

AGENDA**Art In Public Places Committee**

4:00 pm – 6:00 pm

Coloma Community Center, Jamestown Room

4623 T Street, Sacramento, CA 95819

Wednesday, November 1, 2006

Time	Item #	Item	Presenter
	1.	CALL TO ORDER	Gotthart
	2.	REFRESHMENTS: J. Nicolaus	
	3.	APPROVE AGENDA: November 1, 2006	
	4.	APPROVE MINUTES: October 4, 2006	
6. ACTION ITEMS:			
	6a	None	
	6b		
7. DISCUSSION ITEMS:			
	7a	Micro Grant	
	7b	Review of Retreat /Training	
	7c	New Members	
	7d	APP Holiday Event	
	7e	Possible Deaccession of County Mural	
8. WORKSHOP ITEMS:			
	8a	APP Policies and procedures	
9. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:			
	9a	John Nicolaus – Induction into Council of Fellows	

9. COMMITTEE REPORTS – Docent Sub-Committee, Visual Arts Committee

10. CHAIR'S REPORT

11. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

12. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

13. ADJOURNMENT: 6:00pm

REMINDERS:

Next Meeting: December 6, 2006

Refreshments for January:

Panels- Nov. 1, 16, 29

Dec. 5 SMAC event at CC

Staff contact information for day of meeting:

Cari LaZansky's cell #: 849-6602

Linda Bloom's cell #:715-4729

**MINUTES OF APP COMMITTEE MEETING
SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN ARTS COMMISSION**

Date: Wednesday, October 4, 2006
Time: 4:05pm-6:10pm
Location: Coloma Community Center, 4623 T Street, Sacramento, CA 95819
Present: Troy Corliss, Lynn Eder, Nancy Gotthart, Carlin Naify, Linda Johnston-Panattoni, Marquita Plomer, Carolyn Schneider, Don Sronce, Jennifer Tachera
Staff: Rhyena Halpern, Linda Bloom, Cari LaZansky
Excused/Absent: John Nicolaus, Susan Selix
Guests: Robert Brady, Kim Curry-Evans, Michael Hayden, Phil Hitchcock, Christine Remy, Ellen Warner, John Wong

Meeting called to order at 4:05 pm by chair Nancy Gotthart.

Motion: Johnston-Panattoni and Plomer move to accept amended agenda. *Amendment #1:* Under "Discussion Items #7C" change "October 15" date to "October 20". *Amendment #2:* Move Action Item 6B (621 Artwork Proposals) to first item on agenda. Motion passes.

Motion: Plomer and Sronce move to approve September 6 minutes. Motion passes.

ACTION ITEMS:

621 Capitol Mall Artwork Proposals: Bloom introduces guests then briefly reviews history of project, including artist selection process; also that it's SHRA project with artwork budget of \$424,000.00. Bloom reviews original APP Committee concerns as listed on page 2 of October 4, 2006 staff report to APP:

RE Concern about Expenditure for artwork: Bloom mentions that developer has agreed to increase artwork budget by additional amount of over \$200,000.00 to accommodate proposals of selected artists Brady and Hayden.

Bloom introduces art consultant for 621 Project Phil Hitchcock. Hitchcock reviews project and gives background on artists Brady and Hayden.

Michael Hayden makes presentation, explaining his conceptualization/evolution of proposed artwork. He uses maquettes and video presentation to explain. He clarifies this is a "work in progress". Artwork will be located in interior and exterior of building and will be seen by people inside building and by pedestrians/drivers.

Hayden describes theme and technical aspects of artwork. Theme based on water flowing from Sierra Nevada mountains (top of building), running down mountain (side of building), to river bottom/rapids (interior of building). LED technology with digital imaging will be used to create effects similar to light striking moving water. Actual water images on video will be used to create diffraction grading patterns (holographic). "Chicklet"- shaped light-reflecting squares covered with diffraction grading holographic material will be used in interior to reflect LED and natural light sources. Since "chicklet" squares are not practical for exterior use, they will be used in interior space only. Chicklets attached to each other and some walls create a suspended sculpture. Hayden working on prototype for exterior LED strip/lightbox which will run down center of building. Strip will simulate water movement effects of "chicklet" squares. He is working with local company, LED Effects, Inc. in Rancho Cordova, CA. LED technology to be used outside and

inside. Hayden states that installation and maintenance will be as simple as possible. Interior piece will be structured on frame designed to be lowered from above for cleaning/maintenance.

