

Public Art and Community Design Committee:

Artist Roster Subcommittee

Of the Arts Foundation for Tucson and Southern Arizona

Approved Minutes

Friday, August 7, 2026 at 10:30 am

To join the Virtual Zoom Meeting from your computer, tablet, or smartphone use the following methods:

Video: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89662454186>

Webinar ID: 896 6245 4186 Phone: + 16699006833 US

Agenda Item	Type	Presenter	Time
1. Roll Call to Establish Quorum Ms. Shaw began the meeting at 10:40?? and did a roll call to establish quorum. Members Present: Geneva Gluck, Alex Dubois, Violet Rose Arma, Janet Fischer, Anne Lopez, Lizzy Golden, Members Absent: Elizabeth Denneau		Sadie	5
2. Introduction of Guests & Attendees Ms. Shaw asked guests and attendees to introduce themselves. Guests in Attendance: Wylwyn Reyes, Yu Yu Shiratori, Gia Del Pino, Sadie Shaw	Announcement	Sadie	5
3. Call to the Audience Members of the public must sign-up to speak at the Call to the Audience: https://airtable.com/appEkdoNa9uaLutTZ/shr1SX8hMC5u3iS5p Ms. Shaw read the Call to the Audience Script. No comments were made.	Information	Sadie	15
4. Review Artist Selection for Public Artist Roster Ms. Shaw introduced the item and gave the floor to Ms. Shiratori. Ms. Shiratori gave an overview on the voting process, the slate of applicants with higher scores, they slate of applicants with low scores, and the applicants who did not meet at least 3 of the 4 criteria questions. Comments were made by Geneva Gluck, Laura Curry, Anne Lopez, Wylwyn Reyes, Adriane Gallego	Action	Yu Yu	60

Dr. Gluck mentioned that some of these applicants were reviewed by her and some lacked documentation, but also some applicants had more performative work that didn't exactly fit into this category. She wondered if there could be a subcategory created specifically for performance artists

Laura agreed with Dr. Gluck. She noted that siloing artists in an old practice and that she did not take the criteria to eliminate or remove performing artists from the category because she sees that it is still a service to the community but a different type. She thought there needs to be education to include different practices to be considered as public entities.

Ms. Lopez agreed and added that this was a thorny issue. She noted that after reading the resumes of applicants, where one said management of events or participatory arts had more opportunities in the public art realm that she would feel better about accepting them.

Mr. Reyes asked if the lower scoring applicants were on the Arts Foundation's Directory. Ms. Shiratori answered that she wasn't sure but would check. Mr. Reyes added that it is up to the subcommittee members whether they wanted to accept these applicants.

Laura commented that social practice artists usually include performative elements. She asked if the Arts Foundation provides workshops to artists to help them be competitive in their writing and work samples.

Ms. Shiratori commented that they do not provide professional development to improve resumes at this point.

Laura said that the Seattle arts department does this work and suggested that staff reach out to them.

Mrs. Gallego thanked the members for their comments and noted that for this project they were looking for artists who are creating permanent art and that if that is not within the guidelines than the group should add that to a discussion. She asked Ms. Shiratori what step they were at in the process.

Ms. Shiratori added that they are currently reviewing the ten Tier 3 artists who unanimously received low scores that did not meet the eligibility threshold. She asked the subcommittee members if anyone wanted to change their score and recommend any of these artists to be accepted.

No subcommittee members elected to keep the Tier 3 applicants.

Ms. Shiratori moved onto the Tier 2 applicants who received split votes from their evaluators (some 4's and some 0's). She started to review each of the Tier 2 applicants and asked the subcommittee members if they wanted to discuss the Tier 2 applicants. She showed the application for **Rachel Espinoza**. No subcommittee members elected to keep this applicant.

Dr. Gluck commented that she didn't vote this applicant high because they did not include technical descriptions of the artwork.

Ms. Lopez commented that the work was interesting but there wasn't an information about the work that would help them with their evaluations.

Ms. Arma commented that she scored them high because they met the criteria but in hindsight with the repeating subject matter she should have scored them lower.

Ms. Shiratori brought up applicant John Rowse.

Ms. Golden commented that this applicant was emerging and may have needed more time to build their portfolio.

Ms. Curry asked if this artist could be stewarded to work with another artist on the roster to create a partnership or opportunity for them to encourage to develop their practices while they can support a commissioned work. She recommended this applicant because they were clear with their intentions in their mostly conceptual portfolio.

Ms. Golden added that having mentorship would be helpful for this and other applicants.

Mr. Reyes added that this roster is to align with the City's Public Art Program so they are working based on what was within the Request for Qualifications (RFQ). The Arts Foundation is currently working with the Pima County Health Department and so there are RFQs where social practice artists are encouraged to apply. He added that the Artist Directory on their website is also a good resource for non-traditional artists and that the Arts Foundation is working on developing a workshop to help emerging artists.

Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to consider keeping this applicant. No subcommittee members elected to keep this applicant.

Ms. Shiratori showed the application from Jesse Berlin.

Dr. Gluck commented that the subject matter of the work may not be suitable for public art works but that technically it was good but too small. There was no mention of how they would scale it up to be large enough for public art.

Ms. Lopez added that she voted low for this applicant, she didn't have any problems with the subject matter but did not think it was suitable with it being installed publicly.

Ms. Shiratori clarified that the artists that are accepted would not be guaranteed a commission, they would be available for acceptance for fast tracked commissions.

Ms. Curry commented that when she reviewed the applications she did not consider their work samples as something that could be installed. Rather, she used it in a way to see what they are capable of.

Ms. Lopez responded that the materials this applicant used, porcelain, clay, was not suitable for public art.

Ms. Fischer responded that this is the work that he submitted to represent himself. She did not think that the work was appropriate for public art.

Ms. Shiratori presented the application for Randiesia Fletcher. No subcommittee member had comments.

Ms. Shiratori showed the application Susanna Battin.

Ms. Arma noted that she could see why this applicant may have been scored low.

Dr. Gluck asked what she voted for this applicant. Ms. Shiratori noted that she voted a 3. Dr. Gluck said that the work was unique and was mostly video-based. She asked to hear from other subcommittee members regarding this applicant.

Ms. Shiratori noted that the guidelines were not specific to bar non-traditional artists from being eligible.

Mr. Reyes noted that their artwork doesn't have to be permanent based off of the definition of artworks listed in the City of Tucson's Administrative Directives.

Ms. Curry added that she was not assigned to this applicant but she does work as a planner and that video or media art became a rotating exhibit that supported light in a public space and was a cultural representation for the community and served as a way to illuminate a space.

Dr. Gluck and Ms. Fischer changed their vote to allow the recommended list.

Ms. Shiratori showed the application of Roxanna Stevens Ibarra.

Ms. Curry commented that this artist has an interesting trajectory and that she is an emerging filmmaker. If she could be stewarded

with a partnership, or if there is a commissioned artist that she could work with it would be a benefit for this applicant.

Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to change their votes to allow them on the recommended list. No changes were made.

Ms. Shiratori showed the application of Josephine Thomason.

Ms. Arma added that she scored them higher but she understands why they may be voted lower by other subcommittee members.

Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to change their votes to allow them on the recommended list. No changes were made.

Ms. Shiratori showed the application of Valerian Ramos.

Dr. Gluck commented that the explanations provided by this applicant were not sufficient and lacked technical or personal information surrounding their practice and work samples.

Ms. Dubois added that she did not see a connection to Southern Arizona in the art or responses.

Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to change their votes to allow them on the recommended list. No changes were made.

Ms. Shiratori showed the application of Sean Randolph.

Ms. Arma commented that the quality and materials. Dr. Gluck agreed and noted that the applicant should have put more information about their work and intentions.

Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to change their votes to allow them on the recommended list. No changes were made.

Ms. Shiratori showed the application of Sandra Howard.

Ms. Curry said that her artwork can be transferred into other mediums to make it more durable. She felt that the artist had the capacity to do permanent work.

Ms. Golden noted that she voted them low because there were not enough samples and the renderings may have been worked on as a team. She thought that the applicant could benefit from more time.

Ms. Curry added that she reviewed her website and found representations of their tile work.

Ms. Shiratori commented that mockups were accepted since this program is to help emerging artists. Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to change their votes to allow them on the recommended list. No changes were made.

Ms. Shiratori showed the application of Jacques Servin.

Ms. Arma commented that she wasn't sure how this applicant's work samples could translate to a public context.

Dr. Gluck commented that their work is more experiential and that how it is presented on the application was difficult for her to score high.

Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to change their votes to allow them on the recommended list. No changes were made

Ms. Shiratori showed the application of Athena Apodaca.

Ms. Curry noted that she scored this applicant high because her work centers community engagement in the creation of this work and that her materials can be ephemeral in an interior space to not be subject to the elements. She thought that this could be an interesting opportunity to work with a different artist and medium to give the work longevity.

Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to comment further or change their votes to allow them on the recommended list. No changes were made

Ms. Shiratori showed the application of Owl Eye.

Ms. Golden commented that she was conflicted and that the application seemed like they thought it was a grant.

Ms. Dubois added that she also was confused but that the work was interesting. She hopes that in the future performance artists would include video.

Ms. Curry agreed that the applicant seemed confused that this was a grant application but was not well written. She wondered if applicants that weren't accepted could review applications that were accepted.

Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to comment further or change their votes to allow them on the recommended list. No changes were made

Ms. Shiratori showed the application of Kyla Hawkins.

Ms. Golden commented that there wasn't much of a connection to this place and that the subject matter was explicit. She noted that they scored them a 3 since they do have community work experience.

Ms. Dubois agreed and thought they may need more time and growth to update their portfolio.

Ms. Curry commented that her work needs to be developed more but that she did not have an issue with her connection to the place.

Ms. Shiratori asked if anyone wanted to comment further or change their votes to allow them on the recommended list. No changes were made.

Ms. Shiratori reviewed the applicants that would not be recommended to move forward. She noted that Susanna Battin would be moved onto the recommended list per the subcommittee members vote change.

Motion Ms. Golden to approve. Second Ms. Lopez. Approved unanimously via roll call vote.

Ms. Shiratori thanked everyone for their time.

5. Adjournment

Sadie

Meeting adjourned at 12:02

Public Art and Community Design Committee Meetings are Open to the Public

Citizens, particularly artists, interested in public art are encouraged to attend. Action may be taken on any agenda item. This meeting will be held virtually unless otherwise noted on the agenda. Meeting materials will be presented as part of the virtual meeting. Community members who wish to speak at the Call to Audience can click on the link below and will be added to a list on a first come first serve basis: <https://airtable.com/shr1SX8hMC5u3iS5p>

Committee Members

Anne Lopez—W4, Lizzy Golden—W5, Emily Tate—D1, James Glock—AF, Janet Fischer—W6, Maureen Lueck—County Administrator, Nancy Fung—AF, Valerie Sipp—AF, Adriane Ackerman—Mayor, E. Liane Hernandez—W1, Alisha Vasquez—D5, Brandon Varela—AF, Jacqueline Jean Barrios—AF, Adia Jamille—AF, Wesley Fawcett Creigh—City Manager, Dusty Reyes—AF, Logan Greene—W3, Audrey Waner—W2

Subcommittee Members

Anne Lopez—W4, Lizzy Golden—W5, Janet Fischer—W6, Alex Dubois—Arts professional, Elizabeth Denneau—Arts professional, Geneva Gluck—Arts professional, Laura Curry—Arts professional, Violet Rose Arma—Arts professional

Accessibility

If you require an accommodation or materials in accessible format or require a foreign language interpreter or materials in a language other than English for this event, please call the Arts Foundation at 520.624.0595 ext 3. or email PACD@ArtsFoundTucson.Org at least 2 business days in advance.

Links

- Serving on a City of Tucson [Board, Committee & Commission](#) is one way that Tucson's residents can participate in local government. Boards and Commissions typically serve in an advisory capacity to the Mayor and Council. Tucson benefits from the knowledge and expertise that volunteers bring to these Boards and Commissions.
- The [Public Art and Community Design Committee \(PACDC\)](#) is a standing committee of the Arts Foundation that functions as an interagency committee operating in compliance with Boards and Commissions.
- The City of Tucson uses [Administrative Directives 7.01-1 through 7.01-7](#) to implement the City's Public Art Program.
- Pima County uses the [Board of Supervisors Policy C 3.3 and Administrative Procedures 3-16](#) for the implementation of the Pima County Public Art Program.