



## Reno Arts & Culture Commission Special Meeting Minutes

Date: October 23rd, 2018

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Place: McKinley Arts & Culture Center Boardroom  
925 Riverside Dr., Reno, NV 89503

Commission Members
Sharon Honig-Bear, Chair
Geralda Miller, Vice Chair
Dave Aiazzi
Bryce Chisholm
Mario DelaRosa
Doug Erwin
Erik Fong
Dana Hatjakes
Nettie Oliverio
Colin Robertson
Shaughn Richardson
Naomi Duerr, City Council Liaison

---

### AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call** - Present: Sharon Honig-Bear, Chair; Geralda Miller, Vice Chair; Dave Aiazzi, Erik Fong (arrived 4:08 pm), Dana Hatjakes, Nettie Oliverio, Shaughn Richardson. Also Present: Megan Berner, Public Art Program Coordinator; Alexis Hill, Arts, Culture and Special Events Manager. Absent: Bryce Chisholm, Mario DelaRosa, Doug Erwin, Colin Robertson.
- 2. Public Comment on Agenda Items or Other Matters** – Honig-Bear states in the previous meeting she mentioned the University of Nevada, Reno’s new art building construction and passes out site plans for the Commission to look at. Honig-bear also commends the minutes taker for a great job on the RACC meeting minutes.
- 3. Approval of the Minutes** – Approval of the minutes from the September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Reno Arts & Culture Commission Retreat and the minutes from the October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Reno Arts & Culture Commission Meeting -

Honig-bear notes a typo in the September 17<sup>th</sup> minutes and states the title should read ‘minutes’ and notes a potential discrepancy in attendance in the October 9<sup>th</sup> minutes—votes for Item 7.

Nettie Oliverio motions to approve, seconded by Geralda Miller. All in favor: 6, 0 abstain, 5 absent.

- 4. Approval of the Agenda** – October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2018

Nettie Oliverio motions to approve, seconded by Geralda Miller. All in favor: 6, 0 abstain, 5 absent.

(Erik Fong arrived at 5:08 pm)

- 5. Discussion and possible election of Chair of the Arts & Culture Commission from the following candidates listed in alphabetical order:** Dave Aiazzi, Bryce Chisholm, Mario DelaRosa, Doug Erwin, Erik Fong, Dana Hatjakes, Sharon Honig-Bear, Geralda Miller, Nettie Oliverio, Colin Robertson, Shaughn Richardson.

Hill states that the Commission can re-elect the same chair and vice chair.

Nettie Oliverio motions to re-elect the current chair, Sharon Honig-Bear, and vice chair, Geralda Miller.

Dana Hatjakes seconds the motion. All in favor: 7, 0 abstain, 4 absent.

- 6. Discussion and possible election of Vice Chair of the Arts & Culture Commission from the following candidates listed in alphabetical order:** Dave Aiazzi, Bryce Chisholm, Mario DelaRosa, Doug Erwin, Erik Fong, Dana Hatjakes, Sharon Honig-Bear, Geralda Miller, Nettie Oliverio, Colin Robertson, Shaughn Richardson.

Nettie Oliverio motions to re-elect the current chair, Sharon Honig-Bear, and vice chair, Geralda Miller.

Dana Hatjakes seconds the motion. All in favor: 7, 0 abstain, 4 absent.

Miller states that she has enjoyed being the vice chair and it has been a pleasure.

- 7. Discussion and possible update and recommendations on the Poet Laureate nomination process and application timeline (For Possible Action).**

Hill states that she and Megan Berner have been working towards clearing up some issues concerning the Poet Laureate and to more clearly outline expectations of their term.

Berner states that she has changed the position requirements slightly. The position is a two-year term with \$1,000 per year, and added a meeting with staff and the Chair and Vice Chair to outline a preference in activity within the two year period of being a Poet Laureate, with four engagements each year. Ideally the position would interact with the community.

Richardson states that the 'published' part of the requirements may pose a problem as many candidates are poets who do spoken word performances and may not have anything published but have years of performance experience.

Berner states that an amendment could be made to say and/or – published work and/or performance experience.

Honig-Bear recommends Shaughn Richardson add an additional paragraph to the requirements to include performance experience as opposed to a strictly scholarly approach to the position that will lean towards incorporating community and performance.

Geralda Miller makes a motion to approve the City of Reno Poet Laureate nomination guidelines and nomination form with the addition of including a contractual agreement with the Poet Laureate and that Shaughn Richardson will be submitting verbiage to include the publication credit and add to the requirements that during the two year term an original piece either filmed or written be created about the City of Reno.

Seconded by Dana Hatjakes. All in favor: 7, 0 abstain, 4 absent.

- 8. Project / Special Reports Update (For Possible Approval)**

- a. Community Engagement Committee (For Possible Approval)**

- i. Discussion and possible approval of one new member to the Community Engagement Committee from the following list of applicants in alphabetical order:

Zoe Bray, Alicia Briancon, Grace Davis, Michelle Duggan, Dahlia Dwedar, Margot Murray, Bill Newman, Liane O'Neill and Sarah Scott.

Tabled until next meeting.

