



City of Ann Arbor

301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

Meeting Minutes Ann Arbor Public Art Commission

Tuesday, December 13, 2011

4:30 PM

Larcom City Hall - 5th Flr Council Workroom

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting began at 4:36pm.

ROLL CALL

Members present: T Derezhinski, E Sims, M Chamberlin, M Parker, W Simbuerger, & C Rizzolo-Brown

Members absent: M Winborne, C Zuellig & C Gendron

Others: Mary Morgan, Ann Arbor Chronicle

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: To approve. Moved by M Parker, second by C Rizzolo-Brown. Minutes approved

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Addition to the agenda; M Chamberlin requested a New Business item on art donation be placed on the agenda.

MOTION: Item added and agenda approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

REPORT FROM CHAIR

Chair briefly commented on the continuation of the 1% funding the public art program, as a result of the City Council meeting on December 5th.

REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATOR

Project Updates:

Dreizeitl sculptures lighting and water will be tested this week and so will the side panels be placed on the sculpture. Stadium Bridges Task Force held a walk-through of the construction site on Sunday. Justice Center proposals were reviewed on Monday and the Selection Panel will meet again next week to finalize the selection. Allmendinger Park artists have sent in Concept Proposals to the Selection Panel and they will be reviewed and the artists will be interviewed on the 20th. C Rizzolo-Brown asked for an update on the repair of the Sun Dragon but there was none to report. C Rizzolo-Brown agreed to become Commission Member Champion of the Kingsley and First, rain garden project. A meeting with the Huron Watershed Council regarding River Up!, and the introductory meeting for a Huron River public art plan was described. It was announced that Colin Smith, the Parks and Recreation Services Manager, would be on the Task Force for the public art project that would be in

Gallup Park or the Argo Mill Race. Jim Kosteva, of the University of Michigan, was announced to be serving on the Stadium Bridges Task Force. There was a suggestion to include the names of the members of each project's Task Forces on the Project Tracking document provided to the AAPAC members each month.

Budget:

The review of the budget resulted in discussion of how the budget is reported. There has been some data provided on the reports in the past that the Administrator eliminated from the budget report. The Administrator described that data as being historical. Commissioners expressed the need for a different budget format, and to include in the format data that included encumbered project budgets and nonencumbered project budgets. The Administrator agreed to provide the Commission with an alternative version of the budget, along with the current budget summary page that is provided to the Commission every month. There was further discussion about staffing. A general question was discussed concerning project management and how staffing for project management is expensed. It was mentioned that project management could be expensed by staff from the moment the project is passed by the Commission and by City Council. C. Rizzolo-Brown stated that AAPAC were not the project managers of projects, city staff were. Commissioners felt they would like to have more information about project management. W. Simbuerger wondered if expenditures to staffing for project management would reduce the amount available for the art. The Commission questioned the Administrator if there were enough hours available to him to manage the number of projects the Commission was likely to approve. Administrator explained that his contract gave him 20 hours a week to administer the public art program and the hours were an average-per-week for the year of the contract's duration. The Administrator indicated that he felt he could manage the work load.

[11-1552](#)

Ann Arbor Public Art Commission Meeting Minutes - December 2011

Attachments: AAPAC Budget Dec 2011.pdf, Project Steps Spreadsheet 2011.pdf, Annual Plan Dev Dec 2011.docx, Solutions.docx

OLD BUSINESS

Follow-up to the October AAPAC work-session

Tabled to this month's meeting was a follow-up of the October AAPAC meeting. During the October meeting, AAPAC outlined many ways to improve the city's public art program. The Administrator provided the Commission with an outline of the results of the October meeting. It was suggested by the Administrator that a discussion of the process of developing the Annual Plan and a discussion of initiating public art programs would be two ways to address many of the Commissions own recommendations of how to change the public art program.

Development of Annual Plan Timeline

The Administrator provided the Commission with a recommended timeline for development of the upcoming Annual Plan and a worksheet to establish some framework for the process of planning for the Annual Plan (see attached). During the City Council work sessions regarding the public art program, city staff recommended some changes to the Annual Plan process by including meetings with the Parks Advisory Committee and a work session with City Council. The Administrator provided the Commission with a recommended timeline that included both of these meetings. M. Parker provided an annual calendar for the planning process and suggested that they have considered the Annual Plan as something that needed to be done throughout the year. Though, it was pointed out that the current plan was due in April and the current planning needed to begin for that. The timeline provided

