1		URAL AFFAIRS, LIBRARIES AND ERGROUP RELATIONS	1
2	CITY COUNCIL		
3	CITY OF NEW YORK		
4		X	
5	TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES  Of the  COMMITTEE ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS,  LIBRARIES AND INTERNATIONAL  INTERGROUP RELATIONS		
6			
7			
8			
9			
10		December 17, 2019 Start: 10:23 a.m.	
11		Recess: 12:43 p.m.	
12	HELD AT:	Council Chambers - City Hall	
13	BEFORE:	JAMES G. VAN BRAMER,	
14		Chairperson	
15			
16	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	Joseph C. Borelli	
17		Laurie A. Cumbo	
		Mark Gjonaj Francisco P. Moya	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1	COMMITTEE ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS, LIBRARIES AND INERNATIONAL INTERGROUP RELATIONS 2
2	APPEARANCES
3	Tom Finkelpearl
4	Commissioner of New York City Department of Cultural Affairs
5	Cultural Allairs
6	Keri Butler
	Public Design Commission
7	Charlotte Cohen
8	Executive Director of Brooklyn Arts Council
9	Savona Bailey McClain
10	Executive Director of the West Harlem Art Fund
11	Cora Fisher
12	Curator of Visual Art Programming for Brooklyn Public Library
13	Januai fan MaCuanan
14	Jennifer McGregor Senior Director of Arts Programs and Education at
	Wave Hill
15	Janet Zweig
16	Artist and Educator
17	Xenobia Bailey
18	Artist
19	Jorge Luis Rodriguez
20	Artist
21	Rowe Rothblatt
22	Sisters in Freedom proposal
	Jacob Morris
23	Harlem Historical Society
24	W
	Margaret Blair

Performing artist

1	COMMITTEE ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS, LIBRARIES AND INERNATIONAL INTERGROUP RELATIONS	3
2	APPEARANCES(CONT.)	
3	Todd Fine	
4	President of the Washington Street Advocacy	Group
5	Marina Ortiz	
6	Harlem	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: [GAVEL] Good morning everyone and thank you for being here. My name is Jimmy Van Bramer and I am very proud to be the Chair of the Committee on Cultural Affairs, Libraries and International Intergroup Relations and Chairing this Oversight hearing on Percent for Art and Public Art in New York City.

We are joined by Committee Member and Council

Member Joe Borelli from Staten Island to my left and

I am certainly expecting more members to be joining

us this morning.

I want to thank Commissioner Finkelpearl for being here. We, at the last hearing, believed that might be his last public hearing but low and behold, we have brought him back one last time. So, all of those laudatory moments that we made at the last hearing we're just going to stipulate again or continue but I do want to say, thank you to the Commissioner for his public service to the City of New York, which I know will continue in one way or another. And all of what he has done for culture and art, not just in this position but also, his tenure at the Queens Museum and MoMA PS1 and of course his

2.2

2.3

2 work as an artist and author and thinker on all 3 things culture and the arts.

2.2

2.3

So, with that, we will talk a little bit about why we're here. Public art is an essential part of cultural expression in New York City and vitally important for enriching our communities and public spaces.

The Percent for Art program is one of the most important programs fostering the creation and acquisitions of public art in the city. The Percent for Art Law requires that one percent of the budget for eligible city funded construction projects be spent on public artwork and we've increased and made a bit larger, the percent for our program over the last few years here at the City Council.

Since the programs inception, several hundred projects have been completed with more than 70 artist commissions currently in progress. Of the commissioned artists to date, an estimated 43 percent are women, 34 percent are artists of color.

In 2017, the Council passed three laws that made changes to the Percent for Art program. We increased the budget for Percent for Arts projects, required that advisory panels recommend works of art for

2.2

2.3

inclusion and required DCLA to publish information about Percent for Art projects and make them more transparent.

DCLA also coordinates Public Artists and
Residence, the PAIR program, and the City Canvas
Program, a new pilot program which permits selected
cultural organizations to install visual art on
sidewalks, sheds and construction fences. And our
city parks are home to over 1,000 public monuments.
The Department of Parks and Recreation has said that
the monuments and permanent art collection in New
York City's parks may constitute the greatest outdoor
public art museum in the U.S. But we all know and
understand that that art and that particular public
art museum does not adequately represent the city
that we currently live in and there are historic
inequities in just who is represented in our public
monuments throughout the City of New York.

So, there are a number of other programs

Department of Transportations, DOT Art program, which works with community based organizations, local artists to present temporary artwork on DOT property. The New York City Mural Arts project and so many others.

Lastly, we've all heard and read much about public monuments and the She Built program and we're also here to learn a little bit more about that process and in particular, the decision making process. Certainly, a Mother Cabrini issue dominated a lot of the conversation and certainly, I will ask about that but there are certainly many other elements to be discussed as part of that. But most of all, I want to certainly as the Commissioner leaves his current position and we await a new Cultural Affairs Commissioners, want to know from this Administration just how committed they are and the City is to increasing public art to making sure that there are more monuments, that they are more diverse and that we do it in a way that involves the community, that listens to community, that respects community and that all of that will reflect the diversity of our great city.

So, I want to thank Commissioner Finkelpearl for being here, all of you for being here, those who have signed up to testify. I also want to thank my Legislative Director Jack Bernatovicz, my Chief of Staff Matt Wallace, our Committee's Finance Analyst

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

Aliya Ali, our Legislative Policy Analyst Cristy

Dwyer and our Committee Counsel Nell Beekman.

2.2

2.3

With that, we will start by swearing in Commissioner Finkelpearl and welcome him to deliver his testimony.

COUNCIL CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this Committee and to respond honestly to Council Member questions?

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yes, I do. Good morning Chair
Van Bramer and members of the Committee. I am here
today to testify in regards to today's topic, Percent
for Art and Public Art in New York.

This subject today is very close to my heart and something I've dedicated my professional life to.

So, I appreciate the opportunity to speak about it on the record as I approach the end of my tenure as Commissioner.

I'll begin with a bit of history of the program.

Mayor Ed Koch signed a New York City's Percent for

Art law into law in 1982. The first American Percent

for Art program was set up in Philadelphia in 1959,

with dozens more following across the country. It's

2.2

2.3

early proponents saw Percent as a way to integrate

public artwork into the country's urban fabric which

had begun to fray in the post ward era.

The Percent for a movement was a quiet revolution of our countries relationship to pubic art. Slowly but surely public art came to be seen as a widely embraced public good.

In the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century saw major growth in the number of statues and monuments, from the Statute of Liberty to countless figures on horseback and war memorials installed across the country.

Percent brought a radically different approach, using public funds to commission professional artists for site specific permanent public artwork. The formula for how to commission these publicly funded projects evolved to balance arts and design professionals with city officials and community representatives.

The results speak for themselves. There are more than 350 Percent for Art programs across the United States. The number of Percent for Art Commissions completed here in New York City is approaching 400.

Nearly as many artists working across media have been

2.2

2.3

commissioned from mosaics to sculpture to an LED chandelier that slices and dices phrases from the plays of William Shakespeare.

A recent audit by the Public Design Commission revealed some illuminating facts about our city's collection of outdoor artwork. It examined pieces installed from 1830 through the present day. In New York City's Public Statuary, not a single Black person was depicted from the period of 1830 to 1970. Now the first 65 monuments built in New York over those years, every last one was a man of European decent.

Just imagine as the Harlem Renaissance pushed

American art and culture forward, not a single person
of color was celebrated among the city's dozens of
monuments. As women were increasingly represented in
public office in leadership roles in our society,
hardly any were recognized for their achievements.

And until the 1970's, 90 to 95 percent of monuments
were created by White men.

In a City that draws strength from its inclusive diverse population, this is an appalling disconnect.

The great diversity of our city and its people only began to be represented in new public artwork

2 commission in the 1970's. The rate increased

3 drastically over the course of the 80's and the 90's.

4 This can largely be credited to the program we are

5 here to discuss today and the shift in public

6 attitudes and practices that it helped foster.

According to the Public Designs Commissions inventory, the percentage of women and of color creating our public artworks has grown from 15 percent in the 60's to over 40 percent in the 80's to 75 percent in recent years. This is an incredible leap forward.

When the public art process shifted from privately driven campaigns with fund raising efforts and wealthy benefactors, to professional panel review process, both the artist commissioned and the work created made a great leap into more diverse, engaging and representative public artworks.

In the 34 years, since the first Percent for our commission was installed in East Harlem, hundreds of schools, parks, plaza's, libraries, court houses, and other civic spaces, have had permanent artwork installed. New York City's Built environment is immeasurably richer for it.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

So, now, to some contemporary issues and reform.

Even with the extraordinary legacy Percent for Art

has created, we are grateful to have partners in the

City Council who are committed to working with us to

make program even better. Percent's Commissioning

process balances community input, arts professionals,

historians, and a range of other voices to inform and

shape the design of an artwork.

Another key goal of the process is championing an artist vision and avoiding artwork that is designed by committee. It is essential to maintain this balance while fostering an environment that mutual respect among people who may have different views.

In 2015, Mayor de Blasio signed legislation sponsored by Chair Van Bramer that expanded and formalized the public notice for works of art. Our Percent for our team has presented to dozens of community meetings since then as a very first step in commissioning process.

In 2017, the Mayor signed another suite of reforms sponsored again by Chair Van Bramer and Majority Leader Laurie Cumbo. This legislation increased the amount that the City of New York can spend on public art, revising the percent for art

2 formula for the first time in the programs history. 3 More funding for public art commissions means higher 4 quality, more ambitious and very importantly for artworks installed outdoors, more durable artwork.

Other bills in this package formalize the makeup of the Percent for Art panels and further expanded requirements for public engagement.

For each new Commission, this is a balance we have to strike carefully. Based on the specific content of a given artwork and as many in this room are well aware, even using the word community in the singular can risk minimizing the differences of viewpoints characterized by a group of passionate New Yorkers. There are always multiple communities involved, not to mention individual actors.

No process will ever be perfect but striving for this balance has created a public art program that has a remarkable track record of success and creates buy in a consensus among participants. We value the Council's partnership in every Percent project and appreciate your role as stakeholders, advocates, partners who are willing to have a constructive dialogue about how to improve the program.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

The reforms in progress achieved in this
legislation are testament to the collaborative spirit
you have fostered.

Let me talk for a moment about the Monuments Commission. I've been working in New York's Public Art community for most of my adult life. I ran the Percent for Art program from 1990 to 1996, so I believe I have a good perspective to say that there has never been a brighter spotlight on the issues of who we honor in our public monuments. Nationally, this could be seen in the clashes around the confederate monuments through the Southern United In New York City, Mayor de Blasio States. established the Mural Advisory Commission on City Art Monuments and Markers to examine how these issues were playing out here and to invite public weigh in. They invite the public to weigh in. The Monuments Commissions Chart was to review controversial items in the city owned property, as DCLA's Commissioner, I served as Co-Chair of the Monuments Commission alongside Darren Walker of the Ford Foundation.

