



**San Mateo County
Arts Commission**

Vacant, 1st District
Robin Rodricks, 2nd District
Sherrill Swan, 3rd District
Karen Chew, 4th District
Lisa Steel, 5th District

County Parks
455 County Center, 4th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
Brenda Bennett, Clerk
(650) 599-1393

**Regular Meeting of the Arts Commission
Wednesday, June 8, 2011
1:30 to 3:00 p.m.
455 County Center, Room 401, 4th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063**

MINUTES

1. Roll Call

Chair Steel called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

Commissioners: Chew, Rodricks (Vice Chair), Steel (Chair), Swan
Staff: Bennett, Lockman, Porter and Tolmasoff

2. Agenda Amendments

There were none.

3. Oral Communications

There were none.

4. Consideration of Minutes

A. Regular Meeting of April 13, 2011

Commission Action: M/S Rodricks/Chew to approve as presented.

Motion carried 4-0.

5. Presentations and Reports

A. Presentation and Request by Artist Diane Tachis (non-San Mateo County resident) to Exhibit in the Caldwell Gallery

Ms. Bennett reported that this request came through a County employee but the artist does not work or live in San Mateo County. The Commission by consensus reconfirmed that opportunities for individual artists to exhibit in the County Galleries should be limited to individuals living or working in San Mateo County.

Ms. Bennett reported that staff had received information about a nationally traveling art exhibit produced by a local artist, Michael Killen, from Supervisor Groom's office. Mr. Killen's creates

art using recycled materials and had expressed a desire to exhibit his national show locally. Commissioner Chew said she would contact him.

B. Update on FY 2011-12 State and Local Partner Grant Application

Ms. Bennett said it appeared the California Arts Council would award a \$10,000 grant to the Commission, one third of which at least had to be used for strategic planning toward establishing a designated arts partner.

C. Report on CAST Project

Commissioner Chew said the CAST committee would meet before June 30 to summarize the findings of the community survey and interviews. She said a report would be made to the Commission at their August 10, 2011 meeting.

Discussion ensued as to whether a special meeting would be needed. Commissioner Chew suggested waiting to decide until after the CAST group met. Chair Steel suggested she work with staff after the CAST committee met to determine whether there needed to be a special meeting or the regular meeting needed to be longer.

6. Action Items

A. Consideration of Work Plan and Draft Budget for FY 2011-2012

- ✚ Work Plan and Budget with Grant Funding
- ✚ Work Plan and Budget without Grant Funding

Chair Steel said the Budget Committee (Commissioner Rodricks and Chair Steel) developed two budgets, one that included grant funding which was not definite yet (A) and the other that did not include that funding (B). She said this budget included the projects and services the Commission usually funds and other funding that would support Member's Projects. The Budget Committee saw the Member's Project as an opportunity for each Commissioner to have allocated funding for a new or existing project that promotes, enhances, or positively impacts the arts in the County. She said project funding would be allocated only after approval of each project by the full Board.

Superintendent Lockman said there was \$54,997 in the Arts Commission budget for 2011-12 but with the County's budget concerns there had been discussion in the County Manager's Office about whether to fund or reduce the Commission budget. He said at this point the budget has not been adopted by the Board. He said the additional \$11,000 was grant funding which was not definite. He said the County was doing a review of Boards and Commissions, and that there might be additional cuts in the next budget year. He said most likely the Commission's budget would be adopted this year, but he wanted the Commission to know that there were unknowns as to future budgeting measures and what the review of the boards and commissions would recommend.

Commissioner Swan said the Commission was at a critical point on making a decision as to what was the best organization to support the arts in the County, and with the grant funding, the expectation was that would be accomplished by the end of fiscal year 2011-12. She asked if it was reasonable to expect the sustaining of the Commission through then.

Superintendent Lockman said if the budget was approved that it would be highly unlikely for funding to be cut midyear. He said the review of the boards and commissions was something outside of his purview and he did not know what the outcome of that review would be.

Commission Action: M/S Swan/Rodricks to approve the 2011-2012 Work Plan and Budget A contingent upon California Arts Council grant funding approval.

Motion carried 4-0.

