



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

January 27, 2021 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by Vice-Chair Moss

In Attendance

Moss
Goulatia
Parsakian
Quintanilla
Newman (DPW)
Martinez (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Mellon Park Fountain Restoration	1-2
2. South Side Park Phase 1 Design	2-3
3. Fire Station 19 Addition	4-5
4. Fire Station 8 Renovation	5-7

A. Approval of Minutes

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

B. Items for Review

1. Mellon Park Fountain Restoration – Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy Briefing

Brandon Riley of Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy briefs the Commission on Phase 1 of a restoration project for the historic fountain in Mellon Park. The entire restoration will cost \$370,000 and include stabilizing the foundation, rebuilding the plumbing, and restoring parts of the stone. The fountain will not be moved or aesthetically changed.

Goulatia asks about the color of the middle of the fountain as it appears different from the fountain base and surrounding walls. Riley says that he believes the middle of the fountain is a pink westerly granite, and the lower portion is limestone, so the color difference is inherent to the design and any repairs will try to match the existing stone as much as possible.

Parsakian says he lives near Mellon Park and it is one of his favorite parks and he is very familiar with the art installation in the garden. He says he is glad that they will be taking care not to disturb that installation. He asks if they have budgeted in for any possible cost overruns. Riley says that the

conservator they have hired has contingency built into the budget. He says the only real unknown element at this stage is the depth of the concrete foundation.

Parsakian asks if they have thought about restoring the original landscaping around the fountain. Riley says not yet, and right now they are focusing just on the fountain. He says that following this they have discussed the need for work on the walls behind the fountain.

Quintanilla thanks Riley for the work that PPC is doing. He mentions the tiles surrounding the fountain and asks if they will all be protected during the fountain restoration. Riley says yes, and that the lawn and tiles will be protected with matting throughout the work.

Moss clarifies that this briefing does not require a motion. Minnaert says that is correct and thanks PPC for this update and their work on the project. Moss asks if it is City property. Minnaert says it is. Moss asks why it wouldn't come through as a review. Minnaert says there is no change being proposed and it is more in line with an in-kind restoration. She says that this kind of conservation work on City assets does not involve any relocation, removal, or alteration and so does not come to the Commission for approval, per the City Code.

Moss asks if construction fencing will be erected for the public's safety. He also asks if the lighting scheme of the park is changing. Riley says they will be putting up fencing to close the area off, although they are not sure exactly where that will be going yet. He says they are only replacing the light fixtures which are currently there and keeping the illumination levels the same or possibly raising them to give better visibility.

Moss says this seems to be a very thoughtful restoration project and he looks forward to its completion.

MOTION: n/a

2. South Side Park Phase 1 – Department of Public Works Conceptual/Final Review

Andrea Ketzel of the Department of Public Works introduces this project, which is the first phase of a large renovation to South Side Park.

Sara Thompson of Pashek + MTR further describes the proposed park improvements, which include accessible walkways, storm water infrastructure, renovated entrances, signage, parking, and recreational amenities. A Percent For Art project will be included, which will be presented at a future Commission hearing.

Goulatia asks if the signage will also be in Braille, and if the signage will be only in English. Thompson says they have not made decisions about the signage yet, but they can consider it. She says it would require reducing the amount of text or duplicating the signs, because the interpretive signs are very small. Goulatia suggests they could make the signs double-sided, and says that it is important to be inclusive, especially for a City project. Ketzel says that is an important consideration especially as the signs will be located along the ADA accessible boardwalk.

Parsakian agrees with the statement about Braille. He also asks if they have considered giving information on earlier eras with the historic signage, specifically the history of indigenous people. Thompson says there was an archaeological study done and it was determined that there were no previous occupants on the site, probably due to its distance from the river. Parsakian says he appreciates this.

Parsakian asks if there are bike paths. Thompson says that there is a bike path that goes along the storm water garden and will connect to the serpentine steps, and that the serpentine steps will be part of a future phase of the project.

Parsakian asks if there are any water features in the playground. He also asks if the rock outcropping area is meant for children to play on. Thompson says they are allowing children to get close to the outcropping, but not creating ways for them to climb it. The discovery garden is called such as it is focused more on the idea of exploration and being in nature than being a playground. Ketzel says there are not water features other than a water fountain.

Parsakian asks when they will decide on the construction materials for the walking path. Thompson says it will be decided during bidding and will be based on what they can afford. They would prefer fiberglass grating, but may need to stick with pressure-treated wood.