We hosted public hearings in all five boroughs to

representation of the city's public art collection.

listen to what New Yorkers had to say about

2.2

2.3

More than 500 individuals attended these hearing, nearly 200 testified and an online survey received more than 3,000 responses.

The Commission considered several pieces of art on city property that were subject of sustained controversy and worked to formulate recommendations for addressing these in a considered inclusive way.

The Monuments Commission issued its final report in January of 2018. In addition to proposals on several artworks, works of art in the city's collection, the reports most far reaching recommendation was to take an additive approach. Commissioning new works to expand the voices and histories represented in the City's art collection. The Mayor embraced this recommendation and allocated \$10 million as a down payment on this long term effort.

A number of new initiatives to make New York's public spaces more inclusive, welcoming and representative of our shared values grew from the Monuments Commission. While we started a more expansive audit of the city's art collection with the Public Design Commission, one area of representation was glaringly obvious. Of the nearly 150 figurative

2.2

2.3

2 statues on city owned park land, just four depicted
3 historical women.

So, with the Mayor's Office and Women. NYC, we created She Built NYC to commission new artwork honoring women who have been unfairly excluded from this form of public commemoration.

We began with an open call for nominations which yielded hundreds of extraordinary candidates. An expert panel then reviewed the public nominations and issued recommendations for future monuments. We have since announced monuments honoring seven incredible figures, all of them pulled from the public nominations.

In May of this year, I joined the Mayor and the
First Lady to announce that the City would commission
a monument to the pioneering LGBTQ activists Marsha
P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera in Greenwich Village.
This was the She Built NYC's panels top
recommendation. Shirley Chisholm was the first
honoree announced in November of 2018 and in March of
this year, the City announced that Billie Holiday,
Helen Rodriguez Trias, Elizabeth Jennings Graham and
Katherine Walker would be the next to be honored.
Bringing new public artwork to all five boroughs. As

2.2

2.3

these pieces are completed in the years ahead, we will more than double the number of historical women recognized in our public collection.

This will help to address the inequity that has been generations in the making which we've moved quickly and aggressively to address through this far reaching initiative.

Another major outcome of the Monuments

Commission, Mayor de Blasio ordered the removal of the statue honoring J. Marion Sims, located at the edge of Central Park across from the New York Academy of Medicine. Sims unethically performed medical experiments on enslaved Black women and this statue is the focus of sustained community opposition in East Harlem for years.

The statues removal in April 2018, marked the beginning of our efforts called, Beyond Sims, to work with local community to commission new artwork for the site. We cohosted in depth community discussion to keep residents engaged in the Art Commissioning process and to articulate what the community wants to achieve through this new artwork.

From the very start, we recognized that this commission was different from most and that the level

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

of community participation needed to reflect this
painful history, the local activism and the
incredible enthusiasm for the Sims removal and the
creation of the new artwork.

As a result, we worked with local residents and other stakeholders on one of the most comprehensive public engagement processes in the history of the Percent program. We started working with local stakeholders and the new commission immediately following the removal of Sims in April 2018. In October, was announced the formal creation of the Committee to Empower Voices for Healing and Equity. The committee consists of East Harlem residents, advocacy groups, cultural organizations, City Council, and Community Board representatives and city agencies. We worked with the Committee for a full year, hosting and participating in 19 public meetings over that period. Through this intense engagement process, four finalists were chosen at the initial artist selection panel hosted at the Schomburg Center in February.

Still, as many of you are aware, the final artist selection held in October sparked intense debate.

After the panel voted in favor of artist Simon

2.2

2.3

Leigh's proposals, Leigh decided to withdraw in recognition of the communities preference for artist Vinnie Bagwell's proposal called, Victory Beyond Sims.

We will work with Bagwell to bring her vision for this site to life and the Percent for Art team will continue to involve community as the design process moves forward.

We took a hard look at how Percent for our process which had so many successful experiences and the vast majority of public art commissions ran into trouble with Beyond Sims project.

One reform we've made is adding an additional panel meeting, to all commissions of new monuments or other sensitive projects. We believe that this way, the community stakeholders and the panelists charged with selecting the artists will have more time to meet and familiarize themselves with the site, the history, the Percent for Art process.

Understand the process and everyone's role in it can go a long way to creating a sense of collaboration and buy in and we think an additional meeting will help foster this essential component.

For Beyond Sims, we followed the standard makeup of

the selection panel used by percent but in hindsight, additional opportunities for the panelists and the community to interact could have helped establish a greater mutual understanding. We believe that this additional meeting between panelists and stakeholders will improve this relationship.

The year, the Public Design Commission also made input from a historian, a requirement for monuments and memorials, a practice we've employed three percent for our panels but which we're glad to see consistently applied citywide. We are open to considering additional ideas for how to improve the process particularly for monuments and memorials.

Controversy has always come with the territory of public art and design. Michelangelo's David was pelted with rocks when it was being installed for its proceed political messaging. The Eiffel Tower was loathed by many 19 Century Parisians. Closer in time to us in space, Millen had to struggle against charges of alienism when creating the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. In the decades since it installed it has become clear that its powerful memorial ushered in a new era in public monuments.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

Just last month, the city announced that a privately funded monument honoring the Lyons Family will be built at Central Park. This extraordinary Black family fought for justice, equality and humanity in the face of despicable racism in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century.

As the PDC audit made clear, our overall public art collection needs to see major new advances to break out of the narrow vision of New York City that it currently depicts. But we believe that the progress we've made together has set the city on a new path.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on such an important issue. I'm happy to answer questions that you may have.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you very much

Commissioner for your testimony and for addressing

all of the issues that have received a lot of

attention over the last few months to say the least.

Because you spoke so much about it, I want to I suppose start with the Monuments Commission and She Built NYC. And you know, I think what folks want is a little more transparency around that process but in particular the decision making process because when

2.2

2.3

you have an open call for submissions, some folks might have understood that to be a vote of some kind and we all know that Mother Cabrini received a significant number of submissions and nominations but was not ultimately chosen.

And maybe you can walk us through that process and who ultimately is the final decision maker there and was it you, as the Commissioner of the Department of Cultural Affairs and if not, who was it?

TOM FINKELPEARL: Okay, so, let me take one step back and then I promise to answer your question. So, there are couple of different times in this whole process where we solicited ideas essentially from the public. And another example was during the Monuments Commission, we had an open portal, we asked for lots of comments, over 3,000 people made comments about the monuments but it was completely not perceived as a vote. Nobody says there was a vote you know, in the monuments and why didn't you follow the vote. It was just very well understood as input.

So, the second time we solicited public input and again, there were lots of public meetings and public hearings but this online portal that you are referring to, which was a nominations portal. We

2 asked for nominations of She Built, it was announced.

3 We're going to commission; we have money to

4 commission monuments to women. So, the nominations

5 came in, then there was a process which is an

6 interagency process between Cultural Affairs, City

7 Hall and Parks also to look around for sites. We

8 | wanted to find a monument for each borough. This

9 | being a citywide initiative and that list than which

10 created that list of five people that I referred to

11 was brought to the First Lady and Deputy Mayor Glenn

12 for the final approval.

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

So, again, it wasn't something where they were choosing off of a list, it was a big interagency process of evaluating. The other thing that is very important to say is that this was not a final, you know, final final. There is going to be a second round as the Mayor said, Mother Cabrini who's an amazing person; I want to also say that publicly. I've said that before, what an incredible woman. There are lot of incredible women on the list and it was very you know, possible that that could be part of the second round of She Built.

So, that process is about to happen; we're going to go back and find more people from the list to

2.2

2.3

commission. So, that was the process that happened and the interagency process that took into account and by the way, let me also repeat that there was an expert outside panel that made recommendations. So, their top recommendation was or will be Commissioned which is Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera. We had the outside panel and then we had the interagency city decision making process.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Sure, so just to put a finer point on this. You were not the final decision maker on who would be honored in this way.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yes, that's correct and again, you know, Women. NYC was very involved in this.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: But the final decision rested with First Lady Chirlane McCray and Deputy Mayor Alicia Glen.

TOM FINKELPEARL: They approved the list, that's correct.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Right, and of course, as it turns out, Mother Cabrini will be honored.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yeah, it's fantastic in Battery
Park and I think everybody is very happy about that
and again, an incredible person. We're so glad that
the state you know, took up the mantle of something

2.2

2.3

we had started and a great site for it. There's a commission going on, so congratulations. I am really happy that that's happening.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Maybe people underestimated how many people read the tablet, particularly in the Queens and Brooklyn.

But I think as you prepare to leave particular role, are there recommendations that you would make to your successor and to the Mayor's Office and obviously the First Lady and the Deputy Mayor that the Commissioner of the Department of Cultural Affairs reports to.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: About how future decisions can be reached in a more transparent way that create less confusion about just who is in charge here. Right, because I think a lot of people think that you are because you are the Department of Cultural Affairs Commissioner.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Right.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: And you were appointed by the Mayor who was dully elected by the people of the City of New York. But obviously, when it comes to the public monuments and She Built NYC, there are

other significant players here and, in some cases, those folks are actually making the final decisions

4 and not yourself. Obviously, you have input, as you

5 know, I respect greatly your tenure here at the

6 Department of Cultural Affairs, but are there ways in

7 which this could be done better to avoid some of the

8 controversy particularly since the commissioner is

9 not the final decision maker and the final arbiter,

10 but often you get the blow back because you're in

11 | this role and people think, well Tom made that

12 decision but you didn't.

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

TOM FINKELPEARL: Right, well, I mean, I will say just that the decision making process that I engage in all the time is something where you know, stuff happens at the agency, we'll all talk it over and often, almost always, I will — if it's a major decision, bring it up to the Deputy Mayor and sometimes to the Mayor for you know, major initiatives, that kind of what I've just described.

In other words, a bunch of city agencies getting

22 together and then going to the Deputy Mayor. That's

23 a very normal way that I operate.

I will say that you asked, do I have recommendations? And the recommendations that I put

2.2

2.3

in my testimony are already — so I really think that having an extra panel meeting, that we've talked this over. So, everybody sits together, understands, everybody is on the same page, I think is going to be helpful. I also just don't think that there's any way per say to avoid controversy in public art and we have experienced this in your borough — I mean, you district.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: That's a great slip.

TOM FINKELPEARL: There you go but of course, so that was a piece of very lighthearted public art, which I think in the long run is popular, I believe it to be, I see it all over Instagram etc., which even that kind of thing can flip.

So, I'm just saying in the intensity of the environment that we're in right now, in relationship to monuments, stuff like this is happening in lots of places across the country and I think it's very important to put things in place to make it as clear and transparent as possible. I will certainly recommend that to my successor.

