



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

Wednesday, November 30, 2011

4:30 PM

Larcom City Hall - 2nd Flr Council Workroom

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting began at 4:30pm

ROLL CALL

Present: M Winborne, M Chamberlin, M Parker, C Zuellig, W Simbuerger, C Rizzolo-Brown

Absent: T Derezinski, E Sims & C Gendron

Others present: Bob Miller, John Kotowski, Mary Morgan

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: To approve. Moved by C Zuellig, second by M Winborne; Minutes from October 2011 were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

M Parker requested report from Public Relations Committee be placed on the agenda. MOTION: To have item placed on the agenda. Moved by C Zuellig, second by M Winborne.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

REPORT FROM CHAIR

None. Request to limit meeting to 6:30pm.

REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATOR

Project Updates: see Project Tracker, November document

A Commissioner had a question about project Task Forces and how the membership of the Task Forces was determined. The question was asked if there were any guide lines for who could volunteer and how many volunteers could serve on a Task Force? C Rizzolo-Brown provided a description of the Fuller Rd Task Force and who is on the task force.

Amendment to the Ordinance:

Public Art Administrator reported on the amendment to the Public Art Ordinance being considered by City Council at the next Council meeting. Seagraves described the Council's first reading of the amendment and the discussion that followed. He stated the Council seemed to be taking into consideration the art program presentation at the Council work session in October and that they were sympathetic to the challenges the program has faced. The amendment features the following:

- Eliminates % funding for public art from capital improvements funded by the General Fund*
- Eliminates sidewalk repairs as a % for art*
- Would reduce the percentage from 1 to 1/2% for the next three years*
- Beginning in July 2015, with the return of the full percent, unspent funding for public art that became revenue to the program three years earlier would be returned to the source of the funding. AAPAC could request 6 month extensions for particular amounts and extensions could be given indefinitely.*
- Does not eliminate projects funded by the streets and sidewalk millage from funding public art*

Discussion of the proposed amendment followed.

The discussion focused on particular points and changes within the amendment. M Winborne had questions about the 3 year time limit on Art in Public Places revenue and how that timeframe would be tracked. M Parker expressed Council could have responded to AAPAC work session to a greater degree. Commissioner felt they did not seem to understand the amount of projects and the staffing needs and that here will be a hardship to accomplish the projects in three years. There was discussion on the amount of money that is set-aside for staffing and if it were possible to increase the amount of money for Administration. Additional funding for staff for project management is an issue. Further questions about when project managers are used for projects for public art projects. C Rizzolo-Brown commented on how the Fuller Rd Station project management functions. C Zuellig asked about how the project management time could be used now and discussion ensued about the administrative budget. There was an Ordinance Report, at the time of the original ordinance passage, which placed the amount of the Administrative budget at 8%. There was additional discussion on the amount of money that is currently in the balance and how the Council regards the balance and how it relates to the amount of public art projects can be accomplished. Administrator stated there is some likelihood that Sue McCormick would go forward with the recommendation to increase public art administrator's staff time. The Commissioners discussed the whether or not the opportunity to make public comments at Council meetings was something they were comfortable doing, given their role on the Commission. M Parker stated that the public comment can be used to voice concern about how to address what needs to be done to work on improving the AAPAC. There was discussion about allowing staff to accomplish the work of AAPAC which is a situation that AAPAC did not have last year. A Commissioner stated that there is a process that has not played out, in terms of the work of the Council, and that needs to be given a chance. There was a comment on the worth and value of advocating for the public art program, including people from the Commission.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Public Relations Committee Report: M Chamberlin suggested the PR report and some of the items that were listed in the Report be delayed for the working meeting in December. As recommended in the business items.

[11-1489](#)

Ann Arbor Public Art Commission Meeting Minutes - November 30, 2011

Attachments: Public Relations Committee - Nov 2011.pdf, Mural Task Force Meeting - Nov 2011.pdf, AAPAC Business Items - Nov 2011.pdf, Work Session Memo Nov 14 2011.docx, AAPAC Project Tracking - November 2011.pdf

OLD BUSINESS

Public Art Project at the Rain garden, Kingsley and First:

C Zuellig presented the Project Assessment document for the rain garden project. M Winborne asked if it was on AAPAC's Annual Plan and if it should be before it can go forward. He was concerned about creeping off track by focusing on other projects and said that the process AAPAC needed to accomplish was to move forward with projects. C Zuellig described the West Park public art project as one that was not on the Annual Plan and came up during the course of the year. She said city initiated projects are the only thing on the Annual Plan. The direction in the past was to not do items that are not on the Annual Plan. Seagraves recommended the Annual Plan be considered a guide, but not a strict plan. There was discussion on the location of the project and a description of it being off the beaten path and it is interesting that there is staff involved. M Parker asked the question if there is an issue with staffing and if this additional project could be accomplished with current staff. She would support the project. C Rizzolo-Brown would support it but would like to reduce the amount of the budget for the project to about 15,000. W Simbuerger would support the project and believes that there is enough support from staff. She also mentioned that the 10,000 might be too low. M Chamberlin commented that there might be a need to use the full amount currently pooled in Storm Water fund. There was further discussion regarding the budget for the project.

MOTION: Final recommendation of budget of 20,000 to 27,000 and final budget from the Task Force and approve the creation of the Task Force. Motioned by M Winborne, and second by M Chamberin. Motion passed unanimously.

DIA partnership, Inside/Out program:

M Chamberlin described the partnership as helping the DIA find locations of the Inside/Out program on city properties. M Winborne described the partnership as simply helping the DIA find the sites.

*MOTION: To accept AAPAC partnership with the project with the understanding that AAPAC would find locations for the DIA replicas.
Motion by M Winborne, Second by C Rizzolo-Brown. Motion passed unanimously.*

October AAPAC work session follow-up meeting:

M Chamberlin recommended continuing the work the Commissioners began in October. She expressed AAPAC could meet to decide how to move forward and could begin planning for the Annual Plan. Commissioners discussed that changing the regular AAPAC December meeting from the fourth Wednesday to a different date and to schedule a work session during that date. The Commission decided to schedule a meeting on the 13th of December to follow up on the working session. It was recommended that Seagraves work with AAPAC chair and vice-chair on developing the agenda for that meeting and to meet with them to do so.

NEW BUSINESS

Administrator's recommended changes to Project Steps:

The role of the Admin was discussed and so were the roles of the AAPAC committees. The first several steps were discussed, as outlined in the document. Seagraves described the changes as streamlining the selection process. Commissioners recommended moving the changes to the project steps to the December meeting. Connie C Rizzolo-Brown discussed streamlining the process to 11 steps. Commissioners decided to move the discussion to the December meeting and Seagraves agreed to work with C Rizzolo-Brown on refining the changes to the process.

Public Art Program, "Street Art Spots," non-commissioned, existing works, direct purchasing process:

Issues were raised about the Curator's role and if the curator would be paid. A consult fee was seen to be a better option than giving commission. There was some discussion on the need for the program. It was mentioned that city staff identified this process of purchasing art as an idea for AAPAC to consider. The discussion on the program was decided to be tabled to a future meeting in January or February, giving Seagraves more time to develop the proposal and see if a similar program is conducted in other cities.

Planning Committee:

It was mentioned that Annual Plan was a project that the Planning Committee has typically done in the past. There was a discussion on the amount of times the Planning committee would meet and if it they could meet quarterly. There were comparisons to other city committees and the role they have in comparison to AAPAC. There was discussion on the planning functions and the possibility of delineating functions to other members of the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:25. Motion to adjourn by C Zuellig, Second M Winborne