Date: July 20, 2016

GENERAL BUSINESS, NEWS, ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Approval of Minutes:
Commission Approved June 15, 2016 minutes.
Sandra Abbott abstained from voting.

Status Report/Update

Q & A re: Sale of Parcel at 111 S. Hanover Street containing Merrick Fountain
Presenter: Dan Taylor from Baltimore Development Corporation.

Dan Taylor, Assistant Managing Director of the Baltimore Development Corporation, attended the meeting to discuss the proposed sale of the city owned parcel at 111 S. Hanover Street. This parcel contains the Merrick Fountain, a gift to the City that was created by Landscape Architect/Sculptor Thomas Todd as part of the development of Baltimore’s Waterfront. A sales ordinance is before City Council and there have been some news articles about the sale, as well as the possible relocation of the fountain. The assumption is that any buyer of the property would want to pursue the same kind of “bump out” retail development that has recently been completed on other Pratt Street facing blocks further East.

Dan explains that there is currently a sales ordinance before City Council. This ordinance simply grants the BDC the right to sell the land. If the sales ordinance is passed the BDC will issue an RFP to potential buyers. The RFP will state that the parcel contains the Fountain and it will be up to the buyer to go through the proper procedures to gain approval to – remove, relocate, or “re-design” the fountain. The Public Art Commission will be included in this review and given an opportunity to provide feedback on any plans regarding the fountain.

The adjacent property owner (The Carlyle Group) has already issued a conceptual proposal about how they could relocate the fountain to the parcel immediately West which sits aside the Federal Courthouse. This conceptual proposal has not been presented to the Public Art Commission but has received a letter of support from a Federal Judge who works at the building, and been documented in some local news articles.

Commissioner Brian Ostend: We should be cautious to “kick the ball” down the road, so to speak.. What if the owner of the next location also decides that their property should be developed in a similar way... If the GSA decided to sell the courthouse, that property may be similarly developed and result in the same circumstances for the fountain.

Dan went on to explain that while the language currently being used in the draft RFP is very general on purpose, the language that will be in the actual land disposition will be much more specific and intentional so the situation
Commissioner Kuo Pao Lian: Maybe there are things that you don’t want to happen, maybe there should be language that restricts certain outcomes, something that says, “it is your responsibility to do ___ to the fountain if you choose to develop this site but ___ can not include just tearing it down or demolishing it.

Commissioner Jeremy Rountree: Once we have a chance to review the developers proposals we may have further comment. It may be that keeping the fountain in place could actually generate more economic activity for the site if you can develop around it creatively.

The BDC promises to keep Staff and the Commission informed of further developments. Overall the BDC acknowledges this is not a common situation, and everyone is developing the process as it is happening, and they want to make sure it is handled correctly.

**Project Review:**

**Project:** Rash Field  
**Agency:** Waterfront Partnership  
**Presenter:** Lauren Maloney, Waterfront Partnership & Jason Castillo, Mahan Rykiel  
**Stage:** Initial Presentation  
**Project Manager:** Ryan Patterson

Lauren Maloney of Waterfront Partnership & Jason Castillo of Mahan Rykiel provide an overview of Waterfront Partnership’s work on the Inner Harbor 2.0 plan and how their latest concepts for Rash Field are a scaled back version of some of those ideas.

The project is funded with approx $4M local and $1M state grant, resulting in about $40,000 for a Public Art component for the project. There are many locations identified for artwork but the PAC is being asked for input on where the $40K should be focused within the plan.

Lauren and Jason presented an overview to the PAC and asked for their input (see attached).

After the presentation there was a conversation discussing if an artist should be selected to “make on thing, or element” or be “included as a planner/designer” to consult on the overall scheme. Staff pointed out while there is a precedent for an artist to act as a designer in this way, this usually results in the artist curating in various projects throughout the landscape, and there is no financial guarantee that this is possible. Additionally $40K does not buy a very large scale, long term piece of public art. It is suggested that we focus the artist to be a part of design development on a very specific area of the plan where they can work with what is already being proposed and utilize the material budget for that section to stretch the art budget.

After examining and discussing the various options  
There is a **motion** to issue an RFQ for a public artist to become a part of the design development and incorporate public artwork specifically into the “overlook” section described in the proposal, including the climbing wall, paving, and potential relocation of the Pride of Baltimore memorial.  
**Vote:** Passes unanimously
**Project:** Central Avenue Bridge  
**Stage:** Follow up from discussion at June PAC meeting.

Staff reports that they have not been provided a budget of unallocated DOT funding. DOT reports that there are no additional funds to offer for the bridge, and all funding for this project has been dedicated to the Central Ave streetscape Percent for Art Project.

Staff pointed out that DOT recently presented plans for artwork atop a pedestal, that seems to go against the best practice of percent for art being incorporated into the bridge.

The Commission agreed this is not desirable but argued that artwork atop the pedestal would be better than no artwork incorporated into the project, and that Staff should pursue this option if there is any funding to do so.

**Deaccession Policy**
Staff presented the Commissioners with a draft Deaccession policy for the city. The City currently does not have a deaccession policy for artwork, and needs one in order to make responsible decisions about the City’s public artwork collection. The Commission had a number of comments regarding the policy and informed staff they were not able to vote on it at this time. They offered to submit comments to staff by the next meeting.

**August Break**
Before closing the meeting Commission Chair, Elford Jackson proposed taking a recess in August. The other commissioners agreed this was a good proposal and that they would reconvene in September. Staff agreed to table August agenda items until September.
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