a price tag on the money “in addition to” the current grants proposal (\$150,000 per year that would be saved). All other options should be pitched for regional use – but advantageous terms for Arlington groups/preference to Arlington groups/reduced prices for Arlington groups.

MR – why expand to the region? TP – a perceived deficit was underuse – utilization & income. Increasing the demand will require balancing the users. MR – assumption that all Arlington groups that want to use it ARE using. If we make more Arlington groups aware of it. AK – still a preference for Arlington groups.

MR – question about need to build a set v maker space times. SD – scheduling. Suggested an ice rink (public times & private) scheduling as an analog. CR – alternative – something that is used WELL.

CostumeLab:

RB presented the alternatives. Concern about the loss of the CostumeLab but the numbers don’t justify. For most users it is not a make or break. Value to be had for the community.

Two main proposals. The Signature concerns may be raised again and will need to be addressed in the narrative. Organizations have multi-tiered approach toward costuming: Target, thrift stores, rent from other theater companies, rent from online, sew, CostumeLab (limited), etc.

Clarifying questions:

Alternative 1.

AK – close or move signifies that the space would be returned to Gunston. Good faith & recognition. Compromise.

Alternative 2. Part of a bigger ecosystem.

MR - do schools use? CC – No. CostumeLab far away from many schools; hard for transportation to try; sizes are an issue; kids wear & tear costumes.

MB – seems like keeping where it is but expanded.

Alternative 3.

SY – Not at Gunston? RB – last sentence = either or.

Issues?

CC – people seem to like makers spaces. Could be an educational component for costumes as well. No sewing in schools any longer – so it could be useful. Gunston is a hard location. 3700 is a better located – create a “cool” place.

MB – optics. A model for a company to have a costume inventory is common throughout the country.

JF – organizations providing clothing for women for jobs/proms/etc. Opportunity to reach out into the community. Thinning out – perhaps a use for others.

SD – Encore perspective. Costumes have less values than the equipment. Access to the equipment raising the impact to the community.

Add-ons

Add an alternative similar to #3 of the Scenic Studio.

Mobile Stage:

RB reviewed the alternatives.

Clarifying Questions and Issues (combined)

Alternative 1. CR clarified that funding would be for training the users (\$4000 per training). MB – “comically unreasonable” REMOVE.

Alternative 2. SY asked about “temporary” employees – is it contracted? County employee. JK – question about maintenance? Clarify – UNTIL the stage is no longer functional.

Alternative 3. Community benefit of the stage – high social value.

Alternative 4. #1 & #2 could be part of it. Perhaps closest to status quo. Add fees. CR to clarify that it means expanded users.

Alternative 5. JK – clarify if the County rents OR the user rents? Could set it up that user goes directly to the vendor.

Alternative 6. No discussion.

Alternative 7. No discussion.

SY – all seem to suggest that the county will use the stage to it’s end. Why not buy a new one & heavily market it. Costs \$122,315 for a new mobile stage. JK – is it cost prohibitive?

SD – no timelines for when stage goes away – transitional plan. TP – “tiered demise”

MR – no truck? CR – the truck designated for this is gone? But there ARE trucks in the County fleet – cooperation.

MR – status quo. Do other Arlington Groups use private contractors? (Rosslyn BID – outgrew the stage)

Joint Use Scheduling:

RB – this is very different and very detailed. Need some practical answers – SD has reached out to facilities managers. Transformation of how people perceive – online calendar – can see everything. Made a difference to how it feels. Make it practical.

TP – what about Gunston 2? RB – no change – just the timing would be different. Not subject to similar pressures. TP – advantageous to those that use Gunston 2 to move the timing.

SY – the only action is the .5 FTE. RB – seems more efficient to have a staff person to liaison between the schools and the users but final decisions would be made by a team. CC – discussed an idea that, if the groups grew, hard to manage. Need to add.

AK – scheduling software? SD – instead of submitting pdfs – something more interactive. MR – work through the calendar in advance & provide it for input into EMS. CR – Hal spoke with Cindy.

SFW – Is there functionality in the software now to meet the needs? AK – limited access. SFW – is the tool functional to meet the needs? AK – yes. Belongs to APS & CAD has been granted access. MR – discussed that it wouldn't be appropriate to open it up to groups.

JK – LP stated that it was going to be revamped. RB – not mentioned again.

CC – is it ideal? No. It doesn't include the rehearsal space here (3700). 3 tiered approach...needs to involve the rehearsal space. AK – ideally to include scene shop. SFW – important considerations/asks. Describe clearly. SD – just look at theater scheduling. CC – can go beyond...benefit to community. MR – add something at the end. RB – concern about using a computer system to fix. Focus on the scope. HUGE change.

WRAP-UP

- Next Phase.
- RB – Request. 3 main steps
 - Reorder; fleshing out the alternatives – operationally understand; write up the ideas – create a worksheet. Google Docs or Email to evaluate to get back to RB regardless of meetings. CR – Not creating a business plan. PROXIES.
 - Bring back to the group – October 10
 - Take information & create draft
 - Review by group – October 17
- AK – pros & cons developed using the evaluation criteria. Can adjust...
- RB – POINT OF REFERENCE is *Enriching Lives*
- JK – only doing own subcommittee? CR – could be beneficial...
- SD – should there be a deadline? October 4 – COB? **RB – send out a timetable?**
- CR – send out email for final alternatives - if something triggers – add. RB – leaders of the subcommittee make certain its finished by the deadline.
- MR – encouraged. Just polish.
- Next meeting
 - Full committee: October 10, 2019 @ 6:30 pm

ADJOURN

- The meeting adjourned at 8:56 PM.