



RACC/PAAC REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, January 11, 2024, 7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Location: 450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond Rm, 1st Floor Conference Rm
In-Person Meeting. Masks are highly encouraged.

RACC Chair

Lynson Beaulieu

RACC Vice-Chair

Kaelen Van Cura

Council Liaison

Soheila Bana

Staff

Winifred Day

Tony Tamayo

Shane Johnson

RACC/PAAC Members:

Phillip Mehas, Ted Bell, Melody Kozma-Kennedy, Carole Porter, Arleide Santos, Virginia Jourdan (Currently all, Richmond Arts and Culture Commissioners (RACC) also serve as Public Art Advisory Committee (PAAC) members)

- I. **WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL (Chair Beaulieu)** 7:00 p.m.
- II. **ACTION ITEMS:** 7:03 p.m.
 - a. **APPROVE January 11, 2024 RACC/PAAC Meeting Agenda**
 - b. **APPROVE December 14, 2023 RACC/PAAC Meeting Minutes**
- III. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** 7:06 p.m.
Individuals who would like to address the Richmond Arts and Culture Commission (RACC) on relevant matters not listed on the agenda may do so under Public Comment. Public comments cannot result in discussion/action at this meeting.
- IV. **INFORMATION ITEMS** 7:08 p.m.
 - a. Budget Wish List FY 24-25
- V. **RACC PROJECTS and PUBLIC ART Staff Report/Updates** 8:00 p.m.
 - a. Arts District Master Planning Consultant RFQ/RFP
 - b. NPA Mini Grant RFP Update
 - c. CW Allen Brothers Public Art Project RFQ/RFP
 - d. Large Public Art Commission Project Update
- VI. **Discussion Items** 8:15 p.m.
 - a. Ad-Hoc Committee - leaders
- VII. **Commissioner Updates** 8:45 p.m.
- ADJOURNMENT until February 8, 2024** 9:00 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS

1. RACC December 14, 2023 Meeting Minutes
2. Technical Assistance Workshop
https://richmond.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=35
3. Sample Memorials Policy
4. Gifts and Memorials Intro
5. Portland Memorials Policy
6. Public Art related opportunities

NOTES

Please encourage artists to register for the Artist Database using this link:
<https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/FormCenter/Arts-Culture-Division-20/City-of-Richmond-Artist-Database-149>

Please submit a boards/commissions application for consideration to:
cityclerkdept@ci.richmond.ca.us

Link to application:

<https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/2641/BOARD-OR-COMMISSION-APPLICATION-FORM-fillable>

MEETING PROCEDURES

The following provides information on how the public can participate in this meeting.

Public comments may be submitted:

Via email to winfred_day@ci.richmond.ca.us. Email must contain in the subject line **public comments – Item #**. All comments must be submitted on or before Wednesday, January 10, 2024, by 4:30 pm and must include the following:

- a) Your Name
- b) Your Phone Number
- c) The item for which you wish to make a Public Comment.

Requests for comments received up until the public comment period on the relevant agenda item is closed, will be accommodated as is reasonably possible and will be limited to a maximum of one to two minutes, depending on the number of commenters.

Record of all public comments:

All public comments will be considered a public record, put into the official meeting record, and considered before Commission action. All public comments will be available after the meeting as supplemental materials and will be posted as an attachment to the meeting minutes when the minutes are posted.

Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities:

Upon request, the City will provide for written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services and sign language interpreters, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in and provide comments at/related to public meetings. Please submit a request, including your name, phone number and/or email address, and a description of the modification, accommodation, auxiliary aid, service or alternative format requested at least two days before the meeting. Requests should be emailed to Winifred_Day@ci.richmond.ca.us or submitted by phone at (510) 620-6952. Requests will be granted whenever possible and resolved in favor of accessibility.

ATTACHMENT 1

**RICHMOND ARTS AND CULTURE COMMISSION (RACC)
PUBLIC ART ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAAC)
In-Person Meeting
450 Civic Center Plaza, 1st Floor Conference Room
Richmond, California
Regular Meeting Minutes
December 14, 2023
7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.**

Present: Chair Lynson Beaulieu, Vice-Chair Kaelen Van Cura and Commissioners Ted Bell, Virginia Jourdan, Phillip Mehas, Carole Porter, and Arleide da Silva Santos

Absent: Commissioner Melody Kozma-Kennedy and Council Liaison Soheila Bana

Staff Present: Arts & Culture Manager Winifred Day

I. WELCOME / CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The RACC/PAAC Regular Meeting was called to order by Chair Beaulieu at 7:00 p.m.

II. ACTION ITEMS

a. APPROVE December 14, 2023 RACC/PAAC Meeting Agenda

Vice-Chair Van Cura reported she had been unable to open all of the attachments shown on the December 14, 2023 meeting agenda.

Arts & Culture Manager Winifred Day explained that the information was available on the RACC website and she could resend the information if needed.

Chair Beaulieu said that the attachments should be resent to all the Commissioners so that everyone had the same information.

