

ART COMMISSION

Minutes of the meeting on Wednesday, January 22, 2020
Beginning at 2:00 p.m.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION: Indovina, Baskinger, Goulatia, Parsakian,
Gable, Lucas (for DOMI)

PRESENT OF THE STAFF: Cavalline

AGENDA ITEMS COVERED IN THESE MINUTES

ITEM	PAGE
1. Pittsburgh Pirates Banners	1-2
2. McKinley Park Gas Regulator Building	2-4
3. Bloomfield Bench Master Plan	4-6

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Roll call. Indovina asks for Commissioners to review and comment on the minutes from November 2019. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Baskinger. All ayes. Motion carried.

B. Correspondence

None.

C. Items for Review

1. Pittsburgh Pirates Banners – Pittsburgh Pirates (*Conceptual/Final*) *Kiley Cauvel, Pittsburgh Pirates*

Cauvel describes the banner program, which is on light poles in the area around PNC Park. There are eighty banners, which have been in use throughout the history of the ballpark, with the design periodically changed. The proposed design would replace the currently installed banners, which were approved by the Art Commission in March of 2017.

Indovina says there are eighty banners and asks if that number is the same as it has been in the past. Cauvel says yes. Indovina asks if these banners are in lieu of the player-specific banners. Cauvel says those banners are on the park itself and so do not require City approval. She says those banners are changed out every few days.

Goulatia asks what material the banners are made of, and Cauvel says vinyl. Parsakian asks about the actual dimensions. Cauvel believes they are 30 inches by about 48 inches.

Goulatia says that going forward it would be wise to think about sustainability in materials, as vinyl is a pollutant. Cauvel says they would be interested in thinking about that, as they have green initiatives.

Baskinger says that in the future it would be good to see the exact locations of the banners in a bird's-eye view so that they can get a better idea of the context. Cauvel says they will do that.

Cauvel hands out a packet that includes the letters of support.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

MOVED BY: Goulatia

SECONDED BY: Baskinger

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

**2. McKinley Park Gas Regulator – DiSanzo Construction
(Conceptual/Final)**

Jeff DiSanzo, DiSanzo Construction

DiSanzo describes the proposed building, which would be a small brick structure to contain a gas regulator that is currently installed in McKinley Park. The City of Pittsburgh has an agreement in place with Columbia Gas for the installation of the regulator which stipulates that the building must aesthetically fit into the character of the neighborhood and park.

Indovina asks what the roofing material is. DiSanzo says that the agreement says it is to be shingles but the architect's rendering shows paneled steel. He points to a picture in his handout showing the steel panels.

Goulatia asks if the yellow bricks are painted yellow. DiSanzo says no, that it is actual brick. He shows samples, one of which is smooth and one that is more textured. Parsakian asks if they will have a graffiti-proof finish and DiSanzo says they can put an acrylic finish on it. Parsakian notes that anti-graffiti finishing helps at city bus shelters. Parsakian asks who will be responsible for removing any possible graffiti. DiSanzo says that Columbia Gas would be, and Gable confirms that per the agreement Columbia Gas would have this responsibility.

Indovina asks if they have considered a darker brick, as opposed to yellow. DiSanzo says they could use a darker brick, and shows them a sample of a dark red brick.

Gable explains that there is an existing structure at the site, and that what is proposed will be a new structure. He says that his concern was that the new building look better than the existing building and fit with the architecture of the park, but that there was no decision made as to the color.

DiSanzo shows images of a previous building he constructed with a similar red brick. Goulatia asks if the new structure will have the same white detailing as the example image. DiSanzo says no, that the agreement stipulated dark grey finishing.

Baskinger asks if DiSanzo is proposing an asphalt shingle roof. DiSanzo brings up the discrepancy between the agreement and the architect's drawing, but says that the metal option is more durable. Parsakian confirms that he is proposing metal for the roof, and asks what the finish is. DiSanzo says it is silver but can be lighter or darker.

Goulatia asks if he has a red brick with more texture, similar to the texture of the yellow sample that he has presented. She says the red sample is very flat and plastic-looking. DiSanzo says he has more samples in his truck, but that the more textured red is an option.

Goulatia asks about the color of the grout, and DiSanzo says it would be grey.

Lucas asks if the brick sample represents the pattern of brick. DiSanzo says that the sample is just for the finish, and the architect's renderings show the brick pattern.

Indovina says that this is a fairly utilitarian building and says it should remain in the background as much as possible, so he favors the darker brick and fascia. Goulatia agrees that the darker red textured brick would be preferable, as well as the lower contrast of the darker grey finishes.

Indovina asks Gable if a textured brick is more of a concern for graffiti. Gable says there is always a concern for graffiti but that Columbia Gas would be responsible for that. DiSanzo says they will seal the building to help as much as possible.

Baskinger agrees that this sort of functional building should be visually quiet, and that it should also be durable and as integrated into the park as possible. He supports the darker brick, the darker tone steel roof, and the grey fascia that matches with the mortar so there are as few different colors as possible. Parsakian adds that the door should also match.

Goulatia asks if the roof is reflective. DiSanzo says they can get a less reflective satin finish. Baskinger asks if it is powder-coated from the factory and then sprayed to get a particular color. Indovina says that it's probably possible to order it from the factory with a chosen color, which DiSanzo confirms.

DiSanzo confirms that the desire is for darker red, textured brick; fascia, grout, and door to match; and a satin finish for the roof.

Baskinger asks if DiSanzo knows how many sites like this are in the city. DiSanzo says that the Columbia Gas engineer was meant to be present today but was unable to be, and he could get that data to them if need be. Baskinger says they do not necessarily need it for this project, but it would be useful for other similar projects going forward. Parsakian mentions that near his business on Ellsworth there is a gas meter that has been hit by cars from the nearby parking lot. DiSanzo says that the gas company does not house the gas meters, only the regulators, as they are much more dangerous.

Cavalline notes that the project requires DPW support, which Director Gable gives. Baskinger asks Gable if he knows how many of these sites there are. Gable says there aren't very many, and the various equipment is owned by different companies.

Baskinger asks if the other equipment (further up the hill) is now defunct. DiSanzo says that it is not defunct but may be at some point. There may be plans in the future to remove that equipment and building. Gable says the old building will be taken down and the area restored to the park.

Goulatia suggests that the final design be sent to the PACD Division for staff review to ensure that it adheres to the criteria they've laid out today.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval with the condition that the building design must adhere to criteria set forth by Commission during the hearing in regards to the materials, colors, and fixtures used for the doors, bricks, roof, fascia, and mortar: specifically, the dark red textured brick; matching dark grey doors, fascia, and mortar; and satin finish for the steel roof.

MOVED BY: Baskinger
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

3. Bloomfield Bench Master Plan – Bloomfield Development Corporation (Conceptual/Final)

Christina Howell, BDC

Sam Spearing, BDC

Howell introduces the project, which is for 24 sidewalk benches and planters in the public realm on Liberty Avenue, Main Street, and Penn Avenue in Bloomfield. The project previously received Conceptual Approval for a testing phase.

Spearing goes through some of the results of the community feedback on the testing phase of the benches and the designs that they have decided on for the final proposal.

Goulatia asks if the planters are the light grey color, and Spearing says yes. He says that the benches fade to a grey tone as well after being in the sun for some time. Goulatia asks if the aluminum hardware is all black, and Spearing says yes.

Baskinger says the the lpe wood that they have chosen is a good choice for longevity but is a rainforest wood. He says that Black Locust is a domestic wood and would be a more sustainable choice. Spearing says that the company they are purchasing from has a sustainability plan and the lpe falls under that, as new trees are planted for ones cut down. Baskinger says that he is referring to sustainability in terms of shipping, as well as materials replacement when needed. He says that Black Locust begins as a lighter wood but fades to a similar light grey color. Although it is a small detail, it can be a major implication to future projects.

Lucas asks that they reach out to Port Authority to be sure that they are placing the benches carefully in relation to bus stops. Spearing says that they have ranked their locations according to priority and have placed the bus stops at the top of that list. Howell adds that when they reached out Port Authority they made it clear that benches would be placed near the bus stops. She says that their maintenance plan calls for BDC to take on all maintenance.

Lucas says to just be sure to continually have up-to-date conversations with Port Authority to make sure that the benches are not interfering with anyone's ability to get on or off the buses.

Parsakian asks if the benches will be set back from the street or if they will be next to the curb. Howell says they tested both placements and found that car doors will hit them if they are too close to the curb. She says the encroachment permit dictates a setback from the street, so they will be placed according to that encroachment.

Howell says some businesses requested a bench right in front of their location.

Parsakian asks about the fiberglass planters, as he is not a big fan of that material. He asks if this company makes planters that would complement the benches. Spearing says that they looked at one like that but that it had hard metal corners that were a safety concern. Howell says that those planters also don't come in higher versions.

Parsakian says on Ellsworth Avenue they often have planters pushed over. He notes that these will be harder to knock over due to their size. Indovina asks who will be in charge of tending the plants. Howell says that they have talked to the business owners about what arrangement would work for them. She says that they will provide volunteers to install the plants and also pursue grant money. She said the business owners also had the idea to have households sponsor planters and care for them.

Howell says they are going to have less planters than benches. She says they will get grants and work with the business owners, and hopefully get in-kind donations from local corporations. Parsakian suggests local greenhouses and says that having a professional taking care of the plants would be a good idea, if they had grant money to pay them. Howell says that is a good long-term goal and that in the short-term they will be using volunteers. Parsakian says partnering with a local sustainable business would be a good idea.

Goulatia asks if there is access to water if local residents are going to be helping with this. Howell says there is no public access, but the business owner that proposed it offered their water facilities. Howell says this was a great idea but she is unsure how feasible it is yet. Ideally they will want to partner with businesses that will water the plants on a set schedule so they will want to make careful decisions about where the planters are put, in front of which businesses. Parsakian says that it's important to spread them out so that they have the maximum impact.

Goulatia asks if they have a visual with the colors that will show how the grey of the weathered bench will relate to the grey of the planters. Howell says she does not have a good photo of that. She shows a color that she says is a bit darker than what the benches will weather to. Goulatia asks how long will it take for the benches to weather. Howell says that she believes it is four to five years. She also says that she likes the idea of using Black Locust wood.

Parsakian confirms that the planters are 18 inches square, and three feet high. Howell says that there are three sizes and one is only 18 inches high and they are not sure if that is high enough. Parsakian also says that they should be aware that the planters will be used as trash receptacles. Howell says she is aware.

Goulatia asks if any of the benches or planters obstruct vision. Howell says no, and shows on the visuals where pedestrians cross the street.

Parsakian says that the local businesses put tents out for Little Italy Days, and asks if they are aware that the benches would block that. Howell says that those tents are in the street and not on the sidewalk. Howell says that Little Italy Days was mentioned in their Vision Plan as a time when people need more places available to sit.

Indovina encourages that they have a positive planting and maintenance plan for the planters before any of them are put into place. He says that having them professionally maintained would be ideal.

Indovina asks how the planters will be implemented, if they will all be put out at one time or phased. Howell says they will put out five planters and eight benches first, using a grant they have received. They'll be asking for something from the businesses in writing saying that they support it, as the benches require an encroachment permit, while the planters do not.

Goulatia seconds Baskinger's recommendation of Black Locust wood. Howell says that she thinks their supplier offers that sort of wood. Goulatia says the cost may be less. Baskinger says it is likely comparable in cost, but will be a slightly different look than lpe for the first three years. He says that he just asks that they give the wood choice consideration, but that it would not affect his overall approval of the project. Howell says that sustainability is one of their group's core values, and she thinks the board would be in favor of switching the wood.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

MOVED BY: Baskinger
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

Meeting Adjourned

ART COMMISSION

Minutes of the meeting on Wednesday, February 26, 2020
Beginning at 2:00 p.m.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION: Indovina, Arimoto-Mercer, Luckett,
Parsakian, Gable, Lucas (for DOMI)

PRESENT OF THE STAFF: Cavalline

AGENDA ITEMS COVERED IN THESE MINUTES

ITEM	PAGE
1. Mount Washington Banners – Mount Washington Community Development Corporation	1-2
2. Allegheny Commons – Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy	2-3
3. Activation Under the Fort Duquesne Bridge - Riverlife	3-6
4. Beechview Memorial Parklet – Pittsburgh Hispanic Development Corporation & Beechview Area Concerned Citizens	6-7
5. Small Cell Aesthetic Standards Amendment – Crown Castle Fiber LLC	7-10
6. CMU Forbes Corridor – Carnegie Mellon University	10-11

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Roll call. Indovina asks for Commissioners to review and comment on the minutes from January 2020. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Arimoto-Mercer. All ayes. Motion carried.

B. Correspondence

None.

C. Items for Review

1. Mount Washington Banners – Mount Washington Community Development Corporation
(*Conceptual/Final*)
Gordon Davidson, MWDCD

Davidson presents the proposal, which is for updated banners, welcome flags, and street directory signage. The new banners would replace those that were installed in 2010. The current proposal represents a redesign following previous Art Commission feedback.

Arimoto-Mercer asks how long the banners are expected to last. Davidson says the last banners lasted about five years. He says that the specs of these banners say they will last for three years but they're expected to last for six.

Parsakian comments that the black skyline gets washed out, and asks if Davidson thought about using white to contrast more with the sky. Davidson says he believes the black areas in the images should be grey. Parsakian asks if he has an example, and Davidson says no.

Parsakian asks about the hashtag, and comments that the "L" and the "I" in it might confuse people. Davidson says he understands. Parsakian says he likes the overall simplicity of the design.

Luckett says that there is also some confusion with the font.

Parsakian asks what the dimensions are of the welcome sign. Davidson says around 32" x 42". He says it is very prominent. Parsakian clarifies that it will be on a facility that is existing already, and Davidson says yes. Parsakian says the cutout of the silhouette is very nice.

Arimoto-Mercer appreciates Davidson showing all of the locations of the banners in the presentation.

Parsakian asks how they are attached. Davidson says that they will be modifying the brackets that are there, they will be using coated stainless steel hardware to mount to the posts, and that the attachment is very hardy. It is also covered by their three year warranty.

Lucas notes that DOMI supports the proposal.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer

SECONDED BY: Luckett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

2. Allegheny Commons – Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy (Final)

Susan Rademacher, PPC

Joe Hackett, LaQuatra Bonci

Rademacher introduces the proposal. Hackett describes this restoration project of Allegheny Commons that includes reconstruction of the central promenade walk and connecting pathways, tree planting, and general improvements to pedestrian amenities.

Arimoto-Mercer asks if any of the trees will be labeled. Hackett says they do not have plans to do so at this time, but they could look into that in later phases of the restoration. Arimoto-Mercer says the preservation plan is very thoughtful and thorough.

Indovina asks about the material for the pathways. Hackett says it is bituminous, with concrete for the sidewalks. Indovina asks if this is what it is currently, and Hackett says yes. Parsakian

asks if they will be using a different material around the George Washington Monument, and Hackett says they would like to use porous pavers to absorb rainwater. Maintenance is a large consideration and they have been talking to DPW about this. Rademacher adds that they've been having an extensive review with DPW about maintenance routes into the park. They will be having areas of reinforced turf adjacent to paths where access routes will be needed. The oval around the monument is sized so that it will have the right turning radius for maintenance trucks.

Luckett asks if they needed to increase the number of receptacles and benches. Rademacher says there are currently no benches in most of the park, so that number has increased dramatically. She discusses the placement of the benches, which are offset from each other on pathways, and paired nearer to entrances to the park, with spaces in between for wheelchairs. Rademacher says that the receptacles in the park are mostly the default cans as opposed to the more formal standard. She says the number has decreased from their original plan based on discussions with DPW, who is also informing where the receptacles are laid out.

Parsakian asks if they have an example of the light poles, and if those are new. Rademacher says they are all new and match the Allegheny Commons standard.

Arimoto-Mercer asks if they have plans to look at the post-construction usage of the park. Rademacher says there are no concrete plans but they are in talks with a researcher to do post-occupancy studies of another park, and it will depend on funding. They will do observations on a staff level and expect use to increase. Arimoto-Mercer says that the path repairs and benches should help increase use. Parsakian asks if the Farmer's Market will still be held. Rademacher says that is held in the East Commons and that area remains the same. They are not making provisions for that type of use in the currently proposed area, but restorations of other areas of the park will make more accommodations for similar uses.

Arimoto-Mercer notes that they are eliminating a lot of paths that are used now, and asks what plans they have if those pathways continue to be used. Rademacher says they have thought a lot about this, and they have tried to make sure that they are placing paths at the most intuitive places, with the pipe rails reinforcing this and drawing attention to those entries. From feedback given by neighborhood organizations, they added two paths back into their design that they were going to eliminate.

David Demco, Assistant Director of Scenic Pittsburgh and a neighbor of the park, speaks from the audience and gives his support for the project.

MOTION: Final Approval

MOVED BY: Parsakian

SECONDED BY: Arimoto-Mercer

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

**3. Activation Under the Fort Duquesne Bridge - Riverlife
(Conceptual/Final)**

Stephan Bontrager, Riverlife

David Seiter, Future Green Studio

Bontrager introduces this public art project, which will be installed under the Fort Duquesne Bridge. It is intended to open in June and to remain in place for three years. Seiter describes the project, which involves sculptural birdhouses, natural wood seating, and a wheat-paste mural.

Luckett asks if the wood benches were sourced locally, and how they were treated. Seiter says that they looked in local sourcing but the cost was substantially higher. They haven't made a final decision on the supplier.

Arimoto-Mercer comments that they have river birches here in Pittsburgh and not white birches. She suggests the mural could have a stronger connection to the area by featuring images of river birches instead of white birches. She acknowledges that they are regional but do not easily grow here. Seiter says the trees are more representative of an idea, but that is a good point and they will consider it. He says the image they used is from a forest closer to Altoona.

Arimoto-Mercer asks about the birdhouse stands, and whether people who have sight problems might have difficulty maneuvering around them. Seiter says that they thought about this. He says that the site is not a great location to begin with for accessibility for those with sight problems, as there is no railing next to the river. He says that they consulted ADA guidelines for the birdhouses, specifically with the size of the poles and the space between them. They have also included a dashed line along the bike path that will be painted as a visual indicator.

Indovina says there may be an encroachment issue with including elements in the walking path. Seiter says there will be a clear delineation and a three-foot offset between the walking path and the structures. Indovina says there is nothing to prevent people from walking through the structures and so they should look into the code requirements. Seiter says they will.

