

All minutes are drafts until approved by vote of the Council

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

May 9, 2017

9 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Mingei International Museum

1439 El Prado

San Diego, CA 92101

(619) 239-0003

PRESENT:

Council Members

Donn K. Harris, Chair
Nashormeh Lindo, Vice Chair
Larry Baza
Phoebe Beasley
Christopher Coppola
Juan Devis
Kathleen Gallegos
Jaime Galli
Louise McGuinness

Council members absent: Steve Oliver and Rosalind Wyman

Arts Council Staff

Ayanna Kiburi, Interim Director
Caitlin Fitzwater, Communications Director
Shelly Gilbride, Programs Officer
Andrea Porras, Art Program Specialist
Jaren Bonillo, Art Program Specialist
Jason Jong, Art Program Specialist
Josy Miller, Art Program Specialist
Mariana Moscoso, Administrative Analyst

Invited Attendees

Craig Watson, Previous CAC Director
Anjanette M. Ramey, City of San Diego
Erin Anova Kerr, California African American Museum & Delta Highway Productions
Katrina Coltun, Center Theatre Group
Mitch Menchaca, Association California Symphony Orchestras

Molly Terbovich-Ridenhour, San Diego Civic Youth Ballet
Rebecca Nevarez, Latino Arts Network of California

Other Attendees / Members of the Public

Lynette Tessitine, City of Chula Vista
Lissa Corona, San Diego Art Institute
Caron Adregg, Choral Club of San Diego
Russ Sperling, San Diego Unified School District
Dalouge Smith, San Diego Youth Symphony & Conservatory
Diania L. Caudell, California Indian Basketweavers Association
Marissa Cassani, Barrio Logan/Urban Corps
Josephine S. Talamantez, Chicano Park Museum
Mark Steele, Barrio Logan Planning Group
Gale Petrie, Patron
Helene Held, House of Isabel
Calvin Clayton, San Diego Young Artists Music Academy
Alan Zita, San Diego Artist Culture Coalition
Caren Dufour, The Old Globe
Linnea Searle, Playwrights Project
Annamarie Maricle, The Old Globe
Marilyn McPhie, National Storytelling Network, Pacific Region
Kiara Ater, Urban Corps/Barrio Logan
Sarah Weber, Association of California Symphony Orchestras
Carol Manifold, Choral Consortium of San Diego/Sacra Profana
Mary Lou Valencia, Congregación de Danzas Aztecas en Aztlan
Robin Brarsford, Public Address
Whitney Roux, City of San Diego Commission for Arts & Culture
Dana Springs, City of San Diego Commission for Arts & Culture
Alexandra Kritchevsky, La Jolla Playhouse
Scott Hickey, VetART.org
Jean Isaacs, San Diego Dance Theater
Jessica Monahan, California Association of Museums
John Gabriel, San Diego Opera
Jess Baron, Guitars in the Classrooms
Matt Carney, San Diego Dance Theater
Rich Horner, The New Children's Museum
Patti Saraniero, Moxie Research
Diana Agostini, Italian American Arts & Cultural Association of San Diego
Rebecca Tortes, California Indian Basketweavers Association
Llewellyn Crain, The Old Globe
Barry Edelstein, The Old Globe
Mandy Shefman, Arts for Learning San Diego
Nicolas Rexeles, San Diego Opera

Tony LoBue, Tony the Vet
John Highkin, Fern Street Circus

MINUTES

I. Call to Order, Roll Call and Establishment of a Quorum

The Chair opened the meeting at 9:32 a.m. He thanked the San Diego community. Rob Snider, Director of the Mingei International Museum, shared the history of the museum's name and the importance of preserving traditional craft. Dana Springs, from the San Diego Commission for Arts & Culture, welcomed the Council. She provided background on Balboa Park. Additionally, she thanked Council member Larry Baza for his hard work and his contributions to the city arts.

II. ACTION ITEM: Minutes of meeting on February 2, 2017 and March 13, 2017

At 9:42, the Chair requested a motion to approve the minutes for February 2, 2017, and March 13, 2017. Gallegos asked for a sentence to be removed on page 5. Gallegos also requested for a typo on page 12 to be fixed. Gallegos asked how the Council will receive a follow-up of the adjusted minutes. Moscoso responded the minutes are uploaded onto the website. Gallegos clarified her question; she asked how "follow-up" items are completed. Kiburi responded that the Council will be notified when items are completed. Beasley noted a typo on page 12.

ACTION ITEM: At 9:46, Baza moved to approve them as amended. McGuinness seconded. Beasley, Coppola, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, and Lindo voted to approve the minutes as amended. Devis, Oliver, and Wyman are absent at the time of the vote. The motion passes. The February 2, 2017, minutes were approved 8-0.

There were no amendments to the March 13, 2017, minutes.

ACTION ITEM: At 9:47, Coppola moved to approve the minutes. Gallegos seconded. Baza, Beasley, Devis, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, Lindo, and McGuinness voted to approve the minutes. Devis, Oliver, and Wyman are absent at the time of the vote. The motion passes. The February 2, 2017, minutes were approved 8-0.

