Minnesota State Capitol Preservation Committee
Art Subcommittee Meeting Summary
June 3, 2016
10:00 am – 2:30 pm
Minnesota Judicial Center – Room G-6

Summary

Attendees

- Support: Erin Campbell, Cathy Klima, Alice Roberts-Davis, Brian Pease, David Kelliher, Mariah Levison
- Interested public members, the media and others

1. Call to Order – Rep. Loeffler presiding
2. Updates/New Business
   a. Subcommittee approved February, April, and May meeting summaries.
3. Results of surveys and discussion of recommendation items
   a. The results of two surveys, “Consensus Poll on New Art” and “Consensus Poll on Broad General Policies for New Art,” plus the initial survey to prioritize topics taken at the April meeting were combined into one document and listed in the order of those receiving the highest percentage of agreement to the lowest. It was noted that the items listed were all suggestions submitted by Subcommittee members. As such, there is overlap among some suggestions, in addition to differences in writing style. Subsequent voting on the suggested items was and will be on the concept, not on the specific wording, which will be refined further later.
   b. A motion was made by Justice Anderson to approve by consensus any recommendation that received 60 percent agreement or above. Rep. Urdahl seconded the motion. Motion was approved by voice vote. It was noted that among items not meeting the 60 percent threshold of agreement, most did not generally have much if any opposition,
rather a significant number of members indicated they wished to discuss the ideas further.

4. Discussion on approved possible recommendations
   a. Five minutes discussion was allotted to each approved recommendation for Subcommittee members to offer input on refining the concept and its wording. Final wordsmithing will be done by the tri-chairs, Cathy Klima, and Mariah Levison, and then added to the draft of the final report.
   b. Matthew Welch noted that the “realistic style” is not a dominant style used by artists in the 21st century and, furthermore, that we should not dictate how art is done. The tenor of kind of art accepted needs to be considered. There will be inherent bias if we make art “fit in the Capitol.”

5. Discussion on possible recommendations that did not receive a 60 percent consensus.
   a. The Subcommittee discussed the majority of the possible recommendations that had less than 60 percent agreement.
   b. Five minutes was allotted to each recommendation, then an up/down vote was taken.
   c. Those approved will be added to the final list of approved recommendations.
   d. A small number of recommendations were not able to be addressed within the time allocated for the meeting. They will be reviewed at the June 17 meeting along with recommendations on topics not included in this set due to time issues.

6. Implementation of Recommendations
   a. The new era ahead for Capitol and its demands were discussed. With over 90,000 square feet of new space available in the Capitol after its restoration, there will be many opportunity areas for public engagement and art. Anticipated increase in public interest in the Capitol and an objective to increase and engage the number of visitors to it throughout the year will create new demands. Changes in programming and space will challenge current models and resources.
   b. The Preliminary Report on Capitol Art stated “the governance related to art is complex and will be a focus for the Subcommittee as it moves forward”. The many statutes and policies in place are seen as ambiguous and overlapping by some, and clear to others. At times the legislature or governors have taken direct action in deciding what art should be added, or its size and style.
   c. Early in our work, the tri-chairs asked Cathy Klima to review how other states manage and administer their art collections, policies, selection and programming. She reviewed
the work of 13 states (information available online) and identified for discussion models from three states having ideas worth consideration. The Subcommittee discussed a handout that summarized those models.

d. Subcommittee had a brief discussion about how the Subcommittee’s recommendations will be implemented and managed.

e. There was broad agreement that, given the expansiveness of the recommendations and the new space, there is a pressing need to delineate roles and responsibilities and secure resources.

f. There was disagreement about whether the current structures for managing art at the Capitol are adequate or whether other options should be explored, and whether or not there is overlapping jurisdiction.

g. Some Subcommittee members expressed interest in new structures, while others were interested in identifying what improvements need to be made to existing structures, while still others believed that the current structures are adequate (though additional funding is needed).

h. It was unresolved whether the Subcommittee intends to explore this topic only in regard to the management of new art or in regard to all Capitol art. (Oklahoma has separated the responsibility for historic art and art depicting history from other art designed to showcase other themes and talents.)

i. It became obvious during the discussion that there is not a shared understanding among Subcommittee members of the adequacy of the existing structures.

j. Next step: A task force of members will meet before the June 17 meeting to further refine recommendations on this topic.

7. Appendix

a. A proposed appendix was distributed to members. The goal of its contents is to strike a balance between including what is essential and necessary, yet keeping it from being too long and cumbersome.

b. Members were encouraged to provide feedback via an online survey over the next week on items they think are missing and should be included, and items listed that may not be necessary to include.