

ART COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF January 26th, 2011
BEGINNING AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION:

**Klavon, Indovina, Lockett, Rhor, Slavick,
and Ben Carlise in place of Kaczorowski**

PRESENT OF THE STAFF:

Morton Brown, Noor Ismail

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Brown stated the minutes for the November and December Art Commission hearings could not be approved since a quorum was not present.

B. Correspondence

Mr. Brown stated there was no additional correspondence.

C. Items for Review

- a. Three Rivers Heritage Trail Interpretive Signage: Conceptual and Final Approval
 - o Pennsylvania Department of Transportation

Mr. Jeff Clatty of PennDot introduced himself as the Senior Project Manager. He stated they are proposing the Three Rivers Heritage Trail Interpretive Signage as part of the overall Route 28 Improvement Project. He introduced Greg Cerminara as the design consultant from Michael Baker Jr., Inc., and explained Mr. Cerminara would be doing the proposal portion of the presentation.

Mr. Clatty stated as part of the overall Route 28 Improvement Project, they came to the point between the Heinz Plant and Millvale Industrial Park. He explained that they are building an interchange between the 31st Street Bridge to separate southbound traffic near the 40th Street Bridge, which includes barriers and other features to improve safety and allow people to move through the corridor. He stated through their environmental studies and involvement of their environmental assessment, they have made commitments to historic and environmental aspects along the corridor, some of which include architectural treatments, walls that fit the context of the area, extension of historic aspects, the 31st Street Bridge that was done under that rehabilitation project a few years ago for the new connection to Route 28, and accommodating the trail through the area. He stated what became a win-win situation for them was being able to fund the trail and build it as part of this project.

Mr. Clatty added one of the other commitments through this process was providing a minimum of four panels to help present and preserve the heritage of the area of the city. He stated that with the trail being constructed, it provided a very logical place for them to put those panels where they would be readily available to the public to enjoy the heritage of the region. He stated that this is where the idea originated as part of the overall Route 28 Improvement Project.

Mr. Greg Cerminara with Michael Baker Jr. Inc. introduced himself as the design consultant for PennDot on the project. He introduced Mr. Tom Baxter of Friends of the Riverfront, and stated Mr. Baxter has been very instrumental in working with them on this project. He explained the panels he was about to present would be along the corridor part of the North Shore portion of the Heritage Trail. Mr. Cerminara displayed a map of the overall corridor, and explained their project focuses on the Chestnut Street overchange and continues up through Millvale, roughly 2 miles in length.

Mr. Cerminara displayed the first panel which focused on St. Nicholas Church. He stated they chose the proposed location on the trail near a parking area, where people would be able to see the church in their site line. He then displayed the second panel which focused on the canal also known as "Lift Lock No. 4" which he proposed also be placed near the same parking lot that the first interpretive panel was also to be located. He explained they would also place additional canal stones at this site, in which there were already some present. He pointed out there is a park bench in this location, so the panel will further enhance this area.

Mr. Cerminara stated that the third panel will focus on the Thomas Carlin's Sons Foundry, which they propose to be placed at the base of River Ave as it reverses down to the 31st Street Bridge, and the trail continues underneath. He explained the foundry site was once located in this general vicinity. Mr. Cerminara stated that continuing underneath the 31st Street Bridge structure; the fourth panel's focus will be on the 31st Street Bridge itself. He stated currently there is construction going on in this area, but by the time they install the panel, everything will be cleaned up. Mr. Cerminara added they were required to come up with a minimum of four panels, but in total they came up with five. He stated the last panel to be located near the north end of their project limits would focus on the East Ohio Street Corridor. He proposed it be placed near the newly constructed trail bridge along the trail itself.

Mr. Cerminara then went back to further explain the canal stones that would be installed in addition to the second interpretive panel. He stated that maintenance was able to salvage many canal stones from the I-579 corridor project going through the area.

He showed the designs of existing panels along the corridor. He stated for the new panels, they are following similar standards and formats as these designs, and that even the hardware will be similar.

Ms. Rhor asked how the sites were chosen for each of the panels. She asked why these sites were chosen to be commemorated and what was the process for choosing those sites.

Mr. Cerminara stated they had discussed which signs should be out there, and what the theme should be. He stated that basically they went out to their cultural resources folks, who figured out where the existing signs were, since they did not want to create clutter in any way, and then asked which locations would be appropriate. He stated in the case of the St. Nicholas Church, it was very important that people be able to see what they were reading about. He said the gist was to choose locations next to the subject, and to make sure the site lines were appropriate for the panel.

Ms. Rhor asked what the level of community engagement was. She stated she deals a lot with the people of St. Nicholas Church, and asked if they were engaged during the process of writing these panels. She asked from where the research came.

Mr. Cerminara stated they came up with conceptual or tentative designs which they presented to different community members. He said they spoke to Troy Hill at their community meeting in December, who had mentioned getting Herr's Island folks involved in the project too. He stated they also left the panel designs at a separate Troy Hill meeting for the community to review and comment on. He stated they have their letters of support. He added they have also spoken to members of St. Nicholas Church who are interested in preserving the church for feedback. Mr. Cerminara further stated they originally did not have a panel regarding the canal, because there is already existing signage out there that incorporates this subject, although not specific to it. He said based on what people were saying about the canal, they decided to add this panel.

Ms. Rhor stated that she saw a piece of information absent from the St. Nicholas Church panel that she knows the church people would want to see included, and therefore is not sure how much back and forth they have had. She stated she would encourage this back and forth to happen as much as possible.

