

**RICHMOND ARTS AND CULTURE COMMISSION (RACC)  
PUBLIC ART ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAAC)  
In-Person Meeting  
450 Civic Center Plaza – City Hall Building  
Richmond, California  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
May 8, 2025  
7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.**

Present: Chair Tobin Richmond, Vice-Chair Arleide Santos, Secretary Virginia Jourdan and Commissioners Ted Bell, Carole Porter and Sandra Richmond

Absent: Commissioners Kiara Kempfski, Yeymi Perez and Council Liaison Claudia Jimenez

Staff Present: Arts & Culture Manager Winifred Day; Economic Development Director Nannette Beacham and Administrative Assistant, Arts & Culture Division Jordon Nesbitt

**I. WELCOME / CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

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

**II. ACTION ITEMS**

**a. APPROVE May 8, 2025 RACC/PAAC Meeting Agenda**

Motion by Commissioner Sandra Richmond, seconded by Commissioner Jourdan to approve the May 8, 2025 RACC/PAAC Meeting Agenda, as shown, carried unanimously by a show of hands.

**b. APPROVE April 10, 2025 RACC/PAAC Meeting Minutes**

Motion by Commissioner Jourdan, seconded by Commissioner Sandra Richmond to approve the April 10, 2025 RACC/PAAC Meeting Minutes, as shown, carried unanimously by a show of hands.

**III. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

In response to questions from some members of the audience about when public comment was allowed, Chair Tobin Richmond explained this portion of the meeting agenda was for public comment on items not on the meeting agenda. There was some disagreement from members of the audience about the process and it was clarified that public comment was for items not on the meeting agenda but if anyone was present to speak on a specific agenda item, public comment would be taken at the time the item was considered on the agenda. The Chair emphasized that no member of the public would be prevented from speaking.

Michele Seville, former Arts & Culture Manager for the City of Richmond, former Richmond Arts and Culture Commissioner (RACC) and Public Art Advisory Committee (PAAC) member, explained the City of Richmond's Public Art Program started in 1987.

Since that time, the goal of the RACC had been to commission amazing art for overpasses and underpasses, BART stations and throughout the City. The next goal was to support emerging artists with funding and training on how to apply for NPA Mini Grants. Applicants were trained in making proposal presentations to the RACC, with the winners elected by a democratic vote and grantees each assigned to a RACC Commissioner for guidance for the duration of their project. Simple contracts were written, approved and assigned and grantees were paid up front. For many years, this process worked seamlessly and the outcome was a generation of youth who became versed in presenting and executing their artistic work and becoming artists. Today, things were different, the number of NPA applicants had decreased and local artists were concerned with the administrative burdens being required for relatively small grant amounts, with artists having complained about being required to provide an ever-growing amount of information, insurance and paperwork, which often delayed the signing of contracts. One grant recipient had declined an NPA Mini Grant because the financial burdens placed on them made the acceptance of the NPA Mini Grant financially unfeasible.

Ms. Seville suggested the City could improve by streamlining all contracts, adopting Best Practices models used by cities and work with insurance companies to provide umbrella insurance for small grant recipients to avoid having them pay exorbitant fees. She asked that the RACC make Richmond arts great again with a recommended list of improvements she could make available to the RACC.

BK Williams, having served in the past, thanked RACC members for the work they did as volunteers. She was an advocate and activist for the arts and she was present since she was working with the Arts Corridor in Richmond, which was trying to make art happen everywhere in the City of Richmond in partnership with the RACC. She supported processes that were simplified and allowed artists to show up at the RACC and throughout the City. She understood the issue on a micro and macro level, was aware of the RACC's work, and had watched some of the RACC meetings on video, but wanted the RACC to be aware the public wanted the process to be simpler and easier to make art happen in Richmond.

Kate Sibley, commented that as a museum administrator in the 1980s, she was aware of the Richmond Arts Center and the City of Richmond's art profile. The City of Richmond had been a leader in public art, advocating for the arts and not the narrowly defined "fine arts," but art from the ground up from the people. After moving to the City of Richmond 22 years ago, she served on the RACC and PAAC, and while serving in that capacity had been involved in two major projects including the establishment of the one percent for public art in private development and a rewrite of the policies and procedures to ensure that private development public art meshed well with those already in place for the one and a half percent public art City projects.