Commission Action: M/S Swan/Chew to approve the 2011-2012 Work Plan and Budget B (\$54,997) in the event the grant funding was denied.

Motion carried 4-0.

B. Consideration of Artsopolis Proposal for Services for FY 2011-2012

Chair Steel noted the agreement amount was the same as the previous year. Commissioner Chew asked if there had been a site activities report prepared. She said the proposal indicated that growth in website traffic could be achieved in 2011-2012 and asked how that would be quantified. She said through the interviews done with the CAST project it was obvious that artists wanted to be seen and heard and consumers wanted to know what was available. She said that Artsopolis needed to drive more activity in San Mateo County. She said the question was what the County had gotten this year from Artsopolis and whether it was worth \$25,000. Commissioner Swan indicated that there should be a report provided. Director Porter asked how many years Artsopolis had been the vendor; it was indicated for three years. He suggested that for FY 2012-2013, the Commission consider doing a request for proposals and a multi-year agreement with a contractor. Superintendent Lockman suggested including in the new agreement in the scope of service to request an annual site activity report showing the change from the prior year and some information on the numbers. He said the budget indicated \$2,000 for marketing and development of the Artsopolis website, and asked if that was something being asked of Artsopolis. Chair Steel said that was intended for something that the Commission might do such as the marketing cards done in the last fiscal year.

There was Commission consensus for staff to request a site activity report from Artsopolis for FY 2010-2011.

Commission Action: M/S Steel/Rodricks to accept Artsopolis proposal for services for FY 2011-2012 with an added scope of work to include annual site activity report.

Motion carried 3-1 with Commissioner Chew opposed.

Commissioner Rodricks asked if members would be able to check out activities on the website throughout the year. Chair Swan said the proposal indicated that was possible. Commissioner Chew said that was for organizations using the website to post events. She said the objective was getting visibility for artists and how to connect them to Artsopolis. Ms. Tolmasoff said that the optimum was to have a fresh and expanding website and for there not to just be the same 50 organizations using it. Commissioner Chew said that if Artsopolis really wanted to expand they should consider multi-lingual offerings. Ms. Tolmasoff said strong dynamic ethnic communities were using Artsopolis in Santa Clara County.

C. Consideration of Proposal to Fund RAFT \$8,000 to Provide Baskets of Art Supplies to 100 San Mateo County Teachers

Commissioner Swan said the Commission at its prior meeting had talked about \$8,000 remaining in the FY 2010-2011 budget and using that for a RAFT project. She said she contacted the RAFT Executive Director and they had discussed a proposal of creating gift art baskets for teachers in low income school districts. She said if the proposal was approved it was suggested that a check be written for RAFT with the direction to give the gift art baskets to the teachers at the beginning of the new school year.

Superintendent Lockman said this was a great idea but he had concerns with how to facilitate, as he believed they would need to do a sole source agreement in that the County does not grant money. He said it was doable. He said however that he had concerns with how this might be perceived within the County organization because of the budget situation. Chair Steel asked if that was because the amount of money. Superintendent Lockman said that was part of the consideration. He said that there needed to be a demonstrated need that was supportable and there needed to be care and records that the distribution was equitable and defensible. Commissioner Swan asked what would happen to the money if it was not used. Superintendent Lockman said it would roll back to the County's general fund reserves, which was being drawn down. He said the County has an \$82 million structural deficit and the projection being made was to make \$52 million in cuts and use reserves for the balance. He said that it might raise a red flag if money that had not been budgeted in the Commission's work plan was spent rather than sent to reserves.

There was discussion as to whether to approve the proposal as presented, modify, or not approve. It was the Commission's consensus that staff should write a letter to RAFT Executive Director Mary Simon and explain that due to the lateness in the fiscal year and budget issues, the Commission would not be able to partner with RAFT at this time. Discussion about getting the necessary supporting information such as the demographics and financial condition of public schools in the County followed. Commissioner Chew said she liked the idea of using funds as seed money to enable RAFT to extend services further in the County noting the Commission had originally sparked Santa Clara County RAFT's interest in having a satellite office in San Mateo.

7. Staff and Commission Reports

Chair Steel said Commissioner Chew and she were working on a description for a curator and asked staff to provide input on what that should include.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.