

COMMUNITY ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting (#5)

6:30 PM, Thursday, October 10, 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)		
Ava Boston (AB)		x	Amy McWilliams (AM)	x	
Carol Cadby (CC)	x		Leslie Peterson (LP)		x
Sara Duke (SD)	x		Tom Prewitt (TP)		
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), Cindy Richmond (CR)

INTRODUCTIONS

- I. Welcome
 - The meeting was called to order by AK at 6:40 pm; quorum present.
- II. Agenda Review
 - AK quickly reviewed the agenda.
 - Metaphors came to mind as to the work of the committee: “baking a cake,” “making a roux”
 - JH reviewed the expectations/ground rules

LEVEL SETTING

- III. Review of Evaluation Process
 - RB reviewed the process to date:
 - Exploratory; exploratory & creative; analytical; very analytical (NOT scientific);
 - And process moving forward:
 - interpretive, informed intuition, political; above all – plus representative
 - RB explained how he pulled together the evaluation pieces received from members of the committee: INCREASE, REDUCE, STAY ROUGHLY THE SAME
 - Highlighting is reflected in the numbers
 - Increase +1
 - Reduce -1
 - Stay the Same 0
 - EXCEPT – Risk...Increase (-1) and Reduce (1)
 - Comments are reflected in the reasons & arguments
 - Provided TWO scores: split out County staffing & net tax support

- Three numbers to evaluate:
 - Impact – sum of all the ratings against the main criteria apart from County staff & net tax support
 - Impact – assuming staff & net tax support is a positive
 - Impact – assuming staff & net tax support is a negative
- CR to clarify that everything to move forward? Perhaps offer but provide explanation & show the work.

MOVING FORWARD

IV. Summarized Scores & Recommendations

- RB explained the analysis and the need to review & address

Joint Use Scheduling

- Just one scenario. Reflects 3 member's assessments.
- JK asked if there were comments received from the APS members. No.
- SD explained the meeting with TJ facilities manager. TIMING – all teachers that use the facility must submit their dates to Pam Farrell. Need to have an earlier date & coordinate with Pam. Look at the school's calendar rather than the Superintendent School. Need to have an agreement for use of the theaters – rules. Work with APS on the space needs of the users for the stage (band, orchestra, etc). PK reiterated the need to have rules, etc for the space.
- AK asked WHO would coordinate the coordinating group? SD stated this is an outstanding question.
- MR stated that there are challenges with the Gunston facilities manager. Parent-Teacher Conference and “parking” is needed. This is being communicated via CAD (Toni Essex). Pushing back on the APS. Positive but being ignored.
- RB – need to meet with Pam Farrell AND work with Gunston.
- SD – ACTION ITEM for the Coordinating Committee – Figure out the leadership; SOP & Rules
- CC – shouldn't be up to the personalities to dictate how things are used. Protocol.
- Some discussion about the MOU ensued. CR – suggested that the conversation can inform future MOU discussions.
- SD – recommend the scenario. Trial run for this season. Adjustments for the 2021 season. Pilot Phase. Needs to be a staff person with technical expertise & understanding how theater works.
- CR and RB stated the importance of a transition plan.
- TRANSITION:
 - Form the Group
 - Who & who leads the Group – just arts groups + APS
 - SOPs, Rules, Regulations – Committee Charter
 - Roles & Responsibilities

Mobile Stage

- AM stated that the evaluations made sense based on the conversation of the subcommittee. Scenario 4 takes the onus off the groups to compete on the open market to rent at standard commercial rents; takes the onus off the County to store & move & manager; allows the County more advantageous rates.

- AM suggested the Scenario 3 could increase the community impact BUT investment by the County in the stage AND staffing.
- CR stated that there is a viable private sector solution. If the government can work out a deal and allow for the private sector to accommodate – it’s a win-win. Considers the role of government.
- SY the private partnership makes sense if it saves money. If the County uses it a fair amount – is it worth to purchase? Need a Plan B if we can’t get a good pricing structure.
- MR – role of government & how much weight? Selling? It would be surplus. Is there a vendor of mobile stages? Yes.
- MB question about “surplus” and what it means. Disposed of per standard practice.
- RB – recommendation of Scenario 4. Question about including additional scenarios? Should Scenario 3 be included? One additional point – the difference that can be made with proactive marketing for facility use.
- MB is concern that there is a risk that it could not accommodate all of the uses & needs.
- CC what is affordable price? If there is a limited number of vendors, is there a
- AM stated that the intention would be the County would get the best price for the 13 uses & users would pay a subsidized price. KW change the pricing structure for equity. MR a pro is that the vendors would have multiple stage sizes, etc.
- SD there is a safety bonus going with the vendor. Is there a transition for the period of time? How to accommodate? JH yes for the transition; goal to get to equitable
- RB asked to clarify if there was just one recommendation? Yes.
- RB question about the role of government? CR the government shouldn’t compete with the private market.
- TRANSITION
 - Market research
 - Current stage
 - Equitable price structure
 - Contracting

