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1. INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

The following report contains the results of a sculpture conservation survey conducted in December 2014 for the City of Santa Monica (hereafter known as the City). The purpose of the survey was to examine forty-four (44) works of sculpture, integrated design elements, and mural painting located throughout the City. The aim of the survey was to develop a comprehensive maintenance, preservation and conservation program for the collection. Chief conservator Rosa Lowinger and senior conservator Christina Varvi carried out the survey with onsite assistance from paintings conservator, Viviana Dominguez and RLA conservation technician, Timothy Linden. Rosa Lowinger reviewed all reports prepared by all the staff and approved costs, treatment methodologies and priority designations.

The primary responsibility for care and maintenance of the collection falls under the auspices of the City’s Cultural Affairs Division. The collection consists largely of medium to monumental outdoor sculpture, large-scale integrated design installations, as well as painted and ceramic tile murals. The most highly represented material is stainless steel, followed by painted murals. Painted mild steel, bronze, aluminum, marble, concrete, ceramic, stucco, fiberglass, glass, galvanized steel, wood, and terrazzo are also represented. Many large-scale installations in public locations are installed throughout the city. These present challenges for long-term care and maintenance that are addressed in the individual reports.

The survey was conducted entirely as an onsite object-by-object project. Examination of the City’s records was not conducted. The only prior reports that were read or examined are those that were generated during the Sculpture Conservation Studio Condition survey, carried out in 2001. That survey, which was directed by Rosa Lowinger, served as the baseline observation tool for this public art conservation survey.

A full examination of each piece/installation, together with condition reports as well as treatment and maintenance recommendations are included in Section II of this report. Comments on location, siting and other environmental factors were included for each object. There is evidence that the collection has had some work done in ensuing years though documentation of said treatments was not available at the time of this survey. Overall the collection is stable, however nearly every piece is in need of conservation at present.

How to use this report: This report contains information on conservation and maintenance for each artwork examined. The report forms are divided by category into three subsets: lighting artworks, murals, and objects. Because the murals constitute the single largest category of high priority artworks to address, these have a separate cover page that summarizes our goals for their long-term care.

In this report, we discuss both maintenance and conservation. Conservation treatments are specified within the individual reports and costs are given for each work to be treated. Moreover, a summary of groups of treatments, given by priority, is included in this summary.
Maintenance: In the reports we provide protocols for maintenance for each work. The cost estimates are given for the performance of said work by an outside firm or team. However, we have also included a list of pieces whose maintenance can be carried out by in-house City staff, in lieu of an outside firm. The costs for using in-house staff are not provided, as these would depend on the rate of individuals working for the city.

At present, we recommend that all artworks continue to receive preventive maintenance by either an outside conservation firm or in-house city staff, as indicated within the report. The exception would be priority #1 artworks, as designated in the list below. These works should not be maintained until they are conserved. The cost of maintenance for priority #2 or #3 will continue to be within the same range after conservation is carried out.

Please note that the costs given are in 2015-dollar values. The City should expect costs to go up by approximately 5% per year for all of the tasks, treatments and maintenances given in this report. Therefore, a maintenance cost of $2,000 in 2015 will cost approximately $2,100.00 in 2016, $2,205.00 in 2017, and so on.

2. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON COLLECTIONS

The care of the City’s works requires a proactive and ongoing policy to make sure they are maintained for future generations. The following are general observations pertaining to overall condition and care that were noted during the survey:

• Though many of the pieces require maintenance and conservation, none were found to pose a public safety hazard at this time.

• The entire collection is located within 5 miles of the ocean. As such, it is subject to saline conditions and humidity from fog and marine layer conditions that occur repeatedly over the course of a year. The collection overall is nonetheless in good condition, especially given that Santa Monica is a highly trafficked, pedestrian friendly locale. Wear and tear are prevalent as are minor to moderate instances of graffiti. Most of these conditions can be addressed through routine maintenance.

• In general, siting of the pieces is good. Of greatest concern is proximity of sprinklers and damage from pooled water. Although few sprinkler heads were observed, RLA noted evidence of watering from nearby or mobile watering units. Mineral deposits, erosion and corrosion are the result of such repeated watering.

• Public “abuse” in the form of touching and climbing on the pieces was a frequent cause of damage. Because many of the streets adjacent to sculptures are moderately-to-highly trafficked, dirt and grime are an ongoing problem.

• A moderate amount of vandalism was noted throughout the collection, especially in the form of incised and applied markings as well as people climbing on elements of the artworks. This is not surprising giving the high concentration of tourists/visitors at any given time. Nonetheless, several pieces could benefit from additional lighting and possibly surveillance to prevent vandalism.
• Over the years, there appears to have been multiple approaches to how applied graffiti has been addressed. In some cases, graffiti has been painted over without any attempt to integrate the over-paint into the original design. In other cases, there is evidence of graffiti ghosting, indicating that attempts were made to remove graffiti by chemical or abrasive means. RLA opines that the latter practices are more recent approaches to graffiti mitigation and have replaced the former methods of over-painting. However, training in effective methods of doing this are warranted.

• Several pieces, mainly Saint Monica and Totem Pole appear to have taken on a special meaning within the community. People place flowers and other items on the base of Saint Monica and locals touch the lower portion of the Totem Pole prior to starting their run or walk through Pacific Palisades Park. While some artworks and installations have been designed with public interaction in mind, pieces like the aforementioned actually suffer damage (i.e.: staining/soiling, paint loss, burnishing, etc.), though it may not be intentional. We are of the opinion that such acts of respect or veneration should not be discouraged; however creative methods for mitigating the damage they cause should be incorporated into regular maintenance.

• The painted murals and integrated design elements are the highest priority for conservation and exhibit the greatest wear and damage. The majority of the painted murals are subjected to high levels of UV throughout the day and carbon-based particulates from vehicles. Extensive bleaching/lightening of the surfaces and binder loss is apparent on almost all painted murals. While the integrated design elements were likely designed with public interaction in mind, they have still suffered moderate to heavy damage and soiling due to constant public interaction.

• The pieces containing ferrous components are also the ones that have consistently deteriorated the most. This is to be expected in a high salt environment. However, RLA noted that in many cases primer and paint systems were insufficient to protect ferrous metal components. We strongly advocate for the City instituting a pre-construction conservation review of any potential new commissions. This will serve to catch potential conservation problems prior to fabrication and installation.

• With many of the integrated design and art and architecture works, there are instances where the artist must be consulted and times when it is not necessary. For example, the La Lannes mandate that they be consulted in terms of any changes to the plantings around the Dinosaurs of Santa Monica, yet they do not insist on being consulted regarding the fountain system. Similarly, Robin Brailsford only wishes to be contacted regarding specific elements of River of Life, such as the origami bronze figures, glass, as well as mosaic and etched granite pavers, not the seating, signage, lighting, or shelter structure.

• Using our rating system and looking at all pieces in the collection that have been assessed (including Beacon (Pinto), which was assessed prior to this survey), we feel the top three priority pieces for conservation within the City’s entire collection are as follows:
  1.) Overlook Beacon (Pinto), $59,202.00 + Access
3. RATING SYSTEM

In order to assess priorities each artwork was assigned a numerical designation based upon its state of conservation. The priorities were based on a combination of factors having to do with materials, condition, siting, and the ability to safeguard the artwork using factors such as maintenance. The priority ratings range from 1 to 3, with 1 being the pieces in most dire need of conservation and 3 being pieces that presently require minimal treatment.

Specifically the ratings should be interpreted in the following manner:

- **Priority 1** objects exhibit structural instability that could result in imminent, irreversible damage to either the piece itself or to the public. Pieces with severe surface issues—delamination, active surface loss, self-perpetuating corrosion—are also included in this category. It is recommended that treatment on these works be carried out as soon as possible.

- **Priority 2** objects are not in imminent danger, however they exhibit condition issues that exhibit normal wear and tear from the elements that results in corrosion, breakage, loss, abrasion, or paint loss. If maintenance is continued, treatment could be carried out within 2-4 years.

- **Priority 3** objects require minor treatment, such as cleaning, minor corrosion removal, coating application, and/or fungal removal, but lacking urgency. If maintenance is continued, treatment can be carried out within 3-4 years.

Based on this priority breakdown the collection can be said to be in fair to good condition overall. Though all of the works are in need of routine maintenance and some conservation, roughly 18% of the works require attention in the immediate future. Another 36% of the collection requires attention within 2-4 years. Fortunately, category one pieces, which require urgent care, is the smallest category. This is pleasantly surprising due to the fact that the collection does not presently receive regular maintenance. It is our opinion that environmental and siting factors, frequent interaction with the public, and differed maintenance issues are generally the problem with category 1 pieces and that once the collection is brought up to a good state of conservation it will be possible to keep it stable with regular, ongoing care.

The following is the breakdown of the artworks examined by conservation priority. Priorities within each priority category have also been identified below.
4. PRIORITY RATING & CONSERVATION COST BREAKDOWN*

As requested by the City in the original RFP, of the works we surveyed, the following artworks are considered the top three (3) Priority 1 pieces:

1.) *Overlook Beacon* (Pinto), $59,202.00 + Access
2.) *Untitled* (McMakin), $20,560.00, 2-3 weeks for treatment
3.) *Bells and Books* (Dreager), $19,880.00 + Casting, 2-3 weeks for treatment

A breakdown of these costs (hourly rates, materials, etc.) is included in the individual condition reports that follow. Please note that these costs are for treatment labor, materials, and equipment only. Costs for parking, any required City permits, and/or art handling services will need to be added to these costs.

In being priority one pieces, these works represent the most urgent conservation needs. However, we also advocate allotting funds for instituting maintenance as part of the overall first phase/priority treatment of the collection. This will aid in preventing the need for future work.

As specified in the proposal, digital photographs were taken for each artwork examined. These photos illustrate this report and provide a full photographic conservation record of the collection as of December 2014. We are also including an electronic copy of a full range of images on CDs that will be submitted to the City.

**Priority 1 = 6 works**

1.) *Overlook Beacon* (Pinto) $59,202.00 + Access
2.) *Untitled* (McMakin) $20,560.00
3.) *Bells and Books* (Dreager) $19,880.00 + Casting
4.) *Children’s Mural* (Alonzo) $32,100.00
5.) *Whale of a Mural* (Alonzo) $38,100.00 + Permits
6.) *Unbridled* (Gordon) $35,800.00 + Permits

**Sub-total Priority 1:** $205,642.00 + Casting & Permits

**Priority 2 = 18 works**

1.) *Singing Beach Chairs* (Hollis) $12,320.00 + Rigging
2.) *Montana Ridge* (Kelmek & Robbins) $10,820.00
3.) *Tables of Content* (The Wexlers) $37,750.00 + Rigging
4.) *Dinosaurs of Santa Monica* (The LaLannes) $26,020.00
5.) *Untitled: Homage to Jack Kerouac* (Staccioli) $21,350.00
6.) *Oneness* (Rompanen) $10,990.00
7.) *The Big Wave* (DeLap) $18,320.00 + Permits
8.) *Totem Pole* (Tlinget) $11,870.00 -24,740.00
9.) Ocean Park Segue (Kohl) $11,320.00
10.) CNG/LNG Station (Wyatt) $14,400.00
11) Children’s Play Area (The Buchens) $69,200.00
12.) SMURRF (Turner) $32,880.00 + Permits
13.) History of Pico Neighborhood (Thiermann) $34,930.00
14.) Another Magical Sunset at Santa Monica Beach (Lujan) $7,740.00
15.) Colonial Spanish & City Seal (MacDonald-Wright) $24,140.00
16.) Two Hundred Fourteen Movements and a View (Petropoulos) $29,800.00
17.) History of Civilization (MacDonald-Wright) $27,800.00
18.) Recycle, Renew, Repair, and Restore (Cockcroft) $11,050.00

Sub-total Priority 2: $412,700.00- $425,570.00 + Rigging & Permits

Priority 3 = 21 works

1.) Cradle (Ball Nogues Studio) $12,120.00 + Permits
2.) Light Overhead (Klein) $21,760.00 + Permits
3.) Untitled (Lere) $21,250.00
4.) River of Life (Brailsford) $20,060.00
5.) Saint Monica (Monrahan) $20,820.00
6.) Cool Fire (Erskine) $6,530.00
7.) Underwater Canopy (Cheng) $11,670.00
8.) Untitled: Downtown Parking Structures 2, 4, & 5 (Garten) $21,800.00 + Permits
9.) Livin’ Together (Baron) $3,920.00
10.) Arcadia Bandini di Baker (Sanae) $2,865.00
11.) Twilight and Yearning (Muller) $2,680.00
12.) Digital Divide (Corson) $18,320.00 + Electric
13.) Wheels (Karlsen) $14,320.00 + Permits
14.) Wave and Shell Obelisks (Doner) $8,190.00
15.) Recreation (MacDonald-Wright) $15,120.00
16.) Our Santa Monica Heritage (Thiermann & The Hunns) $10,450.00
17.) Our Pico Neighborhood (East Los Streetscapers) $10,300.00
18.) Santa Monica Beach (Mortimer) $7,670.00 + Access/Permits
19.) Garage Your Desires (Shire) $6,880.00
20.) Weather Field, No. 1 (Manglano-Ovalle) $10,600.00
21.) Watermark (Hamrick) $4,420.00

Sub-total Priority 3: $251,745.00 + Electrical & Permits
TOTAL $870,087.00 - $882,957.00

* Note: Costs do not include cost of parking, any special permits, or art handling services.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS:
The following are overall recommendations for the collection:

- Carry out treatment on as many of the Priority 1 artworks as possible. Begin with works that have already been identified as needing treatment and continue with the list until completed.

- Make changes to siting as indicated in the individual conservation reports. Most important is the removal of sprinklers that are in contact with pieces, particularly those made of ferrous metal. Remove plantings from direct contact with pieces. Where possible and appropriate, consider planting low, barrier hedges a few feet away from some of the artworks to deter people from going up to and touching them. Warning signage and faux security cameras may also deter vandalism as well as keep people from touching and climbing upon certain artworks.

- For some of the integrated design artworks (i.e.: Tables of Content, Children’s Playground, River of Life, etc.), more signage throughout the installation area reminding people that they are interacting with works of public art may help prevent abuse and vandalism.

- Begin to schedule a regular maintenance program for the works in question. A detailed recommendation for each piece is included with the individual reports. Even something as simple as rinsing down some of the pieces may mitigate damage due to corrosive salts from the nearby ocean and carbon-based particulate matter from vehicle emissions.

- Establish a systematic approach for documenting and redressing damage or vandalism. If possible, vandalism should be mitigated as soon as possible to discourage the public from continuing to vandalize the artworks.

- Establish a system of vetting new works using the most up to date Design-Phase conservation review. Such a review would provide analyses of materials and techniques proposed for fabrication of new works and make recommendations for siting and maintenance. The review will also allow the City to properly plan for costs associated with future maintenance.

6. CONCLUSIONS:
Based on our examination, it appears as though the coastal climate, strong UV, heavy vehicular traffic, and large tourist/visitor population have all contributed to the various degrees of deterioration observed throughout the collection. For the most part, there are a few issues in terms of encroaching or overhanging plantings, but watering practices should be reviewed and modified in order to prolong the effectiveness of
conservation treatments and routine maintenances as well as mitigate damage to the artworks. Furthermore, grounds staff should be reminded to take care while working around sculptures in order to minimize damage (scratches, abrasions, etc.) and resulting deterioration. If possible, the community should be educated on the deleterious, costly, and potentially irreparable effects of climbing on, touching, and vandalizing the artworks. Once they realize the harmful effects of certain actions (even if there is no mal intent), they may take ownership of their City’s art and advise tourists/visitors of the harmful effects of their actions as well.

Additionally, we recommend instituting a maintenance program that addresses the work on an ongoing basis. In Section III of this report, we have indicated which maintenances can be completed by City personnel with some training and which should be completed by a qualified conservation firm. For maintenances to be carried out by a qualified conservation firm, cost estimates do not include cost of parking, any special permits required by the City, or any fees associated with art handlers/rigging. These would need to be added. Moreover, costs are given for 2015 and should allow for approximately a 3-5% increase annually beginning in January 2016.
ELECTRONIC & TIME BASED MEDIA REPORTS
Introduction:

**Electronic or Time Based Media** is a form of art that depends on technology such as video, light, digitization, the Internet, and/or sound components. The City of Santa Monica contains a number of works that depend upon lighting components, many of which are dependent upon programmable systems. This survey addressed the condition of the following four artworks:

- **Digital Divide**, Dan Corson (2009)
- **Big Wave**, Tony DeLap (1991)
- **Untitled (downtown parking structures 2, 4, & 5)**, Cliff Garten (2009)
- **Light Overhead**, Sheila Klein (2001)

Not included as part of the survey, but also part of the collection, is **Light Wall** by Michael Davis. City staff has advised the conservators that in 2009, the light sequences were re-programmed in conjunction with the artist. The lighting equipment and controller for **Light Wall** were also replaced. The glass walls (both 1st and 2nd floor) are the original glass walls.

Electronic works of art differ from other sort of public artworks. Their dependence on technology adds a layer of maintenance to these works that is not often within the purview of traditional conservation. The meaning of these works is dependent on less tangible matters, for example light, and the physical deterioration of minor components can affect an overall aesthetic of the piece.

Industry decisions to discontinue or reduce the use of particular technologies (fiber optic lights is a perfect example) also affects the care of electronic artworks. As a result, their care is best served by obtaining clear maintenance instructions from the outset, as well as written information from the artist on what would be acceptable and unacceptable methods for migrating the technology forward as the current method becomes obsolete.

As part of this survey, RLA examined the pieces visually. Fading of colored lighting and coatings and observed malfunctions were noted. However, we were unable to inspect components or review existing documentation records to make sure that the information needed for these works is complete. We recommend undertaking this task as a next step in addressing the collection as a whole. We recommend additional inspection of components and examination of records to make sure that future standards are in place for making changes to electronic works as the need arises. RLA’s personal experience working with Mr. DeLap on the replacement of fiber optic lights with LED lights is a perfect example of how this dialogue with an artist can result in appropriate changes to works.
2014 Examination: December 11, 2014 by Tim Linden and Christina Varvi

Artist: Dan Corson

Title: Digital Divide

Date: 2009

Materials: Painted galvanized steel, aluminum, and electronically enhanced glass with video.

Dimensions: Approximately 300’ L x 15’ H

Location: Along Colorado Blvd.

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The work is a dividing wall separating the Big Blue Bus parking lot from the public corridor; including electronic glass panes, aluminum, and galvanized steel. Approximately 50% of the blue glazing can electrically switch between transparency and translucency in less than a second. The wall is about the length of a city block and is four rectangular glass panels high. At irregular intervals the wall staggers in ascending order by about two to three feet. The form of the wall and the electric panels are meant to give the appearance of a rolling façade, similar to a wave. The framing of the wall is formed in aluminum and lighting lines the bottom of the wall in its entirety. The backside of the installation is supported by a painted galvanized steel support structure. This support structure is installed every two glass panels across. The entire installation sits atop a low concrete wall. At each section of the wall there are surveillance cameras.

Condition: The overall condition and structural stability of the piece appears to be good. Upon inspection, there do not appear to be any structural issues pertaining to this piece. Overall, there is mild soiling of the structure, including accretions of grime and guano. Water spotting/mineral deposits occur on both sides of the wall, likely from nearby sprinklers. Furthermore, atmospheric soiling has collected along the horizontal recesses along the glazing. Around 11 lighting fixtures are broken or missing. There are two small dents on the 7th street side of the wall that appear to be from blunt impact. On the parking lot side there are relatively more plants encroaching on the sculpture than on the street side. Where the galvanized supports on the back side of the wall meet the ground, ferrous corrosion appears to be occurring on some of the connections. This is likely due to the flora watering system nearby.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The street side of the installation is exposed to a high pedestrian traffic area and is somewhat within reach of the public. The piece is not accessible to vehicles,
but it is adjacent to the Big Blue Bus parking lot and maintenance yard, so it is likely subjected to high carbon emissions particulate matter. The work is outdoors and exposed to the elements. There are sprinkler systems within reach of the wall on both sides and streetlights nearby. Surveillance cameras are placed around the piece. There are overhanging trees and slightly encroaching vegetation at both sides of the wall.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Trim vegetation and fix lighting system. If possible, redirect sprinkler heads so that they do not spray onto the surface of the installation.

Treatment Priority: #3

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Cut electricity to the installation during treatment.
3. Trim back plantings that are encroaching upon the installation.
4. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
5. Rinse the installation with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent.
6. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and dry with cotton cloths.
7. Mechanically remove any extant mineral deposits/water spotting with micro-abrasive means making sure not to scratch the surface.
8. Excavate and passivate any corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease areas with denatured alcohol.
9. Prime and in-paint areas of exposed mild ferrous metal. Paint system selected is to match original in both color and reflectance as well as be rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light.
10. Attempt to address issues of dented aluminum framing. Appearance of dents may be minimized, but may not fully be removed without more involved steps, such as partial de-installation of the panels.
11. Repair and/or replace damaged and missing lighting elements.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 48 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 6,240.00
Conservation Technician: 112 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 10,080.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 1,000.00
Access: (Allow up to) $ 1,000.00
Electrical to repair/replace uplighting below installation: $ TBD
Total: $ 18,320.00 + electrical

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Trim back plantings that are encroaching upon the installation.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
4. Rinse the installation with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent.
5. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Mechanically remove any extant mineral deposits/water spotting with micro-abrasive means making sure not to scratch the surface.
7. Examine painted mild steel surfaces for signs of corrosion and address accordingly.

**Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs:** $8,000.00
2014 Examination: December 11, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Tony Delap

Title: The Big Wave

Date: 1991

Materials: Painted mild steel, optic fiber lighting, Lexan, and stainless steel hardware

Dimensions: Overall: Height: (approximate) 40', Width: 12'
  Beam Dimensions: Width: 8 3/4", Depth: 6 1/2"
  Linear Length: Approximately 157.0'
  Minimal Metal thickness: ¼"
  Lexan: Thickness: 1/8", Width: 5 ¼", Maximum Length: 8.5'

Location: Wilshire Blvd, near Franklin

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The piece consists of a series of arches, with a bend segment, built in painted mild steel, which displays LED lights on the underside. A perpendicular arched section connects two larger parallel half arches at the center point. The western-most arch is around 5 feet shorter than the eastern-most arch at the area of connection. As a whole, the segments resemble a single ocean wave. The optic fiber lighting system is in cased by 5 and ⅛” wide panels of Lexan, and illuminates the sculptures underside in the night. The mild steel, radial square tubing used is about ¼” in thickness and about 8 and ¾” x 6 and 1/2” in dimension. The whole piece reaches a height of around 40’.

Condition: Overall the condition of the piece appears to be good. The structural condition seems to be stable, but there is one consideration to be addressed. Near both bases, cracking of the paint coating along a welded joint that extends from the bottom connection to about 4 feet in height was observed. This cracking has led to a corrosion of the ferrous substrate and subsequently stained the surrounding paint coating. At this point in time, it is unknown whether or not the welds themselves have cracked or have become compromised due to corrosion. This condition is likely an inherent one due to movement at the base of the sculpture and vibration from traffic. This is not a critical issue but should be addressed.

The surface condition is good, with only minor issues. There is overall soiling from atmospheric dust and debris, likely carbon emission sediment from proximity to high traffic area. Slight warping, possibly due to UV exposure, of the Lexan panels has occurred, and on the south side one panel has broken. The hardware connecting these panels to the structure has begun to oxidize, causing ferrous staining of the panels. Mild degradation of the paint has occurred. Slight fading of the paint surface, in addition to loss, abrasion, and ferrous staining, has appeared since the last treatment. Graffiti has been etched into the paint, exposing the metal
substrate to oxidation. The plaque ascribed to the piece lacks a protective coating seems to have mild corrosion. All optic fiber lighting seems to be functioning at this time.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** Last known treatment of *The Big Wave* was performed by RLA during the period of November 15th to December 6th in the year 2010. Treatment included replacement of the optic lighting system and light covering, corrosion mitigation, priming and painting, as well as application of an anti-graffiti coating to the lower 14’ of the sculpture on either side of Wilshire Blvd.

**Comments on Mounting:** None at this time.

1. **Comments on Location:** The sculpture is set in a high pedestrian traffic area and its bases along Wilshire Blvd are within reach of the public. It is somewhat accessible to vehicle traffic, but is definitely exposed to heavy vibration and carbon emission particulates from heavy traffic along Wilshire Blvd. The piece is outdoors and open to the elements. It appears to receive significant direct sunlight throughout the day. There are streetlights nearby, but the piece is not spot lit. There are no overhanging trees, encroaching vegetation, or nearby sprinklers.

**Comments on Safety/Risk Management:** None at this time.

**Recommended Site Improvements:** None at this time.

**Treatment Priority:** #2

**Curatorial Priority:**

**Treatment Recommendations:**

1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
3. Rinse sculpture with filtered tap water and wash with a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with filtered tap water and dry with cotton rags.
5. Remove extant sacrificial graffiti coating from lower 14’ of sculpture at either side of Wilshire Blvd.
6. Excavate and passivate any corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease areas with denatured alcohol.
   a. If deemed necessary, have an engineer inspect the welds to ensure structural stability has not been compromised.
7. Sand, prime, and in-paint areas of paint loss and incised graffiti. Paint system to match original in both color and reflectance as well as be rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light.
8. Replace broken Lexan panel, and address any panels that have warped.
9. Ameliorate ferrous stained panels and consider replacing hardware with stainless steel equivalent.
10. Re-apply sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to lower 14’ of installation at either side of Wilshire Blvd.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

Conservator: $6,240.00
Conservation Technician: $10,080.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $1,000.00
Access: (Allow up to) $ 1,000.00
Permits & Traffic Control (for working in the street): $ TBD
Total: $ 18,320.00 + Permits & Traffic Control

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** Ladder and lift

**Recommended Maintenance:**
To be completed bi-annually – Clean lower 14’ of installation at either side of Wilshire Blvd.:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Rinse lower 14’ of sculpture with filtered tap water and wash with a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
3. Rinse with filtered tap water and dry with cotton rags.
4. If deemed necessary, remove extant sacrificial graffiti coating from lower 14’ of sculpture at either side of Wilshire Blvd. according to the manufacturer’s specifications.
5. Inspect surfaces for signs of corrosion and incised graffiti that may compromise protective paint layer and address accordingly.
6. Re-apply sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to lower 14’ of installation at either side of Wilshire Blvd according to the manufacturer’s specifications.

To be completed approximately every 5 years – Clean entire installation:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Rinse sculpture with filtered tap water and wash with a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
3. Rinse with filtered tap water and dry with cotton rags.
4. If deemed necessary, remove extant sacrificial graffiti coating from lower 14’ of sculpture at either side of Wilshire Blvd. according to the manufacturer’s specifications.
5. Inspect surfaces for signs of corrosion and incised graffiti that may compromise protective paint layer and address accordingly.
6. Inspect all lighting, panels, and associated hardware for signs of deterioration.
7. Re-apply sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to lower 14’ of installation at either side of Wilshire Blvd according to the manufacturer’s specifications.

**Estimated Maintenance Costs:** $ 2,000.00 - $ 10,000.00
2014 Examination: December 11, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Cliff Garten

Title: *Untitled*, Downtown Parking Structures #2, 4, and 5

Date: 2009

Materials: Aluminum, stainless steel, acrylic sheet, and LED lighting.

Dimensions: Approximately 24’ W x 80’ H

Location: 2nd St. (north of Arizona), 2nd St. (south of Arizona), and 4th St. (south of Santa Monica).

General Condition: Excellent  Good X  Fair  Poor

Representative Image of All Three Installations

Description: The installations consist of an architectural design element in aluminum and LED lighting that is installed above each parking garage entry. It incorporates perforated, undulating panels of aluminum that protrude from the exterior wall and a tubular column that bisects the panels, extending towards the top of the structure. The perforation is honeycomb in pattern but uses ovoid holes to create negative space. The panel contains text elements that display the words “public parking” and the numbering pertaining to the lot. The columnar element that rises from the bottom panels contains LED up-lighting that illuminates the piece at night.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in good condition. The structural condition of the work appears good. However, a large indentation exists on the lower paneling of Parking Structure 5, likely due to a vehicular accident. This aspect does not present any immediate issues of concern related to risk management, however, the piece has been structurally disfigured. Condition regarding the surfaces is also good. There is, however, evidence of atmospheric soiling, biological accretions, streaking, hard watermarks, and ferrous corrosion, especially at the lettering at Parking Structure 2. The lighting appears to function as intended.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The each of the three installations is set in a high pedestrian and vehicular traffic area. They are not easily accessible by either the public or vehicles, but since they are mounted to a parking structure, they are likely subjected to constant vibration. All of the installations are outdoors and open to the elements. There are nearby streetlights. There are
no overhanging trees or encroaching vegetation. Proximity to the ocean is less than 1 mile and both of the installations on 2nd Street face west. The installation on 4th Street faces east.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Consider signage for accessibility height, as to thwart tall vehicles from trying to enter the parking structure, resulting in damage to the piece.

