



ART SELECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 3, 2012 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM
City of Fairbanks, City Hall, 800 Cushman Street
FMATS Conference Room

1. Call to Order
2. Introduction of Members, Staff and Attendees
3. Public Comment Period
4. Approval of the September 26, 2012 Agenda
5. Approval of the Meeting Summaries (Action Item)
 - a. August 10, 2012
 - b. August 28, 2012
 - c. September 7, 2012
 - d. September 12, 2012
 - e. September 17, 2012
 - f. September 26, 2012
6. Old Business
 - a. Draft Final Selection Process Discussion
7. New Business
8. Public Comment Period
9. Informational Items
10. Adjourn

Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System
ART SELECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
800 Cushman Street, FMATS Conference Room
City Hall, Fairbanks, Alaska
Meeting Minutes – August 10, 2012

1. Call to Order

Chair Donna Gardino called the meeting to order at 1:00pm.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

The following were present:

Name	Representing
Donna Gardino, Chair	FMATS Coordinator
Ron Inouye	Historian
George Lounsbury	Pioneers of Alaska
Amy Nordrum	Downtown Association
Mark Fejes	Community Artist
Julie Engfer	Festival Fairbanks
Carol-Ann Newcomer	Doyon
Kelley Hegarty-Lammers	Chena Riverfront Commission
Jessica Smith	FMATS
Margarita Bell	City of Fairbanks
Emily Taylor	Design Alaska

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Approval of the August 10, 2012 Agenda

- **Motion:** To approve the August 10, 2012 Art Selection Advisory Committee Agenda. (Nordrum/Engfer)
- **Vote on the Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

5. Approval of the July 24, 2012 Minutes

- **Motion:** To approve the July 24, 2012 FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee minutes. (Nordrum/Lounsbury)
- **Vote on the Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

6. New Business

None.

7. Old Business

- a. Request for Qualifications and Concepts Questions and Answers**

Ms. Gardino referred to the questions included in the meeting packet that were received from interested artists. A draft of answers to the questions are included in the meeting packet. Ms. Gardino asked the committee to review the questions and answers.

Mr. Lounsbury asked if the budget covers the maintenance costs, such as lighting/electricity. Ms. Gardino said she has been talking with the Borough Parks & Rec and the concerns of the ongoing expenses.

Ms. Nordrum suggested the committee go over the questions page by page.

Mr. Fejes asked if the site detail drawing could indicate the elevation change in contour lines. Ms. Gardino said she would ask the DOT to update the drawing. She also noted that changes can be made to the grading, but all changes must be approved by the DOT. Ms. Nordrum asked if those changes are funded by the artists' budget. Ms. Gardino said the changes would come out of the artists' budget. Ms. Nordrum suggested making a note in the answer indicating these details.

Mr. Fejes suggested labeling the bike path on the site design figure. Mr. Inouye asked if the bike path will be extended to the Borough Building. Ms. Gardino said that Festival Fairbanks was championing a path along the north side of the Chena. This effort would connect the Borough buildings; currently the planned bike path is as indicated on the engineering drawing.

The committee reviewed the questions one by one as included in the meeting packet. The committee suggested grouping like questions together. Ms. Gardino will deliver the final answers to all questions during the conference call on August 13, 2012 at noon.

b. Review Draft Selection Process

Ms. Gardino referred the committee to the Draft Selection Process in the meeting packet. The draft procedure lays out the process and determined the goals for dates/deadlines to accomplish selection. Ms. Gardino and Ms. Smith outlined the process for scoring in two phases, including 1) Yes, No, Maybe, and 2) numerical scoring with outlined criteria. The committee will be able to have flexibility and opportunities for discussion between the first and second phases of scoring. Scoring will always occur prior to group discussion within the committee. Committee suggestions regarding wording and minor process changes will be made to the document and presented at a future meeting for committee approval.

8. Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

9. Other Issues

None.

10. Adjourn

- **Motion to Adjourn:** (Lammers, Newcomer) @ 3:04PM

Next Art Selection Advisory Committee meeting will be Monday, August 13, 2012, 12:00 PM at Fairbanks City Hall, City Council Chambers for the Pre-Submission Teleconference.

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Donna Gardino, Chair
FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee

Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System
ART SELECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
800 Cushman Street, FMATS Conference Room
City Hall, Fairbanks, Alaska
Meeting Summary – August 28, 2012

1. Call to Order

Jessica Smith called the meeting to order at 1:00pm.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

The following were present:

- * Jessica Smith for Donna Gardino, Chair, FMATS Coordinator
- * Julie Engfer, Festival Fairbanks
- * Sue Sprinkle, Graphic Designer (absent)
- * Mark Fejes, Community Artist
- * Kelley Hegarty-Lammers, Chena Riverfront Commission (by phone)
- * George Lounsbury, Pioneers of Alaska
- * Amy Nordrum, Fairbanks Downtown Association (absent)
- * Carole-Ann Newcomer, Doyon Limited (absent)
- * Julie Engfer, Festival Fairbanks
- * June Rogers, Fairbanks Arts Association
- * Ron Inouye, Historian, Community Member
- Becky Sheller, Fairbanks Arts Association

- * Art Selection Advisory Committee Members

3. Public Comments

None.

4. Approval of the August 28, 2012 Agenda

- **Motion:** To approve the August 28, 2012 agenda. (Inouye/Engfer)
- **Vote on the Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

5. New Business

a. CaFE Juror Training

Ms. Smith provided a tutorial of the Call for Entry jury process. The tutorial followed the outline of the materials provided in the meeting packet. Committee members asked specific questions regarding use of the CaFE system. Ms. Smith reminded all committee members to provide the Artist ID number by 8AM, Friday, September 7th in order to prepare for the upcoming selection meeting that afternoon.

6. Old Business

7. Public Comment Period

8. Other Issues

9. Adjourn

- The meeting adjourned @ 12:45PM

Next Art Selection Advisory Committee meeting will be Friday, September 7, 2012, 12:00 PM, in the FMATS Conference Room.

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Donna Gardino, Chair
FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee

Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System
ART SELECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
800 Cushman Street, FMATS Conference Room
City Hall, Fairbanks, Alaska
Meeting Minutes – September 7, 2012

1. Call to Order

Chair Donna Gardino called the meeting to order at 1:07 pm.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

The following were present:

Name

*/**Donna Gardino, Chair, FMATS Coordinator
*Sue Sprinkle, Graphic Designer
*Mark Fejes, Community Artist
*Kelley Hegarty-Lammers, Chena Riverfront Commission
*George Lounsbury, Pioneers of Alaska
*Amy Nordrum, Fairbanks Downtown Association
*Carole-Ann Newcomer, Doyon Limited
*Julie Engfer, Festival Fairbanks
*June Rogers, Fairbanks Arts Association (absent)
*Ron Inouye, Historian, Community Member
** Jessica Smith, FMATS
Margarita Bell, City of Fairbanks
David Hayden
Jeff Putnam, Design Alaska
John Rowe, Design Alaska

*Art Selection Advisory Committee Members

**FMATS Staff

3. Public Comments

None.

