

Meeting of the Ann Arbor Public Art Commission

Wednesday, January 25th; City Hall, 2nd Floor Conference Room

CALL TO ORDER:

4:37

ROLL CALL:

Members present: T Dereziński, M Chamberlin, M Winborne, W Simbuerger, J Kotarski, B Miller & C Rizzolo-Brown

Members absent: C Gendron

Others: Mary Morgan, Ann Arbor Chronicle; Ryan Stanton, annarbor.com

Introduction of new commissioners: J Kotarski, and B Miller

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by W Simbuerger, second by T Dereziński.

Minutes approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion by T Dereziński, second by J Kotarski.

W Simbuerger requested “Stadium Bridges budget” added as a New Business item to be added to the agenda.

Agenda approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

REPORT FROM CHAIR

No Report

REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATOR, COMMITTEES & REPORTS ON PROJECTS

Administrator gave a brief communication regarding the Public Art Public Survey released earlier in the month. Administrator reported on the number of responses, the activity in the promotion of the survey, and informed the commissioners of the date the survey would close. M Chamberlin asked about the quality of the responses to the survey. Administrator reported that approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of the responders answered a majority of the questions.

Administrator answered questions about the ongoing public art projects. Commission offered changes in the status of public art projects on the Project Tracker document: suggestions to change the status on the Fuller Rd, and the Rain Garden project to inactive. C Rizzolo-Brown recommended continuing to work with the Sun Dragon’s Project Manager and resolve the project and asked about the status. Administrator offered to follow through on the project. It was recommended that J Kotarski be added to the Huron River & Parks Task Force listing. M Chamberlin asked about the status of the Huron River & Parks public art project and if the project had the Commission’s approval. It was agreed that following the upcoming Task Force meeting there would be a better indication of the scope of the project and the Task Force would bring the request for approval of the project to the next meeting. It was requested that the Administrator update the list of Task Force members for each project on the Project Tracker document.

Stadium Bridges Task Force Report and discussion of the budget for the project:

W Simbuerger, one of the Commission members on the Stadium Bridges Task Force, updated the Commission on the progress of the project. One of the main ideas for the project includes “a gateway” concept for the public art and that it will reflect the diverse use of the location. There was discussion on the Task Force’s selection of the different locations for the project and the expectations of the Task Force regarding the art. The sites for public art were selected and determined to be the State Street bridge and several adjacent areas. The project is now drafting the Request for Proposal. The budget for the art project was discussed and W Simbuerger recommended a project budget of \$250,000. The commission discussed the possible features the art could have. B Miller suggested the art proposal would be guided by the amount of the budget and stated that the bridge construction already designed and the art would have to fit the construction. It was suggested that since there was not an approved budget for the project, a budget need to be approved to inform the scope of the project. Goal of the project was stated. The Administrator gave some information about the current amount available in the “Streets” pooled funding and the amount the bridges capital project has contributed (about \$97,000). Commissioners suggested that, because of the location, the public art project can be a showcase. W Simbuerger indicated that there would likely be a public input component in connection with the public art project. There was consensus among the Commissioners to table the approval of a budget for the Stadium bridges public art project until they could follow through with the completion of the Annual Plan for the coming year and connect the project, and the funding available, with the larger picture of planning for public art through the city.

OLD BUSINESS

Annual Plan development & review of possible projects

C Rizzolo-Brown suggested the annual plan development is challenging because there isn’t a narrative for the overall vision of public art planning. She stated it is difficult to place the budget priority surrounding these projects. And she offered a request to the Commission to take the time to decide how to tackle the vision of the Annual Plan and to allocate money to the projects that are a part of the Annual Plan. The Commission discussed the possibility of creating the Annual Plan as if it were a master plan.

The Administrator discussed the results of an internal survey, given to the Commissioners, of possible public art projects and locations. There was question about the process and the participation of the Commission. The survey process was described as being challenging and there was frustration expressed about the locations and projects on the survey. M Chamberlin described the survey was just a list to get ideas and gave a reminder that it is not a binding agreement regarding their Plan for the Commission. The Commission talked about the usefulness of the process and there was discussion about how to continue the selection process. The Administrator spoke to the timeline of the process and informed the commission about the scheduled meetings in March at the City Council work session and with the Parks Advisory Council.