Despite the City's public art reputation in the outside world, it had never been easy to persuade City leaders that art was critical to the health and success of the City of Richmond. Through perseverance the City had been able to finally develop a solid enough budget to sponsor a neighborhood public art program, an incredibly successful effort to engage residents in art and community making. These small but mighty projects provided the City with wonderful and meaningful artistic messages for years. Recent developments had threatened this program and much more in the City's arts and culture arena. She suggested due to mis-management, the City of Richmond was on the brink of abandoning much of the City's powerful artistry and now artists must sacrifice their own financial well-being. Those receiving NPA Mini Grants must jump through increasingly high hoops. Even established entities like Pogo Park found themselves hemmed in by unreasonable demands made after contracts had been signed for ridiculously small grants that should be approved easily with as few as possible bureaucratic barriers.

Ms. Sibley suggested that all pointed to the fact that Richmond was losing its way, and threatening the rich legacy of the City's arts history. She was part of a group of people who were committed to ensuring this did not happen. She suggested the members of the RACC were best positioned to honor and preserve the City's arts legacy and build upon it for years to come and had the responsibility to address what was currently being threatened by City staff.

Phil Mehas, a 10-year member of the RACC and PAAC, understood the system well and how he believed it should operate. He referenced a memorial project the RACC had been working on which started a year ago and was ongoing. He wanted to see the RACC do things without resistance from staff, such as evaluate the resources and needs of local art organizations, facilitate communication and cooperation among art groups, pursue ways to increase funding and resources for the arts in the City including but not limited to soliciting funds from public art foundations, corporations, public agencies and appropriate sources. He also recommended disseminating information concerning arts and culture programs throughout the City and updating the City's website noting the information on the RACC still identified a former Chair and Vice-Chair who were no longer members of the RACC. He also recommended the administration and coordination of the NPA Mini Grant program designed to stimulate the arts and culture in the City. All of these recommendations had been taken from the responsibilities identified for the RACC, but they were not being done. He noted the feeling both on the RACC itself and outside of it that those creative ideas were being squashed, with more artists starting their own organizations. He noted two start-ups had been created since the change on the RACC.

Cordell Hindler, Richmond, reported he had spoken with members of the Youth Council and had potential candidates for the vacancies on the RACC he hoped the City Council would consider at one of its June meetings. He invited everyone to the Contra Costa Mayors' Conference on June 5, 2025 hosted by the City of San Ramon, with Kristin Connelly, President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO), East Bay Leadership Council, to discuss what had been learned from the last election cycle. To attend the Mayors' Conference an R.S.V.P was required by mid-May and tickets were \$70 per person. For a future agenda item, he asked that the RACC consider a retreat at a location in the City, which may include a location at City Hall but one with more space than the current meeting location.

#### **IV. Mayor's Office – City Council Liaison Report (Tamayo)**

There was no report.

#### **V. INFORMATION ITEM ONLY**

##### **A. Tiny Houses Village and Garden Project (Hindman)**

Economic Development Director Nannette Beacham reported Tiny Houses Village had been invited to provide a presentation to the RACC. This was an informational item only. No action was asked of the RACC.

Sally Hindman, Project Coordinator, Inti Gonzalez, Youth Organizer/Creative Lead and Gabe Monett, Village Planning, Support and Organizing Consultant provided information on Tiny Village Spirit, a San Francisco-based project developed in response to the emergency shelter crisis and need for housing justice in the State, nationally and worldwide, and who promoted the construction of tiny houses village, an innovative model intended to address the housing crisis and engage in community organizing village residents and allies to create system change towards garnering resources needed to end homelessness.

One of the projects, Oakland Tiny House Empowerment Village, located in the City of Oakland, was highlighted and consisted of 22-units of tiny houses that served unhoused youth ages 18 through 24. This development had been in operation since 2021 and had over 100 murals on tiny houses and a ground mural.

Village Spirit was currently engaged with the City of Richmond's Tiny House Village and Garden Farm, which involved a seven-agency collaboration doubling the number of dedicated emergency housing units serving young people ages 18 to 24 in Richmond. The project was located at 175 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and had a move-in goal of July 2025. A total of 20 murals for year one would be provided with 18 of the murals funded by the City of Richmond NPA Mini Grant funds and remaining murals funded through other sources. In year two, an additional 20+ murals would be painted on the tiny houses in the village. By fall 2026, they hoped to have 50+ murals in the project. The murals were intended to convey the diversity of the Bay Area and emphasize the environment, with participants between the ages of 16 to 25 to paint the murals. Competition guidelines for the murals, proposed themes and imagery were all highlighted.