III. Chair's Report

At 9:47, Harris spoke about the Summer of Love in San Francisco. He shared that San Francisco is preparing numerous events to commemorate the 50th year anniversary. Harris shared he is close to the family of artist Ruth Asawa. He also noted Asawa was one of the original Council members of the CAC, and recounted a bit about her work and life story. Harris also shared a story about an original portrait of Governor Jerry Brown from his during his first administration. He noted Governor Brown founded the CAC. Harris also recounted a story about a basketball player that said that the world is not round—

noting the basketball player is a graduate from Duke University. He said that such a claim is a sign of the times and the current political climate, referring to the importance of education.

He continued to share his thoughts about the future of the arts. He noted digital technology will likely play a larger role in the arts and asked the Council and the public to contemplate potential future genres of the arts. He concluded the Summer of Love was an important historic moment and should reiterate itself in a new form in the present.

IV. Director's Report

At 10:02, Kiburi informed the Council she left them a copy of her report on their chairs. She provided legislative updates and noted the Keep Arts in Schools voluntary tax fund, SB 503, passed. She said the fund brings about \$250,000 to the CAC. Kiburi added that the fund has decreased and this is partially due TurboTax's alteration of their platform. This change has affected organizations requesting funds from a tax checkoff.

Kiburi provided an update on the Arts-in-Corrections program. She noted the expansion of the program from 20 to 36 institutions. Kiburi shared information about the open Request for Proposal (RFP) to distribute 2016-17 Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) funds. Harris asked who would adjudicate the proposals. Kiburi responded CAC and CDCR staff. She added that applications will likely come primarily from current art providers.

Kiburi thanked staff for their work preparing for the Council meeting. She shared the various tasks completed by staff for the meeting.

Kiburi acknowledged the transitional training Watson provided her. She noted the numerous meetings she attended with different legislators and government officials. She spoke about an event she attended held by the Armenian caucus. It was a youth art contest about the Armenian genocide. She noted Bonillo and Porras were judges.

Kiburi provided staff updates. She noted the transition of Minerva Anguiano and Peggy Megna from the CAC. She additionally acknowledged the current work of the new hire, Stephanie Anderson, in Arts in Corrections. Kiburi verbally introduced Yurika Jimenez, the new accountant. She additionally shared the previous CAC Senior Accountant, Theresa Walters, has returned part-time to help. Kiburi asked Fitzwater to share more about the new Information Officer, Kimberly Brown. Fitzwater provided information on Brown and talked about her role as interim program leader for the Cultural Districts program.

Harris admired and acknowledged the work of Kiburi as interim director.

Gallegos asked if the CAC will receive funds from the Safety Committee again. Harris asked if the Subcommittee 4 funding is different from CDCR. Kiburi answered it is.

Galli asked about the decline in tax contributions. Fitzwater said that other organizations have experienced a decline. She spoke about a coalition that has investigated the issue with the tax

contribution option and this investigation concluded the tax contribution has been compromised in the TurboTax platform. McGuinness noted the tax contribution is good for visibility. Galli asked if there will be advertisement. Fitzwater said the next goal is to reach October filers. Fitzwater said she will reach out to Council members for promo materials when the time comes.

V. Panel Recommendations 2016-2017

At 10:19, Beasley introduced the Programs committee: Baza, Kiburi, and Gilbride. Beasley noted this grant season there was a high volume of applications. She said the guiding principle of the committee was to ensure grant fund allocations are consistent and equitable. Beasley said the Council will have to decide on a scenario. Beasley said staff initially had five potential scenarios and that during a committee meeting these were narrowed down to two.

Beasley made several remarks about the Artists in Schools program. She noted that pre-K is now part of the Artists in Schools program in Exposure. She acknowledged the new Artists in Schools Extension program focuses on pre-K to grade 12. Beasley also shared information about AIS Engagement. She further explained Engagement is in school, Exposure includes concerts and plays outside school, and Extension is after school and summer school. Beasley said the explanation was so individuals are aware of the work the Artists in Schools program is doing.

Beasley spoke about the Professional Development program and how the grant scenarios would affect the Creative California Communities program. She reminded the Council that the program goal is to increase vitality and cultural impact in the community.

Beasley noted Gilbride's name should have appeared on the revised version on the agenda. She also explained the unique adjudication process of the Professional Development and Consulting program. Beasley explained the Council would have to vote on a scenario.

Kiburi recognized the hard work of Baza and Beasley in the Program Committee. She expressed the committee's desire to give the Council at least two options without being overwhelmed by numerous scenarios.

Gilbride thanked the Programs Committee for their hard work and for maintaining the principle of consistency and equity. Gilbride elaborated on the differences of Scenario 1 and 2. She shared that in Scenario 1, the greatest impact would be that more funds would be available for other organizations because only applications ranked 6 and 5 would be funded in Creative California Communities. She explained briefly that the vote for the scenario would occur after they have discussed all of the recommendations. (At 10:32, Devis joined the meeting).

Artists in Schools Exposure

At 10:33, Gilbride introduced Miller for the Artists in Schools Exposure. Miller shared it is one of the two funding strands the Council voted on in September's Council meeting. She explained the program is for arts organizations to visit school sites or to get students to professional arts venues. She reminded the Council that it is part of a 40-year arts education program and this new iteration is the Council's

renewed commitment to arts education. Miller highlighted numerous applications were received. She stated 71 applications would be funded. Miller also stated that the program is unique because it gives touring organizations an opportunity to be funded. She added that 27% of the recommended applicants are brand-new organizations. Miller continued that the guidelines focused on underserved students geographically, economically, etc. Miller explained the recommendation would provide funding for 343,000 students, tenfold of the residency programs funded by the CAC. Miller introduced Kate Coltun, her panelist presenter.