Indovina notes that they are anchored into the concrete slab. He asks how they will be disassembled. Seiter says that all holes will be patched up upon deinstallation.

Parsakian says that Shephard Fairey used a similar technique around the city as their wheat-paste mural and so he loves the idea. He asks if they have considered using bird sounds to enhance the experience. Seiter says it's a great idea and they had discussed it, especially with the dominant sound of the traffic overhead.

Parsakian asks about the lighting, and whether it is a 24-hour experience. Seiter says that the location is officially open from dawn to dusk. The lighting is meant to be accent lighting to be visible from afar, but may provide some visual clarity for accessibility if anyone does go there after hours.

Parsakian asks about the point of entry to the installation location. Gable says that you can get to the area from Point State Park or through the lower level of Allegheny Riverfront Park.

Luckett says the pavement there is pretty rugged in its current condition. Seiter agrees. He says that there is a general cleaning that will happen as well as addressing the current mural in preparation of this installation. Bontrager adds that one of the main purposes for this installation is to make the case for long-term improvements to this area.

Indovina asks about the charred surface of the benches. Seiter says that most of the salvaged wood is yellow pine, which is a relatively resilient wood, although it would not be the best choice for a long-term bench in the outdoor elements. Seiter says the charred surface will make the

bench more resilient, and they will also be adding a clear coat, which will protect it as well as ensure that no soot can come off on clothing.

Parsakian says he appreciates that their organization is elevating art in the city. He asks about maintenance for the installation. Bontrager says they have a maintenance plan that is included in the project management plan with Clear Story. It includes bi-weekly walk-throughs and supplemental maintenance. They also have estimates for more major maintenance such as acts of God or major vandalism.

Luckett asks if there is a trash receptacle. Bontrager says there is a sort of receptacle there, but given previous comments by the Commissioners, they can definitely include receptacles in the plan.

Luckett asks about signage, and whether partner acknowledgement is allowed. Bontrager says that it was their understanding that the signage would be temporary. He says they will have the artist statement on semi-permanent signage and that they would have the partner acknowledgement in place for the Three Rivers Arts Festival and then have it removed. Lucas says that she has seen partner acknowledgement on trail signs on the other side of the river. Luckett says that is different.

Lucas asks how wide the bike path is. Bontrager says that they are working with Bike Pittsburgh to make sure that they have a wide enough path for bike traffic. Lucas says they should also work with DOMI on that.

Parsakian asks if there will be any sort of celebration on the site for Earth Day. Bontrager says that is a good suggestion, and there are a number of programming opportunities at the space. He says that Future Green has created bird stencils which will be used by community volunteers on the mural as the material degrades over time. He says an Earth Day event would be a possibility for future years.

Indovina asks to see the various versions of the birdhouses. He recommends they do not use the lowest version, as people could trip over it. Seiter says that is the two-foot birdhouse and is only five of the seventy-five birdhouses in the installation. It would most likely not be used by birds and had to have a wider angle of legs to accommodate ADA standards, but they included it as a way for children to be able to access the birdhouses. He says they can consider removing that size birdhouse all together.

Luckett says she likes the overall design but asks if they have considered just having a single leg, as people might be able to harm themselves on the tripods. Seiter says that they considered it but the structural design of the eight and ten foot sizes has more integrity on three legs. Bontrager says they also considered hanging birdhouses but PennDOT does not allow this. Seiter says that the higher birdhouses will be the ones that will be used by birds. Luckett asks if the preference for tripod legs is mostly aesthetic, since they also need to think of safety. Seiter says that when considering a single leg they ended up with a very thick tube for the higher birdhouses to make them structurally sound and so the tripods were a combination of structural integrity and aesthetics.

Indovina encourages them to locate the birdhouses in the more passive areas, back from the walking paths. Seiter says that they will do that, and that they are located in the recessed alcoves and are at least three feet from the pillars and the walking paths.

Lucas asks if they will get enough solar power for the lights. Seiter says they will get enough ambient light power to keep the lights on overnight. Lucas asks if the birds will want to use the houses if there are lights on inside them at night. Seiter says that there is a lot of discussion about birds and how artificial light affects them. He says the lights will be shining down from the bottom of the birdhouses, and they will be using a warmer light which is more desirable for birds. He says that the noise is probably the most limiting factor onsite for birds nesting there. He says that they have had conversations with consultants and they think that many local birds will nest there, and the boxes can be cleaned out and eventually deinstalled during winter months when those species will not be nesting there.

Arimoto-Mercer says she thinks a lot of city birds will nest in the lit conditions.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the conditions that 1) the lower birdhouse be eliminated, and 2) the birdhouses be located outside of the walking path

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer

SECONDED BY: Luckett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

**4. Beechview Memorial Parklet – Pittsburgh Hispanic Development Corporation & Beechview Area Concerned Citizens
(Conceptual)**

Keith Wehner, Office of Senator Wayne Fontana

Wehner describes the project, which is for a new monument honoring peace and those who served in all wars, to be placed in Beechview Memorial Park.

Indovina asks if the RCO meeting process was complete. Cavalline says that Wehner had the meeting with the RCO earlier that week and that he has received a report from the neighborhood planner, who was in attendance.

Parsakian says that his father was a veteran. He says that when he thinks of peace he wants to think of life and joy, not death. He says that with the other monuments in this park, it looks like a graveyard, and this monument looks like a gravestone. He says he has a problem with the overall design including the lettering, and the whole thing gives him a very negative feeling. He says that the idea of honoring people in future wars is horrible to say, and he would prefer something like a peace garden. He says this does not elevate the conversation, and artistically it could bring something to the community for them to think about war.

Indovina asks how the design was derived, who produced it, and whether it was vetted through the community. Wehner says the design was derived through Beechview Area Concerned Citizens in consultation with the American Legion in Mt. Lebanon and the granite company that put the design together.

Luckett asks if they worked with a designer or artist. Wehner says they worked with the granite company who designs monuments and memorials.

Phyllis DiDiano introduces herself as the President of Beechview Area Concerned Citizens and says that the original intent was as a monument to the hope for peace. She says that they had thought about using imagery like an olive branch and a dove. She says that they will have lighting and they want to express hope for global peace, which is why they have the globe image. She says the color is a beautiful pink granite and looks darker on the presentation images.

Parsakian says it isn't the color, it's the concept that he has an issue with. He says that he knows it has to come from the community's wishes, but he wishes they could have gone beyond this idea. Luckett says that presenting this to the community when they might not even know the possibilities and the range of what is out there is doing them a disservice. She says that there does not seem to have been any exploration of the possibilities of what this could look like beyond a few options from the granite company.

Parsakian mentions the Vietnam Memorial in D.C., which was considered too stark when it was first erected and is now one of the most-visited monuments. He says that seeing a version of it gave him an emotional reaction, and he doesn't think he would feel anything looking at this monument.

Phyllis says they wanted to be more timeless, and be relatable to young people. They also wanted to keep names or specifics off of this one so that it could be used to contemplate peace.

Arimoto-Mercer says that this is a very last-century concept, and so if the goal is to relate to younger generations, this is an opportunity for a 21st-century monument that can give you real hope when looking at it, possibly in a more abstract way. She mentions that her father was also a veteran, and says that he was also very moved by the Vietnam Memorial and was less moved by the WWII Memorial. She says that it might be good to have more younger people, even children, participating in the conceptual planning of this project. She says utilizing an artist or designer could really let them see the possibilities.

Parsakian says there is a monument in New York that honors John Lennon and says "Imagine" on the ground. He says something as simple as a word can mean a lot, and it doesn't have to be in hard stone. He agrees that stone monuments are of the last century and that bringing in artists can help to expand the idea of honoring people and peace. Arimoto-Mercer says their hearts are in the right place.

Indovina says that he supports the idea of the monument and the location, but also has a problem with the design. He agrees that it misses the mark in regards to the possibilities that are available. Parsakian brings up the 9-11 Memorial in New York as another example of a contemplative monument.

MOTION: Table

MOVED BY: Parsakian

SECONDED BY: Luckett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

5. Small Cell Aesthetic Standards – Crown Castle Fiber LLC

(Conceptual)

Thomas Musgrove, Crown Castle

Musgrove presents a proposed amendment to existing small cell standards, which would add an additional design option for ornamental light posts in the public right-of-way with integrated wireless facilities.

Parsakian asks if this is only in the Downtown area. Musgrove says it is an amendment to the city standards, so it would be for anywhere where you have an acorn-style light. Parsakian asks if all the light fixtures would be replaced. Musgrove says not all of them, just single instances to provide coverage in that area.

Indovina asks how much spacing there would be between instances. Musgrove says they need to be close enough for continuous coverage but not so close that they overlap. He estimates from 1500 feet to a quarter mile.

Parsakian asks if 5G will be obsolete soon. Luckett asks what the future of this is. Musgrove says it comes down to the capacity for data, and the speed you can manage it with. Luckett says that the capacity is dependent on the light poles that they want to install this equipment on. She says she would still like to see them looking at other structures where these could be installed. She asks where he sees it going in the future. Musgrove says many cities utilize traffic signals to hold this equipment. He says they have to take a look at all the existing infrastructure available, as they are trying to limit new poles being erected in the right-of-way. Luckett asks if they will be here again next year. Musgrove says this is up to the Art Commission and the city, as they are talking about vertical real estate: the higher the poles are allowed to be, the more carriers they can accommodate on a single piece of infrastructure.

Indovina asks if the proposed pole would be single-carrier. Musgrove says yes, because the goal was to stay within the 15 percent design standard.

Indovina says different providers are coming and suggesting additional poles and locations, and they have gone through several iterations of designs, which have gotten better since the first ones. Parsakian says he would think that in the future this equipment will eventually be very small, and asks if they are working with anyone to refine this technology in that direction. Musgrove says they have a national department that works on finding the most effective ways of deployment. Parsakian asks if this is the best technology available today. Musgrove says yes.

Indovina asks what concept they are reviewing today. Musgrove says it is being able to replace the acorn-style lightpost with the proposed lightposts. Arimoto-Mercer asks if they are proposing both Option A and Option B. Musgrove says that this was giving the Commission an option as to which was more aesthetically pleasing. Arimoto-Mercer confirms that the luminaires on Option A are 15 feet high and they are 14 feet high on Option B. She asks how that fits into their current standards. Musgrove says he is not sure what the current height standard is for the luminaires.

Lucas says that in regards to the mixing of designs, these designs have two lights on them, and there may be streets where some poles have single lights and some have two lights. She says DOMI has been working with Musgrove. She also says that there are height limits in the current standards. She says that the 4G technology has a shroud and doesn't believe that the 5G technology uses a shroud. She mentions that if there are two lights instead of one, they can be dimmed to be consistent with the light levels of the rest of the street. She also confirms that its

possible there would be 4G and 5G equipment on the same pole. Musgrove says yes, they are separate technology and not integrated.

Parsakian confirms that single-light poles will be replaced with double-light poles, but at what interval it is not yet known. Musgrove says yes, and the distance would be a matter for the carriers, as Crown Castle manages their equipment but not their network. Parsakian says that in East Liberty the poles are very close together, and they are a little further apart in Shadyside. He is curious how many will need to be switched. Musgrove says that a benefit is that the newer poles are LED and might be improvements on the older poles.

Indovina says that Option A is preferable, but this approval is very conceptual since they don't know how close they would be together, how many there would be, or where they would be.

Arimoto-Mercer says that Option B is too wide. She would still like to be sure that the luminaires are at the same height as the other lights on the street. Musgrove says another question would be whether they would want the lights to stick out parallel to the street or perpendicular.

Parsakian says that a lot of the light posts also have banner standards. Indovina says the parallel option would be less intrusive than the perpendicular.

Lucas asks what the process would be to amend the existing small cell standards. Cavalline says that they are here for Conceptual Review to gain feedback, and then they would submit an actual revision document for Final Review, which if approved would then become part of the existing standards.

Arimoto-Mercer agrees with Luckett that if they approve this Conceptual Review, they would still like to know that alternatives to pole equipment are still being looked into and considered. Musgrove says that they are always looking for creative solutions to provide coverage for their customers, but these solutions are based on what is currently being used and what needs to be done if those current solutions no longer work. Arimoto-Mercer says they have discussed not just using poles. Musgrove says that it depends on what kind of coverage the carrier is trying to provide, as often the equipment needs to be closer to the end user than the roof of a four-story building would provide. Arimoto-Mercer says that there are a lot of lower buildings in Pittsburgh, and their concern is that poles will be their go-to solution without thinking of how it affects the streetscape.

Indovina clarifies that what they are presenting today is an option but is not the only option. Musgrove says that is correct, that this is just to provide coverage when the only piece of existing infrastructure is the acorn-style pole, which wasn't fully taken into consideration in the original approved guidelines. Indovina notes that this is a proposal with a fairly narrow scope.

Joe Cortes, an attorney for Verizon Wireless, speaks from the audience and says that there are additional considerations that he has presented to DOMI and that he thought would be part of the presentation today. He asks for an opportunity to present that information at the next scheduled meeting.

Jim Pena from AT&T speaks from the audience and brings up the FCC regulations that obligate the city to accommodate this equipment, and that the Art Commission is working to ensure that this is done within the standards of the city. He uses an analogy of eyeglasses to say that new things stand out for a while because they are different.

Luckett says that she doesn't think that the glasses analogy holds weight, and that they need to encourage good design. While their city needs this technology, the Art Commission's job is to make sure that the applicant and carriers are reaching out to innovate, and to think about how we as humans interact with the built environment, because that affects all of us.

Indovina adds that when he gets new glasses he chooses ones that look as close as possible to the old ones. Arimoto-Mercer says that Pittsburgh presents challenges that may not be like those in other cities, and they want to push them toward solutions that may be of use in other cities. Musgrove says that the design proposed today is custom made for the city of Pittsburgh based on the city's existing lightposts. Arimoto-Mercer says they appreciate that.

Indovina says that this is going in a positive direction, and he prefers Option A. Arimoto-Mercer and Parsakian agree.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval, with a preference for Option A

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer

SECONDED BY: Luckett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

6. CMU Forbes Corridor – Carnegie Mellon University

(Conceptual)

Bob Reppe, CMU

Reppe describes the proposal for streetscape improvements along the Forbes corridor at Carnegie Mellon University, including tree planters and storm management systems.

Parsakian asks if there are plans to reconstruct the Forbes Hollow Bridge. Reppe says they do not own the bridge – the pavement and right-of-way is owned by the state, the city owns the bridge, and it goes over a railroad. He says there are several options for the future of the bridge. Parsakian asks if he's familiar with the Highland Bridge in Shadyside. Reppe says that bridge, along with the nearby pedestrian bridge, are good models of what they would like to do. Parsakian says that he was a member of the Ellsworth Avenue Merchants Association that had input into those bridges and thinks Reppe should get that kind of input for the aesthetics of this bridge.

Parsakian asks if there are bus stops included in this plan. Reppe says they have been working with Port Authority and explains where the bus stops and shelters will be. Parsakian says that Pitt has a very artistic shelter and he encourages that kind of thought.

Parsakian asks if they are thinking about small cell technology implementations. Reppe says that they are, and that they are waiting to see what kind of distributor heads will be going on the fluted light poles. They used to have the kind with the large boxes at the base, and they now have newer versions on traffic light poles.

Indovina applauds their planter beds. He says that is a great idea to have on streets with high-speed traffic such as Forbes and Fifth, and that it creates a better pedestrian experience.

Arimoto-Mercer agrees and says that the raised beds alongside the street increase the feeling of safety.

Arimoto-Mercer says that in the elevations the bike lane widths seem variable. Reppe says that the width of Forbes Avenue varies greatly, from about 37 feet in the eastern end of the site, going to about 60 ft, down to 50 ft, wider again, and then narrowing across the Forbes Hollow Bridge. They prefer to keep a consistent bike lane width, so the buffer is what flexes as the road width changes.

Lucas asks if there is a way to protect the bike lanes. Reppe says they have had that conversation with PennDOT and they were not interested, and getting the bike lanes was a feat in itself.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

MOVED BY: Lockett

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

Meeting Adjourned

ART COMMISSION

Minutes of the meeting on Wednesday, June 24, 2020
Beginning at 2:00 p.m.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION:

Indovina, Arimoto-Mercer, Baskinger,
Goulatia, Lockett, Moss, Parsakian, Gable,
Lucas (for DOMI)

PRESENT OF THE STAFF: Dash, Minnaert,

Cavalline

AGENDA ITEMS COVERED IN THESE MINUTES

ITEM	PAGE
1. Great Allegheny Passage Trail Markers – Regional Trail Corporation	1-3
2. Pauline Hanauer Rosenberg Historic Marker – Matthew Falcone	3-4
3. Allegheny Landing Gate - Riverlife	4-5

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Roll call. Indovina asks for Commissioners to review and comment on the minutes from February 2020. Arimoto-Mercer motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Parsakian. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Correspondence

Minnaert says that within the last few days the Division has had a number of public comments relating to the Columbus statue. One is addressed to the Commission and will be shared with them.

C. Items for Review

1. Great Allegheny Passage Trail Markers – Regional Trail Corporation (*Conceptual/Final*)

Linda McKenna Boxx, RTC

Boxx describes the project, which is for four non-permanent mileposts to be installed along the trail. These are needed due to an ongoing reassessment of the trail to correct inaccurate mile measurements.

Indovina asks how long these will be in place. Boxx says they are hoping to resolve the issue of measuring within a month or two. They need to get permission from a property owner to pass through his property.

Goulatia asks what material the temporary markers are made of. Boxx says it is a vinyl composite called carsonite, and it is quite durable. The vinyl lettering is professionally made and installed. Goulatia notes that some of them are leaning in the pictures. Boxx says they were just sitting on cinderblocks for the pictures, and will be anchored securely in the ground when installed.

Luckett says she is an avid cyclist and asks if the markers are currently up. Boxx says some are in place outside of the City, but the four shown here are not up. Within the City the original granite markers are up, but are at incorrect distances. Luckett asks if any of these temporary posts are up currently to test them out. Boxx says they have mile markers 130-144 installed, and only the last four which are within the City of Pittsburgh are not installed.

Arimoto-Mercer mentions Boxx's plan to cover the existing granite posts and asks if it might be beneficial to have some sort of explanation so that someone does not uncover them. Boxx says they have had discussions within their team about putting a notification up to that effect, as they have had people remove the vinyl coverings.