But again, it's part of what's happening in

America right now and things are inflamed in general

around monuments specifically.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: So, you and I, I think we did some good work around that particular controversial piece, public art in Long Island City and I, as you know, have said publicly in the New York Times and other places that there is no perfect process. We will never get to a place where everyone agrees in subjecting public art to the public vote and public taste is a very dangerous road to go down. And this is why I think it's just important that whoever is the Commissioner of the Department of Cultural Affairs is in a place where there's clear transparency. Just about how the decisions are made, in particular because these are controversial things by their very nature and I just wanted to be clear to the people of the City of New York whose making those decisions because it's fundamentally unfair for let's say the Department of Cultural Affairs Commissioner to be blamed for decisions that they didn't in fact make. And I just want to say that publicly.

I have other questions but I know that Council Member Borelli also would like to, so I want to give him an opportunity and then I will ask some follow up questions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: Thank you Chairman. I just want to say thank you for your service over the past five years. I have always enjoyed your frankness in addressing the concerns of some of the institutions in my district and appreciate the moments when you personally weighed in to help those.

I have one question and it's only because you referenced the Statue of Liberty and we're having almost like an exit interview now and I'm really interested in your opinion of this.

You referenced the Statue of Liberty, after five years in what is considered the highest echelon of public art governance in New York City, do you think given the controversy, the opposition, the environmental regulations, the acquisitions, the approvals from buildings and the City Planning Commission, etc., etc., etc. Do you think it would be possible for New York City in 2019 to build something as grand as the Statue of Liberty?

TOM FINKELPEARL: Wow, that's a very deep question.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: It is, it is.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: That was the point.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yeah, wow. Look, I think that the initiative that's going on right now, not as an individual monument but collectively is on that scale of ambition.

So, if you think of \$10 million being set aside plus let's say, the Lyon's monument, which is the first privately commission monument announced recently, that's a big initiative and again, look, there's a lot of time to make up. There are you know, 145 monuments to man and only 4 to women in parks. I think it's a multigenerational initiative but I think that the initiative to tackle history in a new way is on that scale.

I wouldn't say that we have any individual monument obviously planned on the scale of the Statue of Liberty. So, I think that would be my answer, but I think the question of whether we could put something, all of our eggs in one basket and weigh as a city, is a very excellent question to ponder.

COUNCIL MEMBER BORELLI: Well, thank you and I would submit myself as a model for said statue.

Thank you and I wish you good look.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Thank you Councilman.

2.2

2.3

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: So, I love Council Member Borelli, but please do not erect of a statue of Council Member Borelli. That will be privately funded on Staten Island one day, but I want to follow up actually on Council Member Borelli's question and your response, because it is true, we don't have anything of that incredible grand scale going on, but you know, we saw what I think is this hideous monstrosity called the Vessel built in Hudson Yards and that is a significantly privately funded work of I guess public art that you might call it that - if you were generous. But it points to something that I think you care a lot about to, which is you know, grand, grand expressions like that shouldn't just be reserved for the billionaires and millionaire class right.

So, how do we get to a place where we're once again thinking maybe on more grand scales for public art that's publicly funded and that's actually for -

TOM FINKELPEARL: So, there is one example of that going up in New York City next year, which is by David Hammons. It's across the street from the Whitney Museum on the water side, which is largely publicly funded but there is Council money and

2 | administration money in that. I believe it's a \$19

3 million project. It's larger than the Whitney Museum

4 | itself. It is on the scale; I wonder if it's bigger,

5 I wonder if you could fit the Statue of Liberty

6 inside it, I'm not sure about that. But that's a

7 grand piece of public art. It's a public private

8 partnership, it was created you know, from a

9 curatorial vision of the Whitney Museum, I will

10 admit.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

But I think with lots of good groundwork done in the community, I feel like it's embraced the history of that site. The LGBTQ history, the labor history, to have a senior artist of his repute. I believe it will be the largest piece of public art erected by an African American artist ever in America. That's the scale, it's ambition again, it's a public private thing. It's not like the Vessel, which essentially was decided by one; as I understand it, one person, a developer. Very private, private, private billionaire-ish initiative.

But also, very, very popular itself. I don't want to you know, shed to much shade on that but the vision of the David Hammons piece across from the Whitney, I think is a wonderful legacy of public art.

2 So, it is possible to do things on grand scale still.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: I think he's a

billionaire, not billionaire-ish. Extremely wealthy.

So, yeah, no, look, I'm a huge supporter of that project as you know.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yes.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: And look forward to that incredible piece. So, let's turn to the Sims process and what you think can be changed there to make it better.

So, I made a note when you were testifying, right, there's the standard makeup of the panel and of course this was consistent with the current standard. But should we now take this opportunity to change what is now the standard makeup of the panels and make them more truly representative and amplify the voice of local communities? Do you support that? Do you think the next commissioner in this administration should take this opportunity to change the standard makeup of the panels?

TOM FINKELPEARL: So, look, what I believe happened and there's a lot of people in this room who were in the room with us when a lot of this unfolded, was that there was getting to the four finalists,

2.2

2.3

there was sort of this belief that all four finalists were completely embraced, which actually on the last day turned out not to be the case.

Embraced by our communities and there were a lot of people in the room had been this very same people who fought valiantly and successfully to take down a piece of what was deemed to be racist public art.

And you know, again, they're here and I do want to recognize the incredible work that went into that.

That was very, very important for the city. One of the best moving moments of my time as Commissioner was to be there that morning, a cold early morning, where everybody showed up to see Sims taken down.

That then the feeling about that site and the legitimate sort of feeling of ownership of that site was very intense.

So, again, what I'm recommending is in my testimony. What I think could be done is if we'd all been in the room with the panel, with the expert panel, for a series of three meetings to really get to know what's going on. To understand fully and emotionally and intellectually the history of that site and I'm not just talking about the history of Sims, but the history of the activism of the

2.2

2.3

community. I believe that that would go a long way
towards getting people on the same page.

So, I'm not going to recommend any other changes than what I've already said in my testimony. I think that again, it's also a very small sample size, right. That if you think of the nearly 400 Commissions, the vast majority of those, including other monuments, have gone well. And so, I'm not recommending any other changes than what I've already proposed in the testimony, which again, is not my recommendation, it's collectively decided and discussed throughout my staff and city government.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: So, I appreciate what you've said and I realize that the experience that you all have had with the Sims process and the Beyond Sims project, is one of many that you've encountered and have had many other good experiences or better experiences or different experiences, but I'm still a little surprised that after all of this, because whatever process we've got, you know, I'm sure that we can improve it and we can always create more transparency. We can always create more community involvement and I'm a little surprised that that's your only recommendation with respect to this process

2.2

2.3

2 and not open to changing the standard makeup of the 3 panels as you call it.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yeah, so, look, I also said in testimony, we are open to new ideas. I'm just saying this is the one idea we are proposing.

Again, I mean, and this is not unique to our city. Across the country there is always this balance in these makeup of these percent for our panels between folks with sort of general artistic public art knowledge. A balance of you know, folks in particular subject area that's related to that Commission and community representation.

So, you know, that's endemic to this field again, is this idea that there can be controversy and sort of disputes over ownership of the sites.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Well, I know that there are lots of other folks who signed up to testify, who will obviously share their thoughts and recommendations as well.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yes, they will.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: I had a question about staffing at the Department of Cultural Affairs, particularly with respect to Percent for Art and even some of your other programs but this hearing is

2.2

2.3

really about Percent for Art. Do you have enough, obviously I know and respect the staff that you have running this particular piece of the agencies work, but as this work becomes even more complex, as we do even more of it and as public attention in this space is greater than ever, do you have the resources and are there enough staff doing this work? Could it be done better? Could more voices be included if you had even more support in this particular part of the agency?

TOM FINKELPEARL: So, look, more can be done with more people always, but I do want to recognize one thing. So, when the Monuments Commission results were complete, when we looked at the workload of the unit, we did add another full time position. So, Kaila[SP?] is here. She is new to the group joining Sergio and Kendall, so it's a 50 percent increase in staff. We understood that the legislation which you sponsored in the past, which requires the extra community meetings already has the staff out and about more. So, we did add an extra position already.

I don't want to pass by the idea that yes, it is more work. Monuments are more work and more

2.2

2.3

community engagement is more work, but we did already
add a staff member.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Right, I realize it's a 50 percent increase from one to two, but —

TOM FINKELPEARL: No, two to three.

We can you know, give whoever is charged with this incredibly important and as we note controversial role, where you know, sometimes invariably whatever decision is going to be made is going to be met with intense opposition and to support Kendall and the team in as many ways as we possibly can. Obviously, that is not going to be your charge after a couple of more weeks, but whoever becomes the next Commissioner will obviously have to confront this head on and be driving us all hopefully into a better space.

And I'm also asking you some of these questions because this is probably the last time, I'm going to be able to ask you any of these questions in this particular venue with us in these two positions, so, I want to say that.

You also talked a little bit about LGBTQ representation, which as a gay man, it is particularly important to me as well and do we have a

2.2

2.3

sense of how the LGBTQ community is represented currently? Have we even looked at that, either you or PDC and I know obviously, because I was at the announcement with you about the Sylvia Rivera and Marsha P. Johnson pieces but you know, have we even taken an inventory about LGBTQ representation in the City of New York?

TOM FINKELPEARL: I don't believe we have. I have not seen any statistics.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Obviously, the sexual orientation and or gender identity of some of those folks who died hundreds of years ago is perhaps hard to ascertain, but it certainly seems like something we should take a look at because the LGBTQ community is an important part of New York City, worthy of representation. And it seems to me like we should have a sense of how underrepresented, because I'm just going to guess that our community is underrepresented as well and would you support something like that? Taking inventory of how LGBTQ people are represented and therefore we know the problem and we know how to fix it.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yeah, I mean, I think that like you say that going back in history to understand what

2.2

2.3

a 19<sup>th</sup> century figure — how they would self-identify might be difficult but it sounds like a yeah, sure, it sounds like a good idea.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Yeah, obviously we were not allowed to self-identify for a very long time.

TOM FINKELPEARL: Yeah, I know. There was an article recently about the question of the gender identity of Pulaski of the Pulaski Bridge; I think you probably read about that. Yeah, is that your district?

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: It is. So, I know that we have the Public Design Commission or a couple of members of the Public Design Commission here and we're obviously going to talk to them and then I want to obviously hear from all of the members of the public and the artists as well.

But I want to thank you Commissioner Finkelpearl for your service to the City and all that you have done for Culture and the Arts in the City of New York. I think as your farewell toast on Friday evening indicated while you were in the public realm and therefore subject to folks who disagree with you and who may attack you and that is part of the public discourse as someone who is also in the public realm,

- 2 and often has the good and bad of that as well.
- 3 There are many who have worked with you for decades
- 4 and many who respect what you've done for the City of
- 5 New York.

