

CAPITOL COMMISSION MEETING

JUNE 5, 1987

Capitol Commission Members Attending: Treasurer Steve Adams, Secretary of State Gentry Crowell, Chairmon Amon Evans, Comptroller William Snodgrass, Senator Douglas Henry, Commissioner William Whitson, Commissioner David Manning, Mr. Russell Hippe.

Agenda Item No. 1: Suggestion from Finance and Administration Regarding a Circulation of Appropriate Decor Prior to Implementation by the Decorations Committee

David Manning stated that he and the Building Commission wanted to be certain there was opportunity to comment on decor before final decisions were made. Members of the Commission as well as occupants of the respective offices might be allowed 2-3 days to see the items and comment prior to implementation.

Chairman Evans stated that parameters are needed for the selection process since the period dictates that certain things will work and others will not. By example, the Decorations Committee was the selection process for the decor of the Supreme Court Chamber. Discussion arose as to whether the Governor should be given the opportunity to select what he wants. Mr. Mesick addressed the question by referring to the Historical Structures Report.

Mr. Mesick explained that there are various approaches to the decor of the Capitol depending upon documentation available, and that documented areas involve little guesswork. As to the question of present occupants deciding everything ^{for their spaces}, it was pointed out that there would be a compromise and that selections would need to be responsive to the past and the future. With ceremonial spaces (where documentation is available); however, it would not be a democratic process (i.e., universal acceptance would not be necessary). Mesick and Evans both alluded to the White House as a case in point - the decor is very inconsistent. Evans stated that with certain parameters, there is the compromise of fact.

Mr. Crowell asked who would be checking with the occupants regarding decor selections. Mr. Evans stated that Mike Fitts, along with the Ehrenkrantz group, will probably generate the samples. Occupants could then respond to Fitts withing 2-3 days. Fitts stated that there would be a palette with acceptable options and if none of the options are acceptable to the occupant, we can rethink the options.

Manning alluded to the carpet selection for the Library since there has been a certain amount of negative comment about it. He stressed the need for some sort of review of such selections among a broader group. Mr. Mesick reviewed the selection process of the Library and explained that the room was designed according to documentation based on the 1850's. The room looks uncoordinated because that was the mid 19th century style. It does not represent a contemporary renovation.

Members discussed that if they had questions about selections being made, they should contact Mike Fitts or the Ehrenkrantz group.

Agenda Item No. 2: Support Services Change Possibility from General Services to Finance and Administration

Mr. Evans welcomed Commissioner Whitson to the Commission and introduced the second agenda item.

Evans suggested that the procurement function of the support services should go to F&A. This move would ease the flow of communication between the Capitol Commission, the Building Commission and F&A. It was decided no motion was necessary. No one objected.

Evans stressed the fact that the Commission needs someone to act as a clearinghouse.

Senator Henry asked whether the public and non-public spaces were governed by two policies. Evans explained that there is one policy but different spaces are approached in different manners.

Discussion arose as to the members of the Decorations Committee and how the committee will work. The Committee will make selections and then go to the occupant. Mr. Snodgrass asked if it could all be done at one time.

Mr. Adams asked if carpets and drapes should be the same throughout the offices on a particular floor. Mesick explained that everything should not be alike but that everything should not be different either. There should be consistency with some variation.

Agenda Item No. 3: Update on Temporary Relocation of First Floor and Basement Offices of Capitol

Mike Fitts stated that the offices scheduled to move are now out of the Capitol. Evans stressed that it is important to get people back in the Capitol on time and asked if everyone was reasonably happy with relocation. Members designated that they were. Crowell suggested that a Room Location sheet be printed and Adams stated that the first floor directories need to be changed. Fitts said exterior signage for the John Sevier Building will be ready in the next two months.