Treatment Priority: #3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and filtered water, using soft, natural-bristle brushes and microfiber cloths.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Remove stubborn accretions and sticker residue mechanically and with appropriate solvents as needed.
6. Excavate and passivate any corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease with denatured alcohol.
7. Address misshapen panel section of structure 5.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 24 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 3,120.00
Conservation Technician: 152 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 13,680.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 1,000.00
Permits (for blocking sidewalk and partial access to the garage): TBD
Access: (Allow up to) $ 4,000.00
Total: $ 21,800.00 + Permits

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders and boom lift.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed every 3-5 years or on an as-needed basis:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and filtered water, using soft, natural-bristle brushes and microfiber cloths.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Remove stubborn accretions and sticker residue mechanically and with appropriate solvents as needed.

Estimated Maintenance Costs: $10,000.00
**2014 Examination:** December 11, 2014 by Tim Linden and Christina Varvi

**Artist:** Sheila Klein

**Title:** Light Overhead

**Date:** 2001

**Materials:** Galvanized steel, lighting, glass, and paint.

**Dimensions:** Approximately 300’ L x 16’ H

**Location:** Centinela Ave. and Pico Blvd., under the I-10 freeway overpass.

**General Condition:** Excellent Good Fair X Poor

**Description:** An arrangement of curved and stylized light poles manufactured in galvanized steel, integrates with the painted, architectural underbelly of the cement overpass. The light poles extend from the ground in pairs for four, illuminating the painted ceiling. Bulbs are inset into the pole tubing and protected by glass coverings. Above the sculptural lighting, the ceiling and cement columns are painted with a pattern in chartreuse/neon yellow-green. The whole installation spans the length of the overpass, as it is architecturally integrated.

**Condition:** Overall the piece appears to be in fair condition. No serious structural condition issues are apparent. One light pole seems to have been hit by a car. A painted metal covering strapped around the damaged area has somewhat visually improved the issue. While the cover is a temporary aesthetic fix, it does not add structural strength or fix any aesthetic long-term issues. The overall surface condition is fair. There are small, localized areas of corrosion throughout the light poles where the protective zinc coating has been compromised, likely through abrasion. Additional ferrous corrosion of the hardware and associated staining was also noted. Spray paint, tape, and zip ties have been added to the work by individuals other than the artist, and should be removed. Every galvanized steel element has applied and possibly etched graffiti of pentagram-like stars. The paint at the ceiling and columns appears to be in fair condition as well. Cracks in the surface follow the formwork seams of the concrete over which it was applied. The painted area also encompasses drainage holes from the roadway above. Atmospheric soiling is present throughout the installation and is especially heavy on the top/horizontal surfaces of the light poles and on the painted areas of the ceiling from the heavy car exhaust trapped beneath the overpass. Bird guano, bug webs and casings, as well as other organic debris were also noted in localized areas throughout the installation.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** Not available at this time.

**Comments on Mounting:** None at this time.
Comments on Location: The location is set in a high vehicular traffic area and is accessible to the public and vehicles. It is outdoors and open to the elements, though the overpass likely protects the majority of the installation from high UV exposure and rainfall. Conversely, the overpass likely traps particulate matter from carbon emissions, resulting in their deposition on the surfaces of the installation. The work creates lighting at night, but there do not appear to be any surveillance cameras in the area. No overhanging trees, encroaching vegetation, or sprinkler systems are of concern.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #3

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Treatment may necessitate lane closure to protect staff and vehicles from overspray.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
4. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and filtered tap water using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
   a. Consult with City staff to determine whether electricity should temporarily be cut to the light poles during the washing phase of treatment.
5. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and dry metal elements with cotton cloths.
6. Remove any applied graffiti, tape, paint, or other extraneous materials applied to the metal elements with the proper organic solvent.
7. Reduce or remove ferrous staining and etched graffiti using appropriate methods.
8. Excavate and passivate areas of corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease with denatured alcohol.
9. In areas where the protective, zinc coating has been compromised, prime and in-paint areas of exposed ferrous metal with a paint system rated for outdoor use. Paint to match adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
10. Consider changing out corroded hardware for stainless steel equivalent.
11. Examine painted areas up close and determine stability of current coating, especially along the formwork lines where it appears to be cracking.
   a. Remove lifting/flaking paint.
   b. In-paint areas of loss with a paint system rated for outdoor use that is compatible with concrete substrates. Prep surface according to the manufacturer’s specifications. Paint system to match original in both color and reflectance.
12. If deemed necessary and possible, address deformed sculptural element. May require replacement.
13. Apply a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to lower 10’ of each light pole to mitigate damage from applied graffiti.
Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 32 hrs @ $130.00/hr $4,160.00
Conservation Technician: 160 hrs @ $90.00/hr $14,400.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $2,000.00
Access: $1,200.00
Permits (to close lanes for lift access): $TBD
Repair or Replacement of Pole Hit by Car: $TBD
Total: $21,760.00 + Permits & Pole Repair

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Lift

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed every 3 years or on an as-needed basis:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Treatment may necessitate lane closure to protect staff and vehicles from overspray.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
4. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and filtered tap water using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
   a. Consult with City staff to determine whether electricity should temporarily be cut to the light poles during the washing phase of treatment.
5. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and dry metal elements with cotton cloths.
6. Inspect metal components for signs of corrosion and address accordingly.
7. Inspect painted elements for signs of paint failure (cracking, lifting, etc.) and address accordingly.

Estimated Tri-Annual Maintenance Costs: $10,000.00
MURALS REPORTS
Introduction:

The City of Santa Monica’s murals and wall paintings are a unique group of works within the overall public art collection. These works are attached to existing building structures and have been carefully tended to by the City’s Department of Cultural Affairs over the years. Since 2002, over $100,000.00 has been invested in the conservation of a select group of painted and petrachrome murals. The prominence of murals in Santa Monica is renown. The particular affection that residents express for them makes them worthy of special consideration within this report as a whole.

In the 2001 general collection survey report conservators Rosa Lowinger and Will Shank suggested undertaking a more detailed and in-depth examination of the city’s murals. This was carried out in 2002 by Rainer & Zebala Partners. As a result of these surveys, a series of murals were conserved by the City, including Whale of a Mural (Daniel Alonzo, 1983), Unbridled (David Gordon, 1986), and the petrachrome murals Colonial Spanish and Recreation (Stanton MacDonald Wright, both 1939) in City Hall. In 2004, Rainer & Zebala Partners also compiled a murals status update report for all City-owned murals.

For the purpose of this survey painted murals are grouped together with those made of tile and petrachrome, a mid-20th century pictorial terrazzo that was particularly prominent in California. For the purpose of conservation, the painted murals would be conserved by a paintings conservator. The petrachrome, tile and other murals listed below (marked with an *) should be addressed by a conservator of architectural materials or sculpture.

CONDITION ISSUES: Several issues are found to repeat in the condition questions for murals.

1. Preparation of wall supports: The single most significant factor that underlies mural condition appears to be the preparation of wall supports. For example, Children's Mural (Alonzo) is painted on a stucco wall that is cracking and detaching from the wall. This damage results from inherent tensions in the wall such as compression (bearing loads) and expansion and contraction. Moreover, the stucco is of poor quality and pipes running through the wall create differential moisture and temperature components within the wall.

In contrast, the mural Our Pico Neighborhood by the East Los Streetscapers is executed on a thick woven material that is well adhered to the wall and isolates the paint layer from dimensional changes in the wall. Although the canvas will still move with changes (cracks, fractures) in the wall, the presence of the canvas affords a flexible and structural buffer for the paint layer. Stable cracks on a cinder block support, i.e. ones that are present but do not move or change, do not present a threat to murals. This is apparent in the piece Another Magical Sunset at Santa Monica Beach (Lujan).

Wall structures and support stability are threatened also by vibrations in high-transit areas. This is evident in the murals located on Ocean Park Boulevard (Unbridled (Gordon) and Whale of a Mural (Alonzo)).

2. Salt Efflorescence: Salt efflorescence is a continued issue with murals close to the ocean. Salt efflorescence can rise from the soil and travel up walls through capillary action. This produces a white flaking that can damage paint layers. This condition was noted on the bottom edge of nearly every outdoor mural that accessed the ground itself. Unlike the issue of wall preparation, salt efflorescence issues are manageable through maintenance.
3. **Sun Exposure:** Murals that are exposed to the sun for many hours a day are subject to photochemical damages, such as color fading. This is evident on most of the murals examined, and particularly those that have southern exposure. Because walls exposed to sun also get extremely warm during the day and cool down during the evening, expansion and contraction accelerates flaking and peeling of paint layers.

4. **General Paint Failure:** Failing paint systems, i.e. where the paint itself is flaking or detaching not due to any of the aforementioned conditions was evident in *Unbridled* (Gordon) and the *Children's Mural* (Alonzo). This condition appears to be related to the fabrication of the mural. In both of these cases the artist appears to have thinned the paint too much. As a result, the binder is not holding the pigments together and/or there is not a good balance between binder and pigment. In *Unbridled* (Gordon) the paint layer is powdery to the touch and on the latter the color is fading. In addition graffiti tagging and its cleaning with an aggressive medium is also wearing out the surface.

5. **Special Conditions Related to Tile and Petrachrome:** Overall, the ceramic tile murals appear to hold up very well under a range of different environmental conditions. Surface and grout soiling may easily be remedied. Surfaces at street level are more prone to damage to the surface due to abrasion, including scuffs, scratches, and cracks through the glaze. Both tile and petrachrome pieces are prone to grout loss and/or discoloration/fading. This is more problematic for petrachrome pieces since the grout acts as a binder for the stone aggregate, so grout loss may also result in subsequent aggregate loss. Wall structures and support stability are threatened also by vibrations in high-transit areas. This is more problematic with tile and petrachrome pieces since they are fabricated using more rigid materials than painted murals and are thus more prone to damage from the stresses imposed by vibrations.

6. **General Wear and Tear:** Wear and tear from the public is the least harmful of all of the problems, however scratches and abrasions are seen from pedestrian traffic, bicycles and skateboards. In addition murals decorating interior walls are subject to scratches from leaning objects (chairs and tables) against them. Excessive and inappropriate repair of cracks is also contributing to the existing problems, but more egregious is the effect of over-painting from graffiti and its removal.

Though it may appear self-evident, it is important to note that outdoor murals need more frequent maintenance than indoor murals. This is particularly true of those exposed to strong, direct sunlight and those that are closer to the ocean. It goes without saying that murals painted with acrylic paint are much more sensitive to weathering than tile murals.

The following is a list of the murals by priority of care. The conditions are detailed in the individual reports:

**Murals in Severe Condition, requiring attention in the near future:**

*Children's Mural* (Alonzo)

**Note:** Though this piece is in severe condition, the extent to which it has been overpainted does not warrant allocating significant resources to this piece.

*Whale of a Mural* (Alonzo)

*Unbridled* (Gordon)

**Murals in better condition that require care within 3-5 years:**

*History of Pico Neighborhood* (Thiermann)

*Another Magical Sunset at Santa Monica Beach* (Lujan)
Colonial Spanish (MacDonald Wright)*
History of Civilization (MacDonald Wright)
Recycle, Renew, Repair and Restore (Cockcroft)

Murals that primarily require maintenance:
Wheels (Karlsen)*
Recreation (MacDonald Wright)*
Our Santa Monica Heritage (Thiermann & The Hunns)
Our Pico Neighborhood (East Los Streetscapers)
Santa Monica Beach (Mortimer)
Garage your Desires (Shire)*
2014 Examination: December 08, 2014 by Viviana Dominguez

**Artist:** Daniel Alonzo  
**Title:** *Children’s Mural*  
**Date:** 1978  
**Materials:** Acrylic on plaster  
**Dimensions:** Approximately 20’ L x 9’ H  
**Location:** 1406 Marine Street (Marine Park)

**General Condition:** Exellent  
 **Good**  
 **Fair**  
 **Poor X**

**Description:** The mural depicts a children’s fantasy playground under the ocean. Kids are playing on top of a wrecked boat, a dolphin, and an octopus.

The mural is painted with acrylic paints on a wall covered with stucco and primed with a white coating. The mural covers the entire wall from top to bottom. The wall has a cornice at the top where there is a water drainage pipe. The presence of a surface coating needs to be determined with further examination that would involve testing.

**Condition:** The mural is in very poor condition. The stucco surface exhibits an array of cracks branching into different directions. The most visible and longest ones appear to have been repaired with patches of cement or a similar material and painted with a neutral color (beige). The larger patches are located on the edge of the lower left quadrant of the mural and the faucet (middle bottom edge), on the middle left edge of the mural and on the lower right corner. There are also small holes (1 to 2 inches in diameter), about 7 of them, accompanied by stucco losses along the bottom edge close to the sea stars. A larger loss of stucco and paint (3 to 4 inches in diameter) is exposing the wall’s wood frame. This loss is also located at the right bottom edge of the mural.

At the middle of the top ledge, above the painting, there is a hole (possibly a water drainage spout). Below the hole the paint exhibits large stains/crusts of what are likely bird guano and/or salt deposits.

The entire paint layer is severely faded and in many places the white primer can be seen through the top layer of paint. This may a problem related to dilution of the paint when the...
mural was painted. Excess water in the original paint mixture could have caused this effect over time in addition to the photochemical reaction with the direct sunlight. The lower bottom of the mural has either completely eroded or has been painted with grey paint.

The surface of the painting is extremely dirty and exhibits black streak marks, which may be extant residue after cleaning graffiti from the mural. It appears to be the redeposit of a diluted anti-graffiti coating, however further examination needs to be done on this area. There is also a whitish hazy veil in some areas that may be attributed to blanching of the anti-graffiti coating.

There are traces/ghosting of old graffiti that was previously removed. However, new tagging was found at the time of examination at the lower right quadrant of the mural.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: According to the 2001 Survey, previous treatment consisted of gray plaster and beige overpaint, which are located at the bottom left center, bottom right, and bottom left of the mural. As this previous treatment obscures the original surface of the mural, it does not appear to have been completed by a conservator and was likely undertaken by maintenance personnel.

In 2002, the mural was surveyed as part of a city-wide, murals-specific survey. That report was not available at the time of this survey.

In the 2004, murals status report, the surveyors noted, “In the 2002 survey, it appeared that the mural had been repaired and scrubbed in the past. The repairs did not match the surrounding design of the image, and the scrubbing left large areas of surface abrasion. Treatment was recommended for aesthetic reasons, though the mural appeared to be in stable condition at the time (if the scrubbing and repairs did not continue). It was deemed that the artist’s participation may be necessary to address large areas of surface abrasion.”

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The mural is an outdoor piece situated behind the Marine Park building on a wall facing south. An access ramp was built in front of the mural after the painting was finished. The ramp has a green metal railing. There is a children’s playground, including a sandbox, and bench located right in front of the mural. The mural is exposed to the sunlight most of the day, however there are trees in the park that cast partial shadows on the surface. The piece is highly accessible to the public, but is not susceptible to vehicle traffic. There are no encroaching plants or nearby sprinklers, but there is a spigot centrally located along the bottom of the mural. The piece does not appear to be spotlit, but there is general park lighting in the immediate area.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Mitigate water flow down the front of the mural by adding an outward-facing scupper to direct water flow away from the face of the mural. Also install mesh covering over the hole to prevent birds from nesting above and defecating on the face of the mural.

Treatment Priority: #1 Curatorial Priority:
Note: Though this piece is in severe condition, which places it within our Priority 1 characterization, the large extent to which it has been overpainted does not warrant allocating significant resources to this piece.

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Test solubility of the surface to determine the presence of an anti-graffiti coating or other protective coating.
3. Sound entire surface of mural to ensure stability of plaster substrate.
4. Remove surface dust and anti-graffiti coating.
5. Mechanically remove salt deposits from surface.
6. Undertake damp cleaning if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing.
7. Safely remove over-painted patched on top of cracks and remove old repairs.
8. Inject cracks with a conservation-grade microinjection grout.
9. Stabilize hollow areas around plaster losses and any noted areas of delamination with a conservation-grade microinjection grout.
10. Fill losses with a conservation-grade patching material rated for outdoor use.
11. In-paint areas of loss with a conservation-grade paint system rated for outdoor use and match to adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance. Consider reglazing faded areas to saturate the color again.
12. Protect paint layer with a coating such as UV-stable varnish and apply sacrificial anti-graffiti coating.

Estimated Treatment Costs
Conservator: 120 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 15,600.00
Conservation Technician: 150 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 13,500.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 2,500.00
Access: (allow up to) $ 500.00
Total: $ 32,100.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: ladders

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1.) Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
2.) Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
3.) To remove more stubborn accretions, locally damp-clean areas with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and distilled water on cotton swabs. Damp-rinse areas with distilled water on cotton swabs and dry with a cotton or microfiber cloth.
4.) Remove and re-apply anti-graffiti coating every 5 years, or as specified in the product data sheet.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $ 2,500.00
2014 Examination: December 08, 2014 by Viviana Dominguez

Artist: Daniel Alonzo

Title: Whale of a Mural

Date: 1983

Materials: Acrylic on concrete

Dimensions: 360’ L x 24 ½’ H feet

Site Location: Ocean Park Blvd and 4th Street

General Condition: Excellent Good Fair Poor X

Description: The piece in question depicts groups of dolphins and families of large whales swimming under the ocean.

The mural was painted with acrylic paint on a concrete wall. The wall is a retaining wall divided by expansion joints into a total of 20 sections, 8 sections on the East and West sides respectively and 4 sections underneath the overpass. Each section is approximately 3 ½ to 4 feet long. Pressed cardboard edges were placed in each of the expansion joints. A cornice runs all along the mural top approximately 3 feet from the top edge. There is a ledge running across the top of the wall and the mural extends over it. The imprints of the plywood forms and plugs, used to pour the concrete, show regularly and prominently across the surface.

The wall was prepared with a white ground layer prior to applying the acrylic paint. The paint covers the entire concrete wall from East to West, approximately 8,400 square feet, including the ledge at the top. The overall surface has an acrylic protective coating as well as a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating up to 6 feet from the ground.

Condition: The overall condition of the mural is very poor. Salt efflorescence blooms were observed scattered throughout the surface. The salts appear to have crystallized between the paint layer and the substrate, producing blisters beneath the paint layer. Some of the salts have broken through the paint layer and the paint is now flaking. There are many small and large areas of paint losses. The losses were most noticeable on the East side of the wall and all along the bottom edge of the mural. Additionally, the surface is exhibiting blanching (‘cloudiness’) in some areas. Specifically the light blue background is exhibiting cloudy areas. This could be either efflorescence or humidity trapped between the anti-graffiti coating and the paint layer. There are also residual marks/ghosting of graffiti from previous attempts at removal.

The acrylic colors have become slightly faded, likely from strong UV exposure. The surface is covered with a thick layer of soot and grime from nearby vehicle traffic.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: In 2002, the mural was surveyed as part of a city-wide, murals-specific survey. In the 2004 murals status report, the surveyors noted, “At
the time of the 2002 survey, this mural,...exhibited a degraded surface, powdering paint and graffiti. In 2004, the City requested that Rainer & Zebala Partners work with the City graffiti abatement team to reduce and remove the graffiti. At the time of this limited treatment, surface cleaning was carried out in collaboration with the City Maintenance crew as was possible without damage to the vulnerable paint layer. Full conservation treatment would include primarily further surface cleaning and surface consolidation to resaturate the color in areas that appear faded. Evaluation of the results of this treatment would help to determine the extent of artist participation in partial repaint of faded areas. Graffiti should be removed as soon as it has been reported. This mural requires comprehensive treatment to address all of the deterioration problems over the entire surface. Artist participation may be necessary for this phase of work. Upon the completion of such a treatment Rainer & Zebala Partners will be able to apply a protective anti-graffiti coating.”

In 2005, Rainer & Zebala submitted a proposal for the aforementioned conservation treatment. In the proposal, they also noted that the paint layer and/or binder had deteriorated variably causing, in some areas, considerable and permanent color shift on the mural surface. Subsequent work carried out included removing plant growth and salt efflorescence, treating basilar erosion, injection grout all open cracks, consolidate and re-attach loose or delaminated paint, surface clean mural and mitigate staining, remove graffiti and accretions, fill deep losses, inpaint paint losses and abrasions, as well as apply an anti-graffiti coating overall.

Comments on Mounting:  None at this time.

Comments on Location: The mural is located on the south wall of the underpass of Ocean Park Avenue, 4 blocks from the Santa Monica beach. The wall is facing north and it is exposed to direct sunlight from early morning into early afternoon. Due to its proximity to the ocean, there is a constant breeze coming from the sea. The sidewalk that runs along the bottom of the wall is approximately 6 feet wide. It has a slope downwards from East to West. There is a bicycle lane on both sides of Ocean Park Avenue. The mural is accessible to both pedestrians and vehicles. The mural is not spot lit, but there are nearby streetlamps. There are no encroaching plants or nearby sprinklers.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #1          Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
14. Test solubility of the surface to determine the presence of an anti-graffiti coating or other protective coating.
15. Remove surface dust and anti-graffiti coating.
16. Mechanically remove salt deposits from surface.
17. Undertake damp cleaning with distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing. Once clean, rinse with distilled water.
18. Stabilize around paint losses with a conservation-grade adhesive rated for outdoor use.
19. Where deemed necessary, fill losses with a compatible conservation-grade patching material rated for outdoor use.
20. In-paint areas of loss to match adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
21. Protect paint layer with a coating such as UV-stable varnish and apply sacrificial anti-graffiti coating.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservator:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$130.00/hr</td>
<td>$15,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technician:</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$90.00/hr</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (at cost + 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits (if required to close down sidewalk):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access:</td>
<td>(allow up to)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,100.00 + Permits (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** ladders and rolling scaffolding

**Recommended Maintenance:**  
To be completed bi-annually

5.) Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
6.) Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
7.) To remove more stubborn accretions, locally damp-clean areas with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and distilled water on cotton swabs. Damp-rinse areas with distilled water on cotton swabs and dry with a cotton or microfiber cloth.
8.) Rinse salts from the surface with distilled water.
9.) Remove and re-apply anti-graffiti coating **every 5 years**, or as specified in the product data sheet.

**Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs:** $6,000.00
Description: The mural in question depicts the waste management and recycling plants in the City of Santa Monica. On a light blue background, trucks drop trash to conveyor belts to be processed. Water is being filtered and purified. The artist dedicated the mural to all those workers who do the difficult but essential task of keeping our society and the environment in good condition.

The mural is painted with acrylic on a cinder block wall. The support is the exterior wall of the City yard. The mural covers the entire wall from end to end and from top to bottom. Above the wall there is a rain gutter and three down spouts. The spouts are painted with acrylic paint following the mural's design. There is one window on the wall where the artist installed a removable, translucent transfer that follows the mural's design. Further examination and solubility tests are recommended to determine the presence of a varnish or anti-graffiti coating.

Condition: The overall condition of the mural is good. However, there are a few scratches and abrasions along the bottom close to the sidewalk. Hairline settlement cracks in several of the cinder blocks and paint layer were noted in localized areas, but these appear to be stable. The rain gutter is broken in two places, above the operator on the phone and the water truck, dirty (rusty) water splatters all over the mural below. The mural has a dull appearance due to a thick layer of dust, most noticeable at the top and at the bottom of the painted surface. There are other stains such as heavy guano deposits, paint splatter, and other undetermined materials. The transfer on the window is torn on the lower right and left corner. There are no large losses of paint, only a few abraded areas.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: In 2002, the mural was surveyed as part of a city-wide, murals-specific survey. In the 2004 murals status report, the surveyors stated that the mural was in excellent condition, noting, “According to the 2002 survey, the mural,… showed large drips of bird excrement down the surface. Aside from the drips of excrement and other scattered damages, the mural was in fairly good condition, and would benefit from
cleaning and other minor conservation treatment. Additionally, it was advised that a suitable bird deterrent system should be investigated and installed. In fall 2002, Rainer & Zebala performed treatment on this mural, including removal of bird excrement, surface cleaning, retouching of abraded areas of paint and other minor operations. The City of Santa Monica took on the responsibility for repair of the gutters, which were malfunctioning, and causing drips down the wall. The City was also responsible for installing a bird deterrent to protect the mural. Heightened ongoing maintenance is critical to this mural as long as the birds are a problem.”

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The mural is located on the outside wall of the Santa Monica Yards across the street from Bergamont Station very close to the 10th Freeway. The entrance to the building is along this wall as well. The mural faces north and receives direct sunlight. There is a sidewalk in front of the mural, so it is highly accessible to the public. It is also somewhat accessible to vehicles and is subjected to heavy exhaust from nearby vehicle traffic. The piece does not appear to be spot lit, but there is ambient light from nearby streetlights. There are no encroaching plantings or nearby sprinklers.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #2 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
22. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
23. Test solubility of the surface to determine the presence of an anti-graffiti coating or other protective coating.
24. Remove surface dust and extant anti-graffiti coating, if applicable.
25. Undertake damp cleaning with distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent, if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing. Once clean, rinse with distilled water.
26. Protect paint layer with a coating such as UV-stable varnish and consult with the City of Santa Monica regarding the application of a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 40 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 5,200.00
Conservation Technician: 40 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 3,600.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 1,500.00
Access: (allow up to) $ 750.00
Total: $11,050.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: ladders and rolling scaffolding

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
10.) Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
11.) Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
12.) If safe to do so, gently wash the mural with a solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent with soft, natural bristle brushes. Rinse with distilled water.

13.) If wholesale cleaning is not possible, locally damp-clean areas with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and distilled water on cotton swabs. Damp-rinse areas with distilled water on cotton swabs and dry with a cotton or microfiber cloth.

14.) If applicable, remove and re-apply anti-graffiti coating every 5 years, or as specified in the product data sheet.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $ 6,000.00
2014 Examination: December 08, 2014 by Viviana Dominguez
Artist: East Los Streetscapers
Title: Our Pico Neighborhood
Date: 2004
Materials: Acrylic on fiberglass mesh (t.b.c.)
Dimensions: 80’ L x 18’ W
Location: 2200 Virginia Avenue

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The piece in question depicts people from all ages and from different ethnic groups performing everyday activities, such as playing sports and gardening, as well as cultural festivals such as musical concerts and dance events.

The mural is a marouflage (mural painting on canvas), painted with acrylic paint on a fiberglass (t.b.c.) mesh that was adhered to the wall in sections or panels. The mesh was then installed on a stucco wall (the park’s center building). Apparently the mesh has a thick ground layer (textured). However, the adhesive used to mount the mesh to the wall is undetermined. The paint layer is very thick and the surface is textured. The overall surface is very glossy, which suggests it has a protective coating, most likely a varnish layer.

Condition: The overall condition of the mural appears to be very good and stable. There are bubbles (blisters) and wrinkles on the surfaces that appear to be hollow areas between the mesh and the substrate. This may due to problems with the adhesion during the wall painting installation or it may be related to adhesion problems (adhesive failing) on those particular small areas. Monitoring and or more investigation may be warranted.

The paint layer appears to be in good condition and the colors are still very saturated. Localized lines of what appear to be abrasion (< 1’ L) were observed in two areas near the bottom 3’-4’ of the mural. At the bottom, proper left corner, there appears to be white paint transfer splattered on the face of the mural. Water streak/drip marks, either from rain or condensing water along the top edge, run down the surface up to 1’ from the top of the mural. The surface is covered with a layer of soot and grime from the traffic on Ocean Drive.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not Available at this Time.

Comments on Mounting: The fiberglass mesh on which the mural is painted has been mounted onto the wall with an unknown adhesive. It is also unknown whether there are additional supports/mounting mechanisms in place throughout the mural in addition to the adhesive.
There are anchors in groups of two, evenly spaced along the top of the mural. It is unknown whether they serve a structural purpose for the building or are related to the mural.

**Comments on Location:** The mural is located outdoors along the southeast wall of The Park’s Center. As such, it is exposed to full sun most of the day. There is a narrow sidewalk and a parking lot right in front of the mural, but the placement of a low planter along the front of the mural mitigates interaction with the public and accessibility by cars. Low, dense vines line the bottom of the mural and are starting to creep up the wall/mural. Sprinkler heads were not observed at the time of inspection. There are fourteen (14) light fixtures mounted on the roof and directed at the piece in order to illuminate the mural during the evening.

