

MINUTES OF THE ART IN PUBLIC PLACES COMMITTEE MEETING

HELD ON June 10, 1997

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Marcy Friedman, Maggie Jimenez, Alan Oshima, Ed Haag, Laurie Bacon, Mike Morris, Juanishi Orosco, Linda Merksamer, *Sandra Yee*

STAFF PRESENT: Linda Bloom, Donna Pulverman

I. The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Marcy Friedman

II. Agenda and minutes were approved.

III. **The Project Development Team of 13th & K-** were invited in to attend meeting. The team said the purpose of Esquire Plaza is to create new entertainment zone day and night. Will have Art Deco design similar to 1201 Linear Plaza. Phil Hitchcock said art is proposed for Lobby area, flooring etched glass over entry doors (50 x 50) which will face to the exterior. Railings around the restaurant could be done by an artist as well as gate pylons at each entrance. The fountain will also be commissioned by an artist.

A. Process - (Project team in attendance)

Phil said the selection for artist would be done on a limited competition - he felt the process would generate the same quality of artists. Marcy asked that there be consideration for artists of color. When asked if there was still a possibility for a sculpture Garden and if we could suggest artist from our pool - Phil said he was open to all possibilities. Juanishi asked if a member of our committee could be a part of the selection panel - Phil said he would take it into consideration. He said he is always open to comments. There was discussion about adding new artists to our collection and not using artists that had already had major commissions in the Sacramento Area.

The Project Team was thanked and asked to consider the suggestions proposed.

B. Discussion (Project team not in attendance)

It was pointed out that the six pylons at entry points would be more architectural than art pieces. The APP committee felt that the sculpture garden would be money better spent than the architectural pieces. Linda pointed out that once an art piece is installed it cannot be moved or removed without permission from the artist. Ed was concerned about the artistic design of the fountain since the project team did not want any water to splash outside the fountain.

It was proposed that they take our suggestions - then have the Arts Plan brought back to us. SHRA plan as written encourages their proposal.

Maggie made a motion to vote, Laurie approved. There was concern about the selection process and architectural embellishment. At least one artist new to Sacramento scene should be commissioned. There should be one APP member on selection panel.

The letter Marcy wrote to them nicely summarized the committee's concerns:

1. That the works selected for your project be of enduring excellence
2. That you consider using the \$600,000 towards fewer, but more important, commissions
3. That the works selected are not simply decorative or architectural embellishments
4. That items such as benches, water fountains and railings be left for projects by others which may not have the high visibility of your building and site
5. That you explore the inclusion of artists that reflect the rich diversity of our society
6. That you include at least one widely respected artist on your selection committee
7. That you seek to enhance the public art collection by commissioning at least one artist whose work would be new to the Sacramento collection (not previously commissioned).

Sandra made a motion to table the vote to give them an opportunity to consider our proposal, Laurie seconded the motion.

Everyone was encouraged to take home the SHRA packet and underline the questionable portions.

Designee would get one vote