Quintanilla thanks them for the presentation and asks if there will be lighting for safety in the evening. Ketzel says that City-standard light poles are included in the design. There is also lighting for the parking lot and basketball court that is contingent on funding, but they will be running conduits for this lighting to be implemented later if they cannot do it immediately. Quintanilla asks if the City standard for lighting allows for dark sky requirements. Ketzel says that the existing standard for pedestrian lighting does not include that, but they have been discussing it. The current standard is an open acorn light.

Quintanilla asks if there are emergency call boxes in City parks. Ketzel says that this project does not include those but they have been engaging with the Public Safety Department and EMS regarding safety especially in areas that will have events. Quintanilla says a lot of parks in California are doing this.

Quintanilla asks about the materials for the sidewalks and parking lot. Thompson says the parking lots are pervious gravel held in place with a geoweb, with r-tanks under some areas with additional gravel storage. There will be some concrete sidewalks, but most paths, the bike paths, and the driveways will be asphalt. The discovery garden trails will be a trail surface aggregate for higher accessibility and a more natural feel.

Quintanilla says that it looks like some of the signage will be on the railing and will become worn due to a lot of contact. Thompson says they haven't experienced issues before with this kind of signage on railings due to the process of embedding and the protective coating. The reason for it being put on the railings is so it will not be obstructive to the view from the railing.

Goulatia asks if there will be places for people to charge their cell phones in case of emergencies. Thompson says that is not part of the scope. Ketzel says that did not come up as part of the Master Plan process. She says that has been included with some parks but it is not part of the current standard for parks.

Moss asks if there is a Percent For Art component. Ketzel says they are working with the Public Art & Civic Design Division and have issued an RFP and selected an artist for the project using a selection committee. They are currently in the process of getting a legal agreement in place in order to begin community engagement.

Parsakian asks if there will be tech support for festival staging and access for vehicles. Thompson says their scope did not originally include the festival green but they are grading the site to accommodate a future pavilion and an amphitheater. They are setting up conduits for future electrical connections. The parking lot in that area will have an accessible path that will usually have bollards, leading up to the festival green area so that food trucks, maintenance, and fire trucks can access the space. Parsakian says he appreciates the level of detail in this project.

Goulatia encourages the applicants to make sure the art is included in the project planning as soon as possible, to ensure that the art component is integrated into the park design.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the understanding that the art component returns for separate Art Commission review and approval.

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

3. Fire Station 19 Addition – Department of Public Works Conceptual/Final Review

Claire Mastroberardino of the Department of Public Works and Gerrod Winston of Winston Design & Development describe this project. The applicants propose to demolish an existing 80 sq ft room and build a new 360 sq ft addition to the fire station. The proposed addition will provide adequate space for locker rooms, showers, and ventilation systems. A Percent For Art component will be included and brought to the Commission for a future review.

Goulatia asks if the brick for the new addition will match the older brick. She also says that she likes the idea of the decorative fencing but it would be good to keep the neighborhood in mind when selecting an artist, and to really make the fence look like a work of art. She says that it could be a template for future fire stations that will receive Percent For Art projects (mentioned by Mastroberardino in her presentation). Mastroberardino says that the plan is to match the brick, but it may not be possible to match exactly as the existing brick is very old. She also says she has been in conversation with the Public Art & Civic Design Division regarding the art project and that their aim is to capture the spirit of the neighborhood in each art installation.

Moss agrees with the concern about the brick matching, and says the mortar can be important as well. He suggests they have a mock-up done to ensure they have the right brick and the right mortar.

Moss draws attention to a detail of the renderings where the existing wall is set back about a foot and suggests that the new addition follow this line. Winston says they had that idea but they have a need for as much square footage as possible, so they could not afford to lose that space by setting the wall back. Winston says they are looking at brick styles to get as close as possible to the original.

Quintanilla says that they have done great work on the proposed doors for the building. He says that for an art piece the decorative fencing will not be evident enough in the back of the building, and if it is approached it will be sad that it is seen to be concealing a generator. He suggests a simple brick wall to hide the generator so as not to call attention to it. Mastroberardino asks if he has another suggestion for the art project. Goulatia says she agrees that the artwork should not be secondary and shouldn't be used to disguise the generator or garbage bins. Quintanilla suggests an art piece that references the current moment and first responders, like a bench with a statue of a fireman. Mastroberardino says they can start looking at these options. Moss suggests the railing at the front of the building. Mastroberardino notes that the Coke machine in the front of the building needs to remain. Winston says that the same idea they had for the decorative fencing could be introduced for the front railing. He notes that the generator itself is self-enclosed.

Parsakian asks about the use of the new addition, how many people will be using this space at the same time, and what happens to their contaminated clothing when they use the new shower space. Mastroberardino says there are four firemen assigned to the space, and they are usually staggered coming in and out. She says that they each have two sets of turn-out gear and that the lockers need to accommodate both sets.

Parsakian says that the building is a beautiful Arts and Crafts building. He asks if they will be updating the air conditioning. Winston says yes, it will be more efficient and there will not be any apparent window units on the outside of the building. Parsakian asks if there will be an external unit next to the new generator. Winston says yes. Parsakian says that they might consider an Arts and Crafts style fencing in the back to lessen the amount of brick needed. He says that the public art could be some kind of entrance sign.

Goulatia says that the art could also be quotes from the community about first responders. She says it doesn't need to be a sculpture or an object, it could just be words, because words have a lot of power.

Teresa Duff speaks from the audience. She says that she likes the idea of the decorative screens for the generators and says that there is a lot of precedent for functional art such as this. She says that some

of the best design is received unconsciously and adds to the overall experience. She supports the idea of the decorative fencing, although she says that she sees the need to explore other options.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the understanding that the art component returns for separate Art Commission review and approval.

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

4. Fire Station 8 Renovation – Department of Public Works Conceptual/Final Review

Claire Mastroberardino of the Department of Public Works and Beth Eckenrode of Auros Group describe this project, which is for metal cladding on the façade of the building as part of a passive house renovation. This is being done to comply with Net Zero energy goals that have been adopted into the City Code. The project came before the Commission previously in October of 2020, at which time the Commission denied the application and asked the applicant to return after rethinking the proposal. The renovation includes a Percent For Art component, which would be brought to the Commission at a future hearing.

Goulatia says she loves the idea of a three-dimensional work of art on the building but says the art needs to elevate the people of East Liberty who have experienced such a high level of displacement. She says that she is for energy-saving measures and if this is the approach we need to take then she is in favor of it.

Moss says he finds this a challenging project for the Art Commission to review. He says he understands the new Code requirements that need to be met and notes that it is the first project that has come before the Art Commission under these new requirements. Moss says that this building is architecturally significant in a way that the other stations (mentioned in the presentation as being up for future renovations) are not.

Moss says that the Code requirements provide a way to exempt projects, and cites 19.5.8d5 of the City Code which recognizes that there may be instances where full compliance may not be feasible. He says that this may be the way to approach this, and wrapping this building would be accomplishing something good but with a negative impact as well. He encourages the project team to look at ways to achieve the most they can toward energy objectives without compromising the building's architectural integrity. He says he is glad they are reusing the building instead of tearing it down and building a new one, but the aluminum cladding would be using a lot of new material, and that could be considered unsustainable. He asks that they not let adherence to the Code requirement cause them to damage this significant building.

Mastroberardino agrees that it is a difficult conversation, but to reach the goals that they need to reach, they need to utilize this method. They do not have another large building that uses this much energy that they can use to get these results.

Moss asks why meeting this goal is the most important thing rather than preserving the architectural quality of this building. Mastroberardino says that they have made a public agreement to meet Climate Action goals within nine years and this building's renovation is necessary to do so.

Eckenrode says that Pittsburgh is leading the U.S. in these goals but the U.S. is behind many other nations. She says that the City needs to be able to teach people and other building developers that it is possible to achieve these energy results.

Moss says the requirement in the Code is a good move for the City but questions its application to this building. He says they can go a long way toward improving the energy efficiency of this building

without cladding it. He says as Art Commissioners they need to maintain their focus on beautifying and preserving aesthetic quality.

Quintanilla says that when he saw the application he thought it looked like a whole new building, and says that if they go this route they might as well tear down the building and build a new one because the history is gone. He says there is a simplicity to the building and the cladding with different colors makes it look like a McDonald's. He says that buildings do not have to do so much, they can be simpler. He says he understands Passive House design and its limitations, but in this case they need to decide whether it is more important to achieve these goals or to keep this historical building.

