

ERIN MENDENHALL
MAYOR
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, RDA



BEN KOLENDAR
DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT of ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Salt Lake City Art Design Board Meeting

November 5, 2020

4:00 – 6:30 pm

Webex Online

PRESENT: Larissa Trout Jann Haworth
Justin Johnson Joe Jacoby
Nancy Rivera

Staff Members

Felicia Baca, Arts Council Executive Director

Kat Nix, Public Art Program Manager

Abby Draper, Public Art Program Assistant

EXCUSED: Aurelio Velazquez

GUESTS: Wendy Wischer, Art in Transit Public Art Opportunity Finalist
Jiyoun Lee-Lodge, Art in Transit Public Art Opportunity Finalist
William Littig, Art in Transit Public Art Opportunity Finalist
Nate Srok, William Littig's Collaborator
G.J. LaBonty, Utah Transit Authority Customer Experience Manager
Andrea Pullos, Utah Transit Authority Project Manager
Cara Lindsley, Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake Project Manager
Kelly Gillman, CRSA Lead Designer
Laura Smith, CRSA Architect

I. Call to Order/Approval of Minutes

- a. After a quorum was established at approximately 4:00 pm, Mr. Justin Johnson called the meeting to order. Ms. Nix introduced the digital meeting platform and Mr. Johnson made a statement regarding the digital meeting format. Ms. Nix led the meeting in an opening breathing activity and all meeting attendees introduced themselves.

II. TRAX Art in Transit Finalist Presentations

- a. Ms. Nix introduced the 650 S Main Street Art in Transit project and stated that the Board could choose to select one artist's proposal for recommendation to the Mayor for final approval, could request revisions to one or more proposal, or could move to reject all proposals. Ms. Nix read the artwork goals and Mr. Johnson made a statement regarding productive conversation in the meeting.



SLCRDA



BUSINESS
DEVELOPMENT

SLCRDA.COM

WWW.SALTLAKEARTS.ORG

SLC.GOV/ED

- b. Ms. Jiyoung Lee-Lodge presented her proposal for the 650 S Main S. Art in Transit Public Art Opportunity.
 - i. Ms. Nancy Rivera asked if Ms. Lee-Lodge had considered a US-based glass fabricator who may be less expensive. Ms. Lee-Lodge replied that she valued the referral that accompanied the Germany-based fabricator she had selected. Ms. Larissa Trout asked about the potential for damage to glass artwork given the location at a transportation hub and Ms. Lee-Lodge described the replacement costs, timeline, and warranty. Ms. Jann Haworth confirmed that the intention was that the multi-colored glass layers would allow the design to be seen from both sides. Ms. Andrea Pullos asked about the opacity of the artwork, which was required for the windscreens at the station and Ms. Lee-Lodge stated that she was considering a variety of ways to achieve that requirement. She noted that she was open to developing a storage solution for the artwork if the construction of the station itself was delayed. Ms. Trout noted that the structure provided side windscreens in addition to the primary windscreen and asked about the vision for the design in those areas. Ms. Lee-Lodge stated that she intended to continue to design to add to an immersive experience for station users. Ms. Lee-Lodge asked the stakeholders about facilitating a connection to community members to receive input on the work, and Ms. Cara Lindsley noted that engagement with the artwork could be incorporated with the community engagement process the Redevelopment Agency was running with regard to the station as a whole.
- c. Ms. Wendy Wischer presented her proposal for the 650 S Main S. Art in Transit Public Art opportunity.
 - i. Mr. Joe Jacoby asked about the acid-etched windscreen panels in the designs and Ms. Wischer clarified that a single continuous image would be used, rather than a repeating graphic. Mr. G.J. LaBonty and Ms. Andrea Pullos asked if the stone-mosaic planters in the design would be durable. Ms. Wischer described the hardness and porousness of the grouts and adhesives she intended to use and how a previous mosaic project she had completed gave her confidence in the artwork's durability through attempts to damage the work and temperature shifts. Ms. Pullos asked about the reinforcement required for the platform to support the natural boulders in the design. Ms. Wischer noted that the budget included room to thicken the platform as needed and that she'd spoken with the structural engineer to get initial assessment of the feasibility of supporting those one-ton components.
- d. Mr. William Littig presented his proposal for the 650 S Main S. Art in Transit Public Art Opportunity and introduced his collaborator and fabricator Ms. Nate Srok.
 - i. Mr. LaBonty asked what fabricator would etch the glass and Mr. Littig noted that he would cut the stencils and local fabricator Dan Cummings would sand-blast the designs. Ms. Jann Haworth asked if there were multiple iterations of the sculpture with wings feathered with license plates, and Mr. Littig indicated that there were two sculptural forms: one streamlined and one feathered with cut license plates, each raised off the platform. Mr. Pullos asked if the sculptures

were higher than the canopy of the station. Mr. Littig stated that the sculptures were approximately as tall as the height of the canopy and had been designed to be centered in the platform so there were six feet on either side of the sculpture to the wires. The Board clarified that the license plates would add color on both sides of the sculpture. Mr. LaBonty asked about the lighting plan. Mr. Littig stated that he was open to a variety of strategies including lighting from the top of the poles supporting the sculptures or the installation of an LED strip light. Mr. LaBonty asked about the irony of blending automobile-inspired artwork into a train station. Mr. Littig noted that it was a salute to transportation, which has been an industry in the neighborhood for a long time and relates to the sense of place of the artwork.