Coltun introduced her experience in the panel. She said it provided her exposure to other organizations working in California. She spoke about the cultural “deserts” and “oases”—the differences between urban and rural settings and art access. She spoke of the different ways art encounters impact youth. She said the panel took very seriously the guidelines of the Exposure program. Coltun noted the observations she had of the panel process. She provided the different methods used by organizations. She spoke about creating a rubric based on the particular challenges and program structure for different focus areas. Coltun noted that the strongest applications provided not only an exposure experience but also had a follow-up component in the classroom setting. However, she also added that this cause can access problems because there was the need for a full-time arts educator in the staff. She stated that the goal of the panel was to find the applications that followed the guidelines most authentically. Coltun said the panel recommendation was to make Exposure a single application and for it to not be a part of Engagement. She recommended that the guidelines distinctly outline that Exposure is meant to expose students to highly professional artists. Coltun stated that the grant process could also be more accessible to organizations that do not have grant writers and to ask applicants to define “need” in their own particular community because the vague definition made it difficult for the applicants to understand the argument in their applications. Coltun said that there was low number of applications that connected students to the visual arts. She also expressed the panel would benefit from spending more time with applications. Coltun noted that the panel was not ethnically diverse. Coltun concluded by expressing the importance of this program. Miller invited the council to ask questions.

Harris asked if the Exposure program was a new strand in the Artists in Schools strands. Miller said this is a brand-new funding strand and that the Extension is the oldest program.

Gallegos asked if we are looking at Exposure and Extension separately. Miller answered affirmatively and explained that the deadlines were different deliberately. Gallegos asked why this was done. Miller said the Exposure and the Extension programs deadlines were earlier because of the seasonal nature of the program. She said the Engagement program takes deep collaboration with classroom teachers so they were given more time in the spring to prepare and submit their application. Miller added an organization can apply to multiple programs as long as the project reaches different constituents.

Beasley asked if Miller could speak to the reach to pre-K. Miller said part of the program expansion voted on by the Council in September added pre-K to Artists in Schools. Miller noted that there were four applications recommended in Exposure and five in Extension. She concluded her remarks noting Exposure is a thought-leadership gesture because this has not been done before and she looks forward to the program including more pre-K projects in the future.

Harris thanked Miller and Coltun. Gilbride then asked Miller to introduce Artists in Schools Extension.

Artists Schools Extension

At 10:59, Miller introduced Artists in Schools Extension. She provided background information on the Extension strand of Artists in Schools. She shared that with the Extension there is the opportunity for programs with different age levels at community centers either after school or during the summer months. Miller noted it took three panels to adjudicate. She also noted that some previous Local Impact programs applied. Miller introduced Molly Terbovich-Ridenhour, her panelist representative.

Terbovich-Ridenhour expressed being on the panel provided her an invaluable experience. She spoke about her experiences on the City of San Diego panel compared to the CAC panel. She also shared the importance of time management while reading the applications. Terbovich-Ridenhour recounted the challenges of working with different panelist with their own areas of strengths and how they came together throughout the process. Terbovich-Ridenhour acknowledged the help of Miller facilitating. She mentioned the value of having snacks.

Galli asked for Terbovich-Ridenhour to elaborate on the differences between the city and CAC panel. Terbovich-Ridenhour said the panelists in the city panel were more objective and she perceived the CAC panel to be more emotive-based. She said the city had a stronger rubric. Terbovich-Ridenhour said that using “feeling” language is different. Terbovich-Ridenhour also stated the CAC evaluation process was very clear. She noted it was evident when an organization had an experienced grant writer complete the application. Terbovich-Ridenhour expressed she learned more about the CAC grant process and grant writing in general.

Harris asked if the panelists were able to see through the language of applications that were obviously not written by a grant writer. She said that she believed so but that sometimes it was difficult to understand the goals of the application. She said that having a second round to look at the applications helped see things that were not obvious during the first round. Miller reminded the Council that work samples are part of the application package, which aids the panelists through the grant review process. Terbovich-Ridenhour informed the Council that some applications have concise work samples, whereas others clearly used an iPhone to document. She said that the panel was able to see through the quality of the work sample.

Devis asked if the lack of a strong rubric between the city and state, in her opinion, would have resulted in some of the currently recommended applications to not be considered. Terbovich-Ridenhour said she did not think so, because the scoring system was clear and objectively evaluates. Her concern was the language of how the panel discussed the applications.

Terbovich-Ridenhour offered two suggestions: for panelists to have more time to read the applications and to have the right questions to evaluate the applications.

McGuinness asked how confident Terbovich-Ridenhour felt with the grant review process. Terbovich-Ridenhour said she felt confident to give time to each application equally. Miller reminded the Council of the adjudication process: Apps are evaluated individually and then reviewed again.

Artists Activating Communities

At 11:09, Gilbride introduced Porras. She acknowledged this was Porras' first presentation. Porras directed the Council to Tab D and provided clarification of dates in her memo. She introduced her panelist, Erinn Anova. Porras shared there were two Artists Activating Communities panels in February. She stated a total of 99 applications were received and 62 applications are recommended for funding. She added that funding would be awarded to applications that scored 4, 5, and 6. Porras noted that the Artists Activating Communities program is unique because projects are centered on a lead artist—it allows the artist's voice and projects directly reflect what the community wants. She noted 30% of the applications were returning applicants from the previous year and 40% of those applicants were recommended for funding. Porras noted it is the second year of Artists Activating Communities programming, highlighting that artists are central to civic life and vital to communities.

Porras introduced and shared Anova's background, noting her accomplishments teaching playwriting to foster youth and ESL students. Anova said she was proud to be part of the grant review process and was impressed how organized the entire process was. She noted it was her first time participating. Anova shared that it was apparent there is a lot of careful consideration in the process. Additionally, she noted that it is apparent how much each panelist brought their passions to the grant review process. Anova said the previous panelist to speak at the Council meeting made her think about the grant-writing process, noting that the second round of the process brought together the panelists' differences. She added that it was clearly evident from the applications which ones were written by grant writers. Anova noted that each panelist brought a unique set of expertise. She provided an example about one of her fellow panelists and her passion for writing. Anova shared that this panelist felt passionate about a memoir program for LGBT seniors and the impact it had in its community. She added that in some applications, the ways artists activate their communities were much less apparent. She noted there were numerous different mediums for the different communities—Anova said community impact of the project was central. She stated that the language used by the panelists during the review process is very important. She said that it was a very fair process. Anova stated that were starkly different scores amongst panelists but this helped highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the applications. She concluded the criteria were very helpful.

Harris provided historical context of the grant program. He commented that prior to his involvement with the Council, he spoke to a previous Council member and artist, Peter Coyote—he told him of the 1970s version of the Artists Activating Communities grant. Harris said the goal of the program is to allow artists the opportunity to bring to fruition a project. Harris asked Anova if there were any projects that were really “out there.” Anova responded there were many unique ideas. She said she really enjoyed a particular program in Los Angeles that provides a free, weekly safe space for people to join together in song. She noted that this program said they were hoping to give voice to those that feel voiceless under the Trump administration. She stated that it was also a functional program because the program intends to go to rallies to sing.

Devis asked if the panelists noticed any trends because of the social nature of the programs. Porras responded, noting the type of work that was reoccurring brought attention to gentrification, immigration rights, queer and POC inclusivity, or ethnic-cultural issues. Anova added that there were projects which were a call-to-action of a lead artist musical or ethnic style to be preserved. Porras said there were applicants that did a fusion of cultural/ethnic artworks.

Devis asked what were the kinds of innovative projects did they observe. Anova said the most innovative projects were found in dance. Porras agreed, adding that in theater as well. Porras provided the example of Teatro Campesino being done in Salinas that combines Quiche, Nahuatl and local indigenous languages. She said the goal of the project is to be educational and introduce the languages to each other and others.

Lindo asked if a lot of the work they saw had a focus on social justice. Porras said not all of the projects were but that there was certainly a presence. Anova added that she also noticed a trend of projects focusing on girls.

Harris asked if there is a disqualification process prior to the panel. Gilbride explained unfinished applications are ineligible and do not go to panel. She added that applications that do not meet the program criteria were taken to panel, leaving it to the panel to decide.

Harris asked if some of the applications may have fit in a different program. Anova acknowledged that this was often the case. McGuinness asked if applicants applied into the wrong program, if they are notified. Gilbride responded that the applicant was unable to apply to another program because the deadlines had past, but it did open up the opportunity to begin technical assistance.

Gallegos commented several programs appear innovative and she said she appreciated the informative descriptions in the Council book. Harris thanked Porras and Anova for their presentation.

11:30 Break

Creative California Communities

At 11:40, Harris called the meeting back to order. Gilbride asked the Council to turn to Tab H and introduced Creative California Communities. She reminded Council that the CAC is still looking to fill an Arts Program Specialist position that would administer this program.

Gilbride began by reminding the Council that Scenario 1 would largely affect Creative California Communities because only applicants that scored 5 and 6 would be funded. In Scenario 2, applicants that scored 4, 5, and 6 would be funded, but funds would be taken from other programs. She noted that there were two Creative California Communities grant review panels for a total of 95 applications. She reminded Council that Creative California Communities funds large-scale creative placemaking programs over a two-year grant period.

Gilbride reminded the Council that they approved changes in the guidelines. The changes resulted in splitting the program in two parts to ensure equitable distributions. Gilbride stated the first day of panel focused on large organization, small organizations were adjudicated on the second day, and the third day was the second review of the applications. She added that this program focuses on issues relevant to the community development and honors the residents of communities. Gilbride noted that the panelists were rigorous and knowledgeable. She stated that the discussions centered on the role of creative placemaking, the possibility of it being an agent of positive change but also addressing the dangerous aspects when artists are considered to be gentrifiers. Gilbride thanked all of the panelists for their discussions. She noted that Creative California Communities also received four planning applications. Gilbride added that 30% of applicants were applicants last year and 50% were funded. Gilbride recognized the role of the panelists and noted their ability to read grants and recognize quality applications that clearly explain their project without necessarily hiring a grant writer. Gilbride introduced Anjanette Maraya-Ramey, Senior Manager of Arts and Culture Funding Programs from the City of San Diego.

