

George Mason/Mary Ellen Henderson Campus Joint Process Planning Committee

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 20, 2014

7:30AM

CITY HALL – OAK ROOM

IN ATTENDANCE	David Tarter, Mayor (DT) David Snyder, Vice Mayor (DS) Susan Kearney, School Board Chair (SK) John Lawrence, School Board Member (JL) Ruth Rodgers, Planning Commission Chair (RR) Michael Novotny, EDA (MN) Wyatt Shields, City Manager (WS) Toni Jones, Superintendent of Schools (TJ)
OTHERS PARTICIPATING	Jim Snyder, Development Services (JS) Rick Goff, Economic Development (RG) Justin Castillo, School Board Member (JC)
DOCUMENTS/ RESOURCES	http://www.transwestern.net/public/MidAtlantic%20Region/Bethesda/TrendLines_2014/Post_Event/TL2014_Post_Event_Eblast.html http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/air_rights_development.asp

Agenda

2A:	Review schedule for meeting agendas.
2B:	Review Draft Roadmap (Meeting 1) and identify issues for each stage
2C:	Agreement on objective for next meeting.


Discussion and Recommendations (By Speaker)

Agenda	Speaker	
2A	WS	Deliverable by April 1 – Roadmap out to public. Two key pieces of information: Truth test the economic development assumptions. One assumption is that development would pay for, in substantial part, high school construction. Second assumption is that school will fit on campus after development. Will need expertise in urban school design to test that assumption.
	RR	Inquiry, do we anticipate having to pay the consultants to test the assumptions.
	WS	Thought would be to use parties with expertise that are not likely to be interested in developing the project.
	DT	Group must be sure we get good data. Caution that group does not rush based on the tight timeline.
	SK	First objective to see if we can build a school and still develop part of campus. Second objective is to determine who may be interested, and what types of development.
	DT	As part of roadmap, group should put thought into what group replaces this initial planning group.
	JC	This group has a charge not to delve into substance. The anchor is the conceptual location of the school but this group cannot choose that location.
	MN	If the objective is highest and best use, it will not come out of a short presentation by general experts.
	SK	The objective for <i>this</i> group is not to determine highest and best use.
	JP	There are some market resources available to provide help testing the aforementioned assumptions – cited potentials.
	MN	There is short-term value in learning about the school possibilities which will drive this project but little value in bringing someone in to tell the group that the land is valuable.
	SK	It is important to understand the value before process gets too far because it may unlock other potential considerations about what parts of school are on or off campus.
	JP	Parking on this site must also be a primary consideration.
	2B	DT
WS		Courtesy visit and discussion has started with UVa but there isn't much to report at this point.
SK		Suggest JL set up a meeting with Supervisor Foust.
WS		Distributed updated conceptual roadmap, which is designed to serve as the potential “deliverable”.
MN		Would like to see an actual schedule with specific objective for specific groups.
WS		Three modules to planning part – Information gathering, Vision, Strategy. (reference handout) Information gathering will be as public as possible.
JP		Grant application has been submitted.
WS		The implementation decision (PPEA, traditional municipal approach, etc) occurs much later in the process and is informed by the first three phases.

	RR	Inquiry – how will we inform and engage community groups that have already begun discussions. The League of Women Voters may have scheduled a panel to occur in March.
	WS	Ambassadors to those local groups will be important because keeping the groups in sync is vital.
	MN	(see photo attachment of alternative roadmap)
	MN	Visioning is probably the first part of the public process (as presented photo attachment)
	SK	Visioning may occur like the previous school visioning process.
	TJ	The current conceptual plan does not match the current budget. Need to figure out how to access resources for expertise during this process.
	DT	Next meeting – can we bring in one or two experts?
2C	SK	Update on contacts made. Next version of process roadmap. Resource needs.
	WS	Meeting next week will be to discuss resource needs. One meeting to bring in outside experts. One meeting to conclude this group's work.

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,	JL/Staff	
Set up a meeting with WMATA and VDOT	Staff	
Communication Plan to city groups	Staff	
Reach out to League of Women Voters – opportunity to join March panel	RR	ASAP

 Task Completed

Action Items (Discussed not assigned)

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

