

FCPA - Resident Curator Program Development Project Team
March 28, 2016, 6:30 p.m.
Fairfax County Government Center Conference Rooms 2-3
Meeting Minutes

Facilitator: Denice Dressel, Park Authority Resident Curator Project Manager

Members Present:

Robert Beach, FCHC	John Burns, ARB	Elise Murray, FCHC	Cindy Walsh, FCPA
Linda Blank, DPZ	Elizabeth Crowell, FCPA	Judith Pedersen, FCPA	Connie Weyant, FMD
David Bowden, FCPA	Christopher Daniel, ARB	Sara Silverman, OCA	
Janet Burns, FCPA	Josephine Gilbert, DOF	Michael Thompson, PAB	

Call to order: approx. 6:30 p.m.

Opening and Welcome

Welcome David Bowden, Park Planning and Development Director, in place of Brian Williams

Administrative Items

- Agenda approved
- February's meeting minutes approved without comment
- Program update – Cindy Walsh reported that a Not-In-Package (NIP) item was presented to the Board of Supervisor's to update them on the RC program development progress. The project team is approved to move forward with advertising Ellmore Farmhouse and Stemspon House for Applications for Curatorship, and Ash Grove, Hannah P. Clark House, Lahey Lost Valley, and Turner Farmhouse for Invitations for Expressions of Interest.

Ms. Walsh mentioned the Caretaker Program was addressed in the NIP, for properties which are not in need of substantial renovation, but confirmed the Caretaker Program development would not be the purview of this RC Program Development Team.

Reports from Committees

- Marketing committee update – An update Communications Plan was distributed. Judy Pedersen reported that she and Denice had met with Channel 16 and were hopeful about the prospect of having video media coverage for the RC program in the form of a 3-4 minute county news magazine piece, a Public Service Announcement, and coverage of the properties' open houses. Ms. Pedersen said that we are waiting for final proof from Production Services on the rack card and logo. We will be using the logo to create the signs for the properties. We will also be placing an ad for the program in the fall Parktakes.
- Financial committee update – Denice Dressel reported that the financial committee met to discuss the valuations from the Department of Taxation and the impact the real estate tax assessment might have on the attractiveness of a curatorship. The group agreed that we should pursue a legislative fix to this disincentive. Ms. Dressel and Ms. Walsh will be following up with the County Executive's office in April. With that, the

FCPA - Resident Curator Program Development Project Team
March 28, 2016, 6:30 p.m.
Fairfax County Government Center Conference Rooms 2-3
Meeting Minutes

financial committee's work is concluded. Ms. Dressel thanked staff who participated in the financial committee for their time and expertise.

New Business

- Review of DRAFT "Inspection Process and Accountability Measures for Curatorship" – comments and edits from project team:
 - General comment that the language is too bureaucratic
 - Make paragraph at the bottom the opening paragraph
 - Terms are confusing – go back and look at application and be consistent with our terms. ("Work Plan" and "General Schedule" were approved in Application and will be used from here on out, throughout the program documents.)
 - Create a definitions page linking back to terms in document
 - Question about digital submissions of photo files – check with DIT as we move forward. Use "Agreed upon electronic media" for phrasing
 - Change psi to dpi. Suggestion was made to change minimum requirements to 600 dpi. However, the state and federal requirements for photo documentation is 300 dpi. I believe we should follow their lead and not require more than what is standard
 - Add Fire Marshall under list of inspections curator must secure
 - Add "sweat equity" as a reported item in annual report
 - Leave open the possibility of more frequent inspections during maintenance phase
 - Historic Overlay District Zoning Ordinance should be added to Appendix where relevant
 - Add a sentence about the approval process for annual report.
 - Concern was raised about unapproved work and the need to monitor the properties. This is a staffing issue and will depend on the workload of the staff. All agree, diligent monitoring of the properties will be necessary.
 - Please review and return comments to by April 11, 2016 for editing and revision.

- Review DRAFT "Invitation for Expressions of Interest"
 - Keep language consistent throughout all program documents. Denice will be going through and editing everything for consistency before public release.
 - The FOIA-ability of the information provided by respondents was raised. PIO will provide a boiler plate statement to be added to disclaimers.
 - The FOIA implications is another issue that should be brought up for a possible legislative fix, due to the sensitive nature of the personal and financial information.
 - The timing of releasing the Invitation for Expression of Interest was discussed. Concerns were expressed that there may be some confusion about the 2 processes, the Curatorship Application and the Expression of Interest. A suggestion was made that some of the confusion can be addressed through the web page layout.
 - Some team members expressed their opinion that the 2 processes should be staggered to avoid public confusion and overburdening staff.

FCPA - Resident Curator Program Development Project Team
March 28, 2016, 6:30 p.m.
Fairfax County Government Center Conference Rooms 2-3
Meeting Minutes

- Staff limitations are a consideration. Resource Management Division is hiring a Historic Preservation Manager, so there will be more staff.
- Question was raised of how long are we leaving these advertisements open? 60 days? Who makes that decision? The next group, the Evaluation Team, will have some say in this process since they will be leading the implementation phase.
- What if we get no response? Maryland refreshes deadline. Suggestion was made for the project team to not micromanage and allow staff to use their judgment.
- Review and have comments back to Ms. Dressel by April 11, 2016.

Old Business

- Evaluation Team and Criteria for Evaluation of Curator Proposal Amendment
Motion was made and discussion was opened on the previously adopted composition of the Evaluation Team. Mr. Beach, representing the Fairfax County History Commission, moved to amend the Evaluation Team composition by striking, “5. A representative from relevant county board, authority, or commission,” and inserting, “5. A representative from the Fairfax County History Commission.”
 - Discussion centered on accommodating representation for both the Architectural Review Board and the History Commission on the Evaluation Team, and the need for a Historical Architect to be represented on the team. Many alternatives were discussed, but none agreed upon. The discussion circled back to, and ended up on the original agreed upon composition of the evaluation team.
- A vote was taken on the amendment which failed to pass. The original language and composition of the Evaluation Team stands.

Meeting Conclusion

- Upcoming tasks – Next meeting should be our final meeting. Please return final comments on discussion items by April 11, 2016.
- **Adjourn – 8:45 meeting adjourned**