4. Approval of the September 7, 2012 Agenda

- **Motion:** To approve the September 7, 2012 Agenda. (Hegarty-Lammers/Sprinkle)
- **Vote on the Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

Ms. Gardino noted that the Selection Process had been presented to the committee and discussed, allowed for a week for any additional changes, and then the revised draft was discussed at the following meeting. After the second discussion, the committee seemed to be in favor of the process, but an action regarding its approval was not yet on record. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers noted that now that the committee had surveyed the applicants, she felt they were better equipped to finalize the selection process document. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers suggested the committee continue the discussion of the selection process after the review of the selected applications. She also suggested spreading out the RFP funds beyond the top five selections.

- **Motion:** To move agenda item 5a to occur after item 6a. (Hegarty-Lammers/Sprinkle)

- **Discussion:** Ms. Hegarty-Lammers suggested amending the motion to include item 6b, as the development of the RFP would likely be informed by the committee's discussion of the applications.
- **Amended Motion:** To move the discussion of the Draft Selection Process and Draft RFP (items 5a and 5b) to after the Presentation of the committee's RFQ/C selections (item 6a). (Hegarty-Lammers/Sprinkle).

Ms. Gardino said to discuss the selection process while in the midst of the process is what the committee is trying to avoid. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said she believed there is a process in place up to a point, but is concerned about details of the process such as the number of finalists selected. Ms. Gardino said that the number of finalists is changed, it will directly impact the remaining budget for the public art project. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers suggested changing the amount given to each finalist. Ms. Gardino clarified that amount to be awarded to finalists was already published in the RFQ/C and could not be changed. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers noted that not only was the number of finalists a concern, but also the timeline of the selection of an artist.

Ms. Sprinkle noted her confusion with the draft selection process, specifically the selection of each juror's top five. She feels the one-week review of the applicants was too short. Ms. Gardino noted in the drafted process the schedule was outlined and the draft process also contained a caveat which indicated that this timeline could be changed if needed. However, no committee member became concerned with the timeline until late yesterday. Ms. Sprinkle said she did not know that the selection of top five by each juror was necessary until yesterday, as well as not being present at the August 10th meeting when this discussion would have been appropriate. Ms. Gardino said that the committee as a whole worked to define the process noting there was much more than interest than was originally expected, but the process was not suggested to change until now. Mr. Inyoue said that he believes the committee should stick to the process of selecting five applicants, and that by sticking to the process, whittling down to the finalists will happen with today's discussion of the 55 applications for review. Mr. Fejes noted that he had voiced concerns about the length of time for scoring at an earlier meeting, but he was told to "buck up." He believes the issue is to do whatever is necessary to select the right artist. He said the reason he could not narrow down his selections to his top five is because he has questions that may shape his decisions. Mr. Fejes believes the committee should be open to flexibility in the process to be able to make the right selection. Ms. Gardino said that the documented process does include flexibility, but it must be documented. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers asked for City procurement staff to be present for today's meeting. Ms. Gardino asked Margarita Bell to join the discussion for further guidance on procurement for the RFP and selection process discussions.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers and Mr. Fejes noted their desire to have more flexibility within the selection process. Ms. Sprinkle suggested that more time would be needed for the review that just happened in the last week. Ms. Newcomer said that she was overwhelmed by the amount of applicants and quality of artists to score in the Yes, No, Maybe round and could not narrow down to a top five.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers asked Ms. Bell if the motion, which is suggested because she believes the discussion and review of applicants will inform the selection process and RFP. Ms. Bell said that the committee should follow the process and the order of the process as discussed by the committee at a previous time. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers pointed out that a number of committee members were concerned with elements of the process after a review of the applicants. Ms. Bell said the concern is the review of applicants could change and impact the selection process and the RFP. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said that part of the process was to complete the RFP draft after the

selection of finalists. Ms. Bell said that the committee does not want the RFP to reflect what the committee prefers in the applicants, as this could be perceived as a bias. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers agreed. Ms. Bell further clarified that what was laid out in the RFQ will shape what is in the RFP, meaning the RFP cannot contain any additional information specific to one applicant. Mr. Fejes asked for clarification regarding this point. Ms. Bell noted that the committee must be sure that once the RFQ is established, the RFP must follow the RFQ information so as not to impact the selection process or the RFP. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers noted this was not the intent of the committee. Ms. Bell said it may not be the intent, but it will be the perception. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers asked how to accomplish the goal of completing the RFP. Ms. Bell said that if the committee is staying with the order of how the process was discussed by the committee, it is acceptable. Deviating from the order of the process would be problematic. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said the committee does not want to deviate from the order, but to change time frames and the number of finalists. Ms. Gardino noted that the RFQ/C did outline that the finalists will receive \$2,000. Any additional finalist stipends would be subtracted from the project budget of \$300,000. Addressing the timeline, Ms. Gardino clarified that the concern was the timeline for narrowing down the 99 applicants to 5 applicants per juror, for a maximum of 45 applicants for discussion. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers noted that at least two members of the committee had voiced concerns for the initial Yes, No, Maybe review. Ms. Newcomer noted her concern with artists that had potential, but did not have a concept. Ms. Smith showed an example of this type of applicant error, and said that because the artist did not submit a concept, this did not fulfill the requirements asked for in the RFQ/C.

Ms. Sprinkle said the timeline included less than 10 business days because of the Labor Day holiday and Election Day. She also noted her confusion with the instructions to narrow down to only 5 selections for today's review, and also that reading the artist's statements of white print on a black background was difficult. Mr. Fejes said he knew for a fact that these types of procurement takes months and cannot be accomplished in 2 weeks. Mr. Lounsbury said he agreed with Ms. Newcomer, as some applications showed great ideas and potential, while others did not. He noted that he "stuck to his guns" and did not accept an application that was not reflective of what the committee had asked. Mr. Lounsbury commented that it was time consuming, and was able to select five. Ms. Engfer also noted that she loved some of the ideas and concepts, but some applicants simply did not submit the full application as described, which helped her choose her top five. She noted that she did not want to let go of many of the applicants, but she made the hard choices. Ms. Nordrum echoed similar thoughts, and that she worked to get her top 5, regardless of the fact she had a lot of questions with applications that did not seem complete. She also noted she had been out of town, so her review time was limited and she may have missed things that others had picked up. She suggested a discussion for today's meeting and the next meeting to continue to narrow the selection down to five finalists for RFP submittals.

Ms. Smith said the committee had selected 55, but pointed out that one of the submissions in the 55 did not include a concept. Of those 55, 12 applicants were overlapping with more than one juror selecting that applicant in their top 5. Some jurors selected more than 5. Ms. Smith noted that approximately half of the applicants had been eliminated; even given the current draft process concerns, and the efforts, great input, and quick progress of the committee's scoring in such a quick turnaround, the final 10 could be selected today by the committee.

Mr. Fejes said on the behalf of those of the committee that can't always respond to process, we have to be careful about eliminating someone just because they did not respond to everything in the request. He believes there are several that did not respond to everything in the request, but there was enough there to squeak them by. Ms. Gardino and Ms. Bell reiterated that the

committee must have a process for selection of the artist. Mr. Fejes noted that this was art selection, and Ms. Bell said that she understood what Mr. Fejes was saying, that art is a little bit different, but there still needed to be a process for the selection. She noted that the committee does not want an applicant to come back to the committee and say that one artist was selected over another, yet one artist may have submitted A, B, and C, while the other artists (selected) did not. The committee needs to stick to a process that is fair to all applicants. Mr. Fejes said he is not referring to whether or not someone forgets a dollar amount or an address, he is concerned with artists responding to the theme. Ms. Sprinkle asked for an example. Ms. Gardino said that if Mr. Fejes was concerned with a response to the theme, she encouraged him to realize everyone observes artwork differently, leaving the response to the theme up to the viewer. Ms. Gardino noted that the conversation at hand was addressing the selection process. Ms. Fejes asked if this helps Ms. Newcomer's concerns. Ms. Newcomer said she understood following a process, she just felt there were artists that did great work even if it was not a complete application, and she did not want to eliminate anyone. Ms. Newcomer reiterated that she did however, understand process.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said that having been informed by Ms. Bell and Ms. Gardino, she does not understand why it is important to adopt the selection process and the RFP before the discussion of the 55 applications for today's review. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers believes in order to get the selection process right, it will need to be discussed after the review of today's applicants. Ms. Gardino said that she prefers to add language that gives flexibility to address the concerns about the process rather than discussing the process after the discussion of the applicants for review today, as she is uncomfortable with approving the selection process after the review of applicants has begun at today's meeting. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers asked Ms. Sprinkle if she is comfortable with the meeting today and next meeting, and change the number of finalists to more than five. Ms. Gardino, Ms. Bell, and Ms. Smith reminded the committee that the number of finalists is set at five, as the RFQ/C already outlined the number of finalists and the amount of the stipend. Ms. Sprinkle said she just would have liked to have a little bump of time for this first review period. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said that can't be changed, but perhaps we could change the time language. Ms. Gardino said it was possible, but the schedule must change as well. Ms. Sprinkle noted that if this art selection process ever happens again, a week is not enough time for initial review.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers outlined the steps to date, as the selection process has followed the RFQ/C, and initial scoring has taken place, and believes that the RFP discussion needs to happen after the discussion of today's review. Ms. Gardino clarified the amended motion on the table, and Ms. Hegarty withdrew her motion in favor of a more specific motion involving only item 6a, the Draft RFP Discussion.

- **Motion withdrawn.** (Hegarty-Lammers/Sprinkle)
- **Motion:** To move the discussion of the Draft RFP (item 5b) to after the Presentation of the committee's RFQ/C selections (item 6a). (Hegarty-Lammers/Sprinkle).

Ms. Sprinkle asked for clarification of the RFP, RFQ/C, and Selection Process. Ms. Smith explained that the Selection Process is a schedule of how the committee will accomplish the selection of an artist. Ms. Gardino outlined the overall process, including the RFQ/C being what was advertised to artists and has been responded to with the applications. After five finalists have been selected, an RFP will be issued to the finalists. Ms. Gardino clarified the motion, noting that after a discussion of the review of the applicants (as the moving of the agenda items will allow), a

discussion of the RFP will occur.

Members of the committee discussed concerns as to whether or not an applicant's concept would be feasible. Ms. Hegarty suggested having engineering staff at the next meeting to discuss these concerns. Ms. Gardino said this is possible. Mr. Lounsbury said he would eliminate something if it was not feasible. Ms. Gardino said that at this point there is not a level of detail from the artist to know if a concept is feasible. Ms. Engfer noted that many of the artists have shown flexibility in their concepts to make it appropriate and feasible. Ms. Gardino agreed, saying that having engineering staff at this point was not necessary. Ms. Sprinkle asked how the committee could adjust their thinking if a concept is unrealistic. Ms. Hegarty asked if the committee should assume that concepts are possible. Ms. Gardino again noted that there is not an appropriate level of detail to have an engineer determine the feasibility of a concept.

Ms. Smith reminded the committee that concepts at this point do not seem unreasonable. Ms. Smith also reminded the committee that at this stage of the committee's selection process, the committee should be focused on whether or not an applicant has submitted qualifications that are reflective of the RFQ/C and a concept that reflects the community's desires as described in the 180 comments received and analyzed by the committee.

- **Vote on the Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

5. Old Business

a. Draft Selection Process (Action Item)

Ms. Gardino noted the scheduling and flexibility. Mr. Fejes asked what the final end date was for the committee's decision. Ms. Gardino said it was January 16th, 2013. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers suggested changing the language to "proposed schedule." Ms. Gardino noted there was already language that included this flexibility. Mr. Fejes asked about particulars of the schedule, including FMATS Policy Committee and City Council approval. Ms. Gardino clarified. Mr. Fejes asked if there was adequate time for an artist's contract after the final date of January 16th, and Ms. Gardino said there would be 20 months from that date until the installation deadline.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers voiced concerns about the selection process tasks for today and next week. Ms. Gardino read from the Selection Process (August Draft) for the committee's clarification, page 2, September 7th. Mr. Fejes asked what was meant by independent review of the applications. Ms. Gardino and Ms. Smith reminded the committee that independent review is what just occurred from August 28th – September 7th. Ms. Smith noted that she had instructed the committee to independently review the applications and to not speak about their review to one another at the August 28th juror training meeting. Mr. Fejes asked what the 30-minute review referred to in today's tasks. Ms. Gardino said that was what should have occurred today, and Mr. Fejes, Ms. Hegarty, and Ms. Sprinkle suggested a discussion take place regarding the applications.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers proposed discussion of each proposal individually. Ms. Sprinkle suggested grouping the concepts into types of proposals. Mr. Lounsbury suggested each proposal should be talked about, regardless of someone's opinion, positive or negative. Ms. Sprinkle said that she does not think an independent review is necessary, as the committee has already reviewed the concepts on their own. Mr. Inouye suggested extending the meeting time for today to complete

this process for each of the 55 concepts presented. It was clarified that the meeting was scheduled from 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM.

Mr. Fejes motioned that the committee make time to make this happen no matter how long it takes. (Fejes). There was no second. Mr. Fejes suggested a group review of each application, putting a time limit of 15 minutes for each application's discussion. Ms. Sprinkle suggested 10 minute limit per person for comments. Ms. Gardino said each application could not be discussed for such an extended period of time. Mr. Fejes said he's sure there are things buried in each proposal that others did not notice. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers suggested the committee attempt to follow the schedule as outlined, and Ms. Gardino added that the meeting can always be continued if today's meeting is not enough time. The selection process can be amended to reflect an "open discussion" instead of an "independent review" for today's meeting. Ms. Nordrum suggested completing the dot exercise prior to discussion to help focus the discussion. Ms. Smith suggested arranging the process to reflect a dot exercise for discussion purposes, followed by an open discussion, and then a final dot exercise for selection of the top 10. Ms. Bell added that this is following the process as written, only the discussion that would have taken place on September 17th will take place today. Ms. Gardino read the amended process for today's meeting to reflect Ms. Smith's suggestion.

Ms. Sprinkle asked if today, or at the extension of this meeting, 10 applications will be selected for numerical scoring. Ms. Gardino confirmed, numerical scores must be entered by September 13th in CAFÉ, but this date may change if this meeting is extended. Mr. Fejes asked what numerical scoring meant, and Ms. Smith and Ms. Gardino clarified that it is a second round of scoring within CAFÉ. Ms. Gardino continued to walk through the remaining task and asked for edits to the selection process. She noted that the final selection process has not been defined, as this final selection may be more qualitative.

Mr. Fejes asked when the draft RFP would be finalized. Ms. Gardino clarified that RFP details will be discussed after completion of today's review of the presented concepts, which may be extended to another meeting if necessary.

- **Motion:** To approve the FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee Selection Process, as amended. (Hegarty-Lammers/Newcomer).

Ms. Nordrum asked to change the scheduling of the final proposal selection to a later date than October 30th. Mr. Fejes agreed. Ms. Gardino noted the responses to the RFP should be due on Friday, October 26th. Ms. Sprinkle asked in what format the RFPs will be. Ms. Gardino noted that these details can be discussed at a later time with the discussion of the RFP.

Mr. Fejes noted his concern for the short turn around for the detailed proposals. Ms. Engfer and Ms. Nordrum noted that the estimated schedule will allow for any sort of needed flexibility in the scheduled timeline. Ms. Gardino noted that a public meeting for maintenance and safety of the selected finalist will need to be held between the time proposals are received on October 26th and the presentation of a finalist to the FMATS Policy Committee on November 21st. This will include Maintenance & Operations, Risk Management, and other necessary decision makers. Mr. Fejes suggested Risk Management be available, as well as engineering, for public meeting. Ms. Gardino agreed and noted she had already mentioned those parties. Ms. Gardino suggested changing October 30th to November 9th as a deadline for meeting and final selection. A public meeting will be held for safety and maintenance on November 14th. Ms. Sprinkle noted she would be out of town. The confirmed date for the public meeting was selected at November 15th.

Mr. Fejes asked if the process takes longer to narrow down, is there flexibility to change the deadline for artist response to the RFP. Ms. Gardino suggested shortening the committee's review dates from 10 days to 8 days. Mr. Fejes stated he didn't think the committee would be able to select 10 applications and voiced concerns that the artist would not have enough time to develop a proposal. Ms. Gardino said she believed the RFP discussion would have to happen at a later date, but she was optimistic that the committee could narrow down the applications to 10 finalists by the end of today's meeting.

- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.

6. New Business

a. Presentation of the committee's RFQ/C selections

The committee proceeded with the agreed upon selection process. The 55 selected concepts were displayed on the FMATS conference room wall, and each committee members took 5 dot stickers to place on any concept. Concepts without dots were removed from the wall. Each committee member had a chance to discuss his or her choices for dot placement. The committee discussed the remaining concepts and eventually narrowed down the selections to 22 concepts. Because the committee could not agree on 10 concepts, a motion was made to continue the meeting on Wednesday, September 12, 2012 at 1:00 PM. Ms. Smith instructed the committee to revisit the 22 remaining concepts by reviewing the appropriate concepts on CAFÉ for any remaining concerns or questions regarding each artist's application and qualifications. Ms. Smith also reminded the committee that the numerical scoring will take place after the final 10 concepts have been selected at the next meeting. Numerical scoring will be due by Monday, September 17, 2012 at 8:00 AM in order for Ms. Smith to be prepared to present the final top 5 for the September 17th committee meeting.

b. Draft RFP (Action Item)

The draft RFP discussion will be held after the selection of 10 finalists at the September 12th meeting.

7. Public Comment Period

John Rowe from Design Alaska addressed the committee as a citizen and landscape architect. He thanked the committee for their hard work on the project. He also his observation that there are three elements to an art piece that will be put in the space: an icon piece to this project, that is, a work that can be seen from a distance or from a vehicle, a human connection to a piece (such as can be found with an interventional, horizontal level piece), and the all-season element of the piece, where the community can enjoy the piece in both summer and winter. He believes these are important elements to the community to be considered for this project. Mr. Rowe expressed particular desire for the piece to be for the members of the Fairbanks community, with enjoyment especially throughout the Fairbanks winters.

8. Other Issues

9. Adjourn

- **Motion: To continue the September 7, 2012 meeting to September 12, 2012 at 1:00 PM.** (Inouye/Hegarty-Lammers)
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.

The continuation of this meeting will be on Wednesday, September 12, 2012 at 1:00 PM in the FMATS Conference Room.

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Donna Gardino, Chair
FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee

Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System
ART SELECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
800 Cushman Street, FMATS Conference Room
City Hall, Fairbanks, Alaska
Meeting Summary – Wednesday, September 12, 2012

1. Call to Order

Jessica Smith (for Chair Donna Gardino) called the meeting to order at 1:15 pm.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

The following were present:

Name

- */** Jessica Smith, FMATS (for Donna Gardino, Chair, FMATS Coordinator)
- *Sue Sprinkle, Graphic Designer (absent)
- *Mark Fejes, Community Artist
- *Kelley Hegarty-Lammers, Chena Riverfront Commission
- *George Lounsbury, Pioneers of Alaska
- *Amy Nordrum, Fairbanks Downtown Association
- *Carole-Ann Newcomer, Doyon Limited
- *Julie Engfer, Festival Fairbanks
- *June Rogers, Fairbanks Arts Association (absent)
- *Ron Inouye, Historian, Community Member

Margarita Bell, City of Fairbanks
Anne Kristoff, Citizen
Tony Schumate, City of Fairbanks

*Art Selection Advisory Committee Members
**FMATS Staff

3. Public Comments

None.

4. Approval of the September 12, 2012 Agenda

- **Motion:** To approve the September 12, 2012 Agenda. (Engfer/Hegarty-Lammers)
- **Vote on the Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

5. Old Business

a. Approved Selection Process

Ms. Smith directed the committee to the approved Selection Process provided in their meeting packet for the committee's reference. There were no comments regarding this item.

b. Selection of 10 applications for numerical scoring

Ms. Smith directed the committee to the 22 applicants displayed in the conference room, noting that today's goal was to narrow down the applications to 10 applicants for numerical scoring by Monday, September 17th, as outlined in the Selection Process document.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers spoke to the committee regarding public representation in this particular project. She apologized for any decision she may have made at this point in the selection process that may have been of her own opinion verses that of the public desire. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers and Ms. Nordrum asked that the theme as worded in the RFQ/C be displayed on the monitor for the committee to refer to throughout today's selection process. Ms. Newcomer commented that she also felt as though she may have missed something. Ms. Smith voiced that a feeling of concern was to be expected, as this was a new process for each of the members. Ms. Bell noted that if the theme was reviewed and the theme was not seen in any of the selections thus far, then there was a problem, but this did not seem to be the case at this time. Mr. Fejes reminded the committee that it was important to read what the applicant had written in their Artist's Statement. He suggested going through the applicants selected thus far to check for theme, and then remove the applicants that do not accurately represent the theme. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers agreed. Mr. Inouye noted that some applicants may meet the theme better with some alterations and this needed to be considered. Ms. Engfer commented that some applicants even noted in their statements their desire to work closely with the community to better shape their project to meet the needs of Fairbanks. Ms. Newcomer noted that none of the selected applicants thus far had sparkle, which would be uplifting all winter long. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers noted that many of the applicants selected thus far contained lighting.

Ms. Smith displayed the theme as corrected, and it was read by Ms. Engfer to the committee as follows:

The Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System (FMATS) Art Selection Advisory Committee was tasked with choosing a theme for the public art at the downtown greenspace that encompasses the whole of the diverse Fairbanks community. Fairbanks is somehow fixed in this challenging geographical location by the balance between the long, dark, and cold winters and the warm, bright, and lush summers. This dramatic combination of seasonal extremes is vital to Fairbanks' success as a community.

The committee is requesting public art concepts that reflect the cyclic and extreme subarctic climate. These concepts would portray the dramatic seasonal temperatures and arctic light changes as well as related spectacular phenomenon. Concepts should reflect an awareness of being just 200 miles south of the Arctic Circle and isolated within the heart of a wild Alaska in both form and function. The committee encourages public art concepts that acknowledge these changing physical properties through interactive components that will provide a periodic and fresh view. The committee desires public art that is so site specific and appropriate that it could only be envisioned in Fairbanks, Alaska.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers suggested highlighting the main elements of the theme. After a brief discussion, the committee highlighted the following main portions of the theme to guide the selection for the meeting as follows:

- *Portray dramatic seasonal temperatures and arctic light changes*
- *Awareness of being just 200 miles south of the Arctic Circle*
- *Isolated within the heart of a wild Alaska*
- *Acknowledge changing physical properties through interactive components*
- *So site specific and appropriate that it could only be envisioned in Fairbanks, Alaska*

Mr. Fejes asked for each applicant to be discussed for thematic appropriateness. Mr. Lounsbury agreed. The committee as a whole agreed that each individual concept (of the 22 on the wall) should be evaluated for theme appropriateness.

Ms. Smith went to each concept and focused the discussion to that concept. Each committee member was asked “yes” or “no” as to whether or not that committee member believed the concept reflected the theme. Each committee member answered “yes” or “no” for each concept. If a concern was raised about a particular artist’s concept or intent, the Artist’s Statement was read by Ms. Engfer for clarity of the concept.

Ms. Smith recorded on a sticky note placed on each concept how many “no’s” were made for each concept (and 7 committee members were present). Some concepts were unanimously “yes – on theme” and did not receive a sticky note, while others were unanimously “no – off theme,” which received a sticky recording a “U.” The committee agreed that all the selections that were unanimously off theme were eliminated. After this process, 14 concepts remained.

The committee members were each given 5 dot stickers, and asked to place their dots on any concepts they believed were so theme-appropriate that they should be numerically scored and considered as finalists. The result dot counts were as follows:

- 1 concept with 0 dots
- 2 concepts with 1 dot
- 5 concepts with 2 dots
- 2 concepts with 2.5 dots
- 1 concept with 3 dots
- 1 concept with 4 dots
- 1 concept with 5 dots
- 1 concept with 6 dots

The three lowest dot-scoring concepts were eliminated, leaving 11 concepts. The committee asked if they could numerically score 11 instead of 10 concepts. After consulting with Ms. Smith, Mr. Schumate, and Ms. Bell, it was decided that this was acceptable, as there were 5 concepts with only 2 dots. Ms. Smith said she would contact a Westaf staff member to move the CAFÉ applications to Round 2 of scoring for numerical scoring of the applicants from 1 – 20. Instructions will be provided to the committee members via email by tomorrow afternoon (September 13th). Scoring should be completed in CAFÉ by 8AM Monday, September 17, 2012.

c. Draft RFP (Action Item)

Motion: To move the RFP discussion to the September 17, 2012 meeting. (Hegarty-Lammers/Newcomer). None opposed. Approved.

Ms. Bell and Ms. Smith reminded the committee that any original information provided in the RFQ/C cannot be modified in the RFP, such as the theme. The committee should focus on clarifying what is needed in the finalist’s RFP to help better communicate the final concept. The committee was reminded to focus on the schedule, the selection criteria, and deliverables. Mr. Fejes voiced concerns over the theme’s obtuseness. Mr. Inouye suggested that Mr. Fejes clarify his concerns with Ms. Bell; the committee does not seem to share his concerns. Ms. Bell said she could answer any questions Mr. Fejes may have about the RFP. Ms. Smith reiterated Ms. Bell’s instructions, and noted she was available to help any off the committee members better understand the RFP, Ms. Bell was available for questions, and Ms. Gardino would return to the

FMATS office on Monday of next week for any remaining concerns that could not be answered by Ms. Bell or Ms. Smith.

6. New Business

None.

7. Public Comment Period

8. Other Issues

9. Adjourn

- **Motion to Adjourn at 3:06 PM (Inyoune/Hegarty-Lammers).**
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.

The FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee meeting will be held Monday, September 17, 2012 at 12:00 PM in the FMATS Conference Room.

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Donna Gardino, Chair
FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee

Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System
ART SELECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
800 Cushman Street, FMATS Conference Room
City Hall, Fairbanks, Alaska
Meeting Summary – Monday, September 17, 2012

1. Call to Order

Chair Donna Gardino called the meeting to order at 12:00 pm.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

The following were present:

Name

- */**Donna Gardino, Chair, FMATS Coordinator
- **Jessica Smith, FMATS
- *Sue Sprinkle, Graphic Designer
- *Mark Fejes, Community Artist
- *Kelley Hegarty-Lammers, Chena Riverfront Commission
- *George Lounsbury, Pioneers of Alaska
- *Amy Nordrum, Fairbanks Downtown Association (absent)
- *Carole-Ann Newcomer, Doyon Limited
- *Julie Engfer, Festival Fairbanks
- *June Rogers, Fairbanks Arts Association
- *Ron Inouye, Historian, Community Member

Margarita Bell, City of Fairbanks
Tony Schumate, City of Fairbanks
Mary Ann Nickles

- *Art Selection Advisory Committee Members
- **FMATS Staff

3. Public Comments

None.

4. Approval of the September 17, 2012 Agenda

- **Motion:** To approve the September 17, 2012 Agenda. (Engfer/Sprinkle)

Mr. Fejes asked that the meeting summaries be supplied as soon as possible. Ms. Smith noted the number of meetings has resulted in a slower turnaround with meeting summaries and would complete the minutes by Wednesday.

Mr. Fejes asked if the next meeting was not until November 9th, as noted on the agenda. Ms. Smith noted that November 9th was the next meeting day discussed, during which the committee will discuss scoring on the responses to the RFP. Questions regarding RFP logistics were asked. Ms. Gardino noted that this can be discussed during item fiveb.

- **Vote on the Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

5. Old Business

a. Selection of Five Finalists

Ms. Smith directed the committee to a spreadsheet in the meeting packet, which presented the ranking of the 11 numerically scored artists. The average scores in the spreadsheet were arranged in order of ranking, with the top five highest scores being the five finalists. The top five finalists were determined based on the average of the scores from each committee member in the CAFÉ system.

Mr. Fejes asked how the system averaged the scores. Ms. Smith explained that everyone who scored an application (on a scale of 1 – 20), the scores for each juror were summed and divided by the total number of jurors.

Ms. Newcomer asked why she could not view the concepts in CAFÉ. Ms. Smith explained there is a concept's link in the CAFÉ application. Ms. Newcomer said she opened everything and could not find the concepts. Ms. Engfer said she saw this as a flaw of the system, as viewing a concept required downloading the file. The committee asked if this should be addressed, as Ms. Newcomer only saw concepts during meetings. Ms. Hegarty pointed out that Ms. Newcomer was able to see the past work and read the artist's statements. She felt confident she had gleaned enough from the statements and past work to accurately score the applications.

