Date: February 18, 2015

Approval of Minutes
Tabled until March 18th

Gift of Public Art Review: Baltimore Colt’s Memorial
Location: TBD
Presented by: Fred Kail
Phase: Initial Presentation to PAC

Presentation:
Artist, Fred Kail presents his concept for a new sports themed memorial sculpture:
- The memorial would be dedicated to the Hall of Fame members of the Baltimore Colts.
- Mr. Kail has private support for this project from the sports community but is seeking direction from the Commission on approving potential sites before he can move forward in seeking funding.
- Mr. Kail’s preferred location is a grass lawn near the Hilton Hotel, across the street from the Sports Legends Museum. He had considered a few other spots, like Bayard Street and the 33rd Street Y but does not feel these are as appropriate as the location closer to the current stadiums.
- While Mr. Kail does present an initial visual concept, he stipulates this is just a “vision”. This should be considered a starting place as he is looking to the PAC for interest and approval to pursue any kind of memorial to the Colts.

PAC comments:
- Will Backstrom expresses that there are many locations in this town which may be more accessible to the average citizen. The proposed location is a “tourist” location that is mostly activated on gameday. It may be worth exploring places which are populated with Baltimoreans on the day-to-day.
- Jann Rosen Queralt asks what is wrong with a plaza, or “walk” between the two stadiums? (The area currently considered Ravens Walk)
  - Mr. Kail responds that this is all state property and the Maryland Stadium Authority has already expressed that they are not interested in adding any more sculpture to their property at this time.
- Mary Demory expresses that from her perspective she would love to see some attention paid to these players and the joy they brought to the City. She encourages the artists to design the sculpture in a way that can excite young people to understand the history of what the team meant to the City.
- Scott Rykiel also acknowledges that the colts hold a place of nostalgia for him personally. He goes onto warn that the proposed site next to the Hilton is a developable site which has had plans for it’s future already set in place. He agrees with Jann that the Ravens walk location, while it comes with it’s own set of hurdles, is probably the ideal location for a project like this. He also warns that he finds the form of the initial proposal troublesome and would suggest separating the figures to give them a more gracious presence.

Kim Domanski reminds everyone that they are not looking for approval of anything specific right now, but looking for the PAC to approve the general concept of this project. If the PAC approves, the BOPA staff will continue working the donors on exploring locations and developing the concept.
Vote: Mary Demory makes a movement to approve the BOPA staff continue to work with Mr. Kail and his donors to develop their concept and explore sites for this memorial. Scott Rykiel seconds the motion.

In Favor: 5 (Backstrom, Demory, Rosen-Queralt, Rykiel, Rountree, Abbott); Opposed: 1 (Jackson); Abstain: 0

Motion is approved

General Updates

- Ryan Patterson provided the PAC with a model of a project status chart. The purpose of this sheet will to keep the PAC updated on where all ongoing and upcoming Percent-for-Art projects stand at any given time.
  - PAC requests the status chart can be provided on a monthly basis.

- Ryan Patterson reported on a status update regarding the John Eager Howard sculpture at Howards Park along Center and Howard Street. The park's reconstruction plan will be moving forward including the repair and restoration of the statue. Ryan is currently serving as project manager and is working with the artist and contractors to prepare the full plan for the removal, conservation and replacement of the artwork. Construction should begin on-site this Spring.

New Project Presentation: Underground Water Storage Systems
Location: Druid Hill & Lake Ashburton Reservoirs
Presented by: Department of Public Works
Phase: Initial Presentation to PAC
Budget:

Presentation:
Art Shapiro leads the general presentation of the project:

- Both of these projects are designed to comply with a Federal consent decree to store have any public water in a closed storage system. This will affect multiple reservoirs in the City. These two are early enough in their process to have an impact on the project design.

- Druid Hill will result in the surface area of the lake to be about 20% smaller than it is now. There is also an agreement in place between DPW and Rec & Parks concerning the general recreational access to the lake. Once the conditions for the water storage system has been met, there is an agreement that DPW will maintain Druid Lake as a "live" lake and would not let it dry out or go septic.

- At Druid, the tanks will be located, in what is now the shallow end of the lake. They will be separated from the lake with a cofferdam. They will be covered with a green space and additional plantings. There are some limitations on what can happen above the tanks and how much could be planted there but overall they are relatively benign. BCRP has created a proposed Master Plan of recreational projects around the lake.

- At Lake Ashburton achieves a similar goal but without in-filling any portion of the lake. Here the project would level a now sloping forested portion of the park a long Liberty Ave. The BCRP master plan for this
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location includes increased recreational amenities like a football field, new pavillion, and improved paths in this area.

Ryan Patterson points out that at this point we are only focusing on how to integrate art into the DPW reservoir area. The projected budget we are looking at is what is potentially eligible for use.

PAC Comments:

- Jann Rosen Queralt comments that if DPW and their partners were open to it, it would be very exciting to bring an artist onto their team and be a part of the entire design of the space rather than relegated to a specific area of the plan.
- Will Backstrom asks if there is a way an artist could realize, or if PAC could consider a piece of the Rec & Parks master plan as a piece of functional art.
  - Art replies there are specific needs to be met, for example an aeration feature. An artist could address this in some way.
- Jann Rosen Queralt asks what point the project is at.
  - Art says approx 60% design, they would like the project to go to bid in 2016
  - Ryan says it could take 2-3 months to bring an artist on board, at this point they would be approaching 90%
- Jann Rosen Queralt suggests that it may be best to identify one specific area for an artist to work, for example, the aeration feature, so that when an artist comes in at 90% they would know the space they should focus on.
  - Art replies that he thinks it would be best of DPW outline the specific restraints and security requirements that they must work with. This could provide a framework for an artist to work with the designers within.
- Mary Demory points out that the community around Hanlon Park/Lake Ashburton is different in that many of the homeowners are retired and may not frequent the park as much as the community around Druid Hill. The community was also bothered by learning that the trees were coming down. These should be considered when planning future community meetings.
- Will Backstrom thanks DPW for presenting these projects this early. Asks to move on to other projects and the PAC will discuss a vote concerning all 3 projects.

Ryan Patterson comments that Staff is asking PAC for guidance on how they would like to issue RFQ’s on these projects.

New Project Presentation: **Back River Headworks Project**

Location: Back River Water Treatment Plant.
Presented by: Department of Public Works
Phase: Initial Presentation to PAC

Continuing on, Art Shapiro presents the Back River project

- This project is at 90% design and is on a tight timeline. It will address sewer backflows across the City and will help to more quickly drain sewage away in terms of storm water overflows.
- The structures themselves include a tremendous amount of space in terms of walls, roofs etc… the structures are very large
- Ryan Patterson asks if the public every has access to the Back River facility
  - Art replies that they do a tremendous amount of outreach. There is an auditorium facility. And just the fact that they are doing a Billion dollars in construction on the site brings a tremendous amount of attention. It is one of the largest treatment sites on the East coast and “on the radar” of the industry
  - The auditorium provides presentations and trainings and hosts dignitaries, and visitors.
PAC comments:

- Will Backstrom asks, so what is the question? Do we want to determine if we want to do stand-alone projects at each site?
- Scott Rykiel asks if funds from the Back River site could be used for mitigation somewhere else.
- Jann Rosen-Queralt asks if school groups or visitors ever come to the site?
  - Art replies they have hosted many visitors and delegations. It may not host just community meeting spaces, but a lot of people pass through to learn about the plant.
- Jann Rosen-Queralt comments that if the agency is interested there are precedents for other treatment plants opening themselves up as educational facilities. If the agency is interested in this they might try to spend it there.
- Sandra Abbott asks what the rules are to use this funding for conservation in other locations.
  - Ryan comments that it has been very hard to get any percent-for-art projects with wastewater projects because it is a very delicate spending source. The director always gets the final word and can decide to decline a project. It would be best to focus the artwork at the site of the capital improvement project.
- Scott Rykiel suggests focusing the funds towards the DPW museum. Which is in city lines and could benefit from the funds. As long as it’s all within DPW why not give the money to the museum.
  - Elford reminds that there was a former DPW liaison who said that funding could not be taken away from DPW but could be allocated to the museum.
- Elford Jackson goes on, that as these are the first DPW projects we have seen we should really try to just use the money and go through the process and see how it works. After we know how the process works, and have a few projects under our belt then we could talk about moving money around. Let’s try to put projects up and move forward.
- Jeremy Rountree asks if the funds can be split up between the museum, and the location.
  - Art says he will take this request back to director and explore it further. There is a mandate to make this work and bring art into the project.

Voting: Sandra Abbott poses a motion that an RFQ be issued for the two reservoir projects, and that the Back River project funds be split between work on-site and re-funding the DPW museum.

All in Favor (DID ONE PERSON ABSTAIN? recording/notes unclear here)

Motion Approved

Follow-up:
- Art will discuss the concept of splitting funds, or funding the museum with the Director
- BOPA Staff will draft calls and organize artist selection panels/process.
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