

MINUTES

CAPITOL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE

October 28, 2010
Room 548-S—Statehouse

Members Present

Representative Valdenia Winn, Chairperson
Representative Rocky Fund
Representative Lana Gordon
Timothy R. Graham
Carol McDowell
William Wagnon
Barry Greis, Statehouse Architect
Llewelyn Crain, Kansas Arts Commission

Members Absent

Joanne Budler
John Pinegar
Melissa Gregory
Jennie Chinn, State Historical Society

Staff

Reed Holwegner, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Melissa Calderwood, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Jim Wilson, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Jeff Russell, Legislative Administrative Services
Marilyn Arnone, Committee Secretary

Morning Session

Chairperson Winn called the meeting to order with eight members present. By the general consent of the Committee, persons were allowed to be seated at the Committee table and speak in the place of the *ex officio* members who were absent and excused. Cindy Roupe represented Joanne Budler; Mary Madden represented Jennie Chinn in the morning; and Bob Keckeisen represented Ms. Chinn in the afternoon.

Chairperson Winn recognized Jim Wilson, Office of the Revisor of Statutes, to explain SB 54 (Attachments 1 and 2). Mr. Wilson said 2010 SB 54 created the Capitol Preservation Committee and delineated its member makeup and the Committee responsibilities. Legislative Administrative Services has the responsibility to implement the recommendations of the Committee. Finally, the bill repealed the Joint Committee on Arts and Cultural Resources (KSA 75-2266) and the previous method for approval of memorials on the Capitol grounds (KSA 75-105 and KSA 75-106).

The Chairperson asked William Wagon to explain the memorandum he distributed to the Committee (Attachment 3). Mr. Wagon said the memorandum contained comments from former Senate President Dick Bond presented at a Topeka Capitols program sponsored by the Shawnee County Historical Society on October 24, 2010. It gives a history of the events that preceded the current restoration and renovation of the Capitol.

Historical Significance of *Brown v. Board of Education*

Chairperson Winn recognized Cheryl Brown Henderson, Superintendent, *Brown v. Board of Education* Historical Site, National Park Service (Attachment 4). At the direction of the Chairperson, and with the consent of the Committee, the following remarks of Ms. Brown Henderson were transcribed.

The myth of *Brown v. Board of Education* is that my father, Oliver Brown, filed this case on behalf of my sister Linda. The reality is much different. The myth was fueled, in part, by the legal name of the case, *Oliver L. Brown et. al. v. the Board of Education of Topeka (KS) et. al.*, however, is commonly known as *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*. This case was an extension of legal challenges to racially segregated schools that began in the 1800s. The first documented school desegregation case was filed in 1859, in the State of Massachusetts. The State of Kansas became the site of twelve legal challenges to racially segregated schools beginning in 1881. Three of the early Kansas cases were brought against the Topeka Board of Education prior to *Brown*. So by the 1950s, *Brown* was nothing new for the State of Kansas or the City of Topeka, in terms of legal challenges to racially segregated schools. That is an important fact to remember. With that in mind, it is clear that the concepts for the proposed mural need to embrace the entire history of the State of Kansas and not just starting with *Brown* in 1950 to 1954.

1948 was the eve of the last case prior to *Brown*. It was the beginning of a case on behalf of African-American students in Merriam, Kansas, commonly known as the *Webb* case. All of the early cases from Galena, Parsons, Coffeyville, Ottawa, Topeka, Wichita, and Johnson County were argued in State Supreme Court Chambers located in the Capitol. Kansas had been a hotbed of legal activity. Based on this history, the wall outside the Old Supreme Court Chambers in the Capitol would be an ideal place for the mural.

The final challenge to racially segregated schools in Kansas began in 1950, when the NAACP decided to organize one last case only this time they would file in federal court, not State Supreme Court.

McKinley Burnett, for whom the Administrative Center for School District 501 is named, was the strategist behind *Brown v. Board of Education*. Mr. Burnett decided that as President of the Topeka NAACP, he would try again to convince the Topeka Board of Education to integrate their elementary schools. In Kansas, the law governing racially segregated schools had been passed by the Kansas Legislature

in 1879. This legislation specified that Kansas could operate segregated schools only in first class cities defined as those with populations of 15,000 or more and only at the elementary level. So some cases from cities with populations under that threshold were illegally segregating elementary schools. The cities that qualified to have segregated elementary schools were Wichita, Kansas City, and Topeka. The *Brown v. Board of Education* case was really only concerned with these three communities and only elementary schools in these communities. Junior and senior high schools were already integrated. The only exception was Sumner High School in Kansas City, Kansas, which came about because of special legislative action at the request of the African-American parents.