Chair Beaulieu requested the following item be added under Item VI. Discussion Items: Discussion to consider changing the RACC meeting start time from 7:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Day also requested the meeting agenda be further revised with Item VI. Commissioner Updates to be modified to read Item VII. Commissioner Updates.

Motion by Commissioner Bell, seconded by Commissioner Porter to approve the December 14, 2023 Meeting Agenda, as amended, carried by a show of hands.

b. APPROVE November 12, 2023 RACC/PAAC Meeting Minutes

Vice-Chair Van Cura requested that the spelling of Cordell Hindler's name, as shown on Page 2 of the November 12, 2023 meeting minutes, be corrected to read *Cordell Hindler*.

Motion by Commissioner Santos, seconded by Commissioner Porter to approve the November 12, 2023 RACC Meeting Minutes, as amended, carried by a show of hands.

c. APPROVE November 28, 2023 RACC/PAAC Special Meeting Minutes

Motion by Vice-Chair Van Cura, seconded by Commissioner Porter to approve the November 28, 2023 RACC Special Meeting Minutes, as shown, carried by a show of hands.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Introduction of Virginia Jourdan

Virginia Jourdan, a member of the Steering Committee for the Art of the African Diaspora, an exhibiting artist and a teacher who taught art to seniors, introduced herself as a new member of the RACC. As a resident of the City of Richmond, she wanted to see the City be beautified and commented on her experience with event planning and making spaces more welcoming.

RACC members introduced themselves, highlighted their backgrounds and welcomed Commissioner Jourdan to the RACC.

b. Budget Wish List FY 24-25

Ms. Day reported this was the time for the RACC to identify potential projects for consideration in the next year's budget. During the August Retreat, the RACC had been provided information on the budget and the items that had been proposed in the past and for the current budget year. She highlighted some of the budget items that had been identified at this time for the benefit of Commissioner Jourdan.

Commissioner Santos provided an overview of some of her ideas for the Budget Wish List for FY 24-25 including a request for a Youth Assistant for social media and newsletters in the amount of \$9,000; funds for RACC attendance at two conferences, an annual conference for the California Association for the Arts (CAA) and the other an unidentified conference in the amount of \$30,000 for each conference; and funds for RACC Commissioners to attend local arts and culture fundraising events around the community in the amount of \$3,000, with the funds to be used for entrance fees or other associated costs for the events.

Commissioner Porter requested funds to allow RACC members to meet off-site to be able to socialize and get to know one another at least two to three times a year to benefit the team.

Chair Beaulieu pointed out there were limitations for all RACC members to meet off-site due to Brown Act regulations.

Vice-Chair Van Cura understood that RACC members could meet off-site as long as they did not discuss RACC business.

Ms. Day clarified that Artist Steven Bruce had offered his studio as a place for art-related activities, which could qualify for meeting off-site. Another artist from Napa had extended an invitation to tour his studio which offered an example to see how successful artists worked in the Bay Area.

Commissioner Mehas suggested if the RACC met at an artist studio for a tour, as an example, it was likely they would talk business and meeting socially would offer a better avenue.

Commissioner Mehas suggested it was a great idea to set aside funds for conference attendance. He spoke to his past experience attending art conferences both in and outside California. As to the request for funds for a Youth Assistant for social media, he suggested students from Richmond RYSE could be considered as potential interns.

Chair Beaulieu suggested staff review the travel policies and use of funds for meeting both in and outside of the state.

Commissioner Porter suggested if the RACC were to make a difference in the City of Richmond getting outside of the City and outside of the United States, if possible, was important to be able to bring back new ideas and ignite new opportunities throughout the City.

Commissioner Mehas reported he had attended a recent meeting at the Richmond Library and had proposed an artist-in-residency given that the new Library might be able to create a live/work space (a room in the new Library) for an artist. He suggested the City of Richmond could partner with the Richmond Art Center and other organizations to create an artist-in-residency program.

Ms. Day clarified the majority of the funds for the renovation of the Library were going towards improvements to the building and not so much for programming.

c. Cultural Event Fund and Memorial Policies Procedures

Chair Beaulieu stated the Cultural Event Fund and Memorial Policies Procedures Committees needed leadership. She recommended a RACC committee comprised of two or three members and explained that the purpose of the Cultural Event Fund Committee was to create the rules for someone to access funds from the Cultural Event Fund and identify, as an example, who was eligible to receive money from the fund.

Commissioner Porter volunteered to take the lead on the Committee for a Cultural Event Fund.

Ms. Day explained that staff would also research how other cities had handled a Cultural Event Fund since it was likely other cities had the same challenges as the City of Richmond.

Vice-Chair Van Cura recalled that Commissioner Kozma-Kennedy had expressed interest in serving on the Cultural Event Fund Committee.

Chair Beaulieu noted the RACC website included a portal for the NPA Mini Grants, which had information on the NPA Mini Grant applications and ideas that could be helpful with a Cultural Event Fund program.

