

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA

Public Art Committee Meeting January 19, 2024

The Public Art Committee met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Friday, January 19, 2024, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Roxanne Horvath, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL: Roxanne Horvath
Julie Dickover
Christina Parrish-Stone

Absent: David Bagnall
Diane Mataraza

Also Present: Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

2.General Public Comment

(None)

3. Welcome Team Members and Guest

4. Review of Meeting Minutes

4.(a). Minutes December 1, 2023

MOTION

Ms. Horvath MOVED to APPROVE the December 1,2023 meeting minutes. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Parrish-Stone and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

5. Review and Discuss Documents

Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney, reviewed the documents with the committee. She pointed out where the main art piece would be located and where smaller interpretive panels could be placed. She stated the trees in the space would grow and affect how the art piece could be viewed. She discussed how to apply for the project, the budget, the travel stipend, the selection process, the estimated schedule, the submission deadline, the final proposals,

what to expect if selected, and how to contact City Staff. She noted supplemental information was added based on the input by the committee.

Ms. Parrish-Stone felt the document provided was outstanding. She said everything from the last meeting had been incorporated and the document contained an abundance of information that would be useful to the artist.

Ms. Lopez asked if there were any changes or if the committee wanted more information added. She said she wanted to confirm the timeline before proceeding.

Ms. Lopez informed the committee that David Bagnall had resigned as he was unable to commit the time required. She advised that Ms. Mataraza reviewed the document and had no changes for discussion.

Ms. Horvath said at the upcoming City Commission meeting she would request that Randal Roark be added to the committee if he was in favor.

Mr. Roark confirmed he would be willing to participate as part of the committee.

Ms. Horvath asked if Mr. Roark had comments regarding the document provided.

Mr. Roark commented that the documents were very well prepared. He felt it should be clearly noted that secondary pieces could be installed, and the entire site was able to be used. He said a water feature could be added to the primary site as there was electricity and water available. He asked if the twenty-five-foot max height was a stipulation of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). He said if not, he thought the height could be more in line with the zoning requirements. He noted some maps that provided scales and an overview could be beneficial to the artist.

Ms. Lopez said the twenty-five feet was from the DOT guidelines; however, she would ask to increase the height if requested.

Mr. Roark felt the site could handle more height. He said the interpretive panel may have been a little confusing but felt the language should be clarified; noting panels could be at both locations.

Ms. Parrish-Stone commented there was only one possible site for the interpretive panel; however, the secondary panel would not be accessible to the public and it would not be needed.

Ms. Lopez advised the concept was the stabilized surface or donut hole was the primary location and the secondary sites could be anywhere or what was called 'top of bank'. She said the panels could be at both locations or only one.

Ms. Horvath thought with the amount of people entering and exiting the Cultural Center that could be a great location if you could see the art piece.

Ms. Dickover questioned if the interpretive panels should be called 'sites' as it was more of a recommendation than a requirement and felt the wording should be revised.

Ms. Lopez asked if the interpretive panel should have an artist element or was it not necessary.

Ms. Horvath said the panel would have verbiage to explain the art piece or some sort of textile about the art piece.

Ms. Dickover said the cost of the panel would fall within the current budget and those could be a considerable amount which would cut into the budget for the main art piece. She said the main focus should be the art piece instead of the interpretive panel.

Ms. Lopez asked if there was a need for an interpretive panel budget, and if so it could be a request to the City Commission.

Ms. Horvath thought that the \$250,000 budget should be for the main art piece, and they could request an additional budget for the interpretive panel. She said the artist should be requested to work on the panels to explain their art piece.

Ms. Parrish-Stone noted on one side of the walkway at the Cultural Center there was a historic marker, and the interpretive panel could be placed on the other side.

Ms. Dickover said there was an advantage having the panel in front of the Cultural Center was all the patrons from the library and the Water works building as there was not a lot of pedestrian traffic in the area.

Ms. Parrish-Stone asked if the panel would be a requirement or an option; therefore, if

the City chose to install, additional funds could be provided.

Ms. Horvath felt the interpretive panel was necessary.

Ms. Parrish-Stone felt it was better to give the artist the option rather than make it a requirement because it was a different type of project.

Ms. Horvath asked where the RFQ would be distributed besides Café.

Ms. Lopez replied that Ms. Mataraza provided a comprehensive list including indigenous groups, artist groups, Café, more traditional governmental website, the City's website and anywhere the committee felt necessary.

Ms. Parrish-Stone said it could be shared by the Florida Art Professionals in their newsletter and other cultural counsels.

Ms. Lopez said a copy could be sent to the artist association and those on the list provided.

Ms. Horvath asked if a copy could be sent to various universities.

Ms. Parrish-Stone advised that University of Florida had an extensive art program run by Jenny Hagar and knew she would be willing to distribute the information to her colleagues across the country that were involved in public art.

Ms. Lopez discussed the dates with the committee. She asked if everyone would be available for the April 26th meeting and July 19th meeting.

The committee discussed the dates and confirmed the following dates:

- April 26, 2024; Committee meeting to review the applications and selection of finalist
- July 9, 2024; Finalist to present plus Q & A from the committee
- July 30, 2024; Art Committee Ranking of finalist

They determined that May 13th-20th would be feasible for site visits if needed.

Ms. Lopez noted April 1st through April 26th would be the dates for review of the applications.

Ms. Parrish-Stone advised that they need several hours to discuss the art packets.

5.(a). Call for Artist

Discussion under item 5

5. (b). Request for Qualifications

Discussion under item 5

6. Additional Matters for Discussion

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:46 P.M.