

Durham Cultural Advisory Board

SUMMARY MINUTES

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Zoom Meeting

To learn more about how to join the meeting,

visit: <https://durhamnc.gov/452/Durham-Cultural-Advisory-Board>

Durham Cultural Advisory Board Members Present

E'Vonne Coleman	Joey Medrano	A. Demarcus Williams
Eldrin Deas	Andrew Nurkin	
Tom Jaynes	Laura Ritchie	<i>Student Member:</i>
Joseph Jordan	Aya Shabu	Erin Lee
Angela Lee, Chair	Elias Torre	

Durham Cultural Advisory Board Members Absent

Michael A. Betts, II, excused	<i>Student Member:</i>
Margaret McNab	Katherine Lopez
Mayor Pro Tempore Mark-Anthony Middleton	Anna Price
Raafe Purnsley	
Mitchell Sava, Vice-Chair	

City of Durham Staff and Representatives Present

Rebecca Brown, City of Durham	Brenda Hayes-Bright Durham County
Annette Smith, City of Durham	
Stephanie Minor, City of Durham	

Guests Present

Margaret DeMott, Durham Arts Council
Anna Fiore, Discover Durham
Alexandra Benson, Downtown Durham, INC

- I. **Call to Order & Guest Introductions**
 - a. The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by Angela Lee, Chair.
 - b. City Staff introduced guests and members of the public.
- II. **Adjustments to the Agenda**
 - a. None.
- III. **Approval of Minutes**
 - a. **MOTION:** The Durham Cultural Advisory Board (DCAB) approves the May 2023 summary meeting minutes (Torre, Jordan 2nd).
 - b. **ACTION:** Approved (11-0).
- IV. **Announcements**
 - a. **City Public Art Program Updates**

Durham Cultural Advisory Board

- i. City staff member Brown provided updates on many of the current in-progress public art projects, including the installation of regional artist Theresa Arico's first of three temporary public art mosaic benches installed at the upper floor entrance of Durham Station and Merrick-Moore Park's public art project currently in the fabrication stages at Cricket Forge. For more information on the City's in-progress public art projects, visit the City's website at: [Current Public Art Projects | Durham, NC \(durhamnc.gov\)](#). Brown highlighted a need to expand the number of photographers and videographers on the City's Pre-Qualified Artist Registry to document the Cultural Roadmap events in the next year and asked that DCAB members to spread the word to their networks, and invite them to reach out to City staff, or learn more and apply on the City's website here: [Durham Calls for Artists | Durham, NC \(durhamnc.gov\)](#).

b. Public Art Committee (PAC) Updates

- i. The Public Art Committee voted in their May meeting to recommend the Durham Cultural Advisory Board re-appoint Mya Catillo-Marté as Chair and Molly Matlock as Vice-Chair for their second and final terms as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively. Ritchie, also a member of PAC, made a comment in support of this decision and has great confidence in their leadership.
- ii. **MOTION:** The Durham Cultural Advisory Board (DCAB) to approve the recommendation of the Public Art Committee (PAC) to appoint Mya Catillo-Marté as Chair and Molly Matlock as Vice-Chair of the PAC (Ritchie, Torre 2nd).
- iii. **ACTION:** Approved (11-0, with one abstention by Deas).
- iv. Brown shares The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Review of the artwork proposal put forth by Melody Dawkins from ROI/REDEV and artist Taylor White on the W. Morgan St. Overpass Bridge, 601 W. Morgan Street, Durham, NC 27701, has been delayed until August. For reference, the UDO section regarding public art requirements:
 1. UDO Sec. 16.4.2E.3.b.(3)) b. Alternatives
 2. Street tree alternatives specified below shall be used, individually or in combination, and shall comply with the associated standards.
 - a. (1) Spacing and location requirements shall be consistent with those required for street trees.
 - b. (2) Maintenance of alternatives shall be the responsibility of the [property owner](#)(s) of the [development](#) site.
 - c. (3) Table of Alternatives. Shall provide a minimum of 100 square feet of [public art](#) along the [street frontage](#) for each required street tree. Additionally:
 - i. [Public art](#) shall be permanent and include a maintenance agreement.
 - ii. All-weather materials shall be used.
 - iii. [Public art](#) shall not include advertisements, but can include a placard indicating the name of the artwork, the name of the artist, and information about the artwork.
 - iv. Public artwork shall require a recommendation of approval from the [Public Art](#) Committee of the Cultural