**Comments on Safety/Risk Management:** None at this time.

**Recommended Site Improvements:** Trim and maintain plantings at base of mural to prevent damage from encroachment. If sprinklers are present, direct sprinklers away from the surface of the mural to mitigate damage from water infiltration.

**Treatment Priority:** #3  
**Curatorial Priority:**

**Treatment Recommendations:**
27. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
28. Test solubility of the surface to determine the presence of an anti-graffiti coating or other protective coating.
29. Remove surface dust and extant anti-graffiti coating, if applicable.
30. Determine adhesive and ground layer used on the mural.
31. Damp clean with distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent, if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing. Rinse with distilled water.
32. Re-apply protective coating, such as UV-stable varnish, and consult with the City of Santa Monica regarding the application of a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating.
33. Monitor surface of mural for any changes at the observed wrinkles and bubbles.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**
Conservator: 40 hrs @ $130.00/ hr $ 5,200.00
Conservation Technician: 40 hrs @ $90.00/ hr $ 3,600.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 1,000.00
Access: (allow up to) $ 500.00
Total: $ 10,300.00

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** ladders and scaffolding or a boom lift

**Recommended Maintenance:**
To be completed bi-annually:
15.) Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
16.) Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
17.) Gently, wash the mural with a solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent with soft, natural bristle brushes. Rinse with distilled water.
18.) Remove and re-apply anti-graffiti coating every 5 years, or as specified in the PDS.

**Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs:** $4,000.00
2014 Examination: December 08, 2014 by Viviana Dominguez
Artist: Dave S. Gordon
Title: Unbridled
Date: 1986
Materials: Mineral paint (KEIM) on concrete
Dimensions: 360' L x 24 ½' H
Site Location: Ocean Park Blvd and 4th Street
General Condition: Excellent Good Fair Poor X

Description: The piece in question is a monumental mural painting of approximately 8,400 square feet. The mural depicts horses escaping from the Santa Monica Pier’s carousel to frolic on the beach. The entire beach scene is painted in pastel colors to give the impression of a "buon fresco" painting as described by the artist.

The mural is painted with Keim paints (potassium silicate based paint). The wall is a concrete retaining wall divided by expansion joints into a total of 20 sections, 8 sections on the East and West walls respectively and 4 sections underneath the overpass. Each section is approximately 3 ½ to 4 feet long. Pressed cardboard edges were placed in each of the expansion joints. A cornice runs all along the mural top approximately three (3) feet from the top edge. There is a ledge running across the top of the wall and the mural extends over it. Although the wall was fabricated with poured concrete, it is very textured due to the fact that it appears to have been sandblasted before it was painted. The imprints of the plywood forms and plugs, used to pour the concrete, show regularly and prominently across the surface.

After sand-blasting the concrete wall it was covered with an undercoat layer of “Keim Concretal Fixative” also known as “dilution” or “water glass” (liquid potassium silicate). The dilution was mixed by the manufacture with 50% white “Keim Concretal-Lasur”. The artist drew a grid on the wall to transfer his design. The drawings were rendered with light red Keim paint. The artist used the Hellbezugswert series from 9001 to 910, plus Keim concentrated pigments, to paint his design. Before application, the paint was thinned with the “Dilution” (Keim Co.) in different percentages. According to the artist he selected Keim paints since they are compatible with all forms of mineral substrate and it “solidifies” with the concrete. It is also a breathable compound that has lightfast colors.

Condition: The paint layer is in poor condition. Salt efflorescence (from the soil and proximity to the ocean) appears to be the main source of degradation for the mural. Several areas of very hard, insoluble salts were observed emanating from the substrate at various localized areas across the mural including the concrete joints, around the concrete wall plugs, and through...
hairline settlement cracks in the wall. Furthermore, salts appear to have caused flaking paint and losses, most noticeably at the wood pylons of the Pier.

According to the artist the paint pigments have originally a pastel-like appearance. The overall surface is "friable" and the pigments are powdery to the touch, which indicates that the paint binder maybe failing. The constant breeze may have also contributed to the erosion of loose pigments. Presently the original grid rendered by the artist can be seen through the white and blue colors. Condensed water and or rainwater have produced streak marks along the painting, resulting in unsightly pigment deposits on the mural section located under the bridge area. The paint layer does not seem well adhered to the substrate in several areas. As such, it is delaminating and detaching from the wall. The examiner found that most of the detachments were located on the West and East wall and less on the painted area under the bridge. These areas are subjected to strong UV exposure.

Overall, the mural is dirty and has a layer of soot and grime across the surface. Most of the dirt has accumulated below the wall ledge and in the deep textured concrete substrate. Several oxidation and grease/oil stains were observed along the top edge of the mural, just below the ceiling under the overpass.

Ghosting from previous attempts at graffiti removal was noted. There appears to be a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating across the mural, though it does not appear to be adhering well to the surface. There are areas where the coating is flaking and there are large areas of coating loss.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** In 2002, the mural was surveyed as part of a city-wide, murals-specific survey. In the 2004 murals status report, the surveyors noted, “This mural,...exhibited a degraded surface, powdering and flaking paint, as well as failing previous repairs. In 2004, the City requested that Rainer & Zebala Partners work with the City graffiti abatement team to reduce and remove the graffiti. At the time of this limited treatment, surface cleaning was carried out in collaboration with the City maintenance crew as was possible without damage to the vulnerable paint layer. Full conservation treatment would include primarily further surface cleaning and surface consolidation to resaturate the color in areas that appear faded. Evaluation of the results of this treatment would help to determine the extent of artist participation in partial repaint of faded areas. Graffiti should be removed as soon as it has been reported. Full conservation treatment, including surface cleaning and consolidation would greatly improve the chalky appearance of the mural, and should be carried out. Artist participation may be necessary for this phase of work. Upon the completion of such a treatment Rainer & Zebala partners will be able to apply a protective anti-graffiti coating.”

Rainer & Zebala subsequently submitted a proposal for the aforementioned conservation treatment, which included removing plant growth and salt efflorescence, treating basilar erosion, injection grout all open cracks, consolidate and re-attach loose or delaminated paint, surface clean mural and mitigate staining, remove graffiti and accretions, fill deep losses, inpaint paint losses and abrasions, as well as apply an anti-graffiti coating overall.

**Comments on Mounting:** None at this time.

**Comments on Location:** The mural is located on the south wall of the underpass of Ocean Park Avenue, four (4) blocks from the Santa Monica beach. The wall is facing north and it receives direct sunlight from early morning into early afternoon. Due to its proximity to the ocean, there is a constant breeze in the area blowing inland from the sea. The sidewalk that runs along the bottom of the mural is approximately 6 feet wide. It has a slope downwards from East to West.
There is a bicycle lane on both sides of Ocean Park Avenue. The mural is highly accessible to pedestrians and somewhat accessible by vehicles. The work does not appear to be spot lit, but there is ambient light from nearby street lamps. There are no nearby or encroaching plantings, nor were any sprinklers noted.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #1 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
34. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
35. Test solubility of the surface to determine the presence of an anti-graffiti coating or other protective coating as well as to remove stains from the surface. Water may not be an option on this mural.
36. Remove surface dust and anti-graffiti coating.
37. Mechanically remove salt deposits from surface.
38. Consolidate flaking/powdery paint.
39. Undertake damp cleaning with distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing. Once clean, rinse with distilled water.
40. Where deemed necessary, fill losses with a compatible conservation-grade patching material rated for outdoor use.
41. In-paint areas of loss to match adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
42. Protect paint layer with a coating such as UV-stable varnish and apply sacrificial anti-graffiti coating.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 120 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 15,600.00
Conservation Technician: 180 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 16,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 2,500.00
Permits (if required to close down sidewalk): TBD
Access: (allow up to) $ 1,500.00
Total: $ 35,800.00 + Permits (if applicable)

Estimated Special Equipment Required: ladders and rolling scaffolding

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
19.) Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
20.) Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
21.) To remove more stubborn accretions, locally damp-clean areas with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and distilled water. Damp-rinse areas with distilled water on cotton swabs.
22.) Rinse salts from the surface with distilled water.
23.) Remove and re-apply anti-graffiti coating every 5 years, or as specified in the product data sheet.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $6,000.00
2014 Examination: December 12, 2014 by Tim Linden and Christina Varvi

**Artist:** Anne Marie Karlsen

**Title:** *Wheels*

**Date:** 2010

**Materials:** Glazed ceramic tiles, stainless steel, grout

**Dimensions:** Approximately 51’ W x 58’ H / Tiles are 11.5” square.

**Location:** 2nd street, north of Colorado at the eastside of parking garage 8.

**General Condition:** Excellent Good X Fair Poor

**Description:** A large ceramic mural on the exterior façade of parking structure 8, containing geometric circles and lines that evoke an image of a wheel. Within each circle are images that depict long exposure images of the Santa Monica Pier Ferris wheel. This is all amid a pattern of monochromatic tiles in burgundy, teal, light blue, pastel orange, pastel green, aqua, and off-white. The mural stands 5 stories tall—from street level to the bottom of the final level of the garage. Stainless steel panels encase the top and side edges of the mural.

**Condition:** The overall condition of the mural is good, with no apparent structural damage. At least ten (10) tiles have hairline cracks through the glaze, but it is unknown whether these cracks permeate the clay body of the tile. Three (3) tiles have micro-abrasion and subsequent glaze loss. Within the lower 10’, there are numerous localized areas of etched graffiti, abrasions, scuffs, and small glaze and substrate loss in the tile.

Localized mineral deposits and leaching are leaving large drip marks that run down the face of the mural, primarily towards the top. There seems to be no apparent pattern to the leaching, and the drip marks seem to only cover about the top 2/3 of the mural. Towards the top of the mural is a large accretion of bird guano. There is an area of graffiti removal that has a residue of silver spray paint. There is no clear evidence of any protective/anti-graffiti coating on the mural, though this should be confirmed through solubility testing. The stainless steel frame that surrounds three (3) sides of the mural appears to be beginning to oxidize with minor corrosion pitting noted throughout.

Towards the bottom sector of the mural, there seems to be a loss in coloration of the blue grout sections. Where there is a silicon grout, atmospheric soiling from emissions have accrued in higher quantities than in areas of other materials on the mural. It is possible that much of these issues (i.e. cracking of tile, mineral deposits, leaching, change in grout pigment, and oxidation)
stem from an infiltration of water, possibly leaching from an internal sector of the building or from runoff.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** Not available at this time.

**Comments on Mounting:** As the mural is mounted to a parking structure, the movement of cars over the concrete may cause vibration. There are silicon filled expansion joints every 4x4 (48” x 48”) tile section for seismic movement. While these may help with any vibration or earthquake safety, they seem to accrue a more significant amount of soiling compared to the rest of the joints.

**Comments on Location:** The mural sits along a busy street, facing west towards the ocean. There are street lights near by and it is exposed to a high amount of sunlight. It is also exposed to high amounts of vehicle emissions due to its nature as a parking garage, but also due to its location in a busy part of the City and its proximity to a major highway. The bottom is accessible to the public, primarily to pedestrians, but possibly to vehicles also. There are no nearby plantings that encroach, nor are there any nearby sprinklers.

**Comments on Safety/Risk Management:** None at this time.

**Recommended Site Improvements:** None at this time.

**Treatment Priority:** #3

**Curatorial Priority:**

**Treatment Recommendations:**
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Dry-brush the surface with soft, natural-bristle brushes.
3. Rinse with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry surfaces with soft cloths.
5. Excavate and passivate any possible corrosion on side panels.
6. Remove all mineral deposits from the tile and grout surfaces.
7. Remove excess paint from graffiti.
8. Address any areas of concern with regard to leaching and hard water impregnation of the mural.
9. Repair all cracks, fill loss in tile, and inpaint areas of repair.
10. Address loss in grout color by applying appropriate coating matched to original color.
11. If deemed appropriate, apply a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to lower 1/3 of sculpture.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**
- Conservator: 24 hrs @ $130.00/hr $3,120.00
- Conservation Technicians: 100 hrs @ $90.00/hr $9,000.00
- Materials (at cost + 10%): $1,000.00
- Permits (if required to close the sidewalk) $TBD
- Equipment: (Allow up to) $1,200.00
**Total:** $14,320.00 + Permits

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** Scissor lift
Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
  9. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural brushes.
 10. Rinse with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
 11. Rinse with distilled water and dry surfaces with soft cloths.
 12. If necessary, re-apply anti-graffiti coating in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $6,500.00
2014 Survey: December 08, 2014 by Viviana Dominguez
Artist: Gilbert Lujan
Title: Another Magical Sunset at Santa Monica Beach
Date: 1978
Materials: Acrylic on cinder block
Dimensions: 30’ L x 8’ H (t.b.c)
Site Location: 1520 Fourth Street (Parking Structure 3)
General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The piece in question depicts a late afternoon scene on Santa Monica beach. In the foreground, figures (men, women and children) in bathing suits play in the sand, stroll, or sunbathe. Other people represented in this painting are: a spiky haired man dressed in a gray suit, skateboarders, and fantasy characters with dog features. In the background are the city skyline and a heart-shaped setting sun with flames.

The mural is on an interior wall of a parking garage. It is painted with acrylic paint on cement cinder blocks. The texture of the cement blocks is very noticeable/prominent, as are the mortar joints. Further examination will be needed to determine the presence of a ground layer.

Condition: The overall condition of the mural is good. However, there is a long, dark mark along the bottom, about 8 to 12 inches tall, running from end to end of the mural. This is the result of the continuing rubbing on the surface by the pedestrians walking by the mural and also the accumulation of dirty water and debris from cleaning the adjacent sidewalk.

Several cracks were observed at the cinder blocks and thus through the paint layer. One crack runs from top to bottom at the proper right side of the painting. There are another three diagonal cracks at the top, about 12 inches long, located at the top right quadrant within the dark blue sky. The cinder blocks in these areas are slightly out of plane, suggesting the cracking may be due to settlement and/or vibration from the cars. The artist painted the exposed edges of the cracks in dark blue. This may be an indication that the cracks were already there before the mural was commissioned. There are few small extant screw holes scattered throughout the surface as well as a few extant screws embedded in the surface.

The colors are slightly faded, mainly the yellow. There are also minor areas of paint loss (< 1”) in localized areas that have likely been caused by abrasion. The surface is covered with a layer of soot and grime from passing vehicles. The surface is slight glossy but a solubility test needs to be performed to determine the presence of a protective coating.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Notes from the 2001 Survey indicate that the piece was likely treated prior to 2001. At the time, conservators noted that some cracks
appeared to have been filled and in-painted with a paint that did not exactly match the original colors.

In 2002, the mural was surveyed as part of a city-wide, murals-specific survey. In the 2004 murals status report, the surveyors listed the mural in good condition and noted, “According to the City of Santa Monica Cultural Affairs Division, these three murals have been recently retouched by the artists, and do not require immediate treatment. Problems were observed, however, in the form of cracks, losses and some graffiti on these murals. Over time, the City might consider conservation treatment before these problems become more extensive.”

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The mural is located on the first floor of the parking garage, right by the car’s exit. There is a narrow sidewalk for pedestrians.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #2 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Test solubility of the surface to determine the presence of an anti-graffiti coating or other protective coating.
3. Remove surface dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
4. Remove salt deposits from surface from the middle top area
5. Carefully wet clean the surface with a solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent, if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing. Once clean, rinse with distilled water.
6. Fill losses/holes at bottom of mural with a compatible conservation-grade patching material rated for outdoor use.
7. In-paint areas of loss with a conservation-grade paint system rated for outdoor use and match to adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance. Protect paint layer with a coating such as UV-stable varnish and consult with the City of Santa Monica regarding the application of a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 32 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 4,160.00
Conservation Technician: 32 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 2,880.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 500.00
Access: (allow up to) $ 200.00
Total: $ 7,740.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: ladders
Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
3. Gently wash the mural with a solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent with soft, natural bristle brushes. Rinse with distilled water.
4. If applicable, remove and re-apply anti-graffiti coating every 5 years, or as specified in the product data sheet.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $ 3,000.00
2014 Examination: December 15, 2014 by Christina Varvi and Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Stanton MacDonald-Wright

Title: Colonial Spanish and City Seal

Date: 1939

Materials: Stone, grout, pigment

Dimensions: Varied, approximately 20’ H x 15’ W

Location: City Hall, Main lobby (North wall and floor)

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: There are approximately twenty panels depicting the Spanish colonization of the Americas, which include Native American Indians, Spaniards, and monks in a landscape. Text in the west wall corner commemorates important dates of the area and time period. The work is done in petrachrome and a bronze plaque commemorates the work. Inlaid in the floor is the Santa Monica seal done in the same petrachrome style. There are two expansion joints bisecting the seal in a crosshair manner. Throughout both murals a wide variety of colors are used. All sections have grouted joints with less than a centimeter in spacing.

Condition: Overall, the mural appears to be in good structural condition. A gap exists along the edge of plaster wall at both sides. Grout seems to be intact throughout. There is some white haze around the seated figures black hair, as well as, slightly above this area (lower right side). There could be a variety of factors causing such hazing, such as effervescence and leaching. Small losses, less than 1”, occur in border areas between colors. These could be an aspect of the original production, or a possible deterioration of the substrate. The loss does not seem to have been caused by abrasion or impact. The grout that bisects the area of the horses seems to have blanched and whitened. There is also a color differentiation throughout the corner section, where both sides of the join seem to be dissimilar. One side appears yellow/brown and soiled, which is darker in comparison to adjacent surfaces. The surface has mild abrasion, possibly from an orbital that could have scratched the surface, and adhesive residue.

The seal located on the floor has overall good structural stability. However, there are issues of aesthetic, mainly in the form of cracking and losses. The outer edge of the circle is slightly abraded from high pedestrian traffic, and the tiles surround the piece are in worse shape. There are at least 8 segments of these original tiles missing and the replacement fills and tiles do not match in color. There are a variety of cracks throughout. There are cracks in the lower right quadrant, below the “U” in “Populus,” the outer edge of the top left quadrant, and through the mermaid figures wrists. Small, localized losses of stone exist, especially in the top left quadrant.
and in the area of the sailboats sails of the lower right quadrant. These losses have become
darkened from soiling, and filled with wax from maintenance. The piece seems to be kept clean
from general maintenance, however, it remains in a high pedestrian traffic area that would soil
easily.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture
Conservation Studio in 2001. In 2002, the mural was surveyed as part of a city-wide, murals-
specific survey. The mural was treated by Rainer & Zebala in February 2003. Treatment
included, overall cleaning, filling of discrete losses, and the application of a protective coating
both to saturate the surface and to protect from wear and vandalism over time.

In the 2004 murals status report, the surveyors listed the mural in excellent condition and noted
that it was, “…in fair condition, especially considering its age. It showed some areas of material
loss in the petrachrome and joints. In early 2003 treatment was carried out on these murals.
Losses to the terrazzo were repaired, and cleaning and coating helped to restore the original
sheen of the terrazzo surface.”

**Comments on Mounting:** The mounting seems to be well executed, but the space of separation
between drywall and wall mural could be addressed.

**Comments on Location:** Located on the north and west walls of the main entrance/lobby, the
wall piece is somewhat accessible to the public. The work is indoors, with only partial sunlight
entering and overhead lighting installed in the ceiling. It is partially obscured by metro
informational stand and signage. The seal on the floor is in similar conditions, however, its
location on the floor allows for many pedestrians to walk over it, as intended.

**Comments on Safety/Risk Management:** None at this time.

**Recommended Site Improvements:** None at this time.

**Treatment Priority:** #2  
**Curatorial Priority:**

**Treatment Recommendations:**
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes.
3. Damp-clean each piece with a solution of distilled water and a mild, conservation-grade
detergent using microfiber cloths.
4. Damp-rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Remove any extant adhesive residue with proper solvent or surfactant.
6. Test soiled corner with a steam cleaner to remove any extant staining.
7. Test areas of hazing for efflorescence or leaching and address accordingly with either
   poultices or mechanical removal.
8. Sound all surfaces to ensure that there are no areas of delamination.
9. Rout/clean out cracks and inject with a microinjection grout to stabilize.
10. Fill areas of loss with a conservation-grade material whose mechanical properties are
    compatible with those of the surrounding materials.
11. Remove and replace existing fills that do not visually match or are failing.
12. In-paint fills and cracks with a conservation-grade paint system to balance the aesthetic.
    Selected system will match in color and reflectance. Any system utilized on the floor
    should be able to withstand heavy foot traffic.
13. Remove areas of failing grout. Replace grout to match color and texture of original.
14. For seal, apply a compatible, proprietary protective floor coating and buff to a shine.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

- Conservator: 48 hrs @ $130.00/hr $6,240.00
- Conservation Technician: 160 hrs @ $90.00/hr $14,400.00
- Materials (at cost + 10%): $2,000.00
- Access & Equipment: (allow up to) $1,500.00
- **Total:** $24,140.00

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** Ladders, floor buffer, steam cleaner, and scissor lift.

**Recommended Maintenance:**

To be completed bi-annually:

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural brushes.
3. Damp-clean each piece with a solution of distilled water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using microfiber cloths.
4. Damp-rinse surfaces with distilled water using microfiber cloths and dry with cotton rags.
5. For floor seal, re-apply protective floor coating or wax and buff to shine.

**Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs:** $3,000.00
2014 Examination: December 18, 2014 by Tim Linden & Viviana Dominguez
Artist: Stanton MacDonald-Wright
Title: History of Civilization
Date: 1939
Materials: Paint and plywood
Dimensions: Varied (covers over 2,000 sq ft.)
Location: 2nd Floor, Santa Monica Main Library
General Condition: Excellent  Good X  Fair  Poor

Description: There are approximately 12 groupings of approximately 45 panels throughout the 2nd floor of the public library. Each grouping contains panels, of which are painted plywood, depicting the artist’s rendering of the history of civilization and mankind. Each panel is hung by a cleated system, and mounted glass panes protect sections of the mural that hang at the level of the viewer. The mural was originally shown together in a large panoramic format, but has since been moved and separated in chronological sections to fit in the spacing of the library.

Condition: The overall condition and structural stability of the piece appears to be good. As the work is so large, it is most manageable to break up the condition section into similar grouped components as they are viewed in the public space. Their condition is as follows:

1st group: Overall structural stability and surface condition appears to be good. There is paint loss along the vertical seems between panels. Additionally, evidence of in-painting is apparent, especially along the edges of the board panels could be an attempt to ameliorate this issue. There is some crazing, but its stability/consolidation is unknown. It is especially predominate in the areas of dark brown coloration i.e. around the coat sleeve of the closest man and along the floor depicted.

2nd group: Surface condition and structural integrity seem good, overall. Towards the top of two panels is a sizable gap between the two, possibly from warping or removal from the original space in which they were displayed. Along the edges is also a visible variation in coloration; a hard line separates a lighter area. This possibly suggests that a frame or something of that nature once covered the panels. This coloration is later seen throughout a variety of the other groups.
3rd group: This group also appears to be structurally sound, with good surface condition. Lightness around the edges from previous framing and previous in-painting are visible in this grouping as well. The second panel from the right is out of plane with center panel, as it is pushing forward out of alignment. Also, there is an abrasion along the vertical seam between the right two panels.

4th group: Structural stability and condition appear to be good. A few of the panels do not correctly line up and there is minor cracking along a vertical seam. Previous in-painting is apparent, but also appears to be stable. There is a protective glass panel that covers the area of the panels that would otherwise be accessible to the public. The barrier extends upwards to about 7.5' in height. However, the sides of the glass panels do not have end caps or perpendicular guards to prevent wandering hands from touching the artwork. This is the case with all protective glass panels throughout the installation.

5th group: Overall surface and structural condition are good. Much like other panels, there are also areas of lightening and darkening along the edges, likely from past framing. Here, the top edge is slightly darkened, while the bottom edge is visually lighter. The surface has some minor paint loss and abrasions along the edges of panels, and further paint loss on the left panel. Depicted in the left panel are two figures that have paint loss seen in the woman’s skirt as well as the figures right wrist.

6th group: Overall surface condition appears to be good. Structural condition seems to be good, however, the bottom does not have the structural support of a bottom bracket that the others have. In this grouping there are two scenes, one displaying musical history and another of mythology. Both have lightened and darkened edges consistent throughout the groupings. The panels of the music scene have gaps between the tops of each joint. Also, the left panel is especially bowed outwards and lacks a support from the bottom of the piece. In the mythology scene there is a set of flames that appear more translucent towards the right panel than the rest of the section. This could be a result of fading or even a previous effort to conserve the artwork.

7th group: The structural stability of group 7 seems to be in good condition. The surface condition seems to be slightly more compromised. Along the edges are slight abrasions and evidence of in-painting. Paint loss is apparent at the top of the left-hand panel. There is also a misalignment between two panels due to a possible loss in material, which could suggest that they were cut to be re-installed. There are further paint losses throughout the image but all are less than a millimeter in size. Finally, the line of discoloration due to framing is apparent on both the top and bottom here, but more noticeable on the bottom.

8th group: Overall structure and surface condition seems to be in good shape. The surface has minor issues such as discoloration from past framing. The areas of grey and blue, which the line passes through, are especially darkened. Furthermore, there appears to be paint loss and discoloration in the areas of blue curtain and in the shadow of the female figure.

9th group: The structural stability of this grouping is good. There has even been an addition of new MDF board that backs the piece for added strength. The surface condition has issues of darkening pigment and minor paint loss, yet seems to be fair overall. There has been a darkening of the top and bottom edges, as well as in the light blue and blue/grey areas near the center of the grouping. This darkening could possibly be attributed to UV exposure from adjacent west-facing windows. There is minor paint loss of less than a millimeter in diameter in a variety of areas and slight abrasion along the edges.
10th group: The structural and surface conditions are good in group 10. There is evidence of inpainting and darkening pigment towards the top and bottom edges. Exposed wood backing along the edge has snapped, however it is not of structural importance. The support brackets used are screwed directly into the wood surface, causing some cracking along the hardware. This method is evident throughout the series.

11th group: Structural stability of this group appears to be good, while the surface condition seems fair. There appears to an effort to consolidate the paint coating and in-paint areas of loss, however, there continues to be some areas of concern regarding loss and disruption of surface. In an area of black paint that looks to be crazing, it seems to be unstable despite an effort to inpaint the section. There is further cracking of the paint that likely continues through the substrate. A bracket is also screwed into the sides of the wood panels, and abraded plywood edges are exposed from previous hardware. There is a continuation of the darkened edges here from previously existing framing.

12th group: The structural stability of the piece seems to be good. However, the protective glass may be compromised as it is slightly displaced. The surface seems to be in fair condition with minor exposure and delaminating of the substrate, as well as minor losses in the paint. There is darkening of the pigment along the top edge and lightening along the bottom edge. Some abrasion is viewable along one figure’s legs. Wood grain is visually coming through the blue paint layer, and possibly darkening or yellowing. Finally, the area of black and red paint seems to have once been treated, but continues to delaminate.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001. In 2005, the mural was conserved by ConservArt Associates in Culver City, CA under the oversight of Dr. Ilene Susan Fort. Prior to treatment, the mural’s surface was heavily soiled with accumulations of black particulate matter and embedded hand and fingerprints from handling and interaction with the public. Gouges, scratches, and abrasions down to the white ground layer were observed on all of the panels. The varnish was streaky, yellowed, or completely missing in some areas. Previous de-installations resulted in considerable damage, such as pry bar marks, missing sections of plywood, and broken battens. Treatment included structural repairs of the panels, cleaning (dry and damp), repair of paint losses, and varnishing.

Comments on Mounting: Mounting seems to be good. However, there are some areas where the piece is not fully supported from the bottom, perhaps due to warping of the wood substrate. This could be of concern to the stability of the wall mount as the pieces could potentially be quite heavy. With regard to the protective glass panels, it would be even more secure to add end caps to the ends to prevent hands from entering the space between glass and mural.