Ms. Day suggested the committees could provide a recommendation at the January 2024 RACC meeting so that in the month of February the RACC could vote on something and begin implementation.

As to the formation of a Memorial Policies Procedures Committee, Chair Beaulieu suggested the item be postponed to allow the RACC to read the documents that had been included as attachments to the meeting agenda, which all Commissioners had not been able to access. She recommended the documents be resent as PDF files.

Ms. Day explained that the examples provided in the attachments to the meeting agenda had come from Barbara Goldstein, the City's consultant for the Public Art Master Plan, and there were plenty of other examples available from across the country.

Commissioner Mehas commented that the people involved with the existing Miller Knox Memorial had been part of a number of private donors, former staff and others and there had been plenty of research for that memorial that could be considered.

Ms. Day reiterated the intent to have a Memorial Policies Procedures Committee comprised of about three people who would do the research and make a recommendation to the RACC.

Commissioner Porter clarified with the Chair that the Memorial Policies Procedures Committee was intended to review potential policies and procedures for how the City of Richmond would address requests for memorials outside of any funding.

Ms. Day provided further clarification and explained the purpose was to define a policy for any memorial that had some kind of art connection or art context. She also provided an update on the Pedie Perez Project. The concept design had previously been presented to the RACC, the Perez Family and the artist had been working on a design they could agree on, to consist of a photo transfer process of different stages of Pedie Perez's life, although the Perez Family had not yet approved the design transfer, which was why the project had yet to be completed. Once the project was complete, the RACC could be informed.

Commissioners Bell, Porter and Chair Beaulieu expressed the willingness to serve on a Memorial Policies and Procedures Committee.

Ms. Day also provided an overview of the Brown Act requirements when Commissioners sent out emails to other RACC members and explained that those requirements had been outlined in the RACC handbook.

V. RACC PROJECTS and PUBLIC ART Staff Report/Updates

a. NPA Mini Grant RFP Update

Ms. Day reported the RACC had been provided a test on the NPA Mini Grant Request for Proposal (RFP) and if any changes were recommended to the NPA Mini Grant document, she asked that those changes be provided to staff immediately so that the information could be available during the holidays. She recognized there had been challenges with the length of the document in the past, but there were certain legal checks and balances required to be in place. The call for NPA Mini Grants would be out a bit longer and the current cycle had started earlier than it had in the past.

Ms. Day added that for the next RACC meeting, a summary of the current contracts and whether there were existing RACC liaisons assigned would be provided along with solicitation of RACC liaisons for any unassigned projects. She urged Commissioners to consider which projects they would like to serve as a liaison. She also said that two projects – those proposed by Peggy Mocine and Sally Hindman were no longer moving forward.

Vice-Chair Van Cura reported she was already working with the Richmond NIAD Art Center on its contract and had previously expressed the desire to serve as the liaison for the John Wehrle project. She also asked that Ms. Day review the previous months' minutes because the Commissioners had already discussed which projects they would be liaisons for.

Commissioner Jourdan expressed the willingness to serve as the liaison for the Steven Bruce and Art of African Diaspora NPA Mini Grant projects.

Commissioner Santos would get back to staff with the artists she would like to serve as liaison.

Commissioner Bell expressed the willingness to serve as liaison for the same artists he had worked with in the past year, which was John Barrow and Mark Anthony. Speaking again to the Budget Wish List for FY 24-25, he requested consideration of some form of mentorship/incentive program for repeat recipients and possibly additional funding to whatever the artists were receiving or reward for mentorship, and Ms. Day suggested a proposal could be put together.

Chair Beaulieu liked the idea of an Incentive Fund for mentors.

Commissioner Santos commented she had started to prepare some social media language for the NPA Mini Grants and was working with Administrative Analyst Shané Johnson on the use of Ms. Johnson's Facebook account to posts ads.

In terms of advertisement of the NPA Mini Grants and in response to Commissioner Jourdan, Ms. Day confirmed the Art of the African Diaspora mailing list had been used, as had other sources.

Commissioner Mehas reported that the Point Richmond Gallery had informed him of the willingness to have all of their artists on the RACC mailing list.

Ms. Day urged Commissioners to use the database information posted on the back of the meeting agendas.

Vice-Chair Van Cura suggested it would be a good idea for the RACC website to have a button for subscribers.

Chair Beaulieu understood the artistry registry was where people signed up and provided information about themselves as artists.

Ms. Day explained that when she did mailings she used the Art for the African Diaspora, Richmond Arts Center and other lists and if there were specific projects looking for specific types of artists, she had groups she could contact who may have pre-qualified artists to match to specific projects.

Vice-Chair Van Cura highlighted some options using an email service provider such as Mailchimp or Klaviyo that could be considered to better organize a list of names for a mailing list and comply with federal SPAM laws.

Ms. Day suggested if the Vice-Chair was willing, she encouraged her to work with staff to design something that could be considered. The first step would be to detail and write out exactly what she wanted it to look like.

