

From: [VernaCastro@inafa"maolek.org](mailto:VernaCastro@inafa)
To: [Jackie Keliiaa](#)
Cc: [Jennifer Padilla](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: 2024 Cultural Arts and Arts Programming Grant
Date: Thursday, June 6, 2024 9:52:40 PM

This decision not to fund Inafamaolek.us Chamoru Language Through Arts Program is extremely disappointing and problematic since many 1st nation indigenous Chamorus people from the Marianas settled in Alameda in the early 60s after before interned in WWII. And, our language is on the endangered list so having a cultural arts language program would have been beneficial and just to Alameda and the people who have called the island their home.

Just curious, has Alameda ever funded a Chamoru language through arts or any Chamoru program historically? If not, perhaps considering 1st nation people like the CHamorus.

Inafamaolek.us will survive not being recognized and continue to seek good programming for our communities.

Verna A. Castro

On Thu, Jun 6, 2024, 5:42 PM Jackie Keliiaa <jkeliiaa@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Dear Verna,

Thank you for your proposal for the 2024 Cultural Art and Arts Programming Grant. Unfortunately, the City received a high number of competitive proposals, and the Public Art Commission has not funded your proposed project: *Chamoru Language Through Arts Program*.

While we are not able to support your proposal at this time, we wish you success with your work. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jackie Keliiaa

Development Manager

Base Reuse and Economic Development Department

City of Alameda

Office: 510-747-6857 | Cell: 510-561-9616

Please note, our office is closed on Friday

From: [Wes Warren](#)
To: [Liz Rush](#); [Lois Butler](#); [staff](#); [Adam Gillitt](#); [Jack DenhamConroy](#); [Economic Development](#); [Sarah Henry](#); [Jessica](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Serious Concerns with Alameda Public Art Funding.
Date: Sunday, June 9, 2024 3:27:20 PM

To whom it may concern,

We have two important items that we would like the City and the Public Arts Commission to address.

Item 1: Unbalanced funding

We are making a formal request that the PAC reevaluate the awards and the process to address the unbalanced allocation of funding to preferred groups.

After reviewing the scoring and awards, we see **two grants were awarded to Rhythmix and two to WEAD, taking 4 of the 8 awards.** (\$30,000 of the \$60,000 going to just two organizations). This leaves only 4 spots for the remaining 18 applicants.

1. **Rhythmix** (Rising Seas) \$10,000
2. **Radium** (Together in motion) \$10,000
3. **Rhythmix** (Rhythmix in Parks) \$5,000
4. **WEAD** (RE-CYCLE) \$10,000
5. *FunAmeda* (Anywhere) \$5,000
6. **WEAD** (Fiesta Alameda) \$5,000
7. *Forward Alameda* (Asian Pacific Islander) \$10,000
8. *Alameda Ballet* (La Bayadere) \$10,000

We must also consider that the [City of Alameda already worked directly with Rhythmix, Radium, and WEAD to secure a grant of \\$20,000 each for those organizations.](#)

In actuality, if you look at the two grant distributions together, it becomes more obvious.

1. **Rhythmix** (Rising Tides - Bloomberg) \$20,000

2. **Radium** (Rising Tides - Bloomberg) \$20,000
3. **WEAD** (Rising Tides - Bloomberg) \$20,000
4. **Rhythmix** (Rising Seas - Part of Rising Tides) \$10,000
5. **Radium** (Together in motion) \$10,000
6. **Rhythmix** (Rhythmix in Parks) \$5,000
7. **WEAD** (RE-CYCLE) \$10,000
8. *FunAmeda* (Anywhere) \$5,000
9. **WEAD** (Fiesta Alameda) \$5,000
10. *Forward Alameda* (Asian Pacific Islander) \$10,000
11. *Alameda Ballet* (La Bayadere) \$10,000

If you group these awards by org, it equates to the following:

Rhythmix: \$35,000
WEAD: \$35,000
Radium: \$30,000
Forward Alameda \$10,000
Alameda Ballet \$10,000
FunAmaeda \$5000

That is \$100,000 shared between Rhythmix, Radium, and WEAD, with the remaining \$25,000 shared among the other three organizations, and nothing for the remaining 17 organizations. We are not suggesting that all of these projects should have been funded and realize that not all projects are suitable for the PAC grant.


Why was the Rising Tides public art proposal not run through the PAC? [Were other arts organizations invited to participate in the program?](#) Why would this project that clearly falls in the category of "Public Art" be organized and funded behind closed doors and not part of the Public Art Program. We think this is a great program and we would have loved to participate as I am sure many other organizations would.

Not only does the city help secure over \$60,000 for these three orgs from this separate grant, but then they allow these same organizations to take up 5 of the 8 grant slots.

I don't know why no one has addressed this, but this reflects some horribly imbalanced methodology resulting in a grossly lopsided allocation of funding.

Item 2: Overweight ranking of scores.

We are curious why Jennifer Hoffecker gave our proposal the second lowest score of any member for any proposal, while every other member scored us in their top 10. She also voted the ballet number one, when it was not in the top 10 of any other 5 commissioners.



Because of vast discrepancies they applied a ranking system similar to grading on a curve. It did not make a difference. The ranking of one member Artpush last (20) and La Bayadere (1) - is enough to move Artpush out of 8 awarded orgs and La Bayadere in. Even though the other scores are obviously averaged in the other direction.



I understand her daughter is very involved with the ballet and her family is a patron of the Alameda Ballet, so that explains why it is her top choice. But why would she give us the lowest score out of all proposals? There were several proposals that scored much lower in general by the other members, yet we received the 2nd lowest score of any of the 20 proposals by any member. This has the appearance of bias. This one score specifically dropped us out of the awarded list and replaced us with the ballet. Of course there are always outliers but this seems egregious.

I understand there are many projects, and there is limited funding. \$60,000 to be divided across 8 organizations would seem to have very little impact. However, even 5,000 for an organization like ours can make or break us.

Please examine the last 10 years of City grants towards the arts. Our records show that ArtPush has received \$1,300 from one grant in the past 11 years. I believe you will find this same type of lopsided funding going back as far as public art has been funded in Alameda.

We appreciate and respect the time and effort that the committee members put into the PAC. We also appreciate and regularly work with these great organizations Rhythmix, WEAD, and Radium. We believe these organizations should be supported, but not to the exclusion of so many others.

We believe many things could help keep this process more equitable, these are a few suggestions:

1. List the name of the organization in all documents instead of just the program name.
2. List all affiliations committee members have with each organization.
3. Set some kind of limitation so that a single organization cannot take an overweight percentage of total funding when distributing multiple awards.

We are very much looking forward to the City and the PAC addressing these issues.

Sincerely,

Wesley E Warren - ArtPush Board (Unpaid volunteer)

Jessica L. Warren - ArtPush Executive Director (Unpaid volunteer)

Cheryl Harawitz - ArtPush CFO (Unpaid volunteer)

PS: Please feel free to forward this email to any and all concerned parties. I did not have the email address for all the PAC members.

[Studio 23](#) // Alameda California Community Art Gallery // Co-Founder
[Artpush](#) // California based 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. // Co-Founder

