

DRAFT

**CITY OF CORAL GABLES  
ARTS ADVISORY PANEL MEETING  
Wednesday, August 25, 2021 9:00 a.m.**

**Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Department  
Hybrid Meeting & Virtual via Zoom**

<b>MEMBERS</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>A</b>
	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>
Nelson de León	P	-	-	-	V	P	E	-	P	P	P
Eugenia Incer*											P
Adler Guerrier	P	-	-	-	V	P	P	-	P	P	P
Maggie Hernandez*					V	P	P	-	P	P	P
Jacek Kolasinski	P	-	-	-	A	P	P	-	P	E	P
Emily MacDonald-Korth	P	-	-	-	V	V	P	-	V	P	E
Manny Mato	P	-	-	-	V	V	E	-	V	P	E
Marijean Miyar	P	-	-	-	V	P	V	-	V	P	P
Juan Roselione-Valadez	P	-	-	-	A	P	P	-	V	P	P

**LEGEND:** A = Absent; P = Present; V = Virtual; E = Excused; \* = New Member; ^= Resigned Member;  
- = No Meeting    + = Special Meeting

**STAFF:**

Warren Adams, Historical Resources and Cultural Arts Director  
Catherine Cathers, Arts and Culture Specialist

**MEETING RECORD / MINUTES PREPARATION:** Catherine Cathers, Arts & Culture Specialist,  
Historical Resources & Cultural Arts Department

---

The Arts Advisory Panel meeting was called to order at 9:08 a.m.

**APPROVAL OF JUNE 23, 2021 MEETING MINUTES:**

**A motion was made by Ms. Hernandez and seconded by Mr. Guerrier to approve the meeting minutes of June 23, 2021 and accept the excused absences of Mr. Mato and Ms. MacDonald-Korth, which was unanimously passed by voice vote.**

NEW BUSINESS:

a. NOMINATION OF CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR

The Panel was advised to appoint a Chair and Vice-Chair. After a brief discussion, the following motion was made:

**Mr. Guerrier made a motion nominating Jacek Kolasiński for the position of Chair and Maggie Hernandez as Vice-Chair. Mr. Roselione-Valadez seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

b. PRE-QUALIFIED ARTIST REQUESTS – BRIAN DONNELLY, KAWS; MARIA CRISTINA CARBONELL; AND PHILLIP SMITH III

The Panel received pre-qualification materials for artists Brian Donnelly, known as KAWS; Maria Cristina Carbonell, and Phillip Smith III. Panel members reviewed the materials prior to the meeting and agreed that the artists presented meet the criteria. With no further discussion, the following motions were made:

**Mr. Roselione-Valadez made a motion to accept Brian Donnelly, KAWS, as a pre-qualified artist. Mr. Guerrier seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Roselione-Valadez made a motion to accept Maria Cristina Carbonell and Phillip Smith III as pre-qualified artists. Ms. Miyar seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

c. AIPP WAIVER REQUEST, THE PLAZA – BRIAN DONNELLY, KAWS

Staff introduced Carlos Beckmann, representing Agave for The Plaza development project. Mr. Beckmann shared his screen and introduced Per Skarstedt, representing the artist through Skarstedt Gallery.

Mr. Skarstedt gave a brief overview of the artist and his work, saying that KAWS started as a commercial artist about twenty years ago and has emerged as an international artist. Through his appeal to diverse audiences across the globe, he comes through a tradition of Andy Warhol and Keith Haring and noted that Warhol started as a commercial artist with Haring having his beginnings as a street artist. KAWS signature pieces, Mr. Skarstedt continued, Companion and BFF, are easily recognizable and the artist has created a global language which is being appreciated and connects with experienced art lovers as well as people who have never set foot in a museum or gallery.

Mr. Skarstedt stated that KAWS offers an exploration of humanity itself. The artist's work is both playful and deeply emotional, speaking powerfully to the emotions of our time and bringing joy

and inspiration to a lot of people. He said there are three large scale monumental sculptures installed in New York City, two on Park Avenue and one at the Rockefeller Center, which are in a high-profile locations in New York where artists such as Jeff Koons and Keith Haring have had major installations over the years. He went on to say that the artist has 3.5 million Instagram followers. Mr. Skarstedt shared that KAWS has two museum shows, one at the Brooklyn Museum and one at the Mori Arts Center in Tokyo with more exhibits scheduled in Canada and Europe. He shared images of other large-scale sculptures the artist has done over the years including recent installations in New York, Melbourne, Toronto Amsterdam, Qatar, and Hong Kong. He mentioned that the artist has many requests, but only uses one foundry to produce about one sculpture a year.

Mr. Beckmann added that Agave has spoken directly with the artist and this piece was specifically suggested for The Plaza site. Fabrication and installation will take about a year, he said, and is set for completion in the fall of next year.

Mr. Beckmann reviewed the location, stating it will be in the center of the south, main lawn which is a multi-functional space in the heart of The Plaza where performances may happen and is also in the front of the hotel. The floor plan was shown, showing the location of already approved artworks.

The Panel was informed that this will complete the final proposed art for the project, with artworks distributed throughout The Plaza. Mr. Beckmann called out additional highlights, noting that the artwork is visible from Ponce de Leon Boulevard; encourages Instagram moments; is a friendly, approachable, refined artwork for families and neighbors.

The artwork was described as 16 feet tall from the ground, set on a pedestal, and is a seated figure with a good volume that isn't overwhelming.

The proposed budget and breakdown were reviewed, including the overall (artwork) budget of The Plaza. During the development agreement, Mr. Beckmann said, Agave made an offer to include 2.7 million dollars toward an art contribution. He noted that verbiage was inserted by the City to also use the funds for public safety. Out of the 2.7 million dollars, Mr. Beckmann said he feels 1.5 million could go toward the original goal of dedicating to Art in Public Places. He emphasized understanding that Public Safety is of the utmost importance to the City and if this is how the funds are used, it would be fine.

It was noted that this artwork exceeds the overall (required) Art in Public Places budget. Mr. Beckmann stated that Agave is committed to putting up the difference to bring this piece to The Plaza.

The schedule and a basic maintenance plan were presented, with Mr. Beckmann noting that Agave is a longtime owner of the property and dedicated to the maintenance of all the artworks.

Mr. Guerrier asked for clarification of the 1.5 million dollars. Staff responded that they are additional funds that were dedicated to the City to use for different items, including public art. Mr. Beckmann stated that the development agreement originally included an offer to contribute an additional 2.7 million dollars for art. The City then added language that modified it so it could be used for art or other purposes, including public safety. He said there is a tentative agreement referenced in resolution 2020-199 that pending sale of property (by the City), funds may be recovered, making 1.5 million available for public art.

Staff clarified that this would be included as part of the resolution when it goes forward to the City Commission and asked if the City Manager is aware of the proposed use of funds. Mr. Beckmann responded that the City Manager is, and the agreement just needs to be formalized.

Mr. Roselione-Valadez Asked Mr. Skarstedt if other works were considered. Mr. Skarstedt responded not at this point. He said the artist made a small version of this sculpture for a show at the Gallery and has since been talking about doing a larger version for public display in the U.S. He continued, saying when the project was discussed with the artist, he jumped on the idea to do a monumental scale of this piece. The Gallery asked KAWS if he had other ideas and the artist responded that he felt this would be a perfect piece for the location.

Mr. Kolasiński thanked the presenters, and the Panel continued their discussion.

Ms. Hernandez asked if other artists were recommended by Agave. The Panel discussed the process and options developers have for Art in Public Places. It was noted that the Panel does not have a say in who a Developer proposes; however, the Panel may comment and make recommendations. Ms. Cathers explained that the code specifies that private development projects over one million dollars require 1% of the construction budget be paid to the art fund or they may request a waiver by purchasing or commission artwork at the same 1% value. It was clarified that maintenance of artworks on the project site would be the responsibility of the developer (or property owner).

At 10:15 the gavel was transferred from Mr. Kolasiński to Vice-Chair, Ms. Hernandez.

Ms. Cathers continued, saying the Panel does not have to make an approving recommendation, there is no obligation for the Panel to recommend what is presented. The Panel discussed that the developer and owner pick artwork they want, (the City) does not. Ms. Cathers added that developers and owners often work with a gallery or consultant. Mr. Roselione-Valadez remarked that if the Panel doesn't recommend an artwork, it can still pass. Staff confirmed and said if the

Panel does not recommend a proposal, then comments are requested to forward on to the Cultural Development Board and Commission. The Panel discussed the significance of their recommendation and standing as arts professionals. Staff concurred and said the Cultural Development Board relies on their expertise for guidance.

The Panel continued discussing the proposal. Mr. de León stated that discussions with other presenters included suggestions to do something that is more site specific. Mr. Roselione-Valadez noted that his question to the Gallery wasn't if KAWS was presenting another piece, it was more about if other artists were considered, (knowing) the artists and estates the Gallery represents. He agreed that there may be something more compelling. The Panel agreed and stated that the developer has a difficult job.

Ms. Hernandez asked if the piece is unique, other than the small one previously made and whether there is an edition of the small work. Staff responded that they would find out if the work is part of a series.

Mr. Guerrier stated that the artwork and the artist's art practice is overtly about an image and some of the challenges are (balancing) public and private considerations.

Ms. Hernandez commented that the budget could provide for more art. The Panel agreed.

Mr. Roselione-Valadez observed that as a younger artist this is what he is making now and in ten years he may be making something else as (his practice) develops and changes.

Ms. Hernandez shared her concern that a commercial type of artist makes a lot of money making the same thing because that is what people want them to make.

Ms. Incer expressed concerns about the materials in South Florida and how inclement weather affects these works. She commented on experience with bronze works at the Lowe Art Museum and emphasized the importance of maintenance. Ms. Cathers responded that she believes the developer is working with RLA on a maintenance plan. Ms. Hernandez asked what assurance there is for continued maintenance if the property is sold. Ms. Cathers said there is a Letter of Understanding that is sent to the developer outlining the obligations for completion of the project prior to TCO, followed by a Restrictive Covenant stating that the artwork stays with the property, must be maintained, and if the artwork is removed the amount of the original fee must be paid back to the art fund.

With no further discussion, the following motion was made:

**Mr. Roselione-Valadez made a motion recommending approval of the waiver request to incorporate artwork as presented by artist KAWS into The Plaza development project. Mr. Guerrier seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

d. MURAL INSTALLATION REQUEST – 2600 DOUGLAS CENTRE, LLC

Mr. William Schilling and Ms. Sareska Batista as representatives for 2600 Douglas Centre addressed the Panel with a request to install a mural on the back of the 2600 Douglas Centre building. Panel members were provided with a rendering of the proposed mural in advance of the meeting.

Ms. Batista provided background about the location, stating that the owner has a twelve-story office building with an eight-story parking garage to the west. She said some of the units in the office building have views that are obstructed by the parking garage and the owners have been exploring ways to make it a more appealing to the tenants; one of the ideas being considered is a mural where the view would be art and not a concrete wall.

Ms. Batista shared that prior to Covid, vacant spaces were being used for artist exhibition space in collaboration with gallery night and the building would like to continue having art in the space.

Designers, Luis Carrazana and Karen Rivero, she said, created the proposed image that is a chronological succession of the company's evolution, the Demetree family. Ms. Batista presented a video rendering and described each of the floors, starting with the history of the founders of the company and noting that each level shows a different time-period of the company. The video rendering moved through each floor as viewed on the street and then at each level as viewed through the windows.

Ms. Hernandez noted that the printed rendering colors are blue, red, and white while the video rendering has oranges and yellows. Ms. Batista stated that the red, white, and blue are the company colors for Demetree and are the true colors they hope to use.

Ms. Batista confirmed that Demetree owns the office building and parking garage and there is about a six-foot distance between the two. She said the office building would block any visuals from Douglas Road with a portion on Valencia that would be visible to someone walking by.

More information was provided about the designers who are an architect and graphic designer. They are both Cuban Ms. Batista said, Luis Carrazana resides in Miami and specializes in design and 3D projects, while Ms. Rivero is a graduate of the Institute of Superior Design in Havana and currently resides in Cuba.

Ms. Miyar asked about the funds being used for the project. Ms. Batista said funding is through the building owner. Ms. Miyar confirmed that the request is for approval of the aesthetics, then it will go to the Cultural Development Board and the Commission. Staff confirmed.

Mr. Roselione-Valadez said he is glad they are giving tenants something better to look at than a bare wall. He added that it is an interesting telling of the family's arrival and successes. Of the images, Ms. Batista said, among them depict when the family sold land to Walt Disney where Walt Disney World is now, includes the expansion to Coral Gables, and the company building the first high-rise in Orlando. Mr. Roselione-Valadez asked about the figure in the central lower portion, observing that it looks like a Soviet realist image, and asking if it is a reference to the second World War. Ms. Batista confirmed, saying she believe the founder of the company was an airplane pilot in WWII, then came to Orlando and built housing for veterans; he was an American of Lebanese ancestry.

Mr. Roselione-Valadez asked if this opens the door to other buildings painting murals on their façades. Staff responded that others may go through the same process.

Ms. Hernandez asked if there a way as a professional art Board to not have any objections, but not necessarily approve an item. Ms. Cathers said it could be included as part of the motion.

Mr. Guerrier asked if the alley crosses from Valencia to Almeria. Ms. Batista said it is a partial alley that is not accessible and has trash receptacles and a gate.

With no further discussion, the following motion was made:

**Mr. Roselione-Valadez made a motion recommending approval of the request to install a mural as presented on the west side of the 2600 Douglas Road building. Mr. de León seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

e. FIRE STATION 4 – AIPP PROPOSAL ARTISTS

At the last meeting the Panel agreed to develop a pre-curated shortlist of artists for the Fire Station 4 public art opportunity; it was agreed that Panel members would come back to the next meeting with artist names for consideration. Staff reported that Mr. Guerrier, Ms. MacDonald-Korth, and Ms. Hernandez submitted names. Mr. Roselione-Valadez added names to the list. Staff read the names that were submitted: Ellen Harvey, Robert McKnight, Onajide Shabaka, Antonia Wright & Ruben Millares, Mark Handforth, Harold Mendes, Thomas Bils, Beatriz Monteavaro, Lorie Betran, and Ana Samoylova. It was noted that most of the artists are local.

Staff stated that the current proposed budget for the artwork is one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000). Staff asked if the Panel would like more information about the artists with the intent

to narrow it down to a small number or ask who is interested in creating a proposal. Staff advised that asking the whole list would strain the budget. The Panel had a lengthy discussion about the range of proposal fees and the correlation between the proposal fee and project budget. After further discussion, the Panel recommended a proposal fee of \$1,500 per artist (and artist team) and limiting it to five artists/artist teams.

Staff briefed the Panel on the Commission's comments from the initial presentation of the Fire Station building.

With no further discussion, the following motion was made:

**Mr. Roselione-Valadez made a motion recommending the following artists to see if they are interested in submitting a proposal for the Fire Station 4 public art opportunity: Onajide Shabaka, Antonia Wright & Ruben Millares, Thomas Bils, Beatriz Monteavaro, and Ana Samoylova. Ms. Miyar seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

#### ART IN PUBLIC PLACES UPDATES:

The Panel was advised of the status of current Art in Public Places projects including the status of proposal artists for the Minorca Parking Garage.

The Panel was invited to the Art Basel VIP event scheduled for Saturday, December 4<sup>th</sup>.

The Panel briefly discussed the cancellation of Illuminate Coral Gables. Mr. Guerrier noted that the Panel is a recommending Panel that is apolitical and high on culture. Ms. Hernandez suggested having a discussion on how to be more effective and truer to the professional standard of the Board. Staff stated that the City will be pursuing an update to the Public Art Master Plan and shifting it to a Cultural Arts Master Plan where modifications to the process may be addressed.

#### CITY COMMISSION ITEMS:

Staff advised the Panel that a change to the City's Art in Public Places (AiPP) zoning code came before the City Commission meeting and was passed on the first reading. Panel members were provided with a copy of the existing code and the proposed changes in advance of the meeting.

Ms. Cathers introduced Mr. Ceballos with the City Attorney's Office and asked that he provide an overview of the proposed changes. Mr. Ceballos stated that the ordinance is straightforward, with a request to modify the definition of extraordinary maintenance, specifically with the intent to expand funds used for maintenance. Currently, he said, the AiPP funds can only be used for extraordinary maintenance, he read the previous definition out loud as follows: *any non-routine repair or restoration to sound condition of Public Art or Historic Public Art that requires*



*specialized professional services.* He clarified that typical maintenance such as washing, pressure-washing, polishing, and things of that nature would not fall into that category. The same term would now state: *any repair or restoration of Public Art or Historic Public Art that is beyond regular cleaning, such as pressure washing and polishing, or requires specialized professional services.*

Ms. Hernandez asked how the difference in cost will be determined, if by the City, or someone outside the City. Mr. Ceballos responded that if it doesn't require specialized service from an outside company, then it will be done by the Public Works department, or contractors that do maintenance. Ms. Hernandez stated her concern that it will drain the funds and the City will not have available funds to do the large and more expensive restoration items that will have to be done from time to time. Mr. Ceballos said the intent is that it would go through Historical Resources and Cultural Arts so Public Works would not have access to the funds unilaterally; Historic... would be the custodians and caretakers of the fund. Mr. Adams concurred, saying anything done to the public art would come to the department for recommendation. Ms. Cathers added that the Cultural Development Board had comments regarding the modifications and expressed concern about how the funds would be used. Ms. Hernandez expressed having the same concern and if it's for the artwork or historic restoration. Mr. Ceballos said it is limited to public art or historic public art.

Ms. Hernandez continued, asking what the scope of historic art is. For example, she said, the entrances could need restoration and those could be expensive and the City would be left without money to restore and maintain the non-historic art. Ms. Cathers read the definition of public art out loud as: *tangible creations by artists that exhibit the highest quality of skill and aesthetic principles, including the following: paintings, sculptures, stained glass, projections, light pieces, statues, bas reliefs, engravings, carvings, frescoes, mobiles, murals, collages, mosaics, tapestries, photographs, drawings, monuments and fountains or combinations thereof, and that are one-of-a-kind or part of an original, numbered series. The artwork must be created for placement in a public place or publicly accessible private space, or integrated into the underlying architecture, landscape design or site. "Art in Public Places" and "Public Art" do not include items manufactured in large quantities by the means of industrial machines, reproductions or architectural elements unless designed by a professional artist. Works of art may be permanent, temporary or functional, and can encompass the broadest range of expression, media and materials.*

Mr. Guerrier noted that "historic public art" is not referenced in the definitions. Ms. Cathers responded that it would fall under the definition of public art and whether the piece was designed by an artist.

Mr. Guerrier stated that a key element is the strike out of “sound condition”, stating that it should remain due to the arguments of what level of preparation and repair can be mandated. He continued, saying “sound condition” may be a subjective term within the context of professional assessment, but that it is a long-term goal. To be aligned, he said, some definition for historic public art would be great so the Panel knows what is being talked about. He asked for comment regarding the strike through of “sound condition” in addition to including a definition for historic public art, saying it would make the purpose of the amendment stronger. Mr. Guerrier stated that the definition in the code is fine, if it’s linked elsewhere, then the language needs to mirror it; but this definition doesn’t suggest where the funds come from. The new amendment doesn’t do this either, he said, and found the amendment doing something beyond what the definition requires. Ms. Hernandez agreed, saying the City knows what the public artworks are, there is a list and a maintenance schedule with monies to address restoration; but there is no scope of the historic public art. She continued, stating that (the art) funds may be put at risk for an unknown (use) and (the City) needs to protect the funds to restore and maintain the art we have now, and art being acquired in the future.

The Panel discussed how to address what works would be included in “historic public art” and how it would be defined. Ms. Cathers reiterated that it falls under the definition of art in public places or public art, which means tangible creations by artists that exhibit the highest quality of skills and aesthetic principals . . . and includes monuments and artworks that are integrated into underlying architecture. The Panel discussed how to determine or differentiate which historical projects of the City would meet the definition. Ms. Cathers read the definition of artist out loud as: *an individual generally recognized by critics and peers as a professional practitioner of the visual arts, as judged by the quality of that professional practitioner’s body of work, educational background, experience, past public commissions, exhibition record, publications, receipt of honors and awards, training in the arts, and production of artwork.* Ms. Hernandez questioned whether in certain cases an architect may be considered an artist.

Mr. Kolasiński stated that it’s unknown how many items would be listed under that position, and it could essentially take rather large sums of money. He asked how the Panel can mitigate what is expected without having this knowledge. Mr. Ceballos responded that proposed changes may be taken to the Commission to let them know what the Panel suggests.

Mr. Guerrier said he would like to know a definition of historic public art and keep restoration to “sound condition.” Ordinary maintenance, he said, does not take into consideration the condition at hand if it is defined as routine. Extraordinary maintenance should consider the overall state of the object and that is why a professional would be hired.

The Panel agreed that having a list of the historic public art would help understand the scope of what is being considered. Mr. Ceballos explained that none of that is changing, that it is language

currently in the code for what the funds are being used for; that the scope of the art being maintained is not expanding. The only (language) being changed is loosening the ability for the City to use some of those funds beyond what would be considered extraordinary restoration that's not basic cleaning.

Ms. Hernandez said the scope will inform how much the fund is responsible for now in terms of art and that it's unclear how much more the funds will be tapped into.

Mr. Ceballos asked if staff knows of any historic art that isn't on the regular art list. Mr. Adams responded that one of the items coming up is the White Way Lights. Denman Fink, he said, is a recognized artist from Coral Gables and the obvious one to mention; and whether there are other recognized artists out there who contributed to historic sites in the City will have to be researched. He said his understanding is that the contribution of a work has to be by a professional artist; whether an architect would apply as a professional artist, that would be a question to be answered by someone who is an expert in the arts. He agreed there may be a blurring of the lines as to when an architect may be considered an artist. Mr. Guerrier stated that in this case when the public art is historic is key. Within this language, he said, it mentions public art, but not historic public art.

Mr. Kolasiński asked if the City has a sense of what percentage of the fund would be used in this way to understand what is being considered.

Mr. Ceballos recapped his understanding of the intent of the Panel and asked if there is no list of historic public art, and one doesn't exist, would the Panel like that language struck. The Panel agreed.

Ms. Hernandez stated her understanding that the intent of the Commission is to use these funds (toward maintenance). She expressed concern and asked if the Commission knows how the funds are used today, and how funds are reserved for future projects and restoration. Mr. Ceballos responded that he didn't think the Commission considered this. At this time, he said, the item will go to the September meeting for second reading and a final decision will be made. Now, he continued, if the Board is asking for more information, City staff will be more than happy to provide that and get the information back to the Panel for further input. The Commission may decide no further input is needed and what was provided is enough. He said if the Panel is happy with the current (term) of public art; we can move forward with the minor changes.

**In summary, Mr. Ceballos restated the Panel's concern regarding potential misuse of Art in Public Places fund allocation; potential drain on the funds; request for a definition of what qualifies as historic public art; and removal of the proposed strike through of "to sound condition." Ms. Hernandez made a**

**motion adopting the summary language of Mr. Ceballos. Mr. Guerrier seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Mr. Adams was prepared to discuss the background of the White Way Lights. After a brief discussion, the Panel deferred the item for presentation at the joint meeting with the Cultural Development Board.

ITEMS FROM THE SECRETARY:

Staff asked for confirmation to change the Arts Advisory Panel monthly meeting to the second Wednesdays of the month starting in October.

**Ms. Miyar made a motion approving a change to the Arts Advisory Panel's monthly meeting starting in October from the fourth Wednesdays of the month to the second Wednesdays of the month. Mr. Roselione-Valadez seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

The Panel was advised that meetings moving forward will be held at City Hall in the Commission Chambers.

Panel members were informed that the next meeting will be a joint meeting with the Cultural Development Board on Tuesday, September 21 at 9:00 a.m.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:11 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine J. Cathers  
Arts & Culture Specialist