



Strengthening arts, culture,
and creative expression as the
tools to cultivate a better
California for all.

Gavin Newsom, **Governor**
Jonathan Moscone, **Executive Director**
2750 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300, Sacramento CA 95833
(916) 322-6555 | www.arts.ca.gov

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

October 27, 2022

10:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

The members of the California Arts Council convened via web conference to discuss and vote on various items as listed in the minutes below. The full audio and video of the meeting can be accessed [here](#).

PRESENT:

Council Members

Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Chair
Consuelo (Chelo) Montoya, Vice-Chair
Gerald Clarke (joined for the afternoon session)
Vicki Estrada
Jodie Evans
Ellen Gavin
Roxanne Messina Captor

Arts Council Staff

Ayanna Kiburi, Deputy Director
Liz Azevedo, Director of Program Services
Kimberly Brown, Public Affairs Specialist
Mark DeSio, Director of Public Affairs
Kristin Margolis, Director of Legislative Affairs

1. Call to Order

Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez opened the meeting at 10:02 a.m. and expressed appreciation for all the Council members who took time to prepare and attend.

2. Acknowledgement of Tribal Land

Deputy Director Kiburi gave the following tribute:

“The California Arts Council recognizes the original caretakers of these sacred lands within the state of California and throughout the United States. As guests, we pay respect to their stewardship of the air, the water, and land, and uplift their legacies as they continue to build and sustain their culture and practices today, and for seven generations. As the Council does its work

it will seek ways to carry out our responsibility as stewards of the land, and our responsibility to ensure that all people are strengthened and supported.”

3. Roll Call and Establishment of a Quorum

Ms. Margolis conducted a roll call. Present were Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice Chair Chelo Montoya, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, and Roxanne Messina Captor.

Ms. Margolis announced that quorum was achieved.

4. Chair’s Report

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez thanked staff and the Legislature for making it possible to finish National Arts and Humanities Month on a very high note. While visiting many of the cultural districts across the state, she had found strong and important spaces for arts development and creativity.

She reminded her colleagues of the importance of the decisions they make as Council members. We are called upon to identify funding opportunities, create new programs, and make decisions on continuing programs and ending programs. As we do this, we need to be conscious of the fact that as programs come and go, there are people associated with those programs. We need to make a determination to cause no harm to the field. Our decisions may benefit one population and displace another; that is why we use the decision support tool before we come to a vote.

5. Voting Item: [Minutes from Previous Council Meeting](#)

Ms. Gavin requested a change of the word “scholarship” to “fellowship” on page 24.

MOTION: Councilmember Estrada moved to approve the September 15, 2022 Meeting Minutes. Councilmember Messina Captor seconded the motion.

Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice Chair Chelo Montoya, Vicki Estrada, Jodie Evans, Ellen Gavin, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

6. Public Comment

Ms. Gavin commented that she was very disappointed that the opportunity to visit the cultural districts was not made available to the entire Council, as the Legislators had wanted to limit the number of members. The Council is to set policy and program, and the staff is to implement them. If the Council had been able to go and understand the cultural districts, there would be buy-in and energy from the members. We must be able to know and understand what we are fighting for. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez wholeheartedly agreed on the importance of Council

members being out in the field, experiencing firsthand the activities in progress. Moving forward, staff and the Executive Committee intend to engage more members on these visits. This had been an unusual opportunity: an invitation from the Legislature not initiated by the Council. Because of Bagley-Keene limits, it had been the Executive Committee that was invited. This had not been the Council's call.

Ms. Evans commented that before Covid, the Council had met at the locations of local partners. This had resulted in the familiarity and inspiration that Ms. Gavin was seeking. It is a shame that we cannot meet like this anymore. Ms. Evans encouraged that the next meeting be in-person. Being in the field nourishes us as we give our time.

Vice-Chair Montoya reviewed the [memo on this topic that was supplied in the packet](#). She and Chair Gonzáles-Chávez had been able to have rich discussion with the leaders of the cultural districts, and the Legislators had led valuable discourse around the struggles the districts had had. There is wide variety among the districts which range from Nevada City to Little Tokyo. Vice-Chair Montoya hoped to build in such opportunities to meet with the people on the ground for future Council meetings. She encouraged the Council members to keep a lookout for opportunities such as juried art shows to visit the cultural districts on their own. She apologized that this opportunity could not be extended further this round.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez noted that Committee Chair Ben Allen and Assemblymember Boerner Horvath had been the initiators and coordinators of this process. They are the Chairs of the Joint Committee on the Arts.

Ms. Messina Captor agreed with Ms. Gavin that sometimes new members feel a disconnect between Council members and staff. They wonder where things come from and how they happen. Ben Allen represents her district and happens to be a personal friend; it would have been valuable for Ms. Messina Captor to be a part of this visit. The Strategic Framework Committee intends to address this issue of the need for better communication.

Ms. Estrada commented that there is nothing to prevent individual Council members from visiting local arts districts. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez confirmed that nothing keeps individual Council members from visiting any site, grantee, or program; our role as ambassadors is wide.

Ms. Gavin pointed out that it is different when you are invited to go as an official member of the Council. We need to deal with Bagley Keene; if we need to publicly notice a meeting because it will have more than two members, then we can do so. We are soon to get five new Council members. As people step off, their knowledge goes with them. Ms. Gavin wanted to see a vibrant, engaged Council with busy subcommittees that can have more than two Council members and also have outside members. This agency has gotten some bounty lately which is exciting. Communication is key, as is the opportunity to engage with the field.

Ms. Margolis mentioned that Bagley-Keene is actually good for us because it forces transparency in our work. We are going to be holding cultural district meetings that can be noticed; she agreed with Ms. Gavin. It is not just cultural districts – it is all our programs. Staff is doing great work and the Council is setting policy that staff should be witnessing. Ms. Margolis thanked Chair Gonzáles-Chávez and Vice-Chair Montoya for taking the time to participate in the cultural district visits; she hoped that all the Council members would get out there more.

Ms. Messina Captor pointed out that as a new member, she would not know how to conduct a district visit on her own. She is new to the process. Some guidance is needed to make this clear.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez thanked everyone for sharing their thoughts on this issue. It has been challenging during the time she has served on the Council. She had joined the Council during Covid, and this had been the first time she was able to go out and visit sites. Staff has the intention for Council members to visit sites and programs, but it is important for staff to know that the Council wants to do this. We can ask staff to assist us in making those connections.

Vice-Chair Montoya commented that she had served on the Legislative Committee for three years. These times have been unusual with Covid making us unable to travel. We had laid out several iterations of plans to separate the different regions, ensuring that Council members could engage with Legislators in their area. We are now ready to start that work, being mindful of Bagley-Keene.

Ms. Margolis noted that we are ramping up for the next Legislative session. We hope to have new Council members coming on, and there will probably be a shuffle on the Council regarding committee work and so on. There are some hot bills such as SB 628 which would have us working with the Workforce Development Board. Ms. Margolis would love to see the Council involved with that. Also, as Legislative Director, she can answer questions that Council may have.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez then explained the purpose and prohibitions for making Public Comment at CAC meetings. Ms. Margolis explained the process and provided specific instructions.

Live public comment:

Jennifer Lane, Executive Director of the San Benito County Arts Council, highlighted the preliminary recommendation in the CAC Policy Committee's report to maintain strong partnerships with local, regional, and statewide partners as exemplified through the SLP State and Local Partners (SLP) / Statewide and Regional Networks (SRN), and folk and traditional art programs. She provided an example of how the networks are strengthened through these grant programs, which then creates opportunities to strengthen local arts support and funding. Recently the Central Coast Art Partners were awarded a California Creative Corps grant. The success of their collaboration is due largely to the trust they have built through the SLP program. The opportunity to work together across county lines will benefit artists and organizations in a significant way. The San Benito County Arts Council is also part of a regional collaborative of SLPs that recently applied to administer the Individual Artist Fellowship Program led by SV Creates. Broad systems thinking is essential to the Council's work to positively impact all parts of the state.

Marie Acosta commented on direct funding to arts-producing organizations and artists in California. At one time, the CAC was their go-to funding agency. She hoped that we go back to that, because so much support is needed by organizations that lobby for their funding but never get it because it gets re-granted. The SLPs should have the job of getting more of their local organizations to receive money directly from the CAC, because they rely on CAC support to create. As a legacy artist, she has found that it has been imperative to receive direct support from

the CAC. Working arts-producing organizations and artists have no voice at the CAC. Please do not forget us.

Alexandra Urbanowski of Silicon Valley Creates spoke in support of the recommended Administering Organization (AO) grants for the individual artists fellowship program. SV Creates has been pleased to collaborate with 15 other SLPs to submit the proposal to serve Region 3 for the Individual Artist fellowship grant program.

Milena Deleva, Executive Director of the Association of Arts Administration Educators, commented that they had submitted their first grant proposal for the Arts Administrators Pipeline last summer. It had been difficult to obtain technical assistance for matters not covered by the FAQ. CAC staff capacity must be strained because it was difficult to get a response. She would also appreciate a clearer definition of the funding criteria.

Rachel Osajima, Executive Director of the Alameda County Arts Commission, acknowledged and appreciated the CAC Policy Committee's report which outlines considerations for the CAC grant programs opening in 2023 – specifically the focus on maintaining strong partnerships through the SLP program. She also valued the Policy Committee's statement that the field is in strong need of general operating support, and that the committee is focused on the goal of consolidating the CAC's grant programs. She also expressed appreciation to the CAC for working with the SLPs on the equity assessment.

Anthony A. LoBue, San Diego Viet Nam War veteran and artist, Founder and Director of Arts for Veterans, had been reviewing the website and did not see how CAC is actively promoting veterans in the arts as they had done a couple of years ago. He wanted to know how he could participate more fully with the Council and his community partners, and promote more activities, education, and opportunities for veteran artists. He offered to participate in promoting veterans in the arts.

Written public comment submissions:

- Janis Butler Holm (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

I hope the CAC has plans to restore individual Arts and Accessibility grants. The disability community is really in need of your help.

- Karen Moreland (She/They), San Diego County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

While much of the nation is moving toward a mentality that “the pandemic is over” or “life is back to normal,” for the Arts we believe the recovery will be a multi-year process. As a direct beneficiary of the Arts and Cultural Operating Relief Grant to support our Youth Theatre programs, continued viability as an operating organization would have been at risk if not for the support of grants and donors. As we move back into a more traditional program schedule, the combination of cost increases and service providers to our programs whose businesses were damaged by pandemic hardships has made it clear that in our world things are a long way from

normal. We worked incredibly hard as a volunteer board to ensure that we could keep theatre alive for students, including providing outdoor rehearsal and performance spaces and absorbing significant costs when venues became unavailable or performances were delayed. The creative outlet and safe-distance socialization that our participants experienced supported their mental health during the pandemic shut downs. But providing those services came at a cost for us and for so many organizations like ours. It is our hope that the Council will consider continuing to offer Operative Relief Grants for at least one additional program year while small organizations continue to get back on their feet as independent, financially self-sustaining organizations. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

- Richard Stein, Arts Orange County, Orange County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

Today, your Policy Committee is recommending some streamlining of the CAC's grants programs, which we welcome wholeheartedly. And we are pleased to see that the Committee is also asking you to consider the possible reinstatement of a few targeted programs. Among these is the Veterans in the Arts. You may not know this about the origins of this program, but in 2015, when CAC had minimal funding, the Legislature offered an allocation to create a Veterans Initiative in the Arts pilot program open to State-Local Partners. The Legislature intentionally targeted this underserved population in the hope that veterans would benefit from it creatively and therapeutically. The Legislature was very pleased with the results, and because their confidence in the CAC grew through this program, so did their willingness to invest larger amounts of money to fund a wider menu of grant programs proposed by CAC. The Veterans in the Arts program grants were opened up to all applicants after its pilot year, and many impactful programs around the state have benefited veterans and provided employment to artists. During the pandemic, the CAC felt it was necessary to pool various grants programs to be funneled into relief funding. This had the unintended consequence of CAC-funded veterans arts programs losing their funding. Now that the portfolio of programs is being reviewed and possibly reordered, we hope that you will reinstate the Veterans in the Arts grants program. Thank you!

- TJ Walkup (He/Him/His), Omnific Pictures, Solano County

First thank you. I wish to say that it is my hope to be awarded a grant at some point from you. I work on documentaries about people, mostly creative people. I would hope that you make available grant writers for film makers as it is an increasingly difficult task to be funded and many film makers outside of the Hollywood system sacrifice so much to be heard. The voices elevated in documentary work are remembered. Please pair documentary film makers with grant writers. We need to have support for the work we do it is important for legacy. Thank you for all you already do for the arts it is essential work. TJ Walkup

- Hellen Smith (She/Her/Hers), Orange County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 7. Voting Item: Grant Programs Allocations; 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

Hello! My questions are: 1) how does CAC determine ranking? and 2) why for some programs rank of 3 or rank of 4 are sufficient to recommend a proposal for funding but in other it isn't.

Thank you very much!

- Dennis Vincent (He/Him/His), Ventura County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 7. Voting Item: Grant Programs Allocations; 8. Discussion Item:
Proposed Grants for 2023

I believe it is very important to provide funding for youth development and improve access to education grants for music and arts non profits. The arts have been getting the short end of the proverbial stick since the beginning of COVID. Arts education is slipping away due to a lack of funding and it is so important to provide opportunity to underserved youth and general enrichment in communities throughout CA. All sorts of organizations have been getting emergency funding but the arts have been ignored. Please find the funds to support the arts, especially music education in our schools. It is almost going to be too late if we don't step up now and make a difference.

- Anonymous, Los Angeles County

How and when will the Individual Artist application process be made available with guidelines and deadline? I was told it would be August and then the Fall of 2022, but this has come and gone but no word on when then.

- Joshua Lamont (He/Him/His), Los Angeles County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

As an artist and arts administrator who has worked with small to mid-sized organizations, it is extremely important to fund general operating and capacity-building support. In the past two years, there have been a growing number of nascent organizations, many of them fiscally-sponsored and many of them working for and led by people of color. If the Council is serious about its EDI work, then it is imperative that they invest in the infrastructure of these smaller organizations. It is not enough for them to be funded for a project, but to be funded to function. Leaders are still not paying themselves for their work. Staff positions are still underfunded. Budgets are still needing to be cut and not grown. CAC's recognition of relief needed from the COVID pandemic is admirable and very much appreciated. Now, we need to move away from relief to stability.

It is important to note that 2028 is coming sooner than we all think. The eyes of the world will be on California and every other sector will be grossly funded. Artists and arts organizations need to feel heard, understood, and FUNDED NOW. It will be too late to begin thinking about this in 2025-26. The organizations who would be called upon will have closed their doors by then. I urge CAC to continue to apply pressure to the California legislature to support the arts and culture sector. If the Council believes that \$1 per capita is enough for the whole state, then we are severely undervaluing the role Arts have in our lives.

- Joshua Lamont (He/Him/His), Los Angeles County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 7. Voting Item: Grant Programs Allocations

I would like to support the Council's recommendations to support Los Angeles Performance Practice. The organization has helped multiple emerging and mid-level artists develop their work, grow their audiences, and sustain their businesses. The organization is more than capable to handle the funds from the Council and will do the Los Angeles region a great service. We are lucky to have them here in LA.

- Milena Deleva, Association of Arts Administration Educators (AAAE), Los Angeles County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 7. Voting Item: Grant Programs Allocations

I'd like to respond to:

1) Council member Estrada regarding the decision-making process of the Arts Administrators Fellowship Pipeline. Council member Estrada said that CAC "only got one application, and that it was from the Association of Arts Administration Educators in LA, and that it was the only application so we've decided that the request of 1.2 million would not be available this year". This reasoning made it seem like that the applicant was penalized for the low response to the Call. Also, it was mentioned that applicant got Rank of 4, and that CAC normally funds higher ranks. According to the Ranking rubric on CAC's website, Rank 4 means "Sufficiently achieves the purpose of the program." Previously, applications of the Rank of 4 had received 90% of the requested amount. We would appreciate more thorough feedback that would improve our changes in the future, and that is aligned with the Guidelines.

2) Council Member Ellen who initiated a discussion about the size of the AO's approved for the Artists Fellowship Pipeline and their capacity to administer \$. This is an important consideration but something that should have been discussed prior to accepting the Guidelines for the said Call, out of respect for the applicants who invest time and effort in preparing the applications. We are all in the same boat, staff stretched too thin... Thank you once again to staff and council members and evaluation panels.

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 5. Voting Item: Minutes from Previous Council Meeting - September 15, 2022; 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

Here are some more puzzle pieces for the Council (Grants Ideas)

{Three of these ideas come with "Storytime" and an underpinning to put them into context.}

Storytime #1:

Underpinning => Everyone on the team matters and is valuable...from the person in charge to the person who cleans the restroom.

After attending the LA Opera at the Music Center, my Uber refused to pick me up. The driver wanted me to request the ride again for some reason...so after canceling the ride, it was shown that the prices had surged in the area so it would seem that he just wanted to make more money from the ride. After seeing that, I switched to Lyft; however, there were no drivers in the area and I had a higher than average wait time. While all of this was happening, my phone had less than 5% battery left so I spoke to one of the Valets about the situation and asked if I could charge my phone. She said yes and allowed me to charge my phone in their office as I waited for the Lyft.

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 5. Voting Item: Minutes from Previous Council Meeting - September 15, 2022; 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

[Storytime #1 cont'd]

While waiting, I decided to engage her in conversation. We spoke about the Opera and I asked her if she got free or discounted tickets since she worked at the Music Center. She looked a bit bewildered and said “No...we’re just the Valet,” as if their work didn’t matter and like they weren’t important. I told her that their work did matter and that they were integral to the experience of all of the events that take place at the venue, not just the LA Opera. The Valet helps create the atmosphere of the event, which is essential to the experience. These overlooked and underappreciated positions are a wonderful gateway to equitable access to the arts.

New Puzzle Piece (a wonderful Equity Opportunity):

Staff Appreciation Grant

Discounted and/or free tickets to events for staff such as the valet, custodial team, landscape maintenance team, etc. This is an untapped source for a potential equity stream. The tickets could be for staff and their families. Encourage them to bring age appropriate children to the events so the children can have exposure to different forms of art.

I think this grant would best be suited for companies that own event spaces and host art and culture events; however, it may be great for the organizations putting on the event as well. This idea could be a great jumping off point for similar equity based opportunities that open the gates to people that may not normally have the means to engage in the arts.

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 5. Voting Item: Minutes from Previous Council Meeting - September 15, 2022; 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

Quick Note to the Person Compiling This: I am aware that my comments are technically a continuation from September’s meeting agenda items so feel free to move and recategorize my comments as you see fit.

Storytime #2:

Underpinning => Those who contribute to the creative economy should have access to full-time, permanent positions with great benefits.

The new longitudinal study I’ve been working on within my artistic practice has led me to delve deeper into materials and archives so I attended the LA Archives Bazaar this month (October). I had the opportunity to speak with several archivists and listen to their concerns regarding their work. I learned some valuable things about how their industry operates. I had no idea that their job was unstable and is mostly hired on a project basis. So once the project is finished, they would have to find a new job. I honestly thought that archivists were permanent staff in the museum in which they worked.

New Puzzle Piece:

A grant for museums to develop a paid program and/or internship that would require the museum to hire a permanent archivist to train new archivists/students wanting to enter into the profession. (Something like a job shadowing program) This permanent, in-house archivist would also be

doing the conservation work for the museum as well as doing the training. (This could apply to any institution that houses collections that need to be preserved.)

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 5. Voting Item: Minutes from Previous Council Meeting - September 15, 2022; 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023; 14. Future Agenda Items

Storytime #3:

Underpinning => Natural beauty is art and influences culture.

So this actually happened today (10/28/22) as I was walking in my neighborhood. I tend to walk by a building that has beautiful vines covering the wall that faces the street. I look at it every time I walk by...and today, I saw some men removing the vines with pitchforks. So I go up to them and say “Awww, why are you removing the beauty?” The guy in charge said that the owner of the building didn’t want to pay for the upkeep after allowing the vines to grow wild and cover the wall. The covered wall requires higher fees to maintain.

Of course, I’m thinking that it may be a lack of funding issue versus the owner not wanting to pay for the upkeep sooo...

New Puzzle Piece:

A grant that offsets maintenance costs for buildings covered in vines and plants. Not only does it improve air quality, it also adds beauty to the surrounding area, which influences all who see it.

We can help create a culture that values nature for it is the first version of art. Walls covered in plants and vines are just as valuable as walls covered in murals.

There’s actually a new study being conducted that is examining the relationship between public art and longevity...and I think this fits right in there! I am aware that this idea might require a mindset shift that expands what is considered art and culture. When we zoom out, we can begin to identify root causes so we can then create the desired effect. (Pun intended)

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County
RE: Agenda Item(s) 5. Voting Item: Minutes from Previous Council Meeting - September 15, 2022; 8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

More Puzzle Pieces/Grant Ideas:

- A grant that covers residency fees, exhibition fees and/or application fees. This disguised “Pay to Play” structure is hurting our community. Not only do we pay to create our artwork, we also have to pay to display it? That’s ridiculous. All of these fees are counterproductive and is another form of gatekeeping. Funding should be available to cover these fees for the artists so that money will no longer be a barrier to exhibit great work or to create work in a different location. I know the intention is to create more opportunities for artists to show their work but it shouldn’t come out of the artists pocket.

- Grants for Paid Internship development, which will allow arts and culture organizations to transform Volunteer opportunities into short and/or long term paid internships for arts and culture organizations (\$5,000 minimum).

- Maeva (My-EEE-vuh) (She/Her/Hers), Los Angeles County

RE: Agenda Item(s) 6/11. Public Comment, 12. Voting Item: Changes to the Council By-Laws

Other Thoughts Tangentially Related to My Other Public Comment:

To clarify my verbal public comment, I was referring to Ellen's idea as a tool and a catalyst for beneficial change. And to illustrate my sentiments another way, eating vegetables is a tool for building a healthy lifestyle and just because you don't like eating your vegetables, doesn't mean you block everyone else's access to vegetables. That's a selfish decision.

The process she described reminded me of a modified version of the Alpha and Beta testing phases of an idea...where the Alpha phase is the testing of an idea within the group that created it (which could be with other Council members and/or the Advisory board that Kristin mentioned...[also, I'm still a little unclear about how that works and the details surrounding that...Google did not help clarify the matter either! Haha])...then after getting that internal feedback, the subcommittee would have the Beta testing phase where they would solicit ideas from or have a public discourse with the public for further refinement prior to bringing it to the larger Council meeting. (At least, this was my understanding of the proposed layering of the process.)

Also, I remember hearing that there was more money left over for Covid relief...(I don't know if I heard that correctly because it was only briefly mentioned); however, the Emergency Relief Grant for Artists was underfunded.

- Laura Pecenco (She/Her/Hers), Project PAINT, San Diego County

I am the Director of Project PAINT: The Prison Arts INiTiative, a small visual arts organization that partners with the William James Association to provide arts programming for people incarcerated at the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility in San Diego and California State Prison, Centinela in Imperial. Prior to the 2022-04 Arts in Corrections award, we received AIC funding since its reinstatement in 2014 and were listed on the Intent to Award for this summer's 2022-01 contract. After the rescinding of that award, we applied again, having even cut our funding request to adhere to CAC's new guidelines. We were devastated to find out that we were not included in the revised 2022-04 Intent to Award, despite having a very high narrative score, strong statements of support from our participants and the CRMs at the institutions at which we work, and a lean budget that still strongly values our teaching artists, which includes people who are formerly incarcerated; with this we have now been completely defunded. We also are aware that many other long-running organizations have faced significant cuts with this reduced funding. The current cost point formula ignores context entirely and does not consider program type nor total budget, nor does it prioritize teaching. On behalf of our participants and teaching artists, I request that the CAC revisit the funding formula and put participants first and value teaching artists appropriately. Thank you for your consideration.

7. Voting Item: Grant Program Allocations

Ms. Estrada referred to page 30 of the packet. The Grant Allocations Committee had not been able to award all the money they had hoped to. The memo listed the panelists and their rankings, plus a demographic breakdown of where they came from (quite a few came from Los Angeles County). Breakdowns of age and ethnicity were included.

Ms. Estrada pointed out that for the Arts Administrators Pipeline Fellowship, only one application had been received; the Association of Arts Administration Educators in LA, who received a ranking of 4. For rankings of 4 or less the committee had not given any money. The committee had decided to reissue the fellowship to get a better response.

For the Administering Organization-Individual Artist Fellowships, there had been five applications. The top three, with rankings of 5, were awarded the money they requested. The other two did not receive a high enough ranking to be awarded the money they requested.

The Jump StArts Extension recommended amounts totaled \$2.8 million.

The Council proceeded to vote on the recommendations.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Montoya moved to approve the item. Councilmember Messina Captor seconded the motion.

Ms. Messina Captor requested an explanation of Arts Orange County and Los Angeles Performance Practice. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez answered that the issue is not the organization itself but the service that they will provide. The application was very thorough, and the ranking was provided by the panelist – they had all the information, and that is how they moved forward with all of these recommendations.

Ms. Messina Captor suggested that rather than giving these organizations such a huge amount of money, we give them a grant that they can match. These big organizations have other big donors that are giving them money. This is a lot of money to come from us, and Ms. Messina Captor would like to see the wealth spread out better. It was hard for her to vote when she did not really understand what these organizations do, their budget, and how they get their funding. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez responded that in this instance, these will be administering organizations, and that is why the amount of money is so large. They are going to be regrants to the field. The panel considers the question of whether the organization is large enough to administer these funds. The ranking of 5 or better indicates that the organization has that capacity. The AOs have a better understanding of their communities, so they will be regrants in those communities.

Ms. Gavin asked about an individual artist who is looking for a fellowship, but their region does not have a qualifying AO; is the result that the artist has no chance? Chair Gonzáles-Chávez responded that the organizations looking for funding have reach in multiple areas. Ms. Gavin asked if the allocations are fair geographically. Deputy Director Kiburi answered that the state of California is broken up into different regions. Each of the organizations that received a grant had demonstrated in their application that they could reach the region they are supposed to be serving. They will be doing outreach, media campaigns, etc. to get artists to apply and be a fellow for their region. Ms. Gavin asked if we know that every region is covered. Ms. Azevedo answered that as noted in the memo, Region 4 did not have an eligible application that was received, so the recommendation was to reopen this grant program for applicants from Region 4 – to re-solicit applications that could serve this region for the Individual Artist Fellowship program. Deputy Director Kiburi further explained that the regions were determined by the Council; there were four.

Ms. Gavin asked about how much overhead in each AO does not go directly to artists. Deputy Director Kiburi answered that it was 20% for this one. When the guidelines for this grant program were approved by the Council, the Council approved the admin cost at 20%. Ms. Azevedo added that this program is for more than just regranting; the AOs awarded are responsible for planning and implementation of the program, including providing access and support for individual artists and culture bearers throughout the course of the application award and evaluation processes.

Vice-Chair Montoya reminded everyone that we had done this at the Council level for the first time in 30 years. We want to try this out in a way that honors the local reach of some of these organizations. It is a very large orchestration of a project, including all the outreach, and she felt that 20% is in line with the workload.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez noted that this was not the project that utilized the decision support tool at this stage. The decision support tool was utilized at the implementation of the program and determination of the program roll-out.

Ms. Azevedo stated that the determination of allocations for Individual Artist Fellowships in the Pipeline are based on the panelist rankings. There were some notes captured by staff from the discussion on reallocating the Creative Youth Development funds: how to ensure that those funds are encumbered within the fiscal year before they expire. The panel adjudicates the applications and assigns the rankings. You can see within the allocations memo who the panelists were, their backgrounds, experiences, disciplines, and also demographics of the panel. They evaluated the applications according to the criteria for each program and then submitted their final rankings as part of that process. The committee used those rankings to develop the recommendations brought to the Council today.

Ms. Estrada felt that we need to do a better explanation in the memo; there are far too many questions and misunderstandings of where the money is actually going. Every time we do this, we should summarize what the program is all about.

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that the process of the vote for the allocations comes after the Council has approved the guidelines. If it's helpful, staff can re-post the guidelines or insert a link to the guidelines when we put the allocations memo together.

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that the actual breakdown of the regions was included in the May 12, 2020 Council votes.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Vice-Chair Montoya withdrew the original motion.

MOTION: Councilmember Estrada moved approval of the Administering Organization-Arts Administrators Pipeline Fellowship funding of \$0. Councilmember Messina Captor seconded the motion.

Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Vicki Estrada, Ellen Gavin, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Councilmember Estrada moved approval of \$2,450,000 for Administering Organizations-Individual Artists Fellowships. Councilmember Gavin seconded the motion.

Ayes: Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Vicki Estrada, Ellen Gavin.

Noes: None.

Abstain: Chair Lilia González-Chávez, Roxanne Messina Captor

The motion passed.

MOTION: Councilmember Messina Captor moved approval of \$800,000 to be reopened for Administering Organizations-Individual Artists Fellowships in Region 4. Vice-Chair Montoya seconded the motion.

Ayes: Chair Lilia González-Chávez, Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Vicki Estrada, Ellen Gavin, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Councilmember Estrada moved to encumber remaining funds in this fiscal cycle for the Jump StArts program (additional \$2,835,829); and for another cycle for Creative Youth Development (additional \$1,795,550). Councilmember Messina Captor seconded the motion.

Ayes: Chair Lilia González-Chávez, Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Vicki Estrada, Ellen Gavin, Roxanne Messina Captor.

Noes: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

(9.) 2022 Grant/Contracts Allocation Summary

(Note: Item 9 was heard after Item 7)

Deputy Director Kiburi spoke regarding the Arts in Corrections (AIC) program. The last contract had to be canceled and a new one was released; those who had won contracts were notified on October 23. The interagency agreement contract with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) has been signed and ratified; the funds are coming through and we can pay the contract holders.

Deputy Director Kiburi displayed the funding numbers for the 2022-23 AIC program. Every year CAC receives \$8 million in an interagency reimbursement agreement. 10% of those funds are

allocated for operations for CAC to pay for staff and other administrative costs. The rest is parsed out into different line items dictated to us from CDCR.

Deputy Director Kiburi explained contractor payment. The first contractors to be paid will be those who worked from July through September. The contractor payment budget leaves a balance of \$267,720 which CAC will use to release another RFP for contractors to do innovative programming in the institution.

Deputy Director Kiburi explained the other CDCR line items. She emphasized that of the \$8 million, 10% is taken out for administrative costs, and other line items do not go out in regular programming contracts – they are for specific purposes including research and program evaluation, training organizations, outreach and capacity building, and programming.

The CAC anticipates that in 2023 we will again have \$8 million. We will probably be working on breaking out the line items a little differently. We may have an opportunity to change the breakout in our next interagency agreement with CDCR, which will provide an opportunity for input from Council members.

Ms. Estrada asked about the administrative costs: has it always been 10% – is that standard for state agencies? Deputy Director Kiburi replied that it is standard. We have to reimburse for these charges, so we are only going to spend the amount for which we can send an invoice to CDCR. If the invoices do not total 10% and there is leftover money, it gets reverted back to CDCR's budget.

Ms. Gavin noted that she would like to see a budget breakdown like this for every program, as well as a report of how much labor it takes. With every program we should ask if we are getting fully reimbursed for the effort we are expending as a state agency. She also asked if there are any opportunities to bring together all the players – to create a sense of community. Deputy Director Kiburi responded that it is hard to assess right now with the many vacant positions. We are starting to fill them; there will be three dedicated positions for the AIC program. We are going to do time studies on how much it takes for these programs when we get solid staffing. For AIC, the wardens control the programming and the institution, with the CRMs also being highly influential in the whole process. Staff needs to get a list of AIC performances and art shows to share with the Council so that they can be present.

Ms. Margolis commented on CAC staff capacity. Governor Brown had started the AIC program when he was first in office, and he was the one who brought it back. He was very communicative to CAC and asked what we needed, so we requested two staff members. The cultural districts program does not have such support and there is no authority for us to hire a staff member. We are putting forward the need for staff, and the Governor may be interested. This underscores how important it is to have Council members involved in those conversations.

Deputy Director Kiburi emphasized the importance of engaging the Council more where we can. Another area that has come up is the cost point structure of the contracts: contractors are competing not only with the budget for their programming but also how much they are charging to do their program. The state establishes a cost points threshold, so if the contractor comes in under budget, they have more points and that will bump up their application.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez pointed out that in this last round we observed that some applicants came in at the lower cost points because they were paying artists less. The field of service providers in the AIC has worked diligently to raise the rate of pay that artists get. When you play the cost point game, you reduce pay to artists, which is not supportive of the field. Making sure that we do no harm is directly related to that outcome.

Regarding the decision for innovative programs, Chair Gonzáles-Chávez also pointed out that when AIC was started many years ago, there was a clear understanding that art in and of itself was therapeutic and cathartic. We were not creating art therapy programs but doing art for art's sake. Over time the guidelines have changed and now too much language in the guidelines sounds like art therapy. The CAC should be at the forefront of honoring art for art's sake. When we create programs that are "innovative," what exactly does that mean? We should just support art programs and let the artist identify what that means.

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that none of these decisions have been made by the Council because the Council has not been involved in the program planning for AIC up to this point. The previous and current Executive Directors had determined that this is a state contracting process. However, we are opening that up now. The opportunity exists to begin different types of art programming such as arts and technology. We do not want to let \$267,000 go back into the General Fund. This idea could be given to the Programs Committee.

Deputy Director Kiburi displayed a summary of all the funding support by the State of California, as awarded by CAC, for arts grants. For 2022-23 it totals \$39,111,559. It includes reappropriated funds from 2020 and 2021. CAC has allocated almost the entire amount. We think that we are going to have baseline funding for 2023 of about \$23,000,000. Deputy Director Kiburi broke down the numbers. She emphasized that Creative Youth Development is the name of our funding source, but we also have a grant named Creative Youth Development. All of the other listed arts and grants are funded through Creative Youth Development money. We are using all of the funding.

Deputy Director Kiburi explained that we have spent all of the 2022-23 money – it is all encumbered. From this point we project. Staff will be getting conditional approval from the Council for the guidelines for 2023-24. When the Governor puts out the budget on January 1 next year, we will make necessary adjustments according to our funding.

Ms. Gavin asked about when we compare the present year's budget with next year's: is it the same, and do we have to re-allocate these programs in order to increase our operational support? Deputy Director Kiburi responded that this year was a combination of several years, so the \$40 million is gone. We will only have \$23 million in 2023-24.

Ms. Gavin asked if the Council could see a breakdown of all the program funding to check how much overhead for the CAC is being covered by these programs. Deputy Director Kiburi replied that there is a separate Operations line item for staffing. It is in our General Fund budget, and it is public from the Department of Finance. Ms. Gavin felt that it would be helpful to break out the CAC budget by staff and amount, and allocate the staff to each of the programs, so that we can see which are costing us money, which are paying their way, and which need more support.

8. Discussion Item: Proposed Grants for 2023

(Mr. Clarke was now present.)

Ms. Evans shared with the Council the framework that she and Mr. Israel used.

In deciding what funding the Council will allocate to each of the programs in a fiscal year, some things are determined, such as Folk and Traditional Arts (federally funded), State and Local Partners, and Statewide and Regional Networks.

The Policy Committee wanted to retitle the Relief Support out of Covid to be named General Operations Support. The committee wanted the Council to consider opening the General Operating Support grant for 2023 with a focus on capacity and infrastructure building, as well as reopening the Cultural Pathways grant as another priority General Operating Support grant.

Another consideration is the balance of funding between Project Support and General Operating Support. The Council has historically invested in a number of project-based grant programs. The committee suggested that the Council balance the project-based funding opportunities with the General Operating Support opportunities in the 2023 slate.

Another consideration is that fewer is better. Too much is overwhelming, and the field feels that it benefits those with bigger budgets because they have the capacity to write more grant applications. The committee suggests that we identify a smaller number of key programs that are open to a diversity of organizations and projects and invest in them more heavily. Some of the programs should be identified as under-resourced communities to be served in the grant guidelines. Other project-based programs include Innovations and Intersections, and Professional Development.

Ms. Gavin commented on the beneficial experience she had during her final interview before approval to be named to the CAC Legislative Subcommittee. All of the various aides were on the call, and they had great ideas that reflected the general tone of what we are all talking about – fewer grants and more money. They also raised the issue of multi-year funding. On the organizational support side, having at least three tiers would be wonderful.

Ms. Gavin asked if there are limitations on having three-year funding. Deputy Director Kiburi answered that there are not, as long as you encumber the funds in one fiscal year, but you can fund them with more of a grant award that will go for a longer time period.

Deputy Director Kiburi asked how the recent evaluation and our strategic framework have played into these ideas. Ms. Azevedo answered that the items within the suggestions that are tied to those pieces are laid out in the memo; for example, the continuing partnership and federally funded programming which include the strong partnerships between the state and local levels, and the regional investments.

Ms. Messina Captor stated her agreement with the idea of taking the relief funding from Covid and using it for administrative costs. One of the issues that keeps coming up is the chronic lack of staff and the need to have people who oversee certain parts of the program.

Vice-Chair Montoya asked for clarification about the State-Local Partner mentorship program: at what point do we reopen it? Ms. Azevedo responded that the suggestion in the memo is to reopen the State-Local Partners grant in 2023. Vice-Chair Montoya strongly felt that it really needs to be addressed, because it has been 30 years since the State-Local Partnership program started, and these counties have never received direct funds. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that there were funds allocated that should have been encumbered; there were multiple awards possible and just one was awarded. Deputy Director Kiburi clarified that no funds are encumbered unless they are approved by the Council; we only encumbered the amount for the SLP mentors grant. Those funds are gone, but there is still money in the coffers for 2022 that the Council could open up again. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez agreed with Vice-Chair Montoya that those counties have gone without service for 30 years, and we should do something about that promptly.

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that those counties have not designated as SLP. Their County Boards of Supervisors have not come together to say, “Organization x is our designated SLP.” This would allow them to apply for money from CAC. Part of the mentoring program is to fund current SLPs near these counties, to help educate those Boards of Supervisors, who need to identify an organization to become an SLP. Deputy Director Kiburi noted that this is another opportunity for Council members to go out and speak about the SLP program. The intention has always been to go back and open that up for more people to apply. Deputy Director Kiburi added that there was a concern regarding how much money those grantees would have for overhead to support their work with the other counties. Vice-Chair Montoya agreed that we need to revamp the program and reconsider the equity across these SLPs and the counties that remain vacant.

Ms. Gavin commented on the overlap in issues that some of the programs address. She also expressed confusion regarding which programs we are implementing ourselves and which programs we are passing funds through with AOs.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez agreed and noted that for a long time she has wanted the Touring Artists program to come back – it allows them to expand their reach and receive greater exposure. She would like the Program Committee to consider that program in the next round to refund. Artists in Communities is another important opportunity for artists, although she recognized that it does sound a lot like Creative Corps, as Ms. Gavin had noted. She reiterated her concern that we want to hire artists to do art, and for communities to engage in projects that provide them with arts access and arts experiences, rather than to focus on issues.

Deputy Director Kiburi asked if there is a way to display this information in a way that would be more helpful to the Council. Would they like to see the programs that use an AO model separated from proposed programs that are going to be managed by the Council?

Ms. Gavin suggested dividing programs by levels: Operating, Individual Artist Support, and California Culture, Education, Prisons, and Social Issues. These can be divided by AO/non-AO. It has been confusing when so many programs have come and gone, and they are named in different ways, and they have different levels of Council input.

Ms. Margolis commented that staff hears from the Legislature and the Administration that there are redundancies in our program; it is a big concern. She appreciated the idea of taking away the

titles of the program and thinking more about the groups we are focusing on. This would allow the Legislature to see where the gaps are, which then allows them to see where the need is and how they can best support us.

10. Council Committee Updates

Equity Committee

Vice-Chair Montoya reported that the Equity Committee had held the SLP Equity Impact Assessment workshop. Mr. Clarke had been present and helped to facilitate along with the staff.

The memo in the packet included preliminary data, as well as the *SLP Strengthening Arts, Culture, and Creativity Throughout California* brochure and two pages of California SLP contacts. (Vice-Chair Montoya stated that it has actually been 42 years, not 30, that the four counties have not been represented.)

Vice-Chair Montoya encouraged the Council members to consider carefully the populations and the disparities between the SLPs in general.

Mr. Clarke was struck by the diversity of the SLPs. Because of limited capacities, some of them struggle to answer the various requirements and evaluations that we ask. He felt that the mood of the workshop was positive. The SLPs expressed appreciation for the CAC requesting the information and trying to ensure that the programs are equitably spread out throughout their communities. They expressed concern about SLPs that are in more socially conservative areas where equitable activities are not prized; they were happy that the CAC is pushing that. Some of the SLPs felt cautious that the information might hurt their future funding.

Ms. Gavin asked which county's Total Operating Revenue was \$20+ million. Vice-Chair Montoya answered that it was Los Angeles County. In view of the disparity in resources among the counties, Ms. Gavin suggested that the CAC might come up with a program that targets rural counties.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that CAC identifies programs by making large pots and identifying the pieces within that need to be included.

Mr. Clarke referred back to the previous agenda item's conversation when the Council discussed three-year funding. It would save CAC staff labor and help smaller SLPs.

Strategic Framework Committee

Ms. Messina Captor commented that the committee was going through the database provided by Deputy Director Kiburi gleaned from the consultant's strategic framework proposals. They were discerning which of the proposals were pertinent and need to be addressed by the Council.

The committee already has discerned that new Council members need an introduction that clarifies their job and responsibilities, and how the Council instigates new programs. Council members also need to decide which committee would take care of new members.

The committee also is going to address better communication between staff and Council members – possibly a monthly or quarterly email.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez encouraged the Strategic Framework Committee also to look at integrating the findings of the evaluation with the strategic framework so that there is an alignment going forward.

(11.) Voting Item: [Changes to the Council By-Laws](#)

(Note: Item 11 was heard after Item 12)

Ms. Gavin of the Governance Committee explained the proposed By-Laws change. She stated that at the previous meeting, the council had agreed to have more than two people participating on the subcommittees. If a subcommittee chooses this, its meetings need to be publicly noticed and open to public participation. Ms. Gavin explained the proposal stating how a member of the general public can become a voting member of a subcommittee.

There will be a pilot period of six months.

Ms. Gavin emphasized that with the Council’s new direction, we really want to have public participation with robust thinking, people from the field, and people with past experience. She felt that it would work particularly well if we have co-chairs.

Ms. Estrada, also of the Governance Committee, explained the second recommendation. Currently the Council meetings hold Public Comment in the morning and the afternoon. The public can comment on any item they want to. Ms. Estrada proposed to have the morning Public Comment for non-agenda items. The afternoon Public Comment would concern voting items; the Council would hear what the public has to say before voting.

MOTION: Councilmember Estrada moved to approve the two recommendations.
Councilmember Gavin seconded the motion.

Ms. Gavin felt that with the potential for five new Council members coming on, it is a good idea to have more than two members of the Council participating on the subcommittees.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that the information outlined by Ms. Gavin would be a paragraph following the By-Laws that describe the process for committees to meet: *Current Standing Committees*.

Ms. Messina Captor stated that she was very much against opening committees to the public. It is the only place we have to discuss issues and get work done. She would like to see more Council members on each committee. However, she was totally behind changing the structure of the agenda.

Ms. Estrada pointed out that if more than two Council members are on a committee, the meetings must be publicly noticed; by default they become transparent. That is the dilemma. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez explained that it is a public information issue per Bagley-Keene. In the Governance Committee’s recommendation, they give the subcommittee the option to opt out of

having more than two members. The Governance Committee has brought forward a flexible plan and they are providing a six-month pilot period for us to try it out.

Deputy Director Kiburi pointed out that the CAC agreed to have a decision support tool for assessing the equity of any ideas coming to the Council. Further, our attorneys had responded that what you were basically doing with this proposal was adding more public Council meetings. Alternatively, you could open up sections of the Council meeting for your committee work – then everyone is invited. There are only eight meetings total that the Council members can attend per year by law. Having extra meetings at the behest of the committee members might cause you to exceed the limit of eight.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez noted that it is not the intent of this recommendation to expand the number of full Council meetings; the intent is to allow for additional Council members and the public to participate in committees. It does not require that the full complement of Council members attend.

Ms. Gavin commented that subcommittee meetings and full Council meetings are not the same. She emphasized that for Council members who want to hear more from the community at large and who want to participate on more than one committee, this is an open invitation. She also pointed out that adding subcommittee work to a Council meeting would make it inordinately long.

Ms. Margolis wanted to know how the new committee structure would work to make sure that staff has the capacity to support it. She also said that the Council meetings could be better structured. Being able to discuss and share information on an item in preparation for voting is a great way of operating.

Mr. Clarke offered the idea of having a committee meet a few times to do the work and come up with ideas, then having an open meeting where the public is invited.

Vice-Chair Montoya felt that the recommendation should now go through the decision support tool to verify the impacts, for example, to staff who would have to do the work behind it. She pointed out that the Council had held a committee-focused meeting in the past. It had been publicly noticed and public comment was allowed.

Deputy Director Kiburi noted that the agenda format could afford the committees a lot of information from the public on the different items. You could have public input on discussion items as well.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that she had consistently felt that two-member committees are limiting to the opportunity to fully engage and make appropriate recommendations to the Council as a whole. She has looked for other opportunities where we can engage more Council members. She also felt that we have not effectively engaged the public, in part because we have not engaged the field (partly due to Covid). She viewed the recommendation as another attempt to try something different; everyone would agree that it is important to hear more voices and to engage the public. We have to keep trying. She cautioned that the decision support tool should be used with the recommendation. Another idea is to use standing committee meetings open to the public and publicly noticed with adequate time; that addresses the staff workload issue.

Ms. Gavin stated that her first priority is to have subcommittees with more than two members to allow more interested voices to contribute to intense, important conversations. Her second priority is to hear ideas from the general public that can really inform us. Third would be to have public participation in the committees; she would be willing to let that go. If two people on a subcommittee choose not to have more members, that's fine. In spite of not having gone through the decision support tool, she was reluctant to postpone the vote today.

Deputy Director Kiburi stated that the decision support tool could help with the equity issue. If there are committees that want public participation and others that do not, it may cause concern to the public regarding accessibility. The standing committee meetings are public and that sounds like a good solution. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez responded that with the six-month trial period, we can change it if we get public backlash. We shouldn't be afraid to try something new because of possible backlash. She did not see a clearly defined equity issue in this, because the intent is to be more inclusive rather than less.

Ms. Margolis commented that if we invite the general public to vote, we should check that out with the Governor Pro Tem and the Speaker because they make appointments to the Council, giving them the right to vote. She also commented that the Programs Policy Committee and perhaps the Allocations Committee are ones in which the Council really wants to participate. Maybe as a standing practice, those meetings should be held during the full Council meetings.

Ms. Margolis noted that the December CAC meeting would actually be the ninth meeting, so we may need to skip December and hold it in January.

Vice-Chair Montoya pointed out that as volunteers, we make ourselves available for committee participation, and it is a lot of work. Sometimes our scheduled meetings have to be adjusted. She encouraged inviting the public to meetings that are fruitful for discussion. This needs to be fleshed out a little more.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that the Council is not bound to the decision support tool before taking action because it is not in our By-Laws – but it is a part of the Strategic Framework.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez reviewed the motion: to adopt the recommendations brought forward by the committee with the removal of Item #1b.

VOTE: Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vicki Estrada, Ellen Gavin.

Noes: Roxanne Messina Captor, Gerald Clarke.

Abstain: Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Jodie Evans.

The motion failed.

MOTION: Councilmember Gavin moved to adopt the revision of the agenda format which is related to when Public Comment is taken. Councilmember Estrada seconded the motion.

Ayes: Chair Lilia Gonzáles-Chávez, Vicki Estrada, Roxanne Messina Captor, Ellen Gavin, Gerald Clarke.

Noes: None.

Abstain: Vice-Chair Chelo Montoya, Jodie Evans.

The motion passed.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez suggested that the Council look at other ways of reintroducing this, perhaps completing the decision support tool. While we are not legally bound to use it, it is something that the Council adopted in the Strategic Framework, and we should honor it.

Ms. Messina Captor asked if there is a way to revise the agenda to make meetings less long. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez replied that when you have a timed agenda and Public Comment is set at a given time, you must wait for that time so that people expecting to comment can be present then. The Executive Committee can consider this issue.

Deputy Director Kiburi noted that while the Council has now voted for the new agenda format to open it up to more public input, if the timing of agenda items fluctuates, it may impact the public that is waiting on a certain item. She suggested for the Committee to think through this change a little more.

Ms. Estrada commented that this situation happens at any City Council or Planning Commission meeting. After a presentation, you cannot always predict times. Not all of our issues will be critical enough to have multiple people commenting on them. This may make the meetings a little longer, but if it gives us a better understanding of how the public feels, that is what is important. She said that she will research how other organizations resolve this issue.

Ms. Estrada asked where the rule of no more than eight meetings per year comes from. Ms. Margolis answered that it is stipulated in the Government Code.

11. Public Comment

Ms. Margolis explained the process and provided specific instructions.

Live public comment:

Karen Altree Piemme, Director of the Red Ladder Theatre Company, expressed gratitude for Chair Gonzáles-Chávez's comments regarding the detrimental nature of cost points in awarding contracts. Her company prioritizes paying their artists a living wage, and as an ensemble-based theater company, they will never be able to compete for being the lowest-cost program when other programs involve just a single individual teacher or artist. Based exclusively on the merit points of our program – we scored highest in all but one region – our programs have been decimated from our previous contract. As a result, 1,140 participants per year, who have counted on our programs for the past eight years, won't be served. We are having to reduce our annual budget by 75% and lay off 60% of our artists, all of whom are artists of color. We implore you to rethink the way that costs of programs are considered in AIC RFPs moving forward.

Susie Tanner, Founder and Director of TheatreWorkers Project, commented that they are also AIC contractors. She echoed everything Ms. Piemme just said. They are also an ensemble-based theater company, and they also program with a staff of five teaching artists. Consequently, they can never be seen as an inexpensive program. She encouraged the Council to rethink the cost point evaluation.

Maeva (no last name given), an interdisciplinary conceptual artist and entrepreneur, shared a quote by author Kobi Yamada. She always encourages people not to operate in fear or create from a place of fear; that energy will reflect in whatever is created. It was a selfish decision to block an idea that might improve a process that could streamline more equity-based thinking and result in better and more developed ideas. She asked the Council to reconsider the idea that Ms. Gavin had brought to the table.

Kathryn Carner, Director of Operations for the Actors Gang Prison Project, commented that there are many factors that go into the programming in prisons. It has been a very difficult three years, and now to have our programs unfunded has created a lot of harm for the participants, the teaching artists, and the organizations. Funding left over (\$267,000) from the award should not result in another program being created – it should have gone out to one of the many organizations that have applied.

Robin McNulty, a teaching artist with Project Paint at Richard J. Donovan and Centinela State Prisons, commented that her organization had been awarded funding in the first RFP round that was then rescinded; they were then 100% defunded in the second round. They had lost the funding by .2 points to a program that won by the cost point by paying teaching artists \$20/hour less than the average. We have hundreds of artists in the state prisons that are not going to get visual arts programming. The harm caused by the AIC funding awards mistake had not been rectified. The original Intent to Award was a total funding amount of \$10.9 million while the second round had been \$9.4 million. Where did the missing \$1.5 million go, and why could it not have gone to the programs originally awarded in the rescinded RFP?

Steve Dilley, Veterans Initiative in the Arts, stated that in 2019, 56 projects of theirs had been funded. At any time that the Council could deem it necessary to return to the Veterans Initiative in the Arts, they would love to see that.

13. Call for Nominations

Ms. Gavin of the Governance Committee asked who was interested in running for Chair and Co-Chair.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez read from the By-Laws regarding the Nominating Committee. She said that the Governance Committee was charged with identifying two Council members to serve as the Nominating Committee. Ms. Estrada responded that the committee had appointed themselves. Chair Gonzáles-Chávez asked if that was in keeping with the intent of the By-Laws. Mr. DeSio responded that they had discussed it, and it was not inconsistent.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez provided instructions for the nomination procedure.

Ms. Estrada nominated Consuelo Montoya as Chair.

Ms. Gavin nominated Vicki Estrada as Vice-Chair.

Ms. Margolis stated that by law, the CAC would take action on the slate at the January meeting.

The two nominees accepted their nominations.

Ms. Messina Captor stated that she and Dr. Mercado supported the nomination for Chair.

Ms. Brown stated that a meeting had been added last March 17 because during the March 3 meeting, the Council had not gotten through the entire set of guidelines that needed to be approved. Chair González-Chávez felt that we could assume that because it was a follow-up meeting, it was in actuality a special meeting limited to a single item; therefore the Council could still meet in December. Ms. Margolis responded that this was reasonable. Going forward when we have a special meeting, we may want to specify it as such. Ms. Estrada pointed out that technically, it was an extension of the same meeting.

14. Future Agenda Items

Ms. Estrada stated that she wanted the CAC to be more proactive; she gave an example of the hindrances Caltrans has experienced when seeking to display public art within their right of way. Chair González-Chávez noted that there had been an attempt for the CAC to partner with Caltrans in this process. Ms. Margolis explained that within the Legislature there had been a point at which the CAC was brought into this Caltrans effort; we were taken out of it when it became more about clean-up. She agreed that there is a lot of work that we would love to do with Caltrans. Chair González-Chávez felt that this would be an excellent agenda item. Ms. Estrada asserted that she would like to take the lead on it.

Ms. Gavin stated that, after the failure of the motion to have public input, she was befuddled about how to participate in designing the future programming of the CAC in a more public way. Ms. Gavin also asked about the timing of Chair González-Chávez's exit as Chair.

Vice-Chair Montoya suggested for the Governance Committee to present the item once more with the decision support tool; the item can be refined. The decision support tool is intended to delve into how changes impact the different groups: the public, CAC staff, and the Council members.

Ms. Evans expressed confusion that the Programs Committee had opened up today with offerings of structure for the conversation to happen regarding which programs we want to fund. We are just giving recommendations – it doesn't need another meeting. Ms. Gavin countered that we had only touched lightly on the issues. Chair González-Chávez submitted that she was hearing a request for an open Programs Committee meeting before they submit a final recommendation. The Programs Committee had done an open meeting in the past to hear from more voices, but the response was not substantial. It would be worthwhile to try it again, but it is up to the committee.

Ms. Margolis suggested that the Council could establish an Advisory Committee. Such committees are not paid. They are staffed by the general public and allow a lot of timing – they can meet frequently, whenever they are needed. We could put out a call to the public that is

thoughtful of the time people have and their availability. The Council would be able to hear what the public is thinking prior to taking a vote.

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez reiterated that right now, it is up to the Programs Committee to decide what their next steps will be. With regard to new members, we have a list of people who have applied to serve on the CAC. Those positions are appointed by the Governor through the Appointment Office. That will happen according to the timeframe they determine. CAC staff is diligent about meeting with the Government Operations Office to encourage them to make the appointments as soon as possible. We serve at the Governor's pleasure and must acknowledge that the action proceeds according to the time designated by the Governor's Office.

Regarding her personal participation, Chair Gonzáles-Chávez stated that she has contacted the Appointments Office, and if the Governor determines that he would like to have her continue, she has indicated that she is willing to serve. If he chooses that she not continue, then her term ends at the end of this year.

Ms. Margolis added that those members of the Council who are gubernatorial appointees have a 60-day grace period. When your term ends, if you are not replaced by a new member, you can stay on the Council for 60 days if you so choose. Also, staff encourages Council members to urge promising people to apply as Council members. The CAC has the longest list of people who want to be appointed – it is a great position. In fairness to the Governor, he has thousands of positions to appoint.

Vice-Chair Montoya encouraged the Poet Laureate to apply; it would be amazing to have her at CAC meetings as an appointee.

15. In Memoriam

Vice-Chair Montoya recognized the following individuals who have recently passed.

- Kari Marboe, faculty member at California College of the Arts.
- Art Webb, a flautist based in Southern California.
- Mike Davis, a thinker and writer of our time, and author of several notable books.
- Former CAC member Roz Wyman, a political legend who helped bring the Dodgers to Los Angeles. Deputy Director Kiburi stated that she was a confident communicator who was extremely loyal to her causes, one of which was the CAC. Ms. Margolis added that if not for Ms. Wyman, the CAC might not be here: at a time when our budget was flat, Speaker Jon Perez had carved \$1 million out of his budget to give to the CAC so that it could once more gain relevancy and respect from the Legislature.

16. Adjournment

Chair Gonzáles-Chávez adjourned the meeting at 3:14 p.m.