



Public Art Committee of the Reno Arts & Culture Commission

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Date: March 8, 2021

Time: 11:00 a.m.

Meeting via teleconference only pursuant to NRS 241.023

Public Art Committee Members
Erik Fong, Chair
Cynthia Albright
Bryce Chisholm
Kelli DuFresne
Candace Garlock
Dana Hatjakes
Paul Quade
Mark Salinas
Tamara Scronce
Shoshana Zeldner
Vacant

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call** - Meeting called to order at 11:00 a.m.
Present: Erik Fong, Chair; Cynthia Albright, Bryce Chisholm, Kelli DuFresne (arrived at 11:20 a.m.), Candace Garlock, Dana Hatjakes, Paul Quade (arrived at 11:03 a.m.), Mark Salinas, Tamara Scronce (arrived at 11:05 a.m.), Shoshana Zeldner.

Also present: Megan Berner, Acting Manager of Arts, Culture, and Events; Geralda Miller, Chair of the Reno Arts & Culture Commission.
- 2. Public Comment on Agenda Items or Other Matters** – None
- 3. Approval of the Minutes** – February 8, 2021 Public Art Committee Meeting
Salinas moves to approve, seconded by Chisholm. All in favor, motion carries.
- 4. Approval of the Agenda** – March 8, 2021
Hatjakes moves to approve, seconded by Zeldner. All in favor, motion carries.
- 5. Financial Report and Budget Update**
 - a. Review and possible acceptance of the FY2020/21 Public Art Budget Report**
Berner summarizes. The big change on the budget is the Keystone Bridge Project. When we originally put out the call, staff was told that the bridge was not slated to be redone for at least 20 years. That has changed and it is now on the RTC plan for the next 9 years. The PAC will want to reallocate those funds to another project. That will be discussed at the next meeting.

Albright moves to approve, seconded by Chisholm. All in favor, motion carries.
- 6. Discussion and possible approval of a recommendation for an artist or artists for the Bicentennial Sculpture Park Project in an amount not to exceed \$40,000 from the list of the following finalists, in alphabetical order:** Nicole Beck, Cecilia Lueza, Nathan Pierce.

Debe Fennell and Marlene Olsen are moved into the panel as part of the voting committee for Bicentennial.

Berner says this is a continuation from last month, each of the three finalist artists were asked to answer the PAC's questions. That information was given to the PAC prior to the meeting for review.

Fong says it looks like one of them costs \$20,000, another is \$20,000 but is asking for \$2,500 for in transport and installation. Berner says yes, that is correct. The PAC has set aside a budget of \$2,500 for install but could add more to that.

Fong says the other artist says they can't make the piece in the timeframe but offered another piece as a substitution but isn't in the parameters of the call. He thinks it's a fairly easy decision based on this information but asks for feedback from the group.

Zeldner says that Beck's new submission is not comparable to the work we were reviewing. It feels like lower quality work so she is not in favor of it.

Berner says that the other issue is that the new piece does not fit on one of the pedestals and we don't have a space for it currently.

Fennell and Chisholm agree that the new piece is not something they like. Chisholm says that she did suggest a smaller size on the piece that the committee liked but it would also take much longer to produce and there would be transportation costs.

Scronce does not think the new scale is appropriate for the work and is not in support of Beck's proposal.

Berner summarizes Pierce's proposal addressing materials concerns. The panel are easy to replace and it would cost around \$200 for materials.

Chisholm points out that we have unallocated funds and could use those for additional installation costs.

Salinas asks where Lueza lives and if she had any additional costs for transport of the art.

Fennell asks if the pieces can be delivered soon. Berner says that she spoke with the artists and let them know the timeline. Lueza and Pierce both can deliver/install within our timeline.

Quade asks if Lueza's installation costs are included in the \$20,000 purchase price. Berner says that isn't completely clear.

Quade says that he feels that Pierce's and Lueza's pieces are both strong and fit well within the park in terms of scale and color.