A number of samples of the mural designs that were submitted were displayed with each young artist present to describe their vision and what each mural represented.

Motion by Vice-Chair Santos, seconded by Commissioner Porter to extend the time for the presentation another five minutes, carried unanimously by a show of hands.

Commissioner Porter suggested this was a beautiful project with each presenter having presented well.

Commissioner Bell liked the diversity, superpowers and creativity displayed and he urged the artists to continue to use that beyond today.

Chair Tobin Richmond loved the project and the inclusion of the youth, which he found to be amazing.

Vice-Chair Santos loved everything about the project, the inclusion with the unhoused, youth, colors and connection with the community, which she found inspiring. She urged the artists to continue to shine on the community.

Commissioner Jourdan described the project as beautiful and reported she had the opportunity to paint one of the murals in Oakland with the Project Coordinator, and she commended the community for coming together with a project benefitting the people who lived in the area. She loved all of the work being done and the messages being conveyed.

Ms. Hindman thanked the RACC for its comments.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Rebecca Garcia-Gonzalez, described herself as a public artist, leader of visual artists and long-time Richmond resident, who painted her first mural at 18. She had been teaching art for many years, and as an art educator had seen the powerful influence that getting involved in the arts could have on youth. All eight of her Richmond murals had been painted with Richmond youth, including three murals at the Richmond Police Activities League (RPAL). When she learned of the Tiny Houses Village Mural Design Project, she was excited for all of the young artists.

Ms. Garcia-Gonzalez saw this program as an introduction to public art, but was concerned when she learned the designs would not be voted on at this meeting, potentially delaying the work the artists had been selected to do beyond the summer and with that their payment. She suggested disappointment should not be part of the youth's first public art experience. Based on her experience working with young people, youth expected to take care of business and if the RACC loved their work, and wanted to support youth, she urged the RACC to vote on the designs in time for them to start painting this summer. The youth had fulfilled all requirements even those added after the project had been accepted.

Motion by Commissioner Sandra Richmond, seconded by Commissioner Porter to extend the time for the presentation an additional five minutes, carried unanimously by a show of hands.

BK. Williams suggested the best thing she could say was that they all agreed the project was amazing, the participants social and visual commentary was on point and those voices were needed. She encouraged the RACC to approve the project and get the project happening. This project was part of the Arts Corridor and she wanted to see it on the walls as people walked by. She hoped the RACC could make this happen.

Kaylen Van Cura also loved the project and had been following it since it had been approved when she had been member of the RACC; however, the project had been affected by permitting requirements and had to be extended another year. Now the NPA Mini Grant would expire at the end of the fiscal year. The Project Coordinator had been trying to get this item on the RACC meeting agenda for the past nine months and she suggested the RACC as a Commission should have control over its own agenda, but that was not how it currently worked. She asked the RACC to schedule a Special Meeting to approve the mural designs. She understood that required 24-hour notice in advance, but a Special Meeting of the RACC could be requested by the Chair or the majority of the RACC, in order to approve the work and move the project forward. She pointed out there were a number of projects in Richmond that included requirements but there had never been a rule they be completed in a certain order or that a contract had to be completed before review of the artwork. In some cases, she recalled projects had been reviewed by the RACC before the artwork had been completed.

Delilah \_\_\_\_\_, found the mural design a great opportunity for youth to create the tiny homes village since she had experienced the struggle and found it inspirational and relatable. The goal of her mural design was for people to be inspired by anything they set their minds to, regardless of background or challenges. Knowing all things were possible, when people looked at her mural she wanted them to feel hope and understand they had community and help to build further through education and to strive for success. She served at a community service center in greater Richmond every other weekend and saw the project being created. She wanted to be part of it and stated youth were the future and would be in leadership one day and had to see it to know it would be possible.

Kate Sibley suggested the project was the embodiment of what the NPA Mini Grants were all about. The project had been delayed over and over again for months and she agreed the RACC schedule a Special Meeting this month to allow payment by June 1, 2025 and allow the youth to start painting. She otherwise commented she had looked at the City website for the meeting agenda but had been unable to find it or find a posting at the meeting location, all in violation of the Brown Act.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

Vice-Chair Santos thanked the speakers for their attendance and for highlighting all of the things the RACC needed to work on. She suggested a list of improvements the RACC should consider could be submitted for review by the Chair and Vice-Chair. She encouraged the members of the public to attend the remainder of the meeting or consider serving on the RACC since there were vacancies yet to be filled.