Mr. Burnett, in his efforts to convince the Topeka Board of Education to desegregate elementary schools, attended every school board meeting for two years, however, he was unsuccessful with presenting petitions, and had not been permitted to verbalize his concerns. As a result, in 1950 he approached Lucinda Todd who was the [NAACP] chapter secretary, who was now retired after teaching in one of the segregated schools in Topeka. Mrs. Todd along with Charles Scott, John Scott, and Charles Bledsoe, the attorneys for the chapter, decided they needed to recruit families to be plaintiffs for the class action suit they were going to file. Lucinda Todd was a strategist and the first person to sign on as a plaintiff for the Topeka case. By 1950 they had thirteen families on the roster. Again, the myth is disproven in that my father, Oliver Brown, did not initiate this case. He was the tenth parent to agree to join their efforts. Charles Scott was a friend of my father and had asked him, personally, if he would be willing to join the case being organized. My father said yes. In the fall of 1950, their roster now included thirteen families representing a total of twenty children. They were instructed by the NAACP to attempt to enroll their children in a segregated school for white children closest to their home. It was recommended that they be accompanied by another adult to serve as a witness and the report back to the NAACP. That is exactly what they did. Their actions, in the fall of 1950, concluded the direct involvement of the families in Topeka. Once the case was filed, only three or four of the plaintiffs testified in court. The only child to testify was Katherine Carper, who most likely was selected because she was the oldest of the children represented by the parents. In this legal challenge, the parents were plaintiffs on behalf of their minor children.

On February 28 of 1951, the case was filed in federal district court, which, at that time, was located on the upper floors of the post office at Fourth and Kansas Avenue. At the time of filing, it became known as *Oliver L. Brown, et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka (KS)*. The legal shorthand *et al.* means "and others." When the case was filed on February 28, for whatever arbitrary reason, my father Oliver Brown was assigned to head the roster. Alphabetically, first was plaintiff Darlene Brown; so Oliver Brown was not the first plaintiff listed. The arbitrary assignment may have been based on gender, as Oliver Brown was the only male name on the roster of parents. Clearly happenstance and gender at a time when men were considered the head of households may indicate why Mr. Brown was chosen to head the roster. When *Brown v. Board* was argued in federal court, the three judge panel was led by Walter Huxman, who, although a federal judge at the time of *Brown*, had been a former Governor of Kansas. It is believed that Walter Huxman crafted the opinion of the court in a manner that would force the Supreme Court to determine the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment with respect to all citizens of this country. Luisa Holt, a psychologist at the Menninger Foundation, who also taught at the University of Kansas, testified as an expert witness, and it was her words that Judge Huxman used in his opinion, and it was her words that the Supreme Court used from in issuing a

decision about the detrimental effects of segregation when it has a weight of law behind it. So Kansas played a key role in this decision. At the U.S. Supreme Court level, the *Brown* case was combined with similar cases brought by the NAACP from Delaware, South Carolina, Virginia, and Washington, D. C. It is this combination of cases that are collectively known as *Brown v. the Board of Education*. Dwight D. Eisenhower was President when the ruling went into effect and was involved in the first public test of the political will to enforce the court decision, when he was called upon to respond to the attempted integration of Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas.

This is the story of the people, places, and events that contributed to this historic milestone, *Brown v. Board of Education*. My family has come to understand that the myth we live with was a creation of the media, emanating from a photograph of my sister published in *Life* magazine in 1953. Even though the facts were known about the case, we believe the photographer had designs on promoting what he hoped would be an award winning photo depicting *Brown v. Board of Education*. The photo was of my sister Linda standing in front of one of the segregated African-American schools. He seemed to have developed a narrative to go along with his photo, that Oliver Brown initiated the case on behalf of his daughter who had a traumatic experience trying to get to school, and when she got to school, the quality of education was lacking. None of that happens to be true. African-American children rode school buses to school, some even took city buses, and the schools they arrived at were sturdy brick buildings filled with excellent teachers.