M Chamberlin stated that the current process for developing the Annual Plan was much like starting from the bottom up. She also stated that the current process was based on the discussion of the Annual Plan development process at the last meeting. A suggestion was made to switch the Project Committee to a master planning committee that would work

on the public art planning in the broad scope. A recommendation was made to schedule a retreat in the meeting next month (February) with the full commission and work on a strategic planning process. Longer term planning was discussed and it was determined to be necessary. The Commission discussed planning for a master planning retreat. Some of the details of the meeting were discussed: it was described as a strategic planning session; a half-day meeting, on a weekend, Saturday afternoon; the commission's open chair would need to be appointed in time for the meeting; a facilitator will be requested and it was recommended that the facilitator meet with some of the commissioners before the retreat. There was discussion on asking city staff person, Connie Pulcifer, to lead the facilitation of the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Approval of Justice Center Lobby art proposal

Motion by B Miller, second by M Winborne

Administrator gave the background information about the project, the artist selection process, and the recommendation of the selection panel. Ed Carpenter was the recommended artist. The Administrator listed the reasons why the Selection Panel selected Carpenter's proposal: the artwork uses a great deal of the lobby space; the reflective nature of the glass and the visibility of the artwork; the movement of the reflections across the lobby will soften the architecture of the lobby; they responded to the metaphor of the Justice Center's rippling effect in the community. There was a question about the Selection Panel and the recommendation of the artist. The Selection Panel requested new renderings of the proposal from the artist to incorporate some of the concerns regarding the design some members of the Selection Panel had. The Administrator said he offered the new renderings of the design to the Selection Panel members and received no negative feedback.

The Commission discussed the art proposal by Ed Carpenter, titled Radius. The reflective piece and the nature of the lighting were well regarded by the Commission. A question was asked about the timeline and about how long it would take to ready a contract and finish the installation of the art. It was suggested that the project would be finished near the end of the year. There were also questions about the cost of the materials and the budget. M Chamberlin commented that she liked the concept of the Radius art proposal in favor of the other proposals. J Kotarski said he liked theme of the radius and said there is a center that radiates out from the Justice Center. He described it as elegant and it light and liked that you can sit under it were the benches are located.

Vote: All in favor.

Approved.

Approval of Allmendinger Mural art proposal

Motion to approve by J Kotarski, second by C Rizzolo-Brown

Commissioner W Simbuerger presented background information on the mural project proposals and the Selection Panel's decision. Mural proposals were submitted by artists Jefferson Nelson, Bethany Kalk, and Yami Duarte. One proposal was a reflective surface. The Selection Panel asked for a proposal from Kalk because they were amazed by her craft. The proposal she submitted was four different themes. There was a feeling by

Selection Panel that she didn't have a connection to the site. The Selection Panel determined that the artist Duarte may not have enough experience, though her proposal was appreciated and it used typography in connection with pictures and imagery. The interviews gave the Selection Panel a sense about whether or not the artists were experienced and if they were engaged. The Selection Panel loved Mary Thiefels proposal primarily because of the community-participatory program and "memory piece" that will be added to the artwork and because the neighborhood will become part of the imagery. The Commission discussed the community theme and possibility of including a website for the project. Task Force would like to work with the artist on the streamlining the final design and to get the final idea about how the project will be. The Selection Panel felt it was an interesting concept and well thought through.