- I am one of those people and I want to thank you
- 7 again on behalf of the people of the City of New York
- 8 | for everything you've done.
- 9 TOM FINKELPEARL: Thank you and no regrets, I am
- 10 | happy to have done it for six years and I'm not
- 11 | leaving the City but thank you very much. It's been
- 12 | a great pleasure. I've been in many of these
- 13 hearings.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Will you really miss
- 15 | these hearings Tom? That's what I really want to
- 16 know.
- 17 TOM FINKELPEARL: I will not comment on that but
- 18 | I will miss public service. So, thanks a lot.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you Commissioner
- 20 | Finkelpearl for your service. I think we're going to
- 21 | hear from a panel, mixing in some folks from the PDC
- 22 and the public.
- 23 So, Hank Thomas, is Hank Thomas -
- 24 UNIDENTIFIED: [INUAUDIBLE 17:04]

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Oh, okay, okay, alright.

So, are you sitting in for Hank Thomas? Sure, sure,

sure, sure. Is Keri Butler — oh, you're Keri Butler

5 | speaking on behalf of Hank Thomas?

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

KERI BUTLER: Well, I am speaking on behalf of the entire team.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Okay.

KERI BUTLER: Oh, I'm sorry, that's not even on.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Wait, wait, one second because then I think we're going to have to swear you in and I think we'll just have you testify on behalf of the PDC. We'll swear you in and then you can speak on behalf of everyone and maybe also share what Mr. Thomas wanted to say and then we'll go to the public testimony.

KERI BUTLER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Is that fair?

COUNCIL CLERK: Could you please raise your right hand.

KERI BUTLER: Yes.

COUNCIL CLERK: Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this Committee and to respond honestly to Council Member questions.

2 KERI BUTLER: I do.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Feel free to - if you have extra copies of your testimony, you can pass it to the Sergeant at Arms.

KERI BUTLER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: And then, feel free to begin your testimony.

KERI BUTLER: Okay, thank you. Good morning

Chair Van Bramer and members of the Committee. I am

here to testify today on behalf of the Public Design

Commission in support of the Percent for Art program.

The Public Design Commission reviews proposals for permanent artworks, including monuments and memorials on city owned property, both Percent for Art projects such as the Harriet Tubman memorial and non-Percent for Art projects like the Women's Rights Pioneers monument in Central Park.

For the City Charter, the PDC also acts as a caretaker and curator of the City's public art collection. As Commissioner Finkelpearl noted, with the help of Cultural Affairs, the PDC recently completed an initial review of the city's outdoor public art collection. This data, which is available in our most recent annual report, reveals that the

2.2

2.3

Percent for Art program has been instrumental in increasing the equity and diversity of our city's public art collection. The data will also be used to inform the upcoming monuments task force that the City Council created with Local Law 1114.

The PDC has found that the Percent for Art process is designed with a successful balance of community engagement and guidance from art professionals.

While each project is unique and we agree that you can never please everyone, the Commission has found that in general, the Percent for Art staff is clear and professional and the panels are fair.

This year, the Public Design Commission created new guidelines for monuments and memorials and added new requirements for artwork proposals that will ensure that this diversity and artistic integrity of the collection continues and is increased.

The guidelines were developed in close coordination with our colleagues and other city agencies including Cultural Affairs and the Parks Department.

One of the requirements is that for any artwork that is commissioned outside of Percent for Art

2.2

2.3

Percent for Art staff.

program, the artist selection process must mimic the City's Percent for Art program. So, it would be a fair and open process and must include public input, diverse list of artists and an artist selection panel comprising at least three independent art professionals and if possible, a member of the

The Percent for Art selection panel set the bar for best practices in the field and this policy will ensure it's implemented for all permanent public artworks in the city's collection moving forward. As Commissioner Finkelpearl also mentioned, the PDC's new requirements also stipulate that for monuments and memorials a professional historian with relevant expertise must establish the significance of the subject and thoroughly vet any proposed text and images. And this is something the Commission had been doing on a case by case basis but now it's implemented so the teams know in advance that this will be expected.

As the curators of the City's art collection, it is the PDC's responsibility to ensure high quality public artworks that are site appropriate and engaging, enhance the public realm, provide a

contribution to art historical narratives and will stand the test of time. While we recognize that controversy and strong opinions are always going to be part of commissioning public art, our strong partners at the Department of Cultural Affairs make the PDC's job easier through their professionalism and experience and we truly appreciate their work.

Can I read Hank's statement?

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Yes, sure.

KERI BUTLER: Okay, and this is from Hank Willis Thomas, who is one of our art members of the Public Design Commission.

It is my great pleasure to write a letter in support of New York City's Department of Cultural Affairs Percent for Art. My name is Hank Willis Thomas and I am conceptual artist based in Brooklyn New York. I've created a number of large scale public commissions including Raise Up in Montgomery Alabama, Love Overrules in San Francisco, All Power to the People in Opa-Locka Florida. I co-created a number of artist run collaborative projects including For Freedoms, The Writing on the Wall, Question Bridge, Black Males. I'm also an Arts Commissioner

2.2

2.3

for the Public Design Commission of the City of New York.

Having worked with a number of institutions and city's across the country, my experience in working with New York City's Department of Cultural Affairs has been most rewarding. Kendall Henry and his exceptional team made my first city permanent public art commission unity successful. The entire process was very hands on and seamless.

Mr. Henry and his team did everything they could do to ensure everything went smoothly. Mr. Henry is one of the most graceful and intelligent city officials I have engaged with throughout my career. Even as a multiyear process, the Percent for Art was present every step of the way and available to help at every juncture. The supported and understood the artistic process. They were proven advocates from my time and resources without losing site of the end result.

As a Commissioner, I have had the privilege of working with Percent for Art and various other projects. I have always been impressed with their diligence, professionalism, advocacy for the artists

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

2 and their projects as well as their commitment to 3 bringing creative excellence throughout the city.

In conclusion, I fully support efforts of the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs Percent for Art through their enormous support of artists and ambitious projects. I believe their work is extremely important in supporting these projects that benefit our lives and community at large.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you very much.

High praise for Kendall Henry indeed and I appreciate you coming by and singing the praises of the

Department of Cultural Affairs and the Percent for Art program. I think we are going to except that in the record and thank you for your participation. And now, we're going to move to hearing from members of the public, in no particular order. We will hear from — and I hope I am reading all these names right.

Charlotte Cohen, is Charlotte here? Yeah, Savona Bailey McClain, did I get that right? I did, great.

Kora Fisher, is Cora Fisher here, great and Jennifer McGregor, could that be right? Is Jennifer here?

Jennifer McGregor, great, thank you.

And there are two more panels after this one.

The next one will be I believe it's an artist panel.

2.2

2.3

Jorge Luis Rodriguez, Evelyn Rodriguez, Xenobia

Bailey - I hope I said that right and Janet Zweig

among others.

Who would like to speak first on this panel? Why don't we go left to right. My left, yes, you're up first.

CHARLOTTE COHEN: Good morning, I'm Charlotte

Cohen; Executive Director of Brooklyn Arts Council.

From late 1996 through mid-2005, I directed the New

York City Percent for Art program.

During my time at DCA, a pivot from the 100 schools built in the 1990's, most of which had at least one if not more Percent for Art projects. The increased its capital investment in parks and waterfront areas as well as other infrastructure. We were able to work with DOT for the first time in many years and with the Department of Environmental Protection.

I'm particularly proud of our work at the New
Town Creek Sewage Treatment Plant in Greenpoint,
where world renowned artist, George Trakas and Vito
Acconci were commissioned.

Trakas created the nature walk between the creek and the water treatment plant transforming the

2.2

2.3

derelict superfund site into a lush garden. During the projects development it was noted that people did not live close by and the question rose as to who would use it. Trakas argued that the area would be completely different in 30 years, a Prashant response. This example and numerous others including Merrill Letterman, as many working at Fresh Kills Landfill represent the programs ability to participate and interpret incredible transformation in our city. In economic development, land use and environmental impact for example and to make these changes legible to our citizens.

I worked on a number of memorial projects while at Percent including those at Fredrick Douglas

Circle, Richard Rights Invisible Man Sculpture at

Riverside Park, which was the sculpture of Elizabeth

Catlett's last public work, Flight 587 in Rockaway,

Jackie Robinson and Pee Wee Reese in Coney Island and the extraordinary Harriet Tubman memorial by Alison

Saar in Harlem.

I was and continued to be conflicted about the process for developing these memorials because on the one hand, the involvement of the percent program means there is a fair method in the artist selection

2.2

2.3

2 that includes community members, art specialists,
3 government representatives and affiliated designers.

On the other hand, when I was there over 100 projects in the programs pipeline and dozens others on the docket during those years with a staff of two people. It was challenging to maintain the deep involvement and focus these memorial projects demand and deserve.

I urge DCA and the Design Commission to consider the best way forward with the memorials currently under consideration by the city. These examples of permanent works of art demonstrate how artists contribute to the enhancement of our daily experience as a public space. Their inclusion means children spend their days surrounded by beautiful, colorful spaces while in school, rather than what would otherwise be bare, sterile cinderblock buildings and that we prepare the way for shared outdoor sites to help us remember the past and honor our present while looking towards the inevitable changes in the future.

I just want to add that I thank you so much for increasing the annual allocation to Percent for Art and I also want to urge City Council, DCA and the Design Commission to find a path forward on a

maintenance plan for these works of art. It's irresponsible to put them into the public realm without a method and funding dedicated to maintaining them.

Thank you.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you.

SAVONA BAILEY-MCCLAIN: Good morning, my name is Savona Bailey McClain and I am the Executive Director of the West Harlem Art Fund. A very small organization that presents public art throughout New York City including Queens.

I didn't bring any prepared statement because I wasn't quite sure how this was going to flow. I rather this be a dialogue. I do support Percent for Art because I've had a very positive experience with Percent for Art when I served on my local community board. Me and Charlotte presented NARI board whose work received three standing ovations from the local community board for his conception of West Harlem Piers.

I also dealt with Percent for Art as they were trying to do other types of projects as well. I have to commend Kendall Henry. I've known him for many

2.2

2.3

years. He is a thoughtful, conscientious curator and no one should question him.

Now, I feel that though Percent for Art is important, it does not represent all of public art. In the area that I work in, I don't deal with Percent for Art and so, I have to rely on artists and others to give funding for what I try to envision and I have done some significant projects. Time Square, I've done Harlem, the H in Harlem, I've done Queens, for Sleeping Beauty. I've done Dumbo and I would not have been able to do it without artists working with me but I also feel the city has to have a way to get the public more engaged because the city has changed and I did make a proposal five years ago to Eric Adams who was the incoming Borough President about creating public art districts.

We have historic districts, we have business improvement districts, why not public art districts? Because the cost to bring a piece of work, whether it's temporary or permanent is so expensive, it prohibits a lot of communities from having public art. The other problem is that often times communities that are not accustomed to having art will only want what they know. And given that we are

in the number one arts capital in the United States,
why are we limiting ourselves to just figurative
works. We can use new technologies, we can deal with
abstract works, we can deal with sound to make us the
premier city around the globe and we're not doing it,
because we're focused only on sculptures that are
difficult to get funding for, difficult to market,

difficult to get corporate support.

So, I am proposing public art districts, strategically throughout all five boroughs. Where the parameters would be such that insurance, engineering cost could be reduced, so therefore, we can therefore engage more of the public and they would not fear processes like the one at Percent for Art where they only want to see a statue and nothing else.