Goulatia asks if they can temporarily remove the granite markers to avoid confusion. Boxx says they don't want to have to move the granite markers more than necessary as they are large, set in concrete, and easily damaged, so they prefer to keep them where they are until they have the alignment resolved.

Moss confirms that the long term plan is to move the granite markers to the new locations in which they will be temporarily placing the vinyl markers. Boxx says yes. Moss asks about the time frame. Boxx says this is dependent on the private property owner and if they can negotiate a right-of-way through his property.

Luckett asks if there is a way to continue moving the project forward around the property concerns as this is a matter of public health and well-being. Boxx says the mile markers will be in different places depending on whether they can go through that property. Luckett asks how many markers are needed for that property. Boxx says it is between mileposts 129 and 130. Indovina confirms that it is a matter of the length of the trail varying depending on this property owner, and Boxx says yes.

Luckett asks what the hesitation is on the part of the property owner. Boxx says that he is an industrial property owner and is concerned about safety and liability. Luckett asks if they have mileposts on any other private property. Boxx says they do not, and this one would require an easement. Luckett asks how much of the property is involved. Boxx says about a quarter mile.

Goulatia asks if it wouldn't make sense to just bypass the property. Boxx says that the area going around the property is prone to slips and they have had to put about a quarter million dollars in repairs to stabilize the hillside. Utilizing the private property would save them considerable time and money.

Parsakian clarifies that at this time there is no trail going through this private property. Boxx says that is correct.

Baskinger asks how they noticed that the trail markers were measured incorrectly. Boxx says that they did not correspond with the railroad markers and they received complaints from cyclists and runners who noticed that the miles did not match up. They then hired a surveyor to calculate the correct mileage. Baskinger clarifies the parameters of the project with Boxx, and

then asks about the timespan of the temporary markers. Boxx says that two years would give them ample time to resolve the issues.

Indovina says that two years seems like a long time. He suggests the applicant return in one year if they have not resolved the issue then. Boxx says that is reasonable. Baskinger adds that a one-year limit presents the urgency to the property owner.

Arimoto-Mercer clarifies that the Art Commission's definition of temporary is one year. Cavalline says that yes, the purview of the Art Commission is for projects of a year or more, and that temporary projects are under one year.

Gable notes that the trails fall under DOMI's purview, so DPW does not need to provide a support letter for this project. Cavalline asks if DOMI supports the project. Kim Lucas says that DOMI supports the project for the one-year time frame suggested by the Commission.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval for no more than one year, with the applicant requested to seek further approval if the project will be up for more than one year.

MOVED BY: Moss

SECONDED BY: Goulatia

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

2. Pauline Hanauer Rosenberg Historic Marker – Matthew Falcone **(Conceptual/Final)** *Matthew Falcone*

Falcone describes the desire for a Historic Marker in front of his home, which is Rosenberg's former residence. Rosenberg founded the National Council of Jewish Women, and had many notable achievements as an advocate of education, child labor laws, suffrage, and public health. The Historic Marker is granted by the State and has a uniform appearance. Falcone shares the proposed text for the marker.

Luckett says it is great that he is doing this, and asks if Falcone has notified his neighbors. Falcone says yes, and that he has also presented at community meetings and had the project published in local publications. He has received a lot of support.

Arimoto-Mercer comments on the placement of the pole, and asks how close to the curb it is. Falcone says it would not be on the curb but would be close to the street. Arimoto-Mercer asks how wide the sidewalk is. Falcone says he is not sure, but they are fairly narrow, probably about 6 or 7 feet. Arimoto-Mercer asks Director Gable how close the poles can be to parking areas. Gable says he is unsure but that City staff will be installing the pole, and they know where installations need to go to comply with the needs of pedestrians, traffic, and ADA requirements. Lucas says she wondered about this as well, but that she trusts DPW staff to judge this. She also mentions that there is a tree box a few feet away, and suggests that the pole be placed closer to the tree box so as to only narrow the pedestrian space in one area.

Indovina asks if this requires DOMI approval. Lucas says that she would expect this to require a permit, unless it is a DPW collaboration and considered a City project.

Parsakian asks about the orientation of the sign. Falcone says that he used a nearby Historic Marker as a model for the angle, which allows both pedestrians and vehicles to see the marker. Parsakian says it would be great if these markers utilized a QR code so that people are able to look up more information about Rosenberg. He asks if this can be added. Falcone says the signs are regulated by the State, so he is unsure if that can be changed, but he mentions that he has submitted for the house to be on the National and City Historic Registries, which would provide a plaque for the building. Parsakian asks if the plaque on the building would be through the History and Landmarks Foundation. Falcone says that is a separate organization, and the registries would be through the National Park Service and the City's Historic Review Commission.

Luckett asks if there's any way to incorporate Braille on the marker. Falcone says he does not know but he's happy to inquire with the state, and mentions that the National Council of Jewish Women did historic work with the blind. Moss says that it may be impractical at the sign's height. Luckett says other cities have put it on the pole. Parsakian says the Braille is a good idea.

Goulatia asks if the new porch being installed on this property is wider than surrounding ones. Falcone says no, that the current porch replacement is in-kind and will be the same width as the original.

Goulatia asks if there are two trees on the street and if the pole can be equidistant between them. Falcone says there is not another tree but there is a light pole, and equidistant between them would align the pole between two houses. Goulatia says that the QR code is a good idea and asks if this can be presented on the porch. Falcone says he will talk to the Historic Review Commission to see how information could be included appropriately.

Arimoto-Mercer asks if this is a one-way street, and Falcone says yes. Arimoto-Mercer asks if it can be angled the other way to face oncoming cars. Falcone says yes.

Cavalline clarifies that DOMI supports the project. Lucas gives DOMI's support.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with consideration given to the comments of the Commission.

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer

SECONDED BY: Moss

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

3. Allegheny Landing Gate - Riverlife (Conceptual/Final)

Anna Leisher, Riverlife

Colin Butt, Technique Architectural Products

Leisher describes the project, which is a new gate to replace a temporary gate that has been installed to prevent park users from accessing a staircase that leads down to a removed portion of the dock.

Indovina asks about the future fencing Leisher mentioned in her presentation, and asks where that would go. Leisher shows where there currently are hanging chains between bollards, and says that these would not prevent a pedestrian from falling over the edge. The fencing would go between those bollards. Goulatia asks what the bollards would be made from in the future. Leisher says the wood would be removed from the bollards and be replaced with iron.

Indovina notes that this application is limited to the gate. Arimoto-Mercer asks about the project's Art Commission application stating that the pattern of the gate references something in Pittsburgh's history. Leisher says that this was not mentioned in the application. Arimoto-Mercer asks how the bollards and the gate will be tied together. Leisher says there was a vertical tie-in that was designed, but she is unsure of the details.

Goulatia asks what the bollards in the pictures are made of. Leisher says they are cement. Moss asks if there will be a latch to hold the gate open. Leisher says yes.

Parsakian asks what the height of the railing is. Butt says it is 42 inches.

Leisher mentions that LaQuatra Bonci created the gate design shown in the presentation.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

MOVED BY: Goulatia

SECONDED BY: Lockett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

Meeting Adjourned



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

July 22, 2020 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by Chair Indovina

In Attendance

Indovina
Arimoto-Mercer
Lockett
Moss
Parsakian
Lucas

Staff Present

Cavalline
Minnaert
Dash

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Small Cell Aesthetic Standards	1-3
2. Swiftmile Charging Stations	3-5

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Indovina asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from June 2020. Moss motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carried.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)

Minnaert says that a series of emails have been forwarded to the Commissioners regarding the Columbus statue. Indovina says they will discuss these in the Staff Report.

C. Items for Review

1. Small Cell Aesthetic Standards - Final Review

Thomas Musgrove of Crown Castle explains the proposal, which is an amendment to the existing small cell design standards to provide a replacement for the ornamental light poles to make them fully integrated smart poles for antenna equipment.

Indovina asks for clarification whether these standards will apply only for Crown Castle or for all carriers. Musgrove says that they would apply for all.

Moss asks if there are stipulated requirements for the base of the pole. Musgrove says that those would be the standards that the City currently has. Moss asks if this proposal should reference that, to be sure that someone can't install a pole with a base that is too large. Musgrove says that detail can be added to this.

Goulatia asks about the orientation of the light fixtures, whether they are parallel to the street or perpendicular. Musgrove says they will run parallel to avoid a safety issue with a truck driving by and clipping the fixtures.

Arimoto-Mercer asks what DOMI's opinion is for these alterations. Lucas says that DOMI is supportive of the update of the guidelines so that they are applicable to everyone, instead of specific modifications to individual poles. She says that DOMI is comfortable with the proposed amendment as it entails general modifications that would be applicable to all companies. Arimoto-Mercer asks if there is a letter of support. Musgrove notes that Crown Castle submitted two letters of support, from the Pittsburgh Technology Council and the Downtown CDC. Arimoto-Mercer asks if DOMI has given a letter of support. Lucas says that DOMI is a co-applicant.

Moss asks for clarification on the co-location of multiple carriers, and notes that the application describes those additional carriers being mounted below the luminaires. He asks how that would be done. Musgrove says it would be a simple bracket mount, and there would be a port on the side of the pole. Moss confirms that the additional device would be mounted on the outside of the pole. Musgrove says yes, but that those would need to be shrouded. Moss asks if that shroud could conform to the 14"x24" measurements given in the proposal. Musgrove says that it would depend on the type of the antenna, and that is why they added the bullet point about the City allowing reasonable variation of size to promote co-location. Moss asks how many devices could be mounted to a single pole. Musgrove goes over the submitted diagrams and shows where the equipment would be located. Moss says he has concerns about allowing these additional devices to be mounted on the pole at a lower level, and that it would be much better to keep the equipment on top.

Musgrove says that this design is based on feedback from the Commissioners from the last hearing, but that they can modify this design. Moss says he thinks it might be helpful to see an example of what it would look like if it was mounted on the side of the pole below the lamps, as opposed to on top. Indovina asks if this would look like a larger barrel, or like a box. Musgrove says it would look like a larger barrel. Moss says this is his concern, and that Musgrove didn't answer whether there can be multiple barrels on a single pole. Musgrove says that co-location of carriers helps to keep from adding new poles and continually disrupting the streets and sidewalks. He says they fall back on what is technically feasible, so either mounting below the lamps or on top would both work, but that the top option would possibly work better and based on the Commission's feedback seems like the better option. Arimoto-Mercer, Indovina, and Luckett say that would be their preference. Luckett asks how many carriers could potentially fit on one pole. Musgrove says they typically design structures for 2-3 carriers. Moss asks what the maximum height would be for 2-3 carriers. Musgrove says 24-25 feet.

Goulatia says that her preference is also for top-mounted, and asks if the height can be consistent on the poles instead of varying dependent on the number of carriers. Musgrove says that is ultimately the City's decision. He says that the height can vary about 1.5 feet, and that in his opinion this difference is not very noticeable to people on the street. He says it can be modified by lowering the luminaire but that variation would be more noticeable than pole height. Moss, Indovina, and Goulatia agree.

Parsakian asks if all the poles will be uniform as to how many carriers are on them. Musgrove says yes, but that carriers don't all band together when creating the poles. Crown Castle will make a pole for a particular carrier, and then add the other carriers to that pole when needed. He says that there are three major carriers, and the poles would be designed for three major carriers.

Parsakian asks if it would be best to design the pole for the three major carriers so that they do not have to keep changing the design. Musgrove says that the poles will be uniform, but that as another carrier adds their equipment it will be added to the top and shrouded. They cannot design it for three carriers as a uniform design because the carriers' antennas vary in size.

Moss asks if the standards need to stipulate a maximum number of carriers and a maximum height. Musgrove says he will defer to the Commission on that. He also points out that the submitted proposal does include the foundation design, as mentioned by Moss earlier. Indovina says that it would be reasonable to include the conditions of maximum number of carriers and maximum height.

MOTION: Final Approval with the conditions that 1) no poles shall have more than three carriers; and 2) the poles will be a maximum height of twenty-four feet, including the shroud.

MOVED BY: Moss

SECONDED BY: Arimoto-Mercer
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

2. Swiftmile Charging Station - Conceptual Review

Lolly Walsh of Move 412 introduces the project, which consists of charging stations for electric scooters to be located in the public right-of-way. The design is proposed to be a City standard.

Ted Sweeney of Spin describes the context of the project, in which mobility companies are working with DOMI on a pilot program for the creation of Mobility Hubs around the City. The goal of the pilot is to give people a variety of integrated non-motorized transportation options.

Goulatia asks what neighborhoods they are looking at for this program.

Tosh Chambers of DOMI says that they could potentially be in any neighborhood and the program wouldn't be restricted by neighborhood, but for the first installations they are looking at neighborhoods that have a larger density of people and less existing transportation options.

Goulatia says that Sweeney mentioned that they were currently looking at specific neighborhoods and she asks what these are. Chambers says that the first neighborhoods that they are considering are Oakland, Hazelwood, Garfield, and Bloomfield. He says that a certain number of the installations will be allocated to neighborhoods that they are considering to be high need according to the Port Authority's Equity Index.

Luckett asks what neighborhoods are designated to be high need. Chambers says that they are looking at the neighborhoods which are scoring in the top 20% of need for a number of demographics including race and income. He says that examples are the Hill District, Beltzhoover, Allentown, Homewood, Garfield, East Liberty, Larimer, and Sheraden.

Lucas asks if there is an engagement plan. Chambers says they are working on this. [Audio breaks up.] To clarify what Chambers was saying when the audio broke up, Lucas says that DOMI has a plan for outreach, and that they will be working with elected representatives, community groups, and adjacent properties.

Lucas says that the installations would be co-located with existing streetlights in order to power them, similar to Healthy Ride stations. She says that they are looking at transportation demand in determining placement, to fill mobility gaps.

Parsakian asks what the footprint of the unit is, and if six scooters would be standard.

Sweeney says that they would come in six and twelve-scooter versions. He says that the six-scooter version is ten feet. Arimoto-Mercer asks about the width. Sweeney says with the scooters it is four feet. Arimoto-Mercer says that is a pretty large footprint. Lucas says for comparison this would fit into one standard car parking space. Parsakian says it is similar to a bike share footprint. Lucas says yes.

Parsakian says that Oakland and Bloomfield have a big demand, but in terms of marginalized communities it would be good to identify where need lies.

Walsh asks Chambers to talk more about the community identification criteria that was used and the phasing of the program. Chambers says that they have undergone a process to analyze and understand the transportation layout of each neighborhood and compare to demographics and have isolated neighborhoods that have a large population of people that could benefit to having more access to transit. They are looking at census block areas, which are smaller than whole neighborhoods. He notes that the scooters will be free range and will not be restricted to these docks. He says that they have identified the first five neighborhoods and five beyond that as future possibilities, and the exact number of stations they will install is still up in the air but may be around 20-25.

Parsakian asks if the scooters are electric or foot-powered. Chambers says they are electric. Parsakian asks how they operate up and down hills. Sweeney says they can handle about a ten percent grade, and deployments will relate to the hilliness of the area.

Goulatia asks if they have thought about solar-powered setups. Sweeney says that solar power is in the future of the design, but for this two-year pilot they are restrained to the technology that is ready to deploy. Parsakian says that the bike share units have solar power and it is not a large setup. Sweeney says that the difference is that these are electric scooters and the Healthy Ride bikes are pedal-powered. He says that as Healthy Ride bikes transition to electric they will also need to connect to an electric power source.

Arimoto-Mercer asks if the digital information screen is interactive. Sweeney says no. Arimoto-Mercer asks if they will have an app to find locations. Sweeney says that it will be accessible in a single app called Transit that is available to download now. Arimoto-Mercer asks if that is stated on the screen or in the signage. Sweeney says yes and the signage will also point to equity pricing programs.

Indovina says that the application mentioned that there are various providers and that the installation may look different than the proposed picture. Sweeney says that the e-scooters from Spin all have a black and orange color scheme so the exact scooter model will improve but will have the design scheme shown in the application. He points out that some pieces are modular and can be installed in any color, and for those pieces the Pittsburgh system has been done in a black and yellow scheme.

Indovina asks if the scooters can be left by people in any location. Chambers says yes, they can be docked at the station but they can also be left elsewhere. There will be regulations on how they can be parked, such as not being able to block the sidewalk or be parked on private property. Indovina asks if they have a kickstand. Sweeney says yes, and they are locked when not being ridden.

Parsakian says they present a nuisance factor in other cities where they are dropped all over, and asks how they will be kept out of the right-of-way. Chambers says it involves a number of components, but there will be instructions in the app and designated parking corrals. He says they can look into various solutions as the data comes in during the program.

Parsakian asks if there is a GPS on each of the units. Sweeney says yes, and this is a system that they operate in about 70 cities, so there is an infrastructure as to how this operates. He says there are employees who drive around all day picking up and replacing the scooters, and there are repercussions to users who do not end their trip in the required manner. He says that they can also incentivize users to park the scooters appropriately by offering discounts.

Parsakian asks if there are any Covid-related issues. Sweeney says that Covid has led many cities to ask them to scale up their operations as their system offers a socially-distanced method of transportation.

Parsakian asks what the gray box in the image is. Sweeney says that is power and metering equipment. He says that the box may not be necessary depending on where they are plugging into electric power.

Luckett asks if there is any consent given by users that the user is able to operate a motorized vehicle. She also asks how long their contracts with scooter companies are, as some companies have folded and left their equipment for the City to deal with. Sweeney says that upon sign-up, users are given a comprehensive set of documents that they have to consent to, including educational information and expectations of the user. He says there are age requirements but not a driver's license requirement. Sweeney says that Spin is with the City for a two-year pilot, and is a subsidiary of Ford Motor Company, so he is assured in that way of their staying power.

Arimoto-Mercer says that this is a two-year project, and they have determined that a temporary project is a one-year duration. Minnaert says this would not fall under the definition of temporary. Arimoto-Mercer says that the applicant defined this as temporary in their application. Minnaert says that, per the art commission's purview, this would be treated as longer term.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

D. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn made by Parsakian and seconded by Moss. The meeting adjourned at 4:23 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

August 26, 2020 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by Chair Indovina

In Attendance

Indovina
Arimoto-Mercer
Goulatia
Lockett
Moss
Parsakian
Gable
Lucas

Staff Present

Dash
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. West Wing Roof Restoration	1-2
2. 513 Court Place Lighting Installation	2-3
3. Sheraden Healthy Active Living Center	3-4

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Indovina asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from July 2020. Arimoto-Mercer motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Lockett. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

1. West Wing Roof Restoration - Phipps Conservatory - Conceptual/Final Review

Brad Clauss of Phipps Conservatory goes over the project, which is for the replacement of rafters and glass panels in the West Wing of the Conservatory. The project represents a change in materials while retaining the historic design. It is the most recent in a series of restorations at the conservatory, which all previously received Art Commission approval.

Parsakian asks if there was any thought of repurposing the glass. Clauss says that all the glazing of the last four cycles of restorations has been recycled. Most of the metal components are recycled if their condition allows. He says that the only thing they can't salvage is the wood, due to it being so deteriorated. Parsakian asks how the glass is recycled. Clauss says he would have to verify with the recycling firm.

Indovina commends the overall project.

MOTION: Conceptual and Final Approval

MOVED BY: Lockett

SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

2. 513 Court Place Lighting Installation - Clear Story - Final Review

Pete Milo of Clear Story introduces the project, which is a lighting installation as part of a renovation of Pribanic & Pribanic's downtown law office. He describes the lighting installation, which is integrated with a new perforated metal façade. An initial design for this project received Conceptual Approval in March 2018.

Moss asks why this project is coming to Art Commission, as it is on private property. Cavalline says that this project exists primarily on private property, but a portion of the façade extends over the public right-of-way. Indovina notes that their purview is technically only on the portion that encroaches into the right-of-way.

Goulatia asks if the way the lights change will be distracting, especially for traffic. She also asks if the lights will be twinkling, and if this will add to the distraction. She says it doesn't appear to be a problem in the renderings. Milo says that given the speed and arrangement of the light changes, he doesn't see it as being an issue. He says they have a video of the lights as they change. Goulatia says this would be helpful. [Discussion of Zoom screen-sharing; Milo emails video to Cavalline for putting onscreen.]

Moss asks if they have done foot candle analysis, and specifically what is the light spill of light emitted out into the public. Milo says they are not finished with those calculations, but he imagines that it is probably only adding about $\frac{3}{4}$ foot candle. Moss says this is something that should be submitted so the foot candle output can be confirmed. He asks if the light would be projecting onto any other buildings or out across the street, and Milo says no, that it is direct view. Milo says that viewers will not actually look at the pixels, but rather at illuminated PVC elements.

Moss asks for clarification on Milo's statement during the presentation that wiring would not be visible to pedestrians. Milo says that each panel is a self-contained string, and the perforations are a perfect grid, so the wiring will ride in the positive space on the backside of the panels. Moss asks how the wire is attached to the back of the panel. Milo says they are still working on that detail.

Arimoto-Mercer asks what the dimensions of the perforations are. Milo says each one is approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ " on each side of the triangle. Arimoto-Mercer asks what is directly across the street. Milo says it is the ramp coming down from the Boulevard of the Allies.

Luckett says this is a really interesting project in that a private citizen is working on enhancing the side of their building. Luckett says that for safety, it would be good to be able to see the progressions of the variations of the lighting scheme, noting that Clear Story has a good track record of taking safety into consideration. Milo says that the lighting will be safe, for instance it will be below levels that would have a harmful effect on someone with epilepsy.

Parsakian agrees that they need to see a video. He asks what the dimension of the overhang onto the public sidewalk is. Milo says it is two or three feet and says that there will be conventional down-lighting above the sidewalk. Eric Fisher of Fisher Architecture says that the measurement is marked on the drawings somewhere but it is definitely less than five feet.

Moss asks if there is a rendering that shows the street at an oblique angle. Fisher says there are multiple views on his website.

The video of the lighting scheme in motion is shown. Luckett asks if this is the lighting for daytime or evening. Milo says that is still outstanding. They are not designing a system that is meant to be viewed during the daytime, but if it happens to be viewable in daylight they may consider having it active then.

Arimoto-Mercer says it seems fairly subtle, but would be interested as to whether it was a traffic distraction to those going up the ramp. Moss says it doesn't seem like it would be. Goulatia agrees that it is subtle and says it looks very nice. Moss and Arimoto-Mercer agree.

Parsakian asks where streetlights are in relation to the building and asks if it would wash out the effect at all. Milo says that they are clear of streetlights in this immediate location. Parsakian says he loves the project.

MOTION: Final Approval

MOVED BY: Goulatia

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

3. Sheraden Healthy Active Living Center Additions - Department of Public Works - Conceptual/Final Review

Harvey Butts of DPW goes over the project, which is for renovations to the property, primarily to improve ADA access. The additions include accessible routes to the entrances, improved outdoor seating areas, lighting, landscaping, and a new storage shed.

Arimoto-Mercer refers to one of the slides and asks if a planting bed is shown. Butts says that it is a trellis. Arimoto-Mercer says she can see the trellis, but there is no planting bed where the plants on the trellis would take root. Butts says that he can see that a planting bed would be needed.

Arimoto-Mercer asked if they considered other colors for the roof. Butts says that they are trying to get it to match the muted red of the existing roof. Arimoto-Mercer says the red in the renderings is very bright and wonders what it would look like with another color. Butts says the rendering might be more red than they desired. He says the intent is to have it match. Arimoto-Mercer asks if it would be a cost-saving measure. Butts says no, that the intent is to have the same color so as to match, but the images rendered it much redder. Butts suggests it could be a more muted color. Arimoto-Mercer says if the intent is to match, it should match well, as currently it looks like an afterthought.

Goulatia asks if the new roof is attached to the existing roof. Butts says no. Goulatia says that in that case they could go with a contrasting color, but it definitely needs to complement what is there already. Butts asks if she means a complementary color like green. Goulatia says no. Butts says he understands.

Goulatia asks if the pillars are all aligned with the light pole. Butts says the light pole is slightly farther in than the columns that hold up the awning, and that those columns are also smaller. Goulatia clarifies her question as whether the pillars will all be in line with the light pole when you look at it from the street. Butts shows the relevant slide and says that the pole may be about two inches off, but are basically aligned. Goulatia asks if it is possible to make them aligned. Moss clarifies her concern as being the pergola columns set back further than the light pole, but says that since they are such different elements he doesn't think they need to be aligned. Butts also notes that the light pole is a darker color although this does not show in the renderings.

Goulatia asks if the ADA ramp connects to the pergola area as well as to the upstairs of the building, and Butts says yes.

Luckett thanks Butts for this much-needed upgrade. She asks about the grey area in front and asks if it is a walkway. Butts says yes. Luckett asks if it is on grade with the light grey area. Butts says it is. Luckett asks if the parking closest to the building is diagonal. Butts says yes.

Parsakian asks about the materials. Butts says it is metal construction. Parsakian asks what color it will be painted. Butts says they have not decided that yet. Parsakian asks where the dumpster would be in the renderings. Butts says it will be moved to the other side of the parking lot from where it is in the current photographs. Parsakian asks if there will be a fence around it. Butts says they moved it so it would be less visible. Parsakian asks if they have a recycling dumpster and a refuse dumpster. Butts says they only have a refuse dumpster but they should probably add a recycling dumpster.

Goulatia asks if the dumpster will be facing the residential homes. Butts shows where it will be located, and says it will be partially obscured under trees.

Arimoto-Mercer asks to see the planting plan. She says that the planting plan is fairly generic and could be more inviting and a more sensory experience for the same budget. She says that the cotoneaster near a walking path can look very messy. She recommends the master gardener program at Phipps as a resource for more interesting plants for the same budget, or that some places may want to do it pro bono. She said there are also opportunities for sun beds where they could offer programming. Goulatia suggests fruits and vegetables to promote healthy living. Butts says the area out front is mostly concrete and the area to the side is at risk of being damaged by children playing. He says they wanted to make it low maintenance but that their point is well taken.

Parsakian asks if the building is accessed more from the front or back. Butts says more from the front, but those using ADA access, buses, or parking cars use the back.

Butts shows the lighting fixtures and benches. Indovina asks if the bench is different than the City standard. Butts says he thinks the bench is the City park standard. Parsakian asks if the bike rack will be replaced, and Butts says yes.

Moss suggests they see another application for the landscape plan. Goulatia asks about the roof. The Commissioners agree in preferring that the new roof match the existing roof. Indovina asks about the timeline. Butts says that the project is shovel-ready.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval for the project as submitted, excluding the landscaping plan, with the understanding that the roof color of the addition should match the existing roof color. The Commission asks that the landscaping plan be resubmitted as a separate application.

MOVED BY: Moss

SECONDED BY: Arimoto-Mercer

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

C. Items For Discussion

1. Christopher Columbus Statue

Chair Indovina notes that this has been the subject of a lot of discussion and that there have been questions about the process and the purview of the Art Commission, so Assistant City Solicitor Lorraine Mackler has been asked to give an overview of the position of the City on Chapter 175 of the code, relating to the Art Commission.

Goulatia asks to see the letter from the Art Commission to the Mayor, which is shared on the screen. Luckett asks to also see the letter from the Mayor, and the City's press release. These are shown and are summarized by Indovina. [These three items are entered into the minutes as Attachment A.]

Indovina introduces Lorraine Mackler, Assistant City Solicitor. Mackler gives an outline of Art Commission purpose, purview, and process, defined in City Code Chapter 175, as determined by the City's Law Department. [This outline in the form of an FAQ is entered into the minutes as Attachment B].

Goulatia asks to see Section 175 of the City Code. [Entered into the minutes as Attachment C.] It is put on screen. Moss says most of what Mackler said made sense to him, but his interpretation was that the Art Commission could take action on City-owned artwork independently of another agency or the Mayor, and what Mackler said sounded different than that, and that an action would first have to be put before them by the Mayor. Mackler said that's correct, and that the letter from the Art Commission to the Mayor indicated the Commission felt it had broader authority. Moss says correct. Mackler says a careful evaluation of the language of the City Code reveals that it is more limited than that. Mackler describes their methods of statutory interpretation, according to the Laws of Pennsylvania, and says that the whole Code needs to be taken in context.

Luckett asks Mackler to confirm that she is stating that legally the Art Commission is an advisory Commission to the Mayor, and not a separate entity. She asks to see language that gives the Mayor the authority to weigh in on Art Commission decisions and/or processes. She asks to see where the Mayor has the authority to make these decisions and where the Art Commission is advisory. She says that in regards to precedent, the Stephen Foster hearing included a statement by City Solicitor Rachel O'Neill, where the Art Commission was given authority to render that decision.

Mackler states that O'Neill advised the Commission in regards to Stephen Foster, and what Mackler is telling them today is not her own personal opinion but the legal opinion of the Law Department and the City of Pittsburgh. Luckett says that as a Commissioner they took an oath of accountability, and the Code has not changed since the Stephen Foster hearing, and asks to see the language where the Mayor has the authority to weigh in on these decisions. Goulatia quotes the City Code 175.04.

Mackler states that the City Code gives the Mayor all executive authority, including in the disposition of property, which includes artwork, and explains the City Code's stance on the appointment of the Commissioners by the Mayor, and that they can be removed by the Mayor at will. Luckett says this requires consent of the City Council. Mackler says she is unsure of that. Luckett says that it says so in the Code, and that Mackler is saying misleading things. She states that the Commissioners need to be accountable. She quotes City Code 175.01 regarding the appointment of the Commission. She states when the Mayor wants to remove a Commissioner, he needs to go in front of Council and give the reason why. Mackler says this is not true as far as she knows, and maintains that the Mayor can remove members of a Commission at will, according to the separate section of the City Code that deals with Commissions. Luckett says that the Mayor needs to do this with the consent of City Council, and give the reason why.

Indovina says that the matter before the Commission right now is the Christopher Columbus statue. He says the question is whether the Commission can consider that matter on their own or at the Mayor's behest. The Commission wrote a letter saying that they intended to consider it on their own, and the response from the Mayor also asked them to consider it, so at present the purview discussion seems to be a moot point, although it can be and should be a separate discussion. He says the matter at hand is how they consider the Columbus statue.

Mackler asks if they would like a description of how a matter should come before the Commission. Arimoto-Mercer says that this is important because they were told that in essence their vote does not mean anything, and she says she believes that it does matter. Mackler says that she did not say that their vote does not matter, but they are now being asked by the Mayor to make a recommendation. She says that after the Commission makes the recommendation, it would go to the Mayor, who would make a decision. He would then bring that decision to the Art Commission for a ratifying 2/3 vote. She says they can make that recommendation in whatever manner they want, but a vote they take now would not affect a change, it would go through the Mayor and come back to them.

Arimoto-Mercer says that this means they cannot affect any change. Mackler says she disagrees and that the Mayor is looking to the Commission to help him make an initial decision, and that decision cannot be affected unless the Commission makes a ratifying vote. Arimoto-Mercer says this seems like a radical shift from the Stephen Foster proceedings.

Luckett says she agrees, and asks to see where it says that the Mayor has the authority to make decisions on public art. Mackler says that art is property and the Mayor is given all executive functions regarding property. Luckett says she doesn't see this. Mackler asks if she has reviewed the entire Code. Luckett says she has. Luckett says Mackler is making a misleading statement. Mackler says she would be happy to explain how the Law Department's opinion of this process is reached. Luckett says the Mayor's letter references Chapter 175, and so Mackler's statements are causing confusion. Mackler offers to answer any specific question.

Luckett says they need actual information from the City Constitution. Mackler says the City does not have a constitution. Luckett says she means the City Code or Charter. Mackler says there is a difference between that and a Constitution. Luckett says she is making an analogy. Luckett says the Commission will need to be shown where it says that the Mayor can make decisions about art, because she has not seen that. Mackler says that the municipal executive authority must be looked at

as a whole. Luckett says her understanding is that this is how abuse of power can happen, and this is the reason for the Art Commission being separate from the Mayor. Mackler says that the City's position is that the Art Commission is linked to the Mayor as an art advisory group. Luckett says that they are not an art advisory group. Mackler says the City's official position is that they are an art advisory group. Luckett asks to see this in the Code.

Mackler reads from City Code 175.03 and 175.04. Luckett asks her to read the entire section including the headings. Mackler reads the section, as follows:

175.03 - APPROVAL OF ACQUISITION AND PLACEMENT; EXCEPTIONS.

Hereafter no work of art shall become the property of the city, by purchase, gift or otherwise, unless the work of art or the design of the same, together with a statement of the proposed location of the same, has first been submitted to and approved by the Art Commission, acting by a majority of all its appointed members. No work of art, until so approved, shall be erected or placed in, over or upon, or allowed to extend in, over or upon, any street, avenue, square, place, common, park, municipal building, or other public place, under the control of the City or any department or officer thereof. The Commission shall act in a similar capacity, with similar powers, in respect to the design of any municipal building, bridge, approach, lamp, ornamental gate, fence or other structure erected or to be erected upon land belonging to the city, or other public place under its control. However, this section shall not apply to bridges costing less than five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000.00), nor to buildings costing less than two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000.00).

175.04 - RELOCATION APPROVAL VOTE; EMERGENCY ACTION.

No existing work of art in the possession of the City shall be removed, relocated or altered in any way without the similar approval of the Art Commission. Any work of art shall be removed, relocated or altered, in any way that may be ordered, by a vote passed, and approved in writing, by two-thirds (2/3) of all the members of the Commission, unless the work of art is attached to a portion of a building or other structure in process of demolition. In case the immediate removal or relocation of any existing work of art is deemed necessary by the proper authorities, the Commission shall, within forty-eight (48) hours after notice from them, approve or disapprove of the removal or relocation, and, in case of their failure to act within the period, they shall be deemed to have approved the action proposed.

Mackler explains the interpretation of these sections. Luckett asks where the Mayor is referred to in this.

Indovina asks if other City Commissions work in an advisory capacity or if they have final say over their decisions. Mackler says some do and some don't, and the Art Commission does have final say, but they don't have the ability to decide on items in the City's collection unless the matter is submitted to them by the City. Luckett says she is making things up and asks where it says this. Mackler asks City staff to mute all commissioners so she can finish what she is saying. Indovina says to give Mackler time to finish her statements.

Mackler says she has been an attorney for thirty-five years and is bringing all of her expertise to this, and repeats that the opinion she is giving here is the opinion of the Law Department and the City. She says that she is not going to point out where it refers to the Mayor because the interpretation requires the Code to be looked at in its totality and in terms of Pennsylvania statutes as well. Their opinion is based on the way the Code is written now. She says if the Code is not suitable, it is possible to make changes to it. She says if they are looking for one sentence that gives this opinion clearly, it does not exist, because the opinion is based on the Code taken as a whole, and that this is the considered opinion of the City.

Goulatia says that the letter that went out from the Art Commission makes a recommendation and that the letter back from the Mayor asks them to consider it. She asks if that means they are able to vote today. Mackler says that no, the process as the City understands it is that the Mayor would like the Art Commission to make a recommendation and a report to him. The Mayor will then make a decision, and the Art Commission would ratify it or reject it. Goulatia asks how the Commission has the final say if the Mayor can reject their recommendation. Mackler says the process may have been interpreted differently before, but the way they understand it now is that the Mayor must make a

decision. Goulatia says if they make a recommendation and the Mayor rejects it, then nothing will happen. Mackler says it seems unlikely given that the Mayor asked for their recommendation, but if he makes a decision that they are unhappy with, they can reject it. Indovina says in that case it would stay as the status quo. Mackler says if the Mayor wants to maintain the status quo, he would not come back to the Art Commission. Goulatia asks what the point is of collecting information and holding a special hearing if their recommendation can be disregarded. Mackler says that this is an important decision that requires a lot of input, including the expertise of the Art Commission. Goulatia asks if the Mayor takes into consideration the amount of letters received regarding this matter, and the amount of signatures on online petitions. Mackler says the Mayor is asking for a report, and she can't imagine he would have asked for that if he didn't want a thorough examination and would be taking all of this into account.

City Planning Director Andrew Dash says that the Mayor is asking the Commission to hold a public process and make a recommendation back to the Mayor, similar to what they did for the Stephen Foster statue. He notes that there are a lot of people who want to speak today. He says that the intention is for a similar process to be held as was for Stephen Foster, where the Commission gathers input, makes a recommendation to the Mayor, and if there is a decision to remove or alter the statue, then that decision would come back to the Commission. Goulatia says they can decide on a Special Hearing date today, so at least they can move forward. Dash agrees.

Moss says that it doesn't seem they all have agreement on the legal process, but that it may be a moot point for the moment, and scheduling the Special Hearing would make sense. He says they can then make a decision after the Special Hearing, and how the City chooses to proceed with that decision is to some extent out of their hands. Indovina agrees that there is some confusion that should be cleared up later, but they have the matter before them and a responsibility to hear the public. He says it's important that they schedule a separate public hearing on this matter so more people can weigh in on it. He says it is important for the Commission to be thorough and transparent and hear all sides. He believes they should begin this process, and asks if the Commission agrees.

Arimoto-Mercer says that the Commissioners asked the Law Department to weigh in, and it has taken a month or two to get that answer, which has been frustrating. She says that they were told by staff that they would get that answer sooner, and this is why this has been such a heated part of the discussion.

Goulatia reads a comment from the chat which is in favor of the removal and which asks why the process to remove the Stephen Foster statue is different from the process used to remove the Columbus statue.

Luckett concurs with Arimoto-Mercer and says they need to have transparency from the City of Pittsburgh in how they are dealing with this. She says all Commissioners need to have the same information. Goulatia concurs. Parsakian says that the public needs to know that they are forming a group to evaluate all City art.

Indovina asks if there has been any more correspondence received relating to the Columbus statue. Cavalline says that the cut-off time for correspondence for this hearing was yesterday at noon, the standard cut-off time that other City commissions use. Correspondence received after that time will be collected and passed on to the Commission, but was not in the packet published for today's hearing. Goulatia asks for the exact numbers of people for or against the statue removal. Cavalline says that there were 162 emails supporting keeping the statue, and 132 emails supporting a removal or a review with the intent to remove.

Parsakian asks if they can hear public comment at this point. Cavalline says speakers can begin whenever the Commission is ready to hear them.

Moss asks if they can make a motion to schedule the Special Hearing.

MOTION: Promptly schedule a special public hearing to address the question of potential action to the existing Christopher Columbus statue, within the next month if possible.

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

Indovina opens the floor for speakers to give public comment on the Christopher Columbus statue, limited to three minutes per person. Speakers are asked to give their name, address, and affiliation if they are representing a group.

[Public comments are entered into these minutes as Attachment D.]

Following public comment, Indovina asks City Planning staff to schedule the Special Hearing expeditiously. He says it is his opinion that they make a recommendation after that hearing. He says it is important that they hear from the community and they can then make an informed decision.

Luckett says that with Stephen Foster they had a Special Hearing, and then at the next regular hearing they made a decision. Indovina says that is a reasonable precedent. Goulatia asks if they should decide on a timeline. Indovina says a week or two of public comment would be reasonable, with the hearing after that. Parsakian says the next regularly scheduled meeting is September 23, so this should happen before that. Luckett says they will all need to look at their schedules so as not to conflict with another City Commission and notes the Stephen Foster hearing was in the evening. Goulatia says this is a good plan so that people can attend who work during the day.

Dash says that staff can create a schedule based on the Stephen Foster process. He says there was an online survey in that process that collected comment for a 30-day period. Goulatia says it should be done before the next Commission meeting on the 23rd. Arimoto-Mercer says at the Stephen Foster hearing there were experts that gave information on the background and context, and asks if that can be done again. Luckett says they can do that, and it has been discussed with staff. Minnaert says that the City will put forward a few proposed dates to the Commissioners, and that staff will put together the experts to speak at the hearing, and set up the public engagement platform online to collect community input. Arimoto-Mercer asks if the online survey needs to be thirty days. Dash says no and that they can figure the length out, but that giving two to three weeks in advance of a meeting is recommended in the City's engagement guide to make sure people have adequate notice.

Indovina suggests tabling other discussion items.

MOTION: Table additional items for discussion on the agenda until the next hearing.

MOVED BY: Indovina
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

Luckett asks for an update for those discussion items to be sent to them. Minnaert says that she will.

D. Adjournment

MOTION: Adjourn

MOVED BY: Goulatia
SECONDED BY: Arimoto-Mercer
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

The meeting adjourned at 5:54 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

September 23, 2020 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by Chair Indovina

In Attendance

Luckett
Goulatia
Arimoto-Mercer
Moss
Parsakian
Lucas

Staff Present

Dash
Minnaert
Cavalline

Items For Review Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Christopher Columbus Statue	1 - 10

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Luckett asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from August 2020. Goulatia and Luckett ask for amendments. Cavalline notes these to be corrected in the final draft. Moss motions to approve the minutes with these corrections, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

Luckett notes that the published agenda originally had another item on it, the 2635 Penn Avenue tree pits, which was withdrawn.

1. Christopher Columbus Statue

Luckett introduces this item, which the Art Commission will deliberate on and make a decision. She introduces public comment for this item, which is given here verbatim:

1. Miguel Sague

First of all, thank you very much for allowing me to speak at this meeting again. My name is Miguel Sague with the Council of Three Rivers American Indian Center and I sit on the board of directors of our organization. I'm also a Taino, living in the Pittsburgh area since 1977. So I'm a longtime resident of the area. The Taino people were savaged. And there is no other way of reading the history. I know, it's been said that we're not reading history correctly. There really aren't any other ways of reading this history except the facts. There were thousands of indigenous people living in the Caribbean, the area that Christopher Columbus was given power over. And by the time that the catastrophe was over, less than 30 years later, there were barely a few hundred people living in all of the islands, the depopulation of the area was severe, and permanent. That is a form of genocide. And one of the main reasons for that

was the overwork. Columbus was the main proponent of working these people to death. He purposely, when it was told to him, you know, one of your tasks, coming to the Americas is to convert these Indians to the Catholic religion so that they can become proper citizens of the Spanish crown. He surreptitiously kept the monks from converting them to Christianity. The main reason for that, if they were converted, they could no longer be considered heathen slaves and he would lose his slaves. That was an important element in his tactic is to not let the monks convert the Indians to Christianity. It has been said that the Spanish took away my people's spirituality and it's true. But it's also important to know that Columbus actually worked against that because he knew that he needed those slaves, he needed those Indians of slaves and then being converted. would make them Spanish citizens. He didn't want that. Columbus should not be considered a hero to the Italian American people. He gave up his Italian citizenship, he gave up citizenship in the Republic of Genoa to become a subject of the Spanish crown and became a very pronounced subject, he stopped speaking Italian for the rest of his life, and spoke only Spanish. He gave all his children Spanish names, this man does not represent you.

2. Prem Rajgopal

I'll try and be brief. I just wanted to, I think I've already pled my case on why Columbus was a problematic figure. And I'm not going to use this time to do that. Instead, I wanted to speak to the decision making process and who has the final say here. I really think the commissioners should consider that Ms. Mackler's interpretation of the city code was false last week. And that this final decision of removing the statute does lie on the commission, there was an NPR article that quoted someone who left the Law Department, after nearly five years on the job, Daniel Friedson. And he said, "the authority for replacement and removal of public art in the public realm rests with the art commission, according to chapter 175 of the city's law". So I just really wanted to stress that this whole obfuscation from the mayors end is something that should just be sidestepped altogether. And a final decision should be made by the Art Commission. And the other point I want to make and I already kind of made this up the hearing, but I really don't want to see the statue just sold and put up in a prominent public private property location. And I think that would just recreate all the tensions that we're trying to dismantle. And thank you. I'll yield the rest of the time.

3. George Bochetto

Thank you very much. I appear here as counsel, having been retained by Basil Russo, who is the national president of the Italian Sons and Daughters of America, who are deeply, deeply concerned with any purported removal of the statute. Because I only have three minutes, I'll get right to it. The proposal that the Art Commission make a decision to remove that statue would be contrary to law. 175.01 g of the code in Pittsburgh requires that this commission not take any action, which is inconsistent with any ordinance. There is an ordinance that put this statue in Schenley Park, it is ordinance number 198 of 1955. And section three of that ordinance, which has the force of law says that once that statue is located in Schenley Park, it shall be maintained in perpetuity by the city of Pittsburgh. And administrative agencies such as the Art Commission, or an executive such as the mayor does not have the authority to disobey this ordinance or force of law. The only way that can be accepted from is if the city council that originally passed the ordinance amends that ordinance, or if a court declares that ordinance unenforceable. But as we sit here today, we have an ordinance and each of the Art Commission members has a sworn duty to obey the law. And the law here is that that statute shall be maintained in Schenley Park. And it would be a shame if this commission were to ignore that and purport to vote to remove that statute or to recommend that it be removed, because it's only going to

go to a court decision. And then that court decision, we will be given no choice other than to point out that the Art Commission and each of its individual members acted contrary to law, and I don't think any of the Art Commissioners want to be in that position. I don't think the Art Commission wants to become known for acting contrary to the law, and I think it's of very utmost importance. We had the exact same situation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. I was counsel. And the court of Common Pleas agreed with our position completely and stayed the action of the Art Commission which purported to remove a Columbus statute in Philadelphia, declaring that the Art Commission was acting contrary to law. I have provided the commission with a copy of that order. And I urge you to take that into consideration.

4. Basil Russo [Staff note: Mr. Russo asked to address the Commission via email on 9/22 and was confirmed as being on the list of those giving public comment.]

I don't know that I had raised my hand, but I appreciate being called on, and I don't feel uncomfortable speaking, because the first two speakers that you called upon are individuals that had previously, I believe, spoken at both of the of the prior hearings. Suffice it to say, at this point in time that the ISDA feels very, very strongly about this issue. We feel that the effort to remove the Columbus statue from Schenley Park is an effort to erase the history of Italian Americans in the City of Pittsburgh, and the contributions that Italian Americans have made to the City of Pittsburgh. We are prepared to do whatever is necessary, legally, to protect our community's interests. And to ensure that our community's interests is not subordinate or overridden by any other community's interests. It's our intention that everybody should be working together in a spirit of cooperation and good faith, and not be in a position of having confrontation, which is exactly what this scenario creates. It's a scenario that pits one group against another group. And there has to be a winner, and there has to be a loser. And that certainly is not a healthy situation for the City of Pittsburgh or its residents to be in. There should be a way that our community can be honored and respected and our heritage can be preserved, and at the same time, that of the Native Americans can be honored and preserved as well. I would also indicate that in addition to what Mr. Bochetto said, that part of the claim that we will be bringing to the court when this matter is ultimately presented to the court, is the fact that we believe that two of the commissioners acted in a biased manner by expressing their point of view on this issue, prior to the time that any public hearing was held. And that that denies the resonance of the City of Pittsburgh due process under the law, and that those commissioners are obligated to recuse themselves from voting. So we're fully prepared to pursue this matter and to pursue the bias that has been shown by the Art Commission with respect to this matter, to whatever court is necessary for us to prevail on this issue. Thank you.

5. Kate Myers

Hi, my name is Kate Myers, and I'm a resident of Armstrong county about 45 minutes from Pittsburgh. By now I'm sure that you've heard many arguments from both sides in the weeks previous to this current meeting. I think the facts are exceedingly clear. Whether one believes it or not, that it was his intention or not, Columbus was the beginning of centuries of marginalization, disenfranchisement, and frankly abuse suffered by the indigenous peoples of America. Now, I realize that this is a more nuanced situation, however, concerning specifically the Italian American citizens of Pittsburgh and as well as our country. Here, I would like to state that I am in fact, a product of several generations of Italian immigrants. And Italian Americans have also suffered prejudice and racism and many looked up to Christopher Columbus as an icon of heritage and as a figure that validated their place and experience in America. So this is the problem. How do we as a city serve these groups and acknowledge the immense impact that both Italian American immigrants as well as Native Americans have made in our city as well as our country? I think the solution after many weeks of learning and hearing testimony should be

exceedingly clear - education. First, the statue should be taken down, placing the man that murdered raped and enslaved Native peoples on a literal pedestal with no other context than Discover of America is wrong and extremely misleading as well. So once the statue was taken down, which must happen, educate people. Why was the statue put up in the first place? Why was it taken down? What is Columbus's true history and what place did he have as a figure in the Italian American community. I would also like to point out that taking out a statue is not equivocal to erasing the history of Italian Americans. The Heinz History Hall has many artifacts and stories, it shows the history of Italian Americans in Pittsburgh. One artifact being taken down from public view is not erasing a history. I believe it would be in the Commission's best interest to put up something like a plaque in place or in the park to educate, so conversations like these can continue amongst the people. This issue is not going away in the near future, and education would be the biggest asset. Thank you for your time and consideration.

6. Dana Leahy

Hi, my name is Dana Leahy. I live in Morningside and I just did a quick Google and figured out that Basil Russo lives in Cleveland, and I think this decision should be left up to the citizens of Pittsburgh. I understand that he has a vested interest in this, but I just think it's so important that we listen to the will of the people who actually reside in the city. And overwhelmingly that is to take this statue down. No one is trying to disparage the Italian American community. But Columbus didn't work in a spirit of togetherness and inclusion. And so I don't know why we should continue to honor him with a statue in Schenley Park. It's very disheartening that the statue remains. And the other point is, this is the public art commission, that statue, if a majority of people look on it with contempt, and it reminds them of our terrible history of colonization, that's not public art. That's private art. If it's only for the enjoyment of some, that is not for the enjoyment of everyone. And if we want to build a livable city that is inclusive for all, this statue cannot remain. Thank you.

7. Anthony Tony Ferraro

My name is Anthony Tony Ferraro, I'm a Pittsburgh resident, I live in Glenshaw Pa. I've been a resident this area. I'm very active in the Italian American community. And I have to be taken back by the comment about Basil Russo's position living in Cleveland, Ohio, when he represents thousands of Italian Americans that belong to the Italian Sons and Daughters which is located and has been a tenant and landlord in the city of Pittsburgh for many, many years. So as everybody was stating their reasons to take the statue down and remove it, I have to go to the speaker that read the legality and that we have the right to have it up. We've done all the due diligence, we made the investment. If somebody would like to put their own statue up, go raise the money, put it up, and that's your belief. We are very proud of what could Pittsburgh and Pittsburgh region see and Christopher Columbus's accolades. He was living in the time, times were different. Times were different 40 years ago, 100 years ago. So I don't know where there is proof. There has never been a trial. Obviously, years ago, when Columbus was recognized as a hero, people did their due diligence. So for a group to want to have to make this change, I don't buy it. I don't believe in it. And I say the statue stays. And we continue to honor Christopher Columbus, not only in the statue, by the way, we have a parade every year, which we get protested by. And that's our right to have a parade. And we don't really want to be hassled there either. Thank you.

8. Giorgio DePaolo

Yeah, my name is Giorgio DePaolo. I reside on Florida Avenue here in Pittsburgh. And I've attended the special hearing, in addition to the committee meetings. And I appreciate the committee's dedication to this. I think it's a model for the country to follow. So I'm really proud to be a citizen here in Pittsburgh.

And as part of this process, what I would like to say is that there have been many opinions shared. And I was unfortunately disappointed at the last meeting to hear only one side of an expert's viewpoint of Columbus. So that was probably my only thing that I would say, if the commission can do better the next time is to get opposing views. That would be very educational. But the one thing I would just want to remind the commission is that, at one of the meetings, it was mentioned, to review all the statues. And I feel really, really unfortunate about why Columbus solely is being pointed out versus a clearer view of all the statues within Pittsburgh. Metrics, clearly defined, in terms of which statues are deemed appropriate and which ones aren't. And then the vote cast accordingly. I would love to see a vote of all the people of Pittsburgh, an official vote of some manner, to vote on all the statues. But I'd just very simply recommend to the commission, that at this stage of the game, where funds are few, and people really, really need money, and other manners of assistance with their families, that simply all we do with all the statues is put a pro and a con signage for every statue within Pittsburgh, it's very simple to do. It's not very costly. And it's something that can educate everyone, and would not require a lot of money. So I really would appreciate if the commission would consider that seriously. Because on top of Columbus, we do have George Washington, a slave owner, out there and very publicly appearing that obviously we do not want to see people once again, siding on one side of a topic versus another side of a topic. I think education is very important. Let's just go with signage. It's very simple. And you would allow this issue to be appropriate. Thank you.

9. Christy Cleaver

Hi, I'm Christy Cleaver. I live in Wilksburg. I apologize, I came in a little late to this meeting today, but I believe that last place things have stood was there was a pretty overwhelming response to the Art Commission about the status of the statue. And overwhelmingly people voted either to remove or to replace it. So I was participating and helping make sure that people contributed their vote to this. We've done it, we've done the due diligence, the response seems to be pretty overwhelming. It seems like every single time, there's suggestions to get public responses on this statue, it's just delaying and delaying and delaying a decision being made. And this is at least the second meeting, that there hasn't been a decision made. And the decision has been punted. I think we're at there, we've gotten there, and it would be, I think, the best decision for the commission to actually follow what has been responded to, I think it would be useful perhaps, if you already went over this, I apologize, but to address what the actual breakdown and comments were. And with that, I yield my time.

Luckett asks Cavalline to give a tally of public comment. Cavalline gives the following tally, as of the previous day at noon:

Total individual commenters: 5273

[Staff note: Cavalline later corrects this number to actually be 5272.]

Those favoring No Action: 1818

Those favoring Removal: 1937

Those favoring Replacement: 1445

Those favoring Alteration: 65

Those with no outcome stated: 7

Goulata asks if these commenters were all from Pittsburgh. Cavalline gives the following tally:

Commenters residing in Pittsburgh: 3131

Commenters residing outside of Pittsburgh: 1829

Commenters with unknown residence: 312

Arimoto-Mercer asks for a breakdown of outcome based on residence in Pittsburgh. Cavalline gives the following tally:

No Action

From Pittsburgh: 408
From outside Pittsburgh: 1196
From unknown residence: 214

Replacement

From Pittsburgh: 1548
From outside Pittsburgh: 303
From unknown residence: 12

Removal

From Pittsburgh: 1130
From outside Pittsburgh: 303
From unknown residence: 12

Alteration

From Pittsburgh: 43
From outside Pittsburgh: 20
From unknown residence: 2

No Outcome Stated

From Pittsburgh: 2
From outside Pittsburgh: 1
From unknown residence: 4

Moss says that he would like to make the point that while the Commission has asked for and appreciates the public's input, that this process is by no means a process of popular vote. Arimoto-Mercer adds that they are aware that there were at least two petitions online, but that because they are not run by the City and the signatures cannot be vetted by the City, that information does not weigh in the same way that the communications made to the City do. Goulatia clarifies that those petitions were through change.org.