Commissioner Porter suggested the Vice-Chair could prepare a scope of requirements the Information Technology (IT) Department could design.

b. CW Allen Brothers Public Art Project RFQ/RFP

Ms. Day reported the RACC had held a Special Meeting on November 28, 2023 to consider increasing the funds for the CW Allen Brothers Public Art Project. The RACC had approved an additional \$100,000 to approve the 211 West Cutting Boulevard CW Allen Brothers Prologis Building, an additional budget allocation towards the trompe l'oeil or photo realism style mural to complement the 731 West Cutting Boulevard mural.

Staff continued to work on the Request for Proposal/Request for Qualification (RFP/RFQ) with more legal clarity in the contract to ensure that the expectations and legal requirements were clearly defined. The style of the mural had been determined by the developer, with the trompe l'oeil or photo realism style preferred, which had been outlined in the RFP/RFQ. The purpose of the increase in funds for the project had been to ensure a quality product.

c. Large Public Art Commission Project Update

Ms. Day reported the City had recently rescinded the contract for the Large Public Art Commission Project but would reissue the contract for the \$100,000 Kennedy Park Project. Staff was to meet with the Kennedy Park Neighborhood Council in the next month to allow input on the project from the start in the hopes there would not be the confusion that had occurred with the prior contract.

Vice-Chair Van Cura suggested the final artists selected should also meet with the community to ensure there was no miscommunication like what had occurred with the prior contract.

VI. Discussion Items

a. Contract on Pre-payment Arts on Large Commission (Kaelen)

Vice-Chair Van Cura commented that the City's contracts for large commission art projects were similar to construction contracts, which was not normal. She had done a lot of research on Public Art Commission Agreements and one of the agreements she had reviewed highlighted the different parts of the contract and why it was important to be specific to the artwork and refer to the artist. She wanted to look at the City's current contract and compare it to other cities and ensure the payment schedule had been structured in a way to ensure smaller artists would be able to do the work, both to ensure equity and because they did not receive funds for an extended period of time.

Vice-Chair Van Cura explained that her idea was to form a RACC committee to review a model Public Art Commission Agreement and review other cities contracts, particularly the payment schedule and compare those contracts with what the City of Richmond required.

Ms. Day advised the Alameda County Art Commission had prepared a new contract that was similar to what the Vice-Chair sought and could be reviewed.

Vice-Chair Van Cura wanted to ensure the City's contract was normal and artists were able to apply, particularly since they did not get funds for a long period of time. Based on her review of contracts from other cities as compared to the City of Richmond, there were differences in the payment schedule. She could do further research prior to the next RACC meeting and could get more information from Alameda County and San Francisco, and the current payment schedule for the City of Richmond to allow a comparison to the model Public Art Commission Agreement. Thereafter, the RACC could review the documents and provide feedback on any potential changes.

Ms. Day added the cities of Berkeley and Emeryville also had active art groups and contracts that could be reviewed.

b. Arts District

Ms. Day reported the City Council had directed Economic Development staff to create a draft Arts District RFP to solicit an art consultant/team to do the work for an Arts District, with the call to go out at the end of December.

The intent was to hire someone to do the research and then return to the City Council and the RACC with information to identify some of the deliverables sought, and to identify which target neighborhoods would be appropriate to define an Arts District. The scope and deliverables of service would be reviewed by the City Manager's Office. The RACC would not be the lead for this effort since this was a City Council project.

Commissioner Porter asked why Barbara Goldstein's work on the Public Art Master Plan could not be used as leverage for this effort to save the City money.

Ms. Day confirmed that Ms. Goldstein had been invited to respond to the RFP as a candidate for the project, although she (Ms. Goldstein) had informed her she was ready to retire. People with specific Arts District experience and experience with cities the size of Richmond had been invited to apply to the RFP. She reiterated the RACC was not the lead for this effort, this was a City Council project but she had asked that a member of the RACC be represented on the selection panel.

Ms. Day commented that when the RACC had held its August Retreat, it had identified eleven recommendations, one of which was the formation of an Arts District. While the RACC was not the lead for the project, she described this as a positive for the City and she had worked to ensure the RFP had as much detail as possible to allow a clear scope of services in terms of deliverables. The RFP also sought someone with grant writing experience who could raise money. She hoped to have more information at the next RACC meeting.

Commissioner Porter suggested there had been a gap in the process for the City to go out for an RFP for an Arts District and not have representation from the RACC.

Commissioner Jourdan suggested the concept for live/work studios should also be considered as part of an Arts District, and Ms. Day explained that the Arts District would have a lot of parts. She suggested the RACC review the Arts District model for Tulsa, Oklahoma, which was informative.

c. Artist Registry

Ms. Day explained that the intent for an Artist Registry was to have a list of pre-qualified artists so that a call was not required each time. She hoped to have at least ten artists, as an example, who could be available for each medium. A sample directory from Art Murmur was shared with the RACC at this time.