Durham Cultural Advisory Board

Advisory Board.

v. <https://durham.municipal.codes/UDO/16.4.2E.3.b>

V. Old Business

a. Durham Arts Council (DAC) Updates on ARP Funding Contract and Grants

1. The Durham Arts Council contract was approved during City Council's April 3, 2023, meeting, details here under agenda item 5: <https://cityordinances.durhamnc.gov/OnBaseAgendaOnline/Meetings/ViewMeeting?id=576&doctype=1>. Durham Arts Council (DAC) has met the compliance items on insurance, and the City is going through the final review and signing process.
2. Margaret DeMott from the Durham Arts Council (DAC) shares that DAC will hire a temporary full-time staff member, for two years, dedicated to assist with grantmaking. DAC is working on the applications for individual artists and arts organizations to apply for support; the City will need to approve these applications.

ii. Cultural & Public Art Program (CPAP) FY23/24 Festival and Special Event Funding

1. The City is in the process of reviewing and approving the FY23/24 budget; Brown anticipates the Festival and Special Event Funding will move forward soon. CPAP is gearing up to launch and release the RFP online in the coming weeks based on City Council approval of the FY23/24 budget. Brown suggests new DCAB members familiarize themselves with the RFP process and timeline from FY22/23; more information can be found on the City's website here: [FY 22-23 Festivals & Special Events Funding | Durham, NC \(durhamnc.gov\)](#).
2. Brown requested feedback on the Festivals webpage and review process from DCAB members as she refines the FY23/24 RFP. Brown will be meeting with Discover Durham's Round Table to review the process next week. Office hours and workshops will be available for interested organizations to help answer questions. The DCAB will review all of the applications and will make a funding recommendation based on scores and the review criteria to City leadership and/or City Council for final funding approval.
 - a. Jordan discusses pain-points during last year's voting process following the initial evaluation of each application, specifically about repeat funding for organizations and newer or smaller organizations. Jordan suggests planning for this year's review process; what are the priorities within the existing guidelines, so DCAB does not get caught having debates past the rules.
 - b. Lee agrees that having this conversation before August is worthwhile.
 - c. Coleman suggests holding the July meeting, which had been previously cancelled, to come to consensus about the review process.

Durham Cultural Advisory Board

- d. Brown states that any significant recommendations for revision to the existing process, it would need to occur in advance of the RFP release; any adjustments made to the existing process would take a significant amount of time to craft and curate among all departments. Brown's recommendation is to think about specific criteria i.e. new applicants, new events, etc. in the weighting metric that's already been established, or does DCAB realign the scoring that evenly distributes points throughout the four established goals.
- e. Deas clarifies that he feels DCAB is more interested in potentially revising the internal review process and understands the potential burden of any changes on the applicants and City staff. Deas suggests DCAB wait on any further discussion on significant changes for this year and can be discussed later for next year. He summarizes his thoughts: 1. Do we want to ask for more information from the applicants? 2. After applications are received, how does DCAB go about the scoring process? Any changes in scoring would be made public and available to all applicants.
- f. Coleman offers the option to extend this meeting in the next 10 – 12 days to resolve this discussion, recognizing that DCAB will not recommend to significantly restructure this process in a way that would affect applicants due to the timeframe; she suggests that internal discussion and review could continue in part two of this meeting.
- g. Jordan clarifies his intention from his initial comment and does not want to suggest that the broader priorities in the scoring rubric are altered, and that DCAB has a set of rules that are available to applicants. He offers an example of the difficult nature of the review process: DCAB reviews an application from a large, established organization with a long history and can impact thousands of people, and an application for the same amount of funding from a newer organization that would impact less people. He wants to maintain the same scoring rubric and review process and asks that DCAB internally discuss any further priorities or considerations that would obviate any long discussion following the initial review of each application while staying consistent. Jordan does not feel that any alterations to the existing process but wants to avoid extending meetings.
- h. Lee asks Brown to share meeting minutes and discussion notes on last year's conversations and review process and suggests this may be helpful; Medrano agreed with Lee's request and believes it will be helpful, especially to new board members.

Durham Cultural Advisory Board

- i. Brown summarized that DCAB wants to make minor revisions to the review process and not the review criteria and review the applicants holistically against each other, with a comparative analysis of the portfolio of applicants.
- j. Jordan reiterates the need to be consistent among the initial review and final review of applicants.
- k. Deas shares his perspective of a wholistic review process, by reading all applications and ranking them. Deas suggests DCAB's review is a bit different and involves reviewing each application individually for its own merits, and score based on the rubric. After each have been scored, added, and averaged, they review the list of the applications based on the scoring. He stresses DCAB's critical review of the applications and has seen improvements in the process over the years.
- l. Lee agrees the hardest part of the process comes after the initial review takes place when decisions need to be made about allocating funds; there are more requests for funding than funding available to grant, and DCAB intends to be fair.
- m. Coleman suggests extending this meeting or adding an hour to the August meeting to be prepared for the internal review.
- n. Brown reminds DCAB that if guiding criteria or principles need to be updated, this had to have happen prior to the RFP release and will need to wait until next year. Brown requests specific changes to review criteria, guiding principles, or the RFP that can be incorporated and gain consensus over written correspondence following this meeting.
- o. Torre feels the conversation has become bigger than Jordan's initial comments and feels that DCAB doesn't need to change any part of their existing process and feels they should focus on streamlining DCAB's internal process after the initial review. Jordan agrees with Torre's summary.
- p. Jordan spoke to every individual's personal experience and familiarity with the applicant and their unconscious biases, there is no way to legislate against this; overall feels less concerned about the initial concern following this conversation.
- q. Deas suggests guidelines for those reviewing the applications; for example, personal experiences or relationships may or may not belong in the review process.
- r. Shabu included this comment in the chat: "I'm hearing that we are interrogating our own commitment to equity. How well did we do with regards to equity in previous years?"
- s. Ritche raises DCAB's work in equity, and suggests they hold themselves to DCAB's commitment to equity and keep it present throughout the process. Ritchie suggests reaching out

Durham Cultural Advisory Board

to new DCAB members to provide some guidance on this process based on recent years to help prepare them for August.

- t. Torre is confident in their thorough and vetted process, which takes personal bias out of the initial review; he agrees with Shabu and Ritchie's recommendations. He states that if there was available funding to cover the requests, this issue would not exist.
- u. Brown recommends DCAB provides staff with written places of improvement on the review process for the August meeting in the next week. Brown also recommends a 30-minute orientation with new DCAB members before the August meeting. Brown needs specific, actionable steps to help facilitate the conversation in August.
- v. Ritchie suggests summarizing the comments in the chat and offered to reformat the comments and suggestions for staff; Brown and Coleman agree this is the best path forward.
- w. Shabu suggested reviewing funded organizations in the past and reaffirm DCAB's commitment to equity and fairness. Deas said DCAB starts each year with a blank slate, but during the final review, past year funding and performance may be part of their considerations for funding. Brown will include past festival funding details in the review, including compliance.
- x. Torre recommends reviewing the past awarded applications against their final report; for example, did the event impact the estimated audience number.
- y. Ritchie shares her experience as an applicant for the Festival Funding, and that it was not clear that funds were only available as reimbursement. She recommends adding this to FAQ page and making this clearer to applicants. Brown shares contract language that details "proof of need" based on City's contract language, where organizations can ask for specific funds upfront and request approval from the City. Brown will include this detail on the webpage and will highlight this to awarded organizations.

iii. **County Public Art Program Updates**

- 1. The County is working towards determining what the requirements will be for a Public Art Coordinator as a contract position for one year; anticipated date of advertisement is mid-July.

VI. **Governance**

a. **Priorities Refresher & Evaluation - Durham Cultural Advisory Board (DCAB) 2023 Priorities**

- i. DCAB members are encouraged to check-in with their Task Forces and find time to meet in the next few months.