Commissioner Porter sought a debrief of the discussion since the content of the public comments was really important and the RACC needed to use their resources and abilities to help the project move forward. She offered a motion, seconded by the Vice-Chair to continue the discussion on this item.

There was no vote on the motion but the discussion continued.

Commissioner Jourdan asked whether the project had submitted all documents and was informed by staff that not all documents had been submitted.

Ms. Beacham stated to be transparent, she had advised Ms. Hindman she would speak on the subject if asked since she did not believe that all of those present had all the information given that the situation had been presented to the RACC as if the City and the RACC were responsible for the delays associated with the project not moving forward. This was incorrect and she clarified the work could not move forward until there was an executed contract. The work could be reviewed, but the window was dwindling since the contract was not complete. Some required items as part of the approval of the contract remained to be submitted, which had been communicated several times verbally and in writing as recently as the days leading up to the meeting this week. The information remaining to be submitted were insurance documents and she acknowledged everyone throughout the City had been challenged by the current insurance requirements. While there had been a lack of understanding of the requirements in the past and she could not speak to what the group had been told in 2023, between 2023 and 2025, the group had been informed of the City's insurance requirements. In fact, the City Manager had rolled this grant over two times and now a third time since City staff believed in the project, but the group still had to follow the guidelines. The group still must provide certain certification related to the insurance requirements including coverage related to murals and painting, molestation coverage having to do with children and youth, general liability and the like. Most organizations had insurance or found a fiscal sponsor to provide the insurance. In this case, no insurance certification had been submitted.

Commissioner Porter asked how the RACC could help the group move forward.

Chair Tobin Richmond understood the organization had recently secured a fiscal sponsor.

Administrative Assistant, Arts & Culture Division Jordon Nesbitt clarified the organization had submitted RPAL as its fiscal sponsor, but RPAL had not provided any permission or insurance to imply that they would be the fiscal sponsor for this project. After RPAL had been identified as the fiscal sponsor, the insurance requirements were again requested, although acceptable insurance for the program had not been provided. RPAL had been informed they should be handling the contract rather than Ms. Hindman if they intended to be the fiscal sponsor but there had been no reply to that direction.

Ms. Beacham advised staff had been in contact with the fiscal sponsor, they had met today and would provide a list of what was required. She understood RPAL could provide that list directly to their insurance carrier. She clarified, when asked, the group had been informed it would not be able to start the project in June given the lack of an executed contract.

Mr. Nesbitt stated that was why the group had requested a Special RACC Meeting.

Ms. Beacham clarified again that payment could not be made on the contract by June 1, 2025, since once the contract was executed it took a period of time for a requisition order, possibly up to four days, which was why the group could not start the project in June.

Mr. Nesbitt further clarified the typical timeline period from when a project was approved to when the project could commence. A group/business was given a list of items to provide and once provided, the contract could be executed and a purchase requisition made to cut a check, which required a month at a minimum.

Commissioner Porter was happy to help facilitate the matter to move the project forward.

Commissioner Sandra Richmond reported she was the RACC Liaison for the project and she had been told she could not talk to the group until they had a contract in hand. She recognized everyone in the room felt someone had let this group down.

Vice-Chair Santos suggested there were two points: one that the group submit the required documents to allow them to move on, and if that was done she understood the process for approval of the contract could take about four weeks; and two was that several former RACC members were saying something was wrong with the process and she suggested the RACC should listen to those concerns and work together. This was an opportunity to take those things to Ms. Hindman and possibly all involved could work towards a July 1 target date if all required documents were submitted. She understood there were emails back and forth between staff and the organization and they have been made aware of the requirements; they just need to get there.

Ms. Beacham emphasized there had been many opportunities to provide information, set up meetings, and explain things one-on-one but there were times when people only heard what they wanted to hear and used political power to go around the system. While she understood the organization wanted a check to be cut, she questioned what about all of the other organizations that were following the rules.

Commissioner Porter asked that the RACC help and advocate for the organization.