Eckenrode says that there are sets of priorities that need to be managed. She says the approach of wrapping the building also gives them the chance to improve the indoor air quality, which is as important as energy in many regards. She says accountability for energy efficiency is only going to get more rigorous.

Quintanilla says that the stone on the outside of the building will not contribute to the air quality indoors, the natural stone is probably better than manmade materials in this regard. He says that improving the windows may not meet the Code threshold but would make an improvement without losing their history.

Goulatia asks if there is a way to clad it from the inside. Mastroberardino says they have looked at that solution, but it would lose space inside the building and they would also be unable to meet code for staircases and other features. Quintanilla says that they would be talking about around six inches if they removed the drywall. Mastroberardino says twelve. Moss confirms that the main issue would be staircases and egress width. He says that he believes that they should forego the Code requirement for this building and do as much as they can to improve the energy use without disturbing the outside.

Parsakian says there is a fourth wall that is nondescript, so perhaps they could create a green wall or another solution using that wall. He says that they are not cladding Fire Station 19, and so asks why they are cladding this station. Mastroberardino says Fire Station 19 is too small to make the needed difference. That project also started before the Code requirement came into play. Parsakian asks if this cladding will be done on the three stations mentioned as being up for future renovations in the presentation. He says that it all adds up, and if the Code requires it to be done to all buildings, then it should be done to small ones as well. Mastroberardino says that they can only do about one station per year, as it requires the firefighters to be moved out of the building.

Parsakian says that the location and use of this building is politically charged, and he questions the creation of an artwork for a building like this that is having community issues. Mastroberardino says that this is not something she can speak to.

Melissa McSwiggin speaks from the audience. She commends the Art Commission's comments and says that she appreciates that they are sensitive to the historic fabric of the neighborhood in preserving this building. She says she is a proponent of building reuse but suggests in this case using the Code exemption and not cladding this building.

Chris Hornstein, Acting Director of the Department of Public Works, thanks the Commission and the applicant for their comments and hard work. He says he has had a lot of conversations regarding this structure and that cases of energy efficiency need to be taken on a case-by-case basis. He says that this building has significant air quality and conditional issues that require a major renovation not only to meet code but to keep the users of the building safe. He says these renovations trigger the Net Zero code requirement. He says they've looked at various options and it is virtually impossible to meet the code goal in any other way. Hornstein asks if they can consider an architectural cladding that allows them to meet their goal but honors the historic architecture in some way.

Goulatia asks if they can figure out another solution for the stairs and elevators so that the building can be cladded from the inside. She says this may not meet the goal but would be an improvement. Moss says that he agrees, there can be a significant improvement even if the Code goals can't be met. He says the Code was written to allow for an exemption, and says that there are divergent goals for this building, in terms of energy efficiency and historic integrity.

Mastroberardino says that the stairwells are not the only issue with cladding from the interior, the use of internal space is also a concern.

Goulatia says that she is not in favor of cladding it in aluminum and if they cannot reach the Net Zero goals they can still reach an improvement in efficiency. She says they cannot compromise the historic quality of the building.

Moss says that although he does not support the cladding in any form, the previous proposal for cladding was better than today's proposal. He says the building has a quiet elegance so even if it were to be cladded, they should approach it in a way to maintain that.

Mastroberardino says that they would welcome more discussion on this. Goulatia says that discussion would only be fruitful if they can come to a solution where they do not compromise and can explore options to clad from the inside. Moss says this likely would require the exemption from the Code requirement.

MOTION: Table the current proposal. The applicant is encouraged to return with a redesign and for additional discussion on how a compromise may be reached.

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

Quintanilla notes that DPW has a hard job with this project. Mastroberardino says that this is their toughest project. Quintanilla says there must be a way to get them where they need to be while retaining the historic character. Mastroberardino says that many buildings in the City are historic, many more so even than this one, so they will need to start choosing which historic buildings they can do this cladding on in order to meet any part of the energy goals.

Moss says that although DPW may not be happy with the outcome of the hearing, it is a success of the City's systems in terms of checks and balances.

Mastroberardino says there will be some buildings with historic nominations such as the City-County Building that cannot have this done to them, and so there will need to be some kind of trade-off.

C. Correspondence

None.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert gives an update on the Artist Engagement Survey, which was up on the City's website and ran for a month. Minnaert describes some of the feedback received from the 89 responses.

