

# George Mason/Mary Ellen Henderson Campus Joint Process Planning Committee

## MINUTES

APRIL 10, 2014

7:30AM

CITY HALL – OAK ROOM

<b>IN ATTENDANCE</b>	
	David Tarter, Mayor (DT) David Snyder, Vice Mayor (DS) Susan Kearney, School Board Chair (SK) John Lawrence, School Board Member (JL) Rob Meeks, Planning Commission Chair (RR) Michael Novotny, EDA (MN) Wyatt Shields, City Manager (WS) Toni Jones, Superintendent of Schools (TJ)
<b>OTHERS PARTICIPATING</b>	Jim Snyder, Development Services (JS)
<b>DOCUMENTS/ RESOURCES</b>	Draft Process Roadmap

### Agenda

6A:	Draft Process Roadmap

### Discussion and Recommendations (By Speaker)

Agenda	Speaker	
6A	SK	Provided input on document length and stated preference that future steering committee remain similarly constituted as the planning group.
	DT	Agreed with SK that a 1-2 page document would be preferred.
	MN	Found the longer draft proposal helpful.
	SK	Concern that laying out the future steps will turn the steering committee in certain directions that the group has not consciously decided to go in, and perhaps dictates certain outcomes. There is a benefit to the next group for being intentionally conceptual or even vague at this point. The document should only lay out the basic blocks and timing.
	WS	Noted that Action 3 "Select School Construction Method" was a sensitivity.
	SK	The document should be recrafted to include only the 4 or 5 high level decisions to be made, and not described as "steps to be taken", which occur after the information gathering stage.
	JL	Agreed with SK that the current draft feels more like an action plan.
	RM	Disagreed that more information at this point in time was necessarily harmful to the future steering committee.
	DT	Suggested that he would like a shorter 1-2 page document to distribute to the represented groups (CC, SB, EDA, PC) but that the full draft, as presented, would pass through to the steering committee.
	MN	Noting the sensitivity mentioned by WS, suggested that the draft leave out the "construction" section but the "Implementation" section is good and the first three sections are important to the process roadmap.
	WS	Described timeline and sought group approval for "information gathering" to be shown as a summer/fall activity, and "vision" as a fall/winter, or perhaps winter/spring activity.
	WS	Pointed out to group that there is a zoning "vacuum" right now as the campus is not zoned and we are required by law to do so.
	MN	Questioned whether any zoning action taken now would negatively impact the future value of the property.
	WS	The roadmap should list this as a very early action "How to zone it initially".
	SK	Agreed that the "vision" timeline is optimistic and it may extend into Summer 2015.
	DT	Concerned about creating unrealistic expectations using the timelines beyond phase 1 (information gathering) because of the unknown results of that first phase.
	DT	Reported on meeting with Supervisor Foust, learned that the initial plans for the metro property did not include transit-oriented future development. Described it as more of a "suburban" property, but that determination was made long-ago and has not been revisited in some time.
	MN	Back to process roadmap, would like to see language in 1A and 2A changed to "design planning consultant" from "development consultant". The document implies that "we" are developing the property but that isn't the likely outcome and our task is to monetize the property, not develop it.
	SK	Agreed with MN that we will need a "process consultant" or program manager.
	MN	Clarified that we specifically will need "design" help from outside resources and that the internal staff hire should be the "process" manager described by SK.
	SK	Added that one of the early decisions in the roadmap would be what type of staff/consultant needs we have.

	WS	Envisions a firm that has experience advising public agencies on design and master planning. Envisioned staff member coordinates those activities but is not necessarily the process expert. Vetting a consultant list would be a task for the steering committee.
	DT	Suggested that the steering committee would benefit from more "big picture" sessions like the one with Bob Wulff before they get to the point of picking consultants to work with.
	MN	Page 9, Action 2 – suggests that we need to think differently from "developing the property". Suggested "marketing the property". Has difficulty with specific phrase "select developer for commercial development".
	JS	Confirmation that the ULI grant timing (Fall) will work for the steering committee.
	RM	Commended staff for securing the grant and praised the product created by ULI.
	DT	Proposed action item that representative from ULI visit with the steering committee as soon as possible.
	WS	Composition of future steering committee discussed. Advocating for efficient decision-making structure.
	RM	Questioned whether a smaller group was necessary and felt a larger group would be more valuable to the project outcomes and community support for the outcome.
	SK	School Board unlikely to support a larger steering committee, as it is advisory, and not a decision-making group. School Board would expect more SB representatives on steering committee if additional members were added from other groups.
	MN	Economic Development would like to see equal weight on the steering committee between schools and EDA.
	RM	It would be disappointing if the composition of the steering committee was viewed as "city" versus "schools".
	MN	There has not been enough discussion about the ongoing tax revenue resulting from the project, and that will potentially, fundamentally, change the future financial direction of the City. To this point the target has been financing the school but the the next group needs to pay equal attention to the ongoing tax revenue.
	WS	Summary of draft changes. 1. Add issues to be decided as "headline" in the four phases. 2. "Actions" are characterized as expected to flow from the decisions. 3. Construction section should be brief/open. 4. Add zoning as a future decision. 5. Planning committee members should make their case about steering committee composition to the City Council.
	WS	Will produce a cover memo of this groups work and will circulate along with the 1-3 page deliverable.

## Action Items (Proposed)

Item	Assigned to:	Delivery
Determine expertise needed by committee and estimate of costs	Staff	
Make recommendation for staff support (outside of experts/consultants) for both short term (life of this committee) and long-term (life of project).	Staff	
Provide survey of site to include adjoining property descriptions, easements, owners.	Staff	
Locate and provide copy of WMATA deed and special exception	NA	
Application to MWCOG and ULI Washington	Jim Snyder	Feb 14, 2014
Meeting Notice Requirements	City and School Staff	ASAP / Ongoing
Develop Charter for a Steering Committee	City Council/School Board	April 1, 2014
Set up a meeting with Supervisor Foust, (Contact)	JL/Staff	Feb 27, 2014
Set up a meeting with WMATA (Contact)	Staff	Feb 27, 2014
Contact VDOT Urban Affairs	Staff	
Communication Plan to city groups	Staff	
Reach out to League of Women Voters – opportunity to join March panel	RR	ASAP
Request ULI representative meet with steering committee	Jim Snyder	

Task Completed     In Progress

## Action Items (Discussed not assigned)

Item	Assigned to:	Delivery
Develop report on debt capacity and options other than PPEA.		