Chair Tobin Richmond recognized there was support for the Tiny Houses project, but there also had to be transparency from the group of people who had been present, and they needed to be aware of both sides of this issue. He found that since those who had spoken had left the meeting, to him it meant no one wanted to hear the rest of the story. He recognized the concerns there was an issue with the way things were being done now, but things had changed since those individuals had served on the RACC, such as the new insurance requirements. He was not opposed to being transparent and trying to help, but if the group wanted to have a Special RACC Meeting, they needed all requirements to be met. He supported the project but wanted the group to do its part.

Commissioner Porter wanted the RACC to be more transparent with each other and anticipate the problem before it reached this level. She did not know this issue had bubbled up so much, and understood this group of people had been talking about this issue out in the community. She suggested the RACC had great people and they all had to work together to get a positive response. If the group needed help, she could provide assistance, while agreeing the group also had to come to the table with the documentation required. She found the project to be beautiful and the youth should be provided what they needed to move forward.

Chair Tobin Richmond reiterated the RACC must be transparent and the group should also be transparent. He found a lot of people wanted to point fingers at the RACC but not be transparent about the requirements that had not been met. If Commissioner Porter was going to take the lead that could be done and again he recognized the group had been working on the project for a long time but again they had not met the requirements.

Arts & Culture Manager Winifred Day agreed this was a great project but pointed out the group was targeting at risk youth as part of the project. The molestation child abuse insurance requirement was something that would protect the City from a risk management perspective and that was where they were getting the direction. In addition, there were concerns with pollution and contaminated water as a result of the painted murals, and the fact there could not be runoff from the project into City storm drains, which was one of the responsibilities of the project and it was not unreasonable to have those insurance requirements.

Ms. Beacham commented on the upcoming Technical Assistance Workshop, which would detail and outline the specifics of these requirements, and in order for those who wanted to move forward with NPA Mini Grants, they would be aware of the requirements before proposals were submitted.

Commissioner Porter commented the RACC was discussing matters that had already been discussed. When she became a member of the RACC, she had been paired with an artist to help with the things that needed to be done. She asked about the list of what needed to be done now for the project to provide the required insurance, and if there was a person who would be fiscally responsible that should be provided.

Ms. Day reiterated RPAL had not provided the required information as the fiscal sponsor. As to whether a member of the RACC could coach an artist on what needed to be done and in response to Commissioner Porter, she commented there were certain things where the RACC could assist but there were areas the RACC could not provide assistance, such as providing information on insurance carriers.

On the discussion, Chair Tobin Richmond clarified with Ms. Day a punch list of required items had already been provided to Ms. Hindman on two occasions.

Commissioner Porter commented the RACC was supposed to be helping and mentoring, and her point was that it may be possible Ms. Hindman needed help getting things done.

Commissioner Bell asked to keep things in perspective. Those who had spoken before the RACC had an issue. They were not the only ones and that needed to be kept in mind. He added the Chair made great points and he agreed the RACC needed to be transparent, welcoming and ensure artists were not afraid to ask questions and there were things the RACC could do to be helpful.

Vice-Chair Santos commented if an applicant was not getting something after a few years, there was an issue and the RACC should be the solution rather than how many times staff had communicated with the group and they were not getting the information as they hoped. She recommended Commissioner Porter contact Ms. Hindman and ask how she could provide assistance and if the response was RPAL was the fiscal sponsor, then Commissioner Porter could make phone calls. She commented this was not the first time concerns had been expressed with how long it took for a project to move forward. If a Special RACC Meeting was needed with Tiny Houses, that could be done any time.

Vice-Chair Santos would rather see that done to help Ms. Hindman and other artists. She suggested Commissioner Porter could help Ms. Day and Mr. Nesbitt as a third voice.

Commissioner Jourdan asked whether it would be appropriate to have this discussion while everyone was in the room, so they could hear both sides of the story and have an opportunity to be transparent. The RACC should have discussed the matter while the group was present to understand both sides.

Ms. Beacham explained the group presentation had not initially been on the meeting agenda, but she had overridden staff and placed the item on the agenda. It was not an action item. The group had pushed for the youth to make a presentation and show their work and that had been accommodated. She had warned Ms. Hindman there would be no action absent a contract. The group could not force the City to move the project forward without a contract. It was not the RACC delaying the process; it was the City's procurement process.

Commissioner Porter suggested now the RACC could hold the group accountable and discuss what needed to be done to have the contract executed. A face-to-face was recommended to discuss what was required and if that still did not provide the required information, then there would be a problem.