Mr. Cerminara agreed.

Ms. Slavick asked about their prediction for the longevity of the panels, how they will prevent the colors on the panels from fading, and what the maintenance plan is.

Mr. Cerminara stated they have consulted Mr. Baxter a lot about this issue, and he has advised them on specifications. He stated the warranty on the existing panels is 10 to 20 years, even though the longevity may only be four years. Thankfully, the company has been honoring the warranty to replace the already existing panels. He stated they will have these types of warranties available in their contracts as well.

Mr. Indovina asked how many existing panels there currently are.

Mr. Thomas Baxter with Friends of the Riverfront stated there are currently 37 panels right now located throughout the Three Rivers Heritage Trail System. He said their online and paper maps locate the panels on the trail.

Ms. Luckett stated she also wanted to learn more about the information selection process for the panels, and was curious about some of the inclusivity of people of other ethnicities and backgrounds. She stated there is some very interesting history that has occurred in Allegheny City. In particular, the area is known for its stopping points on the Underground Railroad—specifically, Avery College. She stated there was a prevalent history of Native Americans in this area as well that is not mentioned.

Mr. Cerminara stated the panel proposed along the East Ohio Street Corridor captures some of this historical information because of the ethnicity along the corridor. He said the panel addresses it a little bit, but he does not think it gets into much detail.

Mr. Jesse Belfast with Michael Baker Jr. Inc. introduced himself. He stated the public involvement process that PennDot had in place had to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. He stated there were initially public hearing meetings where themes were suggested, which they screened. He stated to answer Ms. Luckett's question specifically, they did not in their research find any direct connection with African American history regarding the Underground Railroad. He stated had they found that connection, this would have been information they would have presented.

Ms. Luckett stated they might want to double-check, even triple-check this information.

Mr. Belfast stated they could certainly look into this, and if the Art Commission has additional information on this subject, they would appreciate it. He stated regarding Native American history, in the archaeology phase of the project, there were not any significant sites in this corridor that had any sort of integrity, so they did not think there was a strong enough connection to put a marker.

Ms. Luckett stated that she was just saying in the spirit of inclusion, it might not be significant to Mr. Belfast, but it might be for other groups of people.

Mr. Belfast stated the impetus for the signs was that they were not just meant to be generic, historical signs, but are actually tied as mitigation measures for adverse effects to specific historic resources that were identified in the Section 106 process. He stated basically there were two Greek revival style houses in the Route 28 Corridor as well as the 31st Street Bridge – St. Nicholas Church and a dwelling store which was actually one of the possibly oldest Croatian bookstores in the country. He stated these were the nationally registered resources that this project had adverse effects upon, and so these signs were developed primarily to mitigate for those adverse effects. These specific resources were given priority in the signs themselves, which is why they have the 31st Street Bridge sign, and so much attention given to St. Nicholas church. These particular resources were directly impacted by the project. He stated this was a little justification as to why some subjects were brought out over others.

Ms. Luckett stated that she would still like for the applicant, moving forward, to consider that Avery College, which was located on East Ohio Street, was demolished at some point, and this was a major destination. She stated she implored the applicant to really think about the inclusivity of people of different races and ethnicities.

Mr. Belfast agreed.

Mr. Indovina asked if the pedestal bases would be the same as the existing bases.

Mr. Cerminara affirmed.

Mr. Indovina asked if the bases have held up well, and if there has been any maintenance issues.

Mr. Cerminara affirmed. He stated most of the maintenance issues are more with the fiberglass panels and being able to see through it when it wears out. He stated this is where the warranty has been covered, honored and replaced in the past. He said he sees the situation of the new panels being very similar.

Ms. Luckett asked about the top placement of the Friends of the Riverfront logo as opposed to the other logos that are located on the bottom of the panels.

Mr. Cerminara stated they chose this design just to stay consistent with the existing panels. He stated they do not have a sponsor for their panels, since it is part of the PennDot project. However, there could be a sponsor in the future for maintenance, so there is a space on the panels to allow for the company name to be placed.

Ms. Klavon asked Mr. Baxter to explain why the Friends of the Riverfront logo is located on the top of the panels.

Mr. Baxter stated this was just part of the design standards, but stated their logo could be moved down toward the bottom. He said they have done this already in some cases, so it is not an issue.

Ms. Klavon asked if almost all of the existing panels were like this.

Mr. Baxter affirmed.

Ms. Klavon asked if this was because Friends of the Riverfront had originally sponsored the signage program.

Mr. Baxter stated he believed so, but since it was almost 20 years ago he could not confirm this. He stated he believes when the program started their logo was put on top for a reason, but he does not recall off the top of his head. He stated that moving forward, if the Art Commission would like their logo to be placed at the bottom of the panels, this would be fine.

Ms. Lockett stated she was just asking the question.

Mr. Brown stated for full disclosure that he had brought this issue up to Mike Gable in Public Works and Stephen Patchan, the Bike-Pedestrian Coordinator at City Planning. They all agreed that it might look better that a nonprofit logo on a city property sign not be located on top, but rather down toward the bottom. However, this was not a mandate by anyone from the city, but just something they would like for the applicant to consider. He stated the issue is whether or not to keep them consistent with the existing signage.

Ms. Slavick asked if Friends of the Riverfront were the driving force behind getting these interpretative signs up.

Mr. Brown stated they were the driving force as he understands it for getting the original signs up, so these signs were meant to match the original signs.