Commissioner Mehas commented on the feedback he had received that some artists had no problem including their names on a mailing list for upcoming events but did not want to have to fill out a lengthy application.

Ms. Day suggested there were ways to attract people and the RACC could build on existing efforts. She offered as an example the Artist Registry for the City of San Jose, which included over 1,000 artists and which included pre-qualified calls. She suggested the City of Richmond could do the same.

Commissioner Santos commented that people liked to earn things and feel important and there were benefits for an artist whose name was on an Artist Registry.

Commissioner Mehas suggested diversity suffered at times with pre-qualified lists.

Ms. Day understood the concerns but stated one of the City's requirements was to have applications from diverse artists.

Chair Beaulieu suggested the registry was important for people to sign up so the City had that information.

d. Ad-Hoc Committee - Leaders

This item had been discussed as part of an earlier conversation.

e. Change of Meeting Time

The RACC discussed a change in the RACC meeting start time from 7:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. There was no consensus to change the meeting start time since not all RACC members could meet earlier than 7:00 p.m. As a result, there was no change to the start time for RACC meetings.

VII. Commissioner Updates

Vice-Chair Van Cura reported she had attended the Richmond Art Center Holiday Arts Festival and had visited an artist/painter studio in her neighborhood.

Commissioner Santos stated she had also attended the Richmond Art Center Holiday Arts Festival and appreciated the local artists. She asked that when Commissioners attended any arts events in the community, they tag the event so she could post it on the RACC social media page. She also reported that Vice-Chair Van Cura had recently taped a video to highlight her background as a RACC member and the work of the RACC, which could also be posted on social media. She added that more footage from Commissioners was welcome.

Commissioner Jourdan reported she had been a vendor at the Richmond Art Center Holiday Arts Festival as part of the Art of the African Diaspora.

The RACC discussed at length the regulations when posting on social media for events in and outside of the City of Richmond, and how to send items to Commissioner Santos for posting.

Ms. Day also reported that the Museum of African Diaspora in San Francisco was soliciting for African-American artists for an entire year for its Artist-in-Residency Program. In addition, she had provided the RACC with a list of its accomplishments for the year. She wished everyone Seasons Greetings and thanked everyone for their support, for the productive meetings and she looked forward to continued efforts in the next year.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT until January 2024

On motion by Vice-Chair Van Cura, seconded by Commissioner Santos, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:06 p.m. to a Regular Meeting of the RACC/PAAC on January 11, 2024.

Glendale Sample Memorials Policy

INTRODUCTION

The City of Glendale may occasionally decide to install permanent memorials on City property to commemorate persons or events of note, or to otherwise convey the City's position on various topics (referred to as "Government Speech"). By placing memorials on City property, the City intends only to engage in government speech and does not intend to open a public forum for free speech activity. The City seeks to establish a standard measure for review of prospective donated memorials by the appropriate City Commission and the City Council to ensure that only objects of the highest standard of excellence are accepted.

The following policy for the acceptance of memorials defines the types of donations that the city will accept and establishes criteria for review and acceptance of these objects. The following types of projects are considered in this policy:

1. The gift of a newly commissioned memorial to be located permanently upon City of Glendale property or public Right of Way;
2. The offer by a donor to organize a public competition that will result in the gift or loan of a memorial to be located permanently or temporarily upon City of Glendale property.

POLICY

This policy provides a framework for review and approval of prospective memorials. The City will only accept memorials that are of the highest quality. Memorials must meet the subject criteria outlined below. In order for the City to accept donations of memorials, it must first determine that there is an identified space for exhibition on City property or within City facilities.

The City will not accept as memorials objects that are unlimited reproductions or are mass-produced. Memorials may be created in media such as paintings, mosaics, sculpture, and other site-specific installations. These memorial donations differ from public artworks developed under the City's Urban Art Program.

DEFINITIONS

Memorials are markers, statues, and other similar permanent installations to express Government Speech, as further described in this policy, and which are installed by the City on City property, or which are accepted by the City and installed on City property with City permission. Memorials may be in various forms including:

- Sculpture;
- Fountains; or
- Other forms of memorials as determined by the City.

Artwork Memorials are memorials that are designed by an artist.

MEMORIALS AND GOVERNMENT SPEECH

The City has established the following considerations for the topic of memorials:

1. The placement of memorials shall be limited to circumstances of the highest community-wide importance, both to maintain the significance of such memorials and to minimize conflicts with the active and variable use of public spaces.
2. Memorials should convey a powerful connection between Glendale, its natural setting, and its history.
3. Memorials should recognize significant circumstance, events, or people or to provide information on topics approved by the City, as set forth below:
 - The contributions of individuals or groups who made a substantial impact upon the City of Glendale or Los Angeles County;
 - The history of Glendale, California, or of the United States;
 - Historical, natural, or cultural influences on Glendale
 - Local innovation or creativity that has contributed to Glendale's growth and prosperity;
or
 - Other criteria selected by City Council and set forth in an amendment to this Policy.