Chair Tobin Richmond commented when he first learned of the issue he too questioned why the group could not be helped, but was now up to speed. He clarified Commissioner Porter had expressed the willingness to provide assistance. Commissioner Sandra Richmond was the RACC Liaison for the project but she stated she was done.

Chair Tobin Richmond understood the RACC Liaison for the project would now be Commissioner Porter who would coordinate with Ms. Day and Ms. Beacham.

Ms. Beacham advised she could provide the list of requirements and Commissioner Porter could reach out and see how she could provide assistance to Ms. Hindman.

Ms. Day responded to Ms. Hindman's comparisons to other experiences she had in other cities, by pointing out that the Oakland project involved no ask from grants or monies from the City of Oakland versus the group having requested funds from the City of Richmond, which was when risk management had become involved, as had the insurance requirements.

Ms. Beacham confirmed the project had been awarded \$300,000 from the City of Richmond.

Commissioner Porter asked why Commissioner Sandra Richmond had been prevented from reaching out to Ms. Hindman.

Commissioner Sandra Richmond explained Ms. Day and the former Chair had informed her that without an executed contract she was unable to speak with Ms. Hindman and she had been unable to make an overture.

Ms. Day explained one of the challenges with the City was until it had more accurate information in terms of advice given to artists, it needed to come from internal guidelines and processes from the City given that there was no desire to put a Commissioner in the position of giving advice that was not in conformance with the City of Richmond.

Chair Tobin Richmond commented he wanted to help people get their art out there, which was why he was serving on the RACC.

## **VI. RACC PROJECTS and PUBLIC ART Staff Report/Updates**

### **a. NPA Mini Grants Update FY 2024/25, FY 2025/26**

Mr. Nesbitt provided a PowerPoint presentation of the list of ten NPA Mini Grants for FY 2024/25 and provided a status update for each artist. (get list from Winifred?). For the FY 2025/26 NPA Mini Grants, staff hoped to have the Request for Proposal (RFP) ready for review in May as well as the application, with a mandatory NPA Mini Grant application workshop required. The first workshop was set for June 28, 2025, with the second on July 23, 2025. The Technical Assistance Workshop would show those applying for NPA Mini Grants what was expected in terms of documentation and contract processes.

Vice-Chair Santos asked about the status of the Richard Salazar project and Mr. Nesbitt reported the mural unveiling party would trigger the completion of tasks and he understood that would be held on May 31, 2025.

### **b. NPA Mini Grants and Contracts Technical Assistance Workshop (Day/RACC)**

Ms. Day reported the purpose of the NPA Mini Grants and Contracts Technical Assistance Workshop was to make new application requirements as clear as possible. She also commented on the mandatory NPA Mini Grant application workshop before people submitted their applications to ensure everyone was clear on what was expected. She noted the application had been changed and was currently being vetted for approval, with an approach taken using an application format that had been successful in other City divisions, and which included a copy of a standard contract so people would know what to expect. The maximum amount for each grant would be \$15,000 with \$7,000 included as a lower limit to ensure artists had adequate funds to pay for insurance.

Chair Tobin Richmond clarified with Ms. Day a prior discussion about the possibility of offering a stipend to the artists to pay for insurance and that was the \$7,000, which had been included as the lower limit for each grant. He also clarified with Ms. Day that while there had been a threshold of a maximum of \$10,000 in the past for the NPA Mini Grants, the amount now being offered had come from a recommendation from the City Manager's Office. City Council approval was still required.

Ms. Day acknowledged the City Council has heard a lot of comments about some of the issues with the NPA Mini Grants and hopefully this current approach would be helpful. She added the Technical Assistance Workshop would be held on May 14, 2025, and she thanked those Commissioners who worked on the slides to be presented. The session would be recorded so that people unable to attend could view the discussions.

### **c. Main Library Public Art RFQ/RFP Solicitation (Day)**

Ms. Day reported a mass mailing had gone out about the Main Library Public Art RFP/Request for Qualifications (RFQ) along with an Art Registry. The RFP/RFQ was very specific that the public art work would involve two main projects including wrapped murals and suspended sculptures in the children and adult areas. A selection panel would be comprised of the Chair of the RACC, three members of Richmond Library staff, a member of the Library Commission, and a stakeholder group, with a meeting to be scheduled in June to consider candidates.

### **d. Technical Assistance Workshop (Richmond, Jourdan, Bell)**

The item had been discussed as part of a prior agenda item.

