(PAC) Public Art Committee Meeting Minutes

Special Meeting: Salisbury Prize 2025

The (PAC) Public Art Committee met on February 14th 2025 at 10:00 AM in the Rommel Center for Entrepreneurship—212 W Main St., Suite 205, Salisbury, MD 21801

In attendance: Chair Susan, Co-Chair Brandon, KT, Max, Mandell, Bill, Heather, Brandon’s son (observing)

AGENDA:

1. Opening, meeting called to order 10:10AM

2. 2025 Salisbury Prize

A. Susan reviewed categories for evaluation for PAC to consider from rubric

B. Bill: not enough submissions, everyone agreed; Susan proposed narrowing down to a few candidates, then grading meticulously via rubric before next meeting

C. Group started to talk about submission process, how prize could better be advertised and requirements for submission made more detailed; Heather requested that “meta” discussions on process be tabled to March meeting so that we could focus on rating the submissions; group agreed

D. KT reminded everyone that this is a community-chosen project, and that we need not feel too much pressure to choose the appropriate winner, because the community will ultimately choose; reminded everyone that TAG found all applications feasible

E. Reviewing submissions:

Submission 1: Bird mural; design has artistic merit and creativity; artist did not choose good materials (cheap Amazon art products); Brandon & Bill suggested reaching out if we have a future budget/grant for mural work

Submission 2: Falling sculpture; artist did not submit best work (Bill and Susan know artist personally); sculpture does not speak to community, diversity, nor would it being particularly beautiful/interesting to look at

Submission 3: Native American plexiglass work; artist specializes in lyrical Native American pieces; while content has potential, Native American community they represent is not local to Maryland; artist has no personal connection to Maryland

Submission 4: Standing man sculpture; sheet metal is fairly inexpensive and easy to work with, however, proposed sculpture would be 17’ tall; wind hazards, etc.; Bill & Heather presented concerns about having artist twice in a row; KT reminded group that community chooses best piece; group agreed to accept artist for 2nd application phase

Submission 5: Photographs of own tree in yard; think they did not understand the art call; rejected immediately

Submission 6: Steel tree; Bill & Heather concerned about accepting trees two years in a row; Susan mentioned it’s nice that it would look “natural” in setting, and perhaps objects could be added to it for more visual interest (like love locks that cities put on bridges); group agreed to accept artist for 2nd application phase

Submission 7: Standing heron; KT and Heather know artist personally—quality artwork but not sure about ability to fabricate something of this size/material as sculpture is not their primary medium; definitely interesting piece, but group not sure how well it could be completed; group agreed to accept artist for 2nd application phase

Submission 8: Swan sculpture; worried about maintenance of paint and reflectivity; group loves how graphic it is, easy to see from road; group agreed to accept artist for 2nd application phase

Submission 9: Mural panels on plywood; group agreed artist has excellent skills and art is compelling; better suited for a temporary installation at a festival or similar temporary event because of materials proposed

Group agreed to meeting over Zoom with candidates on back-to-back from 1-2PM on March 7th, then follow with normal meeting on Zoom from 2-3PM on March 7th.

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 AM.