The committee also discussed the type of artwork that rose to the top five. Ms. Newcomer and Mr. Lounsbury identified their choices as being more traditional, while Mr. Fejes noted he looked for choices that he felt best fit what the committee desired. Ms. Sprinkle said she went deeper into this scoring process, googling each artist and noticing examples of past work or public art that may not have been presented well in the proposal. Ms. Rogers said she did one full round of evaluation, then slept on her thoughts, before scoring. Mr. Fejes asked if Ms. Rogers felt comfortable with the resulting 11 finalists after the selection process, as she was not able to attend. She said that she was fine with the results.

Ms. Smith presented each of the top five concepts and placed them on the wall for reference. Ms. Lounsbury asked about the steam concept that made it to the top five. He is unsure that this concept is plausible. Ms. Engfer said she thought the artist seems to think it will work. Mr. Lounsbury said maybe the artist did not know if it would work; and if it will not work, it should not be considered in the top five. The committee discussed the assumptions the applicant made for the steam concept. Mr. Fejes noted the creativity and nerve of the steam concept's team to submit such a proposal; he also noted their willingness to change to a more appropriate concept if needed. Ms. Sprinkle said she supported the steam concept due to the past work and dollar amount of past commissions the team had accomplished. Ms. Gardino suggested asking all finalists to answer generic questions such as how the applicant plans to accomplish the proposed concept in the RFP does. Ms. Bell agreed this is where these questions about need to be asked. Ms. Gardino also noted items such as maintenance and safety that should be addressed in the RFP.

Ms. Hegarty voiced concerns that the five finalists are all of an abstract nature. She reminded the committee that they should be selecting not based on personal taste but on what was heard from the public involvement. She suggested a more realistic finalist be included in the final five. Ms. Sprinkle pointed out all of the realistic art that was already in place in downtown Fairbanks. Mr. Fejes said that this had already been discussed in the past. Mr. Lounsbury and Ms. Newcomer voiced concerns that the public will not be happy with such an abstract concept, and a more realistic concept may be more appropriate for Fairbanks. Ms. Gardino said what she heard in the discussion were that all people and history was to be removed from the theme, resulting in an environmental theme, based on the climate and geography of Fairbanks rather

than trying to pull a historical person's reference. Mr. Lounsbury said he always thought the theme did not address history as strong as it should. Ms. Gardino reminded the committee that discussions were to take all people and historical references out of the theme so as to not offend or forget others. Ms. Engfer said she can see the theme reflected in every piece of art that has been selected. She reminded the committee that no matter what the outcome, there will be controversy. Ms. Rogers said one of the things she found most reassuring with this committee is that they have been working with the criteria and the selection process. She did not see a lot of personal agenda happening in this committee and felt the selection process was reliable as is. She believes the committee can move forward with the top five selected thus far. Ms. Hegarty agreed that there was an effort to listen and hear the voice of the committee by the committee.

- **Motion:** To use the top five scoring proposals and promote them to the next round of finalists. (Sprinkle/Fejes).
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.

b. Draft RFP (Action Item)

Ms. Hegarty reminded the committee of the areas in the RFP that can be altered and clarified, in Selection Criteria and Deliverables. Ms. Bell explained how each of these sections can be clarified, but there could not be any changes or contradictions between the RFQ/C and the RFP.

The committee discussed each criterion and the questions that would need to be asked to help the applicant fully communicate their ideas and concepts. Specific clarifications in the RFP included asking for dimensions of the proposed art and clarification that any type of media can be used to present the final concept (physical, video, 3D rendering, etc).

Ms. Sprinkle and Ms. Hegarty voiced concerns that there was no interview with the finalists. Ms. Bell discussed with the committee how this could be done, noting that any communication with artists should only be through Ms. Gardino, the project manager. Additionally, any question asked of one applicant should be asked to all the others. Ms. Hegarty noted her experience with professional services agreement interviews. Ms. Gardino noted that this is a similar type of procurement, and reiterated Ms. Bell's comments that each interviewee must be asked the same questions.

Mr. Lounsbury asked how to address the steam concept's artist's statement, which includes a willingness to develop another, most suitable concept if needed. Mr. Fejes and Ms. Hegarty said this will depend on what is asked of the applicant in the RFP. Ms. Sprinkle noted that this is part of the process to get down to one finalist. Ms. Sprinkle voiced her concerns that an actual conversation can happen after responses to the RFP have been submitted.

- **Motion:** To add an interview process to the RFP schedule. (Sprinkle/Hegarty-Lammers).
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.
- **Motion:** To move forward with the changes in the RFP (as discussed), receive changes on Wednesday (September 19) and provide comments by Friday (September 21) and trust Donna to make the changes as expressed by the committee as a whole. (Engfer/Inouye).

The committee continued to discuss details of the RFP, particularly on pages 3 and 4. Questions were answered by staff members (Ms. Bell, Ms. Gardino, Mr. Schumate, and Ms. Smith) regarding procurement, materials to be provided in the application, and wording of each criterion, the schedule, reference checking, and deliverables.

- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.

6. New Business

None.

7. Public Comment Period

None.

8. Other Issues

9. Adjourn

- **Motion to Adjourn** (Rogers/Lounsbury)
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.

The FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee meeting will be held November 9, 2012 at 12:00 PM – 2:00 PM in the FMATS Conference Room.

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Donna Gardino, Chair
FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee

Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System
ART SELECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
800 Cushman Street, FMATS Conference Room
City Hall, Fairbanks, Alaska
Meeting Summary – Monday, September 26, 2012

1. Call to Order

Chair Donna Gardino called the meeting to order at 12:00 pm.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

The following were present:

Name

*/**Donna Gardino, Chair, FMATS Coordinator
*Sue Sprinkle, Graphic Designer
*Kelley Hegarty-Lammers, Chena Riverfront Commission
*Mark Fejes, Community Artist
*George Lounsbury, Pioneers of Alaska
*Amy Nordrum, Fairbanks Downtown Association
*Carole-Ann Newcomer, Doyon Limited
*Julie Engfer, Festival Fairbanks (absent)
*June Rogers, Fairbanks Arts Association (by phone)
*Ron Inouye, Historian, Community Member (absent)
Anna Plager
Tony Shumate

*Art Selection Advisory Committee Members

**FMATS Staff

3. Public Comments

None.

4. Approval of the September 26, 2012 Agenda

- **Motion:** To approve the September 26, 2012 Agenda. (Sprinkle/Hegarty-Lammers)
- **Vote on the Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

5. Approval of the Meeting Summaries (Action Item)

- **Motion:** To move the approval of meeting summaries to the next meeting. (Hegarty-Lammers/Fejes)
- **Vote on the Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

6. Old Business

a. Selection of Five Finalists (Action Item)

Ms. Gardino directed the committee to the scored finalists in the meeting packet. Ms. Gardino walked the committee through the results, in which each juror scored the 11 finalists in order of ranking, 1 being the highest ranking and 11 being the lowest ranking. No two applicants could receive the same ranking. The average, median, and standard deviation of the rankings were included in the results. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers and Mr. Lounsbury asked for a visual of each applicant, and Ms. Gardino provided a description of each applicant's submitted concept.

Ms. Nordrum, Ms. Hegarty-Lammers, and Mr. Fejes asked how the Steam Engine concept (Artist ID 263557) moved from the 5th place to the 11th place. Ms. Gardino explained that the previous scoring process (1 – 20 points for each applicant) resulted in the ability for a juror to weigh more than one applicant equally. By ranking the 11 applicants from 1 -11, no one applicant could place at the same ranking as another applicant. Mr. Fejes asked if Ms. Gardino had learned anything or contacted CAFÉ for advice. Ms. Gardino said she learned that a lower scoring (such as 1 – 5 points verses 1 – 20 points) would have been more useful. She said she also learned that the instructions for how to score an applicant should have been much clearer, as there was some obvious confusion in scoring by the jurors; for example, the instructions did not include that the system would not allow a score of 0 for an applicant, even though that was what some jurors wanted to choose. Ms. Sprinkle said she thought it was interesting that a system that seemed so clear to use (CAFÉ) was not so clear when using the system.

Ms. Gardino said the final selection process would need to be discussed later in today's meeting. Ms. Gardino noted that the RFP is ready to be sent as soon as a motion is made to approve the top five from the ranked scores. The RFP has been drafted and is ready to be distributed as the committee had already approved the draft as amended and all edits had been received. Until a motion is approved, the RFP cannot be sent.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers asked for a moment to absorb the scores, and felt the last meeting lacked that needed time. She noted that there was quite a bit of variation in the scoring. Ms. Gardino agreed and said it was a function of art being in the eye of the beholder. Mr. Fejes asked if it might be a function of discussing the last vote. Ms. Sprinkle said she believes Mr. Fejes is referring to the numerical scoring which was approved at the last meeting, and then the second voting, which was done by ranking the final 11. Ms. Sprinkle said this would be the third vote. Ms. Gardino said she did not know understand the question. Mr. Fejes said he did not know how to express the question.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers asked clarifying questions regarding the criteria for scoring, noting that the criteria seemed to leave little room for awarding points based on artistic merit and scoring for project experience should have been seen as either present or not present in an application. She felt the resulting scores were confusing and did not recognize project experience. Ms. Gardino said the ranked votes resulted in an even playing field, as each juror had to rank each applicant based on numerical scoring. If there was a tie in the numerical scoring, the juror would subjectively choose which applicant should be placed above the other in the 1- 11 rankings. Mr. Fejes asked if that is what the committee really did, why the 5th place applicant moved to 11th place after ranking. Ms. Gardino said some committee members did not apply the criteria correctly, resulting in an invalid scoring of points given or not given to an applicant, which would negate the desires of the other committee members. Ms. Gardino explained how this type of numerical scoring could heavily influence the final results. Ms. Gardino explained the criteria were developed to help a juror score based on what was submitted. Ms. Gardino said the original scoring was so heavily skewed with the 1 – 20 points available that it appeared the criteria was not accurately applied in each juror's scoring process. Mr. Lounsbury said this makes sense to score based on the criteria, giving the applicant a score based on what was asked of them rather than whether or not a juror liked the concept.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers asked if the spreadsheet today reflects the most recent ranking. Ms. Gardino said that it did. Mr. Fejes said he was very disappointed that the only one that displayed any innovation and probably the committee's best chance for something really dramatic and spectacular in the greenspace moved from 5th to 11th place in the final rankings.

Mr. Fejes thinks part of the reason is because at the last meeting the committee discussed whether or not the steam concept was plausible and feels that is unfair, as that criterion was not applied to all other applicants. Ms. Nordrum said she believed Mr. Fejes made assumptions about how the other jurors scored the applications. Ms. Nordrum said she does not think the committee scored based on a technical ability. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers pointed out that the scoring had already taken place before the discussion of the plausibility of a steam concept took place. Mr. Fejes said that discussion may have affected this ranking. Ms. Nordrum said that was an assumption that cannot be made. Ms. Newcomer asked how that looks now that it has been brought up in a meeting. Ms. Gardino responded that the discussion of safety and traffic for that particular artist was brought up at the last meeting, but there were also discussions about particular aspects of particular applications in other meetings as well. Ms. Newcomer asked if someone could challenge our vote due to these discussions. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said she thought not, as there were a lot of things discussed at each meeting about one application that may not have been discussed about another application. Ms. Gardino said there was not a problem with discussion about a concern about a particular project, particularly any criteria listed in the RFQ/C or RFP. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers says she does not believe these discussions called into question the process of the committee. Ms. Gardino said she believes the last ranked scoring better represents the desires of the committee as a whole.

Ms. Sprinkle asked if the top five are presented with the RFP and cannot meet the deadline or other anomaly, what happens to the application. Ms. Gardino explained that as required in the RFP, the applicant must submit an executed agreement (contract) by Monday, October 1, 2012. If the applicant cannot provide the executed agreement, the next applicant in the ranking will be contacted.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers and Mr. Lounsbury noted how interesting it was that the committee was so split between abstract and realistic concepts. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said she was troubled about the absence of realistic concepts. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said there are five people on the committee that do not think there is anything wrong with non-realistic concepts. Ms. Sprinkle explained to Ms. Hegarty-Lammers the lower the number, the better the score. Ms. Gardino noted that the theme was abstract. Ms. Newcomer said that though the committee was diverse, the majority of the committee was more abstract, noting that it may have been different if it the committee included more individuals that liked a more realistic concept. Ms. Newcomer also said that she thinks the top five did come out. She noted that giving your honest opinion as a committee member resulted in a fair assessment of what the committee wants. Mr. Fejes asked if the honest opinion was based on applying the theme and Ms. Newcomer said it was applied how she interpreted the theme. Mr. Lounsbury said he didn't like the theme to begin with, but as he was only one person, what was he supposed to do. Ms. Rogers said she considers herself to lean more abstract in concepts, but found it interesting that none of her top five were found in the final eleven applications selected. She was surprised at how far towards the direction of abstract the final concepts were, given the talk about history and people amongst the committee. Ms. Rogers said that when she had to return to the top eleven and rank, she had to return and really consider the concept, because she had voted four of the eleven as "no" in the "yes, no, maybe" round. She was not sure what or how the process is working, and did not know how many other committee members had that broad of a gap between their top five and the final selections. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers noted that though she also leans towards abstract, she purposely selected more realistic pieces as she thought that reflected the public input. Ms. Rogers said she also voted based on the public opinion.

Ms. Plager commented that the committee seemed to have stayed true to their process and that as an artist, she would have responded with abstract concepts given the theme. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said that Ms. Plager did not have the benefit of seeing all of the concepts that were more realistic, and she felt there should be at least one concept in the top five that represented the public comments about the people. The committee reminded Ms. Hegarty-Lammers that the committee had decided to remove any particular people or persons from the theme. Ms. Gardino said she appreciated Ms. Hegarty-Lammers' concerns, but if the committee were to remove one applicant and replace it with another, it would not be a defensible process. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers suggested awarding the top ten with a stipend to include the more realistic concepts. Ms. Newcomer and Ms. Gardino reminded Ms. Hegarty-Lammers this was not possible. Ms. Gardino detailed the constraints of the FHWA grant, as well as the published information in the RFQ/C.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers asked if any members of the committee could think of a way to include a realistic concept, to help reflect the committee better. Ms. Newcomer said the top five reflect the theme and the committee's decisions. Ms. Sprinkle said the stipend should be spent on the top five to see how they look, and there will not be any realistic concepts because they did not make it to the top five. Ms. Nordrum noted that the concepts, whether realistic or abstract, were discussed as on theme and this is the resulting concepts. She feels as though the realistic concepts were on-theme and discussed by the committee, made it to the top eleven, and when the final five were selected, the committee gravitated towards more abstract concepts. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers suggested splitting the stipend. Ms. Gardino noted the stipend is not negotiable at this point due to the information already provided to the applicants. Ms. Newcomer confirmed the audits and the repercussions of these types of alternatives.

Ms. Gardino said the "hints" given in the RFP will help the applicant show the committee how their concept is uniquely Fairbanks. Mr. Lounsbury said he is curious to how the committee will react to where the art will be placed in the greenspace.

Ms. Plager suggested preparing the public for a positive reaction to the art. Ms. Sprinkle said there is nothing to say there will be a negative reaction, as Ms. Gardino has been actively explaining the project and purpose. Ms. Gardino confirmed. Mr. Fejes believes Ms. Plager's suggestion should be a part of the process. Ms. Gardino said if the committee can come to a decision about the top five today, she will be able to give a presentation to the Transportation Committee on the top five and send the RFP to the finalists selected. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers thinks the presentation would be premature and will result in a political problem, as there is not a local person in the top five; if one of the finalists does not accept the RFP, the finalists will change. Ms. Gardino outlined how that is not an issue, as the RFP will be issued as soon as the committee approves the top five.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers does not believe Ms. Gardino has done the homework required to present this artwork to the public. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said she has had lectures from people saying this should be a local artist. Mr. Lounsbury said he heard similar things, and just explains that with a federal grant, selecting an artist based on locale is not appropriate. Mr. Fejes said he believes it is not a good idea to present the top five to the Transportation Committee because they are concepts and there is a big difference between concepts and the final design. Ms. Gardino said she would present the finalists as a concept only. Ms. Plager said that if this was a hiring process, you would not announce who the selected are unless the offers have been accepted. Ms. Gardino noted she followed an example in which the finalists are listed in the RFP. Ms. Rogers said she has not seen this done in her experience.

Mr. Shumate noted that Ms. Plager's example of hiring process is not always the case and provided an example. Ms. Gardino said she would issue the RFP to the finalists, and the remaining six would be informed of the process in which if one of the finalists does not accept the contract, the next highest ranked finalist will be invited to submit a final proposal. Ms. Gardino said she did not see any reason not to publish this information to the public. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said the concern is that the public relations homework has not been done. Ms. Nordrum noted that although this is a public process, there is a difference between a public process and getting a concept out to the public. Ms. Nordrum concern is that the concepts may not come across with the same strength, and the concepts may be too unrefined at this point. Ms. Nordrum noted this is the difference between promoting the concepts and a public presentation of the concepts. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said this is about to be a big problem; she noted that the Transportation Committee is full of people like Mr. Lounsbury, Ms. Newcomer, and herself. Ms. Newcomer agrees that the concepts are not refined enough to be presented, because someone might see them and think that is what the final design is going to be. Ms. Sprinkle noted that the applicant thought it was good enough for the committee to give them a job. Mr. Fejes said the public is going to want more than a concept. Mr. Lounsbury noted that the entire application is not represented in just the concept. Ms. Gardino said she would not be presenting the entire application and she did not have to present the concept at all; but was advised by staff at the City that the presentation would not be an issue.

- **Motion:** To choose the top five scoring proposals we all voted for the third time. (Sprinkle/Nordrum).
- **Vote on the motion:** Six in favor. None opposed. One abstention (Hegarty-Lammers). Approved.

b. Draft Final Selection Process Discussion

Ms. Gardino asked for the committee's suggestions for the final selection process. Mr. Fejes asked if an interview will be conducted, and Ms. Gardino confirmed it was in the RFP. Mr. Fejes asked if the questions asked to the applicants had to be the same, and Ms. Gardino confirmed that they did and Mr. Shumate could answer any questions regarding that topic. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers noted her experience with process services contract interviews, which includes a dialog between the interviewee and interviewer without the presence of the other applicants. Mr. Shumate noted that this dialog can happen, but there needs to be a consistent, pre-developed set of questions asked of each interviewee. Ms. Sprinkle asked how the interviews would take place, and Ms. Gardino said they would be scheduled individually with the artist. Mr. Fejes asked if specific questions can be asked to each artist. Mr. Shumate said the questions must be the same, but follow-up can be asked for clarification.

Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said she thought there would be value in communicating to the artists that the selection committee is representing the community's values and letting them know what we're thinking. The committee did not understand Ms. Hegarty-Lammers' concern or question. Ms. Gardino reminded the committee that the theme should be what the committee is thinking, and that could not be changed at this time. Ms. Sprinkle said that she hears that perhaps Ms. Hegarty-Lammers is unhappy with the vote. Ms. Hegarty-Lammers said she is unhappy that there is not more variety in the top five, which would probably better represent the public. Ms. Newcomer said she wrestled with this, too, but the concepts are representative of the theme which was agreed upon by the committee. She believes that the committee has really followed the theme in the top five, and to change that will undo everything that has been done, which would also trigger reaction from the FHWA as the committee would be in violation of the process. Mr. Lounsbury noted that Dermot Cole would be key in public relations, as he

is a history guy that will be presented with five abstract concepts and he will need to communicate that to the public in a way that is not a crushing blow to the public. Mr. Lounsbury suggested conveying the final five to Dermot Cole in a way that will accurately represent the concepts.

Ms. Gardino asked if this should be discussed today, or did the committee want to schedule a meeting to discuss this final discussion. The committee agreed there should be an additional meeting to discuss this selection process. A meeting was set for Wednesday, October 3, 2012, 4:00 – 5:00 pm to discuss the final selection process.

7. New Business

None.

8. Public Comment Period

Anna Plager thanked the committee for their efforts.

9. Informational Items

a. RFP – Final

The committee agreed that Ms. Gardino could list the names of the finalists, but not present the concepts. Ms. Gardino reminded the committee to refer all questions from artists, press, or community members to herself.

Ms. June Rogers made the following closing remarks:

“One of the things I think we need to remember in all of this process is that we’re at the beginning of something that creates and makes history. At some point this will be a preferable piece. I think this argument that happens all too often at the beginning of a process is that the artwork is not as representational as perhaps people would like; but at some point it becomes an icon of that community. Instead of being too careful of our community and their understanding of the art, this may be a time when the community can understand art in a new and adventurous way.”

The committee thanked Ms. Rogers for her eloquent words.

10. Adjourn

- **Motion to Adjourn:** (Sprinkle/Newcomer).
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.

The FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee meeting will be held October 3, 2012 at 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM in the FMATS Conference Room.

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Donna Gardino, Chair
FMATS Art Selection Advisory Committee