## **VII. RACC Ad Hoc Committee Reports**

### **a. Memorials and Monuments Ordinance DRAFT (Porter/Bell)**

Commissioner Porter commented that using the Parks and Recreation policy and forms, she had done some brief edits and found there was synergy with what the RACC wanted for the Memorials and Monuments Ordinance, and suggested integrating with what was already in place with the Parks and Recreation Commission. She had reached out to other City staff, and suggested being at the point where Ms. Day could bring the ordinance forward with her superior to find out the next steps. She suggested it would be good for some Commissioners to proof the ordinance prior to a final edit process and she would clarify with staff next steps, but before that she wanted other Commissioners to review the document to ensure nothing had been missed.

Ms. Day explained the intent was for a simple process that tagged onto an existing ordinance and other City documents. She suggested Deputy Director of Community Services Ranjana Maharaj was the appropriate staff person with which to communicate. She would communicate with Commissioner Porter on the next steps.

### **b. Marketing/Communications/Newsletter (Santos, Perez, Richmond, Kempski)**

Vice-Chair Santos reported the Marketing/Communications Committee was moving forward with tabling, social media and promoting the Technical Assistance Workshop, and that Mr. Nesbitt had been helpful in updating the City's website.

## **VIII. RACC Community Event Updates**

### **Table Events – Volunteers Needed for Several Events**

Vice-Chair Santos reported two tabling events had been held. She was proud to be out in the community and was pleased with the energy and vibe, and it was magical to listen to the community and come back to the RACC. She highlighted the tabling event for the Cinco de Mayo Festival held on May 4, 2025, with Chairperson Richmond, Commissioners Kempski, Jourdan and herself in attendance. There had been interaction with many people at the all-day event that had been well attended. She also highlighted her observations for tabling events and suggested the RACC should table at seasonal events and all Commissioners should be present in-person at tabling events to engage directly with the community, incorporate a single-family friendly activity to engage people more such as rock painting to attract and engage the community, provide food vouchers or tickets for Commissioners who were at the event for more than four hours and bring a portable music device to create a welcome and fun environment under the canopy. She looked forward to continuing to connect with the community in a fun and meaningful way.

Commissioner Sandra Richmond liked the idea of rock painting, which was fun and coloring was also fun for children.

Commissioner Jourdan acknowledged the importance for the RACC to be seen in the community and provide information on its work. She had met an individual who was the first muralist in the City of Richmond, found the activities provided to be fun, and Mr. Nesbitt had been very helpful.

Chair Tobin Richmond thanked all Commissioners and Arts & Culture Division staff involved in the tabling events. He found attendance at the Cinco de Mayo Festival to be electric, enjoyed the connection with potential artists, the community, new Council members and other City Divisions.

Chair Tobin Richmond also commended everyone, both Commissioners and staff, for their energy during the event and agreed the rock painting had been fun.

Commissioner Porter commented that one of the reasons it was so important for the RACC to get its house in order based on everything that was being discussed, was the desire to uplift staff and the RACC as leaders to help people do things. Some of the things that were occurring may be political and residue from the past, but she wanted to uplift those of color in the room as people who could get things done and not have the RACC seen as being ineffective, causing roadblocks and doing anything other than what it was truly there to do. She wanted the RACC to attend tabling events and be respected as a group and a Commission and one that was getting its projects done.

Ms. Day reported many Commissioners had received an invitation to offer their opinion about what they thought about Richmond art in terms of the Arts Corridor project, and a listening session had been scheduled for May 10, 2025. There had been discussions for a RACC Commissioner to serve as a Liaison who would report on his/her experiences and ensure there was representation around the table, with the leaders of that grass-roots-led group some of the same people who had been in attendance earlier in the meeting.

Vice-Chair Santos emphasized the importance of showing up, tabling at community events and being present. She reported she had sent emails to Commissioners about upcoming community events and noted that tabling at community events was also a marketing strategy. She commented that they were getting ready for the final seasonal event scheduled for Saturday, June 21, 2025, to celebrate Juneteenth at Nicholl Park and she hoped to have at least four Commissioners present to table; two in the morning and two in the afternoon.

Commissioners discussed their availability to volunteer for tabling at upcoming community events with the Vice-Chair, for the months of May and June.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT Until June 12, 2025 at 7:00 p.m.**

Motion made by Commissioner Bell, seconded by Vice-Chair Santos and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:02 p.m. to the June 12, 2025 Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m.