



**PARK CITY PUBLIC ART ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
March 10, 2025**

The Public Art Advisory Board of Park City, Utah, will hold its regular meeting in person at the Marsac Municipal Building, Executive Conference Room, at 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah 84060. Meetings will also be available online and may have options to listen, watch, or participate virtually.

Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87505710988?pwd=4hllHD85zpaNbZzzcEKtIKbNb6R99G.1>

CLOSED SESSION

The Public Art Advisory Board may consider a motion to enter into a closed session for specific purposes allowed under the Open and Public Meetings Act (Utah Code § 52-4-205), including to discuss the purchase, exchange, lease, or sale of real property; litigation; the character, competence, or fitness of an individual; for attorney-client communications (Utah Code section 78B-1-137); or any other lawful purpose.

REGULAR MEETING - 5:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

II. PUBLIC COMMENT: Any Items Not on the Agenda

III. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

1. Consideration to Approve the Public Art Advisory Board Minutes from February 10, 2025.

IV. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS Stephanie/Jocelyn

1. City Updates- Public for Bodies Recruitment, PAAB Board Member Terms
2. PAAB Representative for the Historic Preservation Award
3. SCPAB/Arts Council- Jocelyn
4. Any other Staff or Board Communications

V. BUDGET/PROJECT UPDATES Sarah/Stephanie

1. Library Artwork Update: Mark Maziarz (Vote)
2. Proposed Code Amendments
3. Board Management Structure

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify Stephanie Valdez at 435-640-1225 or stephanie.valdez@parkcity.org at least 24 hours before the meeting.

Staff/Board Communications

Public Art Advisory Board	Term Expiration
Joann Askins-Stack (moved)	Jun-25
Jess Griffiths	Jun-25
Pam Bingham	Jun-26
Molly Guinan	Jun-26
Samantha Osselaer	Jun-26
Terri Smith	Jun-26
Kara Beal	Jun-26
Elsa Gary	Jun-25
Jocelyn Scudder	no term (non-voting)



City Council Staff Report

Subject: Public Art Advisory Board Code Amendments
Author: Sarah Pearce and Luke Henry
Department: Executive and City Attorney's Office
Date: March 20, 2025

Recommendation

Consider an ordinance to amend Section 2-8-21, the Public Art Advisory Board (PAAB), of the Park City Code. These amendments provide better alignment with Park City Municipal's other boards and commissions.

Background

In 1999, the Park City Summit County Arts Council (Arts Council) laid the foundation for the Art in Public Places plan. By 2003, the City Council established the PAAB, a board of residents appointed by the Mayor and City Council. The PAAB's purpose is to provide recommendations to the City Council on public art projects and artist selection.

The current section of the Park City Code dealing with the PAAB, [section 2-8-21](#), was enacted in 2024. This section largely codified the existing structure of the PAAB and kept in place a rule that the PAAB would be governed by a policy adopted by Council. Under the current code and policy, the PAAB has:

- An eight-member board;
- Staggered terms;
- Members are allowed to serve up to two consecutive, three-year terms; and,
- The Arts Council's role includes providing non-voting support and expertise to the PAAB through guidance on various projects and initiatives.

Analysis

[On September 5, 2024](#), Council adopted an ordinance consolidating and streamlining the administration of boards, commissions, and committees. At that time, we minimized changes to the structure of boards through the ordinance and kept the Council-approved PAAB policy in place.

At this time, we recommend making changes to the PAAB code section to make it better align with other City boards by including the following:

- The PAAB will consist of not less than five members and not more than seven members.
- All members must live, work, volunteer, own property, or own a business within Park City municipal boundaries.
- A majority of members must have their primary residence within Park City Municipal boundaries.
- There should be priority given for members who have expertise in art-related fields or public art selection and implementation.

- The Board will follow the City's Procurement Rules and processes that generally foster broad-based competition in procuring public art.
- A maintenance schedule shall accompany each piece as it is accepted into the collection. The Public Art Advisory Board shall review the Park City public art collection on an ongoing basis or as needed for general maintenance and repairs.
- If the structural integrity of an artwork is critically damaged or risks causing harm, the City Manager may authorize its immediate removal and placement in storage. The Public Art Advisory Board will make a recommendation on the repairing, resiting, or deaccessioning within a reasonable time following the removal.

Additionally, the PAAB follows the policies in the Public Art Advisory Board Policy Handbook. If the City Council approves the amendments outlined in this report, we will amend the policy handbook to reflect the changes.

Exhibits

Exhibit A – Redlined Changes to Section 2-8-21 of the Park City Code

Exhibit B – Ordinance No. 2025-04, An Ordinance Amending Section 2-8-21, Public Art Advisory Board, of the Park City Code

Exhibit C – Public Art Advisory Board Policy Handbook

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS

2-8-21 Public Art Advisory Board

1. A. **Purpose and Authority.** The Public Art Advisory Board will create a public art policy and plan, make recommendations to the City Council regarding strategic planning, acquisition, expenditures, funding and budgetary requests, project identification, donations, proposals or qualifications, maintenance, repair, re-siting or deaccessioning of public art, and establish future funding opportunities for public art.
 2. The City Council finalizes all decisions regarding the acquisition and deaccessioning of public art, regardless of funding amount. The Public Art Advisory Board can make decisions about resiting minor works, but decisions regarding resiting major works must be approved by the City Council.
- B. **Organization.**
1. The Public Art Advisory Board will consist of not less than five members and not more than seven members.
 2. All members must live, work, volunteer, own property, or own a business within Park City municipal boundaries.
 3. A majority of members must have their primary residence within Park City Municipal boundaries.
 4. There should be priority given for members who have expertise in art-related fields or public art selection and implementation.
- C. **Rules and Regulations.**
1. The Board will follow the City's Procurement Rules and processes that generally foster broad-based competition in procuring public art.
 2. A maintenance schedule shall accompany each piece as it is accepted into the collection. The Public Art Advisory Board shall review the Park City public art collection on an ongoing basis or as needed for general maintenance and repairs.
 3. If the structural integrity of an artwork is critically damaged or risks causing harm, the City Manager may authorize its immediate removal and placement in storage. The Public Art Advisory Board will make a recommendation on the repairing, resiting, or deaccessioning within a reasonable time following the removal.

Budget

PAAB Budget Update March 2025

Revenue	FY25 Budget	Actuals	Variance
General Funds	\$ 458,310	\$ 458,310	\$ -
Lower Park RDA	\$ 37,749	\$ 37,749	\$ -
Total	\$ 496,059	\$ 496,059	\$ -

Expenses	FY25 Budget	Actuals	Variance
Project Manager for Public Art (Budget)	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000
Neighborhood Art Program	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000
Transit Shelter Art Project	\$ 95,000	\$ -	\$ 95,000
Shade Structure at Dirt Jump Park	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000
Connections and Pathways	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000
Utility Box Art & Signage	\$ 81,400	\$ 62,627	\$ 18,773
Library Art for Study Rooms	\$ 45,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 10,000
Lucy Moose Repair	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ -
Daly West	\$ 63,000	\$ 33,000	\$ 30,000
Total	\$ 397,000	\$ 133,227	\$ 263,773

PAAB Budget Update March 2025

Percent for Arts Upcoming Projects	Estm Project Budget	1% for Arts Budget
Revenue		
Community Center at City Park	\$15,231,259	\$152,313
MARC Aquatics	\$7,500,000	\$75,000
Homestak Roadway & Trail Improvements	\$9,297,074	\$92,971
Snow Creek Crossing	\$12,916,778	\$129,168
Bus Shelters	\$15,983,249	\$159,832
Total Revenue	\$60,928,360	\$609,284
Expenditures		Budget
Community Center Percent for Arts Project		\$150,000
MARC Pool Percent for Arts Project		\$60,000
Total Expenditures		\$210,000
Net Revenue/(Deficit)		\$399,284

PAAB Budget Update March 2025

Potential Future Projects	Project Budget	1% for Arts
Marsac Remodel	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 23,000
Bonanza District Bus Stops	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 28,000
Thayne's Bike/Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 26,000
Park Avenue Reconstruction	\$ 12,200,000	\$ 122,000
SR248/US40 Park & Ride	\$ 15,000,000	\$ 150,000
Senior Center	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 35,000
Total	\$ 38,400,000	\$ 384,000

Minutes



Public Art Advisory Board Minutes

For more information, go to www.parkcity.org

Date: Monday, February 10, 2024

Meeting Place: Marsac Executive Conference Room, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, UT 84060

Time: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Minutes: Stephanie Valdez, Administrative Analyst/Art Coordinator

Next Meeting: Monday, March 10, 2025, at 5 P.M.

Topic 1: Call Meeting to Order (5:01 p.m.)

Present: Elsa Gary, Jess Griffiths, Terri Smith, Sam Osselaer, Pam Bingham, Molly Guinan, Stephanie Valdez, Sarah Pearce, Deputy City Manager, Chris Phinney, PAAB Staff Liaison, Jocelyn Scudder Jess Moran, Recreation, Marketing & IT Division Manager, Virtual Guests: Lisa Benson, Landscape Architect with Landmark Design, Jeff Michalek with Spectra Systems, Inc. (PIP supplier) and Rhetta McAliff, with Berlinger Play Equipment, Arts & Culture Master Planning efforts, Jasmine and Amanda consultants from Designing Local

2. Absent: Kara Beal

Topic 2: Public Comment: Any Items Not on the Agenda

No public comment at this time.

Topic 3: Approve Minutes from the January meeting

Pam motioned to approve the December minutes. Sam seconded.

Topic 4: Staff and Board Communications

Sarah provided a brief update on City matters. The Council Retreat will take place on February 13-14 at the Police Station. Items of potential interest to the PAAB include the Main Street Area Plan discussion on Thursday at 1 PM, a discussion on the future of City Hall on Friday, February 14, at 12:30 PM, and a General Plan discussion at 2:30 PM. The retreat is open to the public, and the agenda is available on the City's website for more details.

Sarah noted that the March board meeting will include a discussion on the proposed policy for PAAB. Last year, many policies were standardized across City boards and commissions, but PAAB was not included in that process. While there are no major changes proposed, Sarah would like to review the policy with the board before it moves forward for approval.

Jocelyn provided an update on the Summit County Public Art Board's project. They are currently working on permitting and preparing for the installation of sculptures at the Jeremy Ranch Roundabouts. A moose sculpture will be placed on the Pinebrook side, and a crane sculpture will be installed on the Jeremy side. The artists are scheduled to

48 arrive in April, and as part of their community engagement plan, local schools will
49 participate in a naming contest for the sculptures to foster a sense of ownership and
50 connection. The sculptures, which will be visible from I-80, are expected to be installed
51 in May or June, depending on weather conditions. Jocelyn will keep the board informed
52 of any updates.

53
54 Terri inquired whether the names would be engraved on the sculptures. Jocelyn
55 responded that this is still to be determined, as the Summit County Public Art Board
56 aims to avoid signage or engraving near the roundabouts for safety reasons. Instead,
57 information about the artwork will be available on the website.

58
59 Jocelyn shared that next year, SCPAB will be working on Rail Trail projects and hopes
60 to collaborate with Park City PAAB on some of them.

61
62 For the Arts Council, Create PC has a great mix of fine art and creative merchandise
63 from over fifty local artists. It's a continuation of the maker's market, which people
64 enjoyed since they could shop for gifts along with fine art. The space is open
65 Wednesday through Sunday from 12 PM to 6 PM.

66
67 She also mentioned some upcoming exchange workshops as part of the Arts and
68 Culture Master Planning efforts. These are 90-minute conversations designed to dive
69 into the future of the Arts and Culture sector. Jocelyn encouraged board members to
70 attend—there's one on February 14 at Create PC, with more on February 27 and 28.
71 She also asked everyone to take the survey to share their feedback.

72
73 Jocelyn introduced Jasmine Metcalf, a consultant with Designing Local, a firm based in
74 Columbus, Ohio, that has worked on cultural planning efforts nationwide, including
75 public art plans. Jasmine joined the meeting to discuss upcoming public engagement
76 opportunities focused on public art, with workshops scheduled throughout the County.

77
78 These pop-up workshops will run from February 20 to February 28, covering broad
79 topics related to the Arts and Culture Master Plan. One session will specifically focus on
80 Public Art, and Jasmine extended an invitation to both the Summit County Art Board
81 and the Park City Art Board. This meeting is open to the public and will take place on
82 Friday, February 21, from 9:30 AM to 11 AM at the Kimball Junction Library.

83
84 The discussion will follow a roundtable format, led by facilitator Amanda Golden, and
85 will explore public art and creative placemaking throughout the County. A hybrid
86 interactive tool, Mentimeter, will allow public input in real time, with four to five prompts
87 guiding the conversation on how the planning process can shape public art. The
88 consultants also encourage representatives from the Summit County and Park City
89 boards to provide a brief update on current projects and initiatives.

90
91 Amanda mentioned there will be other workshops that the board can attend if they
92 cannot attend the February 21st.

93
94 Jocelyn encouraged board members to attend and noted that a Zoom option will be
95 available. She will send out the invite.

96

97 Pam confirmed she could attend in person. Stephanie will follow up with project updates
98 for the discussion.

99

100 **Topic 5: Budget/Project Updates**

101

102 **Topic 6: Pool Fencing Update**

103 Jess Moran from the Recreation Department provided an update on the Community
104 Center project, accompanied by online guests Lisa Benson, Landscape Architect at
105 Landmark Design, Jeff Michalek from Spectra Systems, Inc. (the pour-in-place
106 supplier), and Rhetta McAliff from Berlinger Play Equipment. They were there to
107 address any questions the board might have regarding the project.

108

109 Jess M. shared that after careful consideration, the play equipment components have
110 been chosen and presented a site layout featuring climbing structures and areas
111 intended for younger children, covering 6,300 square feet that will need surfacing. Jeff
112 discussed the surfacing options and the design process. He explained that while any
113 design can be accommodated, costs differ greatly between a standard 50/50 color mix
114 without design and a fully customized 100% color design. He indicated that he could not
115 provide an exact price until a design was finalized, but he does have preliminary figures
116 to give a general idea. Once the artist is selected and the first rendering is created, Jeff
117 will present the design costs based on chosen colors, noting that color selection can
118 impact costs. He went on to explain that pour-in-place (PIP) installation is the last phase
119 of playground construction. The rubber mixture is combined with a weather-resistant
120 glue/binder, which must be applied to a clean, dirt-free site to ensure durability.
121 Installation requires temperatures to remain above 50 degrees both day and night,
122 making late summer the ideal timeframe. As temperatures drop, installation
123 complications arise due to the sensitivity of the binder to colder weather.

124

125 Jess M. indicated that November is a potential target for installation, contingent upon
126 the weather in Park City. She noted that construction for the community center will start
127 after the summer day camp in 2025, with a projected timeframe of August 2025 to
128 November 2026.

129

130 Jess M. mentioned that usage of this portion of the community center might be limited
131 during the fall and winter seasons, largely depending on the weather. Molly inquired
132 about the possibility of completing the installation in sections and how long the curing
133 process takes. Jeff responded that the timeline depends on the design chosen. He
134 described the installation as a three-step process: first, the general contractor installs a
135 compacted gravel subbase; next, a layer of black shredded tire is added; and finally, the
136 colorful topcoat is applied. This entire process can take about two weeks, while curing
137 may require an additional week under optimal conditions. He emphasized that once the
138 rubber is curing, it must remain undisturbed, and the site needs to be kept clean. Rhetta
139 added that Jeff's team would prefer to complete their work last not the entirety of the
140 project last.

141

142 Pam raised concerns about the likelihood of installing the PIP in November, considering
143 the start of the ski season and potentially lower temperatures. Jeff acknowledged the
144 challenges but stated that it could be possible with proper logistics. Jess M. noted she
145 would follow up with the architect to stress the urgency of meeting this timeline.

146

147 Jess Moran presented some design examples, clarifying that this project doesn't
148 necessarily need a thematic approach like the pool fencing project, which reflects Park
149 City's history in mining. She believes that selecting the artist's design should take place
150 first then the playground color schemes can be finalized.

151
152 Pam emphasized the importance of creating a design that fits within budget constraints,
153 particularly keeping in mind that rubber colors can influence overall costs. Molly added
154 that from a logistical viewpoint if the project continues into winter, requirements such as
155 a tent and heating will be necessary to keep the public away from the work area.

156
157 Jess Moran was cautious about getting overly focused on the timeline since any
158 mitigation measures, like tenting and heating, would impact the construction budget.
159 Jocelyn urged the board to concentrate on selecting the artist and design rather than
160 the construction schedule.

161
162 Jess G. asked Jess Moran what the board needed to do. Jess Moran clarified that the
163 board would be responsible for drafting the (RFP) for the design. Constraints such as
164 color selections would need to be included since exceeding three colors could drive up
165 costs, given that some colors may be more expensive than others.

166
167 Jess Moran then inquired about how Jeff's team typically receives designs. Jeff
168 explained that they usually get digital copies, which they then digitize for measurement.
169 He assured the board that his team would focus on providing the best product that
170 aligns with the chosen design, leaving design selection to the board.

171
172 Jess G. asked if Jeff could provide guidelines for the necessary design parameters. Jeff
173 confirmed that he could.

174
175 Rhetta noted that regarding the medium, Jeff and his team can adapt the design and
176 allow the artist creative freedom; professional documentation isn't required. Once a
177 design is selected, costs can be adjusted accordingly.

178
179 Pam inquired whether any selected designs have historically been more impactful,
180 mentioning color blending or blocking. Rhetta responded that colors can be mixed and
181 matched in various percentages.

182
183 Jeff added that while there are standard color options, vibrant colors—which come with
184 smaller granules—are more expensive but can be mixed with standard colors for cost-
185 effectiveness. For example, blending black with colors like beige, blue, green, or
186 terracotta can adjust appearance and cost. Moreover, intricate designs will incur
187 additional costs due to the increased resources and time needed for installation. More
188 straightforward designs tend to be more affordable.

189
190 Terri asked whether sun exposure affects longevity. Jeff explained that smaller granules
191 typically maintain their color longer, especially as they are combined with a binder that
192 is stable and resistant to UV ray damage. Standard colors weather well and can also
193 have the binding that stabilizes the color over time and includes appropriate
194 maintenance to ensure the PIP lasts, which can be up to 15 years.

195

196 Molly asked if the discussion of designs being considered 3D or just having a 2D
197 design. Jess clarified she was unsure but wanted to consult Lisa regarding how design
198 changes could impact fall zones for specific playground equipment.
199

200 Molly expressed a preference for seeking a more interactive area, budget permitting,
201 and wanted to ensure the RFP contains any specific details. Rhetta added that
202 incorporating mounds would require additional compaction and stabilization efforts,
203 while Lisa noted that any layout changes would also necessitate careful attention to
204 drainage.
205

206 Jocelyn noted that due to budget constraints and the fact that certain colors influence
207 costs, it would be helpful to identify specific colors that could be included in the RFP.
208 Jess mentioned that Jeff had provided a list of colors, which they used to establish a
209 rough estimate of which colors might be feasible.
210

211 Jocelyn pointed out that if the proposal includes only the standard colors, it should
212 remain within budget. Molly added that more intricate designs could complicate the
213 layout process.
214

215 Jess Moran expressed a desire to clarify the process for providing detailed guidance to
216 the artist. Pam responded that it should be quite straightforward, especially when
217 adhering to a budget, as the choice of colors may be adjusted based on the
218 submissions. These considerations need to be clearly defined in the RFP.
219 Include examples of what designs are being sought and examples of successful
220 applications of this type of rubber, the artists can take this into account as they are
221 designing. Molly added when adding collaboration will be included is always positive.
222 Jess M. wanted clarification and wanted the artist to create something unique and not
223 hinder the creative process.
224

225 Jocelyn noted that while there is currently no specific theme for the project, establishing
226 a theme or some guiding concept could help inspire the artist and infuse the design with
227 a sense of playful element as it is a playground and connectivity to Park City.
228

229 Jess Moran agreed to discuss potential themes with the staff and encouraged the board
230 to share any ideas they might have. Jess G. agreed that providing artists with guidelines
231 would be beneficial.
232

233 Jess G. then asked Jeff about the lead time needed for the design to initiate the cost
234 breakdown and subsequent steps in the process. Jess clarified that the design would
235 need to be finalized by January 2026. Sam suggested that the board should factor in
236 some additional time for collaboration with the artist, effectively backing the timeline up
237 from the January deadline.
238

239 Jess Moran inquired about the expected delivery timeline for the design. She asked Jeff
240 whether a six-month lead time would be ideal. Jeff responded that the more time they
241 have, the better, as some elements require scheduling up to a year in advance. He
242 confirmed that if the board were to decide on the design in two months, it could still be
243 feasible. Jess Moran expressed that if the board could finalize the design by June or
244 July 2025, that timeline would work to which Jeff agreed.
245

246

247 Jeff provided the board with rough pricing estimates for the design surface, noting that
248 for a 6,300 square foot area, a basic design featuring a 50/50 wave pattern of colors
249 would cost around \$120k. This price could fluctuate based on the chosen colors. If the
250 design included a mix of 50% premium colors, the cost would be approximately \$0.50
251 per square foot, while switching to 100% premium colors would raise the cost to about
252 \$3 per square foot. Going all-in on 100% premium colors could bring the installation
253 cost to around \$190,000, though this figure is subject to change depending on the
254 specific design.

255

256 Terri raised a question about whether black could be used as one of the colors. Jeff
257 clarified that black is generally considered a more economical choice and is often
258 included in a 50/50 mix to reduce overall color costs. He noted that black is a durable
259 option that absorbs heat, which can be beneficial. Rhetta mentioned that in many of
260 their Utah projects, they often use a base of 50% black and 50% beige as a background
261 to help other colors stand out. This combination is not only neutral but also helps in
262 managing temperature during the summer months.

263

264 Rhetta emphasized the importance of focusing on surfacing design. Jess Moran also
265 mentioned that she has additional information on the fill, which could be useful for the
266 RFP.

267

268 Sarah expressed her support for including the neutral base color background in the
269 RFP.

270

271 Jess Moran then inquired about whether there was any difference in cost between the
272 granule sizes beyond just color. Rhetta explained that using larger granules makes
273 intricate designs more challenging, as smaller granules tend to wear better and provide
274 a longer-lasting finish. Jeff estimated a cost difference of about \$2-\$3 per square foot
275 between large and small granules, with large granules being more cost-effective while
276 smaller granules yield more vibrant colors. Sam added that they would need to settle on
277 a design before getting into the specifics of granule sizes.

278

279 Jocelyn asked Jess Moran what the stipend for the artist's design would be. Jess
280 expressed similar concerns about determining the stipend. Jocelyn referenced the utility
281 box project as a comparison, noting that for that project, artists provided digital copies
282 that were scaled up to fit the dimensions of the box. She emphasized that this project
283 would follow a similar approach, as it primarily involves providing a design without
284 requiring the artist to be on-site for installation. Jocelyn stated that discussion can take
285 place on the artist's stipend as the scale is bigger with this project.

286

287 Jess Moran mentioned that there is a construction budget allocated for playground
288 surfacing, but she did not have the specific figures available. Lisa added that while the
289 cost of playground equipment is substantial, certain other expenses have been
290 minimized, and there is some supplemental funding available in the construction
291 budget.