Thank you.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you, those were powerful and good recommendations and I really appreciate that and appreciate the work that you do. And for recognizing the great borough of Queens in all things. Next.

CORA FISHER: Good morning, my name is Cora

Fisher and I am the Curator of Visual Art Programming

2.2

2.3

for Brooklyn Public Library. Thank you, Chair Van Bramer and members of the Committee, for the opportunity to testify today.

We are at BPL grateful for the support you've given us over the years. It's been instrumental in helping us open our doors for the 2.6 million residents of our borough and to begin transforming our aging buildings.

With your help, BPL has made our most significant era of rebuilding in history. One third of our 59 branches will be renovated or reconstructed over the next five years. We are improving neighborhood libraries with projects ranging from small restorations to full scale renovations.

Today, I'd like to share examples of the significant and positive impact Percent for Art has had on our large scale renovations.

Through our major capital projects, Percent for Art has provided a trusted and competitive draw for public arts submissions by world class artists. The process is inclusive, responsive, both to our institutional needs and the way each library serves its local community and has attracted artists of excellence to submit proposals.

2.2

2.3

At Brownsville, New Utrecht and Eastern Parkway
Libraries Percent for Art has supported us in
engaging local communities and identifying and
selecting artists who will soon be starting on their
design process. And I'll just say a bit about these
projects that have started.

New Utrecht Library in Bensonhurst is a bustling branch. The current building opened in 1956, but the libraries history dates to 1894 with the opening of the free library of the town of New Utrecht. Artist Patrick Jacobs has been selected to design for this diverse and busy branch. His proposal is to create a trompe l'oeil vista of the neighborhood married with natural landscapes through miniature handcrafted dioramas which rival nature itself. We anticipate visitors welcomed to this newly renovated branch excited to experience this artwork. Percent for Art staff were invaluable in supporting the selection and proposal process and we're eager to see this work take shape.

At Brownsville Library, our 111 year old historic Carnegie building will be restored to its original grandeur offering patrons upgraded and inspirational spaces, thanks to the work of LTL architects. With

Percent for Arts leadership and support, we have been able to nominate and select artist Chris Myers from a truly excellent group of candidates. Myers, a visual artist, children's book illustrator and theater dormater will create a series of stained glass tab low that tell stories of neighborhood luminaries with notable activists, scientists and jazz musicians among them in an installation that will inspire youth engagement.

Again, Percent for Art, has been instrumental in providing a framework that asks applicants to respond meaningfully to the context of the neighborhood which Myers has so elegantly realized in his proposal.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: If you could just summarize the last — because I know you got to —

CORA FISHER: Absolutely, we have an amazing artist that was selected through the Percent for Art process Waso Dovernet[SP?] in eastern Parkway and as well, BPL has been a site of engagement for the Shirley Chisholm monument project, so we're very grateful for that.

And finally, I also just want to thank Kendall Henry and his leadership and for all of his

2.2

2.3

been overall very positive for BPL, thank you.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: So far, you've got to be loving this hearing Kendall.

It's

CORA FISHER: Getting a lot of love Kendall.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: It's still early, it may change but — is you mic on?

JENNIFER MCGREGOR: I think that's a little bit better. I'm Jennifer McGregor, I'm the Senior Director of Arts Programs and Education at Wave Hill.

Thank you, Council Member Van Bramer and the entire Committee, for encouraging us to come forward with our comments. Thank you to Commissioner Finkelpearl for your fearless leadership and willingness to open new avenues, which we heard today. Thank you, Kendal Henry and the Percent for Art staff for your tireless work and to all the agencies who enthusiastically participate in this program.

So, I come to you today as the first director of the Percent for Art program and a person who has been in the trenches with many memorial projects. And also, here right when the guidelines were originally written. I also come as a Curator from Wave Hill and

2.2

2.3

I recognize the way that this program has helped so many artists and the way that it has been a foundation for many peoples careers and a way to connect with the public.

Also, I'm a consultant who works nationally on public art projects and I have a perspective of how New York compares to other cities. The Percent for Art legislation and original guidelines were written based on the best practices of the early 1980's. And the process has held up well over time and I'm very happy to hear the changes that have been made in the last couple of years.

The mix of panelists brings the distinct areas of expertise in a focused conversation about what will work best for the given situation. You will find similar panels convening in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, all over the country.

Controversy is an important component. I mean, it happens at some point in every single project. I don't think there's any project that doesn't have a moment of controversy somewhere a long the way.

It is particularly prevalent in memorials where so much is at stake, in terms of content, siting, constituents and delivering a message. As a project

2.2

2.3

manager for the Flight 587 memorial in Belle Harbor

Queens, I was actually engaged by the Mayor's Office

as a consultant to work on this project and I had

first-hand experience of how important the healing

process is as part of making a memorial. This

project was created to honor the lives lost in the

crash of the flight on route to the Dominican

Republic on November 12, 2001.

Multiple city agencies were involved and met weekly here in the Mayor's Office to fast track the initiative. Social workers were at every community meeting which was conducted in both English and Spanish in Washington Heights and Belle Harbor. Percent for Art was an integral part of the infrastructure to deal with the considerable skepticism along the way. An outpouring of support at the dedication ceremony, confirmed that the process had served the participants who were deeply effected by the loss.

Oh, my gosh, we're almost at the end. The city has embraced the challenge to do these new memorials and it's very heartening to see the work that has gone into the community engagement for each project.

I want Percent for Art to succeed, to be excellent.

The staff is strong, but let's be creative about how we reinforce the efforts and tap into the immense knowledge base in our city to commission, maintain, and engage the public about these extraordinary projects.

I have great faith in the process and support finding ways to encourage and reinforce this tremendously important program.

Thank you very much.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you. So, between Tom Finkelpearl, Kendal and the two of you on the committee, we have just two other percent of our leaders who are not here but that's a pretty good coverage.

So, for the two of you who used to run the program and for you having been around when it was essentially created, what recommendations would you make and how would we change it? It's great to hear that you think that it's held up well since the beginning with some modifications that we at the Council have actually recently made, but have we done enough? Have we changed it enough or have we rested on a set of guidelines that were made almost 40 years ago where the city has changed dramatically in those

2.2

2.3

2 40 years, but the program has largely remained very 3 static.

JENNIFER MCGREGOR: Well, I would note and I did say that this was based on those programs of the early 1980's. Percent for Art programs that have developed since then have been able to create a formula that allowed a percentage of the percent to go to maintenance and also administration and also community outreach and engagement. You know, be it apps or websites or all sorts of ways of engaging the public. The way that our capital budget works here in New York and the way our lives structured, doesn't really allow for that but I think benchmarking some of the other programs in the country to see if there are ways that we could find other funding sources for those things would be very important.

Because as staff, as we've noted, a staff of now three, which is fabulous to have three people to manage these monument projects and the important Percent for Art projects throughout the five boroughs is just really — you know, San Francisco, they have like, I can't even tell you how many people they have. Like, other cities have — you know — and they have two percent.

CORA FISHER: Yeah, they have two percent.

2.2

2.3

JENNIFER MCGREGOR: I could spend a lot of time comparing to other cities. New York is really well respected but there could be other ways of doing things that I don't think are the fault of the program itself.

CORA FISHER: I agree entirely. It's really so dependent on the capital budget process and how that funding is allowed to be used. So, that dictates so much of the process and as Jennifer noted, the way that money can be spent.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: And I realize first of all, I just want to say to Cora, as a former library staff person myself before I was elected and Chair of this Committee, I think it is so cool that the Brooklyn Public Library has a Curator of visual art programming and BPL in particular, is taking that so seriously.

CORA FISHER: Thank you, we are, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: And lastly, for this panel and I realize that some of you on this panel may have had zero involvement in the Sims project, so you don't have to chime in. But if anyone would like to, is there anything that you know about that

process, recognizing and I'm willing to stipulate that virtually every project that we undertake here is going to engage some controversy as you said, but is there anything that you think could have been done differently that might have reduced some of the controversy there?

Again, you don't have to chime in but if you'd like to.

SOVONA BAILEY-MCCLAIN: I'd just like to say that I feel one of the biggest problems with New Yorkers now adays because New York has really changed. A lot of people don't understand how government agencies work. So, that's number one, so, they don't understand the process.

Two, a lot of people like I mentioned before, they look at art from their own perspective, from their knowledge and I know for a fact because for the Tito Puente's where we were trying to get the public in East Harlem to look at art differently. That there were so many more options that they could have to make a fabulous presentation, they rejected all of them to go for a figurative piece because that's what they're familiar with.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

This is why I'm saying we need to engage the public to look at art differently. It's no longer this statue. It could be so many different things but if you're not familiar with it, and that's no fault to the community, you're only going to go with what you know.

So, the community saw Vinnie Bagwell's work and I know Vinnie Bagwell's work, and then they looked at or maybe they didn't get to see Samone Lee's but if you're familiar with Samone Lee, you know that that was a stellar artist. That would have made your community proud, but they didn't understand that. They went with, here is the artist who came to visit. Here is the artist who talked with us, they cared about us. But when you're looking at public art, particularly monuments, it's not just about your community, it's about the City of New York and the possibilities that could have come out of the Simone Leigh selection would have been overwhelmingly positive for the community if they understood.

So, I think if behooves us to explain better to the public, opportunities so that they could see it and therefore be trusting of those of us who do this day in and day out. That we're going to look out for

2.2

2.3

you. We're not going to try to shortchange you or be highbrow. We are going to care about you and they would have looked at it a lot more differently.

That's my comment.

CHARLOTTE COHEN: Yeah, I appreciate those comments so much and agree. I would just note, something that someone — a resident from Harlem said to me when we were starting on the projects I did, that I mentioned the memorial project specifically, which was until people see themselves on pedestals, it's very hard to consider work that is not figurative in nature. That is conceptual or abstract.

So, I really appreciate that sort of need to first cover those bases, right and for people to see their own community reflected and their own selves reflected.

This is taking a huge step back, my comment around the Sims memorial but I think these things have moved forward so quickly and perhaps without the consideration that would have really benefited the process if they had slowed down. In my opinion, I don't really understand why we needed a memorial on that pedestal beyond Sims quite frankly. The fact

that it was removed is really important for people today, for people of the past and to recognize that removal. Yes, I agree with that but I really have to question whether people in the future will know who that person was, care who he was, care why it was replaced, understand the process that happened.

So, I think we have to think towards the future as well as the past and our current feelings that are so intense and significant right now when we're in this moment and in this process. So, I recommend slowing the process down tremendously to have real reflection and community dialogue and consideration around the process.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: So, I want to thank this panel for weighing in and for caring about public art in the City of New York. So, I want to thank this panel for being here and before I call the next panel, I want to recognize we've been joined by Majority Leader Laurie Cumbo on our Committee and I think this next panel is artists right, who want to speak to this issue. And that is as I mentioned, Jorge Luis Rodriguez and Evelyn Rodriguez. Are they here? Yeah, Xenobia Bailey, is that correct?