Maraya-Ramey thanked Gilbride for her introduction and noted it was her second time serving on a panel. She added that she is a grantmaker for the City of San Diego. Maraya-Ramey said she is also a grant writer and has been inside of nonprofit organizations. Being on the panel gave her a scope of what's happening across the state. She acknowledged the hard work of staff and enjoyed the snacks. Maraya-Ramey acknowledged the rigorous criteria of the grant review process. She said the panel paid attention to the potential harm that can be brought into communities if organizations are coming into communities as gentrifiers. Maraya-Ramey added that the panel focused on the potential impact of projects.

Devis asked how the panel identified and defined gentrifiers. Maraya-Ramey responded that the panel focused on the idea of social capital in the community—the level of support and need of the project in the community. Gilbride said throughout the panel it became very clear that art organizations and the local partner had social capital in the community and that community needs were being addressed. Gilbride added the panel questioned whether the community would be part of the decision-making process. Maraya-Ramey acknowledged the language used in the application was very important.

Harris asked about project permanence. Maraya-Ramey stated temporary events were considered but not usually part of the higher ranked application. Galli asked why. Maraya-Ramey responded because the place was not defined and temporal quality of the project did not typically address the need of the community and may not have the long-term impact the program guidelines request. Galli asked why one-time festivals were not funded. Gilbride added if the applicant was able to explain how the festival would result in long-term change in the community it probably did well, and the applicant had to also demonstrate that the creators and participants are of the community.

Coppola asked if a festival could be a pilot program for the future. He gave the example of a film festival. Gilbride said the applicant would be a strong candidate if the film festival was responding to a need of the community. Maraya-Ramey said the panelists also considered whether the applicant was a

project or creative placemaking. Harris remarked on the rigor with which the definition of the creative placemaking was kept in the grant review process.

Maraya-Ramey highlighted the attention the panelists paid to the potential of gentrification. She said as she reviewed applications she focused on the “so what?”—asking what is going to change in the community by funding the project. She noted exemplary organizations were in fact very exemplary. Harris asked what was the difference in quality between the applications that scored 5 and 4. Maraya-Ramey responded that there was a clear distinction between 4 and 5. She said that the projects tended to be great but were not very good at articulating the design of the project and demonstrating need.

Beasley asked why if Los Angeles County was 25% of applications, only 4% were funded, asking if it was because there was no “place.” Gilbride responded that this is a geographic trend. She said she consulted Joel Garcia from Self Help Graphics about this. Gilbride said that in the Bay Area there is organizational support in the community, such as Community Arts Stabilization Trust and PolicyLink, in order to cut back gentrification. Gilbride said technical assistance around creative placemaking in L.A. may be lacking to build up community authentically. She added because of everything that is happening (regarding gentrification) that the role of artist as gentrifiers is a one-sided conversation rather than bringing together both sides. Gilbride said Garcia reminded her that Southern California does not have the same kind of philanthropic support like the Bay Area.

Devis remarked that in the Bay Area there is already an institutionalized language around creative placemaking. He added that gentrification is at different levels in different areas. Devis stated that if 64% projects are to be funded in the Bay Area, the assumption might be that gentrification is not occurring in other areas. Harris responded to Devis, noting that in the Creative California Communities program there is an expectation for there to be a cultural collaboration. Gilbride added that Garcia expressed that the Bay Area applicants were able to identify policy change by the creative placemaking project and that Los Angeles was not there yet. She also reminded the Council that the panel looks at the applications without considering their geographical areas.

Devis noted incredible projects are occurring all over California and added there is a need to give assistance to the groups. Maraya-Ramey said the representation of San Diego applicants indicated there could be a lot more technical training done, such as fundamental language that has not been introduced to the area. Maraya-Ramey recommended training and planning grants so they are successful in creative placemaking.

FOLLOW UP: Technical assistance in Southern California

McGuinness said that the conversation makes it appear that the grant is combating gentrification, which is not the case. Gilbride said that is correct but it is a common theme in the applications. She noted across the state that this is an issue in urban areas but not in rural communities. Maraya-Ramey mentioned the rural typically demonstrated different concepts.

Harris reminded the Council that this program is part of the crux of the funding scenario decision.

Local Impact

At 12:05 p.m., Gilbride introduced Porras and Mitch Menchaca. Porras noted there were three panels for 203 applications across California. She stated that the program is rooted in cultivating art in communities, such as those identified as underserved and need equalizing access to the community. Porras introduced and provided the background of Menchaca from the Association California Symphony Orchestras.

Menchaca shared he was excited to have been a part of the Local Impact panel and he thanked staff for making the panel a great process. He said that the panel worked well together and created community, which is at the root of the Local Impact program. He said he was excited about the breadth of the projects, including for orchestras (asked to be on the record) to community arts groups, etc.—making communities better through the arts. Menchaca noted that the panel had a strong definition of what an underserved community is, and how this definition may change depending on the community. Menchaca noted this program centers on grassroots organizations. He said that there had to be openness to alternative grant writing. Menchaca said a challenge of the program was the name of the program itself, because many applicants made a particular location the basis of their application rather than considering non-geographical borders. He said there is a clear need to provide technical assistance to these organizations and make it clearer in the guidelines that the community does not have to be geographical. Menchaca added some applicants were deemed ineligible because of the amount requested. He said that there need to be some leniency with applications because many of the organizations are small but represent the diversity of California.

Harris thanked Menchaca and asked if the Council had any questions. No one had questions. Gilbride introduced Bonillo.