W Simbuerger said the proposal grabs her and there is a narrative to the project. She also was in favor of the proposal because it is a neighborhood project and likes that the artist is local. She commented on her interest in the Commission's ability to help in developing a sustainable community of artists. She also was in favor of the art work changing the look of the columns at the park. C Rizzolo-Brown described the selection as finding someone with talent who can bring something richer to the project. T Derezinski liked the chance of the neighborhood having ownership of it and that it is a local project. He commented that the Allmendinger family is still in the area and thought that images from the family and the factory could be included. There was discussion about Mary's history and past work. W Simbuerger likes that there is a local and community involvement and appreciates that there is a range of participation. C Rizzolo-Brown mentioned that the concept of mural can be defined differently as a result of the mural program. The mural and found object application was asked about. There was a question asked about the timeline for the project. Administrator offered the project could be ready to start in the summer, or in May. J Kotarski mentioned that there was an option to create a web interface for the project. M Chamberlin asked if the fee to the artist is low because the budget for the mural is only \$10,000. There was discussion on if there was room for flexibility for materials. There was discussion on if the budget could be adjusted. M Chamberlin asked about supporting going forward with the project however asked if there was reason to revisit the budget. T Derezinski commented that it was a conversation that could be had with artist to find out if the budget is accurate. Ask the artist to send an amended budget. A friendly amendment to the approval of the public art project was to accept the artist and request that the task force continues working with the artist to further art design and to ask for a new budget.

*Vote: All in favor.
Approved.*

The Commissioners verified that the monthly meeting time and date for the rest of the year as the fourth Wednesday at 4:30pm

T Derezinski can begin to report on AAPAC to the City Council.

ADJOURNMENT:
Meeting adjourned at 6:04

Ann Arbor Public Art Commission
Annual Planning Retreat
Sunday, February 26, 2012

NEW Center, 1100 N. Main, South Conference Room

CALL TO ORDER at 1:08 pm

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: W Simbuerger, C Gendron, T Reid, B Miller, J Kotarski, T Derezinski, M Chamberlin, M Winborne, and C Brown.

City Staff: Aaron Seagraves, Connie Pulcifer, and Kayla Coleman

Other Attendees: Mary Morgan, Ann Arbor Chronicle; Jamal Bari, Tasfia Bari, Brenda Alcala, Eileen Beiden, Susie Stevens, Hanna Baker, Ana Houten, Ilana Houten

APPROVAL OF AGENDA, motion by M. Winborne, second by T. Derezinski

PUBLIC COMMENTS, none

The annual planning retreat was convened to deliberate the following agenda items:

- ❖ To review the background of Ann Arbor's public art program and to re-confirm its purpose
- ❖ To report on national public art examples and describe different types of public art that other programs produce
- ❖ To introduce the concept of a AAPAC Master Plan for Public Art
- ❖ To establish the Annual Plan for FY13

Why Public Art?

Commission Member C. Brown reviewed:

- ❖ The concept of "placemaking," and introduced relevant concepts from the publication: Economics of Place
- ❖ The reasons why public art programs are established
- ❖ The background of the public art program and the commission
- ❖ The public art ordinance and restated the responsibilities it gives the Commission
- ❖ Defined public art as it is in the ordinance

Public Art Examples and Genres (PowerPoint)

Commission Member J. Kotarski presented a report on national public art examples and described different types of public art that other programs across the country produce.

During the presentation there was discussion on one of the categories of public art and the value of public art. T. Reid commented on the value of permanent public art. C. Brown described community involvement in projects creates identity. T. Derezinski recalled the discussion with City Council and the reason behind the Council's continued support of the program. The reasons that won-out with City Council were the capacity of Ann Arbor to define itself and consideration of the values the city holds, plus it is widely regarded to be economic value in the program.

AAPAC and the Big Picture

Commission Member C. Brown reviewed:

- ❖ An assessment of what AAPAC has the ability to do for the city and what it can do as a national public art program
- ❖ A list of the types of professions in the local community the program supports

- ❖ An explanation of the process for implementing projects and what are tools at the disposal of AAPAC to accomplish them
- ❖ The roles of the different responsible parties of the program and its stakeholders. The Commission identified and listed the roles, as follows:

What is the role of the commission?

- Advisory
- Promulgate guidelines
- Submit a plan each year
- Creates vision
- Set priorities
- Inform / communicate to the community about public art
- Raise awareness
- Generate funds
- Recommend on funding
- Recommend on projects
- Observe, review fabrication of projects
- Set-up partnerships
- Majority decision making
- Takes recommendations from task force
- Appoints task force
- Review job description for art Admin
- Should commission have a role in the performance evaluation (or interview process) for Art Administrator?

What is the role of the Art Administrator?

