

SFAC

MEETING for SAP CRITERIA Review

Hearing on Proposals to Upgrade Screening Criteria

Friday, June 21, 2013

9:30am - 12:30pm

Present:

Committee/ Staff: Jacquelin Thompson, Josie Grant, Jennifer Morningstar, Renee de Cossio, Howard Lazar, Alyssa Licouris

Public: Tad Skye, Willam Joseph Clark, Bob Clark

1.

Howard briefly addressed an issue involving Paula__ that went to Board of Appeals

Howard informed all that the initial SF Street Artists Criteria was drafted and approved in 1977 by SF Arts Commission

2. INTRO

Howard went through the current list of SAP goods/items and announced those whose criteria he said had issues and that needed to be reviewed, discussed:

Pendants- new wording, clarification?

Bead Stringing- the 15% issue, shall we revisit?

Castings- Ceramics and sculpture. He poses the description is a subjective statement.

New Technology Art- a more recent addition, artist's signature/label? We are requiring on the face of the print

Decopage

Feather Art

Micellaneous Items- specifically "function," re-examine definition

Photography- "Self" should be removed

Dry Flowers

Sewn Items- mass produced iron on patches?

Shell Jewelry

Wood Craft

-Public participant, Tad Skye suggested we go through each item "craft by craft" for review. Tad also requested that we review the definition of "Family Unit" with the intention of changing some items that give Family Unit members an advantage over individual SAP artists.

-Discussion continued regarding several Family Units with crocheted hats and those with fork bracelets with examples of people exploiting family unit criteria. It was suggested number of members within a family unit should be reduced. Howard added that the authenticity of other member's contribution should be questioned and whether necessary to have multiple people working on a certain item. SAP Advisory Committee members propose the Family Unit should have as many valid members, but one lottery ticket. Josie proposes one lottery ticket per unit in the initial, main lottery and after main lottery, the Family Unit members would be entitled to use again and even set up at other location.

-Howard suggests that these changes are do-able in Justin Herman Plaza lottery because it is "less official" since Art Commission can't enter into it, but Park & Rec may have concern.

- Howard needs to check with City Attorney to make sure it is okay.
- Family Unit is entitled to many benefits not accessible to single units.
 - Tad explains that Family Unit sellers gain another strong advantage by having "mega booth" where they put 2, 3 booths together.
 - Jacqueline suggests a 2 part structure on the fees and instead of Family Unit, call it a Collaborative Unit.
 - Tad says they are putting together a proposal to restructure definition of Family Unit and will have artists sign and will submit petition describing revisions to the SF Arts Commission for changes.
 - All present at meeting seemed to be in favor of a Proposal for changes to Family Unit to limit to them to 2 artists
 - Meeting attendees say there 2 issues regarding the Family Unit that are a problem: number of family members allowed to be part of a unit, and
 - Howard says lottery issue at Justin Herman Plaza is up to Tad/artists & Howard to put forth to the city.
 - Howard says that SAP Advisory Committee only have jurisdiction over number of people allowed to participate as a F.U., not how lottery is negotiated.
 - Howard discusses problems with City Attorney's outlook defining fairness of individual artist.
 - Proposal for new Family Unit description:
 - Josie suggests lottery rules can only have one Family Unit per lottery sign up for main lottery and afterwards if they want, other Family Unit members could have opportunity to sign up for what she proposes as "sub-lotteries."
 - Justin Herman Plaza is under criteria of Blue Book which covers all--and applies to all areas of street artists locations.
 - Howard reminds us to remain with purpose of meeting which is to cover Screening Criteria and that lottery is not within the Advisory Committee's jurisdiction.
 - A Silk Screening criteria needs to be added
 - Jennifer asked *who* wrote criteria?
 - Howard informed all that the Advisory Committee in 1977 wrote criteria and it was passed by the Arts Commission. It has since been been revisited a couple of times such as for example 10-12 years ago in regards to prints which ultimately led to allowing outsourced printing.
 - Howard advised all that a change of language must be put on another agenda and then we can vote on it.
 - Meeting attendees moved to new topic: Bead Making and Bead Stringing
 - Josie suggests adding new word "thong" or "cord" to description
 - Jennifer suggests adding "significantly" to 2nd sentence in 2nd paragraph of page 1
 - Tad says there is a discrepancy with the 15% rule
 - Howard proposes
 - Jennifer says there is confusion over 15%,
We must monitor closely -cannot be strung the same as purchased.
 - We need to add "stretchy bracelets" in description/ must be included
 - Proposal to change wording under Bead Stringing to include "stretchy bracelets..."
 - Problems with regulating 15% quantity
 - Howard suggests words changes to include "... this includes jewelry strung on elastic cord" with exception of 15% rule
 - Change "...same type of bead" with "strung by the artist."

- Add "solely" to last sentence of first paragraph.
- EARRINGS: propose changing minimum of 2 to 3.
- Public comment: William Joseph Clark said there are problems with the number of family unit members required to make earrings, jewelry. Unnecessary to have numerous people make jewelry that simply takes one person to make. Problem with huge displays by Family Units with these simple items.
- PENDANTS: William J Clark said people are buying the earrings due to the charm. William J Clark suggests category should be judged by what attracts buyer to purchase them. Any commercially manufactured element, one that is specifically manufactured with intention of being a jewelry element OR act as a focal point as a design should not be allowed in minimal designs. He emphasized these to be "items specifically manufactured for jewelry."
In terms of the the minimal amount of components allowable that number should be???
- Further discussion regarding wording to suggest removing and replacing line under "Earrings and Stickpins."
- William suggests saying/ adding "not be" in the Pendant category
- Bob Clark suggests change order of description by saying "No commercially ..."
- Do we need to describe how to make element?
- Suggestion to make 2 separate paragraphs without starting 2nd paragraph with "Exception."
- Bead Stringing:
add "strung by the artist"
- Bob suggests 15% should be eliminated.