We spend every day at the Brown [National Historic Site] and the Brown Foundation trying to educate people about the compelling story of the collective action on the part of the NAACP and the parents that stood with them. Attorney Charles Huston was the one who began this process of ending segregation in public education. Thurgood Marshall was Mr. Huston's protégé, but was not involved at the beginning of this process. Huston hired him later on to assist with his campaign to end educational disparities in teacher salaries, underfunded segregated schools, and school districts that did not provide buses for African-American children. Huston died in 1950 leaving Thurgood Marshall to complete the work they had begun together. What the legal team was able to do was take constitutional abstract and make it into reality. What does the Fourteenth Amendment really mean? On May 17, 1954, at 12.52 p.m., when Justice Earl Warren announced the Supreme Court decision, the *Brown* decision began to dismantle any legal framework for racial segregation. My father, Oliver Brown, the other plaintiffs, and even some of the legal counsel never appeared before the Supreme Court. But their courage in standing up to bigotry was on full display in the arguments of the NAACP attorneys.

Another significant reason people say that *Brown* is one of the most significant judicial turning points in history is that, by declaring racial segregation violated the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution, *Brown v. Board of Education* laid the groundwork for shaping future national and international policies. This case had global impact; so much so that President Truman, while *Brown* was going through the courts and before he left the White House, directed the State Department to submit a "friends of the court brief" to the Supreme Court saying this decision needed to be successful and being unanimous would not hurt. He said so because the Soviet Union and other Communist-leaning countries had started a propaganda campaign against the United States during the period of the Cold War saying that the United States did not have any moral standing in the world, because the United States was engaged in human rights abuses against African-Americans. The United States needed *Brown* to

counteract that propaganda. After *Brown* succeeded, one of the first things President Eisenhower did was to go on *Voice of America* radio broadcast to announce to the world that the United States of America was living up to its constitutional promise regarding African-Americans. So *Brown v. Board* has foreign policy implications.

In many ways, *Brown* really was not about children and education at all. Schools were the battlefield, but society—in fact—was the target. The laws and policies that *Brown* sought to address are at the core of human tendencies to prejudge and stereotype others based on ethnicity, religion, based on physical traits. You can, in fact, legislate behavior. You cannot legislate what is to be in our hearts and minds. The process of getting people to talk about race relations really began with the *Brown* decision. It began dialogue and galvanized people around the issues of segregation, discrimination, and lack of opportunity. Ultimately, what *Brown* did for all of us—whether white, brown, black, white, or Hispanic, disabled or fully able—what *Brown* did for citizens of this country was to finally define our rights are guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution and cannot be arbitrarily restricted by state and local government. The federal government and the Supreme Court safeguard our constitutional rights.

In 2004, when many of us were crisscrossing the nation and other parts of the world talking about *Brown*, people said to me that *Brown* did not make any difference; it did not matter. My response to those people was that *Brown v. Board* did exactly what it set out to do; it created access to opportunity. What people do with that opportunity is up to them. The *Brown* door opened the door of opportunity.

I think it is important work that the Committee is doing because Kansans do not know enough about their history and do not know enough to be as proud of it as they should be. We are not only the geographical center of the mainland of the United States, as some people think, but have been the glue historically. John Brown stopped the westward expansion of slavery. The pioneers from the 1800s that litigated cases recognized that they had certain rights and were willing to stand up for them. Our state has been immensely important to this country and I want our citizens to be proud of that. And that is what this mural, in my view, will certainly represent.

Chairperson Winn thanked Ms. Henderson for her presentation and assured her that the intent of the Committee was to tell a very large story.

Chairperson Winn asked Barry Greis, Capitol Architect, for a report on the work in the Capitol building ([Attachment 5](#)). Mr. Greis reported that work is on schedule to complete the north wing on all floors by June 2012. The rotunda will be completed, as well as Committee rooms, vending machine rooms, and photocopier rooms. The visitor center and site work will be completed using private funding, but no completion schedule has been determined. The exterior masonry work is continuing on the north wing and east wing. The tower crane has been installed and will be used until November 2011. The steel beams protruding from the limestone drum of the dome are to hold scaffolding for the exterior renovation.

Mr. Greis provided floor plans to locate potential places for the mural for *Brown v. Board of Education* ([Attachment 6](#)). Mr. Greis pointed out the back wall of the Committee room as being 28 feet wide by 11 feet high, to give a reference as to the size needed for a mural. It is not recommended to have the mural in the visitor center, because there is no timetable for when the space would be available.