The City does not permit the installation of memorials to living persons, and usually a minimum of five years between an event and its commemoration is recommended, to allow for sufficient historical perspective.

The City may decide, in its sole discretion, to reject a proposal for a memorial and/or may determine the appropriate site for any and all City memorials.

PROCEDURES FOR ACCEPTANCE OF MEMORIALS

Application Process

Potential gifts of memorials must be submitted to the City Manager's Office (CMO) for initial review. If the memorial is determined to be an artwork memorial, the Urban Art Program will be notified to initiate a review and approval process. CMO staff will respond to all donor inquiries and advise donors of the process for review and approval based on this determination.

Gifts of memorials may not be offered for a specific site. Before offering a permanently-sited memorial, the donor must submit an initial request for placement consideration to the City Manager, who will consult with City Department staff to identify an appropriate site. Once a potential site has been identified, the donor must submit a site plan demonstrating the relationship of the work to the proposed location and include color photographs of the site.

For gifts of memorials, the completed application must be accompanied by:

1. A letter from the donor stating the purpose of the memorial and its responsiveness to the criteria stated above;
2. A model, color photographs, or a color rendering of the proposed memorial. If the work is three-dimensional, multiple views are required;
3. If the memorial is an artwork:
 - a. A professional assessment of the artwork's condition created by a conservator and accompanied by maintenance requirements;
 - b. The artist's resume;
 - c. Information of the artwork's context, provenance, and history (e.g. where it has been shown, who owned it, etc.)
 - d. A letter of authentication from the artist or the artist's estate.
4. Evidence that there are sufficient funds available for the fabrication, installation, and ongoing care of the memorial

Review and Evaluation

A six-step process for review and approval includes:

Step 1: City Manager Review

The City Manager will review the proposed memorial to determine whether there is an appropriate location for its permanent placement and to determine whether the memorial meets the topic criteria identified in this policy. If the memorial is not determined to be an art component, CMO will proceed according to Step 4 below.

Step 2. Urban Art Program Review

Staff will review applications for donations of artwork memorials for completeness, evaluate the prospective donation and make written recommendations for review and approval by Arts & Culture Commission. If staff determines that the donation is not feasible, the donor will be notified in writing.

If the City Manager has approved a site for the memorial, then Urban Art Program staff will consult with the City Department responsible for that site to develop a community outreach plan.

If necessary, staff may appoint an arts advisory panel of three to five arts professionals to review the work and make recommendations to the Commission based on the following criteria:

1. Artistic Excellence

Donated artwork memorials should reflect the highest standards of excellence and represent diversity of art forms and artists, while excluding reproductions that are unlimited editions and art objects that are mass produced.

2. Professional Credentials of the Artist

Artist's resume should demonstrate the breadth of professional work through solo and group shows, collections, publications and if applicable, education.

3. Appropriateness to site

Donated memorial should be compatible with the proposed site's architecture, landscape and/or surrounding area.

4. Maintenance requirements

The memorial should be in good condition with a recent conservation report detailing routine maintenance instructions. The materials used in the creation of the artwork must last in a public, non-archival setting suitable for both indoor and outdoor exhibition, resistant to vandalism.

5. Maintenance Endowment

The donor demonstrates the ability to provide a maintenance endowment sufficient for the ongoing care of the memorial.

If the memorial requires siting but no suggested site is specified by the applicant, the staff, after determining the work to be appropriate for placement on City property, may consult with the Department of Public Works and then suggest locations to the Commission for review.

Step 3: Arts & Culture Commission Review of Artwork Memorials

Upon Urban Art Program staff recommendation, the Arts & Culture Commission will review application and make a decision whether to approve or disapprove. The Commission may review artworks in two ways:

1. Approve/disapprove donations of artwork memorial submitted to the City of Glendale.
2. Approve/disapprove placement of artwork memorials on property belonging to, or under the control of the City, submitted for acceptance to other City Departments or officials as donations to the City of Glendale

Criteria for Evaluation of all Memorials

- The donor can demonstrate that the person, group or event being memorialized deemed by the City to have made a significant enough contribution to merit a memorial of the scale, cost and visibility proposed.
- The memorial does not duplicate existing memorial themes.
- The proposal has been through community outreach conducted by the group or person suggesting that the City install the memorial, and that the installation and maintenance of the memorial is within the priorities of the work plan of the responsible Department.
- The community outreach should be consistent with the outreach conducted for similar City projects.
- The proposed memorial is not objectionable to the persons or community that it is intended to honor.
- The proposed site for the memorial is related to its underlying purpose as designated in a specific plan or other approval of the City Council or City Manager as a particularly appropriate site.
- The memorial was designed by qualified professionals who may include registered architects, engineers, landscape architects and artists who can demonstrate professional recognition in the form of public commissions or permanent public installations.
- There is a committed and verifiable funding source for the review, design, fabrication, installation, and maintenance of the memorial before proceeding to incur City costs and staff time.