Agenda Item No. 4: Approval of the Kiosk Design for the Second Floor

Fitts stated that both Speakers approved the design about two weeks ago. Evans mentioned a letter he received from Representative Bragg last week. The letter stated that the design indicated a potential bottleneck and a service delay due to the design concept of serve-and-pay. Senator Henry agreed that we need to allow for the most promptness. Snodgrass added that the Speakers will be sensitive to what the Capitol Commission wants.

Consultants presented five different schemes for the kiosk design. Type of service was discussed and Evans stated that the design should include a combination of pick and pay and serve and pay. The design should incorporate Henry and Bragg's preferences.

Discussion arose as to the placement of phones and the opinion was expressed that the phones should not be put with the food area because of a possible bottleneck. It was suggested that perhaps the phones should be placed along the back wall.

It was discussed that two people may be needed at the kiosk and the architects stated that the design was large enough for two people.

** Combinations of designs were discussed. Crowell suggested that the Commission approve the kiosk with the provision that Mr. Evans talk to Bragg, Henry, the two Speakers and the Commissioner of F&A and reach a consensus. Everyone agreed.

? - Motion made by Crowell. Seconded by Snodgrass. MOTION PASSED. Meeting adjourned.

Decorations Subcommittee **

Agenda Item No. 1: Chandeliers for the Supreme Court, Governor's Office and Constitutional Officers

Mike Fitts reported that two appropriate chandeliers (a matched pair) have been located which are \$17,000 each. Three are needed for the Supreme Court. Evans inquired as to the price of reproducing a third one and was told it could cost around \$40,000, although Fitts explained that he did not have a true cost of reproduction.

There is another chandelier available in Wisconsin for \$14,500. It is the same size as the other two but less ornate. It would be appropriate for the Supreme Court and would be the best model for duplicates in the offices of the Governor and Constitutional Officers. The owner has said he will make duplicates for a one-time set-up fee of \$10,000 and \$17,500 each. It was stated by the architects that it generally takes about five to six months to duplicate a chandelier.

In addition, another chandelier has been located which is the same size and more ornate for \$12,000.

Fitts stated that the Decorations Committee recommends buying: the first two chandeliers with a possible reproduction of a third one as time and money allow; purchasing the \$14,500 chandelier since it could be duplicated for Constitutional officers; and purchasing the \$12,000 chandelier.

Manning asked about replacing chandeliers as covered by the Historic Structures Report. It was determined that the Commission is going beyond the Historic Structures Report. Manning questioned the replacement of chandeliers in the offices of constitutional officers. Mesick described that there is a more eclectic approach among the constitutional offices but said the Capitol needs to be weaved together.

Fitts reported that ten chandeliers would be needed in the long run to be used as follows: constitutional officers; commissioner of F&A; Deputy Governor; 2 for the large governor's office; one for the small governor's office; and two for the reception area. It was stated that regular lighting would remain in the secretarial offices, at least during this phase. Manning expressed concern about cost.

Evans asked if the \$14,500 chandelier was authentic enough for future duplication purposes. Fitts said that it could be used as a model for the Governor's office and others. Evans stated that the chandelier could be purchased and given to the Museum to hold until money was available for duplication.

It was stated that there is \$75,000 in the budget for chandeliers. Manning stated that the Building Commission Subcommittee approved two chandeliers for the Supreme Court Chamber at \$34,000 based on this Commission's discussion plus \$12,000 as a third one in the Supreme Court Chamber for a total of \$46,000 of the budget.

Evans suggested that the \$14,500 chandelier also be purchased and that bids for duplication could be obtained at a later date.

It was discussed that the lighting of the exterior offices should be considered along with the public offices since these are the areas the public will see most. It was stated that no lighting changes have been planned for the exterior offices at this time.

Mr. Hippe made a motion that all four chandeliers be purchased, with duplication and costs to be discussed at a later date. Manning seconded. MOTION PASSED.

Agenda Item No. 2: Carpet for Supreme Court

Fitts began discussion about Supreme Court carpet and asked how we should purchase it as well as approach it in the bid. Manning suggested that no action was required on it today. Evans stated that the carpet selection would be routed around to members today.