Mr. Baxter stated that Friends of the Riverfront has a license and maintenance agreement with the City of Pittsburgh to monitor, maintain, and upgrade the signs.

Ms. Slavick stated she thought it was nice Friends of the Riverfront received the credit.

Ms. Klavon addressed the audience and invited them to comment on behalf, against, or in general about the project. Ms. Klavon stated she felt that Ms. Lockett's question was left unanswered, and asked if Ms. Lockett felt comfortable voting on this project today.

Ms. Lockett stated she did not, and said she would like to see more inclusivity of information. She stated she walks the trails a lot, and this has always been a concern for her and other people.

Ms. Klavon asked if she could cite a specific topic that she knew of.

Ms. Lockett stated in looking at the subject "Traveling through Time" in the one panel, it talks about the city of Pittsburgh in 1921 and how the construction of East Ohio Street resulted in the demolition of 30 small houses. She stated there could be some interesting language here about other things that have happened during the last 200 years about what has taken place. She said there are so many interesting, historical events that have taken place, and she just really thinks there is a big oversight that has taken place. She said people from all over the world walk the trails, and they would really be missing out if they do not try to include other people in the process. Ms. Lockett went on to state that she researched much of this information on the Visit Pittsburgh website. She stated Avery College was once located on East Ohio Street and was demolished with the construction of I-279. She said this was a very interesting place where a lot of the abolitionists were. She stated she did not want to be the historian here, but there is a lot of other great information the applicant could find at the Heinz History Center and Visit Pittsburgh online.

Ms. Klavon stated that of the interpretative signs they have seen, the only sign they could consider under this subject would be the East Ohio Street corridor sign, since the others do not have relevance, necessarily.

Ms. Luckett agreed.

Ms. Klavon stated they could put this as a condition, and ask the applicant to revisit the East Ohio Street Corridor interpretative sign.

Ms. Rhor stated this might just be a matter of passing this information through a historian who is sensitive to multicultural ethnic issues, which Pittsburgh has many. She stated she is not sure of the process for creating these signs, but said it is always a good idea to vet it through the cultural resources of the people, such as a historian at a university. She stated she is not sure if this has happened or not, but this might be a condition they add. She added that she thinks Ms. Luckett's point is very important, and should not be ignored. She said these are the opportunities, whether it is one sentence or two words to change the way we see our city.

Ms. Klavon stated they could add this language, and said it might just be a matter of Mr. Brown emailing the text to the group, so the applicant would not have to come in again.

Ms. Rhor stated that she would feel very comfortable knowing that someone who knows the information better than she might have looked at it. She stated she could name some historians.

Ms. Klavon replied that the applicant already has a professional contract, and so this would be adding expenses to their contract. She stated this is something the Art Commission cannot demand they do, but only suggest.

Mr. Brown stated they can request information on how they validated this information.

Ms. Rhor replied this is a good idea.

Ms. Klavon asked the applicant how they validated the text to be used on the signage.

Mr. Belfast stated that as part of the evaluation of which resources in the area qualified for the National Register, PennDot took historic research and general research from the area itself to develop a historic context for East Ohio Street. He said certain themes in that context were used to evaluate the different resources such as the transportation related railroad canal and ethnic history. He stated the neighborhood was initially settled by German, Swiss, and Irish immigrants, and there was a transition to Croatian immigrants at the turn of the century. He stated they do cover this information with the St. Nicholas Church sign, and cover the Croatian period the most. Mr. Belfast then stated, generally speaking, they looked at various types of historic documents from census records and previous studies already out there. They contacted former residents, church members, historical societies, and sought the advice of the historical museum commission. He stated they did a good deal of primary research, especially regarding the industrial history of the area along River Ave. He said they did quite a bit with the Iron and Steel history there regarding the Foundry as well.

Mr. Clatty stated that the subjects in general context were also submitted to PHMC for their review and approval, which they received.

Mr. Livingstone M. Johnson from the audience introduced himself as a retired member of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, and stated he was actually there for the Southwestern PA WWII Veterans Memorial. Mr. Johnson stated he felt compelled to speak when he heard the name "Avery College" raised and there appeared there was some ignorance as to the existence of Avery College. He stated his great aunt, Olive Hill, who passed away in the 1950's at 123 East Jefferson St. on the North Side, was a graduate of Avery College. He stated when that portion of the PennDot road went through and tore down Avery College, there were a number of citizens of Pittsburgh, not just African American, but of the general public who were sensitive and aware of the history who were upset that Avery College was moved. He said to make no mistake, it is not that it is an insignificant name or school-- it was a stop on the Underground Railroad during the pre Civil War slavery days. He stated that not only African Americans, but many Caucasians who were instrumental in helping to conduct the Underground Railroad had much to do with the institution of Avery College and the conduct of the Underground Railroad.

Mr. Johnson stated his great aunt Olive Hill took a Millinery Course there, and became a hat maker here in the City of Pittsburgh. He said if people are not aware of Avery College, it may very well be that they are much aware of the Croatian and the German and the other societies since their forbearers were connected.

Zoning process and the community involvements, specifically with the Highland Park Community Council is that all of the participants use this as an opportunity to look at the bigger picture. He stated while this in particular has no visual impact, the whole rear of the PPG Aquarium in itself has had some impact. So stakeholders have all looked at this as an opportunity on a broader scale to do some landscaping to enhance the entire area and not focus on the tower itself.