Hayden asks for questions/comments.

Sronce: Similar in concept/use of technology to Alhambra Water Tower artwork by Michael Bishop. Hayden states he is not familiar with Alhambra piece.

Plomer: Doesn't agree. Hayden's concept is very different from Alhambra.

Corliss: Hayden's concept more sophisticated than Alhambra.

Plomer: Originally had concern that artwork would be static, not enough movement for it to be interesting. Plomer states she likes current concept. She asks if artist has thought of incorporating idea of many colors reflected by water, not just blue and green (blue and green theme described by artist in presentation). She refers to fall foliage reflected on water's surface. Is it possible to use this as basis for color of water sculpture to change with season or even use this design idea to create color palette that could change to offset outside seasonal temperature.

Hayden likes idea very much and will think about how it could be used. He states he is still thinking about interactive qualities of piece. He has considered idea of presence of people being able to change color temperature of light.

Eder: Asks if selection of building glass will meet specifications for artwork. Ellen Warner, representing developer David Taylor, answers "yes"; adds that glass has already been purchased.

Hitchcock mentions this is still "work in progress" and welcomes input from APP Committee. He invites members to contact him with suggestions.

Hitchcock explains Christine Remy's involvement as intern with project and that she is employed with LED Effects, Inc.

Gotthart: Restates APP's concern that local artists (Sacramento County) were not considered in artist selection. She asks Hitchcock if his review panel contacted local artists from list provided him by APP Committee. Hitchcock answers "yes" and reads list of artists considered. He mentions that Robert Brady is a local artist, even though he resides in Bay Area now.

Bloom: Were only two artists asked to create proposals for this project? Hitchcock answers "yes".

Robert Brady makes presentation. He gives brief background on his work as artist. He shows maquette and talks about concept and technical aspects of sculpture. Idea was to create a piece that was soft and contemplative in contrast to angular lines of architecture and glass, steel, etc. Sculpture will be 16' high, cast in bronze – an abstraction of human figure with diminutive head shape in relation to the body form with hollow back. To be located near exterior corner of building with seating/planter area surrounding it.

Eder: Likes artwork, but asks if Brady thought about relationship between scale of building and scale of sculpture. One interpretation might be that technology has taken over/is more important than people.

Brady states he hadn't thought of it like that. He doesn't interpret it like that. He states it's still a "work in progress" and describes process it will go through from concept to bronze casting.

Plomer: Asks if small budget drove the size/scale of artwork. Also suggests possible changes to present design that could address concern/comments relative to diminutive head shape and overall scale of artwork.

Brady states that budget was part of issue re: scale of artwork. However building is so large that even 25' sculpture would be small in comparison. Planting/seating area assists in balancing scale issue.

E. Warner: In answer to Plomer's last comment: 621 building is celebration of technology. Everything about it is large scale. Addition of Brady sculpture will humanize environment making it approachable/friendly to people. Scale of sculpture is very appropriate.

Naify: Are two pieces of artwork enough for building of this scale?

E. Warner: Other artwork will be provided by tenants in offices, hallways, etc.

Bloom: Will additional artwork be publicly accessible?

E. Warner: Only the Brady and Hayden artworks will be publicly accessible.

Hitchcock: Less is more. Don't want to "overdo it" with too much artwork.

Corliss: In favor of having several sculptures outside.

Gotthart: Thanks everyone for coming and making presentations. Reminds guests again that in future APP would like local artists considered and diversity of Sacramento represented.

C. Remy: Comments on the large scale of this project. Many local artists don't have this kind of experience.

Gotthart: Comments that APP is asking for local artists to be considered; to be part of the review process. Bloom responds that there are local artists that could handle the scope of this project.

R. Brady: Comments that he considers himself a local artist having taught for over 30 years at CSU, Sacramento and lived in Sacramento and this region for many years.

Responding to Committee's comments, Bloom asks Hitchcock and Warner if they are committed to increasing artwork budget to accommodate potential increases in cost of producing artwork. Warner answers yes, developer is fully committed to it.