Decorations Subcommittee

Manning, Chairman

Motion

Fitts - Kiosk Design

Motion Snodgrass. Seconded _____ . passed.

Fitts described that the people who do stove work should be qualified. Snodgrass suggested approving it subject to the staff consensus. Fitts stated that we needed approval to bid with qualifications.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

JOHN MESICK'S REMARKS - Capitol Commission Meeting - June 1987

Approaches to the Capitol Tape #1 Count: 61-126

I think one could do well to refer back to the Historic Structure Report as that's still guiding us. You will recall that we divided the areas of the building into three various approaches of restoration. The first of those was identified as rooms that are overriding ceremonial and of public significance. They, fortunately, with the exception of one or two, are rooms and spaces that are pretty well documented so one can restore their earliest appearance without much guesswork. Principally, the two chambers and the lobbies can be restored with very little guesswork. The other spaces were: the old library whose function was changing even though there was fairly good documentation and very high survival of original material in the room; and the courtroom which at present doesn't even exist so it has to be entirely retrieved. The second area of a differing approach were all the offices in the building, especially those on the first floor - the constitutional offices and the Governor's suite. And, we advised there that since those rooms had in this century been renovated with Georgian detailing (very fine Georgian detailing but not really any notion that when it was done that it was restoring the historic interiors of the Capitol) - nonetheless, that it be kept. However, we did point out that the offices and this is really the problem of a working capitol - those offices are still working offices though each of the constitutional officers that I interviewed in the summer of '85 expressed an opinion that their office should represent something of the status that the holders had as well as convey a sense of history and dignity which over the years hadn't always been possible because of crowding of staffs into adjoining offices and the not heretofore being a program of acquiring historic furnishings. It's not a notion that really had taken hold before now. Also, the point was made - I remember Mr. Snodgrass in my first meeting talking with him - that what is done in the Capitol should not be necessarily the present occupant of the office determining everything because, after all, the Capitol is going to go on for we hope generations and much of what is aquired will stay in the office. So in our recommendations for those offices, we really clearly said it's going to be a compromise and hopefully on one hand it's got to work. Yes, I suppose the first priority of all is - it has to suit the present occupant. On the other hand, it also has to respond to the past and hopefully to the future as far as aquiring things that are significant in there. So it is more difficult and I think the notion of review (of the occupant - it probably ought to be the occupant of that office) is only realistic and a very reasonable request. When you come, from my point of view, to the first category of spaces (especially the Library and the court and the corridors which are ceremonial spaces) you wish to achieve a correct restoration and have standard quality that's now being achieved in certain few of the state capitols around the country. It's really not a subject for democratic process. You want to bring the best knowledge to bear and aquire the most

accurate and authentic things you can do to make those rooms truly representative. I excluded the two chambers from that because they're still very much working and functioning things. And, as you all know, to achieve the original configuration it's going to take a lot of change in those rooms and there will probably not be some compromises (we know just given the numbers) in the restoration of those probably but our regard then is also they're well documented and really the restoration can be very carefully done.

My airplane reading this morning is something I commend to all of you. It's a rather weighty tome. It's two volumes called President's House and I don't think all the different State Capitol Commissions I'm working with - I wish I could afford to buy you all an individual copy because you really shouldn't have these deliberations without having some sense for what's happening in the White House since the 1790's and how politics, individual personalities, artistic integrity, a sense of tradition, are all wrapped up in that building. And you can see the folly of people and the promise of people all the way back to the 1790's in the White House and how the various will (whether it was in this case Congress fighting the President or the President thumbing his nose as Harry Truman did at everybody else and saying it's going to be done right), you can see how that affects the interiors in these buildings which go on long after us. And, I think it gives you a sense of perspective and the kinds of things you're grappling with that aren't so day-to-day. They're really decade-to-decade and even century-to-century and it's the first time Tennessee's approached this building this way and it's a real opportunity. You can lose it or you can achieve it. Either way. It's really how you go about it.

