



Agenda
Athens Justice and Memory Project
Team Meeting #17
Wednesday, May 18, 2022
5:00- 6:00pm
Virtual WebEx Meeting

- A. Hattie Thomas Whitehead started the meeting by stating this team was assembled in September 2020 to work on avenues of atonement outlined in the Linnentown Project resolution.
- B. Moment of silence for Linnentown descendants
 - The justice and memory team took a moment of silence to acknowledge and show respect to those who were no longer with us.
- C. Attendance: some members are calling in via phone
 - Hattie Thomas Whitehead, Committee Chair and First Descendant of Linnentown
 - Dr. Jennifer Rice, UGA Professor, and Researcher, Parliamentarian
 - Bobby Crook, Linnentown first descendant- calling in
 - Christine Davis Johnson, Linnentown first descendant- calling in
 - Charlene Marsh, Secretary
 - Commissioner Mariah Parker, ACCGov Commissioner, District 2
 - Niki Jones, ACCGov Assistant Manager, non-voting/supporting member
 - Selah Gardiner, ACCGov Interim Inclusion Officer, non-voting member
 - Sherrie Hines, ACCGov Attorney's Office
- D. Ms. Thomas Whitehead stated that the minutes of the last meeting were distributed to members in advance of the meeting and asks if there are any amendments to the meeting.
 - On a motion by Dr. Rice; seconded by Bobby Crook, the minutes are approved with no opposition or abstinent.
- E. Selah Gardiner presents the proposed timeline for the "Walk of Recognition"
 - Mayor and Commission approved the recommendation to move forward with these interpretive signs on Findley street
 - The Request for proposal (RFP) will go out publicly to bid by the end of May 2022--will be available for public bidding for only 14 days for individuals to submit a proposal for this project (estimated to close on June 13)

- Possibility of an extension if the proposer asks for a site visit
- Two-week review period by a committee of 3-5 people who make an evaluation based on the rubric provided by the finance team: Imagine Ms. Hatte as the chair, Dr. Rice as the subgroup lead, and then staff
- The evaluation team would then turn over the chosen bidder back to the finance team, and once the bidder is decided upon, the contracting process begins
- We're looking at a 3-5 month designing process just with the designer that happens *after* the procurement/contracting process is complete
- The schematic design created by the design firm would be presented in a Mayor and Commission work session
- After approval from the Mayor and Commission, the build process would begin (permitting and coordination to install signs)
- The build process could take approximately 8-14 weeks
- This means the installation is predicted to take place in Spring 2023, based on research and conversations with experts
- Ms. Thomas Whitehead opens the floor for questions
- Dr. Rice asks what the RFP and the design firm's instructions are on how to determine the content of the signs and how that gets approved and workshopped before the final proposal.
- Selah Gardiner answers that they did their best to pull language from the resolution and explain the scope of work that they're looking for. The hope is that the firms would have the creative flexibility to work with us after they're contracted. That would come through the evaluation committee, who would look at references, qualifications, and past work they've done to compare and contrast what this group is looking for in these signs and what the design firm is capable to do. Once the evaluation committee decides on a firm, then they would get together to truly flesh out what are the most critical/impactful stories that need to go on these signs.
- Dr. Rice asks if the timeline could be amended to include a could be an Athens Justice and Memory Project (AJMP) approval prior to being presented to the Mayor and Commission work session.
- Selah Gardiner agrees to the amendment
- Niki Jones asks if the consultant would be working with the AJMP team to get feedback prior to going to the Mayor and Commissioner for final approval
- Selah Gardiner responds in the affirmative: all the AJMP meetings that would happen during the design process would have someone from the designing firm sit in on those meetings to collect design concepts.

F. Dr. Rice presents the participatory art pieces (Linnentown Mosaic)

- Dr. Lynn Sanders-Bustle facilitated this process with middle and high schoolers in the “social ecology” studio in the Lamar Dodd School of Art at UGA
- Dr. Bustle had her UGA students go into middle and high school classes, and teach about Linnentown, and art-making skills, and the students come back with the middle/high schooler art, specifically, clay figures to be a part of the mosaic
- Then Dr. Bustle gathered “found” objects to contribute to the community participatory art
- Clarke Middle made clay medallions alongside the UGA students
- Cedar Shoals did “found poetry” on clay: they put words on clay that can be arranged as poetry or put in the mosaic
- Participatory community art would help teach about Linnentown, honor Linnentown and its descendants, build relationships and trust, facilitate dialogue, teach art-making skills, and foster community
- Dr. Rice opens the floor for questions
- Commissioner Parker expresses excitement for the participatory art component of the Linnentown resolution and praises the group for being creative; however, expresses concern for how the participatory art/mosaic component might affect the timeline of the interpretive signs

G. Ms. Thomas Whitehead wishes to vote to formalize the process going forward, specifically 1) the RFP for artists (typical public art process), 2) intergovernmental agreement with UGA (IGA), and 3) the Project Manager as the authorized designee for facilitating the mosaic installation

- Option 1, “RFP for artists” refers to the typical ACC process for public art artist procurements: the individual would be hired and contracted by ACCGov and would be required to hold insurance and liability protections, and would receive full funding for the project
- Option 2 “IGA” refers to the intergovernmental agreement with UGA: ACC gov would go into an agreement with UGA (if they agree) that ACCGov is handing the artistic process and installation of this project to UGA entirely. The reason this was proposed was that Dr. Bustle is a professor at the art school at UGA, which means that UGA (if they agree) would assign Dr. Bustle as UGA’s sole proprietor to oversee this process.
- Sherrie Hines clarifies that just because an IGA goes into effect doesn’t mean that there can’t be restrictions within the IGA about design and how they’ll work together. At that point, ACC would largely have their hands out of it.
- Dr. Rice asks who exactly the IGA would be between (i.e. between the art school and ACC? The president’s office and ACC?)
- Sherrie Hines states that the agreement would be with UGA as a whole because they are the fundamental body. Hines assumes that the art school would act as a

Inclusion Office

THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF ATHENS-CLARKE COUNTY, GEORGIA P. O. Box 1868 · Athens, Georgia 30603
 (706) 613-3015 · Email: inclusionoffice@accgov.com
www.accgov.com

representative of UGA, but at the end of the day, UGA would still be the primary entity.

- Dr. Rice continues to ask for clarification as to which office it would go to
- Ms. Hines responds by stating that figuring out which office would be responsible for the IGA would be part of the negotiation process.
- Commissioner Parker asks if the three proposal options are mutually exclusive or are bundled together.
- Ms. Thomas Whitehead responds by saying that they will only approve one out of the three proposed ideas. She continues by mentioning that UGA is not at the table, so realistically IGA would not pass and AJMP would not like to slow the process down.
- Option 3, “Project Manager” refers to the process by which an individual would be hired and managed by ACC gov and they would be the authorized designee for the use of all the allocated funds and resources for this project. They would continue to facilitate the community workshop process along with AJMP members and Dr. Rice and Dr. Bustle. They would be responsible for managing, allocating, and storing all of the supplies for the community workshops. They would be required to hold their own insurance to ensure that they’re liable and accountable for public funds. They would also need to produce a maintenance plan for the project for up to 25 years.
- Ms. Thomas Whitehead asks if there are any questions
- Dr. Rice asks what the scope of work for this is in terms of it being a full-time or part-time job.
- Mr. Jones notes that they would not be an ACC employee; however, the pay rate will depend on the scope of work and the quote for the project.
- Dr. Rice asks if there is a projection for the pay or the time the project will take
- Mr. Jones responds by saying that the project manager will bid on the scope of the project
- Dr. Rice points out that this proposal would be very taxing on an individual; it is a very specialized job asking for a very specific skillset
- Commissioner Parker asks if someone could juxtapose the pros and cons of options one and three
- Mr. Jones notes that option one is the normative process of contracting someone, so it would be the most efficient.
- Dr. Rice points out that concern with option one is that the individual contracted (if it isn’t Dr. Bustle) would have autonomy over what Dr. Bustle has created/Dr. Bustle may not want to turn over something she’s created. Dr. Rice clarifies that she does not want to speak for Dr. Bustle.

Inclusion Office

- Selah Gardiner points out that the RFP for an artist and a project manager both would have to hold liability insurance. Dr. Bustle could apply as an artist or as a project manager.
- Ms. Thomas Whitehead motions to vote in favor of option 3. Motion is seconded.
- Attorney Hines clarifies parliamentary procedure.
- Selah Gardiner notes that, if option 3 is decided upon, the RFQ will be written in line with that language and Dr. Bustle could continue working as a volunteer instructor with the Project Manager chosen through the RFQ process as the final authority on the project. AJMP would feed their ideas and directives to that Project Manager, but the chosen Project Manager would have the designated authority and funds for the installation. The Project Manager would also carry liability insurance for this project.
- Dr. Rice restates the motion on the floor as made by Ms. Thomas Whitehead and seconded by Bobby - to move forward with option 3 as the official recommendation of AJMP. All 6 voting members on this call vote in favor of option 3.
- Ms. Thomas Whitehead announces the subgroup that will work on recommendations back to AJMP on how to use the financial losses report. On that subgroup will be Bobby, Ms. Thomas Whitehead, Commissioner Hamby, and Charlene. Charlene agrees to lead that subgroup.
- Ms. Thomas Whitehead asks the group about having an in-person meeting on June 22. Dr. Rice states that she can not attend a meeting on June 22. Selah Gardiner suggests meeting at the library on the third Wednesday of June (June 15). Everyone agrees that June 15 at 5PM works.
- Dr. Rice motions to adjourn, motion is seconded, and meeting ends.

Inclusion Office