- 9. Approval of RACC strategic goals and action plan for Fiscal Year 18/19 and 19/20** – the RACC will discuss how they would like to move forward with the strategic goals adopted on September 24, 2018.

Time constraints disallow discussion.

**10. Discussion and possible approval on new grants program options for the RACC:**

- a. **Event and Project Grant proposals for Fiscal Year 18/19 focusing on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.**
- b. **Discussion and possible approval on a neighborhood grant program, including implementation phasing and funding amounts.**

(a) Berner states that the document is not open to the public yet and ideally the grants would be open in mid-November as the first scheduled grant workshop takes place in the middle of November. Berner also states that anyone planning to apply for a grant will be required to attend a workshop.

Hill summarizes the grant proposals and neighborhood grant project. Hill states that there may be some extra money for the neighborhood grant project and it will not be started until spring to avoid taking money away from other grants. Waiting until spring will also give time for outreach.

There are three choices for project grants: an Art Access Project, a Creation Project, and a Youth Arts Project. Hill states that there has been concern about pulling the project grant away but the project grants will help target arts groups and help collect better data. The youth arts project will be especially helpful in possibly reaching out to new sources for money.

The Art Access project is open to arts and non-arts non-profit organizations and ask that the groups engage one of Reno's traditionally underserved populations and neighborhoods with little access to the arts.

Honig-Bear asks if you take out the Creation project, the two other areas (arts and youth) we have \$54,000 remaining we could use that anyway or distribute it how well the Commission likes a project. Hill replies yes.

Aiazzi asks to clarify what neighborhoods have limited arts access and adds that it would help people when applying to know where they are/what neighborhood or ward they are in.

Berner states that it's time to think about how to start collecting data for the final report of the year and it may also mean defining those neighborhoods and see where arts events are happening.

Miller states that defining an underserved neighborhood might be better if a different term is used such as instead of limited arts use 'presence of the arts'.

Hill states that it could be flipped to traditional access to City of Reno arts support.

Berner states that most of the arts support in Reno is concentrated in the downtown area (Ward 1 and Ward 5).

Hatjakes states that the Commission should take out 'neighborhoods' but also 'under-invested populations or places'. She asks whether or not first-time applicants should receive extra points as the Commission is trying to reach out to new organizations or groups.

Hill states that grant outline has been written on the merit of the program but there can be additions. Hill adds that she has realized that there hasn't been any training on non-profits and in particular no training in any organizational development training and would feel remiss if they did not give applicants every chance to create a strong proposal. Hill supports giving additional points to first time applicants.

Hatjakes asks whether the categories will change annually, for example one year the focus will be on youth and the next year a focus on seniors, expressing concern on focusing only one group.

Honig-Bear states that youth and seniors are covered under 'arts projects' and expresses the hope that by including a youth category there may be an opportunity to approach the schools districts to bring art opportunities to children and doing so may also bring funding opportunities.

Oliverio states she would like to see a two-year commitment to whatever project the Commission chooses.

Honig-Bear states to summarize the discussion thus far the Commission is in agreement with the categories and are okay with indicating that there is one pool of \$194,000 to fund all three categories.

Hill states that if the Commission is satisfied with the Arts Access Project she will move onto the Creation Project Award. Hill summarizes the award is a one time \$10,000 to an arts organization and its growing capacity through creation of original work.

Honig-Bear asks whether the terms would exclude individual artists.

Berner replies the Commission cannot grant money to individual artists but to non-profits, however the artist can use something like Sierra Arts as a fiscal agent.

Oliverio states for clarification a group such as Sierra Arts to act as a fiscal agent the entity for whom they are representing needs to be in pursuit of a 501(c)3.

Hill states that while the grants are ideally for a non-profit it is encouraged for these groups to work together with an artist.

Honig-Bear states that perhaps it would be a good idea to add the line 'applicant organization' to avoid confusion.

Aiazzi adds to that stating, 'or working with a non-profit'.

Hill moves onto the next subject Youth Arts Project. Hill summarizes what the project requirements are.

In response to some confusion on whether or not an artist needs to be an accredited teacher, amends Youth Arts Project to state, 'an artist who has experience teaching and working with youth'.

Hill states that from the last meeting the discussion of getting funding for surveys has not been pursued but there will be forms for what it is expected on the surveys as a guideline. Survey assistance can be requested for organizations under \$100,000 but will need further investigation. There is the possibility of finding volunteers to do surveys.

Hill moves onto the Event Grants category summarizing that it is a more competitive application and that the Commission wants them to demonstrate social impact beyond a traditional audience and reaching diverse and underserved populations. Hill adds that it has been upped to \$10,000 and questions whether or not the Commission is in agreement with this or not. Hill adds that another discussion point will be whether or not a group can apply for only one grant.

Hill responds that the idea was that a group could apply for an event grant and a project grant.

Hatjakes states that if a project is worthy than giving \$10,000 shouldn't be a problem and adds that she would like to see artists getting paid for their work.

Oliverio states that in the past, answering the question about artists getting paid, the Commission previously funneled money to Sierra Arts, who is a private agency (in conjunction with the Commission being a public agency) can and did fund money to individual artists. This option is available to the Commission to be pursued again.