APP Committee discusses proposals and reviews again list of original concerns.

Bloom reviewed items of concern from staff report:

- ◇ Concern regarding SHRA reduction in expenditure for public art. (\$424,000.00 APP requirement on a \$70,000,000.00 project.
- ◇ Small amount of APP budget for large-scope project.- Developer is adding additional funds for LED project.
- ◇ Concern regarding the arts plan's lack of opportunities for local and emerging artists.- Direction given to consultant for future consideration. Local artist intern hired for LED portion of project.
- ◇ Accessibility of artwork with regard to location.- artwork provide in lobby and exterior. Day and night presence considered by artist.

Most agree issues have been mitigated, but Committee would still like to see more art for the amount of money being spent. Idea of creating rotating art gallery in building lobby is discussed as way to have more art and support local artists. Committee asks for this information to be presented to the developer.

Motion: Gotthart calls for vote. Motion is made to approve the proposals by Brady and Hayden with recommendation that a rotating gallery be established. Motion passes: 8 ayes, 0 noes, 1 abstention.

John Wong: Comments that questions asked by APP and interaction between APP and presenters was at a higher level of expertise than at previous 621 presentation. He congratulates APP on good meeting. He states he is in favor of project and thinks building and artwork are positive additions to Sacramento architecture and APP collection. He comments that LED technology is "energy-saving" light source and that it compliments building design.

Wong also comments that he thinks it important for APP to make certain that developer is committed to creating the artwork as presented, whatever the cost. Bloom states that developer's artwork budget was increased to accommodate this and E. Warner agreed that costs would be covered.

Colonial Park Artwork Proposal: LaZansky reviews Colonial Park project and explains artwork proposal. Local metal sculptor Lane Van Doren invited by APP subcommittee to submit proposal. Artwork will be figurative 7' to 8' metal sculpture with a face showing an open mouth. In center of artwork will be a flat metal board surface which will function as bulletin board for posting notices, replacing existing board. Open-mouth figure represents a "town-crier". Notices are to be posted on metal bulletin board with magnets. Total budget for artwork is \$3,500.00.

APP suggests that magnets will not work efficiently. They will be taken by kids, lost, etc. There may be safety issues re: children if magnets are used. Discussion includes other ways to post notices, i.e. bar-like strips that would run across board to hold in papers, some kind of permanent holders that can't be removed.

Motion: Sronce makes motion to approve proposal on the condition that the issue of how the notices are posted be resolved to APP's satisfaction. Motion passes.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Promenade Project Arts Plan (SHRA): Bloom informs APP that public meeting for Promenade plan with artist Ned Kahn will be October 26 at 6pm at 1020 11th Street, 2nd floor. Bloom invites APP Committee members to attend; opportunity to give input for arts plan.

Dedications: Bloom thanks APP members for their support in attending September dedications. R. Halpern thanks APP staff and acknowledges their efforts. Gotthart comments on large attendance at Hagginwood dedication and that it was a great reception.

APP Training: Bloom reminds committee of upcoming training/retreat on Oct. 20 from 9am-12noon. Location to be announced.

Welcome: Bloom welcomes Commissioner Jennifer Tachera to APP Committee.

VAC and Docent Program: Bloom states that updates from VAC and Docent program will be made at future APP meeting.

Adjournment: 6:10pm.

**Arts Commission Micro-grant Program
Policy Statement
DRAFT rev. 8/25/06**

The Arts Commission's mission is to provide and facilitate arts experiences and opportunities; create an environment that supports sustainable and flourishing arts organizations and artists; and contribute positively to arts education and a growing artistic and cultural economy. In recognition that the Commission seeks to support the arts activities in the region to the widest extent possible, we believe this new grant program will fulfill our mission, while reaching a new pool of applicants.

The Sacramento arts community is constantly growing, and the Arts Commission recognizes the need to broaden its reach locally and nurture the growth of the arts in Sacramento. There are still many artists and arts groups who do not know of or avail themselves of the resources we have to offer.