Minnaert says that there are a number of upcoming commissions for new pieces of public art, totaling more than \$800,000 in nearly twenty neighborhoods.

Goulatia asks how they sent the survey out to artists, as she never received it. Minnaert says it was on Engage PGH, as well as being sent to the division's email list, posted on the City's social media accounts through the Office of Community Affairs and the Mayor's office, and shared through the Office of

Public Art and other organizations. Moss says he saw it shared at least two or three times. Parsakian says he shared it with his network as well.

Minnaert discusses the collection assessment that was started last year. She says they had a cohort of volunteers helping to come up with a framework and criteria for a first pass at assessing the pieces in the collection. She says that they are currently waiting on the results of this initial research to be shared. She says that it has highlighted the need to dedicate resources to a comprehensive collection assessment done by an individual with a steering committee to oversee. She says this will be a multi-step process.

Goulatia asks about the Chapter 175 revisions. Minnaert says there is still a draft of the changes, and in her opinion the first order of business once there is a full Art Commission is to do an update to the bylaws to make them consistent with the Code. Minnaert says that there needs to be some conversation with the Commission as some of the Chapter 175 revisions with regard to financials were not consistent with City protocol and need to be rethought.

Parsakian asks about the new Commissioner appointments, and Minnaert says that they do not have any update on that.

F. Adjournment

MOTION: Adjourn

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:41 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

March 24, 2021 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by President Moss

In Attendance

Moss
Goulatia
Leach
Parsakian
Quintanilla
Young
Hornstein (DPW)
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Homewood Banners	1-3
2. Pro Bike + Run Street Bike Racks	3
3. 3213 Penn Ave Sidewalk Enhancements	4-5
4. Invisible Ecologies	5-6

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from January 2021. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Homewood Banners – Neighborhood Allies
Conceptual/Final Review**

Demi Kolke goes over the project, which is for a series of 14 banners to be installed on sidewalk poles along North Homewood Ave. The banners honor prominent Homewood figures who represent the neighborhood culture through art, music, sports, and community.

Moss questions if there is a typo on two banners that seem to have the wrong dates. Kolke confirms this and says they will correct it. Moss asks how many banners there are. Kolke says fourteen. Moss asks if they are evenly distributed, and Kolke says yes, there are seven on each side of the street and are spaced in accordance with City standards.

Quintanilla says it is a great project. He says the contrast between the red background and black text make the text get a bit lost. He also says that the word "Homewood" may appear too stretched when printed. He says the QR code is a fantastic idea.

Parsakian says he is very familiar with Homewood and loves the idea. He says he would like to call it “Heroes and Sheroes” after a recent exhibit at the History Center. He asks if the photographs are high resolution and will print well when enlarged for the banners. Kolke says they attained the pictures from a variety of sources and points out that there is one picture they are concerned about printing, but says they have received a better alternative for that photo. Kolke says the banners’ designer is aware of the resolutions and is making sure the banners print right.

Parsakian points out the discrepancy with the dates, and Kolke confirms those will be corrected. Parsakian says that the pictures of musicians should contain the instruments they played. He says he doesn’t understand some of the words that are matched up with the figures, like “generous”. He says he’d like to see more iconic photographs that would explain more about who they are. Kolke says they did outreach to the families and only three were not able to be reached. She says that “generous” was specifically chosen by the family of that person. Parsakian says that is more important than what he thinks.

Parsakian asks if they have estate permission for all of these. Kolke says they do.

Leach mentions the figures that she knew and says she is excited that the project is coming to fruition. She asks if the banners can deal with wind. Kolke says yes, the material is vinyl and they are weighted and have wind slits. Leach asks if they will be able to see where the wind slits are. Leach reiterates that the photos should be high resolution. She asks if it is possible to have different photos on each side, with one side showing a headshot and the other side showing them in context of their achievements. Leach asks if it’s possible to put the info from the QR code on the pole so that everything doesn’t have to go through phones. She also asks if this program will grow into the future. She also asks if the dates of their death are important.

Kolke says the banner team felt the death dates were important to memorialize the individuals. She says that their goal is to continue the momentum of the project, but that they are currently using all of the poles at their disposal. Kolke says that finding photographs that they could legally use was at times challenging.

Parsakian says he doesn’t think they need wind slits but says they should double up the cable ties holding them in place. He notes that the company producing the banners will be able to address this.