Scenic Studio

- Rankings vary greatly with the three impact analysis methods
- Scenario 4 is very long term and will require significant transition and a transformational attitude toward the arts.
- AK is this the only one for the Arts & Industry District? No Scenario 6 does as well. SD what is the status of the Arts & Industry District? CR to clarify the A & I models.
- MB be very clear for Scenario 4. Understand the size, footprints, what does this mean? Can’t assume. Be practical.
- JF no room at 3700 without losing the space; CR ceiling heights.
- SD – if Scenario 4 is included; need to include Scenario 3 as the transitional piece. Is there willingness to leave the shop as it is. Included in the
- JK why even talking about Arts & Industry District. Can the business model be applied at Gunston?
- AM need for the schools to have the space -
- RB Gunston is remote & is not part of a district. It’s different than in a cluster of the arts.
- MR should we be explicit in the opening of the schools.
- AK is the need of APS a reason for moving out? Doesn’t think so... CR
- MB 4MRV Plan – Phase 2 and how to place into the CIP. Not in the CIP currently.

- SD was surprised with Scenario 5 -library model. Still serves the groups well and more users. Could shift to Scenario 4.
- SY states that Scenario 3 is an easy one. Closest to status quo.
- RB stated that Scenario 5 could be done in stages. CR stated that some elements could be piloted immediately
- AK asked about the ownership of the space. What is the impact on APS? Security?
- RB – several recommendations. Scenario 1 should be included as there are some specific benefits. SD asked if there should a dollar amount? \$10,000s Avant Bard – threat.
- 4, 3 transitional, 5 piloting,
- JK – should be an RFP process – “awarded” v “given” and the best bid would operate.
- MR – again concern about awards
- CR – a case where all could move forward. CMO could focus...
- SD some concerns about Scenario 6 – perhaps use the language of 6 for 2? CR keep all in.
- SY is having all 6 doable?
- RB banding makes sense. TRANSITION is most important.
- SD – for each element to include a piece about transition.

CostumeLab

- Scenario 1 – is there another grant? Costumes seem much more accessible these days. CR to retain.
- Scenario 2 move forward
- Scenario 3 – different because Signature already HAS an inventory now. Very common practice in the industry. Likely the only group in Arlington that has a costume shop.
- MR – why 3700 v elsewhere? Less size requirement? In approximately a year – DPR will be moving from the space.
- SD in the ranking likes Scenario 1 instead of 4. Cash may be preferable.
- MB has it been determined if there is a demand for Scenario 4? Overall allocation of resources – not a priority. Prioritizing resources
- MR limited use due to the hours? Not marketed?
- SD stated that costuming has changed over time. JH asked about the use of contemporary clothing for ... Ordering from international resources.
- RB asked if Scenario 4 moves forward? Remove.
- Order: 2, 3 & 1
- Question about TP use of the CostumeLab – need to transition
- Transition:
 - How to curate?
 - Opportunities to borrow? Very informal.
 - Merger of collections – need the bar code system. (Reston has a system)
 - Maker side – market via libraries
- CC – question about the community use and wants. JH indicated that there is a waiting list for the sewing machines @ Central Library.
- SD – maker space in Scenario 2. MR – workshops. CC – costume isn’t just theaters. Lots of creatives/crafty.
- JF – visual artists also need spaces for dying, etc. MR – cosplay.
- AK – question about the need for staffing? SY – yes for staffing (technical + marketing)
- PERHAPS HOLD #4. JF the status quo CAN be the transition.

- RB – report will feature all options
- AK – looking for the recommendations. How to think about the whole – if there are give & takes – how to best reflect.
- SY – space at Gunston. Give up CostumeLab for retention of Scenic Shop.
- SY – giving up CostumeLab is that a SHORT TERM solution & will be asked to CUT again?

WRAP-UP

- Writing the report
 - RB – the narrative should be explicit in how the county should support the arts. How to construct as to not the
 - MB – bigger discussion about the County to support the arts – the most shocking lack of support in the financial support is the grants side. Need to talk about the full picture.
 - RB makes for an odd question about HOW the inert objects are USED
 - MR helpful to have a descriptor (Status Quo, Move-Out, etc).
 - DRAFT REPORT PRIOR to meeting
 - JILL & RICHARD – have a framework to the group ASAP.
- COVER LETTER/TRANSMITTAL LETTER & potential support
- MR suggests that the letter to state the value of this committee
- Next meeting
 - Full committee: October 17, 2019 @ 6:30 pm
- OCTOBER 23 – presentation to the Arts Commission (Jill, Anika, Richard to present)
- AM to confirm with vendors about their capacity

ADJOURN

- The meeting adjourned at 8:48 PM.