Salinas agree with Quade, asks who decides which piece goes on which pedestal. Berner says that this is up to the PAC.

Quade suggests the fish piece go on the pedestal near the river.

Fong asks if we just need to get information from Lueza on any additional costs for shipping/install. Berner says that it does say in the call that the artist is responsible for transport.

Scronce says that Pierce mentioned it because he is justifying the price of his piece.

Fong asks if there are any concerns about the acrylic materials he's using after this conversation.

Fennell says that it was an adequate explanation.

Quade asks if the PAC has a concern over the additional \$2,500 shipping fee. Albright says since we have it in the budget, there is no concern.

Salinas makes a motion to approve the purchase of artwork by Pierce and Lueza in the amount of \$40,000, seconded by Albright. All in favor, motion carries.

- 7. Possible selection of up to two members of the Public Art Committee to serve of the Art Belongs Here Grants Review Committee from the list of the following committee members, in alphabetical order:** Cynthia Albright, Bryce Chisholm, Kelli DuFresne, Erik Fong, Candace Garlock, Dana Hatjakes, Paul Quade, Mark Salinas, Tamara Scronce, Shoshana Zeldner.

Berner summarizes the Art Belongs Here Program and says that there is a special review committee comprised of a member of each NAB (when they are active), two members of the PAC, two members of the RACC, and various City staff including Parks, Engineering, Public Works, and Planning that can give input on the projects and help out with the process.

Zeldner says she is interested depending on availability.

Berner says there are 7 applications to review. The meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 7 from 1-3.

Zeldner asks if they need to get scores to staff prior to that date. Berner says yes.

Scronce says she would be happy to participate, asks if the meeting time can be rearranged if possible.

Berner says that is possible. The best day is Friday, April 16 from 10-12.

Chisholm makes a motion to appoint Scronce and Zeldner to the Art Belongs Here review committee, seconded by Albright. All in favor, motion carries.

8. Discussion and possible approval of a process and call for artists for the video wall at Canyon Flats Apartments in downtown Reno.

Berner summarizes that this project has been in planning for about 3 years. One of the City's planners worked with the developer to use some of their 1% for pedestrian amenities to create a video wall that faces the street. It is on private property, viewable from the sidewalk, audio speakers project out to the sidewalk as well. The draft call is a starting point to decide how to program the space and how much to pay artists.

Albright asks if the developer has money left from the 1% to pay the artists. Berner says that the 1% is not allowed to be used for that purpose.

Scronce asks about the quality of technology and the upgrades of technology necessary in the future. Berner says that the video wall is made up of TV screens.

Chisholm asks how long of a loop we are trying to create. Berner says that is up to the PAC. She thought a 5 minute limit may work, depending on how many videos you want to include.

Zeldner says that less could be more. Suggests a single video at one time. She's not sure we need 10 videos.

Berner says the duration the videos are up is a consideration as well.

Scronce says that the technology will have to be updated still at the owner's expense. We want to make sure that the quality is good. A single video could work or an artist could use multiple screens. The decision we need to make is how many times a year do we want to change work out and how much is the honorarium.

Quade asks if we know how the screens are set up. Berner says that the screen are configured in a grid to make one large screen or picture.

Hatjakes says the big thing is budget. That can be really important in the quality of work we get and how long it will be. Suggests using a theme.

Berner cites other similar calls for video work. It is like doing a call for a gallery exhibition. We aren't necessarily commissioning an artist to make work for this, generally artists will submit previously completed work for a call like this.

Chisholm asks if this is more of an art call or a promo video call. Berner says that it is an art call, we may get all kinds of submissions but this committee will be deciding what to show in the space.

Salinas says that he is more inclined to approach this program like the City Artist or Poet Laureate program, maybe as a video residency. More inclined to beef this up and have a different approach.

DuFresne says she likes the idea of a residency. That way the work may be more topical and relevant and the artist could continue to add and modify.

Scronce says that we would need guidelines with expectations of how many videos and for how long, etc. It could be structured in any way we want to determine it but we need to first decide how much we want to dedicate to this project.