Durham Cultural Advisory Board

1. **Advocate for more city and county funding and support for arts and culture in Durham.**
 - a. Members: Mitchell Sava, Michael Betts II, Laura Ritchie (staff support: Annette Smith).
2. **Support the implementation of a new Cultural Roadmap.**
 - a. Members: Elias Torre, E'Vonnie Coleman, Laura Ritchie, Erin Lee (staff support: Annette Smith).
3. **Strengthen and improve relationships with artists, arts and cultural organizations, communities, neighborhoods, and people of Durham.** Members: Michael Betts II, Aya Shabu (need to confirm), Mitchell Sava (staff support: Rebecca Brown/Annette Smith/Stephanie Minor)
4. **Understand the intersection between Durham's health/wellness organizations, local artists, and our community's art and culture structures.** Members: Dr. Eldrin Deas, Tom Jaynes (staff support: Rebecca Brown).
5. **Support and strengthen the work of the Public Art Committee.** Members: Laura Ritchie, Elias Torre (staff support: Rebecca Brown/Stephanie Minor).
6. **Provide stewardship during the pilot year of the Poet Laureate of Durham.** Members: Andrew Nurkin, Aya Shabu (staff support: Rebecca Brown). This is ongoing; core value.
7. **The Durham Cultural Advisory Board defines "historically excluded communities" as any group of people (by gender, ability, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or other identity) who have been or are currently underrepresented either numerically, systemically, in ways of power, in positions of authority, or in adequacy of resources in Durham's arts and cultural social structures.** This is ongoing; core value.

VII. New Business

a. Cultural Roadmap (CRM) & Cultural Roadmap Planning Group (CRPG) Updates

- i. City staff member Smith thanks DCAB members for attending the updates on Cultural Roadmap's Cultural Planning Consultants AMS Planning & Research (AMS) kick-off meeting on June 6, 2023. Approximately 40 people attended the presentation at the Carolina Theatre. The AMS team along with City and County staff, Lee, and Former Mayor Steve Schewel, Co-chair of CRPG, took a bus tour of Durham and surveyed 51 institutions, cultural assets, and resources including stop and stretch visits at Durham Arts Council, Hayti Heritage Center, Museum of Life and Science, and the Scrap Exchange. AMS also presented to stakeholders from the City and County at the Carolina Theater, including the Durham Cultural Advisory Board, and its Cultural Roadmap Planning Group, sharing initial observations of Durham's many cultural assets, and outlining next steps in the Cultural Roadmap development process.
- ii. Smith is working with AMS to finalize the Creative Community Partnership call and hopes to release the call in the coming weeks. The Cultural Roadmap stand-alone website is in process, with a July 1 goal date for the website to go live. For more information on the Creative Community Partnership opportunity, click here: [Cultural Roadmap | Durham, NC \(durhamnc.gov\)](https://www.durhamnc.gov/cultural-roadmap)

Durham Cultural Advisory Board

- iii. AMS will visit again in mid-July to facilitate stakeholder interviews with 1 – 3 people in each interview. These first 30 internal interviews will include City and County staff and leadership, DCAB leadership, Public Art Committee (PAC) leadership, and strong partner agencies within the government structure. AMS will return later in July to facilitate approximately 20 additional interviews with artists, cultural organizations, and other specific groups; this list will be refined by the CRPG during their next meeting. The information gathered from these interviews will direct the plan for community-wide engagement and larger focus group research.

VIII. Public Questions

- a. None.

IX. Final Thoughts and Discussion

- a. The July 19 meeting has been cancelled.
- b. The next meeting will be held on August 16, 2023, from 2:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
- c. This meeting is Angela Lee's last meeting as a member and the Chair of the Durham Cultural Advisory Board. Lee began her service on the board in 2017 and has lead the Board through many accomplishments. On behalf of the City of Durham, Brown thanks Lee for her years of leadership and service.

X. Public Questions

- a. None.

XI. Adjournment

- a. The next meeting will be held on August 16, 2023, from 2:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. in person at General Services Department.
 - i. Topics will include:
 1. Festivals & Event RFP Evaluation
- b. **September**
 - i. Topics will include:
 1. DCAB Vision, Mission, Values Discussion
 2. Public Art Committee

Respectfully submitted,
Stephanie Minor

For updates on City of Durham's Public Art Projects, visit:

<https://durhamnc.gov/3319/Current-Public-Art-Projects>

For updates on Durham County's Public Art Program, visit:

<https://www.dconnc.gov/county-departments/departments-a-e/engineering-and-environmental-services/durham-county-public-art-program>

PAC Agenda Center:

<https://www.durhamnc.gov/AgendaCenter/Public-Art-Committee-7>