Mr. Sittig stated as far as the impact of the tower, there are the photos showing it is a pole. He stated it is designed to “minimalize” on a stealth fashion by the nature of its structure. The antennas are enclosed within the pole, and looks like a flag pole. He stated you will see in certain areas if it were not for the entrance of the park, you might want to put a flag on it, but here the idea is that it is in the background and they do not want to draw any attention to it. He added, by itself, and by the nature of the structure, hanging anything off of it will close the antennas. He said there are three antenna arrays mounted vertically in that pole, so everything is enclosed. He stated that nothing will be hung on it. Mr. Sittig stated the idea was that the primary aspects that resulted in no impact was the siting of it and is in the design itself.

Mr. Sittig stated that what they are asking the Art Commission to do is to defer the actual landscaping process to the process outlined by the Zoning Board. He stated they were directed to go back to Highland Park Community Council with the zoo and then with the zoning administrator. He stated what they very much welcome is any input. He stated he has worked with Ms. Klavon before, and knows this can only make the project better.

Mr. Sittig then introduced Mr. Frank Cardiari, the V.P. and COO of Pittsburgh Zoo and PPG Aquarium, and Mr. Frank Pizzi, the curator of Horticulture and Grounds for the zoo. He also introduced Herb Hungerman from Verizon Wireless. He stated these men could explain the purpose of the tower and how it is sited as no impact, and what the long-term impact is. Mr. Sittig stated they are seeking Conceptual and Final approval with the condition that the landscaping be addressed through the process outlined by the Zoning Board.

Ms. Klavon asked if what they were stating was that the ordinance or what was outlined in the Zoning Board does not really apply. She asked if they were ok with just letting the area be wooded.

Mr. Sittig stated that what they were successful in doing was getting the Zoning Board to see that those very definitive, and in this application, counterproductive, landscape requirements did not make any sense, so the Board did waive them. But it was on the condition that something on a larger scale be done on the hillside. He showed a perspective from the rear of PPG Aquarium and the equipment area to show how landscaping around the communications facility itself would really make no sense and give you an idea of what efforts will be made to help the landscape on the hillside itself.

Ms. Klavon asked if this concluded Mr. Sittig’s presentation.

Mr. Sittig stated he could have Mr. Cardiari and Mr. Pizzi speak more in depth on the project.

Ms. Klavon stated that she thought the project was simple, so this was not necessary.

Mr. Brown stated that he has vetted this through the Zoning Administrator and the Urban Forrester, Lisa Ceoffe, and they will have final review over the landscaping plan and the entire project.

Ms. Klavon stated she does agree with what they are choosing, and said she would just allow this to be in the woods without any crazy landscaping. Ms. Klavon addressed the audience and invited them to comment on behalf, against, or in general about the project. Ms. Klavon asked for a motion.

Ms. Slavick motioned to approve.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval of the Pittsburgh Zoo and PPG Aquarium Wireless Communications Tower as proposed.

MOVED: Slavick SECONDED: Indovina

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None CARRIED

- c. World War II Memorial on North Shore: Courtesy/Informational Update
 - o Sarah Miller, World War II Veterans of Allegheny County Memorial Fund, Inc.
 - o Todd Johnson, Design Workshop

Mr. Mark Snyder introduced himself as the president of the fund. He stated briefly they would like to take some time to just overview the history and why they are here again, and then will introduce Todd Johnson from Design Workshop, Larry Kirkland, the artist, and Bill Stewart who has been involved in the narrative. He stated they wanted to essentially review the narrative and the images which they said they would do when they got Final Approval last time.

Mr. Snyder stated it has been almost 12 years since they started on this project. He stated he is late to the effort, not joining the group until 2007. He said partly the history was that the fund was assigned a site where they went through an international competition, and obviously selected Design Workshop, and Mr. Kirkland produced a piece that was selected as part of that process that the city and the county paid for. He stated for a number of reasons that site proved unworkable, so with the cooperation of Mayor Ravenstahl, County Executive Onorato, the SEA, and the North Shore stakeholders, the essentially negotiated site is above the great lawn. Mr. Snyder said at this time he joined the fund.

Mr. Snyder stated the design was approved by all of the stakeholders which included Riverlife, the Art Commission, the SEA, North Shore stakeholders. He stated they came in and got Final Approval in 2008. They then came back in 2009 to run by the Art Commission the donor protocol which laid out how they would essentially recognize major givers as well as some of the minor supporters. He stated since then they have been in a fundraising mode for the past year and a half, and are essentially at a point now where they have raised three-quarters of the money. They have authorized the Design Workshop and other artists and writers involved to essentially complete the work. So with this, they wanted to come back and run by the Art Commission where they are at with the final images and final narrative. Mr. Snyder stated their goal is to try to have the monument done sometime by Veteran's Day of 2011.

Mr. Snyder stated that the feeling they had when they started this undertaking, was through Mr. Kirkland's words, that essentially they were trying to build more of a school instead of a shrine. The idea was to build it as an educational narrative that speaks to how Pittsburgh experienced World War II, how it changed Pittsburgh, and how Pittsburgh changed it. He stated that the process that their executive committee went through was sanctioned by the board. He added the executive committee includes Judge Johnson, Bob Kennedy, a WWII veteran, Howard Pfeiffer, and John Vento, both who served in WWII. He said they have a number of WWII vets who serve on both committees, and the overall veterans' committee. Mr. Snyder stated the board approved this work in an iterative process back and forth and tested certain narratives and images, but all keeping within the sculptural form that the Art Commission approved.