Professional Development and Consulting

At 12:17, Bonillo introduced the Professional Development and Consulting program. The applications were reviewed by a staff panel; this is the second deadline to the Professional Development and Consulting program this year. Bonillo stated 324 applications were received over both deadlines. She added the need for organizations to build their capacity is clearly identified through this demand. Bonillo reminded the Council of the two categories available under this program, consulting services and professional development. Organizations who did not receive funding in the fall deadline were invited to improve their application based on the panel's comments and to reapply at the spring deadline.

Bonillo added that the panel focused on the longevity of the impact of the grant activities. Direct fundraising activities and ongoing consulting activities were not eligible activities. She noted 45% of recommended grantees have not been funded by the CAC in the past three years. Harris pointed out the value of this program to support organizations and regions who may not be fully represented in other grant programs.

Galli spoke to the value of this program. She felt that this grant program has a very large impact for the field and also for future CAC grantees. She said she believes that Professional Development and

Consulting grants can help organizations succeed in many ways. She would like the Council to consider in the future increasing their investment in this program.

Harris asks Bonillo to provide an example of what a consulting project may look like. Bonillo provides an example of a strategic planning grant project and the consulting components that may be involved.

Statewide and Regional Networks

At 12:28, Bonillo introduced the Statewide and Regional Networks program and the purpose of the program. There was a 66% increase in applications two years ago, when the definition of regional was expanded. She noted five new organizations were recommended for funding this year.

Bonillo introduced the State Regional Networks panel chair, Victoria Hamilton. Hamilton thanked the Council for the opportunity to serve as a panelist. She said she felt the panel experience was a very worthwhile investment of her time. Hamilton thanked the staff for their efforts in facilitating the panel process. Hamilton noted that many of the applications ranked 3 were new to the program, and it is likely their approach to the program will improve over time. Hamilton remarked that all applications recommended for funding are worthy of the Statewide and Regional Networks designation. Galli asked for clarification on the history of funding lower-ranked applications. Gilbride responded that in the CAC's two general operating support grant programs, Statewide and Regional Networks and State-Local Partners, all applicants who are deemed eligible with a rank of 3 or higher are recommended for funding.

Baza acknowledged Hamilton's long service to the San Diego arts community and thanked her for her service.

Bonillo commented on the strength of California's multicultural organizations. She expected a growth in regional applicants in this area in the future.

At 12:37, the Council began discussing the possibility of the two funding scenarios.

Harris led the discussion of the scenarios—he reiterated the difference between the two scenarios. He noted that it is a big decision.

McGuinness said that the decision is philosophical. She stated that Scenario 2 is macro and Scenario 1 is micro. She added by reducing Creative California Communities, focusing on applicants that scored 5 and 6, there is the opportunity to serve smaller community projects in the other programs.

Galli asked if the Council will vote on the individual programs based on Scenario 1 or 2. Gilbride responded the vote would be for the complete funding recommendations in either Scenario 1 or 2 as they are presented. Gilbride said that if applications that scored 4 were funded in Creative California Communities, all of the other programs would receive less funding. She added that 17 more programs being funded in Creative California Communities, because the requested amounts are so high, would affect 100 projects in other programs and would also impact the programs that need to be voted on in

June. Gilbride said that Creative California Communities is very different from the other programs because the projects are bigger and more costly. She said it is also very competitive. She said the philosophical difference is Scenario 1 funds only the strongest larger projects for two years.

Beasley noted that with Scenario 2, the applicants that scored 4 would only get 70% of the requested funds. There could be a question as to whether they can do the project in a way that the CAC is proud of the work.

Lindo asked if grantees ever expect to get 100% of their requested amount. Gilbride said there is precedent for it. Kiburi said that the exemplary score would set a different precedent.

Galli asked if the vote would be chosen through majority. Harris said it would be and asked if there was further discussion.

Devis asked if there is a way in the future to fund Cultural Districts because of the relationship between Creative California Communities and Cultural Districts. Gilbride said there will be a more in-depth discussion about Cultural Districts. She also noted that during the Creative California Communities evaluation period, there will be an opportunity to see the relationship between Cultural Districts and Creative California Communities. Fitzwater said at the moment there is a significant difference between Cultural Districts and Creative California Communities but a common thread is evident. Devis said there should be a consideration of the vocabulary of these programs and expanding the definition would open up new opportunities. Baza reminded the Cultural Districts program is a pilot and site visits are happening.

Harris asked if there were any other comments. Lindo asked why not fund as many people of possible. She said why not spread the wealth. McGuinness noted there is an immediate need, whereas under Creative California Communities there is more time. She added that the goal of the CAC is to fund diverse programs, and the Creative California Communities would take a lot of funds. Coppola noted it is important to have a diversity of programs to demonstrate the success of the CAC. Galli responded to Lindo's comment, noting that smaller organizations would be hurt if Scenario 2 is funded. Baza said he agreed with Galli. Lindo said that the Creative California Communities program is large and wants to know if there will be a program in place to monitor the project. Gilbride said there will be monitoring and only applicants that demonstrated they could complete the project were considered.

ACTION ITEM: Harris asked for a motion to approve funding Scenario 1. At 1:06, Galli moved. Coppola seconds. The motion passed with 8 "Yes" votes from Baza, Beasley, Coppola, Devis, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, and McGuinness. Lindo voted "No." Oliver and Wyman are absent.