Comments on Location: The location is indoors and the piece is in a climate control system. There is natural UV light and florescent light that illuminate this piece to varying degrees. Some of the panels that were mounted lower on the wall are accessible to the public, especially since there is no protection to either side of the protective glass panes. People can access the panels from the sides. Some reading tables are placed directly below these lower-mounted panels, which may increase the likelihood of these panels being damaged/vandalized.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: Due to a loose support bracket, one glass panel in group 12 may be unstable. It should be addressed to prevent the piece from coming out of the bracket.
Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #2 (with the exception of loose panel)  Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document objects and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Dry clean each panel with natural, soft bristled brushes taking care not to dislodge paint from the surface in areas where it appears to be compromised (crazing, lifting, etc.).
3. Examine areas of crazing and paint loss up close to determine whether or not the condition has previously been treated. This may also include reviewing previous treatment reports and conducting solubility testing for the presence of adhesives.
4. Consolidate any crazing and flaking paint with appropriate polymer material.
5. Where necessary, stabilize any cracks and delamination at panels with a conservation-grade adhesive compatible with the substrate.
6. If necessary, fill cracks after stabilization with a conservation-grade fill material that is compatible with the substrate.
7. In-paint fills and areas of paint loss to balance the aesthetic. Paint will match adjacent surfaces in color and reflectance.
8. Address loose/detached bracket that supports glass barrier panel at group 12.
9. If deemed necessary, address gaps between panels and mounting issues.
10. If deemed necessary, address accessibility of artwork to the public via glass barrier.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 80 hrs @ $130.00/hr  $ 10,400.00
Conservation Technician: 160 hrs @ $90.00/hr  $ 14,400.00
Materials (at cost + 10%):  $ 1,000.00
Access: (allow up to)  $ 2,000.00
Total:  $ 27,800.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders and scissor lift.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed every 3-5 years or on an as-needed basis:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural brushes.
3. Examine surfaces for signs of additional paint loss, crazing, cracking, UV damage, etc. Any damage reported should be addressed by a trained conservator.

Estimated Maintenance Costs: $10,000.00
2014 Examination: December 15, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Stanton MacDonald-Wright

Title: Recreation

Date: 1939

Materials: Stone, grout, pigment

Dimensions: 20’ W x 15’ H

Location: City Hall, Main lobby (South wall)

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: There are approximately twenty panels in petrachrome depicting the five individuals, a horse, and a dog in different acts of athleticism. They stand in the foreground, backed by a scene of the mountains and ocean of the California coast. There are additional cars and boats depicted towards the corner join. On the west facing wall of the piece is grouping of text depicting historic dates. There are small, less than a centimeter, grout joints between each panel. A bronze plaque on the bottom left commemorates the murals inception as a project of the W.P.A. Art Program.

Condition: Overall, the mural appears to be in good structural condition. A gap exists along the edge of plaster wall at both sides. Grout seems to be intact throughout, however, there is some discontinuity in color. There are areas of hazing located between the standing polo player’s legs, possibly from efflorescence, leaching, or sun bleaching. The WPA plaque lacks a protective wax coating. There are surface cracks throughout the mural, located on the dog, road, and in the background of the image – all found around the bottom third of the work. Previous conservation work, such as fills and inpainting, is evident (especially located around the dog), yet seem to be stable. There is minor soiling of the surface throughout, but overall, well maintained.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001. In 2002, the mural was surveyed as part of a city-wide, murals-specific survey. The mural was treated by Rainer & Zebala in February 2003. Treatment included, overall cleaning, filling of discrete losses, and the application of a protective coating both to saturate the surface and to protect from wear and vandalism over time.

In the 2004 murals status report, the surveyors listed the mural in excellent condition and noted that it was, “...in fair condition, especially considering its age. It showed some areas of material
loss in the petrachrome and joints. In early 2003 treatment was carried out on these murals. Losses to the terrazzo were repaired, and cleaning and coating helped to restore the original sheen of the terrazzo surface.

Comments on Mounting: The mounting seems to be well executed, but the space of separation between drywall and wall mural could be addressed.

Comments on Location: Located on the south and west walls of the main entrance/lobby, the wall piece is somewhat accessible to the public. The work is indoors, with only partial sunlight entering and overhead lighting installed in the ceiling. It is partially obscured by metro informational stand and signage.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #3

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes.
3. Damp-clean each piece with a solution of distilled water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using microfiber cloths.
4. Damp-rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Test areas of hazing for efflorescence or leaching and address accordingly with either poultices or mechanical removal.
6. Sound all surfaces to ensure that there are no areas of delamination.
7. Rout/clean out cracks and inject with a microinjection grout to stabilize.
8. Fill areas of loss with a conservation-grade material whose mechanical properties are compatible with those of the surrounding materials.
9. In-paint fills and cracks with a conservation-grade paint system to balance the aesthetic. Selected system will match in color and reflectance.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 24 hrs @ $130.00/hr $3,120.00
Conservation Technician: 100 hrs @ $90.00/hr $9,000.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $1,500.00
Access & Equipment: (allow up to) $1,500.00
Total: $15,120.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders and scissor lift

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural brushes.
3. Damp-clean each piece with a solution of distilled water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using microfiber cloths.
4. Damp-rinse surfaces with distilled water using microfiber cloths and dry with cotton rags.
Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $2,500.00
2014 Survey: December 09, 2014 by Viviana Dominguez

Artist: Art Mortimer

Title: Santa Monica Beach

Date: 1998

Materials: Acrylic on plaster

Dimensions: 150' W x 47' H (t.b.c.)

Location: 1320 Fourth Street (Parking Structure #1)

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: Faux photographic and postcard renderings with white boarders on a matte brown painted cinderblocks background. They have a “cast shadow”, which are trompe l’oeille. The overall surface is very glossy. It was possibly coated with several varnish layers.

The mural extends across the entire side of a 4-story parking garage wall. The base of the mural starts approximately 10' up from ground level. The piece was rendered with acrylic on a cement block wall (most likely from a swing stage). Closer examination and/or testing might be needed to determine the presence of a ground layer.

Condition: The overall condition of the mural appears to be very good and stable. However, the colors are slightly faded as the piece is exposed to the sun most of the day. There are no visible marks left from graffiti removal.

Even thought the mural is out of reach, the examiner concludes there is possibly a layer of soot on the surface due to its proximity to a high-traffic area. Closer examination in the future maybe necessary but should be done from a swing stage.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001. In the 2004 murals status report, the surveyors listed the mural in excellent condition and noted that, “This mural was recently completed and, at the time of the 2002 survey did not require treatment. It should be monitored for any conservation problems. There is one discrete tag on the east end of the wall. Timely treatment when problems arise on this mural will help to maintain it in good condition.”

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.
Comments on Location: The mural is an outdoor piece located at the south wall of parking structure #1 on 4th Street. The west half of the wall is exposed to the sunlight during the morning time and the rest of the mural is exposed in the afternoon. The painted images are painted at least 10 feet up from the ground. The west side of the mural can be accessed from the ground with a scissor lift or similar, but on the other side there is a car ramp that leads to an underground parking structure. As such, the mural is not accessible to the public or to vehicles. The piece is not spot lit, but there may be ambient light from nearby street lamps. There are no encroaching plantings, trees, or nearby sprinklers.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Test solubility of the surface to determine the presence of an anti-graffiti coating or other protective coating.
3. Remove surface dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
4. Carefully wet clean the surface with a solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent, if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing. Once clean, rinse with distilled water.
5. If deemed necessary, protect paint layer with a coating such as UV-stable varnish.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
- Conservator: 24 hrs @ $130.00/hr $3,120.00
- Conservation Technician: 45 hrs @ $90.00/hr $4,050.00
- Materials (at cost + 10%): $500.00
- Permits (if necessary for swing stage): TBD
- Access: TBD
- Total: $7,670.00 + Access & Permits (if Applicable)

Estimated Special Equipment Required: swing-stage; possibly scissor lift

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
3. Gently wash the mural with a solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent with soft, natural bristle brushes. Rinse with distilled water.
4. If applicable, remove and re-apply anti-graffiti coating every 5 years, or as specified in the product data sheet.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $2,000.00 + Access
2014 Survey: December 09, 2014 by Viviana Dominguez
Artist: Peter Shire
Title: Garage Your Desires
Date: 2003
Materials: Glazed ceramic tile
Dimensions: 32’ W x 4’ H (approximately)
Location: 1136 Fourth Street (Parking Structure #9)
General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The mural design consists of a number of colorful, rectangular tiles (green, yellow, blue, red) of various sizes arranged in variegated horizontal and vertical orientations. Among the colorful tiles there are whimsical tiles, mostly in black and white, depicting Santa Monica’s landscapes with whimsical images and an artist’s model mannequin performing balancing acts.

The mural is located within a public parking garage. It has been mounted to a concrete wall at approximately 8 to 9 feet from the floor. Voids between the tile pieces are filled with grey grout. The mural covers the entire wall. It is approximately 4 feet high and 32 feet long.

Condition: The overall condition of the mural is very good. At the time of inspection there were no broken/cracked tiles observed, nor were any losses at the tiles or grout noted. The surface is covered with a layer of atmospheric soot.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: At the time of inspection, it was not clear how the tiles have been affixed to the cement wall. This should be investigated up-close during treatment.

Comments on Location: The mural is inside in a parking structure. The piece is located at level 1 (mounted approximately 8 to 9 feet above the floor). The narrow wall (approximately 4 feet tall) divides the private parking lot for the condominium complex above from the public parking structure. The mural is not accessible to the public or to vehicles, though it is subjected to concentrated vehicle exhaust. The piece does not appear to be spot lit, but there is ambient light from within the parking structure. There are no encroaching plantings or sprinklers. Since it is located within a parking structure, it may be subjected to higher levels of vibration from the constant vehicle traffic.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.
Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #3  Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
43. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
44. Remove surface dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
45. Rinse tiles and wash all surfaces with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and filtered tap water using soft, natural bristle brushes.
46. Rinse with distilled water and dry the tiles with cotton cloths.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 12 hrs @ $130.00/hr  $1,560.00
Conservation Technician: 48 hrs @ $90.00/hr  $4,320.00
Materials (at cost + 10%):  $500.00
Access: (allow up to)  $500.00
Total:  $6,880.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: ladders and rolling scaffolding or scissors-lift.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Remove surface dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
3. Rinse tiles and wash all surfaces with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and filtered tap water using soft, natural bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry the tiles with cotton cloths.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $5,500.00
2014 Survey: December 09, 2014 by Viviana Dominguez
Artist: Anne Elizabeth Thiermann
Title: *History of Pico Neighborhood*
Date: 1996
Materials: acrylic on concrete
Dimensions: Approximately 60’ W x 20’ H per mural
Location: Stewart St at Virginia Ave (Underpass on Stewart Street)
General Condition: Excellent Good Fair X Poor

Description: The mural in question is painted on both opposite walls of the underpass. The painting depicts different neighborhoods/areas, from commercial to residential (including the I-10 freeway), in Santa Monica. They depict people of all ages and from different ethnic groups working, playing, attending school, children being driven to school and so on. Also the mural depicts natural catastrophes such as earthquakes (broken residences) and fires (residences on fire).

The mural is painted with acrylic paints on concrete retaining walls. Further examination will be necessary to determine the ground and rendering techniques. The surface appears to be covered with an anti-graffiti coating. However further examination and solubility tests would be necessary to determine the presence of a coating.

Condition: The overall condition of the mural is fair. The paint layer appears to be in good condition. Most the damages appear to be superficial such as stains, marks and paint smudges left from graffiti removal. Furthermore, there are a few areas exhibiting salt efflorescence emanating from the substrate that has resulted in paint losses. Most of these losses are located on the bottom area of the mural close to the sidewalk, however there are some losses scattered throughout the rest of the surface too. Incised graffiti was also observed in localized areas. Hairline settlement cracks were noted in localized areas at the concrete walls and thus through the paint layer.

Overall, the surface has a large accumulation of soot, dust, and spider webs. Dirty storm water emanating from the drainage spouts stains the bottom of the mural. There are also guano deposits as well as abrasions and scratches left by pedestrians and likely vandals.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: In the 2001 Survey, conservators noted that the mural was in poor condition. The report also states that previous treatment of past graffiti involved large patches of overpaint and that some of the overpaint had since been scrubbed off. It is assumed that this overpaint was not applied by conservators, but by City personnel.
In 2002, the mural was surveyed as part of a city-wide, murals-specific survey. In the 2004 murals status report, the surveyors listed the mural in excellent condition and noted that, “Prior to the 2002 survey, this mural showed extensive tagging. There were also traces of previous tagging, which had been partially removed. The Pico Neighborhood Association had requested that this mural be cleaned and conserved.

In late 2002 treatment was carried out including cleaning, graffiti abatement, and stabilization of the paint layers to discourage further tagging, and to restore the integrity and legibility of the mural. City crews assisted in the treatment, especially cleaning and graffiti abatement, under the supervision of the conservators. A wax based sacrificial anti-graffiti coating was applied over the surface following treatment. The artist participated in this treatment, and was very helpful in reinstating the legibility of sections of the mural, which were particularly damaged by the graffiti. In late 2003 tags that had appeared once again on the mural were removed, and the wax coating was reapplied in areas of treatment. This work was done as a collaboration between the City crew and conservators.”

Comments on Mounting: None at this time

Comments on Location: The mural is located on the retaining walls of a street underpass (on Stewart Street). There are two lanes only and narrow sidewalks on both sides. There are street parking and bicycle lanes in both directions. The murals are highly accessible to the public and somewhat accessible to vehicles. The majority of each mural is in shade throughout the day, though each end likely receives some UV/sun exposure depending on the time of day. The murals do not appear to be spot lit, but there is likely ambient light from nearby street lamps. There are no encroaching plants or nearby sprinklers. Due to their location beneath the overpass, the murals are subjected to heavy emissions/soot accumulation. The walls on which the murals have been painted are likely subjected to moderate-high levels of vibration from street traffic on the overpass.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Provide spot lighting and install fake security cameras beneath the overpass to deter vandalism.

Treatment Priority: # 2 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Test solubility of the surface to determine the presence of an anti-graffiti coating or other protective coating.
3. Remove surface dust and anti-graffiti coating, if present and deemed necessary.
4. Mechanically remove salt deposits from surface.
5. Carefully wet clean the surfaces with a light solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing. Once clean, rinse with distilled water.
6. Remove extant, more tenacious accretions and markings with the appropriate organic solvent(s) or an aqueous solution.
7. Stabilize around paint losses with a conservation-grade adhesive rated for outdoor use.
8. Where deemed necessary, fill losses with a compatible conservation-grade patching material rated for outdoor use.
9. In-paint areas of loss to match adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
10. Protect paint layer with a coating such as UV-stable varnish and apply sacrificial anti-graffiti coating.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate (Hourly)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservator</td>
<td>144 hrs</td>
<td>$130.00/hr</td>
<td>$18,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technician</td>
<td>144 hrs</td>
<td>$90.00/hr</td>
<td>$12,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (at cost + 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access (allow up to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$34,930.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** ladders and rolling scaffolding

**Recommended Maintenance:**
To be completed bi-annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
3. Carefully wet clean the surfaces with a light solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing. Once clean, rinse with distilled water.
4. Rinse salts from the surface with distilled water.
5. Remove and re-apply anti-graffiti coating **every 5 years**, or as specified in the product data sheet.

**Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs:** $6,000.00
2014 Survey: December 09, 2014 by Viviana Dominguez
Artist: Anne Elizabeth Thiermann, assisted by Rob and Dorothy Hunn
Title: Our Santa Monica Heritage
Date: 1980
Materials: acrylic on brick
Dimensions: 28’ W x 11’ H (approximately)
Location: 801 Wilshire Boulevard (Reed Park)

**General Condition:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description:** The mural in question is divided into two sections along one wall; there is a sliding wall divider that bisects the mural. At the proper left side (towards the West) the mural represents the early history of the Santa Monica area. It depicts the everyday life of native-Americans and Spanish conquistadors as well as early European inhabitants. On the proper right side (towards the East) the mural depicts modern and contemporary life at the beach.

The mural is painted with acrylic paint on an interior primed brick wall. Further examination and solubility tests would be necessary to determine the presence of a protective coating.

**Condition:** The overall condition of the mural appears to be good. Several hairline cracks were observed in localized areas. There are a few scratches and abrasions along the bottom, close to the floor. It appears that tables and chairs are sometimes placed against the mural. The colors also appear to have slightly faded. Light atmospheric soiling was observed throughout the surface with slight accumulation of grime by the door where people are more apt to touch the surface of the mural.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001. In 2002, the mural was surveyed as part of a city-wide, murals-specific survey. In the 2004 murals status report, the surveyors listed the mural in good condition and noted that, “According to the City of Santa Monica Cultural Affairs Division, these three murals have been recently retouched by the artists, and do not require immediate treatment. Problems were observed, however, in the form of cracks, losses and some graffiti on these murals. Over time, the City might consider conservation treatment before these problems become more extensive.”

**Comments on Mounting:** None at this time.

**Comments on Location:** The mural is located inside Joslyn Hall at the Christine Emerson Reed
Park building. The interior wall where the mural is located separates the corridor from the hall. There are two doors along the mural to access the hall from the corridor. Opposite of the mural, there is a glass exterior wall with additional access the room. The mural is highly accessible to patrons of the building, but it is not accessible to vehicles. There is a potted tree adjacent to the wall and its branches and leaves appear to be resting on the surface of the mural. The piece is not spot lit, but there is general lighting throughout the room. It receives some UV exposure from the wall of windows opposite of the mural.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: If possible, tables, chairs, plantings, and other furniture/equipment should be kept off of the mural to mitigate damage from abrasion, staining, etc.

Treatment Priority: #3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Test solubility of the surface to determine the presence of an anti-graffiti coating or other protective coating.
3. Dry clean surface with soft, natural bristle brushes.
4. Carefully damp clean the surfaces with a light solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent if possible to safely do so. This will be determined following solubility testing. Once clean, damp rinse with distilled water.
5. Remove extant, more tenacious accretions and markings with the appropriate organic solvent(s) or an aqueous solution.
6. If necessary, stabilize areas around paint losses with a conservation-grade adhesive rated for outdoor use.
7. In-paint areas of loss to match adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
8. Protect paint layer with a coating such as UV-stable varnish.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 20 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 2,600.00
Conservation Technician: 80 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 7,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 500.00
Access: (allow up to) $ 150.00
Total: $ 10,450.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: ladders

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural bristle brushes.
3. Carefully damp clean the surfaces with a light solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent if possible to safely do so.
4. Damp rinse with distilled water.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $ 4,000.00
OBJECTS REPORTS
2014 Examination: December 11, 2014 by Tim Linden & Christina Varvi

Artist: Ball Nogues Studio
Title: Cradle
Date: 2010
Materials: Polished stainless steel and stainless steel cables
Dimensions: Varied (large-scale installation)
Location: 4th and Broadway (south of Broadway), on parking structure #7.

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: This piece hangs from the side of the parking structure 7 in the form of a “cradle” (much like a 3 dimensional parabolic form) of high-polished stainless steel balls hanging from cables all connecting at a single point. There is a housing frame that encapsulates the connection point of the cables. At the back of each hanging ball is a support structure, also in stainless steel, that adds to the strength and stability of the piece. This structure, however, is hardly visible from street level and is only obvious from a higher vantage point.

Condition: The overall condition and structural stability of the piece appears to be in good condition. There does not appear to be any structural issues attributed to the work, however, there are some surface issues that could be addressed. The connection at which the cables attach to has minor ferrous corrosion that seems to have stained the wall. This does not present any immediate structural instability, but should likely be ameliorated. There is significant atmospheric soiling and biological accretions throughout the piece, especially on horizontal surfaces. There is slight corrosion on the backs of the balls, likely from bird guano and carbon emission particulates interacting with the metal substrate. Furthermore, there is a single chain that has been thrown onto the piece that hangs from the bottom of the piece. It is of a ferrous metal and has begun to oxidize and stain the artwork’s surface. Throughout the rest of the piece, and primarily on the balls, there is streaking and dulling of the mirror finish due to soiling.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: The mounting bracket seems to be stable, yet has begun to exhibit localized corrosion products.

Comments on Location: The work is mounted to a parking structure, so it is likely subjected to continuous vibration from the vehicles. It is also located along a busy traffic corridor, is within one mile of the ocean, and is within close proximity to a major freeway. It is generally not accessible to the public, though someone has thrown an object up onto the piece. The piece
faces east and is predominantly in full sunlight. There are no nearby plantings or trees that may encroach upon the piece. There is nearby street lighting.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: It would help the issue of soiling to create a humane system to prevent birds from landing on and creating homes upon the backside of the piece.

Treatment Priority: #3

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Close section of sidewalk to pedestrian traffic for duration of treatment.
3. Remove oxidizing chain (unrelated to piece).
4. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes or utilize pressurized air to remove loose debris and particulate matter from the surface.
5. Rinse surface with filtered tap water.
6. Wash the piece with filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes and/or microfiber cloths.
7. Remove more stubborn accretions with an appropriate organic solvent.
8. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
9. Excavate ferrous corrosion and passivate with proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours, then degrease area with denatured alcohol.
10. Polish tarnished stainless steel surface using appropriate polishing compound for high-polish stainless steel and solvents, taking care not to scratch the surface.
11. If deemed appropriate, apply a clear, conservation-grade carnauba paste wax to the top/horizontal surfaces of the artwork (back sides of balls) to mitigate damage from atmospheric soiling and provide for ease of cleaning in future maintenances.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 24 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 3,120.00
Conservation Technician: 80 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 7,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 1,000.00
Permits (if required to close down sidewalk): TBD
Access: (Allow up to) $ 800.00
Total: $ 12,120.00 + Permits (if applicable)

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Mechanical lift.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes or utilize pressurized air to remove loose debris and particulate matter from the surface.
3. Rinse surface with filtered tap water.
4. Wash the piece with filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes and/or microfiber cloths.
5. Remove extant sacrificial wax coating and more stubborn accretions with an appropriate organic solvent.
6. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
7. Spot-polish any tarnished areas of the stainless steel surface using appropriate polishing compound for high-polish stainless steel and solvents, taking care not to scratch the surface.
8. Re-apply protective wax coating to top/back sides of spheres.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $4,500.00
2014 Examination: December 11, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Abbie Jane Baron
Title: Livin’ Together
Date: 2007
Materials: Patinated Bronze
Dimensions: Varied (small-scale installation)
Location: 14th street corridor, 1525 Euclid street

General Condition: Excellent Good Fair X Poor

Description: The piece is a three-part bronze installation of miniature buildings supported by tree branches, each meant to imitate the functionality and aesthetic of a birdhouse. The work is casted bronze and each architectural component has a different brown patina. There are small recessed holes that are meant to emulate an opening of a birdhouse, and projecting from each is a perch formed by a short rod. The tree branch support of each house extends to the ground and is mounted by a cast concrete anchor set in the planter. A similar patina is utilized cohesively across all three tree branch supports.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in good condition. There are no structural issues involving the piece, however, the surface condition is fair due to a variety of issues. General atmospheric soiling and biological accretions are present throughout the piece. Guano accretions, primarily on the top surfaces of the work, have etched the patina due to the nitrates present in the excrement. There is an overall dry, parched appearance to the sculpture, as a protective wax coating is either blanching in localized areas or is not present. A blotchy, green corrosion has appeared around the surface of the pieces, and more extensively towards the bottom of the tree branch supports, that is also likely due to a lack in any protective coating and proximity to irrigation systems. Several localized areas of bright blue-green powdery corrosion near the bases of the sculptures are of most concern, as they appear to be active areas of deterioration. It is possible that the corrosion could be more extensive than can be visually ascertained, as the piece is hollow. If proven to be extensive, such corrosion patterns may lead to bronze disease—which would be greatly detrimental to artwork.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The work is located within an elevated planter full of high growing vegetation that encroaches on the artwork. There are sprinkler systems near by. The piece is in direct sunlight throughout the day and is open to the elements. There are no security cameras...
or spotlights to deter vandalism. The work is located in a park where there is high pedestrian traffic. Due to its location, the artwork is accessible to the public.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Plantings that surround the pieces should be trimmed back so that they do not encroach upon the surfaces. Sprinklers/irrigation systems and any fertilizer products should be directed away from the sculptures to mitigate corrosion.

Treatment Priority: #3
Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
2. Dry brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove accretions and particulate matter.
3. Rinse with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Remove residual surface coating with appropriate organic solvents.
7. Minimize localized corrosion and mineral deposit build-up on bronze bust and plaque mechanically using mildly abrasive pads of varying degrees that will not cut through the patina and/or scalpel blades at a low angle.
8. Areas where active, bright blue-green corrosion was observed, excavate corrosion and passivate with a benzotriazole-based solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease with denatured alcohol.
9. Warm surface of the bronze with a propane torch. Apply one coat of a carnauba-based conservation grade paste wax to the heated metal surface.
10. Lightly buff surface with cotton cloths once wax has cooled/dried.
11. Apply a second coat of cold, tinted, carnauba-based paste wax to the bronze surfaces in localized areas to re-integrate areas of patina loss.
12. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 12 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 1,560.00
Conservation Technician: 24 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 2,160.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 200.00
Total: $ 3,920.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: None at this time.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
2. Dry brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove accretions and particulate matter.
3. Rinse with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Apply one coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to the bronze surfaces.
6. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

**Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs:** $1,000.00

**2014 Examination:** December 18, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

**Artist:** Robin Brailsford

**Title:** River of Life

**Date:** 2003

**Materials:** Bronze, painted aluminum, stainless steel, powder coated steel, tile, stone, glass, copper, Lithocrete, lighting and electronic signage/screens.

**Dimensions:** Varied (large scale multi-component installation)

**Location:** 14th street corridor/ Broadway, Colorado, and Santa Monica, between 2nd and 3rd St.

**General Condition:** Excellent  Good  X  Fair  Poor

**Description:** The piece is a multi-street installation that incorporates city planning with design elements to create an integrated urban environment that includes bus shelters, tile mosaic and engraved stone sidewalk elements, as well as water fountains, seating, cross walks, and signage. The bus shelters are large architectural elements that rise from the ground in a "V" formation, providing two sides of glass protective canopies. The glass elements include embedded ferrous metal chicken wire and a copper sheet panel. Stainless steel material is used for the overall structure of said bus shelters. Bronze lettering and handrails accent the shelters. Powder-coated
steel elements encapsulate the bottoms of the vertical, stainless steel poles. The majority of the shelters are covered with crawling vine vegetation. Beneath the canopy there is lighting and electronic signage. Stand-alone electronic signage is composed of similar materials as the bus shelters. There are varied seating elements beneath each of the shelters. Each bench and chair is constructed in painted cast aluminum framing with wooden slats for the seat and backrest portion. Below the seating and throughout the surrounding sidewalks are art paver sections made from etched granite and inlaid mosaic murals. The crosswalks are comprised of cement and multi-colored aggregate. There are also several public drinking water fountains with origami bronze sculptural elements mounted on top. According to City staff and the artist, the only elements considered under the auspices of the Cultural Affairs Division are the glass panels, origami bronze sculptures, as well as the embedded mosaic and engraved granite pavers. The other integrated design elements are the responsibility of the Big Blue Bus department.

**Condition:** Overall the installations appear to be in good condition. There do not appear to be any structural issues involving any of the varied elements. The surface condition is also good, with concerns limited to wear and tear caused by exposure. There is a high degree of atmospheric soiling and accretion of organic matter. Due to the intertwined vines and nearby trees, dead leaves and organic matter have collected in the recesses of the awning, on the glass panes. Slight burnishing and corrosion of the bronze was observed in localized areas of the origami figures. Abrasions and graffiti (applied and etched) were noted at all pedestrian level areas. The art pavers exhibit signs of heavy use, with high amounts of soiling and dirt accretions, especially in recessed areas. Minor tile losses in localized areas were also observed.

According to City staff, several glass panes have been replaced in the past. Other cracked panes were re-located to shelters in the transit mall.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** Not available at this time.

**Comments on Mounting:** None at this time.

**Comments on Location:** The installation elements are located within an area of high pedestrian and vehicular traffic and are highly accessible to both the public and vehicles. They are exposed to the elements and various degrees of direct sunlight throughout the day. They are also located within ½ mile of the ocean. Climbing vegetation is an integrated design element of the bus shelters, but there are also several locations with overhanging tree branches.

**Comments on Safety/Risk Management:** None at this time.

**Recommended Site Improvements:** Routinely cut back vegetation overgrowth, any overhanging tree branches, and remove dead leaves from the recessed areas of the bus shelters.

**Treatment Priority:** #3  

**Curatorial Priority:**

**Treatment Recommendations:**

13. Dry brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove accretions and particulate matter. Remove macro organic debris from the glass panes at the tops of the shelters/canopies.
14. Rinse with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
15. Rinse with filtered tap water and dry with cotton cloths.
16. Remove extant accretions, gum, and applied graffiti mechanically or with the appropriate organic solvent(s).

