

PUBLIC ART ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, March 12, 2019
450 Civic Center Plaza, 2nd Floor
Point Molate Conference Room
Richmond, CA 94804

MEETING MINUTES

Present: Michelle Baker, Jenny Balisle, Gretchen Borg-Hillstead, Linda Kalin, Phillip Mehas, and Jessica Parker

Absent: Tom Herriman

Staff: Michele Seville, Arts & Culture Manager

Guests: None

I. Chair Balisle called the regular meeting to order at 7:02 P.M.

II. Roll Call

III. Agenda Review and Acceptance

Motion by Committee Member Mehas, second by Committee Member Baker, and carried unanimously to accept the agenda, as submitted.

IV. Minutes from the February 12, 2019 Meeting

Chair Balisle requested a change in the Next Steps on Page 5 of the minutes, to read: *Chair Balisle commented that the problem went hand-in-hand with cities that had a percent for art program where there would be the need for help in the beginning and continuing throughout the program.*

Committee Member Mehas referenced Ms. Seville's statement on Page 5 to seek a legal opinion as to whether live/work units would qualify for percent for art, and he asked for an update. Ms. Seville advised there was no update at this point.

Committee Member Kalin commented with respect to the discussion on Page 4 of seeking artists to review for the Baranoff project, that while the statement in the minutes was correct, it did not include the substance of the discussion nor the actual artists who had been discussed and considered.

Motion by Committee Member Kalin, second by Committee Member Baker, and carried unanimously to accept the minutes of the February 12, 2019 meeting, as amended.

V. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

VI. Report on Status of Proposed Public Art Board Ordinance and Public Art Policies & Procedures (P&Ps)

Arts and Culture Manager Michele Seville reported that there had been no movement on the Public Art Board or P&Ps. She referred to the proposal to rewrite the P&Ps with the help of a consultant, and noted the Public Art Board was on hold because the organizational chart was under consideration.

Committee Members sought a timeline when the documents might become available and expressed concern that Everett Jenkins of the City Attorney's office was getting accurate information in order to make a decision.

Ms. Seville advised that the City Attorney's office had been provided all available information, although she clarified the decision would ultimately be made by the City Manager. She commented that the Public Art Board and P&Ps had been paired even though they were not necessarily related, and if a consultant was hired to go over the P&Ps all the work done by the PAAC to date would be provided to the consultant for review as would examples from other cities, to be crafted into something that would hopefully work for the City of Richmond.

Ms. Seville clarified the hierarchy of the PAAC and the Richmond Arts & Culture Commission (RACC), stating that the RACC was in charge of public art while the PAAC was more of the hands on group dealing with public art, which all had to be changed in the P&P and amended in the original ordinance that identified the responsibilities of the RACC. A new ordinance would also have to be drafted to establish the PAAC because it did not exist except within the P&Ps. Over the years, the definitions of the missions of the RACC and the PAAC had become separate, although the entities themselves had not been separated.

VII. Request to Hire Consultant to Review/Revise the Public Art Policies & Procedures

Ms. Seville sought a list of outstanding public art consultants who were good writers and asked the PAAC for possibilities.

Committee Member Kalin recommended contacting the California Lawyers for the Arts to see if they had a list of consultants. Contacting other art commissions throughout the Bay Area was also recommended to identify the availability of resources, with a suggestion to contact Palo Alto.

Ms. Seville described the process similar to what had occurred for the Moody Underpass in the selection of a consultant, stated she and the PAAC would work on the scope of work, and the PAAC could serve as the selection panel.

If the PAAC wanted to make a decision to hire a consultant, Ms. Seville suggested starting with Regina Almaguer to identify the going rate for drafting a document like the P&Ps given the limited amount of funds available.

Motion by Committee Member Kalin, second by Committee Member Mehas, and carried unanimously to request that staff hire an arts consultant to review and revise the Public Art Policies & Procedures.

The PAAC would develop the scope of work and requested examples of city Requests for Qualifications (RFQs) from other city consultants in other arenas to get an idea of structure.

VIII. Update on the Artist Roster

Chair Balisle presented the Letter for Invitation to Artists and noted that she was waiting to hear about a potential assistant for Ms. Seville to be able to implement the Artist Roster and its process.

Committee Member Kalin referred to the discussion at the last meeting where Katy Curl had indicated there might be a simpler alternative to the proposed process, and she asked Ms. Seville if that discussion had occurred.

Ms. Seville stated there had been no information from Ms. Curl. She added that the familiarity of how the public art world worked and the best practices of other cities, which the PAAC had previously researched, along with the manner of collecting artist information and images, which was well accepted and well documented, had already been provided and if there was a better way it would have to be from someone who had that knowledge.

Chair Balisle advised that she would bring that up at the next meeting.

IX. Update on New Developer Brochure

Ms. Seville presented the Public Art Brochure, which had been printed and included in the information distributed by the Planning Department.

Chair Balisle requested that the brochure be sent to the artists who had been featured in the document.

The PAAC recommended a streamlined approval process for simple tasks, such as the brochure, recommended to be included in an updated ordinance, although Committee Member Kalin suggested that might need to be part of an internal procedural document, not necessarily the P&Ps that would have to be ratified by the City Council.

X. Report on Website Update

Committee Member Baker reported on the proposed updates to the website and Ms. Seville advised that she and Committee Member Herriman had worked on the updates.

