

PUBLIC ART COMMISSION MEETING

A regular meeting of the Public Art Commission took place on Wednesday, June 12, 2013, at 5:30 P.M. at the Cambridge Arts Council.

PAC members present: Alex Van Praagh, T.K. McClintock, Ross Miller, Dina Deitsch

Staff present: Jeremy Gaucher, Lillian Hsu, Rika McNally

PAC Dates Update:

July 17

August 14

September 18

October 16

November 13

** December 4 ** (Changed from December 11 due to number of conflicts)

1) Dewitt Godfrey

Staff is working with other City departments planning a permanent installation located on the bike path on Waverly Extension near MIT. Artist and staff are still working out details of configuration and overall size. PAC would like staff to address conservation concerns in terms of rust and deterioration. Rika will research best practices for the bolted connections. Potential install timeframe is Spring 2014.

2) Western Ave Project - Mazzotta

The proposed project has been withdrawn from the reconstruction of Western Ave due to an impasse with individuals from the neighborhood. The City has agreed to transfer the Percent budget to another site to be determined. Potential sites include Tobin School at Concord Ave and open space near the Alewife Wetlands. The City is boosting the Western Ave budget for a bronze historic marker project. Lillian will consult on this part of the project, but it will not be part of the Arts Council 'collection'.

3) Cambridge Street Underpass

- Handout: Revised Lighting Plan

Artist has determined, in conjunction with lighting company to illuminate 184 feet on both walls of each tunnel using 11 fixtures per side (15' on center to next fixture).

Ross stated concerns about how hostile the underpass/roadway environment is for LED lighting. Recommends staff makes sure that the factors can withstand these conditions – worried that a 5-7 year range could be the window for the hardware for the project. Ross can get specs for high-end Highway options for fixture housing and seals.

4) CRLS/Mel Zeigler

PAC feels that the "Agree to Fabricate" vote in October 2012 wasn't made with a clear understanding that was a final approval. Staff feels that the budget dwadline and timeframe under which this vote was made led to that confusion. Going forward, staff will bring PAC and artist together in a new 'early concept stage' to add another step for PAC oversight.

5) PAC Oversight

The suggestion is for four steps: Concept Approval (which would include a visual and written concept); Detailed Proposal (a more fleshed out visual and written proposal); Final Proposal (proposal with final changes and a conservation review); Fabrication Approval.

PAC would like projects to have firmer dates set, with deadlines/dates tied to contract.

PAC would like a schematic of a typical project timeline. Staff will provide a draft for feedback.

Staff also will work to more timely post Agenda and Minutes.

5) RFP vs RFQ

RFQ positive: Artist can spend more time developing ideas while immersed in community and working with designers.

PAC wonders which has given us better results.

RFP: If there are time and money, artists can create a decent site-specific proposal and community can at least see an idea of what the result may be as opposed to just an artist's previous work.

TK doesn't feel that the RFQ process is the best way to achieve significant results.

Ross suggests that giving some specific direction in either process may lead to better results citing the Vietnam Memorial in Washington as an example wherein the committee required each artist to include every name in the design.

All in attendance had to leave at this point in the meeting.

Meeting Adjourned 6:30pm.