

My comments focus on the unintended and detrimental consequence to the Arts Commission's Public Art Program that will result if the Civic Design Committee is removed from the Charter and delegated to the Planning Department. Civic Design and the Public Art Program are intrinsically related, working in tandem for many years. The value created by this coordinated relationship has resulted in the successful implementation of many significant public art projects over decades. Moving Civic Design to Planning will disrupt, and permanently impact, the integral relationship between these programs.

Here is why the relationship between the two programs is not only beneficial, but essential. More than 35 years ago, the Arts Commission made a policy decision to link the 2% for art mandate as a prerequisite for the scheduling of the Civic Design review of capital projects managed by city departments. Design approval from the Arts Commission is required for the capital project to obtain its building permit. As a result of this decision, the Arts Commission is guaranteed early access to the design process whereby thoughtful decisions can be made about the design of the facility and the siting of public art. As a result, the artworks are better able to be planned for as part of the design process and it enables the art that was commissioned to more meaningfully

respond to the project design, its context in the city and the function or public service it provides. Another critically important benefit is that it ensured that the Arts Commission received 2% of the construction cost mandated by the 1969 Art Enrichment Ordinance.

If these two programs are decoupled by the move of Civic Design to Planning, this important link between the Public Art Program and Civic Design will be broken and the requirement may be bypassed. If the program is moved to the Planning Department, it will be harder for the Public Art staff to track new projects and there will be no enforcement mechanism to ensure the 2% allocation. Early involvement in the project will be difficult to achieve. There is no established methodology for the Arts Commission to work with Planning and little history of the two departments working together on projects. It is entirely possible that this change, if approved, will diminish the ability of the Arts Commission's Public Art Program to ensure the set aside of the 2%.

In my professional opinion, this move will have a detrimental consequence that will diminish the impact and success of the Public Art Program. Support for the program among city departments and the public has

Jill Manton
Page 3 of 3

expanded exponentially over the years. It is an important component of each project, notwithstanding that it is only 2% of the project budget. San Francisco's program has grown to be among the most highly recognized programs in the US. It is a significant cultural asset for the city of San Francisco.

I urge you to please reconsider the proposal to remove Civic Design from the Charter to the Planning Commission considering the potential damage and impact to the city's beloved Public Art Program.