



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
PUBLIC ART & PLACEMAKING ADVISORY BOARD
TOWER 101, SUITE 1100
101 NE 3RD AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301
SEPTEMBER 15, 2025 – 1:00 P.M.

<u>MEMBERS</u>		January-December 2025	
		PRESENT	ABSENT
Martha Steinkamp, Chair	P	6	0
Phoenix Marks, Vice Chair	P	6	0
Lori Franke	A	5	1
Edison Lozada	A	2	4
Erica Mohan	A	3	3
Jodi Tanner	P	5	1
Elisabeth Wennberg	P	6	0

As of this date, there are 7 appointed members to the Board, which means 4 would constitute a quorum.

Staff Present

Joshua Carden, Cultural Affairs Officer, Staff Liaison
K. Cruitt, Recording Clerk, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

Roll Call

Chair Steinkamp called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Approval of Minutes – 8/18/2025

Motion made by Vice Chair Marks, seconded by Ms. Tanner, to approve the April minutes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

1. Welcome & Introductions

Chair Steinkamp briefly reviewed the parliamentary procedure used by Fort Lauderdale advisory bodies, which is based upon *Robert's Rules of Order*. She emphasized the importance of following this procedure.

Chair Steinkamp continued that the call to artists process used by Fort Lauderdale is also used nationwide. She also reviewed the requirements of Florida's Sunshine Law, noting that this Law prevents the Board from meeting informally or at alternative locations. Notice for all public meetings is provided on the City's calendar. She thanked the members of the public present at today's meeting and requested their participation in the meeting in an orderly manner.

2. 13th Street Roundabout Selection Process

Mr. Carden advised that following the August 18, 2025 Board meeting, Troy Liggett, president of the Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association, had sent an email to members of that Association to request their feedback. There were responses from six individuals, but no consensus. Once there is a short list of artists, those artists will develop site-specific proposals for which it will be easier to gauge neighborhood feedback.

Mr. Carden continued that at the previous meeting, two artists were dismissed from consideration. He noted once more that there was no consensus on any single proposal. He emphasized the Board members' backgrounds and experience in public art, adding that they were asked to revisit all the applications and determine which ones they would like to advance.

Ms. Tanner commented that it can be challenging to select an artist for a specific space, as this requires not only reviewing the artists' previous work but their abilities to work with the community. She reiterated that no final proposals have been submitted by the artists so far in the process.

Ms. Tanner emphasized the importance of selecting an artist whose work will be representative of the community. She felt the Board was ready to move forward with the next step, which is identifying artists who will be invited to submit more comprehensive proposals.

Mr. Carden clarified that the Board is asked to select three artists, who would then be asked to complete renderings of their proposed designs. It was suggested that the Board members select these three artists from among those who received two votes each.

Motion made by Vice Chair Marks, seconded by Ms. Wennberg, that we review the four candidates that have two votes each, and narrow down from the four to the top three, and then award those top three the opportunity to give us their actual rendering that they intend for this project; they would have one month to do that, and receive \$1,000 in compensation. [The **motion** passed by consent.]

At this time Chair Steinkamp opened the discussion to members of the public.

Troy Liggett, president of the Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association, asserted that he protested the Board's process, as he felt it was not fair or transparent. He did not believe it was appropriate to vote on the short list of artists before hearing feedback from the public.

Mr. Liggett continued that the Neighborhood Association was the entity which had requested the project in conjunction with the Central City Alliance, but had not asked the City to choose the project for them; they had only requested funding for the project.

Chair Steinkamp explained that the community was given multiple opportunities to participate in the selection process, citing surveys as well as correspondence with Mr. Carden's office to discuss their wishes for the project. She pointed out that the individuals present at the August 18, 2025 meeting had seemed to understand the process, which involved identifying a short list of artists for consideration. She felt the Board has done its best to offer the Association an opportunity to participate in the process.

Mr. Liggett stated that the Association had requested City funds so the neighborhood itself could develop the project, recalling that the proposal is for work to replace a sculpture the neighborhood itself had selected and funded. He added that the residents were not aware that the Board would lead the selection process.

Mr. Liggett continued that at the June 2025 meeting, Mr. Carden had advised the Board that he would reach out to the Neighborhood Association regarding the next scheduled Board meeting. He asserted that he had not been informed of this date until shortly before the August meeting, and as a result, the community residents in attendance had not seen the artists' submissions and could not provide input on them. He had submitted a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to review all the applications and had not received them to share with the neighborhood until the previous week.

Mr. Liggett provided copies of emails from residents of the neighborhood who had wished to provide input into the selection process.

Chair Steinkamp advised that the Board is following its process in the open, with opportunities for the public to participate. She suggested that Mr. Liggett and/or the Association may not have fully understood the process. Mr. Liggett stated that while he had been aware that the Board would make the decision, he had concerns about how the decision was made.

Mr. Liggett continued that one possible outcome to the process would be that when the Board makes its recommendation to the City Commission regarding the selection of an artist, representatives of the neighborhood may also be present to object to the process on the grounds that they were not involved in it.

Chair Steinkamp pointed out that a survey was sent to the Neighborhood Association members, who had had opportunities to express their wishes regarding color, size, and other aspects of the proposed artwork. She noted that residents had also sent multiple emails to Mr. Carden as well as to Board members to further clarify their wishes. Mr. Liggett reiterated that he did not feel this process was fair or transparent.

Vice Chair Marks observed that the same or similar processes are followed by all governmental organizations nationwide. She recalled that because the Board had not existed when the original artwork was selected, the Association may not have realized the process for its replacement would be different. She emphasized the importance of following designated procedures, noting that the record of the Board's August 18 meeting indicated the Association's highest priority was the selection of a local artist with whom residents would have some input. By comparison, the Board's judgment does not focus on the artists themselves, but on the quality of work and experience with the proposed type of project.

Vice Chair Marks continued that there is a gap between the Association's wishes and the Board's responsibilities, clarifying that the Board is required to function according to specific rules and procedures. She suggested that the Association may wish to share their recommendations with the Board before the final selection is made.

Mr. Liggett asserted that he was familiar with the Board's process, as he had previously represented the Middle River Terrace neighborhood before the Board during the selection process for a mural. It was noted that the previous project was of a different type from the current proposal, which did not make for an accurate comparison.

Mr. Liggett concluded that the selection process is different for the roundabout project because the Board had made it different. Mr. Carden advised that the roundabout project is City-funded and must follow the required call to artists process. The mural project for Middle River Terrace had been addressed differently, as it had been submitted to the City as a line item in the neighborhood's annual budget request.

Mr. Liggett stated that he wished to make additional comments about a specific artist on his own behalf and not in his capacity as president of the Association. He explained that while the neighborhood has existing connections with artist Moshe, it is the neighborhood's understanding that there are "forces within the City" who do not want that artist to be responsible for the roundabout project.

Mr. Liggett continued that because the neighborhood had strong feelings about selecting a local artist, he had wished to suggest the Board's short list consist of three local artists and three at-large or national artists. He offered examples of local artists and architectural firms, proposing that the Board consider or reconsider their designs.

Chair Steinkamp reiterated that because the process is governmental in nature, the Board is not permitted to place restrictions on who can or cannot participate.

It was asked if the Ordinance governing the Board defines the call to artists process. Mr. Carden explained that the call to artists can be structured in different ways; the intent was to make the process as open as possible, which was why the call to artists was not restricted to, for example, Fort Lauderdale or Florida residents. Mr. Liggett asserted that it was the Association's understanding from the beginning that there would be both a local and a national call to artists. Mr. Carden clarified that this was a single call.

Moshe, member of the public and artist, stated that there were two separate calls to artists with different requests, which he had found to be confusing. He added that he had submitted an application, but it was dismissed as incomplete.

Mr. Liggett observed that the call to artists required five components: resume, statement, budget, maintenance plan, and photos of previous works. He asserted that of the applications he had reviewed, 35 did not include either budget or maintenance estimates. Vice Chair Marks noted that missing elements were taken into consideration by Board members when they made their recommendations.

Mr. Carden reviewed Moshe's application for the Board members, noting that the full proposal was received on August 21, 2025, after the original deadline of July 27. The artist's original incomplete proposal was received on July 25. Moshe asserted that a member of City Staff should have contacted him to inform him that the application was incomplete.

Mr. Carden reviewed the original submission, pointing out that it was received shortly before the deadline. After the deadline, the full proposal was submitted; however, the artist's *curriculum vitae* showed he had previously completed only one public art project, which was not a sculpture. The application also did not include a budget or maintenance plan.

Moshe requested clarification of why his application was dismissed and asserted that other applications also did not show artists' previous experience with sculpture. Vice Chair Marks pointed out that if an application is not submitted correctly or is incomplete, it is the artist's responsibility to address the situation. She noted that the City's service provider for applications is a neutral platform.

Chair Steinkamp advised that if individuals continued to interrupt and/or speak over others without being recognized, the meeting would be adjourned.

3. Rivewalk Garage Mural Donation – Smart Growth Partners

None.

4. New Business / Board Comments

None.

5. Communications to the Commission

None.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]