Goulatia says she loves the project. She asks if they have thought of a more permanent way to honor these individuals instead of using vinyl banners, which are not sustainable. Kolke says the materials they are using are meant to be pretty durable and should have a 5-10 year lifespan, and they are fundraising to be able to replace the banners if any should need it. She says this is part of the larger “Homewood Experience” program that includes mural installations and other architectural and artistic features of the neighborhood, and they can consider how to make things more permanent as they move into Phase 2 of that program.

Young says she really loves the project overall. She says the QR code is a great idea and asks if it will be on the banner or separate from it. Kolke says the QR code would be on the light pole. Young asks if it would lead to the Homewood Experience website. Kolke says yes, and that scanning one QR code will allow a user to access all the bios. Young says to be sure to think about the presentation of the mobile website.

Elwin Green, Homewood community member, gives his support. Technical difficulties prevent him from being heard clearly, but his prepared statement is shared through email with all Commissioners.

Sadik Roberts, co-facilitator of the Homewood Experience, thanks the Commission for their feedback and highlights the community collaboration that took place during the progress of the program.

Dawn Webb-Turner, project partner, gives a brief history of her involvement with the Homewood community and the banner project. She also speaks of the curriculum she is developing for the local school community and the support of the students there for the banners.

Leach asks Webb-Turner if the curriculum she is working on will be a part of the website. Webb-Turner says that she is developing a way to bring both projects together.

Quintanilla reiterates that the applicant should look at the contrast of colors on the banners to ensure visibility.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

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

**2. Pro Bike + Run Street Bike Racks – Pfaffmann + Associates
Conceptual/Final Review**

Rob Pfaffman of Pfaffmann + Associates describes the project, which is for a series of 21 bike racks in two designs at the corner of Smallman St and 24th St. The bike racks will support the Pro Bike + Run store as well as a fitness studio, pub, café, and events room.

Moss says it looks like a great addition to the neighborhood and the bike racks are an elegant design. Pfaffmann says that sometimes City bike racks pull out from the ground and they will be paying special attention to make sure that the proposed bike racks will be secured.

Parsakian acknowledges that anchoring systems can have issues and is glad they are addressing that. He says the design is very sleek and futuristic, and that the facility will elevate how they look at transportation in the City.

Lucas acknowledges DOMI's support. She says a challenge with the narrower racks of this project are that they do not support the bike in two places and so bikes may tip over more easily. She says that all bike racks may have installation problems but that these are cut down when they attach in more than one place to the pavement. She says that the proposed under-the-deck rack is similar to ones she has worked with before and notes that they require annual maintenance, and asks if they will be exposed to precipitation. Pfaffmann says that the deck is solid so it should no drip through. He notes they will have a variety of bike parking options.

Goulatia asks if they considered bike racks that are artist-designed. Pfaffmann says there will be a lot of opportunities for artists in the interior of the facility and so the project partners went with an off-the-shelf product for the bike racks. Goulatia says it would have been a great opportunity to use an artist for the bike racks. Pfaffmann notes that in this case the owner has chosen to utilize artists elsewhere in the project.

Parsakian asks if there is street parking for cars around the building. Pfaffmann says no, but that there is a Healthy Ride station right across the street. Leach asks what the capacity of the space is, and if there will be enough racks. Pfaffmann says that is part of the normal calculations in Zoning and has been reviewed. He says it exceeds the requirements for the retail use. Leach asks if the bikes will be locked up. Pfaffmann says that is up to those using the racks and explains the different parking options.

Quintanilla says he appreciates the rack design.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

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

3. 3213 Penn Ave Apartments Sidewalk Enhancements – Oxide Real Estate Development Conceptual/Final Review

Shawn Kichline of Oxide Real Estate Development presents the proposal for sidewalk enhancements consisting of planters and bike racks outside of a new multifamily residential building.

Moss clarifies that what is before them are the non-standard street furnishings, which are the bike racks, planters, and benches. Cavalline says that the application is for non-standard bike racks and planters, but that the other elements follow City standards.

Moss asks about the planters, as it looks like there were two different planters in the presentation. Kichline says that to his understanding the planter beds do not require approval. He says there may be different planter dimensions. Moss asks how the metal of the planters are finished.

Ryan Indovina, architect of the project, clarifies what is non-standard in the project. He says the planters would be painted aluminum pre-fabricated planter boxes. He also mentions the benches as needing the Commission's review. He explains the different dimensions of the planters on review. Moss asks if the planters are irrigated. Indovina says there would be fenestrations at the bottom but not fixed irrigation.