Baza commended Gilbride. He noted Beasley and himself wrestled with the funding scenario possibilities. Gilbride added that the other three scenarios said it did not meet equitable and consistency of grants.

VI. Cultural Districts Update

Kiburi introduced the Cultural Districts topic and reminded the Council there is not any funding. She acknowledged it is a hybrid program. Fitzwater expressed she was excited to provide the memo and the amount of work in the program process. Fitzwater acknowledged this program is setting a precedent in the state. The extensive public input for the best practices of the program note the diversity of the state. She stated 43 applications were received but expressed many communities are interested in this program. She said many self-selected out because they realize the importance of the program. Fitzwater said there were many letters of intent. Fitzwater said she asked Baza to participate in the panel because he participated in many of the public input meetings. Fitzwater noted the site visits for the program have begun and will continue until June 2. She noted all the site visits are strong contenders. She added some districts will be considered for elimination. Fitzwater said even weaker applicants demonstrated unique potential as a districts as an authentic participation from the community. Fitzwater directed the Council to the map in Tab I. Fitzwater said that suburban category was challenging, however rural and urban identities tend to have strong identities. The timeline is tentative but Council will likely vote on Cultural Districts in the summer—likely telephonically.

Lindo asked how many districts will be part of the first cohort. Fitzwater said there is likely to be 15 district recommendations. She continued to provide the unique perspectives in the Cultural Districts panel.

Baza spoke about the responsibilities and provided definitions of the categories in the review process, noting the difference from emerging, midpoint, and established districts. Baza expressed that he felt privileged to take part in the panel process and noted that Council members normally do not participate on the panel. He noted that the panelists were prepared for the panel and diverse, also in discipline. Baza said many of the applications were robust. Baza noted that the issue of gentrification was heavily noted in Oakland and Los Angeles input meetings. Baza recommended Council members visit the Cultural Districts application sites. He noted many applications will get notes with recommendations, and concluded that if the CAC is successful, it will prove to be a great program.

Beasley asked if any of the legislators wrote recommendations for their districts to be part of the program. Fitzwater said that they did, but in an appropriate manner. She said this was reflected in the form of letters from government officials. There was a transparent process in the timeline.

Fitzwater shared the benefits of becoming a Cultural District. She added that the Cultural Districts will benefit from convening and technical assistance. She added that there is a \$5,000 stipend to assist with the work and the goal is for the locations to improve the program. It would be a shared learning opportunity. Fitzwater said it would be leverage to have this designation.

Gallegos said this is about economic development for the arts. She added that it is about turning things around and acknowledging that in some areas this will change the communities. Gallegos said the application requirements of three letters are not enough to understand community support for the designation.

Fitzwater said that there will be community meetings when the designation will take place. She added that the application needs to be manageable and the first application needs to be accessible. She said special attention will be paid to noting whether the program will be harmful to the existing community.

Kiburi remarked the site visits are an important component of the designation. Kiburi noted she will participate in nine visits.

VII. Honoring Craig Watson

Harris shared the contributions of Watson during his leadership at the CAC. Harris asked the Council and staff around the table to share. Lindo shared her first impressions about Watson. She acknowledged Watson's dedication and encouraged that the work with the CAC is a civic duty. Lindo remarked on the California Association of Museums reception and accepting the award on the behalf of Craig. Coppola said Watson is a superstar. Gallegos said Watson made her feel welcome. Baza shared his experiences in the many years knowing Watson prior to the Council meeting. Beasley spoke about meeting Watson for the first time. She said it was a joy and honor to have met. Kiburi playfully remarked it was her third time saying goodbye and thanked Watson for his leadership. Galli said she was grateful for the sense of belonging he created for her on the Council. Devis mentioned feeling part of the CAC and acknowledged the work of Watson to make the CAC valuable again. McGuinness said gravitas has been an important aspect of Watson's work. Fitzwater also playfully remarked it was her third goodbye as well and said it was an honor working with him the last four years and noted the success of the CAC. Moscoso was thankful for the unique art gifts Watson would leave staff.

Dana Springs represented the Mayor. She said he proclaimed the day Craig Watson Day. The resolution acknowledged the growth of the CAC, Arts in Corrections, VIA grants, and development of Cultural Districts. Springs also acknowledged her personal interactions with Watson and shared an anecdote.

Deluge Smith (Youth Symphony) and Victoria Hamilton (incoming president) from Californians for the Arts shared next. Smith provided an anecdote regarding the period when the CAC had lost its funding. He mentioned the profound difference Watson's leadership had made while the position was not government appointed. This was a benefit he leveraged this advantage and allowed for growth. Smith said on behalf of the board, his partnership with the CAC had an incredible impact. Smith also acknowledged that Watson upheld the highest principles and presented Watson a gift.

Harris presented the gifts from the CAC Council and staff—a photographic journey with notes. Fitzwater explained the book gift was to commemorate his time at the CAC.

Watson provided some updates. He spoke about his trip to San Miguel de Allende, Mexico, noting it is known as an art city. Senator Ben Allen asked Watson to facilitate a talk with the Canadian Minister of Culture. It was a public meeting in Southern California. He added that he gave a morning keynote address for the Association of Major Symphony Orchestra Volunteers, and lead campaign targeting influencers in the Republican delegation in California. He also recounted a meeting with Ali Baba, the "Google" in China. He remarked they are opening an office in Pasadena focusing on film. He will help

with a project to film nonprofits. Watson noted he has been very busy and has been asked to join five different art boards. Watson expressed the importance of the staff and is proud to have served and build the team. He said he plans on attending future meetings.

VIII. Public Comment

At 12:36, Harris calls for the Public Comment. The following individuals provided public comment:

- **John Highkin, Fern Street Circus**
He remarked that they are getting funded through Local Impact and Artists in Schools Extension. He said he started the circus in 1990 and it went dormant, until it restarted in 2014. Highkin said that the CAC got them started again. He thanked the CAC for their work.
- **Jessica Monahan, California Association of Museums**
Thanked Gilbride, Kiburi, and Watson for helping their organization. She noted how they have extended resources for accessibility.
- **Lynette Tessitine, Cultural Arts Manager for City of Chula Vista**
She is looking to support cultural organizations in the South Bay region. Tessitine said they are looking to create infrastructure for those that do not have a voice. She noted that the area does not have a regional arts council to translate it to the city. She said she would appreciate technical assistance.
- **Barry Edelstein, The Old Globe**
Edelstein shared they are the largest arts organization in San Diego and fifth largest regional theater in the country. He noted that they have sent shows to Broadway and have sent 30,000 patrons to shows for free. He also provided information about their work with veterans and the homeless. He noted that they have received three grants from the CAC. Edelstein expressed his fear that public funding will leave the arts and asked the CAC to maintain its dedication to distributing public funds.
- **Scott Hickey on behalf of Steve Dilley, Veterans Art Project**
Hickey said this program is important to him because he is a veteran himself. He said it is a free program for community members to create any type of art. Currently the work has been focused on casting. He noted that he works with Tony the Vet. Hickey said that they are funded by a private donor. He concluded his public comment noting that there is a veterans exhibition in Oceanside in May.
- **Linnea Searle, Playwrights Project**
Searle said Playwrights Project works on several projects with the CAC but most importantly the Arts in Corrections program because it has transformed their program. She said that they have worked with incarcerated youth and it has been informative to see the experience of adults so as

an organization they can continue to improve their program and disrupt the school-to-prison pipeline. She thanked the CAC for their work.

- **Nicolas Rexeles, San Diego Opera**
He thanked the CAC for their generous support. He said he is delighted at the possibility of Barrio Logan being considered for the Cultural Districts designation. Rexeles said that they are currently working on a project that will create opera from stories in the communities. He said that it is called Opera Hack, a meeting of opera and high tech.
- **Marissa Cassani, Barrio Logan/Urban Corps**
Cassani expressed that she is thankful that Barrio Logan is being considered for a Cultural Districts designation. She said that it is very special because the community has struggled very hard to maintain its authenticity.
- **Mark Steele, Barrio Logan Planning Group**
Steele said he moved to Barrio Logan nine years ago. He said it is an area of multigenerational communities, a unique space and very authentic. Steele said that it is more than art, it is the community. He noted it is both an historic and emerging community.
- **Josephine S. Talamantez, Chicano Park Museum**
Talamantez said she is excited to see the Chicano rock opera. She thanked the CAC and reminded the Council she worked there for 26 years. She thanked the Council for closing the meeting in Rosie Hamlin's honor because she was a local. Talamantez noted she is part of Barrio Logan Association and she is working on creating the Chicano Park Museum Cultural Center.
- **Mary (Unable to transcribe entire name) Seated Commissioner in San Diego and Makeda Cheatom, World Beat Cultural Center**
Makeda spoke about her organization, World Beat Cultural Center. She said she is from Barrio Logan. She noted that she has a cultural center in Tijuana called Casa del Tuno. She shared about an exhibition for the 50th anniversary of the Black Panthers.
- **Tony LoBue, Tony the Vet**
He thanked the CAC for supporting the arts and especially for creating and maintaining the Veterans Initiative in the Arts. He said that the funding helped a joint proposal for an exhibition. He said the last time the Council was in San Diego, he had asked the CAC to consider more San Diego commissioners to the Council and veterans as panelists. He said he is pleased to see that his voice was heard.

IX. Reentry through the Arts Panelists

At 2:36, Gilbride reminded the Council they approved the Reentry guidelines in January's meeting. She noted the panel will begin on May 23. Gilbride said that it is important that the panelist have special knowledge about incarceration populations and settings. She said that she reached out to Homeboy Industries for recommendations. Gilbride asked the Council to approve the panel pool.

ACTION ITEM: Harris asked for a motion for staff to approve the panel pool. At 2:38, McGuinness moved. Lindo seconds. The motion passed 8-0 with “Yes” votes from Baza, Beasley, Coppola, Devis, Gallegos, Galli, Harris, Lindo, and McGuinness. Beasley, Oliver, and Wyman are absent.

X. Adjournment

The Council honored the memory of singer of “Angel Baby,” Rosie Hamlin. Lindo requested to also honor Jonathan Eubanks, a documentarian and portrait photographer from Oakland that was most famously known for his photographs of the Black Panther Party. At 2:40, Harris asks for a motion to adjourn. Baza moves to adjourn. Gallegos seconds. The motion passed at 2:41 with 8-0 votes from Coppola, Galli, Harris, Lindo, and McGuinness. Beasley, Oliver, and Wyman are absent.