by the Administrator placed the public input process in February and it was suggested that this process begin earlier, in January. The Administrator suggested developing a survey to gather public input about public art projects and to attend several neighborhood association meetings to encourage survey participation. There was some discussion about other civic organizations in which public art input could be gathered. Some recommended organizations were professional organizations, Main Street and State Street associations, Remaining Washtenaw meetings, and Rotary. M. Chamberlin commented on the survey and how AAPAC could get the word-out about it, such as, by issuing press releases to the media, and gave a recommendation to restrict participation in a survey to people who live in Ann Arbor. C. Rizzolo-Brown agreed with the recommendation to do both the public meeting presentations and the survey. There was continued discussion about what public opinion should be surveyed and how it would be useful for public art programming input. It was recommend that a presentation be developed about the public art program and there were suggestions on how to implementation of the presentation and presentation format. Some Commissioners felt a survey was impersonal and though liked the idea of gathering public input at meetings. The Commission was in agreement with the process of developing the Annual Plan and recommended dates be placed on the timeline as if it were a project calendar. Commission asked the Administrator to begin to ask the public entities for time on the organizations meeting agendas. The Commission discussed how a work session meeting with City Council regarding the Annual Plan could be presented and what AAPAC should expect in terms of input and comment from City Council. There was further discussion about the need to present the Annual Plan to City Council during a Council meeting.

Development of Annual Plan Projects/Programs

The Administrator presented the Commission with a short worksheet/list of recommendations for the Annual Plan. There was discussion on the process for developing the Annual Plan and how the criteria could be used to help the Commission decide upon a Plan. The Administrator also asked the Commission to discuss the idea of public art programs and listed several different possible programs that could be implemented by the Commission. The Commission discussed many of them generally and brainstormed additional ideas. M. Chamberlin suggested putting together a RFP for sculptures and murals and subsequently select several of the proposals to implement. E. Sims said selecting mural artists for each location would take too long. She thought a program that created banners could be easily replicated and emphasized replication of projects that are easy to put up. T. Derezynski suggested public art projects could be done at bus stops, such as the new stops at Washtenaw. There was some further discussion of bus stops as a program for public art and if they would be located on city property. C. Rizzolo-Brown recommended that the Commission not consider artist design crosswalks because she had looked into this before and was not feasible. M. Chamberlin indicated that there has been some discussion with city finance about defining the lifetime of a public art project as two-years. She also recommended that the Commission really think more about the concept of public art programs when developing the Annual Plan. M. Parker recommended that the Commission choose one program to place on the Annual Plan. E. Sims recommended a program that involved the community in art making and had a strong community process. M. Chamberlin said this could be a mural that is created by using the paint-by-numbers steps. She also reminded the Commission that city ownership of the property was criterion for any public art project. The discussion then centered around a way to agree upon several criteria for selecting programs and then create a scoring template to rate different programs and public art projects. A few useful criteria was discussed and they included, "ease of implantation," and "visibility." The recommendation of the Commission was to bring to the January meeting a scoring rubric to help the Commission make choices and selections.

Project Steps

The Administrator discussed the need to streamline the project steps process and that was the reason for bringing it to the Commission as an item on the agenda. The outline of the project steps distributed at the meeting was an updated process and new format from the previously approved version of the Project Steps document. M. Parker said it was great to simplify the process. She wanted to include more steps during the artist selection process. She thought it needed to be fleshed out for the purpose of giving clear guidelines to project Task Forces. There was discussion of creating additional steps, or clarifying some of them as they were outlined. There was some discussion on the role of project Task Forces and if they needed to report to AAPAC, or if it would be the role of the Administrator to report. C. Rizzolo-Brown said it was the role of the Administrator to report to AAPAC during the fabrication of the public art project. It was recommended that the Administrator make the changes discussed and bring an updated version to the next AAPAC meeting for consideration.

NEW BUSINESS

Donation; Peace Gates

A resident requested AAPAC to consider a donation of an architectural gate and fence. The usual process outlined in AAPAC's guidelines is to form a committee for requested donations to the city. The Chair asked the Commission if there is a need to form a task force for each donation request and if it were possible for the Commission to decide upon the donation at the meeting. M. Parker said that there was no documented artist as the creator of the work and that it was an architectural element, as opposed to an artwork. T. Derezhinski did not know the artistic merit of the piece, and asked if there was other information regarding the gate that would make it appealing. The Commission discussed the cost of shipping the gates. They also talked about the cross symbol on the gates as being unfavorable. The Chair described other factors against the acceptance of the donation as the cost, and the lack of a selected location to place the work. The religious symbolism was also described as a reason not to pursue the acceptance of the donation. M. Parker moved to not accept the donation of the gates; because there was no history of an artist, no selected location for the piece, it was not possible for a Task Force to view the work, and because of the religious symbolism. The motion was seconded by E. Sims. Motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:24pm.