Step 4: Parks and Recreation Commission Review

If a memorial is proposed for placement at a park, the City Manager shall make a recommendation to the Parks and Recreation Commission for approval. If the proposal is considered an artwork memorial, recommendations will be made by the Parks and Recreation Commission as to appropriate siting and location, and by the Arts & Culture Commission as to compliance with art memorial acceptance criteria. When the City receives a proposal for memorials, excluding standard size wall mounted plaques with an approximate size of 9" by 12", all property owners within 1,000 feet of the park and other interested parties shall be advised of the date and time of the public review by the Parks and Recreation Commission for an opportunity to give public comment.

Step 5: City Council Review

Council review and acceptance is necessary for donations with a value of more than \$50,000. The Council may review memorials in two ways:

1. Approve/disapprove donations of memorials submitted to the City of Glendale.
2. Approve/disapprove placement of memorials on property belonging to, or under the control of the City, submitted for acceptance to other City Departments or officials as donations to the City of Glendale.

Criteria for Evaluation of Donated Artwork Memorial

The City Council shall use the same criteria for approval of an artwork memorial as the Arts & Culture Commission as designated above.

The artist, donor, sponsor or representative thereof, will be required to make a brief presentation concerning the proposed artwork memorial and its proposed locations if applicable to the City Council.

When the donation is rejected by the City Council, staff will provide written notification to the donor.

Step 6: Acceptance

If the memorial is accepted by the appropriate City Commission/s and, when applicable, the City Council, the following requirements will apply:

1. The artist, donor or sponsor of a memorial will be required to pay all installation costs and commemorative plaque associated with its placement on property belonging to, or under the control of the City of Glendale.

2. The donor shall grant the City of Glendale the right to convey the work to another site or to storage or for conservation.
3. The donor shall grant the City the right to deaccession any accepted memorials under this policy with Commission review.
4. The donor will be required to establish a maintenance fund for the memorial. Donor must provide documentation of adequate maintenance for the life of the memorial and establish a maintenance fund at the City.
5. The City of Glendale shall inform the donor that acceptance of a donation is not determinative of the value of the donation.
6. Upon acceptance of donation, the donor will receive an acknowledgement letter. The commemorative plaque identifying the memorial, artist, and donor will be installed near the memorial.

If the prospective donation of an artwork memorial is not accepted, Urban Art Program staff will provide written notification and explanation to the donor. If the prospective donation of a non-art related memorial is not accepted, written notification and explanation to the donor will be provided by the City Manager.

ATTACHMENT 4

Gifts and Memorials

by Barbara Goldstein

One of the most rewarding or challenging situations that can face a community is the offer of an artwork gift or memorial. The offer can be rewarding if the artwork or memorial is welcome and there's a place to locate it. The opposite can also be true. For those who collect art and have confidence in their own taste, offering an artwork gift is a special civic contribution. For those who create art, offering a gift of their own work can be a means of elevating their reputations. For those who support a cause, a memorial artwork can be a means of remembering an individual or a group's history. All of these artworks can be important landmarks on the civic landscape. But, without a policy for evaluating or planning for them, artwork gifts can lead to controversy, hurt feelings and ongoing maintenance issues.

Developing a policy for accepting gifts and memorials can be more important than creating a mechanism for purchasing or commissioning art. Often before a community begins to think about purchasing art, it is offered artwork gifts. If considered carefully and fairly, such gifts can be a significant means of building a civic collection. Cities can even develop a policy to actively build an art collection in this way.

There are a number of factors that should be considered in developing a policy for acceptance of gifts or memorials. The first one is location: where are the meaningful open spaces in your community and how do you want them occupied? A place which is high above the city may seem like an ideal location for a sculpture or a memorial. At the same time people may wish to keep it free for kite flying or daydreaming. Perhaps your community can create a site inventory and seek out specific artwork donations to be placed on designated sites.

Secondly, who does the artwork serve? Is it something which will be cared for and appreciated by the community; or is it a monument to the artist or the collector offering it? Often, a community or interest group rallies around the idea of donating an artwork or creating a memorial. If there is support for this activity, and artwork can be a tremendous asset to a community. If considered in advance, a community can actually raise funds for a memorial and seek proposals they can choose from. This is how the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC was created.

Lastly, who is going to care for the artwork? While a beautiful bronze or painted metal sculpture may look wonderful when it's first installed, it will deteriorate over time if it is not maintained. Building a maintenance endowment or a community-based maintenance plan around a gift of memorial will insure that it remains a civic asset.

The cities of Seattle and Portland have developed policies for the review and acceptance of artwork gifts and memorials which evolved as a result of tackling these issues. Their policies have assisted in helping to build their civic collections with a clear set of rules and procedures in place. They have allowed each city to review gifts and memorials as they were offered, and apply consistent criteria in proceeding with the acceptance or denial of gifts. The following pages reprint policies used in Seattle and Portland.