Mr. Greis led a tour for the Committee to view the spaces available for the mural. The area on the fifth floor has a large wall space, but has grills and stenciling to be considered. This space is not as visible to the visitors to the Capitol. The fourth floor space is large and surrounds the door to the House visitors' gallery. It would be a very visible place. The mural could be seen from other parts of the Capitol throughout the rotunda. This area is usually included on the tours. There are no grills or other impediments at this site.

The third floor has available space outside the Old Supreme Courtroom, and it has historical ties to the cases relating to *Brown*. There is space between the pilasters on the wall, or the mural could continue on past the west pilaster. The general consensus was that the mural should not be around the window with the name Supreme Court on it.

There is no available space on the second floor.

Space is available on the first floor across from the cage elevator. It was noted that it was a busy, noisy space. Another space on the first floor in the west wing was also a busy space; plus it had an exit sign that could not be removed.

Following the tour, Chairperson Winn asked Mr. Greis if he had further comments about the walls or other pertinent facts concerning the mural. Mr. Greis noted that lighting was not an issue; most areas were lighted for murals. Smoke alarms and fire alarm boxes could be moved, but exit or restroom signs could not. The walls were prepared to accept murals.

Mr. Greis provided the Committee with example request documentation for the mural commemorating the First Kansas Colored Infantry Regiment that was approved several years ago (Attachments 7 and 8). That mural project has not moved forward and is in about the same development stage as the *Brown* mural. The First Colored Infantry mural is going to be presented to the Capitol Foundation as an enhancement, so money can be raised. Chairperson Winn commented that the First Colored Infantry mural was not assigned to this Committee.

Mr. Greis said after the decision is made and the funding is in place, the muralist could take a year to complete the work. The artist could work either in a studio or on-site.

Committee Discussion

Chairperson Winn said it was her understanding that the Committee would pick at least two areas for the location; then the Committee would send out requests for qualified artists. A subcommittee could be created to write the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and the Request for Proposal (RFP). After the artists respond to the initial request, then finalists could be selected for proposals. The mural must be done with private funds, but there may need to be clarification on whether the Committee needs to set up a process for collecting funds.

Representative Gordon asked if the First Colored Infantry mural had a location. Mr. Greis said there had not been a location determined yet. The Capitol Foundation would be asked to raise funds. Ms. McDowell commented that she did not think the Capitol Foundation was a functioning entity anymore and probably would not be in the future. It was originally set up to be a way to collect funds to pay for things in the Capitol that could not be paid for by tax dollars. Chairperson Winn expressed doubt that the Capitol Foundation would be a feasible conduit for accepting funds. Ms. McDowell asked if there was a nonprofit or similar organization that was going to be used to accept contributions to pay the artist. Chairperson Winn answered that question was something to be discussed.

Mr. Graham asked if it was better for the artist to work in a studio or on-site. Mr. Greis said there were examples of both in the Capitol. The oilcloth mural, however, was beginning to pull away from the wall. One of the artists worked outside the Capitol, because he did not want the constant comment about his work as John Steuart Curry had during his work in the Capitol.

Representative Fund asked if there were framed murals in the Capitol now, saying he looked at a mural differently than a picture. Mr. Greis said that there were framed murals in the Capitol, and one had hung by the Governor's Office.

Ms. Madden said she thought the definition of a mural was at the core of the issue. Mr. Greis said large framed works are defined as murals. That is one of the issues that the Committee on the First Colored Infantry mural struggled with also.

Representative Fund also asked if the artist would have any choice or any input to the location. The location would have influence on the design. Chairperson Winn answered that the Committee would determine a couple of locations and not debate the definition of a mural, but not have it detachable. The artist would be able to select to the desirable location.

Mr. Graham recommended that based on previous comments, there be a fixed, permanent mural located outside the Old Supreme Courtroom and placed between the two pilasters, and whether the work is done in a studio or in the Capitol be left up to the artist.

Representative Fund wanted to rule out the first floor because of the noise. He liked the Supreme Court location and the fourth floor because of the wrap around effect. Ms. Madden liked the wall space next to the Old Supreme Court Chamber, because of the association with the *Brown* case. She also liked the fourth floor outside the House gallery, as it would allow for more interpretation, and it also could be seen from across the rotunda.