Luckett says they will now move into deliberation on the Columbus statue. She says that per Chapter 175.04 of the City ordinance, it is under the Art Commission's purview, and they do have the authority to make a decision. Goulatia asks if Director Dash should speak regarding the letter received that morning from the Law Department. She asks that Dash read the letter.

Dash says the Law Department issued an opinion on the ratification procedure and the request from the Mayor of August 24. He reads:

This memo is intended to assist staff and the Art Commission by answering questions raised regarding the appropriate procedural path with regard to the hearings pertaining to the Christopher Columbus statue based on various hypotheticals. It is important for government bodies to follow appropriate procedure in taking official actions so as to avoid the risk of procedural legal challenges which may result in those actions being voided by the courts.

As previously discussed, the Law Department has concluded that the Art Commission serves as an advisory body to the Mayor and cannot spontaneously ratify the removal of public art in the City without a decision first coming from the Mayor. The Mayor has yet to make a decision regarding the statue in question, and has instead requested a recommendation from the Art Commission following a public hearing. With this understanding of the law, the appropriate next step is for the Art Commission to make a recommendation to the Mayor regarding the statue.

If the Art Commission recommends removal and the Mayor then decides to remove the statue, causing the decision to come before the Art Commission again, the Art Commission would need to ratify that decision at a separate hearing. As noted previously, it is unclear whether the Art Commission is subject to the Sunshine Act and its minimum requirements for public process. Regardless, the Sunshine Act represents the best available guidelines for a public body such as the Art Commission. Therefore,

action taken on a potential decision to remove by the Mayor should be done at a public hearing. In order to avoid any unnecessary procedural challenges and comply with the relaxed minimum standards permitted by the Commonwealth for public process during the COVID-19 emergency, the City should provide notice of that meeting at least five days prior. There's a listing of [citations]. A quorum will also need to be present to hear and act at that meeting.

After discussions with staff, we also considered the possibility of a dual motion both recommending to the Mayor and ratifying the removal of the statue. If the Art Commission recommends removal, the ratification portion of this motion would be preconditioned on the Mayor deciding to remove the statue and would affirm such a decision in advance. We do not recommend this course of action for two reasons, number one, the validity of such a conditional ratification might be susceptible to a challenge as an improper procedure, and two, opponents might claim that they did not have adequate notice of the potential action beforehand. Notice provided prior to the hearing held on September 17, 2020 was broad and would appear to put participants on notice of the potential stakes of the hearing. However, the public letter from the Mayor to the Art Commission dated August 24, 2020 gives the clear impression that the Art Commission's initial action would only be to make a recommendation to the Mayor.

Given that opponents to the potential removal of the statue have already raised procedural objections concerning the Art Commission's process in reviewing the statue, we recommend that the Art Commission make only a recommendation at its upcoming September 23, 2020 meeting and consider ratification of a potential decision by the Mayor at a separate hearing, which could be scheduled, with required notice, expeditiously.

Luckett states that the letter is in response to the Mayor's letter to the Art Commission, however the Art Commission did write an initial letter to the Mayor stating that they have the authority and that the Commission isn't an advisory group.

Luckett asks the Commissioners to begin deliberation. Commissioner statements are given here verbatim:

Moss:

I'd first like to start by thanking all of those who have taken their time to express their opinions in regard to the Columbus statue and as to the question whether the statue should remain as part of our shared public space. This is certainly been a complicated complex and difficult matter for the Art Commission's consideration. Much has been explained and expressed regarding the history of how Columbus had become a symbol to the Italian American citizens of our country. We've heard from those who continue to see this historic figure as an important symbol representing this ethnic heritage. We've also heard from those, many of whom also describe themselves as being of Italian American descent, who either don't relate to this figure or in many cases take strong offense to the history and character of this figure. As the Art Commission, we are responsible for the works of art that we place in the public realm. The greater question before us is what is the purpose of erecting statues of historic figures? I would believe that such statues should serve a purpose of reflecting who we are as a society, a symbol of pride and aspiration of those who have come before us. I recognize that public opinion changes over time. We evolve, hopefully for the better. I understand that there was a time the symbol of Columbus served as a point of pride for Italian American heritage. The times have changed and hopefully we are wiser and have grown in our understanding of this history. Italian Americans have a tremendous amount to be proud of and this American heritage and culture should be celebrated. As a City I am confident that we can find many great Italians or better yet Italian-American individuals who may be better examples of this pride. Pittsburgh is an amazing city that exemplifies the melting pot of America. We are a community of many distinct heritages of immigrants that call our city home and do so proudly. This is a city of immigrants built upon the backs of hard-working people who came to this country seeking a better life and freedom. Let us celebrate that. We use public figural sculptures often to commemorate heroes of our past that have shaped our society today. Our monuments reveal our beliefs and should serve as reflection of who we are as a society. They should exemplify the best in us as a shared community. Does Columbus do that for us today? It is appropriate for us as a community to evaluate and reconsider our heroes confirming that those whom we have put on pedestals still reflect whom we are, whom we aspire to be, and who demonstrate the ideals of yesterday as well as tomorrow. I believe we must do this. As a society we should continue to strive to become better, we should hold those from our past whom we have honored in the highest regard as long as they continue [recording interrupted] whom we are as a society. I believe that we as a City can do a better job at finding a way to honor and celebrate the great Italian heritage of our city. I would charge that our city leadership do this but in doing so I would also ask our

city leadership to take this as an opportunity to consider the many other immigrant communities that have also been an important part of our city's history. As a member of our City's Art Commission I welcome the day that we see proposals, maybe many proposals, for public artworks that take a step toward doing this. Let us celebrate those who built this city - the tired, the poor, the huddled masses, rather than the conquerors who had nothing to do with our city and massacred innocent people. Remove the Columbus statue as it no longer has a place on a pedestal in our city. Removing a monument should not be seen as an erasure of history, removal is not a reflection of a lack of respect to those whom it was intended to honor, nor ignoring the horrors and injustice the sector of our society faced. Removal of a monument reflects a change, a change in our society and of our public identity as a community. This is a public monument on shared public land that should continue to be a reflection of whom we are as a shared society and we should not be afraid of acknowledging that we as a society have changed over the past 60 years. Rather we should be proud of ourselves. Let us find a new more appropriate symbol that honors the great Italian American heritage of our city as well as the many other immigrants who have made it for city what it is today.

Goulatia:

Today I speak from the vantage point of the colonized. I'm a South Asian Indian American. As unified Americans we need symbols of freedom and liberation and I feel no single recognizable human historical figure can ever successfully represent the many diverse perspectives and experiences of today's America. People are complicated and controversial and hence we cannot continue to commemorate an individual for as long as 500 years. Collected memory of imperialism has been perpetuated through the ways in which knowledge about indigenous people have been edited, suppressed, often silenced or completely erased. One side of history does not represent the whole story of our humanity. From the public testimony there were many moving descriptions from Italian American residents who spoke passionately about Columbus as a symbol of Italian pride, however it has disheartened me to also hear others describe Native Americans, the true and first inhabitants of this beautiful country, as a species, as if our indigenous brothers and sisters are separate and inferior, equated with beasts of the animal kingdom. Glorifying our history by subjugating another doesn't elevate us. Italian Americans have a rich culture, a rich heritage, their warmth and inclusivity gives them the power to be celebrated alongside the indigenous Pittsburghers, Eastern European Pittsburghers, Pittsburghers from Asia, Africa, Australia, South America. I would love for the public art in Pittsburgh to celebrate all Pittsburghers in the totality of our rich and varied history. We need to use our voice to amplify others, to pave a way for the future generations to reconnect to their ancestors without fear and oppression, shame or guilt. This is a pivotal moment where we can show our connections as human beings, where our glory cannot ride on another's fame or a single perspective. I vote for the Columbus statue to be removed. Thank you.

Arimoto-Mercer:

I would just want to affirm what the other commissioners have said and to add that many of us who are recent arrivals or descendants of immigrants have been and continue to be the targets of racism, latent or nuanced. Textbook history does not always reflect our experience and history is not static. When it becomes relegated to a few sentences recited by school children we know that this full story is not being told. So I hope that Pittsburgh's history will show the expansion of Pittsburgh's culture to consider the well-being of its residents and the place where all stories are heard and welcome. Thank you.

Parsakian:

I'm just going to give a little little history of my family which resonates with what we are talking about today. I am a second generation Armenian American. My grandparents left Armenia during the 1915 Ottoman empire's extermination and genocide of 1.5 million of my people. My father was born in America and was a World War II veteran serving as a staff sergeant under General Patton's 22nd armored division. He fought in the Battle of the Bulge and later freed the Munhausen concentration camp in May of 1945. My father was a witness to man's madness of this Holocaust. All cultures need to be respected and all histories need to be recognized. The contributions of the Italian people in the fields of architecture, music, art, and politics are unparalleled. In America we must celebrate and embrace the diversity of all cultures that have had a history of persecution. Pittsburgh is a work in progress that all of us have an opportunity to give voice to. The discussion today is about Christopher Columbus as a symbol. I agree that the Italian American community should have a source of hope and pride but Christopher Columbus should not be that icon. False narratives omit diverse histories. There are symbols that bring us pride but there are also those that bring us much pain in their display. We should find a balance in this new day of awareness and be sensitive not to destroy any culture, even if we question its history. I have ideas of

what I would love to see happen in the future. I don't know how specific I should be, but basically I would like to see the statue replaced, and of course I believe that it should be replaced by, like what Andrew was talking about, somebody honoring another Pittsburgh Italian American hero. I would love to see the sculpture move to a museum and a learning environment to initiate a discussion of its history. I really would love to see the plinth kept and maybe altered in some way. During this discussion of what will happen I would love to see the statue actually wrapped as a work of art similar to what Christo and Jeanne-Claude have done in the past, so we celebrate it as an art piece but still are moving toward a newer discussion of what to do with it. But basically I would love to see it replaced. Thank you.

Lockett:

As the product of African and European ethnicity and culture, I think that Christopher Columbus doesn't uphold the values of our Constitution and who we are as Americans and as human beings. Pittsburgh is representative of a global community and reflective of a very wide and rich culture of different people from around the world who have come here, whether as an immigrant or forced as an enslaved person. And once again that Christopher Columbus does not uphold the values of our Constitution and who we are as people and Americans and so I vote to remove the monument in its entirety. There's so many different ways to celebrate who we are as a diverse group of ethnically and culturally rich people and it could be expressed in so many different ways instead of just looking at it as one individual. There are so many different ways to express public art in so many ways. Thank you.

Lockett asks if there are any more comments. Arimoto-Mercer says that there are many parts to the monument – the statue, the plinth, the water fountain, and signage. She says if they are talking about removal, they need to define what they are removing or replacing. Moss asks if those should be addressed as separate items. Arimoto-Mercer says her opinion is that it is difficult to separate the parts and would want to consider the monument as a whole. Goulatia agrees. Parsakian says he understands looking at the monument as a whole work, but he would like to salvage and alter the plinth in order to reimagine how the plinth could elevate a replacement statue. He says he'd love to see a way of honoring Italian-American contributions in the City, with the plinth not being removed. Goulatia says she disagrees, because putting any human on a pedestal can be problematic, and recommends a more abstract way of honoring Italian Americans. She says that, similar to the discussion at the removal of the Stephen Foster statue, removing something and replacing it is like putting a bandaid on something without letting the wound heal. Parsakian says he can see that point of view, and something abstract can be more powerful. He says he would still like to see Italian-American culture celebrated.

Goulatia says she thinks the statue belongs in a museum in the context of the history of Native Americans. She says it should not be destroyed but should be somewhere that people can choose to see it and are not forced to. Parsakian agrees, and says the statue should be a learning tool.

Arimoto-Mercer says they also need to be clear to the public that they are not destroying the statue, but are removing it from public view. She says in the future there may be a proposal to reuse the plinth, but that would be a whole other discussion, and right now they need to think about removing items from public view that can do damage to our value system and who we are as a City.

Moss says that there are a lot of possible things to talk about, but that today's discussion should perhaps be narrowed to the statue's removal, which they seem to have consensus on. He says there should be further discussion on potential future placement and that the City should take steps to ensure there is a new piece of art that celebrates Italian-American culture in a new way. He says that is a separate matter, but that he does not want them to simply remove the statue and forget about it. He suggests a motion that ties a replacement of some sort into the removal, or a motion to remove with a requirement that the City starts a process for replacement.

Lockett says that this ties into looking at who is missing from the conversation in the art inventory, and it is premature to say that we should be looking at another public art piece that celebrates Italian culture, because there are several pieces in the art inventory that honor a wide range of groups. She says this is a larger discussion. Arimoto-Mercer says it also shouldn't be implied that a replacement should go in that exact location.

Lockett says she sees the monument in its entirety, and separating the parts of the installation would do a disservice. Goulatia says it needs to be preserved as a whole. She also says that whatever motion

they make today should not tie the removal to a replacement, because the two sides of the issue need a space for dialogue to understand each side. She says this dialogue is very important in order to move forward.

Moss says there was a comment made that there should be a plaque at the location with perhaps a photo of the statue giving its history and why it was removed. Goulatia says that could be a good idea, once it is removed. She says it would be great if the City was able to initiate discussions around this. Luckett says there are a lot of great examples out there of virtual discussions about public art. She says that like with Stephen Foster there should be information in the City's archives of why this was removed. Luckett notes that the meeting minutes also document this. She says that opportunities to educate people are paramount. She says it is more complicated than just two binary sides.

Arimoto-Mercer says that through public comment people have expressed an interest and a desire to connect and that dialogue can be a means of bringing us closer together.

Goulatia says once the space is empty it would be a fantastic space for installations or performance art. She says that Pittsburgh should be the most livable City for all, not just for some.

MOTION: Removal of the Christopher Columbus monument in its entirety, to include the statue, plinth, fountain, and signage, to be placed by the City in safekeeping and storage, and that the Art Commission receive a report and a timeline from the City for the removal.

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

C. Items For Discussion

Luckett asks about the Smallman Street Art project. Cavalline reports that the artist selection process for this project is being run in collaboration with the Office of Public Art, and a selection panel recently convened and chose an artist, who is currently going through the contracting process. Goulatia asks what the project is. Cavalline says that the artist will be designing stamps to create an artistic asphalt treatment. Moss asks if this will be on private property. Cavalline says that it is on City property. Moss confirms that this is a project that will come before the Art Commission. Cavalline says yes.

Goulatia asks if there are other Percent For Art components at Smallman Street. Cavalline says the asphalt is the only public art project. Goulatia asks about the budget of the project. Cavalline says he does not have this information at hand. Moss notes that it will all be part of their application when they come to the Art Commission. Parsakian asks if this is the only art being proposed for that project. Cavalline says yes. Parsakian asks if it meets the 1% budget standard. Cavalline says they will have to follow up with the actual budget numbers. Goulatia says that asphalt had been included in the original streetscape project, which came to Art Commission previously. Cavalline says that it had, but adding the artist to design the asphalt patterns is the public art component.

Goulatia says this is a great opportunity for the City to show that they care about public art and this is why the commissioners have been pushing for the Percent For Art. She notes there is a lot of development happening in the City and a lot of opportunities for art, which elevates the City. Luckett agrees and says that it's important for developers to see art as an advantage. Parsakian says that he thinks the Cultural Trust recognizes that and a lot of their public spaces have included world-renowned artists. Luckett says this would be a great opportunity to describe the Percent For Art on the City's website, because a lot of developers do not think broadly enough about it, and it is an opportunity for the City to demonstrate what is possible. Parsakian says the new PNC building is an example, and asks if there is a way to highlight great examples. Goulatia says there are many various ways to incorporate art. Moss asks if the City should prepare examples for developers to help them think outside the box. Luckett and Arimoto-Mercer say that is a good idea. Goulatia says she agrees, because the Percent For Art is often treated as an afterthought. Cavalline says that they can share with the Commissioners the information that the City gives to developers relating to art, although in most cases they are talking about private development which does not require a Percent For Art, although there are other systems such as overlays that may have points for including art.

Luckett brings up the Schenley Park Golf Course clubhouse (the Arnold Palmer Learning Center at the Bob O'Connor Golf Course). Cavalline says that he was told the project is still finalizing funding through grants and so did not have a final budget. Goulatia asks if the project is stalling due to the Percent For Art. Cavalline says that a total budget for the final construction was not finalized, but that he was told that the artwork was still part of planning discussions. Luckett says that the project is under construction, and asks what their timeline is. She says that a lot of time has gone by and they haven't heard anything about that. Goulatia says that when they came for the clubhouse, the Art Commission could not give a lot of input because things like materials were already decided. She says that the Art Commission should be involved at the inception of a project, because she thinks some of the design decisions were rather poor for this project, but it had to be put through due to timing. Luckett says that building was a missed opportunity, and they seemed to be doing the bare minimum to get it approved. Luckett says it would be good to get a status update from them. She says it did not seem like that applicant had any knowledge of how to get an artist or do a call for artists, which the Public Art & Civic Design Division has helped other with in the past. Parsakian asks who connects artists with developers. Cavalline says for City properties, they run RFPs, but that private developers have a range of options of how to engage artists and it is up to them.

Luckett brings up the Art Commission website and notes that it has been updated to reflect the two vacant Commissioner seats. Goulatia confirms that there are seven commissioner seats, not eight. Moss asks if there has been any update on filling the commissioner spots. Minnaert says that there has not been. Dash says that later that week they will be having discussions regarding filling the vacancies. Parsakian asks if there have been recommendations for the architect position left vacant by Indovina. Dash says there haven't been recommendations, but this will be part of the upcoming discussions on next steps. Luckett says that the Commission has made giving recommendations a part of their standard practice when a seat is vacant. Dash says commissioners can make recommendations.

Arimoto-Mercer asks when the positions will be filled. Dash says he does not have an answer to that right now, but an update can be provided before the next Commission meeting. Luckett says that sometimes the process has taken awhile, given the steps of the Mayor's recommendation and City Council confirmation.

Luckett asked if there are any updates on the Percent For Art. Minnaert says they are still working on the mechanics of the Percent For Art in terms of how it works for projects with restricted funding, as well as the trust fund. Goulatia asks if this is just for City-owned properties or all. Minnaert says City-owned properties using City funds. Goulatia says the City should create a good example of utilizing the Percent For Art. Luckett says if it is stalling in a certain department, they need to know why. Minnaert says she will provide an update between now and the next meeting.

