<u>CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA</u>

Public Art Committee Meeting
September 1, 2023

The Public Art Committee met in formal session at 11:00 A.M., Friday, September 1, 2023, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Roxanne Horvath, Chairman, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL: Roxanne Horvath, Vice-Mayor, Commissioner
David Bagnall
Julie Dickover
Diane Mataraza
Christina Parrish-Stone

Also Present: David Birchim, City Manager
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Darlene Galambos, City Clerk
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary
Michele Fudo, Recording Secretary

2. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS

3. INTRODUCTIONS: ROXANNE HORVATH, VICE MAYOR CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

- David Bagnall, Executive Director Lightner Museum
- Julie Dickover, Director Crisp-Ellert Art Museum at Flagler College
- Diane Mataraza, Principle Mataraza Consulting
- Christina Parrish-Stone, Executive Director St. Johns Cultural Council

4. CALL FOR ARTISTS QUALIFICATIONS DISCUSSION: POSSIBLE TWO PART:

<u>4.A.</u>
- **Qualifications**
- **Short List: Concept and Stipend**

Commissioner Horvath discussed the qualifications with the committee.

Ms. Parrish-Stone advised that the Cultural Council had access to a program named Café that could be used to inform artists of the project, and its reach was worldwide.

Ms. Horvath asked if anyone would like to speak to the details of the qualifications. She suggested that a concept should be provided by any finalist and would supplying a stipend be acceptable.

Ms. Parrish-Stone thought providing a stipend for artists would be appropriate but questioned the budget for the project.

Ms. Horvath indicated that a stipend of $2,000- $2,500 per person would be provided and advised the budget was $250,000. She questioned if the project was all inclusive.

David Birchim said the project could be described to artists and it would be all inclusive; however, parameters could be provided.

Ms. Lopez reiterated that the budget for the project was $250,000 and would be used for paying the stipend**.** She also advised that the project, because it was being placed in the right of way, would have to be signed and sealed.

Ms. Parrish-Stone verified her understanding that the entire budget was $250,000 and the committee could select three artist who would be paid around $2,000 possibly to create a proposal.

There was consensus that part of the budget would have to be set aside for a structural engineer.

Ms. Horvath advised that conduit for lighting and water had already been installed.

Ms. Mataraza indicated that she would like to see clarity regarding the involvement of the Public Works. She suggested that a $2,500 stipend and perhaps a travel stipend should be provided if an artist would need to travel.

Mr. Bagnell questioned if the goal was to have the entire project completed within the fiscal year and if the project extended beyond the fiscal year, what would happen.

David Birchim advised that the project would roll over to the next fiscal year. He expressed the desire to get the project moving; however, the project would take as long as needed.
Ms. Horvath agreed and advised that she wanted to be sure the project was done correctly.

5. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

Ms. Horvath discussed the location and the landscaping of the project. She was concerned with the description of the project as the city was unique, and this needed to be representative of the city.

Ms. Parrish-Stone said that some parameters should be provided but the project description should not be narrow in scope. She said the committee should look for a creative approach from the artists that respond, but any submissions should represent the city and its history. She said the proposals should be allowed to be creative. She agreed the finalist should travel, visit the site, and have public input if necessary**.**

Ms. Mataraza questioned when Public Works could weigh in on the parameters and provide what the tree canopy would look like in ten years.

6. DISCUSSION OF TIMELINE

6.(a). Presentation on Recruitment Goals

Ms. Mataraza advised that a timeline should be put together to include everything and make it shareable regarding requirements. Things to include, 1) the Call to Artists, 2) the time for the selection process, and 3) the opportunity for the artists to come before the final selection was made.

There was consensus that a timeline should be put together as soon as possible.

7. SUBMISSION DEADLINE:

The Board discussed submission requirements, that should include up to ten slides with resolution, links to websites, artist biography, and mediums each artist has worked with.

Ms. Dickover questioned if the call to artists should ask for letters of recommendations from prior clients, and the board members agreed that that would be important.
There was a brief discussion regarding the use of the online Café services to assist with the outreach process.

Ms. Parrish-Stone advised that the Cultural Council was a member of The Florida Association of Public Art Professionals, and their procurement will share according to their requirements and the committee would select the finalists to present to the Commission for a final selection.

Ms. Lopez raised a concern regarding artists' rights. She said the city has a resolution for when it purchases or accepts donations of art, and one of the standard requests was that the artist would have to give up rights to the art. She noted the City would have to maintain control because of the right of way safety issues, and it was public art.

Ms. Parrish-Stone would want a form of the agreement to present to the artist and would want to share that in the call to artist as that was a critical piece.

8. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

9. BUDGET
Ms. Parrish-Stone asked how the city budgeted ongoing maintenance for the project.

Mr. Birchim advised that the budget was done every year for maintenance of all public sculptures, historic buildings, and other objects through revenues from the parking garage, and it could be added into the yearly budget.

10. SELECTION CRITERIA AND PROCESS

Ms. Horvath asked the committee if they all wanted to prepare a draft for review at the next meeting to include the project description, location and historical components; or would they rather have the clerk take the information and wordsmith it.

Ms. Lopez suggested that not everyone on the committee need prepare a draft but instead have someone volunteer.

Ms. Dickover volunteered and would use some of the criteria mentioned previously by Ms. Horvath.

Ms. Horvath asked who the contact person would be because of the Sunshine Law.

Ms. Lopez offered that all information could be sent to her and that she would work with the Clerk's office for questions and first drafts.

Ms. Parrish-Stone asked if it would be appropriate for Ms. Dickover to send the first draft to Ms. Lopez who would then distribute it to all committee members to provide comments. She felt a goal needed to be set for when the first draft should be completed.
There was a brief discussion regarding the draft process. It was determined that Ms. Dickover would begin a draft and send to the City Clerk to include in the next agenda for review. After further discussion it was determined that the next meeting would be held on October 6, 2023, at 11:00 A.M.

Ms. Parrish-Stone suggested a schedule that would include when the call to artists would go out, how long the call will be available on Café and through procurement systems, the deadline for all submissions, when to meet to review all submissions, a deadline to have all completed proposals and make recommendation for the commission.

11. METHODS OF ADVERTISING

Café and Procurement—

Ms. Parrish-Stone asked if it would be appropriate, and would the city like for the Cultural Council to advertise the meetings of the Public Art Committee in their e-newsletter.

Ms. Lopez questioned if it would be appropriate to host a charrette to include members of the community that would be interested in giving feedback. The committee thought it was critical to have public feedback and could host the charrette when the artists were in town and have community input.

Ms. Dickover submitted that it might make sense to have an informational meeting for local artists that would provide education as well as examples of exactly all the aspects that go into one of these types of projects such as structural engineering.

Ms. Matazara said that the committee should have neighborhood meetings for those communities to have input. She advised that public relations efforts cannot be too excessive.

Ms. Lopez advised that there were three choices for public meetings, first; notice as a meeting of the art committee to comply with Sunshine, second; coordinate with staff with no communication between committee members, third; each member attended one of the neighborhood meetings but no communication as a committee outside of a committee meeting would be permitted.

Ms. Parrish-Stone said that the second choice seemed to be the best alternative. She noted most of the neighborhood associations held their meetings at the Water Works building and since it was across the street from the location, there would be a chance to take people to see the site. She offered to help to coordinate that when the time came.

Ms. Horvath and Ms. Parrish-Stone agreed that this was not an interactive art piece except from a distance either on foot or in the car.

12. ADDITIONAL MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

Ms. Parrish-Stone said that the city commission should be made aware that this project would take longer than a year to be completed, and that it would be at least an 18-month process from start to finish.

13. NEXT MEETING

14. ADJOURN 11:57

The meeting was adjourned at 11:57 A.M.