

**Civic Arts Commission Minutes**  
**Community Chambers Conference Room**  
**May 25, 2005**

**Commissioners Present:** Joanna Stone (Chair), James Allen (Co-Vice Chair), Olivia Lundberg (Co-Vice Chair), Edelgard Brunelle, Suzanna Duffy-Tajeldin, Roy Engoron, Casey Hutchins (alternate)

**Commissioners Absent:** Stacey Vetter

**Staff Present:** Esther Polito, Cultural Services Manager, Torreya Cummings, Program Assistant

---

Chair Stone called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**1. Approval of agenda**

**Action: Commissioner Engoron moved, and commissioner Allen seconded, to approve the agenda. Motion passed unanimously.**

**2. Public Communications: None**

**3. Covell Village Development Agreement** Commissioners reviewed “Public Art” proposal, Exhibit E-9 of draft CV Development Agreement. Bill Roe, one of the partners in the proposed Covell Village development attended the meeting and spoke with the commissioners about the plan.

Council Member Don Saylor was also present to discuss the public art proposal.

Regarding the planned amphitheater: Commissioners were supportive of the concept of more performance space. Commissioners identified the following areas of concern:

- Since the final budget numbers are not yet determined, it is difficult to say with certainty that \$350,000 for an amphitheater would be half of the total public art budget, as is anticipated.
- The city has had several outdoor venues in the past which were not used regularly and were eventually eliminated. Is there enough community interest to justify such an amenity? Commissioners were concerned that only one group (Acme) has been identified so far.
- To be successfully used for performing arts, amphitheater needs acoustical and lighting equipment, secure storage, access to restrooms, possibly dressing rooms.
- If public art funds pay for the construction of the amphitheater, then the city has an interest in booking and maintenance. If it is turned over to a private organization such as the Rotary Club, there may be a conflict.
- Funding for maintenance should be provided for in the city budget.

- An estimated six months of the year is not conducive to outdoor performances. Would an indoor, or partially indoor space, be more desirable?
- If the planned city recreation building were to be combined in some way with the amphitheater, it may save space and money, and meet the need for storage facilities and restrooms.
- Commissioners would like to see some kind of plan for the \$350,000 in case the amphitheater were to go over budget and was not deemed feasible.

Regarding the third point in exhibit E9, using the remaining funds for public art, the commissioners were concerned that the process for art selection was unclear. Some of the funds should be made available for public projects, such as those in parks and on other publicly owned lands. Public projects should have a public process. Art in the private development areas, such as commercial venues (hotels and retail stores) could be selected by developers, following general guidelines from the Commission on how to site and choose art pieces. Commissioners will revisions to the art location and selection bullet, directing guidelines to be adopted later using the funds.

Mr. Roe participated in the discussion, and indicated that the Commission's conceptual recommendations appeared feasible and appropriate. Council member Saylor also participated, and asked the Commission for provide their recommendations as soon as possible so they can be considered in a timely fashion.

**Action: Commissioner Hutchins moved, and Commissioner Brunelle seconded, to delegate final wording of commission recommendations to the Art in Private Development subcommittee (Commissioners Allen, Engoron and Lundberg). Motion passed unanimously.**

**4. Adjourn** The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Esther Polito  
Cultural Services Manager