Restoration of the Library Tape 1 Count: 285-450

I think it's a very good discussion because it is a problem you've got to face. I'd like very briefly to review the dynamics of what was done in the Library and then maybe that may be some help in how to approach the next rooms.

Unlike the court or really any other room in the Capitol, the Library was not being restored back to what it was historically which was a library. In my mind, the best term for it is legislative parlor. We know the Library is practically the last room, I guess it was, the last room in the Capitol to be finished just before the Civil War.

Mesick's Remarks
June Meeting
Page Three

Young Stickland - his father died of course - had been fired and Samuel Morgan who had seen all the years of the destruction of the Capitol took it over as sort of his personal project. And you can see that in the kind of ironwork that was used in the room - flamboyant rococo stuff - something that the Strickland father and son would never use in their austere Greek temple. The chandeliers? They simply had Mr. Phineas come down from Philadelphia and he sold them his whole warehouse full of wonderful rococo chandeliers, probably nothing like the Stricklands would ever use in this building. That's fact. That's how that room was handled. As best as we can tell, it did not have a carpet prior to the Civil War. The earliest photographs do show carpet but the earliest photographs at best date from the 1870's, possibly the 1880's. It certainly didn't have drapes. As far as we know, no room in the Capitol had venetian blinds. Fortunately, the chandelier survived and all the ironwork survived.

Now, how do you approach the restoration of that room? It was our thought that what we put in it should be absolutely documented to the 1850's so the first thing we did (and this is not new to us) - I already know what carpet's available commercially by market and I knew but we went for the search of looking through principal carpet suppliers for carpet that would be suitable for the room. There was none. We had used Samuel Dornsife of Williamsburg, Pennsylvania as our decorative art consultant on this project. He is probably the country's leading expert on 19th century decorative arts simply because his father was a decorator before him and before anyone else in this country was interested in the victorian period, Sam was collecting. And, twenty years or more ago, he joined the _____ and visited carpet mills and asked for their point papers (the designs which are full size in color) before they threw them out. In many places, they had already thrown them out. But he came back though with an incredible collection of these documents that actually are the designs that were used to punch the cards in the loom that wove the carpet. So one can go to Sam for any decade in the 19th century and say, "Let's see what was in production in the 1850's." And that's what we did. He sent us a whole bundle.

Now, there's several things why (to reassure you) the Library carpet will not be repeated in the building. First place, you have no other room of the immensity and of the scale. I say that - the Senate and House Chambers - those carpets are pretty well documented and you know what they are before we get into it. But you have a tremendously high ceiling for a very grand room. A small patterned carpet which was available and was one of the choices

Mesick's Remarks
June Meeting
Page Four

would not have been suitable in that room. Secondly, we were thinking of Samuel Morgan and his taste. You can see it. It's absolutely congruent with the chandeliers and the iron balconies and spiral stairs - that same rococo flamboyance. The colors are exactly the colors that the point papers show. It's a brown that's almost black and four shades of gold.

Now, I've also heard it whispered in the corridors that nothing is coordinated in the room. The drapes are one color, the ceiling's another color, and the carpet's yet something else. Well, the problem is when you hear that comment, two things are missing. One is the 19th century eyes. We don't look at things with 19th century eyes. We look at things in 20th century eyes and when we see a good job of interior decoration, it's always coordinated. But that luxury didn't exist except for very few houses anywhere in the country, usually in the South, even the interiors in the Capitol. I mean if you really saw them you would think Barnum put them on display. Nothing worked together. Everything was a riot. That's what mid-19th century was about. And it was a reaction to that that architects, decorators (actually decorators in the profession didn't even exist then) came and would offer people coordinated interiors.

