1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	EXCERPT OF VIDEO RECORDED PROCEEDINGS
7	BEFORE THE
8	ST. AUGUSTINE CITY COMMISSION
9	
10	
11	May 11, 2009
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Transcribed by:
21	Carman L. Gaetanos
22	Florida Professional Reporter Coastal Court Reporters, LLC
23	3940 Lewis Speedway, Suite 2102 St. Augustine, Florida 32084
24	(904) 824-3525
25	

COASTAL COURT REPORTERS, LLC

ORIGINAL

1	APPEARANCES:
2	Mayor Joseph Boles Vice Mayor/Commissioner Errol Jones
3	Commissioner Don Crichlow Commissioner Nancy Sikes-Kline
4	Commissioner Leanna Freeman
5	City Attorney Ronald Brown
é	City Manager Bill Harris
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

\*

MAYOR BOLES: Okay. Well then --

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: No, you don't get to --

COMMISSIONER JONES: He's got to speak.

MAYOR BOLES: That's right. You said don't bang the gavel. You're right.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Make yourselves comfortable.

MAYOR BOLES: Oh God.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Yeah, I'm going to need a little bit of time.

When I made my report to you concerning the Bates v. City of St. Augustine case, since that time, the judge has ruled. And we just pulled off of the Pacer from the United States District Court, the Middle District, an order. And let me tell you that the basic is that the judge has entered an injunction against the enforcement of 22-6 as to visual artists.

Now, the four plaintiffs in this case were -those of you who have paid attention to who they
were -- a representative of each of the four
horsemen. And those of you may remember who they
were. This was a case out of -- two federal
District Court cases in New York where Mayor

Giuliani has a bad day in court concerning banning visual artists who didn't -- who were required to have permits to sell on the streets of New York.

The four horsemen, as they like to call themselves, were photographers, printers, sculptors and painters. Each of these artists that's named as plaintiffs in here are basically one of those four.

The judge looking at the materials that were presented, entered the injunction, but provided to you a guideline as to what the judge thinks is likely enforceable in the City. The basic thesis, and I'm giving you just a real clear -- a real quick -- and I'm going to pass out copies to each of you of the order. Basically what the judge said was is that under the law, you know, we have to have -- if it is a content-neutral ordinance, we may have reasonable time, place and manner restrictions on speech in public places.

There is no disagreement in this case that it is a content-neutral ordinance. We do not discriminate on one type of speech over another type of speech. It's the all or nothing theory.

There's also a question as to whether it was -- the ordinance was constitutional on its face.

That is the substance of it was constitutional, or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

whether the ordinance was constitutional as applied. The judge has basically ruled on the assumption that the ordinance on its face is constitutional, but as applied it is not.

What does that mean to you and to the City? She basically looked at the material that were presented at the preliminary hearing. understand, this is not an evidentiary hearing. have a little difficulty getting my mind around this concept that you're turning in affidavits from people, but it's not an evidentiary hearing. nonetheless, that's the way the federal rules look and work. What the judge basically ruled was to say all of the evidence that was presented regarding the adoption of 22-6, which is the ordinance that bans vending of any type in HP-2 and HP-3 on the Plaza de la Constitucion. And she -and I want to give some quotes from this to make sure everybody understands basically, you know, where I think she is coming from --

MAYOR BOLES: What page are we on?

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: -- and where this is going.

Turn your attention to first, if I may, to
Page 11 of the order. It's a 24-page order. And

Λ.

about two-thirds of the way down you will see a second underlying see, as in s-e-e. And following that, Moreover the interest proffered by the City in the preamble, that is the preamble to the ordinance, maintaining esthetics, promoting public safety and assuring the orderly movement of pedestrians all have been recognized as substantial interests that justify some restriction on protected expression. And they actually cite the Cheli [spelled phonetically] v. City of St. Augustine case, which those of you that have been here for some time probably remember, and some on another cases that deal with this issue.

On the next page, Page 12, about a quarter of the way down -- actually, let's start with the very first full paragraph. And I will just read this, In response, however, the City also contends that the ordinance serves a governmental interest of protecting the merchant economy, which such an interest has been recognized as a significant government interest justifying some restriction on protected speech, see the Cheli case. The record before the Court fails to disclose however wide the restriction at issue serves the interest. Indeed nothing in the preamble or the evidence submitted

suggests there's a need to protect the local merchant economy, much less how the ordinance serves to do so. Accordingly, the Court declines to find such a purpose warrants the ordinance's restriction based on the current record.

Nevertheless, and this is the good news for the City, as the Court has determined that the City's remaining interest of maintaining esthetics, promoting public safety and assuring orderly movement of pedestrians within the Plaza constitutes significant government interest, the Court turns next to the question of whether the ordinance is narrowly tailored.

The Court has basically told us at that point that there are justifications in our code to restrict expressive communications in the Plaza.

It's just that the ordinance goes beyond the Plaza.

This thought-process continues, if you look over on Page 15, on the second full paragraph.

While the City may have expressed laudable goals with regard to the Plaza, based on the evidence currently before the Court, it has entirely failed to explain why a prohibition of vending activities throughout the entirety of the historic district is necessary to serve those goals.

That language means your district is too big for the ban.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right.

Page 16, this is even better language. And I'm talking the second full sentence on Line 2 starting with indeed. Indeed if a prohibition of vending activities were limited to the Plaza de la Constitucion, where the City has stated legitimate concerns, and perhaps it's nearby surroundings -- those of you who are attorneys, listen when the judge is telling you things -- it would likely fair better under First Amendment scrutiny.

And finally, if you will look at the actual order itself, if you look at the very last page, on page -- actually starting at the bottom of Page 22 and numbered paragraph 3. The City is preliminarily enjoined from enforcing or threatening to enforce City of St. Augustine Code Section 22-6 as amended by Ordinance No. 2,723 against visual artists, whatever that is, pending further order of the Court.

And my comment was not meant to be sarcastic, except to say if you will recall when we adopted the last version of this ordinance, 2,723, it was

because Judge Tinlin in a state court's decision told us that the four horsemen, the very representatives, granted too much discretion to the City and therefore we couldn't pick and choose who was going to be in there. And he basically told us it was a all or nothing decision.

I now have an order which states that visual artists, and the visual artists described are one of each of the four horsemen, shall be in there. How to enforce that is something we're going to work with the police on and see if we can do it right and follow this order.

Now, let me make it clear, as I can tell, this does effect the enforcement of Ordinance 22-10 which deals with street performers on St. George Streets and the streets 50 feet each side of St. George Street. That is still valid and enforceable. But this deals with vending activities pretty much in the rest of HP-2 and 3, and tomorrow morning and this weekend, at a minimum, painters, photographers, printers and sculptors can set up somewhere in the Plaza, or for that matter, anywhere else in the City. They still can't block our sidewalks. There's some code against that that's not in 22-6.

Now, your schedule is we have another meeting

COASTAL COURT REPORTERS, LLC

This question then becomes what, if anything, the Commission would like to do with regard to this, and what kind of timeframe that we're dealing with. I can tell you that the comparison is this: The Court when they were looking at this issue, had the Horton case in front of it. The Horton case is the case that the City prevailed at the Eleventh District Court of Appeals and made law in this country concerning restriction of First Amendment expression on a content-neutral ordinance. The Horton case basically won because it was a very limited location of restriction: Four blocks of St. George Street, 50 feet on each side of that street.

The paradigm therefore, and think the Court as I read it was attracted to okay, another paradigm would be that would work, at least in the evidence that's now out there, is limit the Plaza and the nearby areas. That was the language that we read. In other words, recreate Horton, and instead of St. George Street and the side streets, you'd have the Plaza and some -- perhaps side streets that serve the Plaza. To do that, however, will require further amendment to this ordinance, which you can do. It happened once.

that will not be held until June 8th. If you follow your regular meeting schedule, the earliest you could notice and pass an ordinance and have it go into effect would probably be a meeting on June 22nd. The ordinance would probably be in effect about the 1st of July. So you are now looking at basically June and the rest of May basically unprotected as to any enforcement of this type of activity.

Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay. I just want to make sure that I understand this.

If we do nothing, if we don't pass an ordinance in the next couple of months, am I correct in understanding what you said, that these four artists can sell their goods, sell their products in the park, however, I can't go set up a soda stand? Is that how -- is that the way it's being interpreted?

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Yes, ma'am. And I will tell you why I think that's the case. She says against visual artists.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I read that.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Now the only definition that we have in this order dealing with visual

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

artists are what the four plaintiffs did.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: And I will give you the precise description of what the four plaintiffs did.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But I mean, you didn't read anything that -- and remember, we haven't had a chance to read this. You didn't read anything in here that --

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: I'm going to read it again, too.

Here's what the four plaintiffs did. Plaintiff Bates is a visual character artist who made his living creating caricatures. Plaintiff Childs is a sculptor and painter. Plaintiff Hecht is a photographer. And Plaintiff Merrick is a painter who creates portraits and paints and sold his creations in the historic district.

Now, if we go by those definitions, then we have a caricature artist, we have a sculptor, we have a painter, and we have a photographer. Now, a very limited reading of this is that that's the only definition of visual artists we have in this order and that's all that gets to go there.

If you recall, the thing that got us into COASTAL COURT REPORTERS, LLC

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

court in state court was that we had a gentleman who made leather masks and leather hangings and painted them, and was trying to say he was one of the four horsemen. We had another lady who quilted and put the quilts in a frame, and tried to say she was one of the four horsemen. And the judge said the police shouldn't be having to make these decisions, and neither should the City. It's too complicated.

I will tell you that the cases in New York which are the Barry case and the Mastrozenzo [spelled phonetically] case deal with these issues, and that Court up there did its best in trying to sort out what is or isn't art. So for example, are earrings sculpture? That Court said no. If you paint on the back of a set of Levis, you know, some landscape, is that painting? And the Court said But it doesn't tell us anything about leather painted, and it doesn't tell us anything about quilts, and I at this point -- we have a conflict on what we're instructed to do with regard to this, because this Court is now saying visual arts are out there. Now, I will say this, I think probably that does prohibit the sunglass salesman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN:

MAYOR BOLES: Good.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: I think it prohibits --

MAYOR BOLES: Seated chair (inaudible) --

market activity which in December of 2006, you know, caused the shut down to start with, and the revision of the ordinance, and the type of activity that's out there. I don't know that there's anything that says we couldn't restrict at some point in time, although we do not have it in our code at this point, you know, you want to restrict a certain location, even in the Plaza, but right now we don't have any of that.

So as I read it at this point, without passing a further ordinance, you're probably looking at those four things, paintings, sculpture, photography and printing. If we can try and stay in some kind of definition of what that is, which I will tell you is a big improvement over what we have.

## COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I --

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Because now I got a

Court telling me visual artists only. Whether

that's going to pass constitutional muster hasn't

been sorted out yet, because there are all kids of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

things out there. But if I go out there and Loran Lueders calls me up and says, I got a person out here with quilts in a frame, do I enforce the ordinance against him? And the answer is I could, I guess. I could tell them that because they're not one of the visual artists that's listed here, but it's not any clearer than that, so we're kind of rolling with it. My reaction is we ought to take a very cautious and conservative view of this code -- this ordinance, and this order now, and enforce it accordingly. So we will be talking with them about that.

If y'all want to wait and see how this goes --COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: What's our option? What choice do we have?

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Well, the other option is you could meet quickly and consider revising ordinance 22-6. And I will tell you that reading this order as it is now, based on the material that's out there, I think you could probably ban any kind of vending activities in the Plaza, and probably the streets that serve the Plaza.

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: The judge basically has said that.

> CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: But the rest of HP-2 and COASTAL COURT REPORTERS, LLC

3 is open season.

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: Well, what's more a concern to me, I mean, I'm not too concerned, and I don't know about my fellow commissioners, I'm not too worried about artists, sculptors --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Painters.

there for a couple of months, you know, as long -in time for us to decide what we want to do, as
long as it does keep out the sunglass salesmen and
the jewelry salesmen and everything else. You
know, if we can -- that's the reason we had the all
or nothing vote. I mean it's because -- not
because we really wanted the artists out of there,
but we wanted the other commercial vendors that
were importing stuff from Taiwan, you know, that's
what the people we didn't want down there because
it was becoming --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I want to see artists in the park. I think that they're an important part of the City. So I think at a minimum if you've given us -- or you've given me a sense of protection from the commercial sales of other goods, but I think we should give it an opportunity to work and let's readdress it when we meet again.

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: Yeah. But we said the park. Now what's to keep -- now, I'm more concerned about St. George Street.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Remember, 22-10 isn't effected.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right.

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: But a vendor, none of those artists can go down St. George Street.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: We've taken a -- no, we were successful in enforcing 22-10 on this issue in state court.

COMMISSIONER SIKES-KLINE: It seems to me that this latest round has kind of brought us back full circle.

CITY MANAGER HARRISS: That's exactly right.

The interesting thing is the commission's philosophical wishes -- obviously a prior commission -- was that the artists be allowed, and that the -- pardon me -- the sunglass salesmen be disallowed. And we were told by the local judge that that can't happen, all or nothing.

Now this order, according to the attorney here says, no, just visual artists. So again, we've got to read this more. We've got to interpret it a little bit more. We've got to give you more

1 guidance.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: This supercedes the previous order?

CITY MANAGER HARRISS: The judge's, yes.

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: -- this order from this judge?

CITY MANAGER HARRISS: It would seem to override the local judge's order.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: I got now an order which give us a legal basis to argue that it does. Here is why you get in trouble in constitutional rights. If you knowingly violate somebody's constitutional rights, problems arise. Now I have an order this says, All right, 22-6 is invalid as to visual artists. Understand something, and y'all didn't get to go to this hearing, we spent a lot of time at this hearing going through the nightmare that was the vending in the Plaza. And the Court is absolutely right, that's what the evidence was about. Because quite frankly there isn't a lot of activity that's not there. Clearly the basic constitutional basis for what we do has been upheld, and I'm very pleased about that. The theoretical basis for how we go about what we do has been upheld. What this basically comes down to

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is, Folks, you just didn't apply it -- you applied it on a much broader area than you should of. is how I read this. And if you really read it that if we really wanted to come back and take on the Plaza, you could. If you want to come back and find evidence as to economic effect on other merchants, on esthetics, on pedestrian safety in other defined parts of the City, and the Court basically says, you come up with that evidence, you may be able to do that also. What this is really about is, you didn't have enough evidence to go outside the Plaza, and you did. And so but she banned it for the whole thing. She can't say, Just do it in the Plaza and not anything else. What she was struck with, is enforce it, or not enforce it as applied.

So if y'all want to leave it alone, then what will happen is we'll probably let painters and sculptors and caricature artists and photographers and people who sell prints of paintings, as well as original, hang out in the Plaza. And I think we've at least got an order that says we can do that.

And this may turn out -- it's adverse in a sense, but it may turn out to be something that solves a problem we were trying to get around. And like I

said, the Court recognizes that we're fundamentally 1 going in the right direction, but went too far in 2 3 the application. MAYOR BOLES: Well, I like constructing 4 5 ordinances by judicial guidance as much as anybody else, and I'm not for doing anything tonight, even 6 if we have the ability to do it because --7 CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: We're not asking --8 MAYOR BOLES: -- it would appear knee-jerk. 9 It would appear -- and I don't want this special 10 meeting. I think you work on something that we can 11 live with and accomplishes some of our goals to 12 13 protect the sanctity of the Plaza de le Constitucion so that we don't have a flea market 14 down there anymore, because that's -- and you know, 15 I've made a lot of really crappy art in my life 16 that I wouldn't want to put out and try to sell. 17 CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Crappy art is not 18 disallowed, folks, just so you know. 19 I know. MAYOR BOLES: 20 CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: If it's a painter, 21 that's --22 MAYOR BOLES: I know. So we need to take a 23 look at it--24 CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: -- no prior restraint. 25

MAYOR BOLES: And I would like you to give some thought to regulatory abilities in it. What can we regulate, time, place, because if we're going to have a fairly significant event in 2012 to celebrate the Cidiz Monument, I don't want to have to walk through two dozen artists out there, cluttering up the sidewalk on that particular day.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: I don't know of anything at this point that says, for example -- all right -- we tried to slot them in --

MAYOR BOLES: We tried to regulate spaces before.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: It's like herding cats, because they don't want to do that.

MAYOR BOLES: Lot of fighting.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: They get into fights because they all want to go to the northwest corner of the Plaza and catch the traffic off St. George Street.

MAYOR BOLES: I know.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: The Plaza is what this is all about. It's worse -- now we're fighting over that, a piece of real estate.

MAYOR BOLES: Well, we can handle that though.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: We can handle that.

1.6

You could, you know, none the less, if you wanted to locate them in the market, I think that's something you could consider. If you wanted to locate them in certain areas of the Plaza, I think that's something you can consider.

MAYOR BOLES: Well, give us your opinion on our options about maintaining our free speech requirements and allowances and what can we do.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Would we consider a workshop on that, or I guess --

MAYOR BOLES: Yeah, I don't know.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: We can consider that at the next meeting.

MAYOR BOLES: Yeah.

CITY MANAGER HARRISS: We could talk about that, and maybe a little item on the 8th. We will have more time to interpret it and go from there, because again, we're all just digesting it right now, and there's a lot more reading to do. We both read it in the last 30 minutes, but 25 pages --

MAYOR BOLES: Yeah.

CITY MANAGER HARRISS: -- but comprehending it is difficult.

MAYOR BOLES: I really do believe that the flea market drove an economic portion of the Plaza

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

draw, just like if you put a Wal-Mart in the middle of downtown, it would be successful and people would come. And you sell sunglasses to tourists, they're going to come buy them. But do I think that our Plaza ought to have sunglasses being sold in it, no, I do not, absolutely not.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: You got some protection here against that.

MAYOR BOLES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: Because there are too many other business merchants paying business licenses and renting space that are selling sunglasses too.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Yeah, you've got that with the artists too.

CITY MANAGER HARRISS: Yeah, that was an argument too within the ordinance.

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: Then you got artists paying rent and selling --

COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay. So --

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: -- but then we get back also to one of the things that always bugged me, the logistics of allowing artists in there, which you've touched on that, you know. It just tears up the grass, and you know, it's just a

constant mess. I mean the Plaza after -- if you get a half a dozen artists in there on the grass for a couple of weeks, there's no grass left.

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Well, we were able to make a strong case, and reading this order, the Court, I think, bought on to the fact that there's really justification to protect that piece of real estate in the Plaza. If you really want to ban it in the Plaza, I think you can. But if you don't --

COMMISSIONER CRICHLOW: I don't know whether --

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: -- then you ought to regulate it.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Can we -- yeah, explore regulation?

CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: You got hours of operation, you've got where you can locate people. I think that you've got a basis where you can do that under this order.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Size of how much space that they can take up exactly. I think that we should at least explore regulation.

CITY MANAGER HARRISS: Yeah, we'll have to talk about that, but let us adjust it and bring something back to you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Can we --

COMMISSIONER SIKES-KLINE: Can we see what they would like to suggest to us, the artists themselves, would like to work with us on what they think would be reasonable. Isn't that type -- that type of discussion?

MAYOR BOLES: Could may very well.

CITY MANAGER HARRISS: We have done that before. It's difficult, I'll tell you.

COMMISSIONER JONES: Can we look at the 8th of June? You will have time to have researched and kind of get another feel of a clearer understanding of the issue, and we can talk about all of the components. You will have met with us individually, so you can discuss any particular questions one of us may have so that we're all clearer rather than taking up this part of -- the meeting itself.

So I would ask these commissioners to make every effort they can to meet with you after you've gathered your needed feedback so that you're clearer and they're clearer on the components of it, one.

But one other thing I'm going to ask is that in light of this, could we now by tomorrow morning,

by 9 o'clock have copies of this document? You do 2 it two-sided so that it takes up less paper, and 3 maybe have 20, 25 copies of this document available for persons that may want to come by City Hall and 4 5 get one? 6 CITY MANAGER HARRISS: We can do that easily. 7 COMMISSIONER JONES: I would say put it 8 online, but if you can't --9 CITY MANAGER HARRISS: It is online. COMMISSIONER JONES: Is it online? Is this 10 document online? 11 CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: Well, it's online, but 12 13 you can't get to it unless you have enrolled in the 14 Pacer program. We do have that, but --1.5 COMMISSIONER JONES: Well, let's get some 16 copies, least get at least 25 copies first thing in the morning. 17 CITY MANAGER HARRISS: We'll do that first 18 19 thing tomorrow. We will have it first thing in the morning. We'll have it by 8 o'clock. 20 COMMISSIONER JONES: So persons are here, if 21 22 you would like to have a copy of this document in the morning, by 9 o'clock --23 CITY MANAGER HARRISS: Yes. 24 25 COMMISSIONER JONES: -- you can come by and

1	pick up your personal copy.
2	CITY MANAGER HARRISS: Not a problem.
3	CITY ATTORNEY BROWN: I'm sure Mr. Guinta will
4	be writing about it too. It's late in the evening.
5	MAYOR BOLES: All right.
6	COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's worth the wait.
7	MAYOR BOLES: Thanks for staying, Peter.
8	Meeting adjourned.
9	(Proceedings concluded.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
STATE OF FLORIDA )
COUNTY OF ST. JOHNS )
I, CARMAN L. GAETANOS, FPR, Court Reporter,
do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
transcribed the foregoing proceedings, and
that the transcript, pages 1 through 28, is a complete
record to the best of my ability.
DATED this 14th day of July, 2008, St. Augustine,
St. Johns County, Florida.
CARMAN (L. GAETANOS, FPR Court Reporter