Augmenting these initiatives is a new revolving Micro-grant Program, allowing for artists and arts groups to apply for small grant awards all year round. These new programs also offer structured avenues for professional development to the arts community. Our objective is to increase the pool of artists and arts projects supported by the Arts Commission. Specifically, our goal is to create a cross-agency initiative that

1. Expands our Stabilization program to include individual artists in areas of Professional Development and Career Advancement;
2. Funds arts projects or events not otherwise eligible for funding through the Sudden Opportunity Grant;
3. Funds arts opportunities in the public schools not otherwise eligible for funding through the Arts Learning Opportunity Grant;

This proposed program will serve as a Pilot Program, functioning on a small scale for Fiscal Year 2007, with built-in evaluation points during our upcoming Business Plan process. We hope to roll out an expanded version in Fiscal Year 2008.

Microgrant Pilot Program: Categories

- Professional Development
Assists artists and representatives of small and mid-sized arts organizations in attending conferences/ workshops/ seminars/ retreats that will contribute to their professional growth. Cannot be used by faculty or students of a college, university or similar educational program.

- Career Advancement
Assists practicing, professional and emerging artists with specific professional development and skill building opportunities which help to advance their work and careers. Cannot be used by faculty or students of a college, university or similar educational program.
- Sudden Opportunity Grant
Assists community and arts groups, especially those in underserved communities, in taking advantage of opportunities that arise within a short timeframe, allowing them to provide arts resources as well as mount projects of a moderate scale. This cannot be used for projects currently 'covered' by any agency RFP's.
- Arts Learning Opportunity Grant
Available to K-12 and after school programs at public schools to provide funding for arts learning projects outside of the annual agency grant cycles. This encompasses unexpected expenses and may include field trip expenses, school fees for touring artists, a chance for participation in an event, an opportunity to purchase art supplies or enroll in a music class. This opportunity grant is also available to pay partial tuition for classroom teachers to attend local arts education training programs.

Microgrant Pilot Program: Eligibility and Policy

- One Microgrant per year in only ONE category
- Cannot receive grant for the same Microgrant category two years in a row
- More than one person associated with same arts organization may apply in the same year; justification may be necessary
- All applicants must be residents of Sacramento county
- Preference given to non-current grantees
- If current grantee, must:
 - Be in good standing
 - Not be applying for activities already covered in current grant
 - The APP waiting period requirement is waived for the purposes of this Microgrant program

Microgrant Pilot Program: Program Architecture

- Up to \$600 without a match; encouraged to ask for smallest amount needed
- No matches required during pilot period
- Not intended as a grant but as agency wide stabilization service

- No contract required
- Grantee is paid with an invoice that includes an indemnification clause
- SMAC credit or use of logo (as applicable) and final evaluation required
- Pilot program to be assessed at end of year
- No matches considered in Fiscal Year 2007
- Little to no technical assistance given
- Must submit a clear, concise and complete application
- Program area Committees to review applications at least quarterly, if not more, depending on workload and number of applications received
- Arts Commission to receive update(s) on activity funded
- Funded from Stabilization funds

Microgrant Pilot Program: Application process

- Letter of request. Describe the following on no more than one, single-sided page:
 - the start and end dates of project,
 - goals and intent of project,
 - benefit to community,
 - specific time and manner in which the opportunity for which you are requesting funds became known to you,
 - your ability to successfully complete the project within the proposed timeframe.
- Description of training or arts event. (Include flyer or brochure as appropriate).
- One page resume(s) of artist(s).
- Up to three print samples of their work, i.e. brochure, review, flyer, photograph of their work, etc.
- One page itemized budget for project, listing expenses and income (including amount requested).
- If artist, include:
 - complete name,
 - mailing address,
 - phone,
 - fax,
 - email,
 - website,

- whether or not you have a City of Sacramento business license,
- letter of support.

- If arts group, include:
 - contact person's name,
 - arts group name,
 - mailing address,
 - phone,
 - fax,
 - email,
 - website,
 - whether or not the group is incorporated,
 - how long the group has existed,
 - Board president name, if applicable, phone and email.
 - If applicable and new to SMAC, copy of 501c(3) letter
 - letter of support.

- If relevant, proof of use of SMAC logo or oral credit given.

- Must submit final report required summarizing the completed event or training, its effectiveness and impact, and future goals.

The Arts Commission reserves the right to reject incomplete applications.