Goulatia asks if the bench is a City standard bench. Moss also asks for clarification on whether the bench is City standard. Cavalline asks Lucas to address this. He also asks whether DOMI supports the current proposal.

Lucas says she does not think the bench is a standard design. Lucas says that the benches are fine and have DOMM's support as long as they are maintained by the applicant, and the same for the bike racks. Moss recommends including the benches in their current review. Cavalline confirms that DOMI supports the planters as well. Lucas says yes.

Goulatia asks about the materials of the bike racks and benches and the planters are black. Kichline says that the planters are painted aluminum, and the bike racks are aluminum.

Parsakian asks for clarifications of the dimensions of the planters. Kichline says he doesn't have the lengths off the top of his head. Parsakian asks if the planters are intended to act as a wall and also to direct pedestrians to the entrance. Kichline says it does create somewhat of a barrier to mask the view into the garage.

Quintanilla asks if the planters will be on the sidewalk. Kichline says partially. Quintanilla asks how much of the sidewalk will be left to pedestrians. Indovina says that the sidewalk is 12'2" wide from the building face to the curb. He says between the planter boxes and the planter beds there will be 8'2" left for pedestrians. Moss says this is plenty. Quintanilla asks if there is any drainage for the planters or if they drain onto the sidewalk. Indovina says they would have drainage holes on the bottom.

Quintanilla asks why all three items can't be the same color. Kichline says they could be all black. Quintanilla encourages them to all be cohesive.

Lucas says the use of bike racks may not be immediately apparent and recommends a little sign to indicate their use.

Quintanilla asks if there could be vines in the planters that could grow up the lattice that encloses the garage. Moss says that is an interesting idea but it is going a bit outside of their purview. Quintanilla says that the plants should be higher. Moss says that with a higher planter, headlights from inside the garage could be blocked. Goulatia asks if it would be a traffic hazard not to see the headlights. Moss says that the headlights would not be blocked when the cars are leaving the garage, but could be blocked through the screens that let light into the garage. Moss says that 36" should be sufficient or possibly a bit higher.

Minnaert asks if DPW has any thoughts, since these matters concern City standards. Hornstein says that the project is fairly consistent with City standards.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the conditions that 1) the benches, planters, and bike racks should be of a consistent finish; 2) the bike racks should have signage indicating their use; and 3) the planters should be of an appropriate height to shield headlights inside the garage.

MOVED BY: Goulatia

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

4. Invisible Ecologies - Riverlife Conceptual/Final Review

Anna Leisher of Riverlife and David Seiter of Future Green Studios describe the project, which is an artistic installation including clusters of birdhouses in the greenspace between the riverwalk and the 10th Street Bypass between the Fort Duquesne Bridge and the Roberto Clemente Bridges on the southern bank of the Allegheny River. This project previously received Art Commission approval in February 2020 in a different iteration titled "After the Storm". Due to intervening circumstances during the pandemic, the project has changed its scope and is now presented for approval in altered form.

Goulatia says the project is fantastic and a lot of thought has gone into it. She asks for clarification on where the light elements are located. Seiter says the lighting elements are incorporated into the bird houses with perches. He says they glow with ambient light from the inside. He says roughly 30% have lights, which are powered by a small solar panel embedded in the top of the birdhouses.

Quintanilla confirms that the material is concrete. He asks how thick the boxes are. Seiter says they have tried to minimize the weight as much as possible. The birdhouses have a wooden frame inside with foam surrounding, then a layer of concrete. Quintanilla asks how thick the concrete on the boxes are, as it may create a hot interior to the boxes. Seiter says the foam insulation buffers the heat transfer and notes that there are ventilation holes. Quintanilla says that it is really a wooden box with a concrete interior. Seiter says that the wood was essential because they want to have the appearance of urban materials but still be habitable by birds. Quintanilla says in the area where the project will be implemented it feels like there is too much concrete. He says the birdhouses will feel very heavy. Seiter agrees and says that was the intention. Moss notes it will cut down the noise from the highway. Seiter says they spoke to ornithologists who did not think that the noise would be a limiting factor but that it may affect which birds come.

Goulatia asks what the intention behind the color on the boxes was. Seiter says they were going for a look of "urban confetti", so there would be about 70% grey with splashes of color. Goulatia says the color shouldn't look forced but should instead look like it was reused material from another building. Seiter agrees that they want them to appear similar to found objects.

