
RULE OF THE CHAMBER

Any person wishing to address the Council shall step up to the podium, state their name and address in an audible tone of voice for the record, and unless further time is granted by the Council, shall limit their address to three (3) minutes.

A person may not give up or relinquish all or a portion of their time to the person having the floor or another person in order to extend a person's time limit in addressing the Council.

Any person who does not wish to address Council from the podium, may print their name, address and comment/question which he/she would like brought before Council on a card provided by the Clerk/Treasurer and return the card to the Clerk/Treasurer before the meeting begins. The Clerk/Treasurer will address the presiding officer at the start of Citizen Comments on the Agenda, notifying him of the card comment, and read the card into the record for response.

You will notice a numbering system under each heading. There is significance to these numbers. Each agenda item is numbered consecutively beginning in January and continues through December of each calendar year.

The City of Monroe will provide necessary reasonable auxiliary aids and services to individuals with disabilities at the meeting/hearing upon one week's notice to the City Clerk/Treasurer. Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the City of Monroe by writing or calling: City of Monroe, City Clerk/Treasurer, 120 E. First St., Monroe, MI 48161, (734) 384-9136. The City of Monroe website address is www.monroemi.gov.

**AGENDA - CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2009
7:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER.

II. ROLL CALL.

III. INVOCATION/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA.

225 Custer Statue and Granite Base – Maintenance and Restoration Proposals.

1. Communication from the Interim Director of Planning & Recreation, reporting back on the Custer Statue and Granite Base – Maintenance and Restoration Proposals, and recommending that the Custer Statue and Granite Base – Maintenance and Restoration proposals be rejected and the project be rebid.
2. Supporting documents.
3. Action: Accept, place on file and the recommendation be carried out.

V. MAYOR'S COMMENTS.

VI. CITY MANAGER COMMUNICATION.

VII. COUNCIL COMMENTS.

VIII. CITIZEN COMMENTS

IX. ADJOURNMENT.



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA FACT SHEET

RELATING TO: Custer Equestrian Monument Conservation Bids

DISCUSSION: The Planning Office was recently tasked with preparing and distributing Requests for Proposals (RFP) for both the bronze Custer Equestrian Monument and the statue's granite base. The bid was to be awarded and the project carried out this fall with "touch-up" cleaning to occur in the spring. The work would include assessing, cleaning, conserving, and, if needed, repairing both statue and base. While the preservation and conservation of an historic statue follows generally accepted preservation standards, this is currently not an area of expertise in the Planning & Recreation Department's Preservation Office. As such, staff contacted Dr. Dennis Montagna, Program Director for Monument Research & Preservation with the National Park Service to review and comment on the RFP and proposals submitted. His comments and recommendations are contained in the attached letter.

While receiving a number of inquiries about the project, it was readily apparent that the quick turn-around time to respond to the RFP and the fact that the work was to be completed yet this year dissuaded a number of qualified contractors from submitting proposals. The Preservation Office received bids for conserving the bronze statue from three firms. The bids ranged from an estimated low of \$10,000 to over \$50,000. The high bid depended upon a number of variables, such as whether costs for scaffolding or insurance were to be included in pricing. Estimates to clean the granite base had a similar range starting at \$6,850 (with add-on's of \$800 for sealer and \$850 to repair seven chips, for a total of \$8,500) to \$7,999 to \$30,000. In the latter bid, salt extraction and graffiti protective coatings, if selected, could add an additional \$31,600 to the price.

Dr. Montagna points out in his letter that "fall is the busy time for qualified conservators that you will want to engage...Typically, they are finishing up existing conservation projects before the change of the season, and are therefore less likely to be able to respond to an RFP that has a short response period and seeks to have a treatment take place before cold weather sets in. At this time of year, securing a large enough number of comprehensive proposals - which would create a competitive environment and provide you with true choice - is difficult." The small number of responses and the lack of specificity in the proposals themselves seems to bear this out.

This is a very important piece of sculpture and our responsibilities as stewards should reflect that importance and our commitment to future generations who, by our actions, will also be able to enjoy the Custer Equestrian Monument. The Preservation Office is recommending that current bids received for the Custer Equestrian Monument Conservation Project be rejected and the project be rebid providing for a longer response time with actual work to be undertaken in spring 2010. In the meantime, staff would propose working with the National Park Service to develop a baseline assessment of the statue, which several potential contractors had inquired about; as well as accepting the Park Service's offer to provide technical with developing a long-term maintenance strategy for this and other monuments in the community.

