



KIMBERLEY DRISCOLL  
MAYOR

Salem Public Art Commission  
98 Washington Street  
Salem, Massachusetts 01970  
(978) 619-5685



**Public Art Commission**  
**May 16, 2023, 6:30pm**  
Meeting held remotely via zoom

### MEETING MINUTES

**Note:** All proposals, presentations, and/or documentation to be reviewed and discussed at this meeting can be viewed online at the following link: <https://bit.ly/SalemPACProposals>

- **Meeting called to order at 6:39 pm.**
- **Roll Call PAC:** Norene Gachignard, Janine Liberty, John Andrews, James Bostick, Gwen Rosemond, & Carly Dwyer-Naik. Absent: Hannah Gathman
- **Meeting Minute Approvals**
  - o **April 18, 2023 Meeting Minutes-** Norene entertained a motion, Jim made a motion to approve the meeting minutes, Norene seconded. Motion carried.
- **Barrio Mural Review**

A mock up of the work proposed was requested from PAC to Maggie Osborn of Barrio and her artist for approval. The location of the mural has been approved by the Salem Redevelopment Authority, which has now been referred to the PAC for review and approval.

John informs the PAC that this image is also copyrighted and owned by another artist despite our requests for an image from the artist. Carly has done a reverse search of the image and found that this particular submission is a piece by a Moldovan artist, and enhanced slightly. Carly and John voice their uncertainty on approval on a copyrighted image after asking them for a mock up from the artist.

Julie reminds PAC that it is not this body's place to define cultural appropriation or to not approve based on cultural appropriation. However, the form, the materials, the placement, & content are all within the realms of this body's jurisdiction. The Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, as well as the legal team have all been consulted on this issue. We cannot rule on the idea of cultural approval alone, but they felt strongly that we should convey our concerns to them, and if they decide to go forward with the pieces, then we are on record having conveyed those concerns.

Carly is still concerned that the image submitted to us twice has been from a different artist, though this

time slightly altered. Julie suggests that it is hard to determine if in fact this image isn't his without talking to the artist, and getting the full story.

At this time, the PAC was having a hard time with audio and connecting to Maggie Osborn as well as the artist Michael McNamara.

Michael McNamara eventually joins us to answer some questions. Michael claims that he only used this image to present to us as he claims to not be computer literate. He is not interested in copying someone else's image, but getting the image over to us is too complicated for him. Jim clarified that the PAC was looking for something in the artist's own hand, even if it was a sketch in pencil on a napkin. Michael does indicate that the image he submitted and plans on producing will be very similar to this picture, ie a symmetrical, close up piece of a female's face, in the day of the dead garb with dark colors; it will be this artist's interpretation of this image. Carly also tried to clarify that the PAC doesn't want a "full blown" artist rendition, but that PAC gets a lot of applications of work that is on a higher scale than what the artist is capable of. Carly says that it is his work that we want to see. John steps in to clarify that there must have been a miscommunication between us, the owners, and the artist. John states that within his 150 mural applications he has reviewed in this role, he has never accepted a proposal without seeing at least a rough sketch. Norene and Julie both agreed that it is his hand and his ideas that are wanted. Michael wanted to verify to the group that he is the artist that has completed the inside of the restaurant. Again he states that this image is what he is going for, not exactly the same layout. As there still seems to be a miscommunication about submitting to us a rough sketch, Jim tries to ask the artist about an image that has been submitted with his portfolio. He asked what Michael's artistic process was in creating the mural. Michael shared that the image was a famous image of Frida Kahlo, in his own hand. Jim asked how he painted it- if this image was sketched down first, or if he painted it right on the building. This previous mural was painted primarily right on the wall itself without any preplanning.

Julie's final take on the mural is that there was clearly a disconnect between all three parties, and that the the PAC should use our due diligence in making sure the credentials, the design, and the materials are valid, instead of getting hung up on the miscommunications and the "easy ask" when there are certain accommodations that should be met for this rare circumstance.

John asked the artist if he could please send us a sketch of any capacity before the work gets completed, and Michael agreed.

Norene entertains a motion to approve the work pending receipt of a pencil rendering sketch to be installed on the proposed spot outside of Barrio. Norene motioned, John Seconded. Carly Abstained. Motion passed.

This opens up a need for a conversation of the process of approving art. John is concerned about how the small business that was responsible in this situation had passed the buck on to the PAC, and how the issue worked out. John would like a clearer understanding of private business public art. Norene and Carly agreed. Jim sees his previous work and he feels that it validates his skills, while Carly feels uncomfortable setting a precedent for approving murals that we haven't seen. Her worry is that we could be signing up for ethical violations that she doesn't want her name on. John wants to have a conversation about the process of responsibility between the small business and the PAC. Carly feels that if the artist isn't good with tech, it is the responsibility of the business to support the artist to get the information to us for approval. John and Jim both agreed that it was empathy for the situation that moved this process forward, along with the portfolio of his previous works.

- **Other Business-**

None

- **Public Comments-**

None

- **Adjourn-** Norene entertained a motion to adjourn. Moved by John, seconded by Carly. **Meeting Adjourned at 7:28 pm .**

*Persons requiring auxiliary aids and services for effective communication such as sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device, or print material in digital format or a reasonable modification in programs, services, policies, or activities, may contact the City of Salem ADA Coordinator, as soon as possible and no less than 2 business days before the meeting, program, or event.*

*Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A § 18-25 and City Ordinance § 2-2028 through § 2-2033.*