Goulatia asks if there is an intention to do something on the walking path to tie into the nearby Ann Hamilton design. Seiter says they are not touching the sidewalk but they hope to incorporate plantings which will be a reference to the Hamilton work. Goulatia confirms that there is no mural in this project. Seiter says that is correct.

Parsakian asks if any found objects from the river will be incorporated. Seiter says that's a great point and they could consider that. Parsakian compares it to a project in Montreal called "Habitat".

Young asks if there was any reasoning for the number of birdhouses in the clusters. Seiter says they experimented with different variations and decided this arrangement worked best formally. There was also some consideration of the necessary range between certain birdhouses.

Quintanilla asks if there is rebar used to add to the construction feel. Seiter says some boxes terminate in a small perch stand but none use rebar. Seiter says perches aren't recommended anymore outside of the opening of a birdhouse. Quintanilla asks where the lighting is. Seiter shows the lighting in the presentation. The light will glow from the inside of the box.

Goulatia asks if the color is painted onto the concrete or intrinsic to it. Seiter says he'd like to do both but so far they have mixed the color into the concrete. Goulatia agrees that they could embed found objects from the river.

Leach asks if there will be an effect of the heat on the birds. She asks if the light will upset the patterns of the birds. She asks if there is a way to use natural color instead of paint. Seiter notes that the goal isn't to create the perfect natural habitat for birds but to show ideas of creating an ecology out of the remains of urban infrastructure that could still support the birds. He says there should not be a negative interaction to the birds from any of the materials used.

Leach asks how safe they are and if they can be pulled down. Seiter explains how they will be anchored and stabilized.

Rob Long from Clear Story describes the lights and notes the output is very visually quiet and should not have the potential for negative impact. He also gives additional details about the stability of the structures.

Leach asks if there will be information given to the public regarding the types of birds. Leisher says they are working on ideas for that and would like to include it. Long says there was a lot of research done by Future Green Studios and it should be shared with the public in some way.

Quintanilla notes that the boxes stand at different heights and asks if the lower ones are further from the sidewalk. Seiter says that the nestable boxes are five feet or higher but that their arrangement was determined by the sculptural quality. They are at least three feet from the sidewalk. Quintanilla asks if there will be anything at ground level to limit kids walking up to it. Seiter says there is a planting area that hopefully doesn't not invite people to walk into it.

Cavalline asks whether DPW supports the project. Hornstein gives DPW's support.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Review

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

C. Correspondence

None.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert notes that PACD has been working on the Art in Parks Call For Artists including artist info sessions and an extended deadline of March 30. They have been investing a lot of effort into getting the word out about this opportunity and making sure that artists can access the application. She describes the Art in Parks grant and program. Goulatia says that the application process is difficult and wonders if the Commission is able to help in some way. Minnaert says this is an ongoing conversation and they are currently focusing on trying to help artists register and apply using the required City procurement system. Leach asks about a video for the artist info sessions. Minnaert says the presentation from the artist info session is included in the FAQ for the Call For Artists but they are not able to put up the recording.

Minnaert says there will be a number of Percent For Art projects coming up throughout the rest of the year.

Parsakian asks about current art projects involving Port Authority. Minnaert says the Bus Rapid Transit Project came in the fall for preliminary review. She says this project will have a Percent For Art component. She notes there was recently an article about the Port Authority's Public Art Policy but this is separate from the City.

Minnaert says they do not have any news about the open Commissioner seat.

Moss asks about the newest draft of the Art Commission Bylaws. A draft was circulated to bring the bylaws into alignment with City Code. Moss notes the bylaws can be revisited again after the future Code update.

MOTION: Approval of Bylaws

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

Moss notes that according to these bylaws, the officers of the Commission are a President and a Secretary. Goulatia notes the previous positions were called Chair and Vice-Chair. Minnaert says these are essentially the same positions but are named in accordance with the Code, and that the positions should be elected on an annual basis.

MOTION: Andrew Moss as Art Commission President

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

MOTION: Sarika Goulatia as Art Commission Secretary

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

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:53 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

April 28, 2021 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by President Moss

In Attendance

Moss
Goulatia (arrived during Director & Staff Report)
Leach
Parsakian
Quintanilla
Young
Hornstein (DPW)
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. DPW 4