CITY MANAGER RECOMMENDATION:

- For *[Signature]*
 For, with revisions or conditions
 Against
 No Action Taken/Recommended

APPROVAL DEADLINE: September 28, 2009

REASON FOR DEADLINE: See Discussion section

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: For Against

REASON AGAINST: See Discussion section

INITIATED BY: Jeffrey Green, AICP - Interim Director, Department of Planning & Recreation

PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENTS, OR GROUPS AFFECTED:

FINANCES

COST AND REVENUE PROJECTIONS:	Cost of Total Project	\$N/A
	Cost of This Project Approval	\$N/A
	Related Annual Operating Cost	\$
	Increased Revenue Expected/Year	\$

SOURCE OF FUNDS:	<u>City</u>	Account Number	Amount
			\$N/A
			\$
			\$
			\$
			\$
	<u>Other Funds</u>		\$
			\$
			\$
			\$

Budget Approval: _____

FACT SHEET PREPARED BY: Jeffrey Green, AICP - Interim Director

DATE: 9/24/09

REVIEWED BY: George Brown, City Manager

DATE: 9/25/09

COUNCIL MEETING DATE: September 28, 2009

Benchmark Summary - Conservation of the Custer Equestrian Monument "Sighting the Enemy"

	Bidder #1	Bidder #2	Bidder #3
Location of Source	Detroit, MI	Monroe, MI	Chicago, IL
Conservation Certications	Member, American Institute for Conservation plus others	None	Member, American Institute for Conservation plus others
Treatment of Bronze Sculpture	\$10,000 - \$20,000	\$11,999	\$21,900 + \$13,800 + \$11,600 + \$3,000 + other amount
Treatment of Granite Base/Pedestal	\$2,750 + \$4,100 + \$15,000 + \$800 + \$850	\$7,999	\$16,400 + \$13,600 + \$1,600
Salt Extraction	No Bid	No Bid	\$30,000?
Optional Laser	No Bid	No Bid	\$18,000



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Northeast Region
United States Custom House
200 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

IN REPLY REFER TO:

24 September 2009

Mr. Jeffrey Green, AICP
Interim Director – Planning and Recreation
City of Monroe
120 E. First Street
Monroe, Michigan 48161

Dear Jeff,

I received the materials you forwarded regarding the anniversary project to conserve the Custer Equestrian Monument "Sighting the Enemy" by Edward Clark Potter. I am familiar with Potter's work including his outdoor bronze General (later congressman) Henry Slocum at Gettysburg, where the National Park Service has been the agency empowered since the 1930s to protect the battlefield and monuments in the outdoor environment that they were designed to be exhibited in. Potter was particularly known for his ability to sculpt horses and he collaborated with Daniel Chester French in creating the monument to U.S. Grant that we have here in Philadelphia. French sculpted Grant and Potter did his horse and the result was a terrific memorial!

Anniversaries are useful things. They were often at the center of efforts to construct monuments and in recent years they have played a big role in conservation planning. They encourage us to remember the past and take stock of where we've been. But they invite us to consider the future. That is why you and your city's leadership are at a good point to take stock of how you want to care for an important Civil War Monument commemorating a major figure and an event important to Monroe and the nation.

Specifically, to this opportunity, I think there are several issues that your city leadership should consider. First, there is the timing of the project and the quick turn-around time specified in your Request for Proposals (RFP). Fall is an unusual time to carry out conservation projects, especially in northern climes. Typically, the conservation of outdoor monuments takes place during the spring and summer, with conservators being secured the previous fall and winter. Fall is the busy time for the qualified conservators that you will want to engage to work on the Custer Monument. Typically, they are finishing up existing conservation projects before the change of the season, and are therefore less likely to be able respond to an RFP that has a short response period and seeks to have a treatment take place before cold weather sets in. At this time of year, securing a large enough number of comprehensive proposals--which would create a competitive environment and provide you with true choice--is difficult. I can share with you some information gleaned from the four firms that I suggested might want to compete for your project. I'm aware that only one of the four submitted a proposal, but I believe that all of them would have responded to your RFP if there had been more time to prepare a response, and if the work could be carried out in the spring.

Another issue is the amount of time required to construct a viable proposal if you want conservators to set forth both a treatment plan and a maintenance strategy—both things you really need. Normally, the NPS allows 30 days in a comparable situation to the RFP process that has been described, so it allows the firms to better assess a monument's condition and conservation needs. Also, without enough time to determine what conservation treatment a monument requires, it is very hard for a conservator to project cost with any confidence. Without this up-front information from your conservator, you'll run the risk of getting into a time and materials project in which you could have a hard time predicting ultimate costs.

From my reading of your intent and timing, Monroe's city leadership doesn't really need to hurry to make this important decision. There is time to secure a conservator in the next few months and then complete the conservation treatment in the spring. In fact, carrying out the work now would likely create a situation in which there will be a need to perform at least a minor post-winter washing and a coating touch up to make sure that the memorial looks its best for the Custer anniversary celebration. To conduct the actual treatment in the spring would lead more directly into the celebration and would create another opportunity to build local interest. My experience has been that media outlets love conservation projects because they are compelling and photogenic events.

Embarking on a conservation effort carries a big challenge, which I am sure you and others in local government have extensive experience with; one of ensuring the balance between the desires of the public to do something right away, and the need to have appropriate treatments carried out by skilled, trained conservators.

During the past two decades, programs such as Save Outdoor Sculpture! and others have sought to make the public aware of the need to care for outdoor bronzes. This awareness has resulted in some well-conceived monument care programs; but it has sometimes had a downside. Citizens on a mission to make a difference may not possess sufficient information to take wise and prudent actions, which then results in further damage done to a monument that had already suffered from years of weathering. Taking hurried action seldom results in a good outcome. Harm done by ill-advised treatments then leads to a need to take additional, often costly measures to try to remedy the damage done. Sometimes, no amount of remedial work can bring back what has been lost. As an example, prospective clients of conservation services often look to commercial metal cleaning companies or foundries who over clean the bronzes in an effort to make them look new. While the Park Service has been active in the effort to guide stewards of outdoor bronze monuments toward professionals with the training and skills to design and carry out appropriate treatments, we've learned some lessons the hard way and made some unfortunate treatment choices in the late 1970s that we're still trying to remedy.

Insuring that your monument will receive the timely maintenance it will need is another challenge that you will face. Conserved outdoor bronzes need to receive the prescribed maintenance that will keep viable their protective coatings. Performing timely, low cost maintenance will protect the investment you make in the initial conservation treatment. The most successful long-term monument care program effort I've seen is the one that the Fairmount Park Art Association has been carrying out here in Philadelphia since the

early 1980s. The art conservator they hired treated twenty-five monuments over a three-year period. Since then, the Association has committed to an annual inspection, a wash-down, and maintenance of the wax coatings. Consequently, the bronzes always look their best and at very little cost. More and more, I'm coming to see maintenance as the element that will make a conservation treatment sustainable over time.

If Monroe could develop a complementary monument maintenance approach, awareness can be shifted solely from the visual impact of an exciting and photogenic improvement of "disfigured" bronze to one that engages the public and educators in the real efforts to fully fund and preserve this important work of outdoor art. To address this challenge, some stewards have established legally binding fiduciary obligations as well as policies that focus on improving the quality, longevity and maintainability of protective coatings. My office would be pleased to partner with you in the creation of a baseline assessment and the development of an on-going maintenance strategy for the Custer Equestrian Monument.

Ultimately, it is up to us as elected or career government officials to make decisions wisely, to work with trained conservators to plan appropriate courses of actions and to promote appropriate cleaning methods based on a commitment to an ongoing maintenance program. Aggressive cleaning treatments carried out by those whose expertise lies elsewhere typically try to make an historic work "look like new." But these treatments often result in the kind of long-term damage that we may not be able to repair. As an agency responsible for commemoration of thousands of those who died on Civil War battlefield, we've sometimes learned these lessons the hard way. My hope is that you will profit from our experience and approach the work before you in the measured, thoughtful way that your monument deserves.

Please feel free to contact me if I can assist you in any way.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Dennis Montagna".

Dennis Montagna, Ph.D
Program Director
Monument Research & Preservation
National Park Service—Northeast Region