- Develops portal for community engagement
- Support
- Conduit
- General Management/day to day administrator
- Liaison
- Maintain website
- Promotion of public art
- Face of communications – chief contact person
- Provide expertise – knowledge: procedural
- Overall leadership of AAPAC
- Implement vision
- Project management leadership

What is the role of the city?

- Manages Projects (Capital)
- Identify funding allocations / categories
- Technical support
- Liaison between artist and department
- Department input for new projects
- Identify opportunities

What is the role of the City Council?

- Oversight
- Final decision makers
- Provide adequate funding
- Amend ordinance when needed
- Approval of AAPAC nominees

What is the role of the Community?

- Serve on task forces
- Sounding board
- Engagement
- Participation in projects/ select sites
- Spreads the word – ambassadors of public art
- Provide ideas for new projects

- Serve on AAPAC subcommittees
- Source for collaborative projects/ Partnerships

What is the role of the task force?

- Recommends to Commission (by Majority)
- Sets vision for particular projects

Following the exercise of listing all the roles of the commission, city, administrator, and the other stakeholders, the Commission identified items and issues that they wanted to address, have clarity on, come to an understanding of, or implement. (These issues were labeled “The Parking Lot” at the meeting.) This list identifies those items:

- Marketing Plan
- Clarify role of appointing a task force
- Clarify roles/ responsibilities where there are gaps
- City council to work with commission to see where amendments to ordinances are needed
- Organization of committees
- Should commission provide a framework for projects?
- Formalize staff liaison/connection to CIP – get commissioners input early on
- Structure how we get done what we want to do? Mechanisms...
- Artist Registry
- Task Force Recruitment

Master Plan

Commission Member C. Brown presented the concept of a public art master plan. The presentation included details on how AAPAC could create such a plan. Also, the Public Art Administrator presented the results of the Public Art Survey (January through February 2012). During the discussion of establishing a master plan to guide the commission’s planning process other related items were brought up:

- ❖ The commissioners discussed asking for more direction on interpreting the public art ordinance in order to better determine what types of projects could be funded.
- ❖ To determine public art project, the commission discussed multiple ways to categorize projects from which to select projects to fund and develop. Ways to distinguish projects included the following characteristics and possibilities:
 - Geographic Location
 - Dividing the city into four areas and equally distributing public art projects in each of the areas
 - Suggestion was made to set a goal of having multiple projects in all four areas as a goal
 - Size and Scope of the project
 - Smaller projects (murals) to larger site-specific projects (Dreiseitl)

- Site Land Use
 - Approve projects that are in a range of areas that are used differently, such as, in parks & recreation areas, in the downtown, in neighborhoods
- Density of population
- Typology, or types of projects, such as, gateways, way finding, etc.

What follows is an outline of what the Commission identified as the potential Goals, Locations, Typology, and Processes the Master Plan would contain:

Goals for the Master Plan:

- Establish relationships with city units and other commissions
- Marketing / communications plan
- Public education and communication
- Better educated public – simple narrative
- City council and staff are better informed about the public art program
- A framework for decision making about topics (locations)
- Diversity of locations
- Interaction with the public to define locations (this is part of process)
- Promote temporary art
- Budget for marketing and communications
- A scoring checklist for project selection

Location

- A gallery in city hall
- Divide the city into quadrants and make sure that each is represented (e.g. use the established planning areas in “Planning Master Plan”)
- Simultaneously working on 2 projects in each planning area (provide structure to support these)
- Public usage
- Underserved communities and neighborhoods
- Addressing large scale projects across planning areas

Typology

- Continue mural program and achieve x number of murals each year
- Visibility impact

Process

- Tie the communities into the project
- Outright purchase of art pieces
- Trade/ lease art
- Some money each year goes to Quadrant projects, some goes to idea specific projects

Annual Plan

Based on some of the goals, locations, typology, and processes identified during the brainstorming for the Master Plan, three items from those identified were picked for the Annual Plan:

1. Quadrants/ Planning areas: Sectioning the geographic locations of the city into quadrants and selecting public art projects for each section
2. Land Uses
 - a. Examples of Land Use areas from the presentation: recreation areas, business areas, neighborhoods, character zones, and entry zones
3. Under-served areas

ADJOURNMENT, at 5:06pm