Now he knew that there would be a lot of pictures in the room with gold frames as yellow appears abundantly in the ceiling and that was the reason gold was regarded as very compatible with what was up there. Also, the sofa (when you see it) is coordinated with the drapery because very often they did coordinate even the public building's fabrics in a room (that would be the upholstery as well as the drapes). Drapery treatment, selection of furniture is all that you would have found if you had walked into that room had it been a legislative library. You see, that's the problem with this room. You asked your consultant to use his best judgement. It's not something that if you go in, for instance, to the railroad station hotel - everything's very coordinated and it has a wonderful feeling for today's taste even though it passes itself off as a turn of the century interior. If you really want to present to the public what this building might have been, you have to be rather narrow and sort of put your taste aside. I've never met a person yet who thought they had bad taste. We all have taste. We don't all have knowledge. And if you want to report this as a restoration and not a contemporary renovation which is the sort of thing you find out in the White House and in most State capitols - even this one. Everytime they did it over, they did what they liked. I mean the 1930's put Georgian interiors in here because of Williamsburg. They were absolutely in love with Williamsburg and they wanted the best

Mesick's Remarks
June Meeting
Page Five

thing in their Capitol. I hope most Capitol Commissions realize that this is not a matter for individuals to exercise their own feelings. It spoils a contending ground, any public building, and what one hopes is that the discipline of an idea can prevail over the rooms. And that's what happened in the Library. The discipline of an idea pervaded. It is not what any one of you would want in your living room. Indeed, I wouldn't either. But most of us tend to judge things by what we'd want in our living rooms and this is a different animal. Now when it comes to the courtroom, there really isn't much guesswork there. What it comes down to just almost - just the carpets. Because the walls were all stone, the ceiling was white.

The furniture: the problem with the courtroom is there's absolutely no documentation. In the 1930's, the historic american building survey made major drawings and we know what the floor plan was. It still had the original rostrum in there. And we know from the bills of payment in the 1850's that the rostrum was something like the one in the House and Senate made out of Knoxville red marble. But we know nothing about its details at all so it was decided not to even try to guess and to reproduce the rostrum mainly because it could conflict with the notion of it being used as a meeting space and a press room. There probably were rails around the attorneys areas but we again know nothing about that and therefore did not need to be reproduced because they conflict with again as the press room. So what one is left with is the furniture, the chandeliers which are gone, and the carpet.

The chandeliers: again, you're trying to put Cornelius and Baker (the same manufacturer) and there's not anything right _____ of chandeliers that can be used in the 1850's. They all though are very similar. You will see: if it isn't buffalo, you'll see cherubs; if it isn't cherubs, you'll see maidens (barebreasted ones at that) holding up the gaseliers. They all are such that if you saw one in one room, you couldn't tell about it in the next room because they were all similar but they were all different. Well, we know how many burners were on the gaseliers in there so we know approximately the size. The problem is they don't exist and we've got to provide them. This has been one of the most difficult problems of any State Capitol (reproducing the missing light fixtures) because the technology is just gone. They usually were thrown out. So, you start out by hoping you can find an antique one which you can use as a pattern to reproduce because the most costly thing is having nothing, only a photograph or one in a museum that you want to copy and the guy

Mesick's Remarks
June Meeting
Page Six

has to go and make all the patterns. That's very costly. If you get one, an original one, it could be reproduced. However, the kind of cast bronze, art-type chandeliers in this room (in this building) are the most expensive kind to reproduce. Ones from the 1880's which are a tartan kind of design are not so expensive. This is very costly. What's been found are two antique ones. The pair is phenomenal - absolutely right, for the right period, made by Cornelius and Baker - and could be put in the building (in the courtroom). The third one isn't there yet.