Ms. Crain liked both spaces, but preferred the Old Supreme Court Chamber wall, because of the significance to the mural. Representative Gordon liked both spaces, but preferred the Old Supreme Courtroom. Mr. Wagnon liked the option of two sites and then to let the artist decide which space to provide the mural. He did like the space of the fourth floor, and it would be visible to the people going into the gallery. Ms. Roupe liked both sites, as well.

Mr. Greis noted there are speakers outside the Supreme Courtroom that are turned on when there is a large gathering outside the Chambers. That could be a distraction to the tours showing the mural.

Ms. McDowell thought the Old Supreme Court space is most compelling, as lawyers for the *Brown* case practiced in that room. That room will always be there, preserved as the Old Supreme Courtroom. She liked the fourth floor location, as well. Her third choice would be for the first floor space across from the cage elevator, directly beneath the John Brown mural. However, she thought the Old Supreme Court space is the darkest space and the least desirable from that aspect even though the history is compelling for that location. She thought the Committee should pick a space and let the artist's proposal be directed to that space, but not limit the artist as to how much of the space is used. She cautioned the Committee to be careful about what message is sent to the artist.

The Committee recessed for lunch.

Afternoon Session

The meeting reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Chairperson Winn asked the Committee to think about having two additional meetings before the first of the year. She did not think that everything could be accomplished in a single day. There were questions that need to be answered before moving ahead.

Chairperson Winn asked Jeff Russell, Director of Administrative Services, what the requirements of the Committee would be to meet two more times in the current calendar year. Mr. Russell answered that an official meeting is one that is noted, posted, and action may be taken legally. There are related expenses and salaries to be paid. Since the Legislative Coordinating Council had not approved any additional days, the Committee may meet, but the members would not receive reimbursement for expenses or any compensation. Staff is available at the request of legislators.

Representative Fund asked Mr. Greis if the speakers could be removed from the front of the Supreme Courtroom. Mr. Greis answered that it could be done—not easily, but it could be done.

Chairperson Winn asked for further discussion on the location of the mural.

Mr. Graham moved, seconded by Ms. McDowell, that the site in front of the Old Supreme Courtroom be the single site and the artwork not be limited to between the pilasters but be at the discretion of the artist and painted on the wall permanently. Discussion followed. *The motion failed on a roll call vote with 2 voting aye and 6 voting nay and 4 excused.* Those voting aye: Graham and McDowell. Those voting nay: Crain, Fund, Greis, Gordon, Wagon, and Winn. Those excused: Budler, Chinn, Gregory, and Pinegar.

Ms. Crain moved, seconded by Ms. McDowell, that two possible sites be identified for the mural: one being on the third floor outside the Old Supreme Courtroom and the second being the fourth floor site outside the House visitor gallery, and the final site be determined by the selected artist's conception and design. Discussion followed. *The motion passed on a roll call vote with 8 voting aye and 0 voting nay and 4 excused.* Those voting aye: Crain, Fund, Graham, Greis, Gordon, McDowell, Wagon, and Winn. Those voting nay: none. Those excused: Budler, Chinn, Gregory, and Pinegar (Attachment 9).

Chairperson Winn called to the attention of the Committee the report by the Statehouse Mural Committee from March 10, 2008 (Attachment 10). The Committee needs to look at the call for artwork, the request for proposal, and the procedure for announcements. Request for Qualifications (RFQs) and the Request for Proposals (FPs) would need to be sent out.

Mr. Wagon thought the RFQ was a good template from which the Committee could work.

Chairperson Winn said she had asked the State Library and the Historical Society to prepare some background material and also asked the Committee secretary to transcribe the testimony from Cheryl Brown Henderson to be added to the historical background.

Mr. Greis said that the specific editing to be done to the RFQ would be to state clearly that the mural was to be permanent, to specify the media to be used (eligibility of the artist, artist criteria); to make the artist aware that he or she would be involved with the public; and to understand the selection process and know what to and to whom to submit to qualify, and establish a timeline for the project. The Committee would look at the qualifications presented by the artists and then select several artists for the submission of concepts in whatever manner the Committee decides upon. The Committee then would select the concept.

Chairperson Winn thought the refinement of the two request documents for qualifications and proposals could be accomplished by a subcommittee. The timeline should be set to move quickly, because the Committee does not have the luxury of several years to complete its plans.

