

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

To: Transportation and Public Works Committee (T & PW)

From: Paul Ogren
Public Works Department

Mary Altman
Public Arts Administrator

Date: January 4, 2008

Re: Questions Regarding the Public Art Drinking Fountain Project

Cc: Steve Kotke, Heidi Hamilton, Dick Smith, Barb Sporlein, Karin Berkholtz, Jeremy Hanson, Brette Hjelle, Mike Kennedy

Below are the answers to a list of questions raised during the T & P W agenda setting meeting by Council Members Colvin Roy and Glidden. These questions are related to the Public Art Drinking Fountain Project, which is on the January 8, 2008 agenda of the Transportation and Public Works Committee. Note that a number of the answers reference the City's Public Art Policies which are located at:

<http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/DCA/publicartpolicies.asp>.

1. **Who are the Public Art Advisory Panel members?** Please see the attached 2008 breakdown of Public Art Advisory Panel members. (Public Art Policy 6.2.2)
2. **How were the criteria established to select the locations?** Six project and site selection criteria were established by the Arts Commission and the City Council (see below and Public Art Policy 7.6). The panel further identified several additional indicators that they would examine in terms of those criteria (see bullets below) as part of the planning process for this project. Those additional indicators were reviewed by the Minneapolis Arts Commission on October 17, 2007.

Stimulate excellence in urban design and public art

Value artists and artistic processes

Enhance community identity and place

- Fitting place to celebrate the story of water and Minneapolis

Involve a broad range of people and communities

- Near schools or libraries, publicly accessible during the days, evenings, and

weekends

Contribute to community vitality

- Destination and on Commercial corridors, pedestrian corridors, bike trails

Use resources wisely

- Not near bars or stadiums
- Water is available, with adequate space
- Doesn't already have drinking fountains
- Possible qualified maintenance partners

- 3. Can the council see the rating sheet for the selected locations?** See attached matrix for reviewing possible drinking fountain locations. Note: The Panel does not generally use a numeric ranking system when review projects or sites for public art.
- 4. Did we consider using the existence of a maintenance plan as one of the location criteria?** The panel considered whether there are "possible qualified maintenance partners" in the area. Note that the panel has not selected the exact locations, but rather general areas. In the coming months, the exact locations will be determined based on proximity to water lines, space availability, and maintenance partners' facilities.
- 5. What is the estimate for a yearly cost to operate and maintain a fountain?** The annual maintenance for winterizing the water lines of the fountain in the spring and fall to prevent significant freeze damage and replacing broken plumbing parts is estimated to be approximately \$600-800 per fountain. Daily sanitary maintenance of the fountains will not be provided by the City.
- 6. Does the yearly O&M cost change depending on fountain location?** For this project, it will probably not change. Under circumstances where there are long or complex lines leading to the water source or sewer, it might be more expensive, but this project will not install fountains under those circumstances.
- 7. How will we finalize the maintenance plans for each fountain?** Maintenance plans will be finalized through long term written agreements with qualified partners prior to installation.
- 8. What are we going to do if the maintenance plans fall through?** Public Works and CPED recognize that these partnerships may not address all maintenance issues for the life of the fountains. If in the future these partners are no longer able to address all the maintenance issues, it may be necessary to considering deaccessing the fountains as determined in the City's established Public Art Policy 14.
- 9. Can PW develop a list of amenities like fountains that PW or others in the City maintain, and describe whether those amenities cannot be operated because of budget constraints?** This information is listed below:

Irrigation Systems: As these systems break down over time, Public Works decommissions them, because they are too expensive to maintain within the existing budget.

Peavey Plaza and Loring Greenway Fountains: Currently Public Works maintains these fountains, however, in the past few years significant and expensive work on the pumps and related infrastructure have been required resulting in some intermittent down time. Due to the extremely high cost of maintaining these aging systems, further breakdowns may require that the fountains simply be turned off.

Medians and related areas, diverters, mini-parks, etc.: These areas are being maintained at the bare minimum standards needed to comply with existing City mowing ordinances. As shrubs and other landscaping items die or are no longer serviceable they are simply removed. No replacements are being made.

Old Streetscapes (without Special Service Districts): These areas are not being maintained by the City and as the items deteriorate, items are being removed.

10. Can PW describe their priority list of which amenities will be operated first?

#1. When there is **underlying revenue** to support Public Works operations or when there is support through **public/private partnerships**. Examples of these are:

- Nicollet Mall
- The 35W Triangle Park (currently developing a partnership)
- Special Service Districts
- 3rd Avenue medians (Downtown Greening Partnership)
- Routine Maintenance Agreements

#2. Those in **high profile areas**, such as:

- Peavey Plaza: Because this is a high profile, high use amenity, PW continues to provide a relatively high level of housekeeping and routine maintenance, but if there is a larger scale problem (pump replacement as an example), this would be problematic. However, PW has significantly curtailed seasonal flower planting due to budget constraints, which has been noticed by the public.
- Loring Greenway: Since much of the core infrastructure was recently rebuilt or improved, maintenance needs are expected to be minimal for a few years for the infrastructure that was affected. Repair of the remaining original infrastructure (e.g., fountains) will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

#3. When **needed through use, location or type of landscaping**. For example, an area with grass in a neighborhood setting will receive a higher level of attention or service than an area with weeds and wild turf in a more "remote" area. Typically the

amenities are maintained at bare minimums standards needed to comply with existing (example: turf maintenance to 8" or less in height) City ordinances.

#4. On a **complaint basis**.

Public Art Advisory Panel: Breakdown of Membership 2008

Position (Policy Language)	Held by	Neigh/Ward
Two Artists	Connie Beckers (Northside Arts Collective)	Folwell (4)
	Peter Haakon Thompson	Phillips West (6)
Arts administrator from an appropriate organization	Susan Rotilie (Walker Art Center)	St. Paul, Walker is in Lowry Hill (7)
Architect or landscape architect	Frank Fitzgerald (Close Landscape Architects)	CARAG (11)
Three Arts Commissioners	David Salmela (Artist)	Bottineau (3)
	Ben Heywood (Soap Factory)	Logan Park (1)
	Nicole Grabow (Midwest Conservation Lab)	Kingfield (8)
Two engineers or technical representatives (i.e. Public Works staff)	Paul Ogren (PW)	Lynnhurst (13)
	Bob Carlson (PW)	North Loop (7)
Three community representatives	Laurie Savran (MPLIB)	Linden Hills (13)
	Diane Moe, Park Board (MPRB)	Field (8)
	Joyce Wisdom (Lake Street Council)	Longfellow/Lake Street (9)
CPED staff member	Mark Garner (CPED)	Cooper (9)

(Wards not currently represented: 2, 5, and 10)