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:

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

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:
     o Exploratory; exploratory & creative; analytical; very analytical (NOT scientific);
   • And process moving forward:
     o 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
     o Highlighting is reflected in the numbers
       ▪ Increase +1
       ▪ Reduce -1
       ▪ Stay the Same 0
       ▪ EXCEPT – Risk...Increase (-1) and Reduce (1)
     o Comments are reflected in the reasons & arguments
     o Provided TWO scores: split out County staffing & net tax support
• Three numbers to evaluate:
  o Impact – sum of all the ratings against the main criteria apart from County staff &
    net tax support
  o Impact – assuming staff & net tax support is a positive
  o 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 ensured. 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:
  o Form the Group
  o Who & who leads the Group – just arts groups + APS
  o SOPs, Rules, Regulations – Committee Charter
  o 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.
• 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
  o Market research
  o Current stage
  o Equitable price structure
  o 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:
  o How to curate?
  o Opportunities to borrow? Very informal.
  o Merger of collections – need the bar code system. (Reston has a system)
  o 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
  o RB – the narrative should be explicit in how the county should support the arts. How to construct as to not the
  o 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.
  o RB makes for an odd question about HOW the inert objects are USED
  o MR helpful to have a descriptor (Status Quo, Move-Out, etc).
  o DRAFT REPORT PRIOR to meeting
  o 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
  o 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.