Mr. Greis said the sites selected by the Committee were ready to accept a mural, aside from some minor changes.

Representative Fund would like to see the word "permanent" added to the RFQ and RFP. He also would like to see the age limit discarded because there were some brilliant young artists who might want to submit a concept.

Chairperson Winn asked for volunteers to serve on a subcommittee to draft the RFQ and RFP documents by the next meeting in November. The Chairperson appointed Representative Gordon, Representative Fund, Mr. Greis, Ms. Crain, and herself to be on the subcommittee. She also welcomed anyone else who would like to participate. In the meantime, she asked the Committee to read the documents on the procedures to select the mural.

Representative Fund suggested that the Committee require a miniature of what will be the finished product from the selected artists. With the computer graphics that are available today, the artist could provide a clear idea of the concept intended for the mural.

Ms. Crain suggested there would need to be criteria set for reviewing the RFQ, so that everyone would be judged equally. Perhaps there would be people from the art community that could help consult on the requests, but would have no part in the actual selection. If there were a large number of requests, this procedure would certainly be of help.

Representative Gordon said she had served on the Committee that selected the state quarter design. She said they had a very good, fair system to judge the many entries presented. Perhaps this Committee might get some ideas for criteria from the coin committee.

Chairperson Winn asked Ms. Crain to think about ideas for financial resources for this project. Although the Committee is not responsible for raising the funds, the Committee should be aware of how these funds could be raised from private entities. Ms. Crain said she had no comprehensive list, but she had some ideas. Since the project has an art focus, foundations, and individuals who care about art would be a source for funds. Other foundations that are interested in politics, history, or African American issues are another. She suggested the National Trust for Preservation or the Tiger Woods Foundation. There are individuals who care about this issue whether living in Kansas or not, and African American alumni of state universities might be a possibility. Even if the Committee is not responsible, it is clear that possibilities for funds should be identified because this project will not happen without donations.

Mr. Graham hoped the funds were solicited from appropriate sources. He said the Oklahoma capitol displayed sponsorship signs for Coca Cola, Pepsi Cola, and others which had funded that state's art. He thought it would be a tragedy to have such an important mural brought to the public by a similar large corporation. He also added that the Committee should not be pressured to select a certain artist, concept, or contribution. Chairperson Winn thought everyone on the Committee would agree with those sentiments.

Mr. Wagon asked that the Committee take the position to endorse the upcoming legislation that would restore the Dillon House. He thought it would be appropriate for this Committee to recommend that legislation be passed. Chairperson Winn said that could be included in the Committee's annual report, but more information was needed on that specific legislation.

Chairperson Winn asked for other suggestions about what should be included in the Committee's annual report. By general consensus, the Committee agreed to include in the report the final versions of the Request for Qualification and the Request for Proposal, the timeline for the mural, the responsibility to begin work on other projects after the mural, the fact that no public funds will be used on the mural, and that the Committee should have authority to oversee the completion of the First Colored Infantry mural for completion.

Chairperson Winn recognized Charles Baptiste. Mr. Baptiste, an original supporter of SB 54, thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity and said he had enjoyed listening to the Committee. Mr. Baptiste said he had taken upon himself to establish a nonprofit organization called the *Brown* Mural Project-SB54, Inc. When there is money to be deposited, there was now a place for it to be collected. He would like to see the public have input as to the mural's depiction and to have some of the public on subcommittees so that a dialogue can take place. This is very important because many people have sacrificed to have the history of the decision portrayed in the mural. It is not about *Brown*, it is not about separate individuals; it is about the decision, how it got to where it is today, and where it is going in the future. Mr. Baptiste concluded by saying that in Kansas, there are people of all colors, and the mural should represent the same intention.

Chairperson Winn asked Senator Anthony Hensley, one of the sponsors of SB 54, if he would like to speak to the Committee. Senator Hensley commented that he had talked to Mr. Baptiste at the signing of SB 54 and was told about the nonprofit organization. Senator Hensley thought Mr. Baptiste's comments should be recognized in the Committee's minutes so the general public would know that a means had been established for the purpose of funding the mural.

Chairperson Winn thanked everyone for participating in the Committee meeting. It was decided to hold future meetings on November 19, 2010, at 10:00 a.m. and on December 17, 2010, at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Prepared by Marilyn Arnone
Edited by Reed Holwegner

Approved by the Committee on:

November 19, 2010

(Date)