17. Bronze:
   a. Use organic solvents to determine whether or not there are any extant protective coatings on the surface.
   b. Remove residual surface coating and any applied graffiti with appropriate organic solvents.
   c. Minimize localized corrosion mechanically using mildly abrasive pads of varying degrees that will not cut through the patina and/or scalpel blades at a low angle.
   d. Warm surface of the bronze with a propane torch. Apply one coat of a carnauba-based conservation grade paste wax to the heated metal surface.
   e. Lightly buff surface with cotton cloths once wax has cooled/dried.
   f. Apply a second coat of cold, carnauba-based paste wax to the bronze surfaces.
   g. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

18. Tile:
   a. Fill losses at tile mosaics with a compatible material rated for outdoor use and heavy foot traffic.
   b. In-paint fills to match original tiles in both color and reflectance. Selected paint system to be UV-stable, rated for outdoor use, and heavy foot traffic.
   c. Seal mosaics with a product rated for outdoor use and heavy foot traffic.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours (Cost)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservator</td>
<td>32 hrs @ $130.00/hr</td>
<td>$4,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technicians (2)</td>
<td>160 hrs @ $90.00/hr</td>
<td>$14,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (at cost + 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>(allow up to)</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$20,060.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** Ladders

**Recommended Maintenance:**

To be completed bi-annually or on an as-needed basis:

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
2. Dry brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove accretions and particulate matter.
3. Rinse with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Apply one coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to the bronze surfaces.
6. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.
7. Re-apply mosaic sealant as necessary per the manufacturer’s specifications.

**Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs:** $5,000.00
2014 Examination: December 18, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Bill and Mary Buchen

Title: Children’s Play Area

Date: 2001

Materials: Painted steel, wood, and sound tubes. Children’s play equipment.

Dimensions: Varied (large-scale installation)

Location: Ocean Park / 2600 Ocean Park Blvd.

General Condition: Excellent Good Fair X Poor

Description: The installation is a children’s play area that consists of 11 concrete pads, three swing sets, one jungle gym, one control tower, one runway, one teeter-totter, two sand play boxes, two sound tubes, and three sets of benches. There are three main areas: one area containing the majority of the play equipment and two swing sets; another that contains the control tower, sound tubes, and circular runway; and a third play area with a swing set. Most structures are made in painted steel, with components of wood. The pads and runway are concrete with painted designs and lines. Beneath the control tower is a pad of conglomerate, child-safe rubber flooring.

Condition: The overall condition and structural stability of the piece appears to be in fair condition. There is atmospheric soiling throughout the work and most surfaces are burnished, damaged, or corroding due to extensive use. There are losses and soiling where all pedestrian traffic occurs and where hands can make contact with the material. Losses, particularly of the paint coating on the metal substrates, allow for corrosion and subsequent staining of surrounding paint. There is extensive graffiti, both applied and incised, especially throughout the tower. It does not appear that any of the interactive components of the tower area are in working order, including the sound tubes and binoculars. At the base of the tower, there is significant loss at the child-safe conglomerate rubber flooring, in terms of gauges.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The location is set in a high pedestrian traffic area and receives much usage from children at play. It is outdoors and open to the elements with the majority of the
components receiving full sunlight throughout the day. There are sprinkler systems and lighting nearby. Moreover, there are no overhanging trees or encroaching vegetation.

**Comments on Safety/Risk Management:** Losses at the conglomerate rubber flooring should be patched to mitigate any trip hazards. Additional concern should be addressed with regard to paint loss and corrosion. Flaking paint could be a potential swallowing hazard and corroded ferrous elements present a possible tetanus exposure.

**Recommended Site Improvements:** Fix or replace rubber mat flooring.

**Treatment Priority:** #2

**Curatorial Priority:**

**Treatment Recommendations:**

1. Document objects and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Set up barriers around each element to be treated to prevent the public from interacting with the various pieces of equipment while in treatment.
3. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter.
4. Wash each surface with filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent and rinse with filtered tap water. Dry with cotton cloths.
5. Painted Ferrous Metal
   a. Remove extant coating where it is failing.
   b. Excavate and passivate any corrosion.
   c. Prime and recoat with appropriate paint system that is compatible with ferrous metal and is rated for outdoor use, heavy foot traffic, and exposure to high UV light. Color will match original surfaces in both color and reflectance.

6. Concrete:
   a. Reduce or remove extant graffiti ghosting.
   b. In-paint areas of loss at painted surfaces with a system that is compatible with concrete substrates and is rated for outdoor use, heavy foot traffic, and exposure to high UV light.

7. Stainless Steel & Aluminum:
   a. Excavate and passivate any corrosion on un-painted metals.

8. Wood:
   a. Coat wood with protective coating or impregnate with protective wood-oils.

9. Patch conglomerate rubber flooring at base of control tower to match adjacent surfaces.

10. Fix all non-functioning elements.

11. If deemed necessary, apply a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating that is safe for use on playgrounds.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservator</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$130.00/hr</td>
<td>$13,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technician</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$90.00/hr</td>
<td>$43,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (at cost + 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>(Allow up to)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$69,200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** Ladders and scaffolding or lift

**Recommended Maintenance:**
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To be completed every 3-5 years or on an as-needed basis:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter.
3. Wash each surface with filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent and rinse with filtered tap water. Dry with cotton cloths.
4. Touch-up paint as needed with the appropriate, compatible paint system.
5. Re-apply anti-graffiti coating where applicable according to the manufacturer’s specifications for re-application.

Estimated Maintenance Costs: $17,000.00
2014 Examination: December 12, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger
Artist: Carl Cheng
Title: Underwater Canopy
Date: 2005
Materials: Powder-coated mild steel, enameled glass, stainless steel hardware
Dimensions: Varied (medium-sized installation)
Location: Santa Monica Public Library / 601 Santa Monica Blvd.
General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The piece is an awning-like structure made of powder-coated mild steel with geometric patterning and circular glass windows of enameled images. The main structural element is a large tube that extends from the buildings corner, wrapping around in a semi-circle. Two poles that enter the ground at oblique angles hold up this main frame. Within the “awning” frame are undulating patterns of steel sheet metal, designed to imitate the motion of water and waves. Within this pattern are five circular glass windows that are set into metal frames. Each window has a specific oceanic image displayed via enamel as a translucent image.

Condition: The overall condition and structural stability of the piece appears to be in good condition. There are no structural issues of concern. There is atmospheric soiling throughout the work that seems to have created streaking along the outside edge of the installation, at the outer tube. The glass images appear to be in good condition, but could possibly be bleaching/lightening from direct UV light. There are localized areas of paint loss and associated corrosion, predominately where sections join at welds and on the top side of the installation.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The location is set in a high pedestrian traffic area within an enclosed courtyard. The two support columns are within reach of the public. It is not accessible to vehicle traffic. It is outdoors and open to the elements. It appears to receive full sunlight throughout the day. There are sprinkler systems for nearby plantings, though they do not appear to hit the installation. There are overhead lights mounted to the building that shine down onto the installation. Moreover, there are no overhanging trees or encroaching vegetation. There are two air conditioning unit vents facing south and west that are mounted above the doors to the café and are directly beneath the installation’s canopy. These may be blowing additional moisture onto the surface of the installation, which could promote corrosion.
Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: If possible, install deflectors at the tops of the A/C units to mitigate moisture deposition on the installation.

Treatment Priority: #3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Perform maintenance when the café is closed or close off area to pedestrian traffic.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
4. Rinse installation with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent.
5. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Excavate and passivate any corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease areas with denatured alcohol.
7. Prime and in-paint areas of exposed mild steel with a system that is rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light. Paint coating will match original in both color and reflectance.
8. If deemed necessary, apply light-fast coating system to protect images on glass.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 24 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 3,120.00
Conservation Technician: 80 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 7,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 750.00
Access: (Allow up to) $ 600.00
Total: $ 11,670.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse installation with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Inspect surfaces for signs of corrosion and address accordingly.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $3,500.00
2014 Examination: December 12, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Michele Oka Doner

Title: Wave and Shell Obelisks

Date: 1990

Materials: Accreted minerals from seawater and copper

Dimensions: Each Obelisk: Approximately 1’ sq. x 14’ H (from top of mound)

Location: Corner of Ocean Park and Barnard Way

General Condition: Excellent  Good X  Fair  Poor

Description: The installation is comprised of two standing totems formed by calcium carbonate accretions on copper mesh. Each accretion was naturally formed through the attachment of coral and mollusks by natural processes to an elongated spiraling form. Extending from the ground, the columns are mounted into the ground through unknown means; the base is likely anchored beneath the soil. Each totemic column is placed at the pinnacle of a long, perpendicular earthen mound that is covered with manicured grass.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in good condition. The structural condition appears to be good and only minor material losses are present. Losses are visible throughout the columns, with some likely abrasions caused by pedestrians. Some may also be due to inherent vice/spalls. Abrasions are visible around the base, most likely caused by lawn care equipment. Larger losses seem to be closer to the top and the east facing side. The south column appears more abraded, also likely more related to human impact. The areas of loss are noticeable because the newly exposed surface is much brighter than the adjacent weathered surface. The overall surface condition appears to be good. General atmospheric soiling was seen throughout, especially on the top and horizontal surfaces. Guano was seen most notably at the top of the sculpture, yet seems to not create any immediate decomposition of the substrate material. Dirt and grass clippings are collecting around the bases, and micro-bio growth was observed around the bottom. The top and horizontal surfaces appear darkened due to the atmospheric soiling, which is possibly the result of carbon-based particulates.


Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The installation is very close to the ocean and within 15 feet of a roadway and pedestrian sidewalks. It is highly accessible to pedestrians and somewhat accessible to cars. It is predominantly in full sun throughout the day. There are no overhanging
tree branches, but grass grows right up to the base and encroaches upon the piece. Nearby street lighting was seen, but the pieces are not spot lit at night. Upon examination, no sprinklers were observed, but they are still most likely present.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: If possible, City staff should trim grass around the base of the sculptures by hand to reduce the chance of impact with landscaping equipment. Also, any nearby sprinklers should be directed away from the surface of the columns to mitigate damage and biological growths.

Treatment Priority: #3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and allow to air dry.
5. If deemed appropriate, apply a gel poultice to remove any residual dark staining from horizontal surfaces.
6. Confer with City staff to decide whether or not areas of abrasion and loss should be in-painted with a wash of a conservation-grade paint to blend with adjacent surfaces or be allowed to weather naturally.
7. Apply a non-toxic biocide to all surfaces to mitigate microbiological growths on the sculptures.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
- Conservator: 48 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 3,120.00
- Conservation Technicians (2): 48 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 4,320.00
- Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 500.00
- Access: $ 250.00
- Total: $ 8,190.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and allow to air dry.
5. Re-apply a non-toxic biocide to all surfaces to mitigate microbiological growths on the sculptures.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $ 1,800.00
2014 Examination: December 10, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi & Rosa Lowinger
Artist: Jaqueline Dreager
Title: Bells and Books
Date: 1998
Materials: Aluminum, bronze, fiberglass, and ferrous armature.
Dimensions: Book stacks: Approximately 13” L x 13” W x 45.5” H
Bells: Approximately 26” L x 26” W x 37.5” H
Location: 3rd street promenade, south of Arizona.
General Condition: Excellent  Good  Fair X  Poor

Description: The piece is a collection of seven groupings that represent book stacks and large bells that are accompanied by educational tools formed in bronze, fiberglass, and aluminum. In some cases the bells and books are paired together, otherwise the sculptures stand alone, separated arbitrarily throughout the space of the promenade. There are numerous plaques that are attached to the work itself and also inlaid into the pavement in front of the pieces. The plaques and sculptural elements are mounted using ferrous metal hardware and armatures embedded directly into the pavement.

Condition: Overall the installation appears to be in fair condition. The structural condition of the work is also fair. Two fiberglass bells appear to be compromised in areas where the fiberglass has cracked, likely due to the swelling of the corroded ferrous metal armatures and/or expansion and contraction of the fiberglass due to high UV exposure. This issue could be present throughout the rest of the metal bells, but because of their material strength they could be more resistant to such physical stress. Also, there are bronze elements that are missing from two of the bells, perhaps stolen. The overall surface condition is fair, exhibiting corrosion, scuffs and scratches (especially noticeable on the fiberglass), soiling, burnishing, applied and etched graffiti, losses in material, gum, and biological accretions throughout the series of pieces. The raised lettering at two of the embedded bronze plaques was significantly worn down (almost flush with the surface) and may need replacement in the near future in order to remain legible.

According to the written agreement between the City and the artist, the City agrees to restore and to repair damage caused by ordinary wear and tear as well as substantial damage or destruction to the work caused by natural disaster, acts or omission of third parties, or any other unforeseen event (or) recurring damage to the work. Furthermore, the agreement states that in the event of damage or destruction to any of the etched letters setting forth the names of Foundation sponsors or donors, the Foundation shall have sole and complete responsibility for the repair and restoration thereof. Such repairs and restorations shall be performed as and when deemed necessary by the Foundation in good faith. Under no circumstance will the City have any responsibility for the repair or restoration of donor etchings.
Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.

Comments on Mounting: Mounting is exhibiting ferrous corrosion at several locations, but otherwise appears stable.

Comments on Location: The location is set in a high pedestrian traffic area and is within reach of the public. It is outdoors, open to the elements, and is exposed to strong UV light. There are streetlights nearby with surveillance cameras throughout the promenade. Officers, public safety guards, and other employees of the promenade consistently patrol and walk through the space during the day. The extent of their presence at night is unknown. There are no overhanging trees or encroaching vegetation.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #1 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter, using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes and microfiber cloths.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Remove stubborn accretions and applied graffiti mechanically and with the appropriate solvents as needed.
6. Mechanically remove water spotting/mineral deposits taking care not to scratch or etch the surface.
7. Attempt to ameliorate incised graffiti throughout the installation.
8. Fiberglass:
   a. De-install fiberglass pieces to adequately address corroding ferrous metal armature.
   b. Excavate and passivate any corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease the areas with denatured alcohol.
   c. Prime and apply a protective paint layer to exposed and passivated surfaces of ferrous metal to mitigate future corrosion.
   d. Ameliorate ferrous stained panels and consider replacing hardware with stainless steel equivalent.
   e. Fill losses or cracks in fiberglass and finish to match adjacent surfaces in texture.
   f. In-paint areas of filled losses to match adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
   g. Re-install fiberglass elements.
9. Aluminum:
   a. Mechanically remove aluminum corrosion products through micro abrasive means taking care not to scratch/etch the surface.
10. Bronze:
a. Mechanically remove copper corrosion products through micro abrasive means taking care not to disturb the patina.

b. Where necessary, undertake minor spot patination to re-integrate localized areas of patina throughout the installation.

c. Apply two coats of a carnauba-based paste wax to gently warmed bronze surfaces.

d. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

11. Replace missing bronze components. If available, use historic photo documentation as a reference for re-fabrication of the missing elements.

12. If deemed necessary, apply a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to all or select surfaces.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

Conservator: \( 60 \text{ hrs} \times \$130.00/\text{hr} \) $7,800.00

Conservation Technician: \( 112 \text{ hrs} \times \$90.00/\text{hr} \) $10,080.00

Materials (at cost + 10%): $2,000.00

De-installation of Fiberglass Elements: $TBD

Fabrication and Casting of Missing Elements: $TBD

**Total:** $19,880.00 + de-installation & casting of missing bronze elements

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** None at this time.

**Recommended Maintenance:**

To be completed annually:

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter, using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes and microfiber cloths.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Remove stubborn accretions and applied graffiti mechanically and with the appropriate solvents as needed.
6. Apply a single layer of a carnauba-based paste wax to all gently warmed bronze surfaces. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

**Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs:** $4,000.00
2014 Examination: December 12, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Peter Erskine
Title: Cool Fire
Date: 2004
Materials: Prismatic glass, stainless steel, sheet metal, and paint.
Dimensions: approximately 3’ x 3’
Location: Fire Station #2, 222 Hollister Ave.

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The piece is a skylight installation built into the ceiling of the firehouse vehicle/equipment garage. Held into place by a metal form, a clear prism allows a spectrum of colored light to fall into the garage. Above the prism, a mass-produced plexi skylight covers and protects the installation from the elements. The sheet metal form and the included hardware are painted with a grey coating.

Condition: The overall condition of the piece is good. The main concerns attributed to this piece are the gaps between the building and the installed frame. Here, insects and dust have infiltrated the space behind the prism, and the space has likely lead to a leakage of rainwater behind the installation. Minor corrosion along the outer edges has occurred where the paint layer has become compromised and water infiltration has occurred. Corrosion was also noted along the seam at the northeast side and, likely, along its parallel seam. On the south side of the piece, two holes of equal size that appear to have been pre drilled remain open, perhaps a fault in fabrication as the sheet metal does not match up. Minor soiling and dead insects have accumulated below the plexi dome and a broken rope remains attached to an eye-hook (perhaps a vestige of a time predating the installation of the piece).

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: The mounting seems to be well handled and there are no immediate concerns. Small gaps between plates of the form and the existing ceiling, however, seem to permit dust and small insect accumulation within area between prism and plexi-glass dome.

Comments on Location: The piece is mounted into the ceiling of the station’s vehicle/equipment garage. It is not accessible to the public or to vehicles. As the piece is located on the ceiling of the garage this is a slight risk for contamination from carbon emissions. However, as there are only a few vehicles coming in and out of said space, this environmental factor may only be of little concern. There are no overhanging or encroaching trees above the skylight that could negatively affect the piece.
Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Determine whether or not the exterior plexi dome should be removed for inspection and/or treatment purposes. Determine condition and stability of existing hardware.
3. Dry brush surfaces to remove atmospheric soiling and debris. If accessible, remove dead insects, atmospheric soiling, and old rope from within the plexi-glass dome.
4. Damp clean surfaces with iodized water and a conservation-grade detergent using microfiber cloths.
5. Damp rinse with distilled water on microfiber cloths and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Excavate ferrous corrosion and passivate corroded areas.
7. Fill gaps in sheet metal to prevent further permeation of water into the metal surface.
8. Prime and in-paint area of passivated corrosion and fills with a conservation-grade paint system rated for outdoor use in order to prevent further deterioration. In-painting will match adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 12 hrs @ $130.00/hr $1,560.00
Conservation Technician: 48 hrs @ $90.00/hr $4,320.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $250.00
Access: (allow up to) $400.00
Total: $6,530.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: scissor lift

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural brushes.
3. Damp clean surfaces with iodized water and a conservation-grade detergent using microfiber cloths.
4. Damp rinse with distilled water on microfiber cloths and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Inspect surfaces for signs of corrosion and address as soon as possible to mitigate additional damage.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $3,000.00
2014 Examination: December 12, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Michele Hamrick

Title: Watermark

Date: 1987

Materials: Painted wood, flexible fabric (Possible polymer), painted mild ferrous metal

Dimensions: Varied (small scale installation)

Location: Ocean Park Library

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The piece is a four-part wall installation that manifests as a painted ladder-like, wood form with clear, iridescent ribbon. Each ladder form becomes consecutively smaller in height as the viewer’s eye moves from left to right. The wood form is painted in blue-green, green, teal, and magenta tones. A metal bracket attaches each form to the wall with stainless steel hardware. Through the “rungs” of the ladder form is woven a semi-transparent, textured mother of pearl ribbon with slight magenta borders.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in good condition. There were no observed structural issues involving the piece, however, there are two mounting brackets that appear to be separating from the wall. Either the mounts were not screwed in properly or the hardware is stripping the drywall under the weight of the piece. There seems to be no immediate risk in failure of the mounting system. The overall surface condition seems to be good. Minor corrosion of the hardware and excess paint from repainting the walls have altered the original aesthetic of the bracketing. Overpaint from the wall was also observed on the back and bottom side of the lower rungs at the proper left side of the installation. There is minor abrasion localized on the top-horizontal surface near the bottom of the northeast-facing element at the corner. Minor atmospheric soiling, dust build-up, and accretions of cobwebs are apparent throughout, especially on horizontal surfaces. A rogue cotton ball is stuck to the northeast side of the piece.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.

Comments on Mounting: Two brackets are loose and should be secured or replaced.
Comments on Location: The work is located within a low pedestrian traffic, administrative hallway, that predominately faces north. There are large windows adjacent to the piece and spot lighting that illuminate the piece. As the piece is indoors, the environment is climate controlled.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Remove cotton ball hanging from piece.
3. Dry clean surfaces with hake brushes and HEPA filter vacuum followed by vulcanic erasers and cosmetic sponges.
4. Test solubility of paint on horizontal wood bars as well as brackets.
5. Remove stubborn accretions by spot-cleaning using applied water or appropriate organic solvent (test first for paint solubility).
6. Address loose brackets and reattach.
7. Carefully remove any overpaint from the wall on original brackets and wood rungs taking care not to disturb the original paint layer.
8. In-paint any losses due to abrasion with a conservation-grade paint system that is compatible with the existing painted surfaces. Colors will match original in both color and reflectance.
9. If deemed necessary, change out corroded hardware for stainless steel equivalent or excavate corrosion and passivate in place with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease with denatured alcohol.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 8 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 1,040.00
Conservation Technician: 32 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 2,880.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 300.00
Access: (Allow up to) $ 200.00
Total: $ 4,420.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually or on an as-needed basis:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry clean surfaces with hake brushes and HEPA filter vacuum followed by vulcanic erasers and cosmetic sponges.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $2,000.00
2014 Examination: December 15, 2014 by Tim Linden & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Doug Hollis
Title: Singing Beach Chairs
Date: 1987
Materials: Anodized aluminum, stainless steel, paint.
Dimensions: Approximately 3’ L x 3’ W x 18’ H
Location: North of Pico on the beach.

General Condition: Excellent Good Fair X Poor

Description: The piece consists of a pair of painted stainless steel chairs that are elevated about four feet above normal sitting height. Five anodized aluminum tubes with a diameter of approximately 3.5” back each chair. These tubes produce sound when wind blows across the openings. The chairs are painted with a monochromatic paint; the northern chair is pastel blue while the southern chair is pastel green. Each piece is meant to be used by the public.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in fair condition. The structural condition of the work is without concern, however, there are some issues regarding the surface. Likely due to the location and usage of the piece, the paint system has become heavily weathered and deteriorated. Extensive soiling and organic accretions are visible throughout the piece. Bleaching due to UV exposure has caused hazing in the paint system. Moreover, heavy public usage has caused extensive paint failure from rubbing, which has also resulted in the burnishing of the metal substrate. As the substrate is without a coating, oxidation and corrosion has set in. Graffiti has been etched into the surface of the piece. Finally, there is minor oxidation of the aluminum pipes, likely due to the close proximity to the ocean and salty air.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time, though the piece has likely been re-painted since its original installation in 1987. Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The location is set in a high pedestrian traffic area and is within reach of the public. It is outdoors and open to the elements. There is no ambient lighting nearby, nor is the piece spot-lit. No overhanging trees or encroaching vegetation is of concern. Proximity to the ocean is less than 100 feet. As such, the piece is very open to natural sand blasting and corrosive salt air.
Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #2

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document objects and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. If possible, have pieces transported to an off-site location for treatment to prevent contamination by blowing sand and salts in the air.
3. Remove sample of each paint color for matching.
4. Mechanically or chemically strip existing paint down to bare metal.
5. Lightly sand stainless steel with a microabrasive sand paper to aid in adhesion of the paint layers and to remove extant corrosion. Follow with degreasing using organic solvents.
6. Prime and paint each chair with a 3-part epoxy-based system rated for use in marine environments and exposure to high UV light.
7. Mechanically remove aluminum corrosion taking care not to etch the surface.
8. Re-install chairs at desired location.
9. Apply two coats of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to all surfaces to act as a sacrificial, protective coating that can easily be removed and re-applied during future maintenances.

Estimations (Costs for materials, time, labor, equipment, and total):

Conservator: 24 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 3,120.00
Conservation Technician: 80 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 7,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 1,500.00
Access: (Allow up to) $ 500.00
De-installation & Re-installation Costs: TBD
Total: $ 12,320.00 + De-install/Re-install

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Inspect all surfaces for signs of corrosion (aluminum or ferrous) and address accordingly.
6. Re-apply a single coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to all surfaces to act as a sacrificial, protective layer.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $2,500.00
2014 Examination: December 10, 2014 by Tim Linden and Christina Varvi

Artist: Julia Kelmek and Leslie Robbins

Title: Montana Ridge

Date: 1985

Materials: Stoneware clay and bronze plaque.

Dimensions: 17’11” L x 67” W x 18” H

Location: Ocean Drive at Montana Ave.

General Condition: Excellent    Good    Fair    X    Poor

Description: Made in stained, high-fired stoneware clay, the sculpture emulates a natural rock outcropping. The piece was constructed in segments and later installed in its current location. Other materials such as cement and possibly chicken wire or rebar lay as a foundation beneath the piece, however it is unknown at this time. Each segment of clay is attached with grouting, similarly to tile laying. While the piece primarily functions as artwork, it is also a bench to overlook a vista of the coast and Pacific Ocean. A bronze plaque embedded in a small concrete pad commemorates the work of art.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in fair condition. No structural condition issues are apparent at this time. There are, however, some surface condition concerns that do raise attention. The overall surface condition is fair. Two abrasions are located on the north and east side of the piece, and two large additional losses are located at the base of the north side as well as the south side vertical corner. Cracking is visible throughout, especially along the top, horizontal elements. The exposed clay body due to losses and cracking could allow for moisture infiltration and accelerated deterioration. At the west side of the object, ferrous staining occurs along a mortar joint that appears to be associated with cracking that emanates from the same space. An interior support system made from a ferrous metal mesh appears to be causing rust staining due to corrosion as well as expansion and associated cracking. Furthermore, atmospheric soiling and biological accretions are present throughout the piece. Small plants and gravel/debris collect in recessed areas and likely trap moisture against the surface. The commemorative plaque attributed to the piece has lost its patina and protective coating. Gravel and sand from the surrounding trail partially cover the plaque and likely abrade the surface when people walk on the piece.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The location is set in a high pedestrian traffic area and is accessible to the public. Pedestrians utilizing an adjacent footpath regularly use the piece as a bench. It is not accessible to vehicles, but is located between a busy street and highway; therefore it is exposed...
to higher levels of carbon emission particulate matter. It is outdoors and open to the elements, receiving full sunlight throughout the day. There is no spot or ambient lighting nearby, nor are there any security cameras. There are no overhanging trees, but encroaching vegetation is of concern. Proximity to the ocean is less than ¼ mile and sprinkler heads were observed adjacent to the piece.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Redirect sprinkler heads away from the piece to mitigate accelerated deterioration due to excessive moisture. Routinely remove small plants and grass from around the base of the piece, as they also tend to trap moisture and accelerate deterioration.

Treatment Priority: #2 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Have sprinklers turned off for the duration of the treatment to ensure it is not compromised by water infiltration.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter. Remove small plants, grass, and sand/gravel from around the base of the sculpture.
4. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
5. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Excavate corrosion and passivate with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease areas with denatured alcohol.
7. Remove or reduce ferrous staining using appropriate methods.
8. Route cracks and inject with a microinjection grout or conservation-grade adhesive to stabilize. Allow to cure per the manufacturer’s specifications.
9. Fill losses with a conservation-grade material that is compatible with fired clay substrates and is rated for outdoor use. Fill will be tinted and textured to match adjacent surfaces. Allow to cure per the manufacturer’s specifications.
10. In-paint fills and areas of loss with a conservation-grade paint system rated for outdoor use. Paint system to match adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
11. If appropriate, apply a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to the installation.
12. Bronze Plaque:
   a. Once plaque has been cleaned, determine whether it requires any repatination.
   b. Apply two coats of a carnauba-based paste wax to the heated bronze surface.
   c. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with a cotton cloth.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 24 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 3,120.00
Conservation Technician: 80 hrs @ $90.00/hr  $ 7,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 500.00
Total: $ 10,820.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: None at this time.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter. Remove small plants, grass, and sand/gravel from around the base of the sculpture.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Inspect surfaces for signs of cracking, damage, and/or corrosion and address accordingly.

**Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs:** $1,500.00
2014 Examination: December 12, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Joyce Kohl
Title: Ocean Park Segue
Date: 1988
Materials: Cast concrete
Dimensions: Approximately 9’ L x 3.5’ W x 20’ H per unit
Location: At the edge of the boardwalk, north of Ocean Park and Barnard Way; near café, playground, and restrooms.

General Condition: Excellent  Good  Fair X  Poor

Description: The piece is comprised of two large-scale concrete elements that are tiered or stepped in nature. Both are made of cast concrete slabs that are rested in a spiraled pattern, creating a stepped platform. Each casting utilizes beach themed items to make impressions in the concrete. The work is currently installed in the sand, just beyond the pedestrian walkway. There is approximately 15 feet between each form, with each piece laying in a north-south alignment—perpendicular to the waters edge.

Condition: Overall the installation appears to be in fair condition. No serious structural condition issues are apparent. Minor cracks bisect various areas of the work, particularly at the step-like areas where people likely walk on the pieces. The condition is likely due to a combination of settlement and significant use by the public. This does not seem to create any serious structural issues at this time. The surface condition of the work is in fair condition. Abrasion of the substrate has occurred due public interaction with the piece and general weathering. Losses, located mostly near the stepped areas, are also likely due to public interaction. Towards the bottom of each form the surface shows signs of soluble salt contamination. Efflorescence and minor surface loss were also noted on vertical surfaces beneath the overhanging elements. The vertical surfaces exhibit signs of applied graffiti and graffiti ghosting as well as attempts to cover graffiti with overpaint, though the color does not match the substrate. Atmospheric soiling, bird guano, and gum accretions are present throughout. Sand accumulates on horizontal surfaces and in recessed areas, which may trap moisture against the surface of the concrete.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.
Comments on Location: The location is set in a high pedestrian traffic area and is accessible to the public. People routinely climb and sit on both elements of the installation. They are not accessible to vehicles. The pieces are outdoors and open to the elements. They are in direct sunlight throughout the day and are within very close proximity to the ocean. No overhanging trees, encroaching vegetation, or sprinklers are of concern. The piece is not spot lit, nor are there any security cameras, but there is minimal ambient lighting nearby.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: If possible, sand accumulations should be routinely swept off of horizontal concrete surfaces and away from the base of the piece to mitigate moisture and salts being trapped against the surfaces of the installation.

Treatment Priority: #2 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter and heavy sand accumulations.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and filtered tap water using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and allow to air dry.
5. Strip areas of overpaint applied over graffiti.
6. Reduce or remove any extant graffiti or graffiti residue as well as gum accretions.
7. Poultice areas of efflorescence to remove soluble salts from the concrete.
8. Rout cracks and inject with a microinjection grout to stabilize.
9. Fill losses with a patching material that matches the concrete in mechanical properties. Fills will be tinted and textured to match adjacent surfaces.
10. In-paint any areas where graffiti could not be removed with a silicate mineral paint to blend with adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
11. Apply sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to all surfaces.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 24 hrs @ $130.00/hr $3,120.00
Conservation Technicians: 80 hrs @ $90.00/hr $7,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $1,000.00
Total: $11,320.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: None at this time.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter and heavy sand accumulations.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and filtered tap water using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and allow to air dry.
5. Re-apply anti-graffiti coating as recommended according to the manufacturer’s specifications.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $2,500.00
2014 Examination: December 10, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

**Artist:** Francoise and Claude LaLanne

**Title:** Dinosaurs of Santa Monica

**Date:** 1989

**Materials:** Stainless steel, bronze, and foliage.

**Dimensions:** Varied (large-scale installation)

**Location:** Between Broadway and Wilshire Blvd along the 3rd street promenade.

**General Condition:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description:** The installation consists of 6 sculptural dinosaurs made in stainless steel, bronze, and foliage that line the 3rd street promenade. Each sculpture occupies a fenced in, elevated grass area. Four of the six dinosaurs function as part of an integrated fountain system. Each dinosaur is made from a frame of stainless steel, with a stainless steel mesh that gives the form volume. Climbing shrubbery has been planted at each of the feet of these forms, allowing the plants to fill out the form with mass. The spines, heads, feet, and claws of the dinosaurs are articulated in patinated bronze sheet metal.

**Condition:** Overall the installation appears to be in fair condition. No serious structural condition issues are apparent at this time. There appear to be repairs and extra supports to a few structural elements, especially along the spine and tail of the Sauropod-like dinosaur. This does not seem to present any serious structural issues at this time, as the work seems stable. The surface conditions of the pieces are fair. Moderate to heavy copper corrosion appears throughout the work, predominantly around the areas closest to fountain plumbing and water. In these areas, there is visible surface and definition loss associated with the corrosion. Elements of several dinosaurs are missing, such as the back-plate from the stegosaurus and a claw of the tyrannosaurus rex. The welds connecting the stainless steel elements are oxidizing, indicating they may not have been passivated or “browned,” which could lead to future corrosion of structural supports. Dents in the metal were noted, especially near the feet—likely attributed to grass maintenance. Atmospheric soiling and bird guano accretions are apparent throughout the installation. An extant, protective wax coating on the bronze sheet has blanched on several of the figures, resulting in white blotchy patches and visible brush strokes. Water spotting/mineral deposits were also observed on the bronze sheet throughout the installation. City staff intimated to RLA conservators that the fountain mechanism will likely be changed out on all of the fountain elements in the near future.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.
Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The location is set in a high pedestrian traffic area. The pieces are technically within reach of the public, though the elevated planters, low fence, spot-lighting and police presence are somewhat of a deterrent. They are not accessible to vehicles, though they are within close proximity to high vehicle traffic areas and are likely subjected to high levels of particulates from carbon emissions. The figures are outdoors, open to the elements, and in full sunlight throughout the day. There are no overhanging trees, but encroaching vegetation and sprinkler systems are an issue. Though it has not been confirmed, the City likely uses chlorinated chemicals to treat the fountain water, which accelerates copper corrosion. Furthermore, the ocean is less than a mile away, increasing humidity and salt levels.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: City staff should change the chemicals used to treat the fountain water to mitigate damage to the bronze. Bromine may be a suitable alternative to chlorine. City staff should trim the grass around the base of the sculptures by hand to minimize damage to the figures from lawn equipment.

Treatment Priority: #2 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter and heavy sand accumulations.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a conservation-grade detergent that is safe for plantings and filtered tap water using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Remove any extant, blanching wax coatings and mineral deposits/water spotting with an appropriate organic solvent.
6. Excavate and passivate all corrosion. Ferrous corrosion to be passivated with a phosphoric acid solution while copper corrosion is to be passivated with a benztotriazole solution. Passivating agents should dwell for 24 hours and then the areas degreased with denatured alcohol.
7. Ameliorate dents in metal through the application of heat and mechanical manipulation.
8. If possible and deemed necessary, have missing components re-fabricated and re-attached to their respective figures.
9. If deemed necessary, perform minor re-patination at localized areas of bronze to re-integrate areas of patina loss.
10. Apply two coats of a carnauba-based paste wax to the heated bronze surfaces.
11. Apply one coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to stainless steel surfaces.
12. Allow waxes to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 48 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 6,240.00
Conservation Technicians: 192 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 17,280.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 2,000.00
Access: $ 500.00
Changing Fountain Mechanisms & Conservation Oversight: $ TBD

Total: $ 26,020.00 + Fountain Changes & Oversight
Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces to remove particulate matter and heavy sand accumulations.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of a mild, conservation-grade detergent that is safe for plantings and filtered tap water using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Inspect all surfaces for signs of corrosion and address accordingly.
6. Apply a single coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to all surfaces.
7. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $6,000.00
2014 Examination: December 15, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Mark Lere

Title: Untitled

Date: 2006

Materials: Stainless steel, latex, rope, mild steel, paint, glazed ceramic, bronze, and terrazzo

Dimensions: Varied (seven individual sculptures of relatively small scale)

Location: Southwest corner of 4th Street and Olympic

General Condition: Excellent  Good  Fair X  Poor

Description: The piece is a multi-installation artwork that functions as collaboration between artist, urban planner, and architect, integrating urban flow and landscape with aesthetic. There are 6 large-scale sculptures adjacent to the elevator at every floor and a 7th occupying a courtyard at the exterior of the building that make up the sculpture collection. Each sculpture is approximately 4 feet cubed, and portrays an object such as a bocce ball, life ring, ball of yarn, diamond-cut shape, or an icosahedron form. The materials used include stainless steel, cast iron, paint, and latex covered rope.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in fair condition. The structural stability of the sculptures is good and shows no signs of faulty mounting systems. Conversely, the surface condition of a large portion of the works are problematic due to both environmental factors and interaction with the public. The sculptures, due to their range in material, exhibit different levels of condition and varying issues. Stainless steel and mild steels components are displaying corrosion. The top floor sculpture of the life ring has extensive corrosion that has led to stone staining, expansion cracks, and minor grout loss. The icosahedron form has a generally tarnished appearance overall with ferrous corrosion forming on the top/horizontal surfaces. The stainless steel teardrop forms anchored into the stuccoed wall also exhibit minor ferrous corrosion. Other metal or painted metal sculpture included in the group are scuffed and scratched, and in some cases show paint or enamel loss. The two sculptural forms that resemble large balls of yarn display signs of material loss. What could either be latex, paint, or a similar proprietary material coating has begun to separate from the rope substrate. Finally, the third floor, bronze diamond shaped artwork appears to have lost its protective wax coating, which has led to a localized change in patina. At two areas in particular, the patina alteration has become so severe that an area of orange cuprite corrosion has begun to shear from the substrate. There is a moderate to heavy accumulation of atmospheric soiling and carbon-based particulate matter on the sculptures, particularly on pieces contained within the parking structure (floors 1-5), the yarn-like sculptures, where heavy, black soiling is visible within the coated rope matrix.
Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The installation is adjacent to heavily trafficked roads and within a ¼ mile of a major freeway. High carbon emissions are present due to road proximity and vehicular movement through the car garage. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic can access areas of sculptural artwork. Two of the sculptures are exposed to the elements and in direct sunlight throughout the day. No surveillance cameras or spot lighting was observed. There are no encroaching plantings or nearby sprinklers.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: # 3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter. Use compressor and air hose to get debris out of yarn-like sculptures.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a conservation-grade detergent and filtered tap water using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Excavate and passivate all corrosion. Ferrous corrosion to be passivated with a phosphoric acid solution while copper corrosion is to be passivated with a benzotriazole solution. Passivating agents should dwell for 24 hours and then the areas degreased with denatured alcohol.
6. Perform minor re-patination at localized areas of bronze diamond to re-integrate areas of patina loss.
7. Apply two coats of a carnauba-based paste wax to the heated bronze surfaces.
8. Apply one coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to stainless steel surfaces.
9. Allow waxes to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.
10. Reduce or remove ferrous staining from terrazzo surfaces.
11. Rout cracks and stabilize with a microinjection grout or appropriate conservation-grade adhesive.
12. Coat exposed mild steel with a clear, UV-stable protective coating to mitigate corrosion and associated staining on the terrazzo surface.
13. In-paint areas of loss at black and white rope sculptures with a compatible paint system that will match original in color and reflectance.
14. Prime and in-paint areas of passivated corrosion on painted steel sculpture using a paint system that is rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light.

Estimated Treatment Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservator</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$130.00/hr</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technicians (2)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$90.00/hr</td>
<td>$14,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladder (wall by sculpture at entrance)

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter. Use compressor and air hose to get debris out of yarn-like sculptures.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of a mild, conservation-grade detergent and filtered tap water using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Inspect all surfaces for signs of corrosion and address accordingly.
6. Apply a single coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to all metal surfaces.
7. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $3,500.00
2014 Examination: December 11, 2014 by Tim Linden and Christina Varvi
Artist: Iñigo Manglano-Ovalle
Title: *Weather Field, No. 1*
Date: 2013
Materials: Stainless Steel and Magnesium
Dimensions: Alternating heights of 19', 20', and 21'; telescoping poles
Location: Tungua Park

General Condition: 

| Excellent | Good X | Fair | Poor |

---

Description: The installation is composed of 49 telescoping stainless steel poles topped with kinetic weathervanes. At staggered heights, the poles stand together in an organized grouping, moving with the changing wind. A kinetic weathervane, coupled with small spinning wind cups, perches atop each mast. As the wind direction changes, so does the group of weathervanes, much like the synchronized movement of bird flocks. Each pole is mounted into ground at the base, and a stainless steel plaque commemorates the artist’s work.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in good condition. There are no structural issues, as is expected due to the fairly recent date of installation. The surface condition is also good. As noted, there is only minor atmospheric soiling and light oxidation of the metal in varied areas. Oxidation is most prevalent at the horizontal surfaces/joins where the telescoping segments meet. Corrosive, carbon-based atmospheric soiling from heavy traffic nearby likely collects in these areas. Oxidation was also observed along the edges of the weathervane’s tail and wind cups. Several minor scuffs/abrasions were noted near the bases of the poles. Water spotting/mineral deposits were also noted at the bases of the poles, indicating they are probably routinely wet by nearby sprinklers or routine watering practices.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.

Comments on Location: The work is located within an area with high exposure to the elements and full sunlight throughout the day. Though located within a park setting, the area is within close proximity to heavily trafficked roads and a major highway resulting in high levels of carbon-based particulate matter. There are a variety of encroaching plants that are adjacent to the work. The installation is near the ocean and the resulting humid, salty air. While it is not
likely, the piece is accessible to the public. Sprinkler heads were not observed, but the water-spotting pattern indicates that sprinklers or other watering practices likely wet the piece.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Plant growth around the piece should be cut back and any sprinklers or watering practices should be directed away from the installation.

Treatment Priority: #3

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment using high-resolution digital photography.
2. If possible, stabilize kinetic weathervanes at tops of poles to facilitate treatment and mitigate damage and potential injury to workers maintaining the installation.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
4. Rinse installation with filtered tap water and wash with a conservation-grade detergent and filtered water with microfiber cloths.
5. Rinse installation with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Excavate and passivate any areas of corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease areas with denatured alcohol.
7. If deemed appropriate, utilize a proprietary, micro abrasive polish meant for stainless steel to remove tarnish, water spotting, and light scratches from the surface of the sculpture. Remove extant residue with denatured alcohol.
8. Apply a single coat of cold, carnauba-based paste wax to the lower 10’ of the poles to mitigate water spotting on the surfaces.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 20 hrs @ $130.00/hr $2,600.00
Conservation Technician: 80 hrs @ $90.00/hr $7,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $300.00
Access: $500.00
Total: $10,600.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. If possible, stabilize kinetic weathervanes at tops of poles to facilitate treatment and mitigate damage and potential injury.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
4. Rinse installation with filtered tap water and wash with a conservation-grade detergent and filtered water with microfiber cloths taking care not to damage any of the kinetic components.
5. Rinse installation with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Inspect surfaces for signs of corrosion and address accordingly.
7. Remove previous wax coating and re-apply a single coat of cold, carnauba-based paste wax to the lower 10’ of the poles to mitigate water spotting on the surfaces.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $3,500.00
**2014 Examination:** December 18, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

**Artist:** Ray McMakin

**Title:** Untitled

**Date:** 2009

**Materials:** Aluminum, paint, cast iron, ferrous metal hardware, wood, glass, and bronze

**Dimensions:** Varied, approximately 20’ L x 13’ W x 8’ H

**Location:** In front of Marion Davies Guest House, 415 PCH

**General Condition:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description:** The piece is a six-part installation that includes painted picket fences, light posts, and chairs made to evoke a sense of domesticity, tradition, and comfort. Each element is made of different materials including aluminum, cast iron, wood, glass, bronze, and ferrous metal hardware. All components are painted in monochromatic coatings of black, white, dark green, or grey. Only the glass of the southern most streetlight remains unpainted. The body of work is presented at the south side of the Marion Davies guesthouse, and aligns with the building in a parallel manner. There are two groupings of a fence, light, and two chairs; one smaller and to the south, and the other scaled larger to the north. Each grouping is painted in a different color scheme, yet constructed of the same materials. Both pairs of chairs are cast iron and mounted to the cement pad via a bolted system. The light posts are made of wood with painted bronze light fixtures and pane glass shields. Cast aluminum components make up the fences structure, while ferrous hardware, handles, and locking mechanisms. All elements appear to be embedded directly into the pavement or anchored to the ground.

**Condition:** Overall the piece appears to be in fair condition. There do not appear to be any structural issues and all mounting systems seem in good condition. A variety of surface condition concerns were noted. The piece exhibited evidence of paint loss throughout, and oxidation of metal surfaces has subsequently occurred in areas of loss. Paint loss and corrosion is especially pervasive on all ferrous components, most notably on the cast iron chairs and hardware. The oxidation of the bronze lantern elements is less pervasive, and only exhibits corrosion around the bottom edges where moisture likely lingers on the surface. Corrosion and associated paint loss was also observed on the aluminum components. Exposed aluminum surfaces have begun to oxidize and corrosion is expanding below the extant paint and compromising the protective coating. The joints between the horizontal cross bars and the vertical pickets have all lost paint in a circular pattern in similar locations throughout this element. It is likely there is a weakness at the connection where a mortise and tenon joint or faux mortise and tenon joint occurs, which would force the paint system to delaminate and fail.
It should be noted that it is possible that the paint system is not compatible with substrate materials. In addition to corrosion coming through the surface, the green and gray painted surfaces also have a slightly blanched/matte appearance, likely due to high UV exposure. Furthermore, general soiling and biological accretions were visible throughout the piece, especially along horizontal surfaces.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** The installation was assessed in 2011 by Sculpture Conservation Studio of Los Angeles. At the time, SCS did not note any lifting or peeling paint. Ferrous and copper corrosion products as well as associated staining were observed throughout the installation.

**Comments on Mounting:** None at this time.

**Comments on Location:** The work is located within a low medium traffic pedestrian area, depending on the visitor count of the facility. It is not accessible to vehicles. As the piece allows for public interaction, the work likely receives daily interaction with pedestrians. Very near the ocean, the artwork also is exposed to higher levels of humidity, salts, the elements, and full sunlight throughout the day. There appears to be no spot lighting or video surveillance nearby, however, guards are on regular duty throughout the campus. There are no nearby plantings or sprinklers that may hit the installation.

**Comments on Safety/Risk Management:** None at this time.

**Recommended Site Improvements:** None at this time.

**Treatment Priority:** #1

**Curatorial Priority:**

**Treatment Recommendations:**

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Set up barrier perimeter around installation to mitigate interaction with the public during treatment.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
4. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
5. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Ferrous Metal:
   a. Hardware:
      i. Excavate corrosion to sound metal/paint.
      ii. Passivate corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution and allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease with denatured alcohol.
      iii. Prime and in-paint hardware with a marine-grade paint system that is rated for outdoor use and high UV exposure. Topcoat to match original in both color and reflectance.
   b. Cast Iron Chairs:
      i. Strip paint down to bare metal. Be sure to protect surrounding pavement from staining/discholoration.
      ii. Excavate any extant corrosion and passivate with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease with denatured alcohol.
iii. Prime and paint chairs with an epoxy-based, marine-grade paint system that is rated for outdoor use and high UV exposure. Topcoat to match original in both color and reflectance.

7. Aluminum:
   a. Gray Fence:
      i. Strip paint down to bare metal. Be sure to protect surrounding pavement from staining/discholoration.
      ii. Excavate any extant corrosion and degrease with denatured alcohol.
      iii. Prime and paint surfaces with a marine-grade paint system that is compatible with aluminum substrates and is rated for both outdoor use and high UV exposure. Topcoat to match original in both color and reflectance.
   
   b. White Fence:
      iv. Excavate any corrosion to sound metal/paint and degrease exposed surfaces with denatured alcohol.
      v. Prime and in-paint exposed surfaces with a marine-grade paint system that is compatible with aluminum substrates and is rated for both outdoor use and high UV exposure. Topcoat to match original in both color and reflectance.

8. Bronze:
   a. Mechanically remove corrosion with micro-abrasive means.
   b. Apply two coats of a cold, carnauba-based wax to all surfaces.
   c. Re-integrate any variation in patina with wax tinted with dry pigments.
   d. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

9. If deemed necessary, apply an anti-graffiti coating to all surfaces per the manufacturer’s specifications.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservator:</td>
<td>32 hrs</td>
<td>$130.00/hr</td>
<td>$4,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technician:</td>
<td>160 hrs</td>
<td>$90.00/hr</td>
<td>$14,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (at cost + 10%):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$20,560.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** None at this time.

**Recommended Maintenance:**

**To be completed on a bi-monthly or as-needed basis:**

1. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water to remove salts that may be on the surface and could potentially facilitate corrosion.
2. Dry pieces with cotton cloths.

**To be completed annually:**

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Inspect all surfaces for signs of corrosion and address accordingly.
6. Re-apply one coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to bronze surfaces. Allow to dry and buff with a cotton cloth.

**Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs:** $2,000.00
2014 Examination: December 10, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Eugene H. Monrahan
Title: Saint Monica
Date: 1934
Materials: Cast stone, paint
Dimensions: 52.5” sq. (H=186”) from pad
Location: Ocean Drive at Wilshire Boulevard

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The work is a sculptural rendering of Saint Monica at human scale, produced in cast stone and painted. The installation appears to have been cast in sections. The figurative form of a cloaked Saint Monica stands atop a tiered pedestal that is formed of 9 platforms. On the back side of the monument is an inscription that reads, “Public Works of Art Project 1934.”

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in good condition. The structural condition appears to be good, however, there are some minor losses and cracks throughout. Horizontal and vertical hairline cracks in the paint layer were observed throughout, mostly on the base. The horizontal cracks appear to follow the formwork lines of the original casting and it is unknown if they continue through the cast stone substrate or are merely superficial through the paint. The vertical cracks do not appear to follow any particular pattern and likely continue through the cast stone substrate. This cracking may be due to settlement of the structure’s footing/pad. Evidence of previous repair attempts of said cracking are apparent, some of which have failed. Furthermore, material loss at the northeast corner and on the engraved “3’ is visible, yet both have since been painted over. The overall surface condition is also good, with only minor paint loss and cracking noted. The piece has likely been painted several times, though it is unknown whether the artist intended for the piece to be painted. There is a reddish darkening of the paint overall, likely due to soiling. A white lime-like deposit is leaching from the base of sculpture, particularly around cracked areas. This may be a result of the piece being wet by routine watering practices for the surrounding grass.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.
Comments on Location: The piece is highly accessible to the public, but is not accessible to vehicles. Flowers have been put on the base by pedestrians, which appears to be a routine practice. The piece sits within a heart-shaped planter area atop a cement pad/footing. It sits within 20-30’ of a busy road and within ¼ mile of the ocean. No security cameras were observed, but the piece is spot-lit at night. It receives full sun during the day and no trees or plants encroach upon the piece. No sprinkler heads were noted, but the piece is likely wet by routine watering practices for the surrounding grass.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Surround the sculpture with a low hedge or bush that has either thorns, sharp/pointy leaves, and/or needles to deter people from accessing the sculpture. Plantings should be placed far enough away and maintained so that they do not rest upon/touch the sculpture.

Treatment Priority: #3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Review historic photos and any documentation to try and determine whether or not the artist intended for the sculpture to be painted.
2. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
4. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
5. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Collect paint sample for microscopic cross-section analysis and color matching (if deemed the sculpture was intended to be painted).
7. Strip multiple paint coatings down to the original substrate.
8. Investigate exposed surfaces to see if hairline cracks extended through the substrate and determine whether or not a structural engineer should be consulted.
9. Route cracks and inject with a microinjection grout or conservation-grade adhesive to stabilize. Allow to cure per the manufacturer’s specifications.
10. Fill losses with a conservation-grade material that is compatible with cast stone and is rated for outdoor use. Fill will be tinted and textured to match adjacent surfaces. Allow to cure per the manufacturer’s specifications.
11. Based on historic documentation and in consultation with the City, determine whether or not the sculpture should be re-painted. If so, utilize collected sample to provide color options for the City to review.
   a. Re-paint sculpture with a paint system that is compatible with cast stone substrates and is rated for both outdoor use and exposure to high UV light.
   b. Color selection to be decided in conjunction with City staff.
12. If appropriate, apply a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to all surfaces.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 64 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 8,320.00
Conservation Technicians: 100 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 9,000.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 2,000.00
Access: $ 1,500.00
Total: $ 20,820.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Scaffolding
Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
   Remove small plants, grass, and sand/gravel from around the base of the sculpture.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water
   and a conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Inspect surfaces for signs of cracking or damage and address accordingly.
6. Re-apply anti-graffiti coating per the specifications of the manufacturer.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $2,000.00
2014 Examination: December 18, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger
Artist: Manfred and Muller
Title: *Twilight and Yearning*
Date: 1998
Materials: Wood, fiberglass, paint, ferrous metal and stainless steel
Dimensions: 18” L x 50” W x 114” H
Location: Beneath the Santa Monica Pier, south side, amongst the pilings.
General Condition: Excellent Good Fair Poor X

Description: The installation is comprised of three orange rowboats that are standing on end (bow facing upwards and stern downwards), fastened by metal strapping that attaches each piece to pier pilings. Each boat is comprised of wooden skeletal elements covered by a skin of fiberglass. This sculptural form has been painted fluorescent orange and then mounted to the pilings with hardware that has been bolted through the piece and secured in place.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in fair to poor condition. The structural elements are in fair condition overall. A large element, the thwart, is missing from southern-most boat sculpture. There is extensive cracking of the fiberglass. This deterioration has exposed the wooden substrate to the elements, likely producing rot in the wet, biologically rich environment. The hardware attaching the work to the pier structure appears to be heavily corroded, yet structurally intact at this time. The overall surface condition appears to be in poor condition. Due to environmental weathering, the original paint system is failing throughout with paint loss and fading in the most exposed of areas. Painted and etched graffiti has been applied to the surface on all sculptural elements and there appears to have been multiple efforts to paint over the vandalism. The overpaint, in many instances, does not match with the original color used by the artist. Heavy environmental soiling from bird guano, exposure to breaking surf, sand, and oceanic biological growth has accrued on the surface of the work. The lower portions of each boat are completely submerged below grade in damp, compact sand, which traps moisture against the surface and accelerates deterioration of the pieces.

That being said, there is a written agreement between the City and the artist that the work is meant to gradually deteriorate and that the deterioration is part of the artist’s intention in creating the piece. The agreement further outlines that if the City determines any portions of the work are a potential hazard due to a deteriorating condition, the City may remove the potential hazard.
Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001. According to City staff, minor graffiti removal has been performed intermittently since the piece was installed.

Comments on Mounting: The mounting system should be inspected on a continual basis in order to monitor and mitigate corrosion.

Comments on Location: The location is set beneath the pier at the water level, in the intertidal/littoral zone. The pieces are directly exposed to seawater and the wave action/impact of breaking surf. Surrounding sand, moved both by wind and water, can act as an abrasive force and also trap moisture against the surface of the pieces. Seawater also contains high levels of biological material that can accrue on the work, further damaging the sculpture. While the public is discouraged from going underneath the pier for security reasons, the pieces are highly accessible to the public. Multiple people were viewed in the vicinity of the artworks at the time of inspection and graffiti was noted on all three pieces. They are not accessible to vehicles. Sunlight is not direct, but the south-facing sides are partially exposed, especially the boat closest to the southern edge of the pier. The pieces do not appear to be spot lit at night, but there are supposedly working security cameras beneath the pier.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: Though the artwork is intended to deteriorate over time, the connections-mounts for the boats should be routinely inspected for stability and safety. Furthermore, as the three elements deteriorate further, they may create protruding and possibly jagged edges that could become a public safety hazard.

Recommended Site Improvements: If possible, the three elements should be spot-lit at night to deter vandalism.

Treatment Priority: #3

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
According to City staff, the artist intends for the work to deteriorate over time, so minimal intervention is warranted.

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Mitigate any applied graffiti with the appropriate organic solvent.
3. Stainless Steel Mounts:
   a. Excavate and passivate any corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours, then degrease with denatured alcohol.
   b. If deemed necessary, prime and paint stainless steel hardware with a compatible paint system rated for outdoor use and marine environments to give added protection to the stainless steel mounts.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator:  8 hrs @ $130.00/hr  $ 1,040.00
Conservation Technician:  16 hrs @ $90.00/hr  $ 1,440.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 200.00
Total: $ 2,680.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: None at this time.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Inspect all surfaces for signs of applied graffiti and address accordingly with the appropriate organic solvent.
3. Inspect mounts for overall stability and signs of deterioration. Address accordingly.

**Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs:** $1,500.00
2014 Examination: December 15, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Renee Petropoulos  
Title: Two Hundred Fourteen Movements and a View  
Date: 1997  
Materials: Terrazzo and aluminum  
Dimensions: Approximately 115' L x 43' W (4,945 sq ft)  
Location: Santa Monica Civic Auditorium lobby, 1855 Main St.  
General Condition: Excellent   Good    Fair X   Poor

Description: This piece is a floor installation consisting of terrazzo in a multi-color, geometric design. The patterns are laid out with speckled terrazzo in black, rust, pastel pink, light brown, off white, and mustard colors. Joints separate floor panels at regular intervals with an inlaid aluminum strip. Individual design elements are also delineated with inlaid aluminum strips. A stainless steel plaque mounted on a wall commemorates the installation of the piece and artist. There is likely a protective wax or acrylic coating across the floor, though this should be confirmed with solvent testing.

Condition: The overall condition of the piece is fair. Small, localized losses, surface pitting, and hairline cracks were noted throughout the floor, especially areas adjacent to joints that comprise the overall grid pattern. This condition is most notable in the areas between the main entry doors and the entrances to the auditorium. An incompatibility between the two materials adjacent to one another due to hardness indices, insufficient material to support heavy pedestrian traffic, and/or issues with fabrication/installation may have contributed to these areas degrading preferentially to other parts of the installation. An area of several square feet at the base of the west staircase is exhibiting granular disaggregation and associated surface blanching. This area is also more noticeably pitted than other areas of the floor. The cause of this condition is currently unknown, though generally this form of deterioration if typically caused by water infiltration as well as the presence of salts and/or nitrous oxides. Furthermore, there is overall soiling and localized staining, as well as a multitude of scratch and scuff marks through the clear, protective coating. Some soiling/discoloration has likely been trapped in the protective coating.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001. The work was treated as a sub-section of a larger scope of repair work at the Civic Auditorium several years ago. The treatment report was not available at the time of this survey.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.
Comments on Location: The installation is located within the main entrance lobby of the Santa Monica Civic Auditorium. The piece is highly accessible to the public and not accessible to vehicle traffic. Although regular usage and operation of the auditorium was suspended in 2013, past usage would have proved to show that the area had high foot traffic at regular intervals during events. During this time, the floor piece would have encountered much abrasion due to the scuffling of feet. Due to its indoor location, however, direct sunlight would have been mild and its environment would have been climactically controlled with a HVAC system. The space is still used from time to time for special events and filming. City maintenance/facilities personnel regularly maintain the floor, though specific products and maintenance procedures are unknown at this time.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #2 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural brushes.
3. Perform solubility testing to confirm presence of protective coating.
4. Strip existing protective coating.
5. Wet clean surfaces with a solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent.
6. Damp rinse with distilled water and allow to air dry.
7. Test stained area with steam cleaner and/or appropriate organic solvent(s) to try and remove any stubborn staining. Apply poultice if deemed necessary.
8. Test area of disaggregation and loss near west staircase for salts, and, if present, desalinate with appropriate poultice.
9. Consolidate areas of disaggregating terrazzo with a conservation-grade consolidant that can withstand foot traffic.
10. Rout cracks and fill with a compatible, conservation-grade grout. Color and texture to be matched to adjacent surfaces.
11. If deemed necessary, mechanically remove localized areas of failing terrazzo down to sound substrate.
12. Fill areas of loss with a compatible, conservation-grade fill material that can withstand heavy foot traffic. Color, texture, and aggregate to be matched to adjacent surfaces.
13. Reseal the floor with a compatible protective coating rated for heavy foot traffic.
14. If deemed necessary, apply sacrificial wax coating and buff to a shine.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 40 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 5,200.00
Conservation Technicians: 240 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 21,600.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): (Allow up to) $ 500.00
Equipment: (Allow up to) $ 500.00
Total: $ 29,800.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Industrial floor scrubber (stripping); floor buffer

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually or on an as-needed basis to be determined by the City:
1. Remove dust and atmospheric soiling with soft, natural brushes.
2. Wet clean floor with a solution of distilled water and a conservation-grade detergent, such as Proctor & Gamble Orvus® WA Paste.
3. Damp rinse with distilled water and allow to air-dry.
4. Apply sacrificial protective wax and buff to a shine.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: Routine maintenance to be performed by City personnel annually or on an as-needed basis to be determined by the City. Future terrazzo repairs to be assessed and repaired on an as-needed basis, though a conservator should inspect the work on a bi-annual basis.
REVISED PROPOSAL FOR CONSERVATION

*Overlook Beacon* – Jody Pinto
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**DATE OF ORIGINAL REPORT:** March 4, 2013

**DATE OF REVISED REPORT:** July 7, 2015

**ARTIST:** Jody Pinto

**TITLE:** *Overlook Beacon*

**DATE:** 2000

**OBJECT:** Ascending wooden pier with perimeter railings. Abstract, boat-like seating area with cantilevered, internally lit mast centrally located at end of pier.

**MATERIALS:** Wood, fiberglass, stainless steel

**DIMENSIONS:** Fiberglass mast: 50’–55’ H; Nautical seating area*: 26’ L x 5’ H

![Figures 1 & 2: Pre-Conservation Overview](image)
Description:
The site is comprised of four major components; a pier, its perimeter railing, a nautical-themed seating area, and an internally lit mast that projects from the seating area. The long, wooden pier is approximately 75’ L x 25’ W and overlooks Santa Monica Beach. It is comprised of rows of 2” x 4” planks running north to south. There is a slight incline of roughly 3’-4’ from the entrance of the pier to its end.

The pier’s perimeter railing primarily consists of stainless steel. Stainless steel Newel posts are generally spaced every 3’ with ten evenly spaced, horizontal, cylindrical stainless steel balusters between them. There is an angled wood ledge near the top of the railing on the interior side on which pedestrians can lean and rest.

Towards the end of the pier there is a nautical-themed wooden seating structure approximately 26’ feet in length and 5 feet in height. The composition of the interior structure/support is currently unknown. However, the structure is clad with 2”x2” wooden boards. The boards are attached to their frame with stainless steel screws. The screw heads have been covered by wooden pegs.

Emanating from atop the nautical, wooden structure, at its most western end is a large, fiberglass mast approximately 25-30 feet high that is meant to resemble the beacon of a ship. At the bottom of this mast is a piece of stainless steel that meets the wooden surface of the nautical structure. When the mast is backlit, a large pole (presumably stainless steel) is visible through the fiberglass and extends to the top of the component, terminating at a lightening rod. Upon initial assessment, it was not possible to tell how the piece lights up at night, but from other photographs it appears that the lighting mechanism is located within the fiberglass mast, most likely near the bottom of the element.

Comments on location and installation:
The site is located in Palisades Park, overlooking Santa Monica Beach. It is set at the corner of Ocean Drive and California Avenue, approximately 40’ from the road. Trees do not directly overhang the nautical structure and adjoining fiberglass beacon, however there are trees overhanging the boardwalk at its easternmost end. On each side of the boardwalk is a gathering of grass and small shrubs that form small plateaus before the cliff begins. At the southern end there is a large tree stump, most likely from a palm tree that used to be there. Black fencing was observed underneath the boardwalk.

Condition Prior to Treatment:
On February 14 & 27, 2013, RLA staff conducted a partial onsite examinations of the site. The site was viewed both at a distance of roughly 5’-10’ to the north and south as well as up close throughout the top side of the pier. RLA staff was not authorized or able to examine the structure at the west end at ground level due to its proximity to the cliff’s edge. Furthermore, RLA staff was not able to examine the underside of the structure, including footings, anchoring mechanisms, etc. As such, the following was observed:

We cannot comment on structural stability but the appearance did not indicate that there is any problem at present. We noted a series of surface issues that should be addressed. Most important among these is superficial hairline scratches seen on the fiberglass as well as a generally blanched surface appearance throughout the mast. These conditions were likely
caused by the deleterious affects of sun exposure (ie: UV radiation) and high humidity on fiberglass. Fiberglass is a fiber-reinforced polymer made of a plastic/resin matrix reinforced by fine fibers of glass. After a few years, high humidity and exposure to strong sunlight can break down the polymer, resulting in a condition known as “fiber bloom” in which the fine glass fibers become exposed and the surface appears blanched/discolored. If addressed and treated, this condition will not affect the structural integrity of the fiberglass.

The stainless steel perimeter railing is showing active ferrous corrosion overall on both the Newel posts and the horizontal balusters. Corrosion was also noted at the stainless steel connector between the mast and nautical seating area. There are five main types of stainless steel, though it is unknown at this time which type was used in this installation. Two of the five types have limited corrosion resistance in marine environments. The installation’s close proximity to the ocean is likely the cause of the stainless steel corrosion. Fortunately, the corrosion appears to be superficial and not affecting the structural integrity of any of the stainless steel components.

Extensive micro fungal growth (mold, mildew, lichen) was observed on the wooden handrails. Bright green bio growth was also observed in localized areas along the pier floorboards. Both of these conditions were particularly notable on the south side of the installation, which gets more shade from nearby trees. Macro bio growths (small plants) were also observed emanating from joins between the pier floorboards in localized areas.
Losses in the wood were observed throughout the installation and range in size from less than 1” to approximately 1’ in length. The majority of the losses are at the nautical seating area and along the wood handrail at the perimeter railing. Some of the smaller losses may have been caused by wood boring insects, though it does not appear likely. They are likely the result of general wear and tear from impact/abrasion and weathering.

Graffiti was noted along the bottom 1’ of the fiberglass mast as well as throughout the wood, including the nautical element, the handrails and the wooden planks of the pier. The graffiti on the fiberglass mast has been drawn with an unknown material (chalk? Paint pen?). The majority of the graffiti on the wood has been carved/etched into the surface, though there were localized instances of ink/marker graffiti on the wood.
The remnants of stickers/tape and a large black accretion of an unknown substance were noted on the fiberglass. Guano was noted at both the top of the fiberglass element and along the wooden handrail around the perimeter of the installation. Garbage and debris has also collected in the slight gap between the fiberglass mast and the stainless steel connector that is anchored to the wooden nautical seating component.

Observed Conditions – July 2015:
At the time of inspection, the installation was partially obstructed by major, on-going construction at the adjacent California Incline that connects the PCH and Ocean Drive. Construction crews have erected chain link fencing to establish a closed-off work area that blocks the path at the intersection. This fencing and associated work equipment creates a quasi-enclosed area that is not visible from the street. As such, it appears that transient individuals frequent the area and a strong urine odor was present on the installation at the time of inspection.

In comparing the installation’s current condition to photographs from spring 2013, the overall condition of the piece appears to have further deteriorated, though not significantly or in any way that is alarming. As stated in 2013, the structure appears to be stable, though this should be confirmed by a structural engineer. Of most concern is the surface condition of the fiberglass beacon element. It appears as though the resin binder has continued to deteriorate, resulting in an increased blanched appearance of the surface. This condition is more pronounced at the west, east, and south faces of the fiberglass, which receive the most direct sunlight. The blanched areas are also more yellow in color. It is uncertain whether this is the result of further deterioration or soiling from the adjacent work site. Bird droppings continue to be an issue at the top of the fiberglass beacon.

Corrosion at the stainless steel elements throughout the installation has expanded, though not at an accelerated rate. However, two of the top rails at the west side of the installation have been bent downwards out of plane, as if someone had sat or stood upon them.

At an area on the south wooden handrail, there is a sizeable abrasion (ca. 4” x 8”) at an area where spotty accretions were previously observed. It looks as though someone tried to hastily scrape off the accretions, leaving a lighter, newly exposed surface. A similar condition was observed atop the nautical seating structure.

Though macro biological growth was not observed at the time of inspection, additional staining/saturation at the wood floor planks was noted. Additional graffiti, both incised and
applied, was observed throughout the top/horizontal side of the nautical seating element as well as the wood handrails around the perimeter of the installation. It appears as though someone has attempted to remove graffiti from the base of the fiberglass beacon, though the method utilized is not apparent.

**Proposed Treatment:**

**NOTE:** Based on our observations, we believe it would be difficult to safely perform an in situ treatment of the fiberglass element without blocking off at least one lane of the adjacent street (California Incline) in order to access the sculpture via a boom lift with an arm extension of at least 60’. There may be other suitable locations for placement of such equipment, but this should be determined in conjunction with the appropriate representatives from the City of Santa Monica.

The following are steps recommended for treatment and stabilization of the whole site:

1. Document treatment with before, during, and after digital photographs.
2. Clean pier area to remove garbage, debris and excess plantings.
3. **Fiberglass:**
   a. Clean all surfaces to remove dirt and grime using tap water and a conservation-grade detergent. Rinse surfaces until all residual cleaning agents are removed.
   b. Remove accretions mechanically and/or with organic solvents compatible with fiberglass surfaces.
   c. Lightly sand down exposed fibers along fiberglass surface using caution and appropriate protective skin and respiratory protection.
   d. Test various appropriate resin coatings to restore the appearance and surface finish. Special care will be taken to ensure that the translucent quality of the fiberglass is not lost. Final selections will be made in conjunction with staff from the City of Santa Monica. If possible, select a coating that includes UV inhibitors or add UV inhibitors to the coating.
   e. Test an anti-graffiti coating on the surface to determine which one is most appropriate. Apply an anti-graffiti coating to protect surface.
4. **Wood:**
   a. Clean all surfaces to remove dirt and grime using tap water and a conservation-grade detergent. Rinse surfaces until all residual cleaning agents are removed.
   b. Perform stain removal of applied graffiti (paint and sharpie) using the appropriate organic solvent(s).
   c. Where bio growth is noted, treat wood with a fungicide and/or preservative treatment as needed.
   d. Remove accretions mechanically and/or with organic solvents compatible with wood surfaces.
   e. Fill voids in wood with a conservation grade wood epoxy.
   f. Apply wood sealant and allow for curing time per manufacturer’s specifications.
   g. Inpaint fills with a combination of acrylic paints and wood sealant tinted with dry pigments and pigmented wax.
   h. Replace missing pegs that cover stainless steel screws.
5. **Stainless steel connector plate, railings and plaque:**
   a. Dry brush the surface to remove dust and debris.
   b. Clean all surfaces to remove dirt and grime using tap water and a conservation-grade detergent. Rinse surfaces until all residual cleaning agents are removed.
   c. Mechanically remove ferrous metal corrosion where necessary.
d. Wipe down stainless steel surfaces with denatured alcohol and acetone to remove corrosion residue and produce a clean and grease-free surface.

e. If deemed necessary, apply one coat of a carnauba-based paste wax (cold) to all metal surfaces to mitigate the deleterious effects of the marine environment.

6. Prepare a detailed treatment report with instructions for future maintenance.

**Estimated Costs:**

1.) Fiberglass Mast & Stainless Steel Connector Plate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Conservator:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>$2,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservator:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technicians (2):</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/Lift Rental:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (if not provided by the City):</td>
<td>$2/hr x 96 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$192.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $15,832.00 + Access

2.) Wooden Nautical Seating Element:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Conservator:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>$1,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservator:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$2,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technicians (2):</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$5,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (if not provided by the City):</td>
<td>$2/hr x 56 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$112.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $9,422.00

3.) Stainless Steel & Wood Perimeter Railing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Conservator:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>$840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservator:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technicians (2):</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$11,520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (if not provided by the City):</td>
<td>$2/hr x 110 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$220.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $18,180.00

4.) Wooden Pier Floorboards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Conservator:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>$840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservator:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$4,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technicians:</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$10,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (if not provided by the City):</td>
<td>$2/hr x 94 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$188.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $15,768.00

**COMBINED TOTAL:** $59,202.00 + Access
2014 Examination: December 12, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Eino Romppanen
Title: Oneness
Date: 1966
Materials: Marble and concrete
Dimensions: 39” L x 31” W x 83” H
Location: Hotchkiss Park

General Condition: Excellent Good Fair X Poor

Description: The work is freestanding, large-scale figurative sculpture produced of white marble, depicting a family of four grouped together in an embrace. Carved from a single block of stone, the piece is scaled to human size. The stone is off-white in color with vertical striations and grey veining. The family depicted appears to represent a mother and father, child, and infant standing atop an approximately one and a half foot pedestal. The pedestal has a carved plaque serving as an epigraph, titling the piece. Below the original work, a two-tiered concrete pad supports the piece.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in fair condition. There are no apparent structural issues at this time. The surface condition, however, appears to be only fair. Heavy soiling, organic matter as well as gum has accumulated on the piece. Burnishing is extensive throughout, likely due to pedestrian accessibility and continuous rubbing of hands touching the surface. The surface also shows evidence of etched and painted graffiti throughout. Ferrous corrosion staining, likely from ferrous inclusions in the stone were noted in localized areas. Hairline cracks along the natural fissures of the stone were most notable between the two large figures. There is also a small loss (<2”) on the arm of the female figure. Small spalls (<1”) were noted at the stone base. The base also shows signs of microbiological growth and cement spatters, likely from the installation. The concrete pad just below the base of the sculpture is exhibiting settlement cracks as well as etched graffiti, microbiological growth, and material losses (<6”).

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.
Comments on Location: The piece is highly accessible to the public, but is not accessible to vehicle traffic. It is adjacent to a sidewalk and the extensive burnishing indicates that people frequently touch and/or sit upon the piece. The piece is exposed to the elements and receives full to partial sunlight throughout the day. Tree branches overhang the sculpture, but there are no encroaching plantings at its base. The piece does not appear to be spot lit at night and no streetlights were observed nearby. Sprinkler heads were not observed, but the piece may get wet from routine watering practices of the surrounding grass. The sculpture is also located within ½ mile of the ocean.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: The City should decide whether or not they would like the piece to be a climbing sculpture. If not, it is recommended to place a low, planting barrier around the edge of the concrete pad to deter people from accessing and touching the piece. Signage could also help deter people from accessing the piece. Overhanging branches should be trimmed back to mitigate damage from falling limbs or debris. Spot lighting and/or security cameras may help deter vandalism.

Treatment Priority: #2

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Mechanically remove any extant gum accretions.
5. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and allow to air dry.
6. Apply a non-toxic biocide to all surfaces to eliminate microbiological growths on the sculptures. Allow to dwell for several days and then repeat steps 3 and 4.
7. Remove or reduce extant applied graffiti with an appropriate organic solvent.
8. Apply a gel poultice to remove any residual dark staining from horizontal surfaces.
9. Remove or reduce extant ferrous staining.
10. If deemed necessary, fill minor losses with a material that is compatible with the mechanical properties of marble. Fill is to be tinted and textured to match the adjacent surfaces.
11. Apply a nano-lime consolidant to all surfaces to mitigate additional cracking along vertical fissures inherent to the stone.
12. Apply a vapor-transmissable water repellent to marble surfaces to protect from water infiltration.
13. Apply a non-toxic biocide to all surfaces to mitigate microbiological growths on the sculptures.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 40 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 5,200.00
Conservation Technician: 56 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 5,040.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 750.00
Total: $ 10,990.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: None at this time.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and allow to air dry.
5. Re-apply water repellent as needed according to the manufacturer’s specifications.
6. Re-apply a non-toxic biocide to all surfaces to mitigate microbiological growths on the sculptures.

**Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs:** $1,500.00
2014 Examination: December 10, 2014 by Tim Linden and Christina Varvi

Artist: Masahito Sanae

Title: Arcadia Bandini de Baker

Date: 1987

Materials: Cast bronze, granite, grout

Dimensions: Bust: 12” L x 18.25” W x 24.5” H; Overall: 1’ L x 1’ W x 6’ H

Location: Palisades and Ocean Park

General Condition: Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Description: The piece is a figurative rendering of Arcadia Bandini de Baker in three dimensions as a bust. Produced in bronze the bust is mounted to a white and black polished granite veneer pedestal. A square polished granite veneer base, rising approximately 6 inches from the ground, supports the granite pedestal. The internal structure of the pedestal and base was not evident at the time of inspection. There is also a bronze plaque mounted on the front side of the pedestal, facing due east, that serves as an epigraph honoring the late Bandini de Baker. The bronze of the bust and plaque surface has a dark patina.

Condition: Overall the piece appears stable, with no structural concerns noted. Surface condition is good, despite minor issues. The bust exhibits copper corrosion, incised graffiti, and mineral deposits at the base. There is an overall breakdown of the protective wax coating. The extant coating at the west side of the bust has blanched and some surfaces appear to lack any protective wax coating. If left untreated, the areas that are unprotected may develop a green patina or etch faster than the protected areas, potentially changing the original aesthetic. The plaque lacks a protective wax coating entirely. The surface of the granite pedestal is good overall. Slight organic build up around base, ferrous staining on the horizontal granite beneath the bust, and a tide line of mineral deposits was noted. Grout losses are visible along a vertical grout line on a northwest corner of the pedestal. It is unknown how pedestal is anchored to the ground; nevertheless it appears to be stable and secure. Gravel and sediment from the surrounding pathway were observed on the horizontal surface of the lower pedestal.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001. Rosa Lowinger & Associates assessed the artwork in March 2013.

Comments on Mounting: None at this time.
Comments on Location: The piece is highly accessible to the public as it is centered in a rose garden and surrounded by a gravel path. It is within 200 feet of a busy road, but is not accessible to vehicles. The piece is exposed to all elements and appears to receive full sunlight throughout the day. It is very close to the ocean and is thus exposed to higher levels of humidity and salts. There are no overhanging tree branches, encroaching plantings, or nearby sprinklers. No spot lighting or protective elements were observed.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: If possible, surround the sculpture with a low hedge or bush that has either thorns, sharp/pointy leaves, and/or needles to deter people from accessing the sculpture. Plantings should be placed far enough away and maintained so that they do not rest upon/touch the sculpture.

Treatment Priority: #3 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
2. Dry brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove accretions and particulate matter.
3. Rinse with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Bronze Bust & Plaque:
   b. Remove residual surface coating with appropriate organic solvents.
   c. Minimize localized corrosion and mineral deposit build-up on bronze bust and plaque mechanically using mildly abrasive pads of varying degrees that will not cut through the patina and/or scalpel blades at a low angle.
   d. Warm surface of the bronze with a propane torch. Apply one coat of a carnauba-based conservation grade paste wax to the heated metal surface.
   e. Lightly buff surface with cotton cloths once wax has cooled/dried.
   f. Apply a second coat of cold, carnauba-based paste wax to the bronze surfaces.
   g. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.
6. Granite Pedestal & Base:
   a. Fill any losses in the grout with a conservation-grade grout compatible with granite. Replacement grout will match original in color and texture.
   b. Test chemical ferrous stain removal in discrete, localized area at top of pedestal to ensure high-polished surface will not be etched. Proceed with ferrous stain removal if safe to do so.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 10 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 1,300.00
Conservation Technician: 16 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 1,440.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 125.00
Total: $ 2,865.00
Estimated Special Equipment Required: None at this time.

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photographs.
2. Dry brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove accretions and particulate matter.
3. Rinse with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Apply one coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to the bronze surfaces.
6. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $1,000.00
2014 Examination: December 15, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger
Artist: Mauro Staccioli
Title: Untitled (Homage to Jack Kerouac)
Date: 1993
Materials: Painted Stucco, wood, and mild steel
Dimensions: Approximately 12’ L x 1.5’ W x 7’ H per structure
Location: Neilson Way at Pico and Ocean

General Condition: Excellent Good Fair X Poor

Description: The work is a large outdoor sculpture comprised of two adjacent, crossing half moon forms, whose surfaces are covered in earthy red colored stucco. Both forms are counterbalanced and mounted to appear as if they have tipped, and mirror each other in position. The structure of the piece is fabricated in wood, primarily 2” x 4” lumber, and surfaced with weatherproof tarpaper and stucco. Just beneath the exterior surface is a ferrous strapping that mounts the structures in position. The work is located amongst both large and small flora, as though it was intended to be integrated with the semi-urban landscape.

Condition: The piece is in fair condition overall. The structure appears to be stable, yet there appear to be moderate surface issues. Extensive hairline cracking and abrasions appear throughout the work. More significant cracks were observed along what is likely the join between the denser framework and the plywood that covers the frame. Additional cracks and delamination were observed on the undersides of the curved elements closest to the ground. As the work occupies the space beneath large palm trees, it is probable that some of the surface scratches are due to falling, dead palm fronds. The stucco has fallen away towards the underside of the piece, leaving the plywood interior and/or mild steel mounting exposed. A hive of bees previously occupied the interior of the piece, which has likely left behind deposits of organic matter. There may be an opening or multiple openings in the piece. If present, it is unknown whether or not these openings are intentional for ventilation or if they are the result of damage/degradation. From what is visible of the mild steel elements, they do not appear to have been primed or painted. As such, the observed oxidation and corrosion of the exposed exterior of the mild steel mounting system is also likely present at the interior of the installation and may be due to exposure to humidity and water via said hole(s). Around the base of the sculpture, what appears to be expandable insulation foam has been applied and has since yellowed significantly and begun to break down. There are tide lines visible on the surface that may be from nearby sprinklers and resulting hard water accretions. The surface exhibits allover hazing or bleaching of current paint system, conceivably due to UV exposure. There appears to be atmospheric soiling throughout, likely from proximity to a large and busy intersection. Dirt, gravel, and other organic debris collect around the base and rest on the surface, likely trapping moisture. Finally, the commemorative plaque lacks a protective coating.
Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: According to an online search, the Shoshana Wayne Gallery preformed repairs and restoration of the work in 2011 after the piece had been struck by a vehicle. This treatment included completely resurfacing the sculptures and select replacement of wood formwork members. In 2015, a hive of bees was removed from the south structure.

Comments on Mounting: The mounting system is exhibiting significant corrosion. It should be inspected by a structural engineer in order to determine whether passivation is sufficient or if the mounting mechanism requires replacement.

Comments on Location: The work is located within an area of high pedestrian and vehicular traffic. It is conceivable that vehicular traffic could enter the site, though four concrete bollards protect the installation at the north and south sides, as do large palms to the east and west. The work is exposed to full sunlight throughout the day and is within a ½ mile of the ocean. The work is located within a plant bed that includes large, overhanging palm trees. Previously encroaching ground flora has been significantly cut back. Though the installation is in a plant bed, people can walk up to the pieces, which are a few feet away from a sidewalk. Multiple sprinkler heads were observed within close proximity to the two elements and tide lines from hard water/mineral deposits indicate that the pieces are routinely hit with water. The piece does not appear to be spot lit, but there are multiple streetlights nearby. No security cameras were observed.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Dead/dying palm fronds should be removed from the surrounding trees as soon as possible to prevent them from falling onto the piece and damaging the surface. Surrounding plants should continue to be cut back so as not to touch the surface of the installation. Dirt, gravel, and other organic debris should be routinely swept away from the base to mitigate moisture retention. Nearby sprinklers should be directed away from the piece.

Treatment Priority: #2 Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter. Remove loose gravel, dirt, and debris from around the base of the sculpture.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and allow to air dry.
5. Remove accretions and markings with the appropriate organic solvent(s).
6. Remove failing foam insulation from around base and attempt to determine if there are intentional openings for ventilation or if there is damage.
7. Inspect interior of each element with a boroscope to determine condition of mild steel mounting system and wood elements. Address accordingly based on the findings.
8. Excavate and passivate any accessible corrosion located on the mounting system.
9. Prime and paint accessible mild steel with a marine-grade system rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV.
10. Stabilize cracks and delaminating stucco with microinjection grout.
11. Where deemed necessary, fill losses with a compatible patching material textured to
match adjacent surfaces.
12. In-paint areas of loss and discoloration to match adjacent surfaces.
13. Protect (and possibly re-saturate) paint layer with a coating such as UV-stable varnish and apply sacrificial anti-graffiti coating.
14. Bronze Plaque:
   a. After cleaning, warm surface of the bronze with a propane torch. Apply one coat of a conservation grade paste wax to the heated metal surface.
   b. Lightly buff surface with cotton cloths once wax has cooled/dried.
   c. Apply a second coat of cold, carnauba-based paste wax to the bronze surfaces.
   d. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservator</td>
<td>40 hrs</td>
<td>$130.00/hr</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technicians (2)</td>
<td>160 hrs</td>
<td>$90.00/hr</td>
<td>$14,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (at cost + 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>(allow up to)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$21,350.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** Ladders

**Recommended Maintenance:**

To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter. Remove loose gravel, dirt, and debris from around the base of the sculpture.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and allow to air dry.
5. Inspect all surfaces for signs of cracking, corrosion, etc. and address accordingly.
6. Apply one coat of a cold, carnauba-based paste wax to the bronze plaque. Allow wax to dry and lightly buff with cotton cloths.
7. Re-apply anti-graffiti coating as needed according to the manufacturer’s specifications.

**Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs:** $2,000.00
2014 Examination: December 10, 2014 by Tim Linden and Christina Varvi

Artist: Chilkat Tlinget
Title: Totem Pole
Date: 1925

Materials: Wood, paint, concrete base, presumably stainless steel hardware
Dimensions: 52.5” sq. (H=186”) from pad
Location: Ocean Avenue and San Vicente Boulevard

General Condition: Excellent Good Fair X Poor

Description: The piece is an ethnographic artifact and artwork produced by the Chilkat Tlingit group; a totemic work carved from wood and painted. The totem is comprised of five (5) spiritual elements depicting a variety of different animals native to the coastal region of southern Alaska and British Columbia. It appears to have been carved from a single tree, and each sculpted element has been painted with five monochromic colors. It is attached to and supported by a painted wood pole via 1” bolts. A concrete pad in the shape of a trapezoidal prism supports the pole structure. There is an east-facing wooden plaque that commemorates the donation of the piece in 1926. Poured concrete pavers surround the sculpture.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in fair condition. Structural condition appears stable. An area of previous repair is visible below the beaked figure at the top. A section of wood has been reattached with what is presumably ferrous hardware. There is a noticeable space around the edge of the repair and the paint has cracked; nevertheless, at the moment it appears stable. Only vertical cracks are visible, yet they are consistent with the wood grain. The overall surface condition of the piece is fair. While the work has likely been repainted, there are consistent issues throughout. Hairline cracking, etched and applied graffiti, paint loss, burnishing, saturation of skin oils, atmospheric spoiling, guano soiling as well as overall fading and chalking are all attributed to the current surface condition. A large, muddled paint residue, likely due to graffiti, covers a section at the center of the totem. Most issues are located on the bottom third of the piece as they are due to public interaction with the piece. The fading, however, has likely been caused by degradation of the paint due to the elements and high UV exposure. Heavy, black soot, likely from nearby vehicle traffic, has collected on the verso of the totem, between the carved element and the support pole. Dirt and sediment from the surrounding pathway was also noted on the totem’s base. The concrete pads that surround the base are uneven.

Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: In 2013, RLA re-attached the black wood beak element at the top of the totem pole. The element had been broken off by a vandal climbing...
the totem. As the cantilevered element could pose a life-safety issue were it to become detached, RLA staff pinned the piece back into place with a wooden dowel and adhesive.

**Comments on Mounting:** None at this time.

**Comments on Location:** The piece is highly accessible to the public and somewhat accessible to vehicles. It is centered on a pedestrian pathway and there appears to be a ritual where people touch the surface of the piece before they start their walk or run along the path. City staff also advised that people frequently climb the totem to the top. A street lamp was seen nearby, but the piece does not appear to be spot lit at night, nor are there any security cameras. No overhanging trees, encroaching plants, or nearby sprinklers were noted. The piece sits less than one mile from the ocean, within 20 feet of a busy road and adjacent to a gravel path. It receives partial to full sun throughout the day.

**Comments on Safety/Risk Management:** None at this time.

**Recommended Site Improvements:** If possible, surround the sculpture with a low hedge or bush that has either thorns, sharp/pointy leaves, and/or needles to deter people from accessing the sculpture. Plantings should be placed far enough away and maintained so that they do not rest upon/touch the sculpture.

**Treatment Priority:** #2

**Curatorial Priority:**

**Treatment Recommendations:**

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Consult with members of the Tlingit peoples on proper method of addressing paint issues.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
4. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
5. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
6. Fill areas of loss due to incised graffiti with a material compatible with wood substrates and that is rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light. Texture fill to match adjacent wood grain.
7. Address failing paint issues based upon discussion with the Tlingit people and what they feel is appropriate.
   a. If it is acceptable, remove the existing paint system, impregnate wood with borates to protect against wood-eating organisms, and re-paint with a paint system rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light.
   b. If it is not appropriate to re-paint the totem, in-paint areas of loss with a paint system rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light. Colors to match original in both color and reflectance.
      i. Consider applying a protective UV coating over the painted surfaces to both re-saturate the existing colors and protect the paint from additional environmental degradation.
8. Re-paint concrete base with a compatible paint system rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light.
9. If deemed appropriate, apply a sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to lower 14’ of the sculpture.
Estimated Treatment Costs:
(Low end is for in-painting & high end is for re-painting.)
Conservator: 24 - 48 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 3,120.00 - 6,240.00
Conservation Technicians (2): 80 - 160 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 7,200.00 – 16,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 750.00 – 1,500.00
Access: $ 800.00
Total: $ 11,870.00 - 24,740.00

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Scissor lift

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Inspect all surfaces for signs of graffiti, cracking, paint loss, etc. and address accordingly.
6. Re-apply anti-graffiti coating as needed according to the manufacturer’s specifications.

Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs: $2,000.00
2014 Examination: December 15, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger

Artist: Richard Turner

Title: *SMURRF (Santa Monica Urban Runoff Recycling Facility)*

Date: 2000

Materials: Tile, grout, concrete, paint, ferrous metal, plastic

Dimensions: Varied (large-scale integrated design installation)

Location: Appian Way (at foot of Santa Monica Pier)

General Condition: Excellent Good Fair X Poor

Description: The piece is an integrated urban design project featuring public educative elements and functional architecture that teaches people about the facility’s effort to treat contaminated water. The work includes tile mosaics, small tile murals, functional water treatment elements, sunshade, and signage. All signage and mosaics formally educate or represent water treatment and its process. The sunshade awning, painted in red, undulates above waist-high signage that is supported by metal tubing. Tiles along the top walkway present images that are photo-transferred and fired on the ceramic surface.

Condition: Overall the piece appears to be in fair condition. There do not appear to be any structural issues involving the installation and all aspects of the work appear to maintain integrity with regards to mounting. The surface condition, however, displays a variety of issues including material loss, minor corrosion, graffiti, hairline cracking, and soiling. There is some concrete loss (<12”) at the raised curb near the informative signage plaques. There is also evidence of concrete repair throughout, especially around the edges of the tile installations that differ from the original material in both color and texture. Localized areas of paint loss (< 2”) were noted throughout most painted surfaces and mild corrosion is visible at welded sections. Some hairline cracks are also noted at tiled surfaces; however, they do not appear to be severe and all grout appears to be intact. Hairline cracks were also noted in the concrete and appear to be the result of settling. A significant amount of the surfaces (especially the tile) have been defaced with etched and painted graffiti as well as stickers, and it is evident that the space is a popular area for such activity. Graffiti ghosting, especially at the circular mosaic installations, was noted where the grout remains discolored and in localized areas at the concrete surfaces. Overall, the work shows signs of heavy environmental and biological accretions. The circular mosaics present a particularly heavy accumulation of bio-growth towards the recessed area at bottom of each. There is some corrosion runoff staining at localized areas of the cement.

Representative Image of SMURRF site.
**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.

**Comments on Mounting:** None at this time.

**Comments on Location:** The work is located within a high pedestrian traffic area and is accessible to the public. It is not accessible to vehicles, but is near a high-traffic area. The installation is open to all elements and receives direct sunlight throughout the day. As the piece is located near the ocean, the work is subjected to higher levels of humidity and salts. No spot lighting or surveillance cameras were observed. There are nearby plantings, mainly vine-like plants, which are encroaching upon some of the tiles. Nearby trees overhang several elements of the installation. Leaves from nearby trees have collected in some of the recessed areas of the tile installations, facilitating biological growth.

**Comments on Safety/Risk Management:** None at this time.

**Recommended Site Improvements:** Remove any encroaching vines from around the tiled areas to prevent cracking. More lighting and possibly security cameras may help to deter vandalism.

**Treatment Priority:** #2

**Curatorial Priority:**

**Treatment Recommendations:**
1. Document installation and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter and build-up of plant debris in recessed areas.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes and microfiber cloths.
4. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. **Tile Installations:**
   a. Trim back any vines or encroaching plantings to prevent them from resting on the surface of the tile.
   b. If there is persistent biological growth after initial cleaning, apply a non-toxic biocide and allow to dwell for several days.
   c. Remove extant applied graffiti and adhesive residue with appropriate solvents.
   d. Where deemed necessary, stabilize cracks in tiles.
   e. In-paint areas of incised graffiti and discolored grout with a conservation-grade paint system rated for outdoor use. Paint to be matched to adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
6. **Painted Ferrous Metal:**
   a. Excavate and passivate areas of ferrous metal corrosion with a proprietary phosphoric acid solution. Allow to dwell for 24 hours and then degrease with denatured alcohol.
   b. Remove extant applied graffiti and adhesive residue with appropriate solvents.
   c. Prime and paint exposed ferrous metal surfaces with a marine-grade paint system rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light. Selected system to match adjacent surfaces in both color and reflectance.
7. **Concrete:**
a. Attempt to reduce or remove ferrous corrosion staining and graffiti ghosting from concrete surfaces.

b. If deemed necessary, rout cracks and inject with a microinjection grout to stabilize cracks.

c. Fill losses in concrete with a compatible material. Fill material to match adjacent surfaces in mechanical properties, color, and texture.

8. If deemed necessary, address the possibility of replacing heavily damaged plastic signage.

9. Apply anti-graffiti paint coating to all surfaces, especially tile installations.

**Estimated Treatment Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservator</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$7,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Technician</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$21,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (at cost + 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits (to block street with lift)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>(allow up to)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$32,880.00 + Permits</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Special Equipment Required:** Ladders & boom lift (for top of canopy)

**Recommended Maintenance:**
To be completed every 3 years or on an as-needed basis:

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter and build-up of plant debris in recessed areas.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes and microfiber cloths.
4. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and dry with cotton cloths.
5. Re-apply anti-graffiti coating as needed in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
6. Cut back encroaching vines and branches to prevent them from touching the surface of the installation.
7. Inspect painted ferrous metal surfaces for signs of corrosion and address accordingly.
8. Address graffiti on an as-needed basis accordingly.

**Estimated Tri-Annual Maintenance Costs:** $12,000.00
2014 Examination: December 15, 2014 by Tim Linden, Christina Varvi, & Rosa Lowinger
Artist: Allen and Ellen Wexler
Title: *Tables of Content*
Date: 2001
Materials: Wood
Dimensions: Approximately 5.5’ L x 4’ W x 3’ H per unit, 14 in all.
Location: Douglas Park

**General Condition:** Excellent Good Fair X Poor

**Description:** The work consists of 14 standard picnic tables that have either been altered or integrated into the landscape and natural elements of the park as an incorporated design element. The tables are constructed of standard lumber (possibly yellow cedar) and stainless steel hardware. The surfaces are painted with a lacquered finish. In certain instances other materials, such as asphalt shingles, are used. Chain tethers are frequently used to securely fasten the bench in place.

**Condition:** Overall the installation is in fair condition. There do not appear to be any structural issues. The surfaces exhibit signs of heavy wear and abrasion, resulting in loss of lacquer coatings throughout. Graffiti in the form of paint and etching is apparent on most of the pieces, especially horizontal faces. The wood has taken on a darkened, grey coloring due to UV exposure/weathering, soiling, and the intrusion of microbiological growth. Surfaces protected from the elements and direct sunlight have retained their lacquer coating and have a golden, saturated appearance. One particular element, a bench with a shingled awning, has a number of missing shingles. It is also missing the four applied gutters that edge the roof and extend past each corner. Two truncated benches (meant to look like they were sawn in half) have been moved from their original location. They originally flanked a pathway and now they are scattered in a dirt/gravel area. A bench that was built around a tree, has the potential to break or become deformed as the tree grows and expands. Environmental soiling and biological accretions are pervasive. All of the feet are heavily soiled from the surrounding dirt and gravel. Dirt, trash, and other organic matter have also become trapped between the planks of the tabletops. There is tape and adhesive residue on the roofed element where people hang decorations for parties held in the park.

**Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition:** Artwork was surveyed by Sculpture Conservation Studio in 2001.

**Comments on Mounting:** None at this time.
Comments on Location: The benches are highly accessible to the public and are used by park patrons on a daily basis. They are not accessible to vehicles. All benches are exposed to the elements and receive varying amounts of sunlight throughout the day. Some benches are directly beneath large trees and one bridges a water feature. The majority of the benches are mounted directly into dirt/gravel.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: None at this time.

Treatment Priority: #2

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. If possible, de-install pieces for treatment.
2. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
3. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
   Remove loose gravel, dirt, and debris from around the bases of the sculptures.
4. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water to re-saturate.
5. Via a pump sprayer, apply a proprietary wood cleaner and brightener, starting from the bottom and working up. Allow solution to dwell for several minutes and lightly scrub with soft-medium bristle brushes.
6. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and allow to air dry.
7. Remove more tenacious accretions and markings with organic solvent(s).
8. Lightly sand all surfaces with 100-grit sand paper in the direction of the wood grain.
9. Fill any losses with a compatible material textured to match adjacent surfaces.
10. Apply two coats of a dual wood preservative and stain or tinted lacquer to match the original finish of the installation.
11. In-paint fills with a conservation-grade paint system rated for outdoor use and exposure to high UV light. Selected system to match adjacent surfaces.
12. Apply a compatible, sacrificial anti-graffiti coating to all surfaces.
13. Re-install pieces to original location.
14. Replace missing shingles and cantilevered gutters from around roofed bench.
15. Re-position separated benches to either side of the pathway according to the artists’ original design and intent.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 60 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 7,800.00
Conservation Technicians (2): 280 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 25,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 4,500.00
Access: (allow up to) $ 250.00
De-installation and Re-installation: $ TBD
Total: $ 37,750.00 + De-install & Re-install

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders

Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed annually:
1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Dry-brush surfaces with soft, natural-bristle brushes to remove particulate matter.
   Remove loose gravel, dirt, and debris from around the bases of the pieces.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of filtered tap water and a mild, conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural-bristle brushes.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water and allow to air dry.
5. Re-apply lacquer and anti-graffiti coating as needed according to the manufacturer’s specifications.

**Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs:** $4,000.00
**2014 Examination:** December 11, 2014 by Christina Varvi and Rosa Lowinger

**Artist:** Richard Wyatt

**Title:** CNG/LNG Station

**Date:** 2004

**Work Type:** Installation/Integrated Design Work

**Materials:** Enameled glass, stainless steel, and granite tile.

**Dimensions:** Varied

**Location:** 5th st. at Olympic (NE corner)

**General Condition:** Excellent        Good        Fair X        Poor

**Description:** This work includes an installation of polished granite tiles etched with sea-life designs and a stainless steel overhang that frames enameled glass panes. The granite tiles line the back wall of the facility and depict microorganisms found in the sea amongst geometric patterns. The overhang shelter for the CNG/LNG pumps has stainless steel I-beams that protrude from the ground in a “Y” formation. The glass panels are decorated with an emulsion-produced enamel depicting multi-color imagery, similar to that of the granite panels.

**Condition:** Overall, the space has heavy soiling and guano/organic accretions about it, but appears to be in fair condition and structurally sound. Grout loss was noted at the bottom course of granite tiles. The existing grout is soft/spongy in nature. The grout losses have exposed the foam backer rod, which is disintegrating in localized areas. Mineral deposits (likely the result of hard water from nearby sprinklers) exist along the bottom two courses of the tile. These mineral deposits are especially prominent along and emanate from the grout lines. There is a possible water infiltration at the edges of the polished granite that is causing a hazed appearance. Localized abrasions were noted on several of the tiles as well.

The canopy structure above the pumps has heavy soiling throughout and massive amounts of guano accretions, especially towards the top, horizontal surfaces. Overall, the stainless steel structure is exhibiting a slightly oxidized surface. Ferrous corrosion was observed in localized areas along the I-beam-like supports and is likely due to environmental factors, such as carbon emissions and salt air, and the nitrates attributed to the guano soiling. Aside from the atmospheric soiling, all of the glass panels and associated hardware appear to be intact and stable. According to City staff, not all of the intended panels have been installed. Several panels broke prior to installation and the cost of replication by the original fabricator was cost prohibitive. To date, attempts to source a local company capable of re-fabricating the glass panels using digital files of the intended images have not been successful.
Previous Conservation Treatments or Condition: Not available at this time.

Comments on Mounting: Address the system used to grout the spacing between tiles, as the grout along the bottom tiles has failed throughout the piece.

Comments on Location: The tiles are somewhat accessible to the public, but the consistent usage of the facility by the police department is a deterrent from vandalism. The space is accessible by cars but mainly vehicles controlled by the city. The space is predominantly south facing and in direct sunlight. Large palms are nearby and vegetation is encroaching along the wall. Environmental factors that surround the station, such as the proximity to a heavy traffic area and to the ocean, allow for atmospheric conditions that could be potentially detrimental to the artwork. The nature of the artwork’s structure allows for a large pigeon population to take roost within the superstructure. Low, grass plantings line the granite tile wall and are somewhat encroaching upon the bottom course of tiles. Sprinkler heads are located within this planter area.

Comments on Safety/Risk Management: None at this time.

Recommended Site Improvements: Address bird problem with a humane and visually streamline system that would both not alter the aesthetic of the piece and rid the problem of a sedentary bird population.

Treatment Priority: #2

Curatorial Priority:

Treatment Recommendations:
1. Document object and treatment with high-resolution photography.
2. Dry brush surfaces with soft, natural bristle brushes to remove loose dirt and debris.
3. Rinse surfaces with filtered tap water and wash with a solution of a conservation-grade detergent and filtered tap water with soft, natural bristle brushes.
4. Rinse surfaces with distilled water. Dry metallic and glass surfaces with cotton cloths.
5. Excavate corrosion layers and passivate with a proprietary, phosphoric acid solution.
6. Rake grout joints to remove failing material.
7. Mechanically remove mineral deposit build-up through micro abrasive means taking care not to etch the polished granite surfaces.
8. Fill areas of grout loss with new backer rod and appropriate grout material to match original grout in color and texture.

Estimated Treatment Costs:
Conservator: 40 hrs @ $130.00/hr $ 5,200.00
Conservation Technicians: 80 hrs @ $90.00/hr $ 7,200.00
Materials (at cost + 10%): $ 1,000.00
Access & Equipment: (Allow up to) $ 1,000.00
Glass Panel Fabrication & Installation: $ TBD
Total: $ 14,400.00 + glass panel fabrication & installation

Estimated Special Equipment Required: Ladders, lift, and safety harnesses.
Recommended Maintenance:
To be completed bi-annually:

1. Document treatment with high-resolution digital photography.
2. Clean objects with iodized water and a conservation-grade detergent using soft, natural bristle brushes.
3. Inspect stainless steel elements for signs of corrosion and address accordingly.
4. Mechanically remove any mineral deposit build-up from nearby sprinklers on granite tiles.

Estimated Bi-Annual Maintenance Costs: $3,000.
ADDITIONAL CITY-OWNED ARTWORKS NOT INCLUDED IN SURVEY
“Gestation III” (1991) by Baile Oakes, “Santa Monica Art Tool: Walk on LA” (1988) by Carl Cheng and “Light Wall” (2003) by Michael Davis were not included in the list of publicly-sited artworks to be examined by Rosa Lowinger and Associates as a part of the survey because they are on a separate track for conservation. In FY2013-14, the Public Art Committee approved the use of a $10,000 General Conservation allocation in the Percent for Art budget for the repair of “Gestation III”, and staff is currently working with artist Baile Oakes on the repair. Carl Cheng has provided an estimate for rebuilding “Santa Monica Art Tool: Walk on LA”, and there is a purchase order for regular maintenance and parts replacement for “Light Wall”.
MAINTENANCE RECOMMENDATIONS & SCHEDULE

1) WHAT MAINTENANCES CAN BE CARRIED OUT PRIOR TO CONSERVATION?

Generally, artworks classified as either Priority 2 or Priority 3 can receive routine maintenance prior to more in-depth conservation treatments. **Priority 2** objects are not in imminent danger, however they exhibit condition issues that exhibit normal wear and tear from the elements that results in corrosion, breakage, loss, abrasion, or paint loss. If maintenance is continued, treatment could be carried out within 2-4 years. **Priority 3** objects require minor treatment, such as cleaning, minor corrosion removal, coating application, and/or fungal removal, but lacking urgency. If maintenance is continued, treatment can be carried out within 3-4 years.

Many pieces will not require annual maintenance. Large-scale installations with multiple components and/or complex access issues may limit the frequency in which a piece is maintained. Within each individual condition assessment, RLA has indicated whether the City should aim to maintain the artwork annually, bi-annually, every 3-5 years, or on an as-needed basis. The ability for the City to maintain certain artworks “In House” may be a more cost-effective option and aid in increasing the frequency with which various artworks are maintained.

The following is a list of the pieces that can receive maintenance prior to conservation, the frequency with which maintenance is recommended, and the estimated cost of maintenance:

**Annual:**

**Priority 2:**
- *Singing Beach Chairs* (Hollis) $2,500.00
- *Montana Ridge* (Kelmek & Robbins) $1,500.00
- *Tables of Content* (The Wexlers) $4,000.00
- *Dinosaurs of Santa Monica* (The LaLannes) $6,000.00
- *Untitled: Homage to Jack Kerouac* (Staccioli) $2,000.00
- *Oneness* (Romppanen) $1,500.00
- *Totem Pole* (Tlinget) $2,000.00
- *Ocean Park Segue* (Kohl) $2,500.00
- *Two Hundred Fourteen Movements and a View* (Petropoulos) $N/A
Priority 3:
- *Untitled* (Lere) $3,500.00
- *Saint Monica* (Monrahan) $2,000.00
- *Underwater Canopy* (Cheng) $3,500.00
- *Livin’ Together* (Baron) $1,000.00
- *Arcadia Bandini di Baker* (Sanae) $1,000.00
- *Twilight and Yearning* (Muller) $1,500.00
- *Wave and Shell Obelisks* (Doner) $1,800.00
- *Santa Monica Beach* (Mortimer) $2,000.00 + Access
- *Weather Field, No. 1* (Manglano-Ovalle) $3,500.00

Total – Annual Maintenances: $41,800.00 + Access

Bi-annual:
Priority 2:
- *The Big Wave* (DeLap) $2,000.00
  * Only for maintenance of lower 14’ of sculpture on either side of Wilshire Blvd.
- *CNG/LNG Station* (Wyatt) $3,000.00
- *History of Pico Neighborhood* (Thiermann) $6,000.00
- *Another Magical Sunset at Santa Monica Beach* (Lujan) $3,000.00
- *Colonial Spanish & City Seal* (MacDonald-Wright) $3,000.00
- *Recycle, Renew, Repair, and Restore* (Cockcroft) $6,000.00

Priority 3:
- *Cradle* (Ball Nogues Studio) $4,500.00
- *River of Life* (Brailsford) $5,000.00
- *Cool Fire* (Erskine) $3,000.00
- *Digital Divide* (Corson) $8,000.00
- *Wheels* (Karlsen) $6,500.00
- *Recreation* (MacDonald-Wright) $2,500.00
- *Our Santa Monica Heritage* (Thiermann & The Hunns) $4,000.00
- *Our Pico Neighborhood* (East Los Streetscapers) $4,000.00
- *Garage Tour Desires* (Shire) $5,500.00
- *Watermark* (Hamrick) $2,000.00

Total – Bi-Annual Maintenances: $68,000.00
Every 3-5 Years:

Priority 2:
- *The Big Wave* (DeLap) $10,000.00
  * Maintenance of entire structure bridging Wilshire Blvd.
- *Children’s Play Area* (The Buchens) $17,000.00
- *SMURRF* (Turner) $12,000.00
- *History of Civilization* (MacDonald-Wright) $10,000.00

Priority 3:
- *Light Overhead* (Klein) $10,000.00
- *Untitled: Downtown Parking Structures 2, 4, & 5* (Garten) $10,000.00

Total – Maintenance costs Every 3-5 Years: $69,000.00
2) **What maintenances can the City do “in house”?**

Routine maintenances can be performed by City personnel after having received instruction from a qualified conservation firm. Such instruction could be carried out as a one-day seminar involving the departments in question, with a conservator and/or experienced conservation technician performing the required training. It is important in such a case to make sure that conservation training is specific to an individual work or group of works and is not translated to other works without written communication from the training conservator or the agency directors. No matter whether this maintenance plan can be implemented in house, it is recommended to have a conservator inspect the pieces for signs of more serious damage and deterioration on a regular basis.

The following 21 artworks can be maintained in-house by City of Santa Monica staff:

- *Singing Beach Chairs* (Hollis)
- *Montana Ridge* (Kelmek & Robbins)
- *Tables of Content* (The Wexlers)
- *The Big Wave* (DeLap)
  - Note: Bi-annual maintenance only. More in-depth maintenance (every 5 years) to be undertaken by a qualified conservation firm.
- *Ocean Park Segue* (Kohl)
- *Children’s Play Area* (The Buchens)
- *SMURRF* (Turner)
- *River of Life* (Brailsford)
- *Colonial Spanish  & City Seal* (MacDonald-Wright)
- *Two Hundred Fourteen Movements and a View* (Petropoulos)
- *Light Overhead* (Klein)
- *CNG/LNG Station* (Wyatt)
- *Saint Monica* (Monrahan)
- *Cool Fire* (Erskine)
- *Underwater Canopy* (Cheng)
- *Untitled: Downtown Parking Structures 2, 4,  & 5* (Garten)
- *Digital Divide* (Corson)
- *Wheels* (Karlsen)
- *Recreation* (MacDonald-Wright)
- *Garage Your Desires* (Shire)
- *Twilight and Yearning* (Muller)
3) MAINTENANCE TRAINING FOR CITY STAFF

- Who can do it?
  - Nearly anyone can be part of a crew of City personnel that carry out routine maintenances for several of the artworks. However, the pieces would be best served by individuals whose departments have a stakeholder interest in public art and/or are invested in the City’s collection and feel a sense of “ownership” over the pieces.
  - Long-term staff members are excellent candidates for maintenance technicians, as their seniority is likely to insure their continued participation in the program and make the training worthwhile.
  - Ability to work from heights, such as ladders, lifts, and/or swing stages.
  - At least one member of the crew should be certified to operate both a scissor and an aerial boom lift as there are several artworks/installations that will require such access.

- What is needed for training and what will it entail?
  - Depending on the budget and time constraints, training should be conducted at two or more sites that include materials representative of the most common materials found within the collection.
  - Prior to commencing training, the qualified conservation firm will put together a maintenance kit including all of the specialty products required for routine maintenances of the pieces identified as those that can be handled “in house” (i.e.: does not include hoses, buckets, etc.). Material safety data sheets should be provided along with written instruction.
  - Training will commence at the first of the selected sites with an overview of the conservation field’s approach to collections maintenance. The City crew will then be given copies of forms for documenting maintenance and reporting damage. The qualified conservator will review all forms with the City crew prior to hands-on training.
  - With the assistance of a conservation technician, the qualified conservator will go through a step-by-step, hands-on demonstration of routine maintenance practices, starting with visual assessment, documentation (written and photographic), maintenance treatment, and summary of maintenance performed.
  - Once training has been completed, the qualified conservation firm will also provide the City with a maintenance manual detailing the steps outlined in the training session(s) as a reference for future maintenances.
Cost estimates for training:

Conservator:
- On-Site Training: 8 hours @ $130.00/hr $ 1,040.00
- Maintenance Manual Preparation: 4 hours @ $130.00/hr $ 520.00

Conservation Technician: 8 hours @ $90.00/hr $ 720.00

Materials for Maintenance Kit: $ 500.00

Total: $ 2,780.00
City of Santa Monica
Maintenance Form

Artist:
Title:
Materials:
Location of Sculpture:
Date of Maintenance:
Date of Report:
Maintenance Performed By:

Aesthetic Condition: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor
Material Stability: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor
Structure
□ Complete □ Dents □ Dry/Unsaturated □ Vandalism □ Copper Corrosion □ None
□ Sound □ Fraying □ Abrasions □ Discoloration □ Iron Rust □ Active
□ Loss(es) □ Fraying □ Delamination □ Scratches □ Loss □ Abandoned
□ Cracks □ Delamination □ Discoloration □ Graffiti: Painted □ Mineral Deposits
□ Splits □ Missing Parts □ Wear □ Graffiti: Incised □ Accretions □ Guano
□ Warping/Distortion □ Loose Parts □ Peeling/Chipping Paint □ Graffiti: Incised
□ Warping/Distortion □ Surface Coating
□ Evidence of Wax □ Evidence of Acrylic Lacquer □ Unk Coating □ Biological Activity
□ Failed Wax □ Failed Acrylic Lacquer □ Failed Unk Coating
□ Failed Wax □ Failed Acrylic Lacquer □ Failed Unk Coating □ None
□ Failed Wax □ Failed Acrylic Lacquer □ Failed Unk Coating □ Active
□ Failed Wax □ Failed Acrylic Lacquer □ Failed Unk Coating □ Abandoned

Condition Prior to Treatment:

Comments on Location / Siting Issues:

Maintenance Performed:
City of Santa Monica
Damage Reporting Form

Artist:
Title:
Location of Sculpture:
Date of Damage:
Date of Report:
Report Completed By:
Contact Info:

Aesthetic Condition:  □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor
Material Stability:  □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor

Structure
☐ Complete  ☐ Dents
☐ Sound  ☐ Fraying
☐ Loss(es)  ☐ Delamination
☐ Cracks  ☐ Missing Parts
☐ Splits  ☐ Loose Parts
☐ Warping/Distortion

Surface
☐ Dry/Unsaturated  ☐ Vandalism  ☐ Crazing
☐ Abrasions  ☐ Discoloration  ☐ Wear
☐ Scratches  ☐ Dirt/Grime  ☐ Loss
☐ Graffiti: Painted  ☐ Accretions  ☐ Crazing
☐ Graffiti: Incised  ☐ Mineral Deposits  ☐ Guano
☐ Peeling/Chipping Paint

Chemical:
☐ Color Change/Fading  ☐ Staining

Metal
☐ Copper Corrosion  ☐ Iron Rust  ☐ Loss of

Surface Coating
☐ Failed Wax  ☐ Failed Acrylic Lacquer  ☐ Failed Unk Coating

Condition of Sculpture/Damage Observed:

Comments on Event(s) Surrounding Damage:

Action Taken: