

Memo



Date: May 4, 2011
File: 1340-40
To: City Manager
From: H. Bellamy, Staff Liaison to the Public Art Committee
Subject: Methodology for Review of the Public Art Program

Recommendation:

THAT Council receives, for information, the report from the Public Art Committee dated May 4, 2011, setting out the methodology and proposed work plan for review of the Public Art Program;

AND THAT Council endorses the work plan for the review of the Public Art Program;

AND THAT Council approves a budget of \$25,000, funded from the current Public Art budget, to undertake the recommended Public Art Master Plan of the proposed work plan;

AND FURTHER THAT staff report to Council upon completion with a final report.

Purpose:

At the 2011 Capital Budget deliberations in December 2010, Council requested that Staff provide a more detailed report explaining the terms and objectives of a Public Art Program review. Further, at the February 7th Council Meeting, Staff's recommendation to review the Public Art Program (the Program) as one of the Program's 2011 priorities was endorsed by Council. The review is based on the need to ensure that the Program is efficiently administered and well positioned to commission and curate a diverse collection of public art projects over the coming decade.

The purpose of this report is to:

- Identify the challenges faced by the Program, the corresponding objective/s for the review to meet and anticipated work;
- Set out staff's recommended work plan and budget;
- Set out the timescale for completion of the review; and
- Seek endorsement for staff's work plan and budget.

Background:

The Program was established by a resolution of Council in 1997. At this time, a Committee of Council, the Public Art Committee (PAC) was established along with a Terms of Reference. The role of the PAC is substantive and strategic in nature with the remit to make recommendations on: suitable locations for public art; the acceptance of donations of art; and the joint funding of publically accessible art (e.g. with a developer).

The PAC is tasked with writing the specifications for works of art to be selected by competition; holding the competition and making a recommendation to Council on the awarding of the commission. In addition, the PAC is required to maintain a record of all artwork acquired and help promote and market the collection.

The Staff Liaison to the PAC has undertaken an evaluation of the Program with City staff and the PAC. The purpose of the evaluation was to first identify and clarify the challenges the Program faces in terms of achieving its objectives and second to define the work plan for the Program review as set out below.

Program Challenges, Program Review Objectives & Anticipated Work

This section sets out the identified challenges along with a corresponding objective for the review of the Program to meet and the anticipated work to be undertaken.

The Program & Strategic Direction - The Program currently operates under the direction of the PAC and its terms of reference. Beyond this Council committee, there are no terms of reference which identify the overall Program's vision, goals and objectives.

There is currently no formal policy direction for joint funding arrangements, developer contributions to public art or the contribution of donated art.

Objective 1: to establish the strategic vision, goals and objectives for the overall Program. This will be set out in a Terms of Reference document.

Objective 2: to identify the opportunities and provide a policy direction for each component element of the Program including:

- Commissioned art in existing public spaces;
- Commissioned art to enhance City infrastructure installations;
- Commissioned art delivered as part of new capital infrastructure projects;
- Temporary art;
- Community art;
- Donated art; and
- Public Art delivered in partnership with developers.

Guidance on how the local art community can participate successfully in the Program will also be considered.

Funding Strategy - the Public Art Fund is allocated from general taxation each year as part of the Annual Capital Budget. Council policy (Objective 9.1 OCP 2030 Policy 2) states that the allocation should be funded at a minimum of \$100,000 annually to a maximum equal to 1% of the City's annual capital budget. However, Council has applied discretion in approving minimum funding levels in recognition of other budget priorities.

Objective 3 - to establish an effective and reliable funding strategy that will meet the goals and objectives of the Program.

This element of work will re-establish the community benefits brought about by public art programs and research practices in the funding of public art programs.

Site Selection and Integration- Direction for the Program is set out in an annual plan. As noted in Objective 1, there is no long term strategic plan for public art.

The site selection and proper integration of public art into the landscape and infrastructure projects is critical to the success of the Program. Clear guidelines and criteria for site selection, planning and budgeting are necessary to ensure the delivery of the right art in the right location.

Objective 4 - to ensure that site selection, strategic planning and budgeting go hand in hand to maximize opportunities.

Staff's recommendation is that this objective is best met through the development of a master plan for public art. The Master Plan will be a three year plan and will set out and establish the following:

- Set out the Program's vision and goals;
- Identify the opportunities for different components of public art including: commissioned art in existing public spaces; commissioned art to enhance City infrastructure installations (e.g. bin wraps, sub-station wraps, drainage grills or cycle racks); commissioned art delivered as part of new capital infrastructure projects (buildings; parks and transport corridors); temporary art; and art delivered in partnership with developers;
- criteria and guidelines for site selection;
- possible locations for public art;
- identification of infrastructure projects where it may be appropriate to incorporate public art;
- guidance on the form of art appropriate to the location including a proposed budget. The cost estimates will help determine an appropriate level of funding each year;
- project prioritization; and
- an implementation plan.

Staff propose to commence work on the Master Plan in tandem with the update to the City's Long Term Capital Plan in order to ensure synergy of project priority for capital infrastructure projects. It is recommended that a public art consultant is instructed to assist staff with this element of work in order to help identify the best opportunities. It is also recommended that public consultation be part of the process to continue to build support for the program.

Roles and Responsibilities - Since the City's reorganization, the responsibility for different components of the Program rests with several different departments e.g. Cultural Services, Infrastructure Planning, Purchasing, Building Services, Community and Media Relations and Land Use Management. Clear roles and responsibilities need to be established in order for each department to work efficiently and effectively in implementing the Program.

Objective 5 - to establish the roles and responsibilities for delivery of the Program.

Recommendations will be made on roles and responsibilities for staff, the PAC, the public and any other roles recommended to deliver the program efficiently and effectively. Recommendations will be made having researched and evaluated other public art program structures.

This work stream will address roles and responsibilities for the following elements of the Program:

- site selection and budget;
- strategy for eliciting artist submissions;
- selection of artists;
- management of the artist and process from selection to delivery;
- developing the local art community; and
- the management and general administration of the art collection including: maintenance, documentation, communication, marketing, promotion, advocacy and artist's roster.

Commissioned Art Process - the process for commissioned works of art has faced some challenges related to the quality of submissions, concerns over public expectations, contractual procedures, cost escalations, changes to original artistic design vision and the length of time required to complete the process from RFP to final installation.

Objective 6 - to elicit a selection of quality submissions during a commissioned art competition in order to build high quality public art.

Objective 7 - to establish processes and procedures which allow for the efficient and effective delivery of public art.

The City currently has detailed processes in place therefore the aim of this work stream is to identify the existing strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for improvements on generic matters such as review and control of the design development process and the insurance provisions. It must also be recognized that each contract and agreement needs to be tailored to the specific project and a careful review at the time of the project be undertaken to ensure the right approach is being adopted. Further, it is imperative that adequate resources are provided to assist in ensuring that commissioned art is well sited and competently installed, especially when it is the center piece of a public place. The need for staff time in the administration of successful art installations is frequently underestimated.

Work Plan & Budget

To meet the above seven objectives, four distinct streams of work can be identified and are set out in the table below along with the proposed allocation of work and budget.

| Work Stream | Objective/s to be Met | Work Allocation | Staff Hours | Budget |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Public Art Program Mandate | 1, 2 and 3 | Staff | 150 | N/A |
| Strategic Master Plan | 4 | Staff & Consultant | 250 | \$25,000 |
| Roles & Responsibilities | 5 | Staff | 200 | N/A |
| Artists Selection Process, Contracts & Delivery Procedures | 6 and 7 | Staff | 110 | N/A |
| TOTAL | | | 710 | \$25,000 |

A report regarding recommended changes will be prepared for Council upon completion.

Timescale for Program Review

Staff anticipate that the majority of work be complete by the end of the year. The work would be managed by the Liaison to the Public Art Committee under the guidance of the Infrastructure Planning Department. The PAC, the public and several other departments will be involved as it relates to the different components of the program including Cultural Services, Purchasing, Building Services and Community & Media Relations.

Existing Policy:

Chapter 9 of the Official Community Plan (OCP) 2030 can be viewed at the following link:
<http://www.kelowna.ca/CityPage/Docs/PDFs//Strategic%20Planning/2030%20OCP/Chapter%209%20-%20Arts,%20Culture%20and%20Heritage.pdf>

The 2030 Public Art Policy directs art to locations of high pedestrian use and or vehicular travel. The policy confirms the funding commitment of 1% of the City's annual capital budget. The policy indicates that in addition to commissions the Art Fund will be used to encourage private sector provision of art through match funding.

Further direction for public art is set out in the Cultural Plan under Policy 274.

<http://www.kelowna.ca/CityPage/Docs/PDFs/Council/Policies/Cultural%20Policy%20-%20Pol-274.pdf>

Financial/Budgetary Considerations:

The proposed budget to complete the recommended Master Plan is \$25,000 funded from the Public Art Reserve. Staff time allocated to this review is estimated at approximately 710 hours.

External Agency/Public Comments:

The PAC will be consulted throughout the Program review.

Internal Circulation:

Director, Real Estate & Building Services
Director, Recreation & Cultural Services
Director, Communications & Media Relations
Director, Corporate Services
Director, Land Use Management

Considerations not applicable to this report:

Legal/Statutory Authority
Legal/statutory Procedural Requirements
Personnel Implications
Technical Requirements
Communications Considerations
Alternate Recommendation

Submitted by:



H. Bellamy, Staff Liaison to the Public Art Committee

Approved for inclusion:



R. Cleveland, Director, Infrastructure Planning

cc: General Manager, Community Sustainability
Director, Recreation & Cultural Services
Director, Community and Media Relations
Director, Real Estate & Building Services
Director, Corporate Services

REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC ART PROGRAM



RECOMMENDATIONS

- ▶ To endorse the work plan for the review of the Public Art Program;
- ▶ To approve a budget of \$25,000, funded from the current Public Art budget to undertake the recommended Public Art Master Plan; and
- ▶ That Staff report to Council upon completion with a final report.





PRESENTATION FORMAT

- ▶ Identification of the challenges faced by the Program and corresponding objective for the review to address;
- ▶ Where required a description of the work stream; and
- ▶ Proposed work plan and budget.



PROGRAM CHALLENGES


- ▶ **Challenge: Strategic Direction**
 - ▶ There are no Program terms of reference identify the strategic vision/ goals and objectives for the overall Program. Instead the Program operates under the strategic guidance of the Public Art Committee (PAC); and
 - ▶ There is no formal policy direction for joint funding arrangements, developer contributions to public art or the contribution of donated art.

Objective 1: to establish the strategic vision, goals and objectives for the Program



Objective 2: to identify the opportunities and make recommendations on each of the following:


- ▶ Commissioned art in existing public spaces;
- ▶ Commissioned art to enhance City infrastructure installations;
- ▶ Commissioned art delivered as part of new capital infrastructure projects;
- ▶ Temporary art;
- ▶ Community art;
- ▶ Donated art; and
- ▶ Public art delivered in partnership with developers.

PROGRAM CHALLENGES

- ▶ **Challenge: Funding Strategy**
 - ▶ A Public Art Reserve Fund is established annually from general taxation. Council policy states that the allocation should be funded at a minimum of \$100,000 annually to a maximum equal to 1% of the City's annual capital budget.
 - ▶ Council applied discretion in approving minimum funding levels for 2011 in recognition of other budget priorities.

Objective 3: to establish an effective and reliable funding strategy to meet the goals and objectives of the Program.






PROGRAM CHALLENGES

- ▶ **Challenge: Site Selection & Integration:**
 - ▶ There is no long term strategic plan for public art. Strategy and site selection is driven by the PAC set out in an annual plan.
 - ▶ Guidelines and criteria for site selection, planning and budgeting are necessary to ensure proper integration of public art into the landscape and infrastructure projects.


Objective 4: to ensure that site selection, strategic planning and budgeting go hand in hand to maximize opportunities.


Objective 4 will be met through the development of a master plan for public art.

Public Art Master Plan Work Stream:

- ▶ Program's vision and goals;
- ▶ Identification of opportunities for different components of public art;
- ▶ Establish criteria and guidelines for site selection;
- ▶ Possible locations for public art;
- ▶ Identification of infrastructure projects suitable to accommodate public art;
- ▶ Guidance on the form of art appropriate to the location including a proposed budget;
- ▶ Identify priority projects; and
- ▶ Include an implementation plan.





PROGRAM CHALLENGES

- ▶ **Challenge: Roles and Responsibilities**
 Responsibility for different components of the Program rests with several different departments including:
 - ▶ Infrastructure Planning;
 - ▶ Cultural Services;
 - ▶ Purchasing;
 - ▶ Building Services;
 - ▶ Community and Media Relations; and
 - ▶ Land Use Management.


Objective 5: to establish the roles and responsibilities for delivery of the Program.




Roles & Responsibilities Work Stream:

- ▶ Site selection & budget;
- ▶ Strategy for eliciting artist submissions;
- ▶ Selection of artists;
- ▶ Management of the artists and process from selection to delivery;
- ▶ Developing the local art community; and
- ▶ General administration and management of the collection including: maintenance; documentation; communication; marketing; promotion; advocacy and artist's roster.





PROGRAM CHALLENGES



- ▶ **Challenge: Commissioned Art Process**

Recent challenges experienced in relation to:

- ▶ quality of submission proposals;
- ▶ Concerns over public expectations;
- ▶ Contractual procedures; and
- ▶ Cost escalations and changes to the original artistic design vision.


Objective 6: to elicit a selection of quality submissions during a commissioned art competition to build high quality public art.


Objective 7: to establish processes and procedures which allow for the efficient and effective delivery of public art.

Commissioned Art Work Stream:



- ▶ Identification of strengths and weaknesses of existing procedures; and
- ▶ Consideration of review and control of the design development process and insurance provisions.





WORK PLAN & BUDGET

| Work Stream | Objective/s to be Met | Work Allocation | Staff Hours | Budget |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Public Art Program Mandate | 1, 2 & 3 | Staff | 150 | |
| Strategic Master Plan | 4 | Staff & Consultant | 250 | \$25,000 |
| Roles & Responsibilities | 5 | Staff | 200 | |
| Artists Selection, Process, Contracts & Delivery Procedures | 6 & 7 | Staff | 110 | |
| TOTAL | | | 710 | \$25,000 |

TIMESCALE

- ▶ Complete by year end.
- ▶ Managed by the Liaison to the Public Art Committee with input from other departments, the Public Art Committee and the public.