2.2

2.3

2 Xenobia, okay, great and Janet Zweig is here. Is
3 that three or four people? Four, okay.

Janet, then I think we'll start with you when you when you are ready and when the Sergeant at Arms is ready and has all of the testimony. And then, our last panel will be Marina Ortiz is Marina is still with us, Todd Fine, Rowe Rothblatt, I hope I'm saying that correctly. Jacob Morris and Margaret Blair. I hope I got all of those names right.

Okay, we were all distracted by the beautiful book that Jorge Luis Rodriguez has presented us but why don't we start with the testimony.

The light should be on right before you, the little button.

JANET ZWEIG: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Great, thank you, now we can hear you.

JANET ZWEIG: Thank you so much for the opportunity to talk to you today. My name is Janet Zweig; I'm an Artist and Educator.

In 1994, I received my first public art commission from New York's Percent for Art program for Walton High School in the Bronx. Since then,

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

I've completed many commissions around the United States.

Currently, we are extremely lucky to have Kendal Henry directing Percent for Art. He is one of the countries best, most renowned, most accomplished public art experts. He and his excellent staff of two now are currently managing — I heard another number but I think it's 137 projects.

This seems impossible and yet they are doing an amazing job bringing world class artworks to five boroughs year after year. Looking at other percent programs in comparison, San Francisco has 10 staff with 75 projects. And I have some other program numbers but they probably could use some more staff but mostly, I'd like to address the importance of art expertise on artist selection panels.

In my experience Percent for Art does an excellent job with this and their selection process is extremely transparent. The panels are diverse in comparison to other programs. I think their panels are really well handled.

The current standards are to have art professionals comprised more than half a selection panel. Now, it's occasionally suggested that only

2.2

2.3

community members should chose artists and this
causes me to wonder why art is one field where
expertise is so undervalued. If you need a doctor,
you typically chose someone with expertise in
medicine. Why wouldn't we have people with expertise
help chose the art that will be part of the fabric of
New York for years to come? Here's an example, the
juror's for the Vietnam Memorial were eight

internationally recognized artists and designers.

One juror, speaking about Maya Lin's handwritten proposal and her impressionist sketch of a black wedge on a blue green background said, at first, I didn't pick it out but the longer I looked at the more convinced I was that it was the one. There was extreme opposition once her proposal was chosen.

Many people just couldn't understand it. They wouldn't have picked it out but the Veterans Fund navigated the controversy with the help of government allies and as you know, the Vietnam Memorial is one of our best loved public works.

Public art very often draws controversy and more often than not, it's initiated by only one person or very few people. So, education and outreach are crucial for success. Percent for Art currently does

this outreach extraordinarily well. I have to admit, I was amazed by the fact that it was year of outreach for the memorial that I just heard about and how much art reach there was.

Perhaps more staff could bring deeper outreach, but the most important thing they need is support from city officials like you. With your support they can turn controversy into productive civic discourse and an understanding of the stakeholders needs and desires.

Thank you so much.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you very much.

XENOBIA BAILEY: Okay, I didn't know how to go about putting this presentation together, so I just put down my experience as an artist, public artist.

My name is Xenobia Bailey and thank you so very much for inviting me to this testimony. I would like to thank everyone at the Arts Transit and MTA program for believing in my artwork enough for it to be installed in such an amazing space at the Number 7 Hudson Yard Subway stop in 2015.

Around 20 years ago, so it seems, I submitted images of my work to several arts organizations slides, registers in hopes of possible public art

2.2

2.3

commission. After that, I had been short listed several times to compete for public art commissions in New York City, which I never won.

Each of these past submissions has their unique stories, such as my application to the Jay Street Borough Halls Train station in Brooklyn, which I did not get. I was very nervous during my panel presentation because I had really terrible renderings for the presentation. I had created works of art that I thought the panel wanted to see in the subway. My concept did not read well and my printer had really messed my image. When all of us artists were waiting together, one of the artists among us had applied for the same commission said, don't be discouraged if you don't get it. He advised that I should learn from this experience to strengthen me for the next time.

Then he added that this was his sixth time trying and he was going to keep trying. He said this like it was part of our job as artists to be constantly rejected and bounce back from the results. What he had said had some comfort, but later, I saw that he had gotten the commission. I witnessed the light at the end of his tunnel and I was in that same tunnel.

2.2

2.3

At that point, I saw a victorious ride of rejection, not my victory but his victory, yet it was my victory also in a sloppy second kind of way.

Then came the Hudson Yard shortlist call to apply to present artwork alongside three other established artists. I was very intimidated about the project because nothing was built yet and everyone at MTA kept saying how big this project was. I was beyond scared but the director and project manager and everyone at MTA told me to do what I do and don't try to please the panel.

Fear, hunger and MTA believed in me but I wanted to just to say that after I got that commission, I had received several other commissions, Coney Island, which Kendal Henry, I too must praise him, was a saint supporting me through that project. And my notes are all messed up because —

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: No, feel free to read your testimony Ms. Bailey.

XENOBIA BAILEY: Okay. I tried not to please the panel. Fear, hunger and MTA believed in my work was the motivation which resulted in winning the commission. If truth be told, Hudson Yard commission jump started the beginning of my art practice. I

2.2

2.3

don't know what my life and my career would be like if I had not gotten that opportunity. I could not have asked for a more supportive group of people than everyone that I worked with at the Art for Transit program at MTA. It was a major game changer for me how my crochet was converted into three large overhead glass tile mosaics created by the masterful mosaic fabricator Steven Mayoto[SP?]. It all seems like the natural evolution of materials of fiber to fiber and glass public places. Okay, I messed up here. But how my crochet was converted into glass tiles for the mosaic.

Because of this opportunity, I have sense received four public art commissions, a pedestrian walkway paved and structural design for Coney Island, which I was grateful to Kendal Henry for that support that he gave me through a very challenging project.

A public art piece in Saint Petersburgh Florida, which was a mini-Hudson Yards project. The grand reading room with Martin Luther King Library in Washington D.C. Mies Van der Rohe architect, which is like pulling a 50 year old dream out of a hat.

And a permanent installation at a sports arena in Los Angeles which I'm just now starting.

2.2

2.3

All of this has afforded me the opportunity to realize my fulfillment of practicing my art full time for the first time in my life, which I was beginning to believe I was delusional to pursue. Becoming a fabric artist using a medium of crochet and the esthetic of the domestic craft of the African

American homemaker and caregiver on a global scale, I would not be in the position if it was not for the Hudson Yards Commission and MTA believing in my work and supporting the development of the project, which has enabled me to contribute my vision to humanity.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you so much and I have seen your work, it's amazingly beautiful and quite a success story. I'm also really glad your not the artist behind the Vessel, based on my comments earlier today about the Vessel.

So, thank you for your testimony and Kendal, Ms.

Bailey just called you a saint, so this joyride

you're on here today at this hearing, it can only go

downhill from here. I think we all understand that.

XENOBIA BAILEY: My I also make a comment?

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Sure.

XENOBIA BAILEY: Laurie Cumbo has also been a major support in my career, when she was Director of

2.2

2.3

the MoCada Museum. She was a major supporter of the artists in the community. So, she too, is the reason why I'm here.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: That's wonderful. And we'll finish this panel and then we can see if anyone on this panel wants to ask any questions before we hear from the last panel.

JORGE RODRIGUEZ: My name is Jorge Rodriguez and I am having some problems with my vocal cords, so I'm asking my beautiful wife to read my statement.

JORGE RODRIGUEZ'S WIFE: Thank you. So, I'm going to kind of paraphrase and call from what we've had here because its become more apparent what we're trying to accomplish.

So, first of all, good morning. Good afternoon actually, City Council Members and elected officials, private citizens. We should thank the opportunity to present here today.

And so, we're going back to the beginning because Jorge was the first person selected and the first commission completed. He was invited among a group of artists in 1984 to be considered to develop public artwork for the newly enacted Percent for Art program. He had a portfolio of already 20 years of

2.2

2.3

artwork of graphic design, painting and sculpture in different media. He was really very pleased to be selected for a site specific project at Harlem Art Park.

He had invested great years of teaching and developing curriculum in the schools and cultural community based organizations and museums including residency at the Student Museum in Harlem. Actually, he did residency with David Hammons in Child Delay, child laborism at [INAUDIBLE 2:23:33].

As the park was undergoing construction, it had not yet been completed. He visited regularly, looked at the dynamics in the park with particular focus on nature, which is one of the running theme in his works and what his impressions inspired him to do was to concentrate on actually the concept of growth because this would be the first project to be completed and that's what the sculpture was ultimately named growth. He was inspired by the dynamics in the park as well as his experiences when he was growing and in his tropical garden would plant seeds, watch them grow and see the transformation in them and he saw the correlation between that and what he was trying to accomplish with the sculpture.

2.2

2.3

So, we were just talking on the way here how we worked hand and hand with Jennifer McGregor and all the people that were present at the ribbon cutting ceremony in June of 1985, you know it's like, from Jennifer — no longer with us. Bess Myerson was there Mayor Koch, Anthony Gleeman, Henry Stern but we still have long lasting relationships with the school that is crossing from the park, their active participation. There are some art programs where the students do come in and visit the park.

Also, having the opportunity to have a 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration, sponsored by New York City Parks. We also had a retrospective work at Center for Puerto Rican Studies at Hunter College which is just a block away. So, it revived the concept and one of the most wonderful things that happened at that occasion is that the park fulfilled its original purpose, which is to have ongoing artist relations and there have been 15 - it says here in the statement 10, but we actually realize there have been 15 installations nearby through the coordinated effort with Connie Lee of the Marcus Garvey Park Alliance. They've made a corridor, public corridor between Marcus Garvey Park, Harlem Park and the local

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER:

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER CUMBO: I just want to thank you all for being here. It is such an honor to have so many of our creative giants here today in the City Council and I'm very much an energy and vibrations and frequency person and it's so important to have your energy here in City Hall.

It's important that what you're saying, the work that you're talking about, the perspectives that you bring are really very critical to the political process. And so, I hope that through your presentations and your testimonies here today, that more individuals from the cultural community will understand that their voice is equally important to all of the many topics that we discuss here in City Hall.

So, we thank you certainly for coming here, for testifying and being a part of the political process. Because often times we have many different political views and some will say they have nothing to do with politics but politics and government interfaces with every part of our lives.

So, it's so important that you're here today and I thank you so much for being here.

JORGE RODRIGUEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you all very, very much for participating and for creating a better New York City.

Our final panel, this panel is excused, thank you, is Margaret Blair, Rowe Rothblatt, Jacob Morris, Todd Fine and Marina Ortiz.

The Sergeant at Arms will take your testimony.

There are five chairs up there and we will — is this everyone?

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: You'll start and then we'll go down the line.