Given the broad range of updates required and the purpose of the website related to public art that needed to be clarified, Ms. Seville suggested the whole website needed to be reconsidered.

On the discussion of what would need to be an almost complete overhaul, the recommendations to look at examples from other cities, such as Palo Alto and Emeryville, and with the need to have regular updates conducted by city staff, Ms. Seville suggested taking everything down now from the website and just posting the Public Art Brochure and the private development ordinance, with a notation that the site was being updated and there would be more to come.

Chair Balisle clarified the work being done by Rosalie Fay Barnes in a call for artists related to a new map for the East Bay Center for the Arts, and noted a request for Ms. Barnes' advice. She added that she would provide information on websites from other cities for discussion at the next meeting.

Committee Member Borg-Hillstead suggested considering something similar to the previous game with the mural at Unity Park.

Committee Member Parker asked to join the subcommittee comprised of Committee Members Baker and Herriman to work on the website, and Committee Member Kalin urged coordination with the IT Department to clarify how the material would have to be provided.

XI. Status Report of Existing/Future CIP Projects and Private Development Projects

Ms. Seville stated there were no future CIP projects on the books, although she referred to an attachment in the meeting packet of a list of the projects where permits had been issued. She described the process that would be taken to notify developers of the public art requirement.

Committee Member Mehas stated the letter should include the PAAC as available to help developers, and identify a specific PAAC member as a liaison to each project.

When asked, all members expressed an interest in being a liaison for projects, although a concern was expressed given that there was no Artist Roster, the responsibilities of a liaison had yet to be discussed, and when things were curated the requirements for research and selection would have to be identified. The process that could be pursued to find an artist pending the implementation of the Artists Roster was discussed with suggestions that meetings with developers could help identify what art to pursue using the brochure to help find an artist and with the developer's help.

It was suggested there could be a collaborative process in the beginning with Ms. Seville to meet with the developer(s) to discuss art possibilities, identify the suggestions from that meeting, ask members to research an artist, and as the Artists Roster expanded, proceed and have a liaison follow the process.

The PAAC discussed the items on the list and offered the following:

- Highlighted each project identified in the packet; while some had been approved prior to the percent for art ordinance, others should be eligible for the public art requirement, potentially even the phased projects. The PAAC had not been notified of those projects;
- Recommended that PAAC staff attend a DRB meeting to clarify the process and suggested that public art be an agenda item before the DRB, and further recommended signing up for DRB packets to be informed of upcoming applications and potential public art eligibility developments;
- Recommended a presentation to the DRB, to include a presentation of the Public Art Brochure at the same time;
- Suggested potentially another role for an assistant to the Art & Culture Manager could be as a liaison to the DRB, and recommended that coordination with the DRB also be considered in the RFQ; and
- Emphasized that information was to be provided to the PAAC during the Planning Department process prior to the approval of permits.

Motion by Committee Member Mehas, second by Committee Member Baker and carried unanimously to extend the agenda item by five minutes.

Citing projects such as the Baranoff project, which had gone through four DRB meetings, the PAAC emphasized the need for an accurate list of proposed projects to be able to comply with the percent for public art requirement, with the need for the PAAC to be provided a list of proposed eligible projects at the time of planning permit application. The PAAC would also need to understand the planning process and the various entitlements involved, with a need for education on both sides.

Committee Members Baker and Mehas volunteered to attend the DRB meeting scheduled for March 13 to become educated in the process.

XII. Staff Report

Ms. Seville reported she had met with the Port Director this date and had appealed to him for money to cover the overage for the port public art installation given the \$400,000 plus overage where the artist would cover three fourths of that amount.

Ms. Seville cited the reasons for the overage, which were outside of the artist's control, and explained that the Port Director had identified a Subaru public art project that might be able to fill in the City's portion of the overage.

Ms. Seville also updated the Officer Bradley A. Moody Underpass, the Community Conversations Grant, the Richmond Writes! 2019 poetry contest, and stated the Richmond Plunge was complete. There was an issue with the, Neighborhood Public Art (NPA) Mini Grants, which had been hit with an eleventh hour request for a city business license which had never previously been a requirement, and which would be considered by the City Council on March 19.

Chair Balisle expressed concern for the last-minute requirement that had not been part of the work job or the application; explained that many of the NPA recipients could not afford the fee; and the issue had not been brought up to the RACC in advance.

Several PAAC members indicated their willingness to attend the City Council meeting on March 19 to speak to the matter.

Ms. Seville also reported that the RACC Social Media Committee was doing a great job, and the John Toki sculpture was almost complete and there would be a meeting at his studio in April to see the finished sculpture piece.

XIII. Next Steps Discussion

Committee Member Baker would reach out to the website subcommittee to further the update of the website; Committee Member Mehas would attend the DRB meeting on March 13 and Committee Member Borg-Hillstead would attend the DRB meeting on March 13 and the City Council meeting on March 19; Committee Member Parker would attend the City Council meeting on March 19, potentially the following DRB meeting on March 27, and would meet with the website subcommittee; Ms. Seville and Committee Member Parker would work on the RFQ; Committee Member Kalin would monitor some of the new projects; Committee Member Baker stated she was still not getting emails and wanted to make sure she was on the email list, and would work to notify the artists that were in the brochure; and Chair Balisle would attend the March 19 City Council meeting and help with some research on the RFQ.

XIV. Announcements

There were no announcements.

XV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 P.M. to the next meeting on April 9, 2019.