Mr. Snyder stated that they are here today proud of the work that the veterans did, and of working with Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kirkland, and Mr. Stewart.

Mr. Todd Johnson introduced himself as the principal with Design Workshop, and together with Larry Kirkland, artist, they joined in this competition 11 years ago. He said he would refresh the Art Commission's memory on the concept that was generated and was awarded the opportunity to move forward. He displayed a simulation of the proposed site as adjacent to the Del Monte building, and in the context of the other war memorials. He stated the WWII vets have been waiting quite a while to have their commitment represented. He stated the memorial is situated on the great lawn, and was decided to be moved into the existing grove of trees, most of which is saved, but with the introduction of this paved surface and a replanting within that existing context.

Mr. Johnson stated the only requirement of the competition was the inclusion of the American flag in some capacity, and there be honoring and dedication of the memorial and crediting of that on the triangular shaped piece that supports the flag. He said you would then move through the aperture into a kind of cathedral-like space, and then you exit on the riverside. In addition to the representation of the flag, they have on another triangular piece, the metal cast or bronze cast folded flag, which is the representation or symbol of the fallen soldier, and the dedication of that flag back to the family.

Mr. Johnson went on to state that internal to the depiction of the story in the collection of large and small images, on the west side is the depiction of the Pacific campaign events and activities, and on the east side, a depiction of the European theaters, at the apse ends of both sides. He pointed out in the documents there

are clear panels and images at the end that are of Pittsburgh, the international events in the Pacific and European theaters.

Mr. Johnson stated the glass panels that carry these images are framed by stainless steel spires that grasp those panels. They are additionally bracketed by stone elements that carry the stories included in the document that they have shared. He explained the organization of those stories are catalogued so that at the bottom is the river and the top is the city. He stated there is a prologue statement on WWI and WWII of carved panels which would be granite. The glass panels will be indicated and framed by stories that are told on stone panels. He explained the smaller panels are the Pittsburgh images located in the ochre tones at the ends. The larger images, of which there are eight panels, are adjacent to them.

Mr. Johnson stated the purpose of the presentation was not to go through the specific content, but maybe to describe a little about the idea. The panels at the entry talk about Americans entering the war and how the war began, and on the east side, the story of the Pittsburgh circumstance at the beginning of the war, and then as you progress around, there are a collection of personal stories, that were vetted twice, once with the veterans, and with Mr. David McCullough who is a local historian of considerable reputation. They then had the good fortune of having Mr. Bill Stewart join their team who is a local writer and historian by hobby. The stories have been through a considerable back and forth about what should be in and what should be out.

Mr. Johnson stated in speaking to the issues of the earlier discussion of the first project that was presented, they were very conscious of what they included from a diversity perspective. He stated Mr. Kirkland did a matrix of all of the stories represented in both the pictures and the narratives. He stated they tried to be as inclusive as they could. The concept here is that there is not limitless space. They tried to grasp or offer the amount of information that would coincide with the attention span of a visitor for a memorial of this type. The large images are intended to invoke the scale and magnitude of the war and the horrors of it. The stories are intended to reveal from local residents' personal experiences and how the experience of the war affected their lives. The collective images are to create a collage and to bring more visual information into the story, some of which is connected back to the selected stories and prologue and epilogue that were written. He explained for example, the Jeep was a product of Allegheny County design and manufacturer, as well as LST's and cannons. Mr. Johnson stated it is an extraordinary rich opportunity to showcase what Pittsburgh's commitment to winning the war was.

Ms. Klavon asked if he was going to discuss the materials.

Mr. Johnson stated yes, and that he was not there to go through the narratives specifically, but just wanted to show how the information would be conveyed. He then showed a representation of what will be carved in the stone, the significance of the scale of the letter, and the limitation of each of the stories – roughly 250 characters – and the positioning of each of those stories in such a way that people of varying ages and height, and handicapped people can have easy visual access to the information.

Mr. Johnson then showed a display of the memorial as it would be lighted at night. He said light from under the seats inside the interior of the memorial would be projected. The light from the stainless steel spires would also be illuminated in an alternating way. The flag pole would also be illuminated. Mr. Johnson then stated that they are currently finalizing the specific details of the survey so they can very responsibly integrate with the geometries of the river walk. He stated the surface itself they are investigating as a sandstone surface delivered from Cory-sourced, within 500 miles of Pittsburgh. The vertical walls would be some slightly more irregular version of that same stone set at a seating height at an infinite capacity almost for the seating of the memorial. The donor pillars are intended to be black granite. The stories that are carved into the stones into the memorial itself are also a polished granite material. They are still considering their color choices in that set of materials. The plant materials are intended to save the existing trees, reuse or offer up the ones that need to be removed in the actual site of the paved part of the material, and the induction of the planting systems with ornamental trees around the edges of the curved seating wall. An understory of planting would sit under that as well. Mr. Johnson stated the intent is to keep the visual access moving through the memorial and the surrounding vegetation so that there is no threat to security. In the materials they have set in the windows investigating alternative ways of representing the visual images in a sandwiched glass technology. They are interested there in the convergence between longevity, archival quality of the color and representation they are looking for.

Mr. Johnson stated Mr. Hal Hilbish, their lighting designer of “local lighting designer of distinction,” was there at the Art Commission. He stated Mr. Hilbish is investigating ways in which they are driving light into the panel. He said the concept there is that light is dropped on either side of the glass in the frame that

it sits, and it is set to go off with an atomic clock system. In the evenings it would be illuminated by a soft light. Mr. Johnson stated Mr. Hilbish had lighting models to show the Art Commission.