Portland Memorials Policy

Placing Memorials in Public Parks: Adopted by City Council on April 12, 1989

The primary use of a park or open space is to be usable by the public. Donors of new memorials should be asked to broaden their search for an appropriate location. Also to be considered are temporary or portable memorials, and naming existing parks. Memorial proposals should represent community values, and be mindful of future generations. The quality of timelessness should be considered in the significance of the person or event being memorialized. Maintenance concerns should be a primary consideration, including durable materials and future maintenance. A location may reach a saturation point and limitations will be considered on future installations at that location. Improvements made in public space become the property of the public. The memorial donor is to pay for the design, installation, manufacture, and maintenance of the memorial.

Seven Basic Types of Memorials:

- **Simple Plaques**-The installation of simple plaques will not change the character or use of park settings. Depending on their placement, however, they may impact park maintenance operations.
- **Adorned Plaques**-The installation of adorned plaques has more of an impact on the use and maintenance of existing parks. Incorrectly placed, they can interfere with use areas or circulation patterns.
- **Sculpture and other permanent art work**-The arts community will be consulted through the Metropolitan Arts Commission and the Design Review Commission. As these proposals are more complex, and can be more expensive, the donor is required to go through the entire process twice: once at a conceptual level and again when the design is developed.
- **Fountains**-Fountains are in a category by themselves because of the added complexity of utilities necessary for installation. As these proposals are more complex, the donor is required to go through the entire design process twice: once at the conceptual level and once when the design is developed.
- **Memorial Gardens and Plazas**-These types of installations can be truly monumental in scale, and can change the character of a park. Other impacts can include maintenance, traffic, and circulation. For these reasons, the review procedure must be more extensive and careful. These proposals also go through the process twice, once at a conceptual level and again when the design is developed.
- **Other memorials**-Any memorial that does not fit any of the categories previously described will be reviewed according to the process outlined under "Memorial Gardens and Plazas" This will ensure that the process is careful, public discussion.
- **Basic park accessories**-Basic park amenities (such as benches and picnic tables, trees and shrubs) that meet park standards do not require an extensive review process. These may be handled administratively by the Park Bureau to ensure that the location is appropriate within the park. The Park Bureau reserves the right to adjust the location

Approval Criteria:

- The Person or event being memorialized is deemed significant enough to merit such an honor. The Person so honored shall have been deceased to a minimum of two years.
- The memorial represents broad community values.
- The memorial has timeless qualities and makes a statement of significance to future generations.

- The location under consideration is an appropriate setting for the memorial; in general there should be some specific geographic justification for the memorial being located in that spot.
- The location of the memorial will not interfere with existing and proposed circulation and use patterns of the park.
- The memorial is compatible with the park's current or historic master plan, if existing. (If there is no master plan the Park Bureau shall prepare a "statement of character")
- The location and design of the memorial is consistent with the character and design intentions of the park.
- The quality, scale, and character of the memorial is at a level commensurate with the particular park setting.
- The memorial contributes to the park setting from a functional or design standpoint.

Maintenance

In general, any proposed memorial should be backed by insurance, a bond or endowment fund, or a maintenance schedule by the memorial donor adequate to ensure its care so that the gift will remain in a condition satisfactory to the donor and the City. The posted insurance or bond should also cover costs of installation and/or removal. If an adequate level of maintenance is not continued , the City reserves the right to remove or modify the memorial or a portion of the memorial. When the City commits to maintain a particular memorial, and the City is not able to maintain the memorial at a level satisfactory to the donor, the donor shall have the opportunity to supplement maintenance as required.

Appeals

If the donor's proposal is not acceptable, the donor has the right after the review process is complete to appeal to the Commissioner in charge of the Bureau of Parks and Recreation, and to City Council for a reconsideration of their proposal. Conversely, if a memorial is approved and a citizen opposes the project, that citizen also has the right to appeal to the Commissioner in charge, and to the City Council for a reconsideration of the proposal.



City of Richmond Public Art related Opportunities posted January 3, 2024:

1. Allen Brothers Steak and Seafood Facility - 250' wide Mural & Mosaic Tabletop Design

Application Deadline February 5, 2024. Vendors may go to the following link to download RFP <https://pbsystem.planetbids.com/portal/14590/bo/bo-detail/112815>

2. Arts District Consulting Services to establish Strategic Plan for Art District(s)

Application Deadline February 2, 2024. Vendors may go to the following link to download RFP: <https://pbsystem.planetbids.com/portal/14590/bo/bo-detail/112820>

(As noted in the RFP, questions must be submitted via the Q&A Tab in the BidsOnline System).

3. Neighborhood Public Art (NPA) Mini Grant

Application Deadline February 18, 2024. Please download the "Grant Application" here: <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/FormCenter/Arts-Culture-Division-20/FY-2425-Neighborhood-Public-Art-NPA-Mini-202>

City of Richmond Arts and Culture Program background:

- A. Technical Assistance Workshop – 10/18/23

https://richmond.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=35

- B. Please register on the "City of Richmond Artist Database" using the below link:

<https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/FormCenter/Arts-Culture-Division-20/City-of-Richmond-Artist-Database-149>