Luckett says she was invited by the City to participate in their collection review. She says the letter is signed by Director Dash and the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy. She asks who else will be involved and what the process will be. Dash says they discussed this at a previous commission meeting, after the Commission decided to write a letter to the Mayor regarding Columbus, and that the City Planning Department will be conducting an audit of the City's entire public art collection in order to proactively flag any potential issues. Minnaert says they are partnering with the Parks Conservancy as many of the City's memorials and art are located in parks. She says they have put a call out to a number of local experts, using recommendations from the Commission as to who to contact.

Luckett says that the Art Commission needs to know when they are sending out this email to so they can give feedback. Arimoto-Mercer asks what the criteria will be, so that each piece of the inventory is being looked at with similar criteria. She says looking at other cities' criteria would be very helpful. Minnaert says the plan is to bring any findings to a future Art Commission hearing. Arimoto-Mercer says that it's important for the Commission to look at the criteria that each piece is subject to. Dash says that the criteria would be worked out after the panel met. Moss says they would like to see what the outline and steps for the project are, suggesting that the steps are to first outline a team of experts, then research what is in the City's collection, then develop the criteria, and then make a presentation of findings. Minnaert says that is right, with possibly reversing the second and third items on that list. Moss says they would like a timeline of those steps. Minnaert says that the goal was to share the first phase of the project at the November Art Commission meeting.

Luckett brings up the Art Commission bylaws, and the name change of the Art Commission to the Public Art & Civic Design Commission. Luckett says that this change does not need to go through City Council but just be vetted by the Law Department and the Department of City Planning. Minnaert says that she has reviewed the last few years of Art Commission minutes and the issue of the name has come up a few times, and the last instance she saw indicated that the Commission wasn't going to have a name change. Dash says that the name of the Commission is in the City code, so that would take a legislative act to change the name. Cavalline says that the name change is in the edits of Chapter 175, and would go through along with any other changes. Luckett says she had not known there was discussion of not changing the name. Minnaert says she can forward along the minutes where she saw that, but she is not familiar with the context. She says that the bylaws were last updated in March 2018, and they are out of sync with the current code. Luckett asks for an update on this. Dash says they will need to look at the current code versus the proposed changes to Chapter 175. He also requests that any possible improvements to the code are suggested now before any changes to Chapter 175 are sent through. He says some of the questions that Commissioners have raised as to process and purview are ones that the edits address.

Luckett says they have two open Commissioner seats. She says they currently have a Vice-Chair, no Chair, and no Secretary. Arimoto-Mercer nominates Luckett as Chair. Luckett accepts the nomination.

MOTION: Kilolo Luckett for the position of Art Commission Chair, for one year

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

Goulatia nominates Moss for Vice-Chair. Moss accepts.

MOTION: Andrew Moss for the position of Art Commission Vice-Chair, for one year

MOVED BY: Goulatia
SECONDED BY: Arimoto-Mercer
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

Luckett asks for nominations for Secretary. Goulatia asks what that role would do. Arimoto-Mercer says she does not think they need one. Cavalline says that position may carry over from before there was a Public Art & Civic Design Division. Dash mentions that the current code has the role of President and Secretary, not Chair and Vice-Chair, although the bylaws use the position of Chair.

MOTION: Kilolo Luckett for the position of Art Commission President, and Andrew Moss as Art Commission Secretary, both for one year

MOVED BY: Goulatia
SECONDED BY: Arimoto-Mercer
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

D. Correspondence

None.

E. Public Comment

Tom Davidson of the Tribune-Review asks for a clarification of the public comment number, as total commenters had been stated as being 5,273, but the numbers seem to add up to 5,272. Cavalline checks and confirms that the total number is 5,272.

Davidson also asks about the process following their decision today regarding Columbus, and whether this will go to the Mayor and then come back to the Art Commission for another vote. Moss says that the City Law Department has said this is the process, but in the assessment of the members of the Art Commission, the Art Commission decision is final.

F. Director & Staff Report

None.

MOTION: Adjourn

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer

SECONDED BY: Moss

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

The meeting adjourned at 4:01 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

October 28, 2020 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by Chair Lockett

In Attendance

Lockett
Moss
Goulatia
Parsakian
Newman (DPW)
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Christopher Columbus Statue	1-2
2. Production Greenhouse Rooftop Solar Project	2
3. Oasis Project Ground Mural	2-3
4. BRT Rapid Transit Project	3-4
5. Frick Park Extension	4-6
6. East Liberty Fire Station	6-8
7. Beechview Park Monument	8-9
8. Swiftmile Charging Stations	9

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Lockett asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from September 2020. Moss motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Christopher Columbus Statue – City of Pittsburgh
Conceptual/Final Review**

Sarah Minnaert of the Public Art & Civic Design Division of the Department of City Planning gives a brief recap of recent events relating to the Christopher Columbus statue, including public engagement and Art Commission actions. She presents the removal of the Christopher Columbus statue for a final vote by the Commission. The statue, plinth, and related signage will be removed, and the fountain will be decommissioned by filling in the basin and laying it with topsoil, grass, and planting consistent with the programming of the surrounding area by Phipps Conservatory. The removal can be facilitated using the resources of the Department of Public Works.

Goulatia asks what the timeline is. Minnaert says that it can begin as soon as possible following Art Commission approval and pending resolution of the existing legal action.

Public comment:

Matt Minsky of Bochetto and Lentz speaks on behalf of the Italian Sons and Daughters of America in favor of postponing today's vote until the legal action has been resolved.

Carmella Mullen speaks in favor of not removing the Christopher Columbus statue.

Prem Rajgopal speaks in favor of removing the statue.

Goulatia says that they have already deliberated on this and she does not feel the need to do so again. Moss agrees and says that the Art Commission has made their point of view clear, and that any legal action is a separate issue that is beyond their control. Luckett agrees. Parsakian says that the Law Department has supported their decision and that their decision should go forward.

The Commissioners clarify the scope of what has been presented, and that it does not include any relocation of the statue.

Moss mentions that many museums have significant portions of their collection that are not out for display. Luckett says only an average of 10-15% of a museum's collection is on display at any time. Moss says that the Columbus statue could be thought of as a similar situation, with it being put into storage and any future use is to be determined later.

MOTION: Conceptual and Final Approval

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

**2. Production Greenhouse Rooftop Solar Project – Phipps Conservatory
Conceptual/Final Review**

Brad Clauss of Phipps Conservatory gives his presentation, which is for the installation of solar panels on available roof space of Phipps Conservatory's Production Greenhouse Building to increase the generation of renewable energy for the facility.

Parsakian asks who is manufacturing the solar panels. Clauss says it is an arm of Sun Power called Solar World. Parsakian asks if there's anything more local. Clauss says unfortunately no.

Luckett commends Phipps for their ongoing dedication to being energy-efficient and eco-friendly. Moss also expresses his admiration.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Parsakian
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

**3. Oasis Project Ground Mural – Bible Center Church
Conceptual/Final Review**

Luckett recuses herself for the discussion of this project.

Arielle Donelan of the Bible Center Church presents the project, which is a ground mural to be installed on Fleury Way Plaza, an area of pedestrian right-of-way owned by the City. The mural

celebrates Black history and culture with visuals of the Pan-African flag and symbols representing unity, history, diversity, and culture across the diaspora.

Goulatia asks if there will be signage to describe the motifs and symbols in the art so the public can understand it's meaning. She asks how the Nadir Way mural that was shown relates to the ground mural, because it seems to clash. She also asks how they will commission the mural that will go on the nearby wall in the future and how it will relate.

Donelan says the ground mural is part of a larger project in that area, so there will be signage that will lead people through the ground mural and ways that they can interact with it. Donelan says that the art pieces are all separate and not necessarily part of one cohesive vision. She says there is not a common theme or color palette, but they are all part of the Homewood Art Walk. In terms of the wall mural, she says that it will eventually be on a CCAC wall, but they do not have anything to do with the artist selection or the work.

Goulatia asks if there will be something going on the wall next to the ground mural. Donelan says yes. Goulatia asks if that will be related or will be a separate project. Donelan says that will be a separate project as well. She says that they have already selected a local artist that will be working on that piece, which will highlight children of color and reference agricultural symbolism like this ground mural does. She says the color palette between the ground mural and this other mural will be aligned.

Goulatia says the murals really activate the space but urges Donelan to work with the artist to make the different artworks relate to each other and be cohesive. Donelan says that all the pieces on the Homewood Art Walk celebrate Black and African-American culture and all utilize bright, bold colors.

Parsakian asks about the artist selection process. Donelan says that they were paired with an architect and team by the Remake Learning administrative staff. She says that the architect they are working with identified Graham Coreil-Allen, a D.C.-based artist, and they will also be including a local artist. Parsakian asks how they are choosing the local artist. Donelan says they have someone in mind already, who had submitted a submission to a previous RFP. She says the artist will include students from Westinghouse High School. Parsakian says he likes what they are doing and is familiar with the neighborhood.

Public comment:

Kota-ki-bey, Grand Inca of the Iroquois Confederacy, asks if this is the hearing for Christopher Columbus. Moss informs him that the Columbus agenda item has already concluded. Kota-ki-bey states that he is aboriginal and indigenous. He speaks against colonialism and for the inclusion of indigenous people in any project or mural.

Moss asks why this project is before the Art Commission, and asks if it is on City right-of-way. Donelan says that it is. Minnaert says that it is on City property and is a project supported by DOMI.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the request that thought be put into the relationship of this mural with any additional artwork that will be put on the nearby wall or surrounding area.

MOVED BY: Goulatia
SECONDED BY: Parsakian
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

4. Bus Rapid Transit Project – AECOM Technical Services/Port Authority of Allegheny County Conceptual Review

Steve Auterman of DOMI introduces the project, which is for infrastructure changes to the bus corridor between Downtown and the East End neighborhoods to improve multi-modal connectivity. The improvements include bus stations, transit lanes, traffic signals, and bump outs. The project currently seeks Conceptual approval for bus shelters, bus operator comfort stations, and landscaping.

Dave Haines of AECOM introduces himself as well as Denise Ott of Port Authority and Osborne Anthony, the project architect and gives some background information on the project.

Anthony goes over the details of the bus shelters, comfort stations, and other specifics of the project.

Luckett asks if any consideration has been given to the shelters having any art design features. Anthony says that the route goes through many different neighborhoods, but there has to be some consistency in the design of the shelters. He says they haven't considered art design. Luckett encourages them to look into this and to look to precedents in other cities. She says there are a lot of different ways to incorporate art and design into these shelters.

Luckett asks about how seating will be incorporated in the shelters. Anthony says all shelters will have seating, but the extent of the seating will depend on the size of the shelter.

Goulatia says that the art design idea is amazing, and brings up the Busnegie project of a few years ago. She says that panels that are normally used for advertising can be used for rotating artists to activate the shelters. She asks if they have thought about incorporating charging stations into the shelters. Haines says that they do not have any solar charging stations at the moment but they can talk to DOMI about that.

Moss says that one potential way to have artist-designed elements would be to pattern the frit in the glass panels. He says that this could customize each shelter to the neighborhood it is in. Moss also says that the comfort stations seem uninspired. He says if they are meant to be utilitarian and unnoticed then this may be okay for the Highland Park structure which is more tucked away, but the structure in Oakland is prominent and it looks like a temporary building. He says if it is meant to stay for a length of time then it warrants further design consideration and potentially artwork.

Parsakian asks about the possibility of using solar panels for electricity in the stations. Haines says they can look into that but thinks that their power demands will exceed the ability of solar panels.

Minnaert says that this application prompted a conversation with DOMI regarding Percent For Art opportunities and that this conversation is ongoing.

Luckett says that lighting can be a wonderful way to incorporate artists. She says that including artists in the early stages can allow them to explore all the many possibilities.

Luckett asks if trash receptacles are incorporated into this plan, and says she sees a lack of trash receptacles at many bus stops. Osborne says that receptacles are planned for each shelter.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval, with consideration to the comments made by the Commission

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

5. Frick Park Extension – LaQuatra Bonci Final Review

Dan McDowell of LaQuatra Bonci goes over the project, which is for a park space located in the Summerset at Frick Park residential community. The land is currently owned by the URA. After completion of the project, the City would take ownership of the land and it will be included as an

extension of Frick Park. McDowell goes over all designs for the park space. The project previously received Art Commission Conceptual Approval in September of 2018.

Goulatia mentions that she lives in the neighborhood for which the project is designed. She asks about the plans for the pathways and if it is similar to the sidewalk by the parkview boulevard overlooking the hill. She mentions that using slate and concrete has been a hindrance and many neighbors have fallen since the slate has been dislodged over time. She also addresses the trees in the neighborhood that are identical and planted in a cookie cutter style. She wishes that landscaping and plant varieties were given more thought both from an aesthetic as well as disease and an epidemiological standpoint.

McDowell says that the pavement of this project would be concrete exposed aggregate. He says that they worked with the City Forester for the trees, and the choices were influenced by them. He says they do have a variety of trees, not just one species, and they focused on flowering and bright trees.

Goulatia clarifies that there are some park benches and some swings. McDowell says yes. Goulatia asks about the new gazebos and how big they are. McDowell says that they are smaller than the existing pavilion in order to maintain the view and also be big enough for gatherings. McDowell says that the neighborhood wanted the swings. He says the swings and the benches are from the same manufacturer. Goulatia says there were concerns in the neighborhood over everyone wanting to sit on the swings, and asks if there was a way to incorporate swings for everyone in the center portion. McDowell says the swings cost about four times the amount as a bench. He says they wanted to include some but did not know how many they could include within the budget.

Goulatia mentions the Percent For Art, and asks how it is incorporated into the planning. McDowell says they are trying to focus on the design of the park space, and have been having discussions on issuing an RFP when the construction documents are complete. He says they will be happy to include the Office of Public Art and City Planning staff in that process when the RFP goes out.

Moss says he is not sure if he's comfortable giving this project Final Approval without the art being a part of it. McDowell says they want to include art, but the reasoning for approval now is just that they need to finalize the design and get it out to bid due to grant funding.

Goulatia agrees with Moss and says the art needs to be included in any approval they give.

Moss says he doesn't want to hold up the progress of the project, but it's disappointing that the art hasn't been considered yet, and that it seems apparent it is an afterthought. Moss asks Minnaert how they can be assured that the project has funds in the budget dedicated to the artwork.

Minnaert says that there is currently a line item for \$13,000 in the project budget, which is 1% of their total projected cost, although this does not speak to the Commissioner's comments regarding the art being put in as an afterthought. She asks McDowell if, since the funds are already a line item in the budget, the call for artists can be moved up in the timeline to better coincide with design development. McDowell says that he thinks it can, and states that the URA is still waiting on funding from a grant that will allow the realization of the project.

McDowell shows the possible location of art in the slide presentation, and says that there has been a lot of discussion about coordinating the art before the project is finalized, but that they were waiting for finalized funding to make sure that the project can actually happen first.

Goulatia suggests looking at the Wightman Park project, which includes art that was thoughtfully connected to the design and themes of the park. She says that the art needs to be an intrinsic part of the process, not an embellishment.

Lockett says that LaQuatra Bonci and the URA have a track record of working with artists from the beginning, and so it is disappointing that in this project the art has been sidelined. She asks that

they not make excuses, but instead they embrace the integration of artistic elements from the project's beginning.

McDowell says he apologizes, and they are not trying to skirt the issue of art. He says it was not part of the original discussion with the neighborhood.

Craig Dunham of Dunham reGroup LLC says that he understands the Commission's concern. He says that the funding has several components, including tax increment financing, neighborhood association funds, and a grant that is still forthcoming, so they have tried to work through the project incrementally as funding has been received and as they have received the necessary permits. He says they could issue an RFP at this time but would be hesitant to engage an artist in work because of the funding that has not yet been finalized.

Luckett thanks Dunham for his input and says that it is better for the Commissioners to hear upfront that the applicants understand that Percent For Art is a necessary City policy and that it is being approached holistically as funding becomes assured. Goulatia says that even if the funding is low then there would still need to be art included, so it may be necessary to do smaller projects that are integrated progressively as the project moves through its stages.

Parsakian adds that in terms of incorporating art into the existing design, the terraced seating could be made into a mosaic installation, or it could be incorporated into the paving. They should have a discussion regarding how they can elevate what they currently have in the design into art pieces.

Haines says they have always been thinking in terms of integrated elements. Parsakian says that a mosaic could be a possible solution. Goulatia says there could also be art, possibly using words, on the walking path. Luckett suggests the retaining walls or the pergola. Goulatia says that there is a good example of a walking space at CMU.

Haines asks about the relation of Art Commission approval to other City approvals. He states that the project has received Planning Commission approval and asks if they would be able to receive approval based on the condition of them issuing an RFP even if they do not engage the artist yet. Moss says this seems reasonable.

Cavalline says that support from DOMI or DPW is needed for the project. He asks Lucas to speak to DOMI's support of the project. Lucas says she is not sure if the project affects public space. Cavalline asks Newman if this would be under DOMI or DPW purview. McDowell says that he sent the request to Katie Reed, who reviewed the project at DOMI. Lucas says she can ask their Director. Newman says she has not received any notifications but she can check with Director Gable. Dunham says that DOMI's approval was evidenced at the Planning Commission hearing. Cavalline says they just need it on the record for this project. He says that the Commission can move forward but they would just need that support as a condition of approval. Lucas says that she just received word that the Director did approve it and the letter has been issued.

MOTION: Final Approval for the purposes of funding and bidding out the project, with the condition that the Percent For Art project associated with the Frick Park Extension be presented to the Art Commission prior to the start of any construction.

MOVED BY: Goulatia
SECONDED BY: Moss
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

6. East Liberty Fire Station – Department of Public Works Conceptual Review

Claire Mastroberardino describes the renovation project at the East Liberty Fire Station, which as a major renovation is required to comply with Net Zero energy goals. The application is for energy efficient insulated exterior facades.

Sam Roberts of Garland Company speaks about the details of the construction and the design of the rain screen system.

Rick Avon of Avon Design Group describes the two design concepts shown in the presentation, and the future possibilities for public art.

Moss says they should focus the discussion on the current proposal and not on possible future proposals. Luckett agrees but tells Avon and Mastroberardino that what they are thinking about is important.

Moss says that he is tremendously disappointed in this proposal. He says that this is an Art Deco limestone building and it seems like the completely wrong approach to clad it with another material. He says that cladding limestone with aluminum is probably one of the less sustainable options. He says that, although the City's Net Zero policy is important and should certainly be applied to new buildings, trying to apply it to this existing building is the wrong approach. He says there can be substantial energy improvements made to this building without recladding the exterior and he cannot support an application making this kind of change to this building.