Mr. Larry Kirkland introduced himself, and stated he and Mr. Johnson are attached at the hip on this project as collaborators. He stated that Mr. Johnson stated everything he was going to say, but he wanted to add that if the Art Commission would look at the glass samples, they are required to get three different bids from three different glass companies. They are finding that each company has different processes and different results. He explained the smaller photos would be enclosed in the glass of translucent white quality. The larger images, the world images, would be transparent. They are doing this first for safety, because they want you to be able to look through the memorial, and second, the translucent glass really picks up the light in a really different way. At nighttime, the two ends or apses of the memorial will really have a glow where the larger images that are translucent will be much more ephemeral.

Mr. Kirkland then explained the two different techniques shown in the two long panels, the image is actually digitally printed onto the glass and there is an interior laminate. He stated the smaller image is a sandblasted image that is then in-filled with an archival ink. Mr. Kirkland stated they are going through a process to determine the longevity of the materials, how archival they are, and find out what the warranty is. He stated the longer the warranty the more expensive the material. Mr. Kirkland stated that the heavier sample has two pieces of tempered glass of quarter inch glass laminated with a urethane, which is a liquid process on half-inched annealed glass. He stated these samples were by far the strongest. The other two pieces, he explained, were of annealed glass with a laminate in the interiors. He stated that some of the laminates are done through an autoclave process, and some are a UV-based process. He stated these are all things they are still exploring.

Mr. Kirkland stated that Mr. Bill Stewart, who wrote the text panels, was there to answer any questions regarding this. He stated he believes they are 95% there. He explained they are having every single story go through the eyes of a military historian, and to make sure that all of the military history is correct.

Ms. Klavon asked what the vertical stripes were on the images.

Mr. Kirkland stated this is where the stainless steel is. He said each panel is 30 inches wide and 10 feet tall, so the images go all the way across are 30 inches across.

Ms. Rhor stated that it seemed from the packet there were numbers or letters that referred to a key, but she was not sure where this was.

Mr. Kirkland stated the numbers are only for him and his archivist to understand exactly what images. He stated they have to make sure each one is copyright free. They mark if the photo came from the Teenie Harris collection, University of Pittsburgh, Congress from the National Archives, who is in the picture, what is it depicting, who in it is from Pittsburgh or Southwest Pennsylvania, and do they have their permission to use it.

Ms. Rhor asked if there would be a place for this information to be available to viewers.

Mr. Kirkland stated they are working on this.

Ms. Rhor asked if they had any idea where this information would go within the whole ensemble.

Mr. Snyder stated that they are working on having a record at Soldiers and Sailors, and the idea is to move more towards a smart phone app, that would essentially allow one to access this information from one's phone. He stated they do not have all of the details worked out.

Ms. Rhor stated she thought this was a great idea to start thinking in this direction. She encouraged them to use the information they collected from oral histories and research and make these available to the public.

Mr. Bill Stewart introduced himself, and stated he wanted to give the Commission some information about the origin of the information. He stated that the four epilogue and prologue panels were all incorporated into the original design, so they pretty much wrote these stories from the universal point of view. He stated there are 16 Pittsburgh stories, and these were either generated or approved by the content committee that was headed by Judge Johnson. He explained their choices were not at all willy-nilly. He said they have been vetted, and they are there because they deserve to be there.

Mr. Indovina asked for clarification that the text is not directly related to the photographs.

Mr. Kirkland stated no, purposely not.

Mr. Indovina asked if the photos themselves were trying to convey a particular story.

Mr. Kirkland stated no.

Ms. Slavick stated that she realized this project has gone through many presentations, and she does not know if any of the Art Commission members were in those earlier hearings or not.

Ms. Klavon stated that she and Mr. Indovina have both been.

Ms. Slavick stated that in relation to the text, is wondering how the memorial is identified. In looking at it, she sees it says "Allegheny County World War II Memorial" and the function of a memorial is to service the veterans or whether it is functioning as a school instead of a shrine. She stated that if it is a school about the war, it certainly must include much of the history they have presented that is focused on the war effort and those who contributed to that war effort, but it is not necessarily the total picture of the war in the sense that they do not show the opposition to the war – even though it is seen as one of the most just. She stated this opposition is seen nowhere in the narrative. She stated she is not necessarily advocating that it be there to question the honor or the duty, she is just curious where that fits in how this is identified. She said it is identified as a public county memorial; it is not one group's story. She stated she is seeking clarification on this.

Ms. Klavon stated they did write about this.

Mr. Stewart stated this information is included in the panel "America enters the war."

Ms. Klavon pointed out this is in West panel two on page 8 of the packet.

Ms. Slavick stated she missed this, and thanked everyone for the clarification.

Ms. Rhor stated she sees what Ms. Slavick is getting at in terms of larger issues, and again listening to what she said about school versus shrine, she sees they are kind of straddling this line. She said they use the words "shrine" and "apse" which are loaded words in a way, which she understands. She stated they cannot teach everything in these panels, but it is very thorough and she likes the balance of Pittsburgh in the larger arena. She finds this to be really strong, and the personal stories to be very strong. She stated that having this balance makes this a very personal memorial and she likes this a lot. Ms. Rhor stated there is the larger world narrative and history which is constantly being looked at, because there are so many reasons to look back and think about what happened in particular to those who were lost in the war. She stated she is noticing in the same panel, "America enters the war" that there is stress on Jews and their genocide as a marker. She stated of course this was a major aspect of the war, and they have not really been able to come to terms with it. However, she stated they are also looking at recent Holocaust studies the other losses due to political beliefs of other citizens who were lost abroad in almost equal numbers. She stated she was wondering if this would be something they would want to include more information on.