The carpet: there's no clue. There's not a clue. All that we know is that the room was carpeted. It was. Young Strickland was still around when this room was furnished and we do have one photograph. There's one photograph of the Senate which we think possibly shows the original carpet. We think that the carpet did survive the Civil War and that photograph may show the original Senate carpet which was a small pattern, geometric carpet like the tile - tile floor, very popular in the 1840s, 50s, 60s - and also something an architect would pick as opposed to the rococo flourishes of lay taste at that time. So what we have done is say that this was probably a Strickland room. Young Strickland was probably involved in the carpet. We've simply taken the clue from what was in the Senate above and put that carpet downstairs. Not the exact carpet - we've left that for upstairs in the Senate. But again, we went to Dornsife's and asked to see geometric pattern carpets from the 1850s and this is one that he came forth with. The rendering, because of the photograph there, tends to meld the yellow and blue and make it look light greenish. This just happens to be. Jim Johnson, the Ehrenkrantz Group, has gotten from Sam Dornside yarns that match the pattern.

There it is. That's the carpet that's being proposed.

Mesick's Remarks
June Meeting
Page Seven

Variations in the Decor for Offices Tape #1 Count: 705-738

The thought was simply that the quadrants, the four major quadrants, be treated as a suite. You could bring it - when there are two different offices.

It would be desirable not to have everything alike (the carpet in the different parts of the first floor). The Governor's Suite has larger-scale rooms than the constitutional officers' suites do and the thought was they could sustain borders around the carpet and can be quite a different kind of carpet. The constitutional officers all have the same size offices and nothing I know from historic precedent in any Capitol I know do they use the same carpet historically throughout all the spaces. The notion was that each office shouldn't be different simply because it would make it look like one of these decorator showrooms that you have for hospital fundraising things where everybody does a different thing in different offices. So the thought was to get carpets of the period and use one color in one pattern if possible in each quadrant so as you went from parts of the building there would be some variation but it wouldn't be jumping from each room to each room.

It would be desirable not to have all the offices the same and it would be most desirable to have each quadrant the same but I wouldn't be adamant about that - as long as there is some variety composed in some orderly way.

Chandeliers - Constitutional Offices Tape #2 Count: 337-455

The Historic Structure Report says that we should restore the Cornelius and Baker gaseliers to the two courtrooms to be restored on the first floor. We should restore three chandeliers that were in the first floor lobby. That's all it says about chandeliers on the first floor. There are photographs of the ones in the lobby so there's very little guesswork. There is only one photograph for the constitutional officers which shows the \$14,000 one from Wisconsin. The Historic Structure Report does not say historic chandeliers should be put in the constitutional offices. However, in the interim since that's been written and with the deliberations we've had the last six months, the course of restoration has changed. You recall Phase One was to deal with the basement and that's been changed to deal with the first floor and the constitutional officers' offices. And so in discussing that, it was decided/recommended that historic chandeliers be also placed in the constitutional officers' offices.

Mesick's Remarks
June Meeting
Page Eight

It recommends that the carpets and the draperies, the window treatment and the furniture be of the original period of the Capitol. In other words, all we said was don't tear it out, it's too good but don't let that be the tail that wags the dog. It did not deal with chandeliers at all.

We really didn't say preserve the Georgian decor, all we said was preserve the panel. But in order that the carpets, the furniture and the window treatments would be of the historic period of the Capitol, it's going to be a more eclectic approach in the constitutional officers' offices simply because they're working offices, they're not museums. But on those significant elements such as drapes and carpet and so forth, try to bleed the whole Capitol as an entity.

(Senator Henry: Does the addition of a period chandelier to these offices - is that a necessary component of this weaving together process?)

It's not in there. I think it's a good idea that it is done because it is the other element that should be. When you walk through the building, you shouldn't be like going into lighting fixture showroom. The thing should hold together.

(How many chandeliers are we talking about?)

I'll let Jim Thompson deal with that but the idea is that right now a minimum number would be ten (of the Secretary of State chandelier).

What would be desirable is ultimately, but not in this phase of construction right now, that the antique furnishings and the paintings go out through the staff offices as well, and hence the chandeliers (although that wasn't being proposed in this phase simply because of budget restrictions).

/pw