ROWE ROTHBLATT: Alright, good afternoon, thank
you for hearing my testimony. My name is Rowe
Rothblatt and I'm here to present the Sisters in
Freedom proposal and I've given your Committee a
dozen letters of support. Actually, since this
morning, we have two more coming in the Council
Member Stephen Levin also signed on a letter and I'll
send that as well. As well as Assembly Member Jo
Anne Simon.

The process of creating a monument should live up to the ideals you want to memorialize. Today, I'm presenting the proposal to build a statue called

2.2

2.3

Community Board 2.

Sisters in Freedom at Willoughby Square Park,
recently renamed Abolitionist Place Park by Brooklyn

This proposal is a model for what the monument process can look like. It's sited at a historically significant location, rises up from grassroots, exemplifies an educational design philosophy and celebrates the voice of the descendants of the honorees.

The city has already funded a contract requiring Willoughby Square Park to build a monument, but this legal commitment does not require Percent for Art.

This is the opportunity for the Cultural Committee to try I would say a better process. Our choice of Ida

B. Wells and four other African American suffragists would educate generations of New Yorkers about a fierce group of women who fought against lynching and for economic and civil rights.

This selection would elevate both these empowered women and New York City's central role in the history of their movement. After Ida B. Wells newspaper was attacked by a racist mob in 1892 in Memphis, she moved to downtown Brooklyn where many strong Black institutions already operated. The women here

2.2

2.3

these women.

assisted her with public speaking, fund raising and publicity. They drove the formation of the influential Black women's club movement. It is impossible to understand the progress of the civil rights movement without understanding the work of

The selection of Sisters and Freedom by this

Committee is obvious and deserving. Their activism

is a model for us and we hope you chose it as a

template to build monuments citywide.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you and under time. Next.

JACOB MORRIS: Jacob Morris; Harlem Historical
Society. By the way, I was responsible for the conaming of Gold Street, Ida B. Wells place and I'm
responsible for originally coming up with the concept
of a group memorial honoring these five great women
from Brooklyn and I'm so glad that the Majority
Leader is here today because I know that she carries
on a tradition of these five great women from
Brooklyn. And that this Sisters in Freedom memorial
would honor — it would honor their struggle and it
would honor Brooklyn and in so doing it would also
honor New York City and there's the connection to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

bringing history to life because Abolitionists Place
Park is one block from where Ida B. Wells lived.

And that leads me to my five points. Monuments siting; now this is a real problem you know, with what's going on. You got Elizabeth Jennings Graham gets thrown of the streetcar in 1854 at the intersection of Pearl and Chatham downtown Manhattan. And by the way, you know, that was 100 years before Rosa Parks.

They just did a statute of Rosa Parks in Montgomery and that statue is located in the immediate vicinity of where Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus and where they stopped the bus and where she was taken off the bus and arrested. And yet, somehow and I'm so glad Mr. Chairman that you brought that out. Who makes these decisions? Who really made that decision about Mother Cabrini and these other siting decisions, are verging on the inexplicable and we did requests. We've gotten no response as to how the decisions were arrived at for siting. That includes the decision for the Lyon's family in Seneca Village in Central Park. More than a mile from where Seneca Village was, it makes no sense.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

25

Elizabeth Jennings Graham at Grand Central Station, when she was thrown off in her Sunday church clothes, all the way downtown and the Colored Sailors home by the way, was located at 330 Pearl Street. You're going to honor the Lyon's family than it should be by the Colored Sailors home.

So, I know you just CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: covered one of your five recommendations.

JACOB MORRIS: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: So, I'm going to ask you Mr. Morris if you can -

JACOB MORRIS: Run through the rest quickly.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Be more concise, yes.

JACOB MORRIS: Okay, I just you know, that this really - I feel very passionate about. That we can do better here in New York City.

The Public Design Commission, they've adopted some new guidelines in terms of historian input. would like that to become permanent. I would like there to be a seat on the Public Design Commission for a historian and this is especially critically important to fulfill the educational function of monuments that have historical themes.

There are two categories of monuments, not one.

There's the esthetic monuments and then there's the historically theme monuments. Now, one of the prior panelists said, oh, well the community, they like figurative monuments when it comes to historic.

That's right, the people of the city they like figurative monuments because of the educational function of historically themed monuments. Not abstract or "contemporary stylings". Figurative has an educational function for the community.

Consideration of best practices around the United States in regards to monument siting selection and artist selection, should be examined and considered for adoption here in New York City for approval and to improve our selection criteria and processes. And the Percent for Art program, you were right, this would go downhill for Kendal, buddy, this isn't anything I haven't expressed in person. Has an abstract and contemporary art bias.

That's not his fault necessarily because we haven't had a whole slew of monuments with historical functions. Now that we do, we need to consider the educational function of historically theme monuments.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

And so, figurative art should not be discriminated against.

Kendal has gone on the record, in public stating that they were going to pick Simone Leigh when they went back to the office, in spite of the overwhelming strong sentiment of those wonderful ladies in East Harlem who fought so long against Sims.

These are very knowledgeable group of women and I just can't say enough about them.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: That's fair.

JACOB MORRIS: Please Mr. Chairman, improve the compliance mechanisms for transparency in the legislation that you already passed.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Got it. I see that, thank you very much Mr. Morris. Obviously, you've invoked Kendal in a public statement. You know, I don't know if he wants to respond in any way shape or form but I just want to give him the opportunity if he'd like to correct the record in any way or respond.

Next panelist.

MARGARET BLAIR: Hello, my name is Margaret
Blair; I'm a performing artist and educator and a
scholar. For the record, we haven't spoken about

anything today. I haven't spoken to any of them and it's amazing how I have like a similar sentiment.

When I'm not studying anthropology and education, I teach dance in a couple of public schools in Harlem. I've spent the last — I've spent many years in the past drawing, painting and sculpting through my studies at the fine arts program EDFIT but I care very, very deeply about historical content, lack of representation and of communities of color in public spaces.

So, this is what I understand about why I'm here. The process may have worked in the past, I'm not taking anything away from Percent for Art. I'm not saying that they haven't given so much to artists and artists of color. I just really appreciate that work. I think it's hard work, whether you're working for the government or you're working for a private industry, it's hard work.

But I understand also and I've spoken to Mr.

Finkelpearl briefly about it. I understand also that at the same time, the public can be regarded and disregarded at the same time. So, the way public involvement, the way and the manner that they are

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

being engaged in new works, seems broken or something
needs to be fixed, it's maybe outdated.

So, I think that the community, like myself, I'm always in Councilman Maisel's office. I live in Brooklyn, I'm in his office constantly about everything. I think the public, like myself, we are critical enough to actually chime in for some things and the way they are being engaged and then disengaged. Their opinions are disregarded at the last minute; I think it's disrespectful. I think the communities who live around these particular projected works, can critically chime in and give their recommendations and their advise as well. And a lot of what's happening, it's just not aiding in the process.

So, I heard someone say today that you know, we need to slow this down. I don't think so. I don't think we need to slow it down, I just think that the way the communities involved needs to change.

I just want to thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you very much. Next.

TODD FINE: Yes, Todd Fine; President of the Washington Street Advocacy Group and I would first

2.2

2.3

like to offer my support for the Sisters in Freedom initiative. I think that's the way that this process could have been done. To talk to community groups, see what sentiment is out there, rather than executive decisions by politicians which was how all of these major monuments were made.

Now, the Commissioner repeatedly said that public art is inherently controversial and if we accept that as a catch all explanation, we could say this was inevitably going to be controversial. That this large scale monument initiative would be inevitably controversial but is that true? No, there are reasons why this monument and boom initiative became extremely controversial and they are the insufficient funding and inferior processes for a widely ambitious program at Percent for Art.

The ambition can be commended, the implementation cannot. According to my count provided to members of the Committee, at least twelve major large scale monuments are underway, many with short term deadlines in one or two years.

Major experts of public art process do not believe this is possible. The former Director for Percent for Arts just explained how a single large

2.2

2.3

this scale.

scale monument taxed their resources. How about twelve, and PDC said all privately proposed monuments will also go through Percent for Art. Now, how is any of this possible? It is irresponsible for this Committee not to press further about how this new initiative is possible. Percent for Art has invited people to speak about past successes and the capability of staff but no one has testified how the specific program, which is distinct from the commissions in the past can achieve this project on

We have entered a twilight zone and there's no road map and there's no oversight. Three staff at Percent for Art, this is absurd. It's stressing all agencies to breaking point, PDC and Parks as well as PDC. The root of the scandal is one, ignoring and neglecting the City Advisory Councils and two, a rushed under resourced process that has led to rash and sloppy decisions that may lead to inferior works in considered locations.

There are several problems; first, weak responses to community sentiment in organically driven projects. Long before the monument initiative, their existing public art initiatives for Tito Puente,

Brooklyn Abolitionism for the Literary Heritage of
Little Ceria. These initiatives developed
organically, but they're now at the back of the list
and they probably may not be competed for three,
four, five years and nobody knows how quickly any of
these initiatives are going to be completed with
dates or two or three years.

Second, is that we marginalized the blue ribbon commissions. We have lots of testimony from people from the Public Art program and from other artists, but we don't have any of the members of those 40 — the 18 member women commission on advising the women selection. Harriet Senie; the CUNY Professor who is on the Commission, said it was charade.

They recommended group monuments and those recommendations were overruled and the people on the Mayor's Monument Commission also said that their recommendations were ignored. That the final decisions only took place in fifteen minutes at the end of the third meeting. So, they didn't feel they had any agency. The decisions were made by political leadership. There's no community involvement and there needs to be more oversight.

2.2

2.3

Third, we're neglecting community knowledge and sentiment in the selection of these monuments. These can be seen in these location problems that my colleague raised the Elizabeth Jennings Graham at Central. Grand Central Station makes no sense. Billy Holiday, which he didn't get into. There are huge sentiment in [INAUDIBLE 2:54:56] Park to site that in Queens where there was a huge jazz move. do it a Queens Borough Hall? Why didn't anybody talk to the people of Queens before we did this? This is what this committee needs to do, have a rigorous oversite into these specific siting decisions. Explain why they were occurred and then we can sort this out.

This monument initiative is not going to be solved within the next year or two. There's 12 monuments in the process. Let's slow it down and let's do them all properly. Let's scrutinize it and do it properly, engage the community.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: You speak really fast but read remarkably well, remarkably fast, because that was like 15 minutes of testimony condensed into

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS, LIBRARIES AND INERNATIONAL INTERGROUP RELATIONS

three and the truth is, I understood every word of it because, yeah, no -

TODD FINE: High school debate.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Really, that was really impressive actually. I mean, maybe some of the older folks remember the commercials where the guy used to like speak really fast, that's who you reminded me of.

But I just want to say, you do raise a lot of real issues and important issues and I share some of the concerns which is part of why obviously in this moment of transition, right, Tom is leaving and there will be a new Commissioner. We hope soon but I did start this hearing with talking to Tom and getting him to talk on the record about exactly who is making decisions and that is important to me and I think important for all of us to understand what's happening here.

So, there is more oversight to be done. There are a lot more questions to be answered. We did talk about the resources question and I just want to say I have concerns. I want to let the next person speak as well, because I'm afraid if I give you the mic

2.2

2.3

2 again, your going to give another 15 minutes in 3 minutes.

2.2

2.3

TODD FINE: One comment. No, I agree this

Committee can do good oversight, but we need to have
a road map of how this 12 monument boom is going to
happen. We can't just have to beg or information.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: I agree, absolutely.

Last, but not least.

MARINA ORTIZ: Yes, I also can do that kind of speed reading which I normally do at Community Boards, but I'm not going to do that. I have a written statement that you have there you can refer to later. I am going to take the liberty of taking a little bit of extra time, so I don't have to speed talk but I appreciate everything you said.

So, I'm here to talk about the process for the selection of the replacement of the Sims statue and from a little bit what I'm hearing today, in testimony and side comments, I'm actually going to respond to some of those comments to clarify.

So, for example, there were not 19 meetings held in terms of engaging the community in East Harlem, regarding the replacement for the Sims statue. There were three communitywide meetings held at the New

2.2

2.3

York Academy of Medicine, Schomburg Center and then at [INAUDIBLE 3:00:10] for the final artist selection.

So, those were three communitywide meetings; the Committee that was formed did in fact meet beginning after the statue was taken down but it does not total 19. And the Committee meetings did not always include representatives from Department of Cultural Affairs or Percent for Art. So, I just want to clarify that.

We were promised in the beginning of all of this that there would be one million dollars allocated for this and is separate from Women's Monument project.

So, we just want to clarify that we want to make sure that that promise is kept.

And talk about the process, so we were always advised by Tom and Kendal that the communities voice was an advisory voice. We were never promised that we would have the final say. So, I just want to make that clear. However, the process leading up to that, the things that we were promised did not happen.

So, for example, we did not have that many meetings. Towards the end as we got closer to the artist selection panel, we were told that we were -

2.2

2.3

the Committee would have an opportunity to interview the five — at that time, five finalists. That never happened and we asked why. We asked to have someone from the community represent us on that artist selection panel and we only thought to ask that towards the very end and I'm glad that we did. We had to push back to get that. The person that was appointed to the panel is an expert, so she qualified, but we were never — we never got an opportunity to speak to the artists. Not to interrogate them or anything but just to get a sense of their thoughts and their vision.

We were never told the names or titles or credentials for the artist selection panel. We only met them that very day. The artist selection panel that we saw, again, I'm going to take the liberty of more time, because this is important.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: But I will — we will certainly allow you to have extra time, as we have several other people but I just want to say there are also limitations.

MARINA ORTIZ: Thank you because going forward, this needs to be corrected and addressed.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Sure.

2.2

2.3

MARINA ORTIZ: So, the artist selection panel from what I can see, consisted of only one woman of color and she is the woman that we pushed to have and we had to push to have on that panel.

There were in fact only three women out of seven.

There were I believe four white people and three people of color.

So, we were like kind of shocked when we walked in. It's like, we didn't know. You know, they were briefly introduced and all of that, but we just didn't know. There was no literature handed out, no information. So, we also questioned the budget for community outreach because in fact, the community members were the ones that did that outreach for free. Everything from printing and posting flyers and attending community board meetings and getting people to the event, which we did.

So, we question the budget as well. We'd like to see more transparency on that as well as one million dollars. We want to make sure one million dollars is applied to this particular project. And I say that because I mean, okay, so you all know that Simone Leigh was selected by the artists. When I walked into that event, I had no prejudgment. Most of the

2.2

2.3

people that were okay, going back again, so, the city also promised to have an online engagement process two weeks prior the artist selection process, so that the general public citywide could input on the artists that were finalized, right.

So, that wasn't put up online until five days before the event, which is ridiculous and we had to promote it and the artist imagery that was presented was also ridiculous. We couldn't even see or make out the work of at least two of the artists very clearly.

So, during the event, I walked in and many others walked in surprised to hear that only one artist was going to be joining us and so, I'm like, okay, whatever. So, we're still looking at the presentations on screen and we still can't make out pretty much any of the artists work. And I'm going to say, it's not a Simone versus Vinnie Bagwell. What was shown to us on the screen of Simone Leigh's work was a very shadowy outline of a woman reclined.

That's the same exact image that was put online for the general public, for the citywide. We couldn't make out what it was. Had Simone Leigh attended and/or entrusted and respected our community

enough to show us her vision, things might have gone differently. Had we seen, were able to see what she was presenting, it might have gone very differently, but she didn't show up and for whatever reason, we were not entrusted or respected enough to see her proposal.

Which is ridiculous and that's why people were outraged, including the Chair of the Community Board, Community Board 11. Including Councilwoman Diana Ayala, who can't be here today, but who did speak out on this formally at a press conference. And then also, we're being subjected to after the fact, hearing audio of people involved in that selection process assuring that the artist — that Simone Leigh's art will go up and their going to do whatever they need to do to make that happen. This is after the city and Tom Finkelpearl announced her withdraw. And people even in this audience snickering and saying that East Harlem, you all are a bunch of bitching and complaining. Exactly what was said, okay.

Bitching and complaining about the Tito Puente statue. We've been waiting for that for ten years.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

Okay, a certain amount of funding was given but we need more funding for that in reality in 2019.

I really don't appreciate people involved in that selection process ridiculing my community, calling us stupid. Telling us we don't know good art, Vinnie Bagwell's art sucks. She's a bad artist and these are the people that are going to be carrying out and fulfilling this mandate.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Well, obviously, all that you just said there is unacceptable to say about the East Harlem community and those who have a different perspective. So, I appreciate everything that you have said.

MARINA ORTIZ: Just two more points, two more points.

Also, the figurative issue, Vinnie Bagwell's presentations goes beyond figurative art. She's talking about LED lighting and eternal flame. A lot more than just figurative art, okay, and it's not bad art. And so, she was there for seven hours, answered every single one of our questions, presented an actual model, said she's open to changing somewhat.

So, of course, people embraced her. And then finally, the proposal or idea around insufficient

2.2

2.3

funding and possible public/private partnerships. I totally do not support that at all, because you're opening up a can of worms for developers to come in.

No, don't go there. The city needs to invest more money into the Percent for Art agency and process needs to be transparent and there are processes in place that should be followed and respected.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Okay.

MARINA ORTIZ: But they're not being.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you. Thank you for all that you have to say. Council Member Barron has joined us and I want to give her an opportunity to weigh in on this important issue.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you for holding this hearing and thank you to the panels that have been here. I haven't heard all of them, but I will certainly review them and make sure. I just wanted to put some items onto the record.

Much of this talk about having the statues and having cultural representations is a result of the fight that began against the statue of Dr. Marion

Sims who as we have found out, for those who didn't know, conducted much of his gynecological experiments

on Black women who were enslaved and who he
administered no anesthesia. Although, when the
procedure was used on White women, he did use
anesthesia.

2.2

2.3

So, we talked about how terrible it was to be able to say that this was a statue to this person and it goes back about ten years and it was launched in the community of Harlem by, I want to put onto the record, we want to have Liola Plumbers[SP?] name entered into the record as the person who began that struggle.

So, as we all know the struggle continues. The statue was removed and placed elsewhere. So, it's not in storage, it's not hidden away, it was placed at Greenwood Cemetery. So, that's where it is, that's where his grave is. I've heard people say it needs to go in the grave with him but that's where his statue is.

So, our concern is that as we move forward in this process that the community is engaged in a meaningful, impactful, way that's not just cosmetic and not just having hearings and committees and participation without having a final say. Without having the ability to except or reject what's coming

into their community. That they are going to be subjected to.

2.2

2.3

I heard an earlier panel, perhaps it was on this panel, talk about the argument over where should it be? Where a particular statue should be located. We need to make sure that the community is engaged, not just in the process and then at the end. Nothing that they have said has been reflected and I just want to draw a parallel in terms of community involvement and its impact to the fact that there will be a new library, as you well know and new lots and last night was their second community engagement process. And all of their comments will be considered and weighed and incorporated hopefully as we then give the plan to the architect.

But we have laid out what it is that we want to see in our brand new \$31 million library. And the community has already gotten its first report back.

Okay, this is what you said at your previous meetings. This is what we are planning to incorporate and until that kind of respect is given to the community for them to know that they are respected. They are admired and they are valued, then until we have that kind of clear process and

2.2

2.3

protocol laid out, we're going to continue to have projects that don't reflect what it is that people want to see in their community.

So, we've heard the presentation about the artist selection panels and who was on it and who wasn't on it and how the persons that were finalists were in fact, it should have been, okay, this is what is expected of you if you are finalists. So, that people would know what to expect and how to participate and how to present themselves.

So, I just think that it's important that particularly as we're talking now about these statues, how are we going to make sure that the community is involved? What are the next steps? How will they be identified? How will they be relayed to the public that these are the next steps that are coming and what is the role that the community will play and have it clearly defined?

So, I just wanted to get all those points on the record. There are others as well, but those were the main ones. And I want to acknowledge that I have had M. Indigo Washington attending those meetings and she's also here and I want thank her for her contributions.

2 Thank you.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED: One second.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Hold on one second, I just want to say something about Council Member

Barron and thank her for her participation, not just in this hearing but over decades and you know how much I respect and value your input and recommendations and indeed, this hearing has been all about some of the changes that we might be able to implement. Particularly, of course, as we go through this transition and have a new Commissioner coming, we hope very soon.

We will see when they appoint — and also, about who makes these decision. That was a big part of the earlier part in particular.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: Absolutely. Rowe, did you want to say something.

ROWE ROTHBLATT: Yes, one of the themes that kept coming up by people advocating for Percent for Art, is like, oh, this controversy is inevitable and I don't necessarily think so. If we start with the

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Grassroots.

Grassroots project going up, you're not going to have the community resistance and there will be debates, but I want to change the template that if we can start from the process going up, so that they listen to the community. The community has a lot of expertise and I'm willing to listen to them too but you know, I think the process should start with the

CHAIRPERSON VAN BRAMER: I agree. Obviously, Kendal has remained with us to listen to all of this feedback but I do think it's incredibly important for the Council to take another look at the program and maybe there are some things legislatively that we can do to further improve the program. Again, a program that was created in 1982, which has done a lot of great things for the City of New York can't remain static, right and so, we have to change with the city that's change along with it and the expectations, right. I think the expectations of community involvement and community decision making has also changed and evolved and we're at a time of us correctly understanding and believing that sorts of projects like these need to be driven by community involvement and input, not from a top down approach.

## COMMITTEE ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS, LIBRARIES AND INERNATIONAL INTERGROUP RELATIONS

So, with that, I want to thank this panel, all of the members of the panel and thank everyone who testified here today. Thank you to my colleagues, Majority Leader Cumbo and Council Member Barron who are with us. Council Member Borelli who was with us earlier.

And with that, this hearing is adjourned. Thank you. [GAVEL]

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date April 1, 2018