And whether someone is showing work that is previously created or making new work, that doesn't matter. What matters is the caliber of work that gets submitted—we just want to show strong work.

Quade says he'd like to see multiple artists at any given time. Is that 5 artists for a six-month long period?

Salinas says that we could rent out DVDs from galleries or museums that are by well-known artists.

Hatjakes says she agrees that old or new work doesn't matter but thinks there should be direction for what we want to see. Are we looking for landscape or cityscape or people?

Scronce says that the expectation is that if we are doing a call for artists that we are looking for art videos—that could be abstract in nature. We aren't expecting to get documentary or fully-developed narrative videos.

Fong suggests we put a number on the budget—say \$2000—and it's a call for artists that asks for qualifications, we can see what kind of work they do and then we can work with an artist to create the content. It's really difficult to know what we might get. Not concerned about having one video play, we don't worry about that with murals.

Quade says it would be nice if we could put public art adverts in there in between some of the videos.

Scronce says that we really should equate this with murals and not as an opportunity to advertise. We should have an exhibition period in essence. This is a moving mural project. It would be great to treat this like any call for artists.

Quade asks if this is going to be on a loop 24/7. Berner says yes, that is the idea.

Berner says that as a video artist, she has applied for call for video art. She also did research into other calls and this is modeled after some of that research. This kind of call is not unusual.

Zeldner says that maybe having just one piece at a time would do the art the most service. Letting it stand on its own. Maybe the call is for a few different videos but we show each one on its own for a set period.

Scronce agrees with Zeldner. Do we start this year with this call and then see how it goes? Or do we do a residency?

Hatjakes asks how much money we have to spend on this. Berner says the PAC has a bit of unallocated money. We should start with a budget.

Salinas says he wants to see some of the examples of the research that Berner did. We are all coming to this with our idea of what is going to be on the TV screen and if we can see some of the examples of what is in use it will help us. Who is responsible for holding the remote control, is it the developer?

Berner says the committee should look at this like a call for artists in a gallery space. When we put out a call to artists, we get all kinds of different work.

Quade says the developer has a website that cites a gallery space for public art. Berner says that there is a separate gallery space from the video wall.

Salinas says those links need to be in the call for context. And the specs for the TV screens.

Scronce says this is a large single image made up of multiple screens. The artist needs to know the screen size that Berner provided in the call not each individual screen.

Hatjakes says we need to specify file format for submission. Berner says yes, that will go into the online submission form.

Scronce says we need to specify that we are looking for single channel video in the call.

Hatjakes says to specify that it is all original work and nothing is copyrighted unless the artist has permission to use it.

Salinas asks what the eligibility for this is. Berner says that is up to the committee. Salinas asks what Berner's recommendation is and what the examples she looked at were. She says those were open to all artists, not limited.

Zeldner asks about the timeline. Berner says that the wall is ready to display work so as soon as we get the call approved. If it is approved today, we can have videos up by June.

Hatjakes says she would move to approve if we change the budget to \$2,000. Berner asks if this is for each artist.

Fong says why don't we start with \$2,000 then see what we get and decide how we proceed.

Scronce says this feels like going from one extreme to another. \$2,000 for one artist for a 3 month window is high. It isn't something that feels comparable to other temporary commissions that we do. It should be in scope and scale for some of the other programs we pay artists for.

Berner says yes, she was looking at this similar to a gallery exhibition which artists don't necessarily get paid to do—not that they shouldn't. Most of the calls Berner looked at did not pay artists. She is not suggesting we should do that. Artists can take the work they show here and show it elsewhere.

Scronce says that we should pay artists comparable to our other programs. Our signal box program is a good example.

Fong asks if \$500 seems like a more reasonable fee for a 3 month period.

Scronce says maybe \$250 makes more sense. Hatjakes is coming at this from a professional aspect as a video producer. Scronce is looking at this like something similar to a gallery curation, an honorarium is totally acceptable. If we purchase something for our collection, that amount should go up. This is temporary.

Albright says that if we do \$250 and select 4 artists for 3 months each, that's \$1000. We can start there and decide how best to move forward in the future.

Quade asks if there is any direction from the developers—what are their expectations. Berner asks if Quade means content. Quade says he means how many artists, how often it gets rotated, etc. Berner says no, they have handed this over to us. There is an agreement in process that stipulates the programming is handed over to the City and the developer is responsible for maintaining the equipment. Quade worries that the developer may not like what we do and that could be an issue.

Hatjakes says she could see the residents in the area having an opinion too.

Salinas agrees and says that we should be proactive and invite them to be stakeholders.

Quade agrees, thinks that getting property management involved is a good idea.

Berner says that the developers don't want to be involved, they made that clear.

Hatjakes suggests letting stakeholders review the submissions and give input.

Zeldner says it sounds like there is a lot to work out. Asks if staff can come back with something. Berner says that there have been too many ideas tossed around and she needs some direction otherwise we might have another similar discussion.

Chisholm says that he is not in favor of inviting the stakeholders into the process. Suggests we put the call out, keep the honorarium low, and see what we get. We are overcomplicating this. It doesn't have to be a residency.

Salinas says he hears Chisholm but thinks we are here to have a better response than "let's see where this goes."

Scronce says we can certainly do spaces on an experimental basis. We did that with the windows on Lake and Center. Not everybody loves all of the work that goes up in there. This is public art. Sees this as an opportunity to present a diversity

of work that we don't currently have. Where our control or influence comes in is to select good caliber work to show in the space. Still unsure about curating multiple videos on a loop. In favor of selecting artists for one or three month runs. We are feeling insecure about this because we aren't sure about what we are going to get.

Salinas says that discussion doesn't undermine this opportunity at all. Doesn't think there is insecurity in adapting our standards to put out an RFP that matches previous ones that we have put out. Thinks the language in the RFP is vague. What is our comparison? What else is out there? This is not insecurity about experimentation.

Hatjakes asks if Berner found other cities that had a specific amount for similar projects? Berner says not off the top of her head but she can share some of that with the PAC. Hatjakes says she would be more comfortable seeing what other entities have done.

DuFresne is in support of paying artists regardless of what other cities are doing.

Fong says it sounds like we need a little bit of clarity on the call itself. We need to come up with an amount and with the exhibition period. It sounded like \$250 was closer to the mark and maybe a 3 month exhibition period.

Albright suggests looking at what other cities are doing in terms of an exhibition period too. Asks how much we compensate the folks who paint the signal boxes. Berner says \$500. Albright says that \$250 sounds reasonable then.

Berner will rework the call. This item will be continued at the next meeting.

9. Update on ongoing projects

- a. **E. 4th Street Public Art Project** –approved by Council, moving forward with that to make sure that the sculpture fits in with the existing structure and access/inspection needs.
Zeldner asks if we have another NEA grant in mind and how the neighborhood will be engaged in the rest of the process. Berner says that we certainly want to include the neighborhood in the progress of the piece and celebrate the completion. Zeldner says that it might be a good fit for a second Our Town grant if there is not another area in mind. Berner says that what we found in this process was that the City has very limited real estate to place public art so we could look at a different type of grant—maybe not for art creation.
- b. **City Artist Program** – approved by the RACC. The applications will come to the PAC for review in May.
- c. **Art Belongs Here Neighborhood Public Art Grants** – we received 7 applications and the PAC will get a report after the review committee meets.

10. Announcements not anticipated at notice date - none

11. Set date, time and agenda for the next meeting. April 12, 2021 at 11:00 a.m.

12. General Public Comment – Albright shares that the bids have come in for the ReTRAC landscaping and the winning bid is only half of the engineer's estimate. Stantec is helping Artown develop a grid pattern up at Rancho San Rafael for their venue this summer.

13. Adjournment – motion made by Hatjakes to adjourn, seconded by Salinas. Meeting adjourned at 12:38 p.m.