



## Minnesota State Capitol Preservation Committee

### Art Subcommittee Meeting

May 6, 2016 Meeting Summary

---

#### Attendees

- Subcommittee: Hon. Paul Anderson (presiding), Rep. Diane Loeffler, Sen. David Senjem, Gwen Westerman, Matthew Welch, Rep. Dean Urdahl, Bill Green, Peter Hilger, Ted Lentz, Matt Massman, Stephen Elliott (ex-officio), Paul Mandell (ex-officio)
- Support: Erin Campbell, Cathy Klima, Alice Roberts-Davis, Brian Pease, Brian Szott, David Kelliher, Sharon Press, Wayne Waslaski, Deb Young
- Interested public members, the media and others

#### 1. Call to order – Justice Anderson (presiding)

#### 2. Updates/New Business

- a. In its April 14, 2016, meeting, the Preservation Commission directed the Art Subcommittee to complete its Final Report by June 30, 2016. Today the subcommittee adopted the following schedule to meet that deadline: June 3, June 17, 10 am-3 pm.
- b. The process for members to provide feedback to tri-chairs in preparation of background information and recommendations to full subcommittee for the Final Report is:
  - i. For communications to full committee – send emails to all tri-chairs and Cathy Klima.
  - ii. For communications to one person only – send emails directly to that person. Use your judgement.
  - iii. The Final Report will be drafted in Google Docs. Google Docs is a free online word processing tool that allows everyone the ability to open, read and comment on the document in real time.
    - Cathy Klima will email instructions on how to access Google Docs.
    - Since the document edits happen in real time, permissions will be set about who can edit and who can make comments.
    - Members are encouraged to provide substantive comments rather than comments on style, punctuation, etc.

#### 3. Elevations report

- a. Wayne Waslaski and Deb Young, HGA lead design for the Capitol Restoration Project, reported that the elevation report is in its early stages.
- b. The final elevation report will be ready in two weeks (end of May). The subcommittee needs the information to ensure integrity in its final recommendations.
- c. The final elevation report will include annotations to make the document legible and understandable to the lay person. It will include:
  - i. More descriptive elements such as photos, scales and people will be added to help visualize the areas, symbols with definitions, page numbers.
  - ii. Basic elevations like ceiling height. Include pages. Electrical outlets.
  - iii. An eye-level line.
  - iv. A sample of one wall to help facilitate conversations.



- d. With the final elevation report, subcommittee members will be able to make decisions about things such as:
    - i. Will foundation-level pillars be able to accommodate art, such as the Governors' Portraits? The pillars have conduit and light sconces on all four sides. Concern was expressed about how the design of the light fixtures will influence the feel of the space. Pictures of the fixtures will be sent to the subcommittee.
    - ii. How will the lighting scheme impede art placement? The height of fixtures is important to know. Need to make art and light work together.
    - iii. Capitol building corridors and hearing rooms provide many spaces for art and interpretation, but light fixture locations may limit opportunities. The elevation report will allow for complete understanding of space available. A request was made for information on corridor wall space for each floor.
  - e. It was suggested that the subcommittee's primary focus be on what type art and how to get art in the building for the Grand Re-Opening rather than where it should go. The Capitol Restoration Project construction process continues to move forward and the sooner the subcommittee can define specific questions or requests on art infrastructure to JE Dunn and Wayne Waslaski, the easier it will be to possibly make accommodations for those requests. It was noted that historically art has always accommodated the finite limitations of buildings.
2. Ted Lentz provided 3-D models to help members visualize the new public spaces.
    - [Basement model \(PDF\)](#)
    - [Third Floor model \(PDF\)](#)
  3. Framing the Discussion of New Art Work Group Report
    - a. The subcommittee discussed information in the [Input from Framing Up New Art Issues](#) document created from the [Art Work-Group's Draft Notes](#), and the document titled "The Current Visual Art Collection and Possible Recommendations" developed by Co-chair Diane Loeffler from initial art work group discussions.
    - b. The Art Work Group discussion provided a brief overview of issues.
      - i. There are many opportunities to incorporate more of Minnesota history and diversity.
      - ii. Sue Gens, from the Minnesota Arts Board, provided information on the State of Minnesota's "percent for art public art" procedures, a model that could be modified and used to acquire art for the Capitol. Examples of art from sites around the state were provided.
    - c. Next steps: Combine the art work group report and Diane's' information for discussion about recommendations at the next subcommittee meeting.
    - d. Discussion about elements involved in organizing temporary visual art exhibits
      - i. Comments from work group:
        - Capacity – Can we identify subset of spaces for opening of the Capitol? What can we manage to do in the timeframe left?
        - Sources – for special exhibits. Institutions have bylaws where they only lend to sister institutions. Where will the art come from for the Capitol? What existing collections does the State already own? Many pieces are site specific and not movable. Perhaps it will come from art community itself?
        - Transportation – Who transports art to the Capitol?



- Staffing – Who coordinates exhibits? Need a curator.
  - Pace – Means the cycle for producing exhibits. Typically driven by the lender’s ability and willingness to surrender art for a specified length of time, for example 6-12 months.
  - Security – Location of art is a consideration. For example, placing art in corridors that lead to parking ramps is not good.
  - Insurance – Does the Capitol have an insurance policy that covers art? There needs to be a value assigned to art. Every time art borrowed, the insurance process starts over. How does the insurance work now with the Capitol? Admin will continue to handle insurance including new art? What is the replacement value? The State owns the art. Include information the State’s art insurance in the final report.
  - Performing art – is there room sufficient size for temporary seating? Intimate work would be appropriate, not rock bands. Authors’ readings, small recitals would require possible microphone, chairs, small platform. Public space committee report assessed each room.
  - This section of the summary could be incorporated into the final report.
4. Discussion of the handout [‘Broad Guiding Principles for New Art’](#)
- a. It was agreed that the first priority of remaining work would be the adoption of recommended broad principles, a number of them were suggested in the handout. The discussion that followed included the following ideas (a free flowing discussion ensued with no items adopted). The full membership will vote on items in the handout via a survey sent by email.
  - b. The subcommittee should create concepts and guiding principles for the future, not where art should go.
  - c. Sen. Senjem suggested that the art about the Capitol as the seat of government and the legislative process should be a focus for new art.
  - d. Ted Lentz suggested that with Minnesota’s 150th anniversary approaching, themes could include featuring 150 highlights that best represent the state.
  - e. It was mentioned that a recommendation should be to streamline art policy wording. Would new policies integrate or supersede current guidelines? Recommended policy guidelines would be part of the recommendations to the commission. The guidelines would put a framework around new art so that Preservation Commission would feel more comfortable there is adequate guidance.
  - f. Bill Greene asked if the Preservation Commission will want to know who we think should make decisions about new art. Will it want recommendations for art themes in opportunity zones?
5. Discussion about ratification of improved language from preliminary report
- a. There subcommittee represented many diverse views when making decisions about art depicting Native Americans in the Governor’s Reception Room. An approach was suggested to encourage each subcommittee members to write a 300-500 word essay describing the thought process that led them to how they voted re: moving art portraying Native Americans from the Governor’s Ceremonial Reception Room. These essays would be



included in the appendix of final report to fully inform the Preservation Commission. Due: June 3.

- b. Governors' Portraits – (Peter Hilger)
  - i. Peter will provide a draft of a written recommendation for consideration about the Governors' Portraits for the final report (i.e. where they may be displayed, any recommended size limitations, displaying in historical context, etc.)
- c. Art that resides in House, Senate, Supreme Court Chambers
  - i. Justice Anderson proposed new language for the final report:

Existing language in preliminary report: Certain areas are not subject to consideration. While some Minnesotans have raised concern regarding the fine art work within the House and Senate Chambers defers to those bodies to determine art content within legislative Chambers.

Possible revised language

"The Minnesota State Capitol building serves several different functions and while it is a quintessential public building it is also a working building that is the home to many tenants. Certain spaces are work spaces for tenants, at the same time, are classified as public spaces.

Three examples of such spaces are the House Chamber, the Senate Chamber and the Supreme Court Courtroom. All three of these spaces contain artwork.

The Subcommittee acknowledges that some Minnesotans have raised concerns regarding certain artwork currently on display in the House and Senate Chambers. The Subcommittee has heard and considered these concerns and has included them in this report for the benefit of the Preservation Commission.

But, the Subcommittee has agreed it should defer to the House and the Senate to decide how to address these concerns. We do so with the understanding that any decisions made by those bodies regarding the art work in their respective Chambers shall comply with relevant statutory provisions and adhere to the guidelines and policies of any governing body charged with establishing general and specific guidelines and policies for art work in the Minnesota State Capitol."

- 6. Confirmation of future meetings and timeframes
  - a. Subcommittee confirmed that June 3 and June 17 will be the next two meetings of the subcommittee.