292

293 Jeff concluded by restating the cost range for the surfacing, indicating low-end prices of
294 around \$19 per square foot and high-end prices of about \$30 per square foot, while
295 noting that there is flexibility depending on chosen color percentages.

296 Jess Moran will also follow up on what other colors might absorb heat and be hot, she
297 also mentioned they are working on the design process for the shading, Jess Moran will
298 also send over the finalized shade design when it has been received.
299

300 Molly wanted to have a clear understanding of the budget from Rec and PAAB. Jess M.
301 stated that this is 1% for art and the budget is \$150k.
302

303 Next, the board will discuss the Library Artist Update. Stephanie stated that in the
304 previous board selection of Mark Maziarz, Mark had other photographs that were sold
305 previously but not in the scale that was requested in the RFP. Unfortunately, the board
306 can no longer move forward with Mark's piece due to it not being an "original" piece as
307 stated in the RFP. Stephanie followed up with the runner-up artist Matt Elder to ensure
308 there were no other copies of the photograph and there are none, this piece is one one.
309 The board needs to vote on whether they want to move forward with Matt Elder's piece.
310 Pam motioned to accept Matt Elder's piece to replace the previous piece.

311 Sarah Pearce stated we would have to go to the Council for approval.
312

313 Next, Jess G, Sarah P, and Stephanie collaborated on the RFP for pool fencing. Sarah
314 wanted the board to review and feel good about it, there were revisions to the scoring
315 and evaluation criteria.

316 Jess G. stated what we tried to do was give the board some room to have connections
317 to Park City that have been discussed in the previous scoring.

318 Sam said the only question she had was if the renderings of the fence were included,
319 Sarah said yes those will be included when being published.
320

321 Terri inquired about the visibility of the art from the condominiums, asking if the intention
322 was for the art to be appreciated from the residents' perspective. Jess G. clarified that
323 the art could be designed as a double-sided piece for visibility from both sides or just on
324 the poolside. He noted that since the condos are positioned at a 45-degree angle, the
325 art would not be directly in the residents' line of sight.
326

327 Molly brought up a similar concern from previous projects like related to the utility box
328 project, mentioning that if a utility box featuring art were to be installed and not received
329 well, there might be limited options for recourse since it is not their property.
330

331 Jocelyn indicated she had a question regarding verbiage in the RFP. There was a
332 sentence describing the search for artists or firms that needed to be revised, and she
333 confirmed that they would adjust this wording in the final version of the RFP.
334

335 Elsa asked whether the project involved a single size for the panels. Jess G. responded
336 that the design is flexible, letting artists choose to create designs for all the panels or
337 just a selection. The RFP specifies that artists can design up to ten panels, but there are
338 no illustrative examples provided.
339

340 Jocelyn asked when the RFP will be posted, she mentioned the Arts Council newsletter
341 is going out on Wednesday. Stephanie will send Jocelyn all the relevant details once the
342 RFP is officially released.
343

344 Sarah provided an update on the bus stop art project, noting that Libby's piece cannot
345 be replicated because it wasn't part of the original submission. Additionally, Stephanie

346 reviewed the meeting minutes and highlighted that during discussions, the board had
347 prioritized other pieces over Heather Olson's submission.

348

349 The board needs to vote on moving forward with Heather Olson's piece.

350

351 Stephanie also presented an updated map showing the locations of the artwork. Sarah
352 mentioned that the filming component could be integrated into phase II of the bus stop
353 project. Furthermore, the 3 Kings location will be included in this next phase.

354

355 Pam motioned for the film piece to be added to the next phase of the bus stop art
356 project, while also proposing that Heather Olson's piece be selected and included in this
357 phase. Elsa seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

358

359 Molly raised concerns about her absence from a few meetings. The board expressed its
360 commitment to ensuring Molly remains involved and emphasized that leadership is
361 important and should not compromise her participation. Sarah mentioned that there are
362 no anticipated voting items for March, assuring everyone that they would make
363 arrangements to ensure Molly is included in any voting decisions.

364

365 Molly motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:39 p.m. Pam seconded.