Aiazzi states that if the language is changed to requiring payment to artists then only the well-established, well-funded organizations will be able to apply for grants.

Berner suggests that in the project event category guidelines or under the creative workforce it could say, 'we would like to see evidence of artists being paid for their work'.

Honig-Bear states that she thinks the \$10,000 amount should be brought down.

Hill states that it could be brought down to \$7,000.

Oliverio reminds the Commission that about 70% of the applications received for event grants are for Artown for free events and the organizations are pooling money in order to provide something for the community where they can't possibly get any money back except through a grant.

Honig-Bear states that she would like to see some events that take place outside of Artown and perhaps encouragement could be added for groups who are not a part of Artown to apply for a grant. Honig-Bear adds that if the Commission is going to pursue art in underserved neighborhoods the subject of encouraging non-Artown applicants will come up again. Honig-Bear asks the Commission if they are happy with \$7,500 for event grants.

Dana Hatjakes leaves at 5:43 pm.

Honig-Bear states that if the Commission has established \$7,500 for event grants then she would like to ask about the 10% match.

Berner states that 9% of organizations put in a larger amount than a 10% match.

Honig-Bear states that before the Commission moves onto the neighborhood grant programs she would like to finalize the Commission's feelings about Bartley Ranch and whether or not it is eligible for grant money.

Oliverio states that according to the rules and regulations, the Commission has to go along with events within the City of Reno. Oliverio states that if the Commission decides that they are no longer restricted to just within the city then where do the restrictions end.

Berner states that exceptions could be included.

Oliverio cannot support adding Bartley Ranch, stating that if you included Bartley Ranch then every other place would want support as well and where would it end? If Washoe County provided grants that would be ideal but the burden falls to the City of Reno, adding that there isn't much money to begin with.

Honig-Bear states that the Commission can come back to the subject at a later time, as it requires discussion with the county and the school district about supporting the arts.

(b) Berner states that the Neighborhood Grants Program is modeled after the P.S. Wish You Were Here program from Denver that provides public art opportunities for neighborhoods, organizations and community groups, adding that the extra money that Alexis Hill mentioned will come from Public Art and not from the Commission.

Aiazi states that looking at the \$60,000 for five awards at \$10,000 each, wouldn't that be \$50,000?

Berner states that the way this had been presented previously was that there was \$10,000 for the five wards and then the last \$10,000 was for the Mayor and at-large councilperson. The districts could be defined separately from the awards if the Commission desired.

Hill states that it isn't known if the Commission will even receive \$50,000 worth of projects to begin with.

Aiazi states there is a different way to approach this, if these are neighborhood grants why doesn't the Commission give more power to the Neighborhood Advisory Boards and let them decide whether performance art will be included or not. Aiazi suggests working with them so they can actually pick the art.

Hill states that she likes the idea of groups coming to the neighborhood advisory boards, that it could be promoted through social media and if there is enough traction within a few years there could be a lot of growth.

Miller states that the Commission should be talking to the Neighborhood Advisory Boards.

Honig-Bear states that there is a great deal of change going on and perhaps the Commission should make a statement that the first year the grants are intended for public art and perhaps after some growth adding performance art as well.

Hill states she likes the 'art tank' idea and will put together some materials for the next meeting. This gives enough time for organizations to get applications together around March/April, and it would

be better for the Commission as well as most of the grants would be done by then and there would be enough time to get the word out.

Nettie Oliverio makes a motion to approve, seconded by Dave Aiazzi. All in favor: 7, 0 abstain, 4 absent.

**11. Updates on ongoing projects (Item for general information only. No deliberation or action will be taken on this item).**

**a. DOCOMOMO Reno**

Time constraints disallow conversation.

**12. Announcements not anticipated at notice date.**

Honig-Bear states that she has contacted Naomi Duerr to get the Commission's presentation in front of city council but has no reply as of yet.

Hill states the City of Sparks voiced an interest in a joint meeting, and agrees with the idea that it could be a social gathering at the McKinley Arts & Culture Center, with two brief presentations on current activities. Tentative date is set at December 17<sup>th</sup> 2018, 4:00 pm at McKinley Arts & Culture Center.

**13. Set date, time and agenda for the next Special & Regular meeting and future RACC meetings.**

Joint City of Reno/Sparks Social Meeting December 17<sup>th</sup> 2018, 4:00 pm – 5:00 pm Presentations, 5:00 pm – 7:00 pm Social, McKinley Arts & Culture Center

RACC Meeting November 13<sup>th</sup> 5:00 pm 2018

Geralda Miller makes a motion, seconded by Nettie Oliverio. All in favor: 7, 0 abstain, 4 absent.

**14. General Public Comment –**

Honig-Bear states that Laughing Owl, having been given money by the Commission, would like to show the Commission what they have done with their grant—Laughing Owl has extended an invitation to all Commissioner's to attend one of their performances in the schools.

**15. Adjournment**

Nettie Oliverio makes a motion, seconded by Geralda Miller. All in favor: 7, 0 abstain, 4 absent.