

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

(November 28, 2012 – February 8, 2013)

PROPOSED REZANOV & ARGUELLO STATUE AND INDETERMINATE LINE SCULPTURES

In accordance with the Presidio Trust's adopted *Art Policy* and associated *Art Collections Manual*, the Trust solicited public comments on two art proposals being considered for installation in the outdoor areas of the park. The public announcement was initially made via the Trust's electronic newsletter (distribution approximately 8,000) on November 28, 2012 and subsequently announced at the November 29th public Board meeting. Information about the proposals was posted on the Trust's public website.

Notifications were also made at various stakeholder meetings including People for the Presidio/Parks, the Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning, via the San Francisco Arts Commission Facebook site, and various other community organizations. During the comment period, the Trust offered three staff-led public walks to provide information about the proposals and proposed locations (December 9, January 8, and January 24).

In total, the Trust received 23 comment letters (5 organizations and 18 individuals). The comments ranged from a handful of enthusiastic supporters for a particular proposal to mild to strong opposition for one or both. Many commenters expressed interest in a particular work with questions or qualifiers linked to their full endorsement ("yes, but..."). Others had general comments on art in the park (e.g., encouraging the Trust to only consider temporary works, others suggested only indoor works should be considered, etc.). One artist provided a sketch for an alternative concept to the bronze Rezanov & Arguello statue. A few commenters expressed concern about the potential precedent-setting nature of either or both works. One noted that figurative commemorative statuary has not been placed in the Presidio for the last 236 years and that a compelling argument should be made for why we should start a new tradition. Another argued that Pershing would be a more appropriate subject should such a work be considered. Several expressed concerns about the use of abstract art in the park (Indeterminate Line) and wondered what kind of precedent would be set for the future. A handful of organizations and individuals provided specific comments on the Presidio's Art Policy and Art Collections Manual, requesting we make changes to both (e.g., recommending we further define or remove the 'enhance visitor experience' portion of our policy, add members of the public and preservation community to future art review panels, etc.)

An overview of the specific comments is provided below. A complete set of the comment letters are available in the Presidio Trust Library.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

(November 28, 2012 – February 8, 2013)

PROPOSED REZANOV & ARGUELLO STATUE AND INDETERMINATE LINE SCULPTURES

Letter #	Name	Organization	Summary of Comments
1	Susan Samols Sausalito, CA		In favor of Indeterminate Line
2	Peter Roos	Academy of Art Student	In favor of Rezanov/Arguello statue
3	Hilary Hyde		In favor of <i>temporary works</i> (Presidio is jewel, many artists would have interest and art is personal so temporary exhibitions would be most responsive)
4	Charlotte Hennessy		Don't clutter the park. Display proposed works, if approved, <u>inside renovated buildings</u> .
5	Kathleen McKenna	Former registrar, The Chase Manhattan Bank Art Program (late 1960s/early 1970s) and former trustee, SF Art Institute, mid 80s	Opposes both works describing them as "banal" at best.
6	Brad Andersen		In favor of Rezanov/Arguello statue (given direct association to Presidio history) Undecided re: Indeterminate Line (but was under impression it was temporary)
7	Nancy Ream	Presidio neighbor	In favor of Rezanov/Arguello statue Finds Indeterminate Line exciting, but recommends deferral until more is known about bluff design.
8	Donald Green		Recommends delaying decision on Indeterminate Line pending bluff design and potential other art for site. Prefers open views without sculpture.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

(November 28, 2012 – February 8, 2013)

PROPOSED REZANOV & ARGUELLO STATUE AND INDETERMINATE LINE SCULPTURES

Letter #	Name	Organization	Summary of Comments
9	Karen Cleek		<p>In favor of Indeterminate Line (modern, playful, sleek)</p> <p>Opposes Rezanov/Arguello statue (stodgy, old-fashioned, awful) – suggests alternative subject might be more appropriate to interpret Spanish era.</p> <p>Raised questions about Rezanov sponsor’s capacity and motivation/how these two figures are “humanitarian heroes.”</p>
10	Whit Hall	None listed – personal comments	<p>Opposes Rezanov /Arguello as currently envisioned (specific comments include new location, reduced size, more context/background, requires an EA at minimum, sets unwanted precedent for commemorative works).</p> <p>Opposes Indeterminate Line (“atrocious”, precedent setting, requests an EIS be prepared).</p>
11	James Hartman		<p>Opposes Indeterminate Line</p> <p>Supports Rezanov/Arguello statue, but recommends Pershing statue be considered.</p> <p>Expresses general dissatisfaction with Trust’s treatment of history and emphasis on “commercial or other redevelopment” activities.</p>
12	Pat Kaye Novato, CA		<p>Opposes Indeterminate Line (cites the need to re-engineer tunnel given scale/weight of art, introduction of an attractive nuisance for graffiti, blocks views/clutters park with art that has no connection to the Presidio).</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

(November 28, 2012 – February 8, 2013)

