



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

## Project overview

This is in response to the Notice of Motion NM2017-32 from September 2017. Administration must report back with recommendations by Q2 2018 on a new process.

In 2004 Council implemented the Public Art Policy “to pursue the integration of public art into the cultural fabric of Calgary, recognizing public art as a vital ingredient in Calgary’s ongoing development as a great city.” In 2017 September, Council directed Administration to report back with a progress update in Q1 2018 on recommendations on a new process for this policy.

Council directed Administration to investigate best practices for: fully engaging the public and their feedback; accommodating concept submissions from artists that foster and enhance local, regional, national and culturally appropriate artists; researching mechanisms for allocating tax dollars during economic downturns; and briefing Council and communicating to the public on the selection of successful candidates for public art projects. Engagement will be conducted to better understand citizens expectations about their involvement in the public art process and to inform recommendations of how The City can improve both when and how citizens are involved.

What the engagement strategy addresses is the need to fully engage with the public on how to receive their feedback and mechanisms for communicating to the public in general. Other points of the Notice of Motion will be addressed by Administration but are not within the realm of public engagement at this point.

This report is what we heard from participants in phase one where we spoke to people who had direct experience in the current public art process.

## Engagement overview

Phase one engagement targeted input from people who had experienced the current Public Art process. There were two in-person sessions at the end of January with: local artists and citizens with roles as current/past Public Art Board members or current/past public art jury members. We also asked for input electronically from local artists (those who could not attend in person) and from non-local artists who have applied for or been successful in a Calgary Public Art competition in the past two years.

The input collected from phase one will inform the development of phase two. Phase two will occur later in the spring and be an online opportunity for citizens to provide their input. All content collected from both phases will be utilized by Administration to inform the recommendations to Council in response to the Notice of Motion.

In-person we had 65 participants. There were 44 artist responses to the electronic survey.



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

## What we asked

We asked stakeholders who have experienced the current public art process to identify the steps in the process they were a part of and then expand on what challenges and improvements, in general, The City of Calgary could make to improve the current process. We also asked them to generate categories or types of art or locations for art that may be used in the engagement questions asked to the broader citizens.

## What we heard

We heard that those people with some experience of Calgary's public art process do not clearly understand "the" process and suggested that there is often more than one process depending on many factors. There were concerns that Public Art Board members and even the local artist community being ill informed did not position them to be allies or advocates of public art in Calgary. Most participants felt the communications of public art should and could be greatly improved including the website/online communications, more communications throughout (and beyond) specific public art projects and should have more involvement of or even driven by the artist(s) hired to do the work. People also suggested that being clear about the Jury selection process or how citizens apply to be part of public art juries was important. As well as more generally, there being better communications about all opportunities for public input into the public art projects. Additional concerns related to the language in the RFPs being limiting in many ways (including for artists with less experience – often local or of diverse cultural backgrounds) and that how funding is assigned is a challenge too. There were also many suggestions (and some frustrations too) for the questions to generate art types and location types that will be used in framing questions to the public in phase two.

- For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the [Summary of Input](#) section.
- For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section.

## Next steps

- Public Art's update to Council Committee happens on March 7, 2018.
- Phase two public engagement, once confirmed, will occur in April 2018 on [www.engage.calgary.ca](http://www.engage.calgary.ca).
- Final recommendations to City Council will happen in June 2018.



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

## Summary of Input

### Questions about the Current Public Art Process

For the questions about the process we asked participants to indicate what they understood to be the current Public Art process, what they saw as challenges with the process and then where in the process they felt there could/should be some or more public engagement or communications.

#### 1. What do you understand as the current Public Art process?

Below is summary of participants' responses.

Perceived step in the process (in order of occurrence)	Explanation or exceptions to this step
The public art policy or Public Art 101	Only came up from one group
City project initiated that triggers the Public Art 1% funding	Not clear how this decision is made or why it appears to vary from one Department to another.
City project may do public engagement related to public art	
Location for the art work is determined	Not clear how this decision is made or why it appears to vary from one Department to another – sometimes the location is pre-determined sometimes not
“Call” for artists	Can be an RFQ, RFP or RFQ then RFP
Artists submit proposals	
Proposals short-listed	
Artist selected	May be done by a jury, sometimes not (if in the case of jury, then the jury is selected before this step). Sometimes the Public Art Board is involved here (introduced to artist) but not clear if that always happens
Selection of Jury members	Not clear when this was done (before or while artist is selected) nor how it was done
Artist gets input from community/citizens for concepts	Doesn't always happen or may happen after Jury selects short-list
Concepts are short-listed or decided upon by Jury	
Risk-assessment conducted on short-listed/final concepts (design development)	
Project management for artist	This is done by the artist or by an external support (mentioned by only one group)
Artwork Fabrication/Installation	came up specifically from a couple groups but implied by others
Artwork unveiled/grand opening	
Evaluation of artist, process	
Maintenance of art work (as applicable)	

There was a variety of responses with different levels of detail depending on a number of factors they expressed such as: what process participants were familiar with (as they indicated different processes for



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

different types of Public Art), and if they had participated in different processes their depth or extent of experience allowed them to make more or less detailed suggestions to the question. As such some groups' responses had more or less steps, combined steps or felt it would vary depending on which City department the art project was linked to or what kind of Public Art process was occurring.

## 2. What challenges do you have with the current Public Art process?

The most common types of challenges that participants have with the current process are listed below from order of most frequently to less frequently mentioned. These were the top four categories of challenges.

Theme of Challenge	Types of challenges
The City's process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no clear process/the process changes</li> <li>• Concerns/suggestions on changes to funding and funding allocation clarity required</li> <li>• The RFP is limiting (costly, time consuming, hard to understand, and limits possible artistic direction)</li> <li>• Concerns about the committee/jury and its selection</li> <li>• Need to encourage more involvement from local artists and multi-cultural groups/artists</li> </ul>
Communications and resourcing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for on-going and wide-spread communications and engagement</li> <li>• Citizens don't understand the public art process or public art</li> <li>• Communications to the public get watered down/needs artist's input</li> <li>• Need for better communications within the process (i.e. between City and artist and other parties involved)</li> <li>• Not involving resources enough (Public Art Board, Communications, Engagement)</li> <li>• Build better relationships and education with Council</li> </ul>
Artists' process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More training/mentorship for artists</li> <li>• Need for project management and engineering expertise</li> <li>• Hard to get into large projects without experience and hard to collaborate</li> <li>• Tying location to art work doesn't always work</li> </ul>
Production and creation of the art work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about location</li> <li>• Final piece didn't meet expectations or timeline changes</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public art creates dialogue and vibrancy</li> </ul>



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

### 3. Where in the process do you see the need to improve public engagement and/or communications?

The most common things that participants mentioned are listed below from order of most frequently to less frequently mentioned. These were the top seven themes around improvements to communication and engagement in the public art process.

Theme area	Example or sample comment(s) to explain the theme
Need early and on-going communication and marketing	"requires ongoing community advertising of winning [artist], project, unveiling", "need to broadcast the message on multiple platforms...", "getting some exposure and explanation [of a contentious art project] earlier might have enlightened some people." "There should be public art profiles released regularly (outside of projects) for existing pieces..."
More flexible messaging, involve artists to tell the story	"Tell stories of local artists doing international work." "Public art/the artist should start the conversation (set the tone)." "A contemporary artwork needs to be communicated to be accepted – if the public doesn't understand it becomes an imposition." "The Fold in Quarry Park's new recreation centre...was done very well." "The works that have been well communicated have been driven by the artists using their autonomy to sidestep the filters and censorship [of] the communication chain."
Use technology to communicate	"...it's good you have Facebook events...", "webpage for project, contextualizing the work", "Top notch video/video-conferencing equipment to process the 'process'.", "Public art directory on Calgary.ca"
Public input before "the call" to artists or during the RFP process	"'public' [input] into how RFPs are written", "City should do engagement before the call goes out to artists", "RFP should include community involvement", "Engagement prior to proposal so the artist can take public feedback as part of proposal."
Education session on Public Art for citizens, employees, Council	"Direct communication to council -> master plan presentation with info panel and [board] members", "public education on types of art", " <i>What is great about public art?</i> School curriculum to educate students about Calgary's Public Art"
Connect value to community	"Art helps people express what the community, project, infrastructure means", "to do what's valuable for people and communities", "How might the public love art like they love sports", "stress how crucial public art is for successful life in Calgary and how it contributes to local economy, [which leads to a] vibrant city"
Use City or other resources as they are prescribed	"[Public Art] Board is mandated to advise City Council but no process to do so [for Council] to listen. Annual report to SPC was part [of that] but no longer.", "Use City Engagement", "Artist-City 'team up' together to tell the story (communications and engagement)", "[Public Art] Board is about building relationships, including the media, information to media/rep [on Board] who is trained..."



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

## 4. What types of art are you most interested in seeing in Calgary?

While some participants had concerns that this question was inappropriate or problematic being asked to them or to the public in general, as it would limit and be problematic for an artists' ability to be creative. There were others that felt the question needed to be expanded to include a better representation of atypical types of art work. The categories of response we received are listed below.

Art Type Categories (in no particular order)		
Functional	Sculpture/object based	Thought provoking/ emotional
Interactive	Space based	Art festivals/events
Short-term	Uses land	Involves community
Uses light	Educational	Not object based
Uses forces of nature/ natural elements	Uses outside walls/ surfaces	On infrastructure (utility boxes, busses, mail boxes, planters)

## 5. What types of locations do you feel public art has the most potential for positive community impact?

Some participants also had concerns with this question and its potential implications or restrictions (“talking about locations is very counter-productive to changing the understanding and perception of public art”) for public art work in general and for the understanding of what artwork can be if not limited by physical locations. However, others felt there was value in providing both physical and non-physical location ideas.

Location Type Categories (in no particular order)		
Parking areas/ concrete	Intimate/lost spaces	Utility boxes
Parks	Hillsides	Transit infrastructure
Trails/pathways	Manufactured spaces	Building sides or spaces
Pedestrian realms	Transit spaces	Interiors
Gateways (community entrances, City entrance, near major institutions like health care or airport)	Art destinations (virtual spaces, purpose-built sculpture park, gathering spaces for public art)	Travelling art (moving to different temporary locations, travelling artist-in-residence or digital art)
Interactive spaces	Natural spaces	Community spaces
Urban spaces (renewals)	Suburban spaces	Non-physical (education, program, sky/projections, etc)
Temporary spaces	Cemeteries	



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

## Verbatim Comments

The following is all of the verbatim comments we received for Phase 1. If an inappropriate word was used, the following is used to indicate that it was removed: [inappropriate word removed]. If personal information was submitted the following is used where that information was removed: [personally identifying information removed]. The comments include the conversation written down by table facilitators at the in-person sessions as well as the direct written comments received from online. All written comments are copied here directly including any typographic errors.

### 1. What do you understand as the current Public Art process?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Group 8	Group 9	Group 10	Group 11
City's "will" to have public art policy	1% of renovation budget goes towards public board	\$ allocated to PA when new project happens	\$ allocated to PA when new project happens	Starts with Public Art 101 - application process for artists	reason for opportunity - project + policy	BU Verifies need, some have artists on staff, get on early	Funding is allocated e.g. 1% of capital projects)	Funding is allocated e.g. 1% of capital projects)	Budget allocated (1% of budgets- new capital projects/\$ pooled-utilities < engagement sometimes happens before this step e.g. TIMN)	Find the RFP /RFQ
RFP + call for proposals	Request for qualifications	Mystery step where a decision is made on what it will be	Mystery step where a decision is made on what it will be	Request for qualifications = Canada council for arts, Canadians first	opportunity that triggers "the call"	RFP out	Location	Location	City department identifies location (some provincial restrictions)	Pay to apply (used to)
interview artists / artist selection	RFP	Call for application released	Goes to purchasing	RFP +	defining "the call"	Jury selection	Call for artists	Call for artists	Open call (RFP or RFQ depending on scale of project)	
jury is selected	Process to select the community assoc	Proposal submitted	international call for large commissions	Refine	call for proposal / artist	Jury decision	Artist supplies portfolio - examples of	Artist supplies portfolio - examples of	Artist researches location (sometimes does some	





# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

	jury member						previous work	previous work	community engagement) - develops concept for art if an RFP	
artist presents concepts to Jury	Jury panel selection	Short list	purchasing decided if the artist can do the work	concept approval	how/how selects the jury (their qualifications)	artist comes on a bit late	Jury selection (short-listed)	Jury selection (short-listed)	Jury selection (7 people, artists/city staff/community members) - public art staff are non-voting - use a scoring matrix	
	Receive email with applicants information to review	artist concept	short list		determine a timeline of when artist is involved - in project or not	Jury decides	Proposal - artists supply proposal	Proposal - artists supply proposal	Artist researches (& sometimes engages) to develop concept < artist needs to supply plan to public art	
	1st meeting reduce # or applicants to 3 / Dwindling down applications to final interviewed stage	production / fabrication	artist concept		jury selection when/how	artist creates the piece	Telephone interview	Telephone interview	Concept goes back to the jury for final approval.	
	phone interviews		production / fabrication		short list artist presentation to the jury	Jury selects a number of RFD	Community engagement (walk about) with artist	Community engagement (walk about) with artist	Artist signs a very long contract	
	Artists present their work / proposal				artist selection		Jury considers the proposal.	Jury considers the proposal.	If approved - start to build - city involved in	





# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 5, 2018

							Selects artists. (some confusion here, but it was agreed that only the final selected artist gives a proposal)	Selects artists. (some confusion here, but it was agreed that only the final selected artist gives a proposal)	varied capacities	
	Artist selection				understand context -social		Nothing further (this was based on a particular project in a community firehall - they expected more involvement but need not see any)	Collaboration (mentors & mentees) - based on a particular project in Kensington/Sunnyside - utility boxes - other than step 11 & 12)	Communicating & unveiling	
	public art board introduced				concepts		After installation - community walkabout to see the results.	After installation - community walkabout to see the results.		
	face to face meeting with artists to fine tune location? / artists work in tandem with City (project) manager				design development project development risk assessment					



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 5, 2018

(maybe) community member input to vision				project management for artists (by artist or external)					
(maybe) Meet with artists to review their concept <u>VOTE</u>				fabrication					
Artist announced to public				installation					
Construct Art				unveiling					
safety discussions				evaluation of process, artists, etc					
unveiling									
grand opening									

## 2. What challenges do you have with the current Public Art process?

who chooses the jury
Not all steps are in all processes
organizations apply to The City to get a chance to get public art
Depends on so many factors & Projects. Look more broadly as a program & not just process
There is no mandated process & no accountability therefore constantly changing
doesn't / does it happen for small scale projects
Communications between all parties. Once an organization has been selected there were many people involved on the Public Art side. Expectations by City for organization. Challenges with turn-over of staff & then strain on an organization's resources
Artist has a very different experience of the process than organization
Artwork didn't meet the expectations of the organization/of facility. Artist's background is about up-cycling metal but had risks, unfinished or challenges during installation & didn't have resources / skills to fix. Ended up 1/ extra cost to organization & timeline and red-tape for the fixes. The City disappeared during the process. **Good opportunity. In the spotlight



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Unclear who was in control of the process & decision
Timeline for completion impacted by weather but other things as well
Pooling (1% for public art) funding was for major piece but now it's an art-slush-fund & many actions aren't actually for public artworks
needs to be clarity & consistency in how its (funds) being used
Clear & articulated mandates & processes
department has some but maybe too much leeway for allocating public art at a location/project of pooling
Public Art Board - impossible to know whether / why the board's input will actually be used in process + projects
Use the Boards to make decisions: RFPs, process for artist selection, more like the Urban Design Review Panel (UDRP)
Process for public attendance, submissions & admin to follow-thru w/ recommendations by admin & dedicated, on-going communications
currently the communications are not consistent by The City -board's messages don't need to be taken as serious or priorities
Public Art Board is involved way too late -> after a contract is signed, then only there as a scape-goat/buffer for blame
No clear view of jury member's role with follow up & before it comes to the jury
artist selected + contract when it comes to the Jury, felt like the input was heard, but not clear how it was used (not clear how this happens/why)
No status update or project installed
what happens if the concept isn't possible
Even less clear to general citizens & were so concerned but don't make the effort
chasing people to be involved isn't a good use of Public Art funds
can't ask general public everything
People don't know how budget selection happens
Citizens don't understand the value Public Art brings to the community
Public Art creates a lot dialogue & level of interest in this "around the dinner table". -isn't that what community is all about? For creating dialogue! Asking what it means, what it could be & thought provoking
Really good things have come out of this
share lessons learned as part of process (with organizational process)
how RFP's are written is a challenge to get representational art / responses especially as abstract concept & that's limiting who influences how the RFP's are written?
Make it part of the process that involves the public more
segregation in calls has issues
people who make calls need to be empowered
not diversity for diversity sake
the right people need to be heard
more admin than actual artistic work
administrators need to flexible
accessible process is needed
application fee is absurd



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

duration it requires -less rigorous timeline
some feel segregated idea bad
it's a process, can't be prescriptive
Jury process, eliminate biases -transparency, pre-screen
Competition for a piece of public art, why?
should be a lottery selection for jury vs current process
Don't include budget in RFP to avoid padding or over build of concept
Technology to support conference calling
How do we know community members represent / reflect to community voice
How is the jury selected?
public perception
who sets / says it needs to be 1% on one project ?
lack of trust in The City
how are things communicated?
turmoil within The City's own departments and communications -ties up stories - too many hoops
lack of communication on why/how we "hire"
1% connected to infrastructure Can't we pool?
not always connected to community/doesn't make sense
number of people coming out to engagement sessions are lacking
trendy vs unique vision
location selection!!
timelines -artists selected based on past work vs current/new concept
no connection between artist and community
Qualifications -artists expected to act as PM and fabrication
Jury doesn't see all the submissions (if goes through finance)
Visual of what you are proposing is missing from the proposal, would like to see a visual component that is project/site specific
tendency to choose concept vs aesthetic
No humor in works
Is The City the biggest patron of the visual or other arts? Why?
what happens if the jury feels no one should be selected?
Public art is design
sometimes the aesthetic does not work
pieces near where we move quickly does not do the piece justice
missing key subject matter experts on projects (ie architect)
unrealistic expectations of artists knowledge. Edmonton has a better process
how do you prevent plagiarism? Reminders to artists and education on copyright law?
more alignment to private proposals
development of space around piece isn't right (ie traveling light could use beautification of area around the piece)



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

community is not ready to accept artists work
how do you bring community engagement into the design? Lack of understands by artists and by community
artists need to be required to have diversity not just local vs international. M - F - Aboriginal etc
subjective. Depending on project
artist working in community course \$200
How do employees have voice?
engagement = accountability. Who is the decision maker? Jury
challenge because of conflicting values of what is good art or not
public opinion of public art program, needs work
How do you balance quality of community engagement
Amount of engage = budget. Dependent on where + what
how are jury members picked? Variety of members engineer, artist, community member.
how can we hear from public art Calgary?
No proper venue for public discussion
No civic art currently
public comment encourages after the RFP is up
Does the work of art have to be tied to a site? Does it have to be on the highway?
Visualization is difficult -A mock up would be helpful part of the budget
What kind of artist is being sought? Local artist may need more time for proposal itself
systemic problem at the beginning, should have more choice about actual location can the artist have more choice/freedom on location?
location preset can be problematic (+ other requirements)
what does The City do to help new artists w/ PM. Not many have happened yet
jury can feel empowered to say no to all + re-run call
depends on RFP/Q w/ RFQ could have
How to decide RFP/RFQ
RFQ risk challenge that an idea may be submitted but used by another
RPQs can limit depending on the size ->more qualifications
RFQ - look at portfolio & then select from fewer concepts
RFP - Jury can see many works to look at
convince + inform council of (all the potential + current) incubator for local artists to get a bigger picture to understand the value of public art.
Clarity of culture Policy + other City "art-related" components
education of how diverse / embedded public art is
don't solve the wrong problem
RFQ can carry less risk
need for direction in public art + to communicate direction / plan strategic operation + culturally (direction). What's going on in other jurisdictions
Build better relationships with Councillors (public art + artists) advocacy to council
City -citizens + council, don't understand arts importance + rich cultural involvement to promote creativity and innovation



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

What was the process for "private" public art?
opening public art to more variety (size + type)
more training for artists locally (facility). Social + education
what is the definition of Public Art as part of culture (museum)
City website need better + easier to access info
have artists more information shared to them about projects -tools to be champions
checklist for the process with timeline
the language + process to apply "the call" is a huge challenge
funding models are different in different departments + unclear how much funding + when public art is informed
"locations" as well as other conditions for performance or other
funding pool to better use public art funding
make the application model more accessible to diversity not targeted culture x only. More multi-cultural input or artists. Richness of a City. Commit to engage to cultural diversity
Risk to local artists is budget or project are cat [?] where small/med projects are "training-ground". Ensure small projects are fair compensation
maybe don't need as many big projects
have in house artist who understands the process for jury decision
jury makes the decision for design, public may not have
every election candidates make this a potential issue
RFP /RFQ
Composition of Jury. Community (CA), City Rep (project rep), Artist (at least 3). Small project, negotiate budget, large project -pay an honorarium
Public art Reserve - policy -pools money to allow flexibility
RFQ (who are you) short listed 4-6 artists, artists not paid for RFP/RFQ - could you pay the shortlist? Artist then present credentials (board members can observe, not participate)
How to engage more people? Eg Tuscany 700 people, how to engage more people?
Barrier between public art board + communications department
Transparency is crucial
communication / transparency of the process is huge
need to raise the profile
fundraisers -relationships are crucial
lack of understanding of council and the board
Advisory board -must be networked must communicate
Advocacy + promotion is key, citizen
Selection of board process needs to have better description of roles/purpose -not very clear, needs to be very clear & descriptive, needs relationship + knowledge base level
Silenced by city administration for last fiscal -potential system -board reports to council -mut many not be occurring - new board may be empowered
placement -can we reconsider this? How we place for the art. Need flexibility on where it's located
Who represents citizens? How do we have consensus?
Artists should be more involved in the decision for location



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Liaison with NPC at CA meetings for public art. Need to connect to Calgary economic development ->bring positive impact to economy
Talk to calgary economic development
vibrant City attracts bright citizens + attracts businesses
Board must - include other artists at the opening
Not enough weight given to local (Alberta) artists (selection started from a list which included mostly non-local artists)
Too many artists on Committee (as opposed to lay persons) - at least half (4 - 5 artists, 2 community members, arts centre)
Artists not always tuned into the community (e.g. 1 was from Canmore)
Jury not involved past selection - didn't even have an opening - no communication at the tail end.
Public art not always publically accessible (shouldn't be inside generally - not in a fire hall)
No support from public art group for follow up (e.g. "opening"/celebration/unveiling)
Lack of communication of final art and where and how to see it.
Working with payment towards the artist is a challenge (from specific project in Sunnyside/Kensington - utility boxes)
Weather (for water/landscape art) - how does it look in winter?
Architectural changes e.g. things on the main project change that effect the public art - but not communicating with each other
Relevance to the community and location aren't always apparent.
Do \$500,000 projects have to be "1 piece" - can they be more effective if seperated into smaller projects?
Tying to location & full 1% doesn't always work.
Not a lot of minorities involved (specifically indigenous - also non English speaking) - might need an extra effort. Some artists may not be aware of call (needs to be communicated more widely)
Finding calls (RFQ) that I can be an acceptable choice for (only really small or really large projects, nothing in between)
No opportunities for an apprenticeship to work with an artist more used to large projects.
No oppourtunities for mentorship or training beyond Public Art 101 (201, 301... possibly collaborating with art college) - would love to see a series of workshops
No oppourtunities for artists to collaborate on projects (all must have experience with large projects)
Gap in experience (e.g. artists as project managers)
1 good example project allowed the lead artist to work with someone else who advised on the PM process.
Need more collaboration between public art, artists & ACAD.
Concerns about selection of jury members: Do people from the wider community reflect the artistic community? - need diversity - is it biased? - need more info on the process (1 individual felt that the jury should not have community members)
Lack of experience at the level of larger projects (\$/size) - lack of experience doing concept drawings
Would like to see examples of successful applications
Treating artists like architects or engineers (need to be able to do schematic drawings)
Public art board cannot recommend an engineer (you have to pay one)
Lack of follow up to improve application (tried to contact - often no response)
You need that 1st project - need to develop a name
Not seen as professionals
Collaboration: we haven't necessarily worked together before - if you don't have examples of projects together, cannot be successful.
How public art is communicated (during & after)
Communicating the process.





# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Engaging with the public
The artist needs an opportunity to communicate with the public - to contextualize the work - message gets watered down
Lack of public understanding about public art - if the public could see the process it would help.
Promotion & being able to show the process to the public.
As an artist you can't speak to the media.
No space for experimentation in the process.
Budget and funding the professionals (e.g. need an engineer - whose work will be challenged by the internal engineers) - it's expensive to hire - why can't artists use the internal engineers? Depending on the project - need different types of engineers.
Display of concepts to public (voluntary)
Should the final few proposals be shown to the public? Some concern about the art than being in the public even if not chosen)
Lack of communication of process (incl selection/budgets etc.)
Dept of Public Art can't speak to the public (they would be a positive voice)
The city has made patrons LAZY! They don't offer \$ directly for art
RFQ's only at first then RFP.RFP + RFQ in context. RFQ more fair to the artist. RFP problem is \$ + time is constraint. RFQ doesn't require upfront cost
Used to have to be part of infrastructure, some departments this is true.
Don't recognized in "city" talent
Artists should be able to come in sooner and be able to respond less decoratively (more holistically)
Call to artist same as construction, some require pre requisite course
Controversy based on budget -disclosing budget
includes residency type art
2 big issues in Calgary this highway art -education is needed - media creates controversy
currently not defined by geography
city looks out not in
City becoming more regional
geographic -need local + international, Calgarians competing against the world
Curatorial (eg. Light project) -sub process
Art that is RELEVANT (site, community, artist) RESPONSIVE
Develop a Communication team w/ Art Specific communicators -ACTIVE + PRE-EMPTIVE
EMPOWER STAFF -work w/ staff, give them communication resources, allow them to become the main advocate 4 artists
The artwork should rive the process, adaptive, less risk adverse, Empower the Project Manager
Look at WATERSHED + as precedent -non-site -pooling of money
Communication -sensitive + arts specific -get ahead of the story -the Public Art Program needs CONFIDENT communications and justify choices
Good work takes time
Authentic Engagement -share process. Professionally document work/process. Create robust communication plans. Empower staff. Empower artists, through these, empower public. Documentaries. Artists talks. Photographs. Curatorial essays.
Artists should be interested in Public _____ in diverse ways. This process should NOT be defined in advance
Public Art not empowered to communicate Artist voice goes through CSC base



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Tendency to "shop + pop" works created
Take the next step (low budget OK), how to be competitive
maybe lower bucket projects help to climb latter
help to raise profile
lack of curatorial. Need to listen to SME in Art Field
RFP -shopping for something that already exists. Reassuring for Jury -no risk
Process run in fear -risk adverse. Need support from City to take risk.
Calgary requires too much paperwork -pre vetting should reduce this
City doesn't understand "artistic process"
Need to be a City Liaison for Public Art
Needs to be someone on the artist side working with City
Artist not community engagement experts
Politicians use it to their advantage
saying nothing encourages poor behaviour
need to value artistic
reinforce positive stories
get a head of the media story -not reactive
Ability to say "no" -stand behind decision being made
If public art approved, not allowed to promote
better public art website
"news freeze" on public art -not acceptable
communications on public art at "arms length from City"
City warns not to advertise (as the artist) -need to promote -need to advocate
list of public engagement
want community engagement -but don't let communicate
Council creating problems -slow + risk adverse
Fear of public ridicule
Lack of understanding from upper management. Workload + micro management slowing the process.
Disempowering staff to act in the best interest of the artist
lack of respect to the artist
Brief can't be too prescriptive, must be open. Media blows it out of proportion
Council need to empower the staff. Internal City staff need more support. Disempowered, low City staff morale
Too prescriptive when contacting the artist
Can't have own photographers
too much red tape, lowers
Chances for local artists to participate. Perhaps have a program for mentor/mentee (like one professional public artist paired with one local emerging artist, learn the ropes) it's difficult to become a public artist without experience.
"Getting the word out to all available artists.
Solution - link on City website specifically for upcoming RFQs. Monitor the number of artists accessing the site and who has downloaded the RFQ. "



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

I am not an artist. Past jury member and when I hit next I seemed to have skipped to this question somehow as my first one. I would like for the online signing up to be a jury member to be made available again.
"Follow Watershed+ model by commissioning the artist not the work for all 1% projects
Also, a project should not be tied to a location, instead it should be broadened to a neighbourhood. Everything looks weird next to a highway."
Artists are not involved early enough in the construction project
Having at least 3 Canadian artists in the final 20 applicants before selecting the final 5 for interviews.
Some of Calgary's population feels uninformed & alienated from the process. Art is an INVITATION; the program should approach it that way. We need inclusive, positive & informative PUBLIC conversations about Public Art! A check-box voting system is a
The jurors are heavily weighted towards artists with usually just one community representative. I would at least double or triple that number.
I believe the current public art process is pretty fair, transparent and works well. Public Art Project calls are posted with a clear description of the project to be developed and with the qualifications expected from the artist and/or artist team.
Regular updates and promotion of project progress.
Not seeing calls for submission publicly advertised. More local advertising of calls for submission.
Capable artists who have worked on large projects for other artists before seem to be not considered for future projects, because they were not in charge. That ensures no one new will get a chance.
The PSO document is arcane and much of the requested information/the framing of questions doesn't make sense for the work (curating art for the Open Spaces gallery). Need a tailor made form for different types of projects. I'm not building a road
Allow the local arts professionals to be more involved in the process
In the social practice initiative requiring projects be undertaken with community organization(s) only after selection was it announced that no collaborative community organizations were involved: this led to an unreasonable load/timeline for artists
I would have liked to see more qualified candidates in the lead of a given public art project. Is the wording in the "call" or how the word gets out that results in who applies? Would targeting potential candidates help?
I think that when a RFP goes out, the budget numbers should not be included. It is very easy for someone to increase the scope of work to fill the budget and that is not necessarily what is in the best interest of the project.
there have been too many projects that the public do not understand, appear expensive, and which do not seem to connect with the location.
The call was new and asked for a literary lead--but the wording was not clear as it mostly read as a call for artists and the asks were art-related, not writer-related
Communication is the biggest challenge. The work needs to be properly contextualized and communicated to the public. This is nearly impossible to do through the city's current communications chain of command.....
Communication to the public on the public art process. more clear information on local vs international artists. A more thought out publicity timeline that is pro-active, not re-active.
A lot of the previous public art in Calgary have been male artists. Encourage more POC and female artists to apply. I can tell at times Im overlooked because of my gender and my age.
"The value of the contract is set but you can't evaluate the value of one approach vs the other.
How do you get your money's worth? Solution - Get detailed breakdown of costs from artist."
Involve the public through an 'inspiration' session with the artist. It has to be clear that they are not designing the piece but instead providing info for the artist to consider. At the end, the artist can give a talk about their influences.
We need better 'Opening' of the pieces - who is present with the artist having an opportunity to speak about the piece, inviting the community and all other stakeholders
"superficial answer to a complex question & will absolutely not solve the problem. Ppl want to be informed about, welcomed by, & invested in the process. Artists & arts workers, engineers, fabricators, jury members, & other citizens must be supported"



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

<p>There is a disproportionate desire to not provide any guidance to the artist in any way. There is no reason why certain desirable elements could not be communicated while still allowing a great of freedom of artistic interpretation.</p>
<p>For every jury selection, I have seen a diverse committee including local artists, engaged citizens and members of the community association related to the project to be developed. What I think it could be improved is more opportunities for emerging</p>
<p>Not enough diversity on juries. New recruitment procedures, such as open calls for jurors.</p>
<p>Too many of these projects are outsourced to other cities and countries when there are more than capable artists and businesses here. When I hear that a firm in Los Angeles is coordinating artistic projects here it makes me sick. USE LOCAL!!!!!!</p>
<p>The process of getting information on the website for new art work is incredibly poor. Two weeks to change things = outdated information is on the site and misinformation. Faster more responsive web admin</p>
<p>Trust artists</p>
<p>In the social practice initiative orchestrated through workshops with mentoring artists it became clear there was no prior planning of the content delivered through each workshop to ensure coherence and integration</p>
<p>Community involvement (especially large projects) needs to be stepped up and there has to be accountability when a variety of groups are consulted. Who did they talk to and when.</p>
<p>Better consideration of the specifics of the location and the actual infrastructure project so that art can be created that can be appreciated in that location.</p>
<p>Once hired, all the logistics needed in order to get paid were not made clear ie., insurance, etc for PO numbers and that these could only be processed every two weeks at the City's end. This delayed payment for our leads until almost the end.</p>
<p>....Please give Calgary Public Art the freedom to communicate with the media and the public directly. Public art is contemporary art, and without proper context the works can feel inaccessible and alienating....</p>
<p>Communication to the arts community. Help us be allies once we fully understand the process and the selection early on especially before publicity stage. Assuming lessons learned no publicity on half finished art projects and avoid election time.</p>
<p>Calgary seems to have an 'aesthetic' it wants to uphold. Usually pleasing to look at but boring. Art needs to be challenging, think outside the box at what can be done. (Like the A/P box project) encourage more of those. ask galleries their opinion!</p>
<p>Public engagement. Solution - get out there early, explain the parameters, welcome and catalogue the feedback, come back and explain what feedback was and how its being interpreted. Shouldn't be any surprises at unveiling.</p>
<p>My jury felt too 'art world'. We largely picked artists that other jury members knew personally. There were two curators - gallery art is different from public art; one is enough. Lastly, there was a juror from Vancouver, that was inappropriate</p>
<p>Jury process must be unbiased</p>
<p>by you to share the stories of each artwork with the public through appropriate mediums, as the artwork is developing. This is an invitation for public engagement that is real and in-depth.</p>
<p>local artists such as professional courses and workshops like the "Artist Working in Community Course" and "Public Art Workshop Series." Opportunities like these prepared artists to work more successful in a public art project with their community.</p>
<p>The drawbacks compared to other locations are that there is not enough prioritization of local artists, and in general there are not enough opportunities for local artists.</p>
<p>The City of Calgary's public art program is fair and informed by community input. It seems to provide a fair and open process for artist selection.</p>
<p>the process seems quite similar to most other jurisdictions I have applied to</p>
<p>I believe the artist selection process is fair and follows recognized industry standards. The metrics that juries use to evaluate applications is clear and leads to decisions made with objectivity. The composition of the juries should aim to be representative of the population of Calgary as a whole (age, gender, ethnicity, etc.)</p>



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

I'm not sure how widely the calls for submission are distributed. Increasing the number and variety of places the RFQs are posted could help attract more varied, qualified and artistically interesting applicants to the program.
It would be helpful to get a direct email similar to other cities.
I did not participate in this process, but would be supportive peer-reviewed selection processes.
It is considered a better approach to use an RFQ process, which would remove the emphasis on object and the 'like dislike' dichotomy that sets up, and focus on the artists ideas throughout the process. the artist would then be part of shaping the whole approach to the project, they would have the time from the beginning to build meaningful relationships to stakeholders, community etc, and have knowledge and experience in the context of the place - which is more than just site. Calgary has a bigger jury than most cities and is not considered best practice to keep expanding your jury for citizen input. more expertise throughout the whole process, and having the artist along the whole journey of the project will provide more public dialogue.
The combination of calls to local, national and international artists works well at this point. Very much in keeping with many other public art programs.
The process is slow, cumbersome and the consultants do not seem interested or enthusiastic about tackling the problems raised by the project.
Artists work closely with the design team and the Public Art Department. This is a common method for most municipalities.
it seems similar to other jurisdictions I have worked within
I appreciate that artists are paid for their time to develop concepts.
More access to the capital project designers and the City business units would help artists in the concept development process. In my experience, it was difficult to access City staff with background information and context that could inform the artistic work.
We were very impressed with the concept development process for Ripple as it allowed time for unique and authentic collaborations between the Blackfoot and settler community where people came together and moved beyond divisions to create a common vision
Can't say. I did not participate in this process.
the artist is asked to come up with a concept in isolation. even with a brief site visit, the artist is coming up with the same kind of work, permanent sculptural work with virtually no knowledge of the place, community the histories etc. they are expected to respond to way too many goals, and solve urban design woes, without any specific learned and experienced knowledge of the place and people. the more we diversify what kind of works artists can do, not always adding more permanent work but process-based, durational etc, the more people will feel engaged and the more artists will want to be part of the program. right now we are 'shopping for art objects' and public art as a field is moving away from this, our urban experience is changing so should our public art process.
Having been on the Public Art Board and on many juries, I've been very pleased with the thoroughness of this process which was developed through much research in best practices in other programs in North America. Do selected artists have enough time to develop their concepts? Possibly not. At times I've thought the process is more advantageous to the city's timelines than what the artists need to create and present.
Not sure
Shortlisted artists are asked to submit proposals that are judged and selected. This is a very common method for most municipalities.
similar to all other jurisdictions I have applied to
The presentation to the selection jury is a process that makes sense. The jury is well versed in the context and scope of the project and with the artists' past work and therefore able to make an informed decision.
It is important for art experts and well informed community members (jury members) to make the concept selection decisions. Please do not implement to a public voting model. I believe this would degrade the quality of the work commissioned.
We actually prefer the Calgary process we had where we were allowed to develop the concept after being chosen. As our preferred process is form follows energy, and we do not come into projects with pre conceived design ideas, this works well for us.





# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

<p>Can't say. I did not participate in this process.</p>
<p>this is a flawed question - there shouldn't be a 'concept selection' as that is place every expectation and outcome on the aesthetics of an object, when we've entirely lost the artists ideas, thinking and process, which is what artists are good at, asking questions exploring in their own way. we need the artist on board at the beginning and as they have time and get to know the context of the place and people, then their ideas and experiences throughout the whole project at many periods throughout are communicated, shared by The City. public art is not decoration for our cities, so we should prioritize the artists way of thinking and working, ideas and process and experiences, that is what people want and expect in 21st century urban experiences, they expect more than just a pretty object plopped into place randomly, it makes no sense to them when the 'concept' is removed from any supportiing narrative about their work, ideas, process etc. THAT is waht should be emphasized</p>
<p>The shortlisted artists present concepts for their proposals which are quite intensely reviewed by the juries. Lively and open discussions are in my experience, well facilitated by public art staff who manage these sessions.</p>
<p>The public art program is a political football. Too many people in the city government are not on the side of public art, and use it as a way to score political points.</p>
<p>Communication- both internal and external.</p> <p>I found internal communication between City departments to be excruciatingly slow. It was easier to get information about the capital project timeline and construction schedule, etc. from community partners. It felt like Public Art was out of the communications loop and that it is perceived as a nuisance that other City staff don't want to deal with.</p> <p>The marketing strategies and policies are very restrictive. It is difficult to maintain relationships with community partners within the City's communications guidelines. The artist is left without important information about the process and unable to relay pertinent information to community partners.</p>
<p>We are not getting email notices of new public art opportunities we may be suited for.</p>
<p>communications. in comparison to how artists and their approaches and ideas are communicated in other cities here and internationally, its appalling that we dont share with the public except when we announce something has shown up randomly near them, in their places, or anywhere in the city. we need to share stories, experiences and thoughts from the artist, from the beginning. we undermine the public by expecting them to love something that's bland bc we're afraid of controversy, then its installed like magic and we wonder why people dont like it. citizens are looking for new ways to see things, and embrace new ideas and challenges and love something they can be part of, so why dont we create public art opportunities of all kinds, not just one way of working, and bring them into the work, let the artist guide how they see approaching a project, as they are the experts and more meaningful relationships will happen. other gaps are clearly leadership and support for the staff and experts in the field to encourage broader public art dialogue. there are proper ways to commission art and work with artists, and if the city doesn't speak up others will and they'll take over a false narrative, the City has an opportunity to actively create dialogue and meaningful conversations btw artists and the public, we need to stand up for contemporary public art, for artists andf for commissioning art that reflects the contemporary moment. to aim for the best most interesting challenging work and not back down every time some bad comment is made.</p>
<p>It appears that the public art is still tied to location of the municipal projects be they roads, bridges, buildings. One of the problems with doing this is that some locations may not be appropriate for public art for a variety of reasons.</p>
<p>The public needs to be better educated about the benefits and ROI of public art projects, and city councilors need to be the ones explaining this, rather than complaining about it to suit their own campaigns.</p>
<p>Change the perception and understanding of the public art program within the City administration itself. Eliminate the stigma. Make it just as necessary for business unit staff to work with public art as it is for public art to work with the business units.</p> <p>Provide more information about the artists, their process and work with City staff.</p> <p>Provide more information about the artists, their process and work with the public.</p> <p>Improve staff understanding of the different ways that artists might work in.</p>



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Update the Artist's Master Agreement to include other ways of working and producing public art that is not permanent sculptural pieces.
Provide written timelines and update them with the artists as the project develops.
Create a marketing and communications plan at the beginning of the process that is agreed upon by all parties.
Inform marketing/communications staff when the proposed work takes the form of printed materials or similar, that may be interpreted as marketing materials.
We could check weekly on the City of Calgary site or call the public art department to let them know we are interested in working again with the City.
communication should happen throughout the project, so the public has a chance to hear about the artist, the artist has a chance to shape how they want to build relationships which are more meaningful if the artist has time to make them! to research and know, so the artist needs to be brought in at the beginning and have some freedom to shape the process with staff. the City needs to find a way to create public art dialogue not be scared of it, share more and talk more, bring artists into the fold to think about how to talk about interesting issues and ask questions, we need to support our artists and arts community by listening to their expertise and supporting that, that is success, when we support more than just objects popping up in places. the public art program should create a public art plan that is a holistic vision for waht it wants, what the collection needs and for how artists are working in a contemporary way, and not just do every project on every site because there's a capital budget to do it. we need to ask critical questions about why we are doing this, what it means, who is it for and how much freedom does the artist have within each project opportunity? otherwise we can responding rather than pro actively seeking out meaningful projects and opportunities.
I would like to see more attention paid to pooling large amounts of monies and devoting them to commissioning more visible, more impacting public art. Too little money per project leads to mediocre results.

### 3. Where in the process do you see the need to improve public engagement and/or communications? (Some also answered with examples where the communications were good or bad and why they felt that)

Jury give input / brainstorming to be considered by the artist
Public Art 101
Speak to other recipiants
"public" into how RFP's are written
People need to be informed sooner -how does the public become aware of public art?
"like + not like" isn't the right way. How to give ppl transparency
roster of artists for electricity boxes
more people need to be engaged
major vs smaller projects and need for variety of processes
Art helps express what the comity, project, infrastructure means
Board is mandated to advise City Council -> no process to do so (to listen). Annual report to SPC was part but no longer
Direct communication to council -> master plan presentation with info panel and members





# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Highly problematic to have Board member-participation in a City-facilitated session that filters or creates another barrier to direct communication with Council by the Board
Board members recognize their views will be filtered through admin
Challenges around the "performance" of engagement. Was it done soon enough. How was input used at all levels. By public Art Board, by Jury members, by CA, and how is that communicated with the general public
People need to be pro-active. But their expectations need to be set around WHO is engaged or WHAT and HOW it's used. At different levels (ie springbank Hill garbage can paintings)
How to do what's valuable for people and communities
variety of places for projects so people can connect with the process and the art differently
Public art directory on calgary.ca
Top notch video/video conferencing equipment to process the "PROCESS"
requires ongoing communications / marketing
requires ongoing community advertising of winning artist/project/unveiling
communications should be based on community need vs broad
Get ahead of the news in unveiling
involve stakeholders in jury panel
hands on engagement with community
Document process? Use City Engagement
Meaningful questions
produce public art catalogue with story?
Engagement Business Unit must "sign off" Communications Plan
Art story on buses Marketing Campaign
involve graffiti artists
Include full budget in the news not just the 1% for art
Start early
state at the beginning that art piece is involved in the project and the cost
idea overview done by the city
City should do engagement before the call goes out to artists
Artists should engage citizens in their proposals -this holds a problem of how much time you are going to / have to spend
In selection, pick from concept designs not just written concept
Concept should include design of the piece. This could be important to the community to show citizens what the artist does. Part of the process. <b>Question: does this force trendy vs unique public art</b>
Documentation of the process needs to happen throughout (suggestion for video / photo)
Can we have communications online about public art?
Public art communications should be integrated into project communications
lack of communication on art piece and connection to the community
promotion & supporting pieces that are there
communicating art earlier
RFP should include community involvement
Refine step should include more engagement
Artist registry should include public roster
How RFP's are shared -access - scope of work
RFP on City of Calgary website artist communications, FB or Groups



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Artists propose the space of Vancouver. Specific criteria. Narrow down the number of artists what can so the work and contact directly
Citizens should have an opportunity for feedback but not decision maker
Communications need to be ongoing
Public education on types of art
Residents + business engaged
Art experience for engineers + City of Calgary 101 for City staff
Mandate from City that there must be a theme - consistency
Earlier is better
Advertisement. Café management
more solidified consultation process
Between RFO selection + concept pitch
When you present the concept, public input is good
engagement of citizens or information to citizens
Community event with "call". Citizen input
inform citizens of short list
citizen input prior to concept but before contract
inform citizens, "progress" report
Citizen inform + announcement
Citizen input by CITY
Communicate out through CA size + type of project.
share all success stories. Tell stories of local artists doing international work. How to capture the energy of positive public art experience + share those stories
Even pooled \$\$ for overall education + communication for Public Art
What is great about public art? School curriculum to education students about Calgary's Public Art, advocate to provincial government
"public perception of art. How might the public love art like they love sports"
"who is the board , how long, how often does membership turn over?"
Public Art budget = misconception 1% for public art -. Key soundbites (+ the trade offs of budget). Is it provincially mandated? Needs a proper budget.
Making the budget relatable, clearly explaining where \$\$ goes (not all artist fee etc). Make the public art budget relatable ie to that whole project (20m of road?)
marketing + advertising publicly to educate
Citizen involvement at concept stage
Better communication with community association and councillor
council involvement to spread the work
Council sits on Board may be solution. Need to be more significantly involved in the process
How to stop council candidates making art an issue - communication between councillors, CA, and residents
Board is about building relationships including the media, information to media-need/rep who is trained maybe the chair? Less likely to "attack" if built a relationship -level of outreach - FCCC
Process is ok - communications, especially to council
need citizens to be informed (including council)
Communication during + after is crucial



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

communication responsive and fast
should never be a vote
conceptual point + construction point
Through existing channels, be proud and supportive of the process
during the opening
artists must have a role in explaining the conceptual idea -communication, website + the map -> make it interactive
if don't like it do something proactive about it
internally ask BU's what's the more appropriate way?
lack of awareness for openings (board, jury, CA, councillors)
stress how crucial public art is for successful life in Calgary + how contributes to local economy = vibrant City
Communication at the end - what happened, where is the art - opportunity for opening
Call for Committee/Jury members could go wider outside of the CA to capture more community members.
Communicate throughout the process (get to know the artist) - easier with local artists
Communicate about where we're at in the process (promote beyond the website)
Councillor could be involved in the communication (connection with the community)
Question: Was the blue ring part of the public art process?
Information about why certain pieces are chosen and where they are located. E.g. Bowfort Towers (< need to talk to the Indigenous people)
Functional map about where the art is (paper & online)
Information available on all public art projects in one spot (detailed about why chosen, what materials, meaning, info about the artist...)
Artist selling their story to the public < in person if possible
Public unveiling (w/ the artists invited)
By the side of the road: don't have time to study
Engagement prior to call (to inform the call)
Engagement prior to proposal - so the artist can take public feedback as part of proposal
Engagement - report back to public how their input was used
If something goes wrong, be open about it.
Public art dept + artists need freedom to speak to the public/media - need to be able to tell the story & provide context - including process, concept, research...) - artists/public art could/should craft the message together
Need a nuanced conversation
Need to broadcast the message on multiple platforms - artists voice needs to be at the fore
More info about the artist at the beginning - get to know the artist
Communicating openly throughout the process
Vetting through communications dept handcuffs the message.
Public art/the artist should start the conversation (set the tone)
Communicate artistically/artfully.
Challenge: city brand
A contemporary artwork needs to be communicated to be accepted - if the public doesn't understand it becomes an imposition.
In order for nuanced work to be accepted it needs to be understood.
Comms needs to be arms-reach from the City's comms



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Need to tell the story.
Artist - city "team up" together to tell the story (comms & engagement)
Engagement prior to open call
Important to have public on jury. The public should not "vote" on artist.
Engagement & communication need to happen throughout the process.
Engagement - while developing concept - talking to community leaders
Engagement during building & production - influencing the process (?)
On the Jury, huge impact
City shouldn't define Artist engagement progress
Artists need to be accountable for criteria
Public design sprint + values of project not architecture / design
Artists should engage community in their own way. Accountability process for artists. Some feel prove the integrity. Artists must be accountable to their engagement
Arms reach
message of artist empowerment
mini doc on artwork
city too risk adverse too much weight on citizen impact.
Survey sent to public art staff
Artist should be able to use their own social media. Risk of misinformation if artist promote on social media
Some BU's scared to talk about it
Artist a chance to speak directly
Local schools, community growth
Artwork to drive communication process
Communication plan + marketing support + community association
Webpage for project, contextualizing the work
Art specific communicators with artist communications plan to be public
membership needed to navigate through the city process
need for artist liaison
During the utility box program with A/P there was little communication with lead artists/withholding information. The artists did not know there were specific things the city needed to have. Make rules, and transactions clear and available
Beaufort and Travelling Light. In both cases, getting some exposure and explanation earlier might have enlightened some people. Worst case, if reaction is strong enough, maybe reconsider the piece being proposed.
sometimes it appears art projects go up and Calgarians don't know of them until they cause some sort of controversy. It would be great for general public to be aware of what area and what types of art is being considered in a general sense.
All public art projects. There should be public art profiles released regularly (outside of projects) for existing pieces, infographics about the contribution of public art to the city, artist talks, pop-ups, info sessions at project start + finish
The 'Opening' of Bowfort towers was scattered, uncoordinated - people didn't know about it
The Wishing Well project in Genesis was a fabulous project but all the communication was negative. On top of that, the City 'stashed' the project in a warehouse. We must face adversity and not hide it. The ideal scenario would be to fix it.



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

<p>Any time the City has allowed the conversation to spin out of control in the media with misinformation about where funding comes from and what it goes to. When reps of the program do a very poor job of repping the project. [personally identifying information removed]</p>
<p>Bowfort Towers is a colossal fail. Obviously, if there was supposed to be an aboriginal element yet no communication between artist and band was mandated, the contract could never be seen to be met.</p>
<p>I think the ideal scenario would be if the City could advertise their program and opportunities for artists in art schools such as the Art Department U of C, ACAD, Mount Royal University and art courses throughout the City.</p>
<p>More information should have been shared about Bowfort Towers. The response to the controversy was also poor. You need to tell people what the restrictions were for a project of this size and why the artist was selected, and support the artist.</p>
<p>Every time a call goes out there is very little warning, most artists are working other jobs, artistic or otherwise, and simply can't drop everything for a last minute call. A MINIMUM of 30 days notice should be given to artists for these calls.</p>
<p>The Bowfort Towers response addressing concerns written about in a letter by local Indigenous artists showed a lack of engagement with their concerns. Real reconciliation means genuine recognition of concerns, risk-taking and open dialogue</p>
<p>Celebrate the work you have, find a way to dialogue about taste, about the importance of public art in Calgary - make local government more aware - education, education, education</p>
<p>By having a website that tells people about all the public art projects that are underway in the city; not the the major ones linked to large capital budgets. Many public art initiatives are absent or under-represented in the City's online presence.</p>
<p>I do not have an example of this.</p>
<p>There might be many but not familiar enough to comment.</p>
<p>Rundle and Chinook projects both had lots of attention. Lots of posts on social media and updates posted.</p>
<p>The Main Streets program is an example all city projects should follow. Most of the challenges faced by public art can be solved through communication/PR/education. The department is too secretive.</p>
<p>Can't think of one</p>
<p>The Fold in Quarry Park's new recreation project was done very well. There was an article in the paper, then picked up by the news, then the artist was interviewed.</p>
<p>With reciprocal community outreach &amp; consultation, direct public involvement in projects, multimedia stories shared across social media, targeted communications, artist talks, conferences &amp; neighbourhood activities. Must offer many points of access!</p>
<p>Last year, I saw the call for Artist Working in Community Course through the Calgary Arts Development webpage. After I did this course, I learned about many links that could keep me connected with the Public Art Department</p>
<p>Peace Bridge. Plenty of lead up time, the public knew the cost and the artist, and the timeline. If the project got off track, the public was informed. There were no surprises.</p>
<p>Varying Proximities Artist: Broken City Lab I heard about this project and there were opportunities to meet the artists and see the work.</p>
<p>Almost never, can't even think of a good example.</p>
<p>I can't think of a specific time. It's good that you have Facebook events because the public art/city website is un-navigable and unappealing. It makes the creative process feel corporate and static.</p>
<p>there seems to be no communication, and thus no excitement or support of public art by anyone</p>
<p>By providing information and calls for the public art 101 program. It hits all the right notes for emerging artists and encouraging talent. It also utilized networks among other art professionals in the city.</p>



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Can't think of a time where there was any communication. Some projects were not controversial.
the final project meeting after a project fraught with bumps, was very well handled, communication was good and we all walked away feeling like we talked and were heard
The works that have been well communicated have been driven by the artists using their autonomy to sidestep the filters and censorship if the communication chain. The staff at Public Art needs the freedom to directly communicate these projects.
smaller interactive projects like the Skateboarding projects and the Chinook Arc in Connaught.
Through the early stages of design and construction. I think if people had some knowledge of projects before the unveiling it would improve perceptions.
I think the city does a pretty good job of communicating to the public. I feel that the various agencies within the city are not always on the same page. The problems expressed in the media about public art are largely the result of politicians who are divisive with this issue. I believe that the City can and should advocate as much as possible for the economic and cultural benefits of public art in a world-class city.
in my own experience, I met with community representatives of the neighborhoods I was working within and so I didn't notice any issues...however, for the larger audience of Calgary generally...even in other cities it is not uncommon for people to not understand how and why things get chosen and built...I am not sure how to counteract that problem except through art education generally
In our experience with Ripple, the community was happy with the engagement process. I do know that they were not happy with some other public art processes. Although there will always be persons - the 6%- who will never like any public art, I do feel it is our responsibility to find and involve local people with their feet on the street to assist with making it a meaningful process, not just dots or sticky notes on a plan.,Most people cannot understand a concept plan, and need to be involved from the beginning to see what the final project will look like - on the street
again, there should be communication about a project throughout the project's life. at the beginning there's a story to be shared about the context of a place, about the opportunities and why its happening. when the artist is on board (early through RFQ), there's an opportunity for a meaningful dialogue to happen in the way that artist works, and for opportunities to share the excitement of bringing this artist in, to work on something interesitng, to share their ideas and perspectives, artists are interesting people who ask question and look at things differently, how come we dont hear about that (and do in other cities). social media, blog posts, artists talks, public art lectures etc, and works that can bring people into the experience, like a temporary or durational project, will share about the work as it happens, as ideas unfold and things are revealed. share the story about the fabrication process, talk about the artists ideas, partner with arts orgs to host a talk with the artist and other arts community members, share the dialogue the artist is having with the community. if we share from the beginning about the context and the stories of citizens, they are the experts in their place, if we hear from them at the beginning on what thier relationships to place is, we will open up an exchange and say we want to hear you in a meaningful way, tell us about your experiences of place and allow the artist to build that dialogue with them, based on the context of each project and each artist. every project is differnet and so the process needs to be responsive to each situation, not a one way approach to doing every single project as if the boxes are just being checked. people see through that and it instills anger and mistrust with citizens.





# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

There is effectively no meaningful communication with the public around the Public Art process as it stands. I strongly believe that 'controversy' over public art could be avoided all together if there was clear, confident and consistent communication about the process. I would like to see the Public Art program and the City more generally stand by the decisions made by the selection juries and the artists they commission. It is insulting and demoralizing for artists to be attacked in the media and not have the City defend itself or them.

When a project is installed/opened, there should be detailed information provided to the public including:

- what the percent for art program is
- what the overall budget for the capital project is
- what the budget for the public art component is
- why the work is placed where it is (explain any provincial or municipal restrictions/regulations that may exist)
- how many artists applied
- where the applicants are from (how many local, national, international?)
- how the jury members are selected
- what the selection process entails
- mention local fabricators, engineers, etc. who contributed to the work (and the percentage of the budget allocated to local sub-contractors if appropriate)
- a statement about the work in the artist's own words

When this information is lacking, it seems like a secretive process without clear protocols or reasoning. It opens the door to speculation and the resulting uninformed conversations derail and devalue the hard work put in by the artists.

The process in general is not flawed. It just needs to be communicated and defended when people have questions about it.

Please stand up for the program, the process and the artists.

If the Public Art staff can communicate the details about the projects, this will lead to better messaging about the works. Also, the City shouldn't be so afraid of controversy. The program has been relatively controversy free except for a few pieces. I've talked to Mayor Nenshi about how misinformed he is on certain points and encouraged him to be part of a jury so that he is better able to defend the program. He promised he would if he won. Well?

at the initial pre-ideation stage of the design - stakeholder information sessions, charrettes, community engagement sessions.

Citizens may volunteer to serve on selection panels. This is a great way for their voice to be heard, and for them to become more informed. Open houses and workshops are other great forums for citizen input.

not sure, as an artist, my own practice is not deeply steeped in community input...

we don't invite citizens to participate in the design of buildings or roads...it is left to professionals and so it should be for artists too





# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

At the jury. During the last program review, new positions on the jury were created to invite participation from the public.
Projects that incorporate a public component can be valuable, but not always. It depends on the artist's way of working.
When they are involved in an informal way from the beginning of the process
Citizen input is needed at different moments, depending on the project.
It is important to understand which publics the work is for, and how to be accountable to those specific publics. There is no way to make work that means something for everybody
at the beginning, they know their site, neighborhood and place best as they live there or work there or use the spaces, so how can we bring them in to share ideas and ownership about the things they know best and want to share with others.
Their numbers have expanded on the juries and that's a good thing. As an artist juror I've enjoyed engaging with community members. Not during the selection process ever, but note that the public's opinions evolve with time.
Through direct conversations and through digital forms of engagement, such as websites and social media. If I can educate people about my approach and my practice, I think they are more likely to take the time to try and appreciate a work of art
We always solicit stakeholder input through formal and informal means. If the structure is not present for workshops, we seek to hold individual conversations.
it makes me feel successful if most people like what I have done
Throughout the process, in different ways. Targeted community contacts are helpful in developing concepts. Different segments of the public may participate in creating the work.
We specialize in indigenous and historical reconciliation projects. We have been successful where additional time is allowed for research and meetings- we are respectful and mindful and listen to concerns and issues and clear those first.
In my public art practice and process 'citizen input' involves specific and personally vulnerable engagement with individual citizens and citizen's self-organized groups.
i see citizen input as informing how i would even start a project, every project should start by forming a context, a vision, an intention and asking questions, building dialogue to learn from one another. this should be an open meaningful exchange
I've been fortunate to have tremendous and ongoing positive responses to my public art. The initial naysayers faded as the years went by. Public acclimatization is part of the process!

#### 4. What types of art are you most interested in seeing in Calgary?

many different kinds of art, not just statue or #D
Projected lights
functional art
colour
Big
temporary and around existing pieces
organized sculpture symposium
Festivals
landscape art



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
 March 5, 2018

Digital
installations
fleeting /short term / pop-ups
bronze sculpture of different things (map of locations)
Detour App/platform that alerts you of story in area ie. History of piece
Incorporate technology
Projection mapping
engages the community -you can use it for something (ex wonderland)
Historical contemporary mix
Sound and light shows
kinetic
Glitch
human sculpture
land art (Earthworks)
Community created art
Functional Art (ex the metal slatted sculptures on the grates by centre c-train stop)
Murals
stencils
sound art
pop-up art
music
suburban renewals
graffiti
modern
small interventions (ie a poem in the sidewalk)
water art
Flood art
weather art (ex uses wind)
Sculpture
light installations
art that can do reconciliation / cultural or community development
performance
Mazes
Flags
lighting
bus shelters
utility boxes
flower gardens
statue gardens
Kinetic art



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 5, 2018

murals
statues
landscape art (flowers xeriscape/zeroscape)
water art
fountains
benches functional art
Sculpture
zen gardens (meditative spaces)
underpass walls
utility boxes
flags
statues
meditative circle
fit with our weather -practical for location
public theatre
decorative fences
playground including art as well
grafitti art
permanent art collection
diversity in the art -not one type of art. Media + approach
travelling art collections
travelling art GoA program
different price points
prework, location needsto accommodate the work
early in the building process
historical public art -that educated
design elements instead
cowboys + cows
temporary art
community generated art
community based
art walk
art/activism
digital art online
elligibility should go to local artists
public art directeory on calgary.ca
Art that helos the community deal w/ social issues
politically correct art
Functional Installations
Sculptural



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Mosaic art
Ephemeral work -less object based
performance and experimental
not permanent
Mid-size projects
temporary or long term temporary (less than 10 years)
living art works (chances & evolves overtime) eg plant life or weathering
land art
multi-media (eg projection, augmented reality)
Community based (public participation with community)
Site specific (designed for its enhancement)
Graffiti legal walls
Edmonton integrated with park -where is this
spectator
Sculpture gardens -somewhere that displays what doesn't have anywhere else to go
Short time frame "sculpture by the sea" ->too commercial
Temporary activations (eg beakerhead -temporary, activates space & to public traffic. -educational - good way for people to learn about public art
Performance or event
media/projection art
water-based bodies of water
book or map
experience
pod-casts
embedded
physical
art infrastructure (i.e. shared spaces)
fellowship, institution, program, facility to promote public art
artists work with subdivision developers
Stupid question!!!
Contemporary art
voice for the unheard
not a fair question
more variety
relevant to values
art created differently
diversity
work that has a sole (not a form)
Broad variety of structures (Diverse eco system)
Fun, humourous, makes you laugh



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

gutsy couragous
what calgarians would like
diverse
stretch imagination
Diversity (locaiton, moving)
create converstation, what it means to me? Dialogue
Private (must come to opening)
makes people think, what story does it tell
surprise and delight's people -inspires
encourage critical thinking
functional art
can be more of an experience
Art that reflects the people or location
Art that is not tied to an obscure capital site
Infrastructure projects have budget component related to public art. That public art should enhance and relate to the infrastructure project.
All kinds of art suggested here would be positive

5. What types of locations do you feel public art has the most potential for positive community impact?

Location types in Public Art Master Plan
Visibility (to the public)
Public accessibility
vehicle and pedestrian flow
use an area's unique character
not all downtown
Floors / Grounds of parking lots
Parkades
Parking lots
Bowls at Sarcee and 16th Ave
Land in need of remediation
plus 15s
train tunnels
Well designed bus benches & Shelters
Dog parks
Public parks and places that can be publically accessed
Art on the hill in front of ACAD
Field at bow trail and sarcee
intimate spaces



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 5, 2018

Along river
Lost spaces
land by bow river (needs remediation)
Hills and ridges
Forests
Douglas fir trail
Bike trails
identities for communities (banners, signs)
walking parks
Sculpture park (bow river - tar remediation)
Glenmore resevoir
Edworthy Park
Fish creek park
Nose hill park
Capitol hill pathway
Art Gateway -entrance to city
Art Park
overpasses / walkways
around every corner
anywhere that is graffitti tags
hotels
community signs
Barlow and Airport Trail
Gateways / first impressions
Urban infrastructure (utility boxes, garbage bins)
Airport
small spaces
Correctional facilities
Public parks and places that can be publically accessed
health care facilities
roof tops
pedestrian spaces
tunnels
industrial
parkades
neglected spaces
anything concrete
exteriors of buildings, sculpture
exteriors of buildings (blank walls)
Arenas



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 5, 2018

schools
fire stations
LRT stations
Bus shelters
community centers
community entrances
Parks
places that are not distracting to drivers
bridges
boulevards
underpasses
bike paths
Inside
Rec centers
Arenas
libraries
airport
A place where people go
Public libraries
fitness centers
Traveling artist in residency -temporary like arts commons
travelling art collections
Sculpture park -Purpose built
Plus 15 network
LRT Stations
Locations that are highly visible where people are able to take pictures in front of it
Central locations where people move slowly
Interactive art in temporary locations
Public participation in the art
construction sites (private)
gathering spaces for public art
Zoo parking lot (temp install)
Recycled or reused art. Beautiful landfill
Science center parking lot (temp install)
Suburbs -> bring the art out to the burbs
Artist working where ppl go ie composting session + artist
Where people already go
Pedestrian spaces
utility boxes
public square





# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
 March 5, 2018

back alleys
sidewalks
bridges
tunnels (non vehicle)
street (pedestrian corners)
The Street
Public Walks
nature spaces
parks
natural spaces
the bow river
Community
residential areas
schools
common gathering spaces (halls, green space, direct living)
Architecture
building windows
on buildings (inside)
On architecture (outside)
Empty buildings (pre demolition, vacant)
Buildings -infront, indoors, on top
public facilities
downtown (high density pedestrian)
Transit
bus stops
on a train line
Train cars
internet
c-train
outer space
auto spaces
parking lots and parkades
underpasses (vehicular)
overpasses
streets (highway, busy)
is this the wrong Q for the public? Not their expertise
what's interesting in your area -as subjects i.e. events
literal but beyond into non-physical
"subjects" vs locations [consider]
What other "engagement types" work well that might fit to public art?



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

artist in design-teams or departments
c-train station areas
city + school partnerships (community schools or City Hall School)
Walkways + bikepaths
artist-run centers
instead of spending on art projects but for "facility" or "program"
also concerns about advocating for these not public art works may backfire
suburbs
things we look past ie cell phone towers
suburbs (near gathering spaces)
parks (touch and feel)
Shopping malls
Recreation centers
strip malls
Cell phone tower art -produce revenue stream
could go anywhere, changes environment
celebration of history
Suburban renewal! On infrastructure: Under/over passes, (older 50s-80s)
Pedestrian areas in the suburbs: walkways, park paths, parkades, bike paths
community signs in established communities
Correctional facilities
neglected spaces
Pedestrian spaces
concrete...
Gateways / first impressions
health care facilities
neglected spaces
public parks
Airport
public parks
health care facilities
anything concrete
overpasses
roof tops on LRT line
land art -large scale earthworks
roof tops downtown
small intimate spaces -pedestrian scale
parks
surprise places ...where you least expect it
forgotten places
urban art -murals, graffiti art, sidewalks



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

places where we can interact w/ the piece
Large works - Along the Bow River Beside major roadways
Smaller Works - EVERYWHERE!!!
parks
community entrances
underpasses
exteriors of buildings
Exteriors of buildings
inside of public facilities
wherever calgarians gather
suburbs
parks
community center
homeless shelters
rental properties
affordable housing
<u>everywhere</u>
in the skyscape we have great skies to take advantage of -
parks
schools
community associations
variety of sites around the city
Smaller projects on smaller sites
outside of downtown
places where younger people connect, getting youth involved
gateways
Pedestrian spaces
public parks
urban infrastructure
Walking overpasses - overpasses
Airport
health care facilities
Artist choice program (Vancouver)
temporary location
permanent art location -Perm collection/museum
sculpture park
community centers -community based practice
suburban communities (as opposed to on the road to the neighbourhood)
walkable places
virtual space



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

Artist in residence at various locations
artist-specified locations
temporary locations -construction sites
libraries
designed into new public buildings from the get-go (ex projection space, a room for a huge painting)
online - temporary apps or website
<u>NOT</u> on major thoroughfares
sculpture park
permanent civic collection space
Define areas of work, processes not site/locations
central locations where people walk (downtown)
plus 15 network
LRT stations (specially the new stations)
traveling artist within the city residencies
Interactive art in temporary locations
Where people already go. Libraries, fitness center, suburbs locations
locations easily accessible by the public
entrances (communities, entering city)
community and recreation centres
cultural centers and locations where there may already be art that can further enhance the area
Landscape architecture in existing parks
Integrations into other City of Calgary Utilities (eg. Watershed +)
more engagement from communities
parks - my favourite place to encounter public art is when I am in a park
Street -walking or underpasses when drinking -these are the ones I like to recall
Gateway to Calgary - I like the travelling light but most people don't
Community
nature spaces
pedestrian transit
Transit
auto spaces
architectural
parks and natural spaces
buildings, inside and out
civic pedestrian spaces
community spaces
empty spaces/buildings
parks
alleyways (back alleys)
public transit



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

corporate buildings
public buildings like libraries
tunnels
bus stops
street
Community hubs IE busy streets where people walk
parks
marginal community locations in the suburbs
sculpture parks (we need same)
Downtown on walkways or on the side of buildings as murals
in the landscape
as community engagement in schools
cemetery
Talking about locations is very counter-productive to changing the understanding and perception of public art
public art should not be a discussion about location
internet
schools
Pedestrian spaces
train cars/c-train
natural (park) spaces
city utilities
parkades
education programs for students on topic of public art
neighbourhoods -more small to medium sized projects
not required to be at location of development
digital neighbourhood walks
education for local artists (next step for 101) mentor, more mentorships
education programs for next step (international)
only roadside suitable projects placed there
downtown
open the requirements that road projects insist on by the road
bring art into the communities for whom the road serves
get art in places where people can walk up to it
c-train
schools
bus stops
sidewalks
community spaces
auto spaces



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 5, 2018

tunnels
natural spaces
sculpture park
existing gathering places ie: zoo -science centre
central locations
interactive temp locations
sculpture park
Where people already go
Traveling artist in residency
central location (ideal for an art walk)
interactive art in temporary locations (like the big red dot (ball))
where people already Go - libraries, fitness centres etc (inside locations as well as outside)
specific site for sculpture -park
suburbs
traveling artist in residence
LRT station
Plus 15 -site specific
Intimate spaces, urban spaces, green spaces
unexpected spaces -urban site + green area spaces (works that integrate with the space and don't stick out as obtrusive.
open space along highway communte into city (it there are any)
PS Don't think it's a good idea to CLUTTER up natural areas in city (ie Douglas Fir Trail) with artwork. Leave these as natural as possible. IE limited evidence of human intervention of any kind
parks for sculpture
walking parks
streets
more in suburbs
"events"
less on infrastructure
along pathways -areas that have space for contemplation -people who can move around the area, experience it -so: not drive quickly by in a car
ephemeral
artist-in-residential in communities/suburbs
sky ->projections
water
cemeteries
public realm
natural space
building interiors
building exteriors
c train / buses



# Public Art Notice of Motion

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 5, 2018

ground -> pedestrian
parks!
parking + train
community fields + any places we walk!
area near Bow River & crowchild where it needs to be remediated (creosote) unused city land
<u>riverbanks</u> or in the river
<u>Building facades</u> (projected ephemeral art)
tunnel (pedestrian)
sarcee & 16th ave <u>interchange</u> -so many places for super landscaping & art
Golf Courses?
infrastructure + well designed "calgary" bus shelters & benches
I prefer that congregation locations -becoming destinations with multiple views / interaction options (art parks, possible) + other than tying projects geographically to infrastructure (not suggesting a templated plan, either way)
This is, in all likelihood, a flawed ask. We want art that is <u>relevant</u> . There can be successful work in any location (yes, even beside a highway) if the artist is given adequate autonomy to impact location. The UEP program and WATERSHED + should be looked at as precedents for non-located commissions -which sometimes take the form of work that is not physical (a residency! a book! a concept) and therefore cannot be located anywhere, specifically -We need, most:
communication that is art specific
flexibility for adoption over time
Relevance to <u>any</u> site, and context -physical or non-physical
Less fear. Less bureaucracy. Less <u>cost</u> (monetary and otherwise)
Freedom for diversity dialogues, driven by specialists (artists, curators, etc)
All of the above as long as the art connects to the location.
Hospitals and health care centres