

Notes
Capitol Commission Subcommittee Meeting
Tuesday, September 8, 2015

1. Call to Order

Commissioner Martineau called the meeting to order at 8:35am. The following were in attendance:

- Bob Martineau, Commissioner, Subcommittee Chairman
- David Lillard, Jr., State Treasurer
- Bob Oglesby, Commissioner
- Jack Johnson, Senator
- Thaddeus Watkins, General Counsel
- Peter Heimbach, State Architect
- Dr. Reavis Mitchell, TN Historical Commission
- Jim Hoobler, State Museum
- Representative, Sons of Confederate Veterans
- Representative, National AM Vets
- Representative, Disabled Veterans
- Elizabeth Coker, private citizen
- Several other attendees from various veteran groups

2. Purpose

To review and discuss the draft policy which addresses the general criteria for displays in and around the Capitol, the principles of the Capitol's interior collection, the criteria for individual works, and the miscellaneous criteria for the acceptance of items.

3. Discussion

- a. Presentation by the State Architect

Peter Heimbach distributed a copy of the draft policy to all attendees. The draft was created by staff personnel and it includes an informational break down of the other states' best practices and common themes. The subcommittee reviewed the draft, section by section.

- b. General Criteria in and around the Capitol

- i. The new policy will add to the Master Plan adopted for current monuments as the policy will apply to interior and exterior monuments.
- ii. Treasurer Lillard asked for clarification on the "Be sensitive" language on item (5); he asked what it meant beyond an architectural scale such as noise and size. He suggested that the language be changed to reflect the professional's verbiage.

- c. Principles of the Interior Collection

- i. This section represents an overarching view of Tennessee History

Notes

Capitol Commission Subcommittee Meeting

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

- ii. Commissioner Bob Oglesby suggested changing the “celebrates common values” language on item (1) as it may be interpreted in different ways.
 - iii. Thad Watkins stated that the interior collection would be reviewed as a whole and not by individual item in order to reflect the full, rich history of the State.
 - iv. One of the unidentified visitors asked if they were allowed to ask questions. Chairman Martineau responded that this meeting was simply a working session and it would be conducted in the same manner as a public meeting. Thad Watkins elaborated by stating that the subcommittee was working through a draft and it would be premature to answer specific questions at this time.
- d. Criteria for Individual Works
- i. Item 1: Commissioner Oglesby suggested that the roles and responsibilities “may include” the items listed rather than items (a) through (i) be an exhaustive list.
 - 1. Item (g) may be taken out of context;
 - 2. Item (f) was the same as (g) – The focus should be on what the work stands for rather than the location;
 - 3. Item (i) mentions the “common values”. It is suggested to rephrase the item to state it “celebrates or broadens the understanding of Tennessee’s heritage and culture.”
 - 4. The goal would be to have zero redundancy in any of the sections.
 - 5. Dr. Reavis Mitchell stated that item (h) should be removed because it is difficult to say what items will have a lasting significance.
 - ii. Item 2: Additional criteria thoughts and suggestions.
 - 1. Commissioner Oglesby asked if items (a) and (b) were redundant.
 - 2. Senator Johnson stated that if item (b) was eliminated then it would eliminate the reference to the “people”;
 - 3. Chairman Martineau stated that it would not be mandatory to fill all the criteria;
 - 4. Item (d) may be removed;
 - 5. The subcommittee should address the permanent display versus the temporary display of items
 - iii. Item 3:
 - 1. Dr. Reavis Mitchell asked if it would include archeological artifacts, and Chairman Martineau answered affirmatively.
 - 2. Commissioner Oglesby had a concern about the language stating “of lasting historical significance”.
 - iv. No Discussion on Item 4

Notes

Capitol Commission Subcommittee Meeting

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

- v. Item 5 is balanced by Item 4; it is not representing a political person/party – it is representing because of the history with the State.
- vi. Item 6: All text following the semi-colon (;) and beginning with “or the death of the last surviving member..” should be removed.
 - 1. Ten (10) years was the most prominent option throughout the data from other states that pertained to an anniversary date. However, it can be five (5), ten (10), or fifteen (15) years.
 - 2. Commissioner Oglesby asked if absolute language should be used in the policy. The verbiage should be changed to reflect “items will only normally or generally be accepted following the 10th Anniversary.”
- vii. Item 7: Instead of using the phrase “normally shall” the wording shall say “generally”.
 - 1. Thad Watkins recommended putting the word “generally” on the last sentence. For example, “Works of art...generally not duplicated”.
 - 2. Commissioner Oglesby asked if this item refers to the interior only. Peter Heimbach responded that the Capitol Commission could extend it as necessary.
 - 3. Chairman Martineau asked to reiterate what is covered by the Capitol Commission’s purview. Peter Heimbach stated that the Capitol, the Capitol grounds, and the Bicentennial Mall fall under the Commission’s direct purview. Areas one (1) block around the Capitol perimeter fall under its advisory purview.
 - 4. Chairman Martineau clarified that Items 3, 6, and 7 pertained to areas at the Capitol not in the Capitol.
 - 5. The subcommittee members agree that a general statement should be placed in the policy preamble that differentiates the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission, the State Building Commission, the Capitol Commission, etc.
- viii. Item 8 discusses communicating a message, not criteria.
- ix. There was no discussion for Items 9 and 10.
- x. Item 11: Commissioner Oglesby asked if the Tennessee State Capitol Collection will be defined.
 - 1. Peter Heimbach answered no – it was intended to be coverage of the entire interior collection. However, the general statement in the policy preamble will explain the scope.
 - 2. Also, Peter Heimbach stated that Items 5 and 7 should be incorporated into a subsection of Item 11.
- xi. Item 12: The subcommittee members stated that artifacts may not be placed in the Capitol. Alternative locations include the War Memorial, various State

Notes
Capitol Commission Subcommittee Meeting
Tuesday, September 8, 2015

parks, etc. Peter Heimbach mentioned that monuments have been placed at rest areas.

- e. Not “In-Policy” Discussion – Conditions of Acceptance.
 - i. Donors will not be recognized on monuments;
 - ii. The item becomes the property of the State once it is given to the State;
 - iii. There will be no stipulation for a permanent location or display.
 - iv. Public funds should not used

- 4. The Subcommittee discussed the non-substantive rules as they applied to the proposed policy. Dr. Reavis Mitchell stated that he would like to see the rules in written form instead of relying on interpretation.
- 5. Commissioner Oglesby suggested changing the title “Additional Criteria for Acceptance of Items” to “Miscellaneous Criteria for Acceptance of Items”
- 6. The Subcommittee deliberated on various changes to the Acceptance criteria. It was suggested to include a clause in the preamble that stated any issue not addressed by the policy would be under the jurisdiction of the Capitol Commission.

4. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 22, 2015 at 8:30am. The staff will redraft and recirculate the revised policy which will then be posted online for comment. All the comments will be distributed prior to the meeting.

The Subcommittee considered allowing the public to sign up to give verbal comment at the next meeting. Direction was given to provide for a process for the public to sign up to speak.