Goulatia agrees that they need to respect the original structure. She asks if there is a way to incorporate solar panels on the roof to make the building more energy efficient. She says that the proposed change would be regretted in a few years.

Avon says he understands their comments. He says that he was brought on to the project with the understanding that this building was going to be cladded on its exterior and turned into a passive house, and that thermal bridging would not allow them to reach the energy goals they wanted. He said that he was hired to make sure this was executed and his job was to design this system and make sure that it works. He says that he understands their objections, but in order for him to complete a design he needs to know what the goals are, because exterior cladding was the only way to reach the goals that were previously set.

Moss says that he thinks the City is applying an inappropriate goal to this building. Mastroberardino says that they have worked with the Rocky Mountain Institute to assess all City buildings and worked out what buildings need to be optimized to meet 2030 energy goals. They have worked with the Auros Group, who is the certified passive house designer on this project, to figure out how to meet those goals with this building. She says they are trying to reach the goals that were set by City Council for all major renovations and new construction.

Moss suggests that they remove all the limestone from the building and start from scratch. Mastroberardino says that was discussed and they had a quote on demolition and reconstruction.

Parsakian asks what the future use of the building is. Mastroberardino says it is a public safety utility. It currently has a fire station, and formerly had a police station, which would move back once the renovation is complete. Parsakian says there is community resistance to having that police department move back and asks if they have addressed that. Mastroberardino says they have not, and it is not in the purview of DPW to address this. Parsakian says that the building needs to retain its integrity and it is sad that this is the only solution for this energy problem.

Luckett says that she does not think this is the only solution to meet these energy goals. She says there are other dynamics at play as well, as more affluent areas get more attention from the preservation community. She says they need real leaders who can step up and offer solutions. She says this sits at a nucleus of vehicular and pedestrian traffic and the rendering shown of the building is appalling. She asks what the presenters really think of this approach, beyond just the City's goals.

Goulatia says that Duolingo did a phenomenal job with the mural on their building, so there are ways to incorporate artists to make the building inviting to the community. She asks about a section

of the building on the roof in the images. Mastroberardino says this is the hose tower, which had structural damage and had to be taken down. Goulatia says that they mentioned that a lot of the building is not being used right now, so it would not matter if the building was insulated from the inside and lost space. Mastroberardino says that there are plans for that space to be used. Goulatia says that aluminum cladding is just not an option.

Moss asks what the energy savings might be with another approach that maintains the limestone exterior. Felipe Palomo of the Department of Public Works says that the inside-out option was at about 50 UIs but the cost was prohibitive. He says there are other problems that need to be addressed in this building. He says there is a historic courtroom in the building which would have to be removed to do an inside-out retrofit. He says they have evaluated all of these things, but in terms of what can be achieved and the cost, the current proposal is what they had to choose.

Lori Moran speaks on behalf of the East Liberty Chamber of Commerce and the East Liberty Historical Society. She says they object to putting any kind of covering on the building and she agrees with all of the Commissioners' comments. She says the current proposal is inappropriate and there are other energy options. She also says they support the Zone 5 police but do not think that the building should be used for the police department.

MOTION: Denial of Conceptual Approval, with the request that the applicant reconsiders the project and returns to Art Commission with an alternate approach.

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

7. Beechview Park Monument – Pittsburgh Hispanic Development Corporation & Beechview Area Concerned Citizens Conceptual/Final Review

Keith Wehner, Executive Director of the Office of Senator Wayne Fontana, presents this revised proposal for a new monument to be placed in the park honoring those who served in all wars. The Senator's office is working with Pittsburgh Hispanic Development Corporation & Beechview Area Concerned Citizens on this project. The project first presented at Art Commission in February 2020, where it was tabled. The current submission represents a reconsideration of the project after receiving Commissioner feedback at the Feb hearing and during a follow-up conference call.

Goulatia asks about the wording and if it will be engraved. Wehner says it will be engraved in granite which will be embedded into the concrete. Goulatia asks if they've tried rephrasing it to make the phrase shorter and less wordy. Wehner says they've gone back and forth with different options but this was a phrase suggested by Commission members and they liked it. Goulatia says that she recalls that meeting but now that she sees it in print she wonders if it can be more succinct. Parsakian says it was a suggestion of his but he would support editing it. He applauds the applicant for rethinking the project and taking the Commissioners' suggestions. He appreciates the light and the contemplative nature of the benches. He thinks there could be some tweaking of the fonts and wording. Goulatia says that two of the words could be engraved on the benches as well.

Luckett appreciates how the project has evolved in a much more thoughtful way. She asks about the scale of the sculptural elements and says they appear somewhat oversized for the space. She asks if they've thought about the scale and proportion in relation to where its located. Wehner says they are limited by the slabs, which have already been cut, but they've tried to space them out and make the cement base a bit wider and less condensed. Luckett asks if there is also grass outside the paved area. Wehner says yes. She asks how much the pavement will be raised above the ground. Wehner says it will be flush with the grass, and the bases of the tablets would sit a bit above. Luckett says this will make a better transition from the grass to the pavement.

Goulatia says she hopes the engravings will be on both sides of the tablet. Parsakian agrees that it should read from both sides, even if the words are different. Goulatia says they are happy to make suggestions if additional words are needed.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the condition that the monument utilizes words on both sides of the stone as discussed in the hearing, and that the font and wording on the base of the monument be revised. The Commission ask that the applicant works with the Public Art & Civic Design Division via email to allow the Art Commission to give final approval on these elements.

MOVED BY: Parsakian
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

8. Swiftmile Charging Stations – Move 412 Final Review

Tosh Chambers of the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure introduces the project, which is for charging stations for electric scooters in the public right-of-way as part of a system of Mobility Hubs. The proposed design and locations guidelines are submitted as a proposed City standard. The project previously received Conceptual Approval in July 2020.

Ted Sweeney of Spin goes over the details of the modular system of charging stations.

Goulatia asks if the information given on the poles will be available in Braille. Sweeney says that their strategy is usually to use Braille to direct the reader to a screen-readable website, but says they can provide more information within the Braille if that is the Commission's preference.

Luckett asks how many stations there will be. Chambers says they are planning on installing fifty within the next two years.

MOTION: Final Approval as a City standard.

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

C. Correspondence

Non additional received correspondence. Luckett notes that Commissioner Moss and she sent correspondence via email to Chief of Staff Gilman regarding the Mayor appointing additional Commissioners and the urgency around that. This was sent over a week ago and they received a response that morning that the correspondence was received. Moss says that the Chief of Staff acknowledged the urgency. Luckett says that he was going to talk to the Mayor and Director Dash and get back to them. She notes the Commissioners have already put forward recommendations.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Items For Discussion

1. Executive Session

Luckett states that the reason for the Executive Session is for consultation with City attorneys regarding information and strategies relating to litigation or potential litigation arising from the possible relocation of the Columbus statue.

MOTION: Commission to enter into Executive Session

MOVED BY: Luckett
SECONDED BY: Moss
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

F. Adjournment

MOTION: Adjourn

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

November 18, 2020 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by Chair Lockett

In Attendance

Lockett
Arimoto-Mercer
Goulatia
Parsakian
Gable (DPW)
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Smallman Street Plaza Paving Project	1-3
2. El Dragón	3-4
3. Townsend Park Public Art	4-5

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Lockett asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from October 2020. Goulatia motions to approve the minutes with noted corrections, seconded by Parsakian. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

1. Smallman Street Plaza Paving Project – The Office of Public Art Conceptual Review

Derek Reese of OPA introduces the application, which is for a public art project consisting of a surface design to be stamped into the pavement of a pedestrian plaza on Smallman Street. This project is part of the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure's Smallman Street revitalization, and will be paid for from the Percent For Art from that project's budget.

Project artist Marlana Vassar goes over her design process and the initial conceptual designs for the project, influenced by the many cultures that have impacted the Strip District.

Goulatia asks about the two designs that were shown, and asks if they are both in development or if one is being pursued as a final design. Vassar says that she has created a few variations and these are just two of them. Goulatia confirms that there is no final design yet. Vassar says that is correct, it is a work in progress that will be refined further over the coming months. Reese says no design has been selected yet but they wanted to include two variations today to get the initial feedback from the Commission.

Goulatia says she likes the second option as it will look more complete and cohesive as an embossed design. She says she is not sure where color would be incorporated in the design but the Commission would need to see how that looks.

Luckett [says that she loves](#) comments on Vassar's research into Pittsburgh's history, and says that she'd love to see Vassar incorporate indigenous people into the design as well. Goulatia agrees. Luckett says that she also appreciates the design motif that is similar to the stained glass of the nearby church. Vassar says that in her research she has seen similar patterns from many cultures and has incorporated them in different ways. She also says there is room to add visual motifs of indigenous peoples.

Arimoto-Mercer asks how color could be applied. Reese says they are exploring two options and have not made a determination on approach yet. He says there are very limited options for stains, but there are specialized paints and thermoplasts that have a wider variety of options. Arimoto-Mercer says it would be good to review those options as well as their lifespans, as they have seen projects that start out vibrant and deteriorate quickly. Reese says they are researching this.

Goulatia asks if this is going to be on asphalt. Reese says yes. Goulatia asks what materials will be next to it. Reese says there is a concrete curb around the circumference and the sidewalk is brick. Goulatia says it could be very effective without color since it is a complex design.

Lucas asks for confirmation that they are working with someone within DOMI, as they want to make sure the surface is safe and non-slippery, and that the tactile nature does not confuse those with accessibility issues. Reese says they are working with Eric Setzler at DOMI. Reese mentions the surface mural that OPA did at the airport, and says he was the project manager on that and learned a lot about the safety standards of asphalt covering.

Arimoto-Mercer asks if the asphalt is permeable or non-permeable. Reese says they have not talked about this and wasn't aware of the different options. Lucas asks if the plaza is shared with vehicles. Reese says it is exclusively pedestrian. Arimoto-Mercer says it is worth looking into. Reese says he will ask his team.

Gable says that permeable asphalt has speed restrictions and so may not work on the street. Reese clarifies there will be no vehicle traffic on the plaza itself. Vassar points out the slide showing the border of the plaza. Goulatia asks what the border is made of. Reese says it is concrete. Vassar adds there are bollards included. Goulatia asks if the concrete border is raised. Reese says it is a raised 6-inch border and the bollards will be sunken into it. Luckett asks if there will be parking on the other side, and Reese says no. Luckett asks if there will be bikes ridden on top of the plaza, and asks if there will be bike racks. Reese says as far as he knows there will not be bike racks, but imagines bikes will be allowed on it. He says there is a possibility of tables being put out on the plaza by the business owners.

Goulatia asks what the measurements are for the plaza. Lucas says that she is sure they are working with Setzler on this, but to make sure that people can access this space who may not be able to step onto or off of curbs. Reese says there are ramp areas from 21st Street and from the sidewalk. Lucas discusses the diagrams shown and states that DOMI should be working with them on designing the access points.

Luckett asks if there is an alleyway between the buildings. Reese says yes, it is called Blevin Way but does not affect the design of the plaza. Reese says the building owner and the City are negotiating possible truck access to Blevin Way by removing the bollards, but he does not have details about that.

Luckett says it would be good to delineate where the bollards will be in the drawings. Goulatia adds they should see what the bollards look like. Goulatia asks if there are safety concerns with people tripping on the curb, or if the bollards prevent this by creating a fence. Reese says he will need to get back to them on this.

Gable says he is ~~all for~~ in support of storm water management. He says if this is a permeable surface, then it has maintenance concerns that are different than for non-permeable, so down the road they will need to have a discussion about who is performing maintenance. He says since it is possibly being painted he suspects that it is not able to be permeable.

[Parsakian was briefly having connection issues and dialed in by phone.] Parsakian says he likes the neighborhood involvement and has no other questions.

Arimoto-Mercer says it would be important to think about whether bikes will be allowed or only foot pedestrians, as that changes safety concerns. Reese says this has not come up yet, so he will clarify whether bikes would be allowed. Arimoto-Mercer says to think about all the ways people might be using the space and how it affects safety.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval, giving consideration to the suggestions of the Commissioners

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

**2. El Dragón – Children’s Museum of Pittsburgh
Conceptual/Final Review**

Zena Ruiz of the Children’s Museum of Pittsburgh describes this project of a dragon sculpture by artist Linda Wallen to be placed outside of MuseumLab. The sculpture was made with help from members of the community and many of the tiles used on the mosaic sculpture came from the original building that were salvaged during renovations last year. The statue will be on a bed of concrete pavers with a landscaped sensory garden.

Goulatia asks if the sculpture will be alright to be exposed to the elements. Luckett also asks for background on the artist and her experience with public art projects.

Ruiz describes Wallen, who is a local artist with years of experience in exterior mosaics. She also describes the materials of the sculpture, which are made to withstand being outdoors. Goulatia asks if it is sealed. Ruiz says it is completely grouted and will be in sections until it is moved outside. She says there is a sealant which will last for five years, and there will be a schedule of assessment to happen every year.

Goulatia says she loves that they used materials from the building and says it looks very nice. She asks if the image shown is in proportion. Ruiz says it is pretty accurate. Goulatia says the organic formation of the pavers is the more interesting option. She says to make sure whatever plants are put there will be good for all seasons. Arimoto-Mercer says the plants will look better with the more organic paver footprint. She also says she likes the color scheme. She suggests that it would be good to have some evergreens for ~~in~~ winter.

Parsakian says that children will have a tendency to want to climb on this piece even with the plantings there. He says he loves the project and admires that they used materials from the project renovation.

Gable notes that DPW has provided a support letter for the project. He says that for ~~an~~ excavation ~~they do~~ they will have to do a One Call to avoid water lines, etc. Gable also says that DPW has experience working with Wallen, they love her work, and they look forward to this piece.

Minnaert asks if the museum owns this piece or if it is being lent by the artist and notes that it is meant to be a longer-term installation but not a permanent one. Ruiz says it is owned by the museum.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

3. Townsend Park Public Art – Department of City Planning Conceptual/Final Review

Cavalline presents the project, which is a public art piece to be installed on the retaining wall outside of Townsend Park. The park recently was renovated and the art piece is utilizing the Percent For Art from this improvement. The park design previously received Final Approval from the Art Commission in June 2019.

Cavalline goes over the history of the project to date, including artist selection, community engagement, and design. He shows examples of artist James Simon's previous work and proposed design for this mosaic.

Simon introduces himself for questions. He says the challenge of this project was that it is a very large wall and the project budget is rather small. He says that his goal was to include a lot of desired factors in one piece: an image that includes diversity, is brightly colored, is cool to look at, and is fun for him to make. He says the streetcar design ties to the past and provides a way to include the name of the park within the mosaic. He mentions that there will be elements of nature like flowers and birds, and that there is a dog included due to the neighborhood previously having been known for having a lot of dogs.

Goulatia says she feels it would be more complete if it addressed the whole wall. She asks if Simon thought of a design that had elements scattered over the whole space. Simon says that he wasn't interested in that design as he felt it would dilute the impact. Goulatia says it just makes the rest of the wall look very bare. She asks if there would be any possibility for the City to extend the project to occupy the whole wall.

Cavalline says that's a great idea and says there would be possible ways for this to be addressed in the future. He notes that Simon often likes to work with the community in the creation of the work, but this is not possible currently, so that could be an option for the future.

Goulatia confirms that this is outside of the park. Cavalline says yes. Goulatia asks if there is a space inside the park for the artwork. Cavalline says the inside of the park is brand new, so DPW received a lot of feedback that they wanted the retaining wall that faces outward into the street to be activated.

Goulatia asks how big the wall is. Cavalline says it is very big. Simon says the mosaic area alone is 23 feet. Luckett says that she visited the space and think that a multiphased approach could be a good idea. She says that she sees Goulatia's point but that the design on the wall could be a good way of inviting people in to the park. She says that it is a very big wall. Cavalline notes that Simon is providing a large piece for the size of the project budget.

Goulatia says that the rest of the wall could even be painted so the entire thing looks fresh. Simon says the actual piece will make more sense on the wall than the rendering appears, and says it will be similar to having a welcome sign right in the middle of the wall. Goulatia agrees and says that especially if Simon uses a grout that is a similar color, it will look more cohesive with the wall.

Luckett says that she loves the character and emotion in Simon's work. Arimoto-Mercer says that she agrees that a fresh coat of paint on the wall would be helpful. Simon says that rubbing a stain into the wall might be a better way since it would retain the old character of the wall. Goulatia and Arimoto-Mercer agree. Cavalline says they can find out from the City what the possibilities are and says there are a few possible routes to explore for a phased project. Arimoto-Mercer says that

people will love it and that will provide the momentum to go further. Cavalline says people in the neighborhood are very excited about it.

Parsakian says he loves the piece. He asks if the telephone pole will get in the way of looking at it directly. Simon says the mural is set just before the telephone pole so it isn't in the way if you are looking head-on. He says he looked over the space a few times and it seemed to be the best spot. Parsakian asks what the vertical dimension of the piece is. Simon says the whole thing is about 4 ft tall by 24 ft long, although the wall changes height. Parsakian says he loves the idea of future additions because it does feel like it could use more, and this could be a great starting point. He also says it seems like it will be very impactful for the neighborhood.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

MOVED BY: Goulatia

SECONDED BY: Arimoto-Mercer

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

C. Correspondence

Minnaert notes that there were two items of mail that were shared with the Commissioners.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert gives an update on the assessment of the City's art collection. She says they have a group of eight experts helping to research and give feedback on the inventory. She says the first phase is looking at the data that they have on each item and beginning to identify those pieces that require further investigation and conversation. She says the group will connect in mid-December to discuss the ongoing research.

Luckett reads a letter of resignation which will be effective December 31, 2020. [Arimoto-Mercer delivered a letter of resignation earlier that day via email.]

Dash thanks Luckett and Arimoto-Mercer for their service.

Luckett mentions that she'd like to thank Gable [who is retiring in January and had already left today's hearing] and notes that he has been great to work with and she has learned a lot from him.

Dash mentions that a press release for the open call for vacant Commissioner seats has been sent to the Mayor's office and they are waiting on a response to that.

Minnaert notes that the Commissioners have all done a great amount of work this year and made significant contributions.

Arimoto-Mercer says that the Commission is in good hands going forward with Moss, Goulatia, and Parsakian.

F. Adjournment

MOTION: Adjourn

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer

SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 P.M.