Mr. Stewart stated that he believes there is a line that states "Jews and other minority populations." He said in this regard he was thinking about the Poles, the Slavs, and gypsies. He said the difficulty was the number of words they were allowed.

Ms. Rhor stated she understood this was the difficulty and that they cannot include every story. She stated she does not have a solution for this, but is just wondering.

Ms. Johnson stated the idea is to make the memorial compelling enough that people will want to find out more. He stated that this is not the be all and end all of the school, but it is more to educate than it is to enshrine.

Ms. Rhor stated this might be something they are thinking about going forward on how they have this interactive media for it. She said they might want to link to different memorials that memorialize something different elsewhere in the world. She suggested they put this on their docket of 'how can this memorial go one step further?' She stated they have a golden opportunity now in the memorial's stages in figuring out

how they can start to think globally. How can they point to another memorial for those who died because of their political beliefs?

Mr. Kirkland explained that one of the epilogue panels talks about the incredible cost of the war world wide, and the over 60 million people who died – the vast majority being civilians. He stated they really tried to take the big world view of civilian populations in a very specific way, so they have been trying to tell that bigger story either in image or in text. He said however, they know this is impossible; it is just too big a story to tell. Hopefully they will encourage those who are interested to go and research more. He stated there is so much written, and the history channel programming is constantly about World War II.

Ms. Rhor stated this should not be a final statement but something expandable.

Mr. Kirkland stated absolutely.

Ms. Rhor stated she wanted to encourage them when planning ahead to think about expanding this information beyond the memorial.

Mr. Kirkland then stated that they “goldilocks” the story of the shrine and the school, and really thought about the right temperature on that. He replied that when you win the competition between the geography, the culture, and the building of the businesses and industry that helped win the war, you have to stay true to that. He stated that in their outreach subsequent to starting this project up again, they approached the Heinz History Center and were discouraged from making it too much an exhibit. He added these things get accomplished in other places.

Ms. Rhor stated she can feel this uneasiness between trying to balance something that gets very text heavy and very didactic with where they are trying to make it something else. She stated it is difficult with the amount of text, not to go into that exhibition sort of flavor.

Ms. Klavon asked how they determined the average amount of time an audience member would spend at the site. She replied that the Roosevelt Memorial in Washington D.C. has many phrases and quotes, and feels more like a storybook. She stated with this piece, she would have to really stand there and read the panels, which she supposes is intentional. She stated she was wondering how long someone would be expected to be at this memorial, and would that person be expected to return several times. She added this was not a criticism.

Mr. Kirkland responded that he hoped this memorial would be a compelling enough place that people would come back, and maybe each time one comes back, he or she sees something more. He stated that if one had a deep interest in this subject, then he would expect that person to spend quite a bit of time there. He added Mr. Johnson’s grandmother is well-known history writer who writes stories for grade school children. He stated that she advised them to think about the eighth-graders, and to write at this level. Mr. Kirkland stated they really tried to keep the “Pittsburgh” stories more in the personal voice instead of it being a didactic panel. The prologue and epilogue panels really needed to embrace this enormous story in as few words as possible, under 250 words. He added “less is more.”

Ms. Klavon agreed.

Mr. Stewart stated that the WWII Memorial covers acres and acres in Washington D.C., but is more a symbol than a teaching device. Mr. Stewart also stated that when you go to visit the World War II Memorial in Washington D.C., you are expected to park and stay awhile. He stated you cannot expect to view the WWII Memorial in Washington D.C. in less than 20 minutes. He added it is not informative in the way it should be, but is more of a tribute. He added that he thinks with the FDR Memorial, this was a man with a lot of quotes, but thought Ms. Klavon was able to learn about the man and the era because there were a lot of panels with text on them. In regards to the proposed WWII Memorial, Mr. Stewart stated he believes anyone who comes from out of town will stay and see what they want to see. The rest of us will walk through it 40 times a year on a way to a ball game or some other event on the North Shore. He stated he thinks it is important that it be informative.

Ms. Lockett asked for more information about the warranty on the glass in terms of vandalism and people etching.

Mr. Kirkland stated that as a public artist doing work all over, you anticipate someone wanting to vandalize your piece. He stated you try to make it as compelling and as beautiful as possible so that people do not do

it, but if someone is hell-bent on doing something they are going to do it. He further explained that all of the glass images will be digitized and filed with the Art Commission, another set with the World War II Memorial group, as well with the glass company that made them, so they can be replaced.

Mr. Johnson added that glass is much more vulnerable on its edges than its surface, so the intent in the design is to completely frame the edges with stainless steel. He explained it would take a pretty strong blow to actually chip it out on its face, but he stated as did Mr. Kirkland, that if someone really wanted to damage the work they could.

Ms. Slavick asked for more explanation about the clear versus semi-white glass for which there is a color difference.

Mr. Kirkland stated they are exploring the color difference to see if the sepia tone evokes the time. He explained the small image is not black-black, but has a lot of brown in it. He replied he tends to like having a little warmth to the color even though it is a little too "1920's." He still feels the black-black is the wrong color.