e. Discussion

- i. The Board discussed the art in transit proposals. Ms. Pullos noted that Mr. Littig's proposal related to the neighborhood itself, while the other two proposals' use of water was a more regional relationship to place. Mr. Jacoby stated that he felt Ms. Lee-Lodge and Ms. Wischer's proposals were more conceptual but that Mr. Littig's would be well received by the public and was more interactive. He noted that he would prefer to include the theme of the wings in all areas of the platform, if it is selected. Ms. Rivera stated that she found the wing imagery in Mr. Littig's design to be dated and the sculptures to be safe and reminiscent of the flying object pieces, which she finds to be static. Ms. Trout agreed that the wing imagery was dated but was interactive and sweet and she was curious to see the final design of the wings – rather than the placeholder graphic used in the proposal. Mr. Jacoby stated that each etched wing could be made more specific and story-driven. Ms. Haworth stated that she felt it was important that art in transit meet the public halfway, and Mr. Littig's proposal was playful, more strongly connected to a sense of place than the other proposals, and most engaging. Mr. Johnson asked the Board if they found Mr. Littig's proposal sufficiently consistent or if the proposal spanned too many styles. Ms. Haworth replied that further development of this proposal would be interesting, especially as the budget become increasingly detailed. Ms. Felicia Baca stated that she requested the Board review the proposals with a lens of how the artwork would be received in the public, rather than Board member's personal opinion, and balance the Board's desire to develop new public artists. Ms. Nix mentioned the artwork goals relating to sense of place and Mr. LaBonty stated that the historic-references in Mr. Littig's proposal could be a grounding contrast to the new development in this area. The Board discussed the component of Ms. Wischer's proposal by which a QR code would activate a video of water, stating that on the one hand it could allow the public to take a piece of the artwork home with them but on the other hand it may not be digitally equitable or fully considered. Mr. Jacoby noted that the scientific grounding of the concept was captivating but the multiple parts of the proposal may have spread the budget overly thin and the connection between the water and the minerals may be lost in the physical manifestation or the work. Ms. Pullos stated that she felt that the proposal incorporated

multiple concepts across the 500 foot platform and that Ms. Lee-Lodge's proposal was similar to previous art in transit projects in that it focused on the windscreen but that the required transparency was a concern from a UTA perspective. Ms. Haworth noted that Ms. Lee-Lodge's Proposal and Mr. Littig's proposals may better relate to the somewhat retro styling of the canopy at the station. Ms. Pullos stated that the concept of showing growth from car to train may build effectively on the past in the evolving neighborhood. Ms. Laura Smith and Mr. Kelly Gillman noted that the structural engineer working on the platform had no technical concerns with any of the designs and the materials used for the canopy were still to be determined and the artist could potentially weigh in on the materials to maximize cohesion. Ms. Lindsley spoke to the relationship between the artwork and developments emerging in the area, noting that newly designed office and residential spaces are what were to be expected in the area. Ms. Pullos noted that the timeline currently looked like the station will be completed by December 2021, and Ms. Trout confirmed that the timeline would, therefore, allow for revisions from the artists.

- f. Mr. Joe Jacoby motioned to accept Mr. Littig's proposal with a request for revisions that created increased specificity in the design. Ms. Jann Haworth seconded. No other Board members voted in favor. Ms. Rivera stated that she felt that Ms. Lee-Lodge's seemed to relate best to the development in the area and the current artwork along the main street corridor and asked the Board to consider requesting revisions from all three artists. The Board determined that they did not want to see revisions to Ms. Wischer's proposal. The Board discussed the revisions they would ask for from Ms. Lee-Lodge, noting that in other art in transit projects, some windcreens had not been replaced upon damage, and that the revisions they would be seeking were with regard to maintenance and budget, potentially requiring a change to materials and or fabrication, given that the piece seemed to embody high risk of needing maintenance. Ms. Rivera stated that Ms. Lee-Lodge could decline to revise if she disagreed with the request but that if the Board was interested in pursuing her proposal they should offer the opportunity for revisions. Mr. Johnson agreed that she could have the opportunity to mitigate risk, and motioned to request revisions from Mr. Littig to push the cohesion of his proposal and from Ms. Lee-Lodge to mitigate the risk of costly or unfeasible maintenance in hers. Ms. Trout seconded and all Board members voted in favor. The Board stated that one revised design will be put forward to the Mayor as the recommended artist and one will be the alternate, upon review of the revisions by the Board.

III. Public Comment

- a. None.

IV. Other Business/Adjourn

- a. Mr. Johnson motioned to close the meeting, and Ms. Trout seconded. All Board members voted in favor and the meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm.