

**Public Art Community Meeting
Summarized Public Comments
January 18, 2017**

The January 18th, 2017 special meeting of the Public Art Commission (PAC) was canceled due to lack of a quorum. A community meeting was held in lieu of the PAC meeting. Staff gave a presentation and following that, the comments below were received:

1. Is the public art placement map on the city's website?
2. Suggest a city-organized tour for artists to look at the installations.
3. Tina Blaine, Rhythmix:
 - a. Very validating that the city took concerns to heart.
 - b. Regarding the list of percentages for other cities, Oakland and Emeryville have residential contributions. Has the city considered a requirement for residential developers to replenish the fund?
 - i. Allen Tai (AT), staff response: all development, commercial and residential, above the threshold requires 1% contribution. Question if it expands to home remodels, if above \$250,000 threshold.
4. Regarding the \$350,000 distribution, will the RFP process be in place to apply to the distribution?
 - a. Staff response: Yes, the RFP will be to distribute the money from the fund.
5. In previous hearings/forums, didn't hear any concern about Jean Sweeney specifically as a location – just that choosing the location should be a transparent and public process.
6. Need to be creative about how to replenish the fund, such as transient occupancy tax (TOT). The city should explore alternative methods because \$350,000 will go quickly.
7. Wes Warren, Studio 23: Great job, agree with everything! Want to learn more about the process developers have to go through for approving art on their property.
8. Mentioned the Walgreens photos. Is there a possibility to put a moratorium on selecting on-site installation, so that money goes into the public pool to help grow the fund. She mentioned that the Chicago "Bean" brings in revenue as a tourist attraction.
 - a. AT: City must give developers an option to provide art on-site or contribute to an in-lieu fund.
9. Have developers already done research on artists or do they ask the city for inventory of local artists?
 - a. AT: City provides a list of local artists to developers.
10. Bob Woods-
 - a. Would like to get a copy of the presentation

- b. Would like to find out the value of the 12 Alameda art installations, to get an idea of the value
 - c. Curious about the two developers that gave \$150,000 in lieu instead of on-site placement; unusual since art would likely increase value of property.
 - d. Who owns the art once it is installed? Does the ordinance address if the property is sold, requiring to keep the art on the property?
 - i. AT: Inheritance of the art is recorded with the land
 - ii. Amanda Gehrke (AG), staff: Only for the lifetime of the art, as defined by the artist.
- 11. Regarding the maritime/historic requirement, think this should be lifted because there are other subjects equally important as maritime history
- 12. Does 1% apply to city property, e.g. the golf course improvements? Those leasing city property, are they required to pay into the fund?
 - a. AT: Yes. The guidelines are for substantial rehabilitation and development costs.
- 13. Wes Warren-
 - a. List of potential artists—people here tonight would like to help package those names.
 - b. Some cities have lower in-lieu fees, which may motivate more contribution (e.g. Berkeley 1% for on-site and .8% for in-lieu contribution)
 - c. Wants to confirm that Sweeney is off the table as a specific recommendation, but that they need to submit an RFP proposal.
 - d. AG: Yes, they are no longer a specific recommendation, but an artist can still submit a proposal for artwork at the park.
- 14. Tina Blaine-
 - a. 5% preference for locals is not included in the cultural slide.
 - i. AG: This is because all cultural events are required to be located in the City of Alameda, but we could also include a 5% preference for local organizations.
 - b. Regarding replenishment of the fund, any discussion about the General Fund funneling money into the art fund?
 - i. Lois Butler (LB), staff: Recommendation that staff time to be paid out of the General Fund and maybe maintenance of certain installations, both are huge contributions to the public art program.
 - c. Consideration of TOT contribution to art fund
 - i. LB: the current goal is to stabilize the City's revenues.

- d. Allocation of the 75/25 split between physical and cultural art—has there be any discussion about raising more for cultural art?
 - i. AG: after reviewing other cities art ordinance, we found that keeping ours at 25% is more in keeping with best practices.
 - e. On third party administrative cost: Administrative costs are defined differently. East Bay Community Organization has different interpretation of administrative costs. Hired staff for a project is not calculated into the budget. I am not a stickler on this point.
15. Does the 1% apply to large renovations?
- a. AT: yes, it applies to “substantial remodels” as determined by the building official.
16. How about the apartments being renovated along South Shore Drive?
- a. AT: No, because the improvements are cosmetic.
17. Can the city pay for a directory of artists, which it did in the past?
- a. LB: The city wants to retain a small amount of the fund for other things, which may include a directory.
18. Are there any grants available to the city?
19. What about Alameda Point historical district? Are these projects required to pay?
20. What about commitments made but not completed?
- a. AT: The development agreement for the public art is a contract.
21. Want the city to develop a section of its website for public art, containing pictures and costs of past projects and ability for public comment.
22. Regarding the local preference: Suggest a requirement that 2/3 of public art be created by local artists. There is pride and value in locally created art. Speaker would be interested in what other people think about this.
23. Regarding the 25% for cultural art, how do organizations apply and what activities would qualify?
- a. AG: It’s an RFP process and the activities are defined in the ordinance.
24. Rachel Campos de Ivanov-
- a. Happy about getting rid of the historical and nautical themes requirement
 - b. Remove requirement on content can open up opportunities for local artists
 - c. Should promote use of public art in practical, fairly inexpensive ways (e.g. Reno bike racks)
 - d. Good examples: Oakland murals can activate neighborhoods and streets
25. Wes Warren-

- a. Big thank you to the city! Did a great job!
- b. All 14 recommendations are great.
- c. Can transform Alameda into a cultural destination
- d. Need to eventually figure out how to keep the fund moving.