Ms. Slavick added that what he was referring to as "black-black" looked actually blue in relation.

Mr. Kirkland agreed. He added they are working the color differences through with three different manufacturers who all want to do this, but they have to make sure they are getting what they want.

Ms. Klavon addressed the audience and invited them to comment on behalf of the project.

Mr. Howard Piper introduced himself as a WWII veteran. He stated this project has been going on for 12 years, and it only took us 4 years to win the war. He stated if this does not tell you something, something very bad is happening. He further stated they need the Art Commission's input and need to move as along as quickly possible. He added that half of the people who started on the project have now passed away, which is sad in itself. They really need movement here to get this project seriously underway. Mr. Piper stated he hoped the Art Commission would consider that.

Mr. John Vento introduced himself as a WWII veteran. He stated he is happy to be there today to see this great memorial become a reality. He stated that we need something like this in the Pittsburgh area to prove not only how great the Pittsburgh area was in making materials needed, but in sending many soldiers overseas who then became the greatest generation we ever had in this country. He joked that he may have some old bias, but stated it is true. He explained he spent three years over in the Pacific, was very happy to do it, and was happy to be there today to see this become a reality. He stated he is sure that when people go to the North Shore they will stop to view this memorial, and that we should be very proud of it. He further stated they certainly appreciate the Art Commission's support so they can move on and get this built before he passes on. He said he would like to see it done and up.

Mr. Rifat Qureshi introduced himself as the Development Manager at the Sports and Exhibitions Authority. He explained he has been coordinating with Mr. Snyder's group along with Mr. Kirkland and the WWII committee members for two and a half years now. He stated the Authority is in support of the design, text, and overall project, and they look forward to seeing the project move along and eventually built.

Ms. Renee Piechocki introduced herself as the Director of the Office of Public Art. She stated it is very exciting to see the development of the memorial since the last presentation. She stated she was there to speak very strongly in support of the project. Ms. Piechocki stated that as some of the Art Commission members who have been there a while know she has not been a fan of the location for the memorial, but replied she was not going to bring up this issue again. She stated she wanted to commend the team for taking what she considers to be a terrible site between the Jerome Bettis restaurant and the American Eagle Amphitheater, and having the design block out the restaurant and entrance to the amphitheater. She said the design allows people to be surrounded by the memorial in offering them a place of reflection and study. She congratulated them on taking sort of weird site and making it still contemplative.

Ms. Piechocki then commended the artist and the whole team for using images that speak to the reality of war, and not just candy-coated or nostalgic images. She stated the image of the people in the concentration camp in particular really touched her. She stated she is glad there are some really serious images like that that are included in the memorial. She further added as the historian had stated earlier, that she felt the WWII Memorial in Washington D.C. is a big disappointment. She stated she may be being too much of a Pollyanna here, but would not it be nice to see more of the horrible things that have happened to human

beings so that we would have war less. She stated she thought it was really great that we are not only focusing on war as a heroic effort, but also on how horrible it was for many people. Ms. Piechocki added that she really enjoys how the memorial makes a local connection, not just by only listing the names of those who have served. She stated while this is important, what she enjoys about this memorial is that the select narratives that are presented connects Pittsburgh to these events, but also really expands viewers' knowledge and understanding of how and why people of Pittsburgh were involved. She stated she felt reading the text was a very rich experience.

Ms. Piechocki encouraged the Art Commission to approve the project as it was being presented. She added as a side note that she also encourages the Art Commission and anyone else to read a new book called Memorial Mania by Erika Doss. She stated the book talks about the last 100 years of memorial culture, and discusses what Ms. Rhor was stating earlier about what the responsibility of new memorials is to connect to viewers.

Ms. Carol Siegel introduced herself as part of the Design Team for the project. She stated she actually brought Mr. Kirkland and Mr. Johnson there to compete in this wonderful project when the RFP went out eleven and a half years ago. She stated they have as a focus for a deadline, 11-11-11, which is Veteran's Day of this year. She stated she is not sure if this is doable, but it would make for a very memorable date for all of them to focus on. She says they will be able to move quickly with the Art Commission's help and fundraising.

Ms. Klavon addressed the audience and invited them to comment in general or against of the project.

Ms. Ismail stated she has really enjoyed the evolution this project has gone through, and commended the group for their determination. She stated she hopes they will be able to complete the project by 11-11-11.

Ms. Klavon thanked everyone for their comments. She stated that there was nothing for the Art Commission to do regarding a motion.

Mr. Brown clarified that the group was seeking an endorsement motion if the Commission felt that was appropriate. The SEA required this project to come before the Art Commission. He also asked them to give comments and suggestions before they make their construction documents.

Ms. Klavon asked for a motion. She replied they could comment on which color ink and glass they preferred.

Ms. Luckett stated she thought this was the group's concern as well.

Mr. Indovina moved to grant favorable endorsement with commendation for the group's determination to get this project completed.

Mr. Livingstone Johnson from the audience thanked the Art Commission for their approval and sensitivity each member brings to his or her work. He added it is very important to see to those who think they know everything that the Art Commission is going about their work very seriously. He stated they cannot come to the Commission with a half-prepared presentation and expect to have it approved. He again thanked the Art Commission.

MOTION: To grant endorsement of the project as submitted.

MOVED: Indovina SECONDED: Luckett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None CARRIED

- I. Director and Staff Reports
- II. Adjourn