



DEPARTMENT of ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Salt Lake City Art Design Board Meeting
May 28, 2020
3:00- 4:30 pm
Webex Online

PRESENT:

Larissa Trout Nancy Rivera
Aurelio Velazquez Justin Johnson
Joe Jacoby Kelsey Harrison
Jann Haworth (Obliquely)

Staff Members

Felicia Baca, Arts Council Executive Director
Kat Nix, Public Art Program Manager
Abby Draper, Public Art Program Assistant

EXCUSED:

GUESTS:

Chien Wang, Salt Lake City Department of Engineering
Chris Norlem, Salt Lake City Department of Engineering
Megan DePaulis, Salt Lake City Attorney's Office

I. Call to Order

- a. After a quorum was established at approximately 3:00 pm, Ms. Larissa Trout opened the convening.

II. 9th South Roundabout Finalists

- a. Project Overview
 - i. Ms. Kat Nix provided an overview of the 9th South Roundabout artist selection process, noting that the Board had decided to meet again today to further discuss the finalist proposals. She noted that the May 14, 2020 Board meeting had run over, and even with lengthy and robust discussion, there were questions left unresolved, a general sentiment that the proposals did not meet all of the artwork goals, and that concerns had emerged from an engineering and risk-management perspective with the selected proposal. She noted that an option the Board had not discussed in the initial selection meeting was the opportunity to accept a proposal with revisions. Ms. Nix highlighted that options for proceeding included that Board could accept the KVV



SLCRDA



BUSINESS
DEVELOPMENT

team's proposal with revisions while keeping Mr. Heath Satow's proposal as the alternate, allow all three finalists to make revisions and re-select from among those revised proposals, or reject all three proposals and reopen the call for artists.

b. Discussion

- i. Ms. Trout noted that the timeline for this project was independent from the construction timeline of the site and reiterated that accepting a proposal with revisions was well within the realm of the Board's process and a common practice in artist selection. She noted that she had some concerns about engineering and safety elements of the piece and would like to see revisions from both the selected team and the alternate and re-select from their modified proposals. Ms. Nix shared with the Board the safety concerns that Engineering, and Risk Management had identified with the selected proposal stating that the height of the suspended boulder could allow for it to be climbed on, the boulder untethered could swing, and the need for deep, caged footings to support the weight of the boulder were among some of the concerns. Ms. Nix noted that the KWV team had anticipated some of these concerns and had addressed them with caged footings and the option to anchor the boulder. Ms. Felicia Baca shared that the team had been made aware that the Board was considering asking for revisions. The Board discussed the options for how to move forward including the difference between a revised proposal and a new proposal, the option to allow all three finalists to submit revisions or just the selected team, or whether they should open the call back up and select new finalists. The Board agreed that the three finalists chosen were qualified, and could deliver on the project, but that it came down to how the finalists' proposals had not quite met all the artwork goals. The Board agreed that it was worth seeing revisions from the original finalists first and they could re-open the call for artists as a last option. Ms. Rivera suggested that the Board consider allowing all three teams, or the selected team and finalist to make revisions. The Board discussed both options and discussed whether the Board would give the artists notes or leave revisions open ended. The Board explored the option of only asking the KWV team to make revisions, to revise their proposal to relieve any concerns about engineering/safety and to better meet the artwork goals. Ms. Harrison inquired of the Board members whether the selected proposal and alternate were within revision-distance from satisfying Board members. Mr. Velazquez stated that he felt revisions were not needed but could potential strengthen the submissions. Ms. Baca noted that the Board could be transparent with artists when requesting revisions about the feedback and the process, specifically that Mayor has final decision-making power even after a revision process. They noted that if the revisions still are not satisfactory to the Board, the call could be re-opened, and it was the Board's responsibility to ensure they were confident in the proposal they recommended to the Mayor. The Board discussed what feedback they would provide the Artists, if they requested revisions to their proposals. Ms. Harrison suggested that feedback for that KWV team would be to return to the artwork goals and more fully manifest them in the

proposal and to address engineering and risk management concerns. Ms. Trout suggested feedback include more closely relating the work to the dynamism of the space and imbuing it with additional emotion. Mr. Johnson also suggested that given the lack of specific feedback for Mr. Satow, perhaps the Board should not ask him to revise his proposal. Ms. Larissa Trout suggested to accept the KWV proposal but ask for modifications so the proposal could address engineering concerns and further articulate the artwork goals. Mr. Joe Jacoby suggested there was value in requesting revisions from all three artists, since all three had qualifications that had initially appealed to the Board, and it would be fair to see re-worked proposals from all three. The Board then discussed the three proposals and what specific feedback there might be for each finalist. Mr. Jacoby suggested giving all three finalists the same feedback, while Ms. Nix suggested the finalist teams should each hear the specific critiques the Board had with each proposal. Ms. Nix noted that if all three teams made revisions, it would initiate a complete revote. She said from the discussion it sounded like the specific feedback was as follows: Mr. Kesler's project would be difficult to maintain and could be more engaging from all angles, Mr. Satow's proposal did not feel site specific, and the KWV team's proposal had some engineering concerns and did not meet the artwork goals of "creating a welcoming entrance to the neighborhood," and "reflecting the unique and funky history of the area". Mr. Jacoby suggested that communication to the finalists could remain consistent if all artists received a document noting all of the Board's specific concerns for all the finalists, and the finalists could choose to use that information to inform their next step. Ms. Baca specified that this request fell under the purview of revisions rather than rejecting the proposals, because the Arts Council did not want to ask the artists to complete new work without offering additional payment, and no additional payment was offered here. The Board noted that artists had the opportunity to engage with the opportunity for revision as much or as little as they desired. Ms. Nix noted that an additional Board meeting would be required to review the revisions, and that the artists would have a couple of weeks to make the revisions.

- c. Voting
 - i. Ms. Trout motioned to invite all three finalists to revise their proposals for the 9th South Roundabout Public Art Project, and for a list of the Board's feedback be provided to the artists. Mr. Justin Johnson seconded. All Board members voted in favor.

III. Arts Council ED Update

- a. None.

IV. Public Comment

- a. None.

V. Other Business/Adjourn

- a. Ms. Larissa Trout motioned to close the meeting, Mr. Jacoby seconded, and all Board members voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.