PROPOSED REZANOV & ARGUELLO STATUE AND INDETERMINATE LINE SCULPTURES

Letter #	Name	Organization	Summary of Comments
13	Amanda Hoenigman		<p>Supports public art as an “essential component of creating a vibrant community”</p> <p>In favor of Indeterminate Line</p> <p>Opposes Rezanov/Arguello statue as envisioned – doesn’t seem “authentic” (also questioned commemorating a love affair between a 15 year girl and 42 year old man)</p>
14	Amy Meyer		<p>Opposes Rezanov/Arguello statue (“overly-large banal representation”) - May have NHLD impacts, consider O Club for venue to tell settlement story more broadly.</p> <p>Opposes Indeterminate Line – premature, precedent setting and potential NEPA and NHLD impacts</p>
15	Lori Brooke	Cow Hollow Association	<p>Presidio Art Policy flawed (too subjective) and recommends art be treated as “new construction” would be.</p> <p>Opposes both works.</p>
16	Mary Anne Miller, Urban Design Planner		<p>Premature to consider – need to look at more comprehensive approach to art in park.</p> <p>Could set unfortunate precedent.</p>
17	William Shepard, Board Chair	Neighborhood Associations for Presidio Planning	<p>Proposed specific changes to Art Policy and Collections Manual (content and process-related).</p> <p>Opposes both works (see letter).</p> <p>Requests electronic access to all public comments received by the Trust on this matter.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

(November 28, 2012 – February 8, 2013)

PROPOSED REZANOV & ARGUELLO STATUE AND INDETERMINATE LINE SCULPTURES

Letter #	Name	Organization	Summary of Comments
18	Raymond Holland, President	Planning Association for the Richmond	<p>Opposes any permanent installations of art, especially if not related to history</p> <p>Opposes Indeterminate Line</p> <p>Preliminary opposition to Rezanov/Arguello statue based on conceptual nature of work and process to finalize.</p> <p>Recommends changes to Art Policy (deleting “enhance visitor experience” as it is unrelated to history and is subjective).</p> <p>Subsequent comments requested the Board act on projects at a public meeting.</p>
19	Ruth Gravanis		<p>Comments on Art Policy (policy doesn’t respect national park status – questions “enhance visitor experience” criteria)</p> <p>No objection to look of Indeterminate Line, but does not belong in Presidio.</p> <p>Rezanov/Arguello statue too conceptual – need further information about associated interpretative program and design before placement can be approved.</p>
20	Gary Widman, President	Presidio Historical Association	<p>Need to engage NPS as these are matters related to interpretation.</p> <p>Need to prepare a CLR for all areas.</p> <p>Need to subject proposals to “Seven Aspects of Integrity” under NLHD.</p> <p>Must meet NPS “Commemorative Art Policy” requirements.</p> <p>Based on “legal context” - opposes Indeterminate Line and criticizes the Trust</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

(November 28, 2012 – February 8, 2013)

PROPOSED REZANOV & ARGUELLO STATUE AND INDETERMINATE LINE SCULPTURES

Letter #	Name	Organization	Summary of Comments
			<p>for reviewing it.</p> <p>Based on “legal context” notes Trust could approve Rezanov/Arguello statue if makes specific findings.</p> <p>Notes that the Rezanov/Arguello proposal is only conceptual and encourages the Trust to approach donation of commemorative art works in the future using this approach.</p> <p>Believes work, as currently envisioned, is too large but has no opinion re: more acceptable design.</p> <p>Objects to exterior installation – recommends interior placement (O Club or O Club courtyard).</p> <p>Cautions Trust re: potential precedent setting nature of works – recommends new policies related to art and preparation of a “general plan” for history in MP.</p>
21	Jeannie Haughn (Arguello)		In favor of Rezanov/Arguello statue – she has a personal family connection.
22	Stosh Horton	Native Californian	<p>Enjoys Bernar Venet’s work, but believes it doesn’t fit with site.</p> <p>Provides alternative concept (drawing) for Rezanov/Arguello statue and background on why an alternative design should be considered.</p>
23	Jan Blum, Becky Evans, Ruth Gravanis, Mary Anne Miller, Matthew	Presidio Environmental Council	<p>Recommends specific changes to Art Policy and Collections Manual and notes without these modifications it would be premature to render a decision on works.</p> <p>Rezanov/Arguello statue – premature to</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

(November 28, 2012 – February 8, 2013)

PROPOSED REZANOV & ARGUELLO STATUE AND INDETERMINATE LINE SCULPTURES

Letter #	Name	Organization	Summary of Comments
	Zlatunich		<p>make decision, need to determine plans for courtyard, finalize historic interpretative themes/other suggestions, and statue has to be finalized.</p> <p>Opposes Indeterminate Line (not relevant to history of Presidio/CA and not uniquely suited to place).</p> <p>Provides suggestions re: future tunnel/bluff design.</p>
23	Kari Jones	Richmond, CA	<p>Comments on Rezanov/Arguello statue:</p> <p>While story is compelling, bronze statue in proposed location is not appropriate.</p> <p>Concerns re: archaeological effects (located atop El Presidio).</p> <p>Concerns re: precedent-setting nature for such art – noting there is an abundance of historic figures/episodes in Presidio history that could be worthy of a bronze statue but in 236 years no such commemorative statuary has been placed in Presidio</p> <p>Suggests more appropriate/alternative ways to interpret legend and Russian -Spanish Colonial relations more broadly.</p> <p>Notes that the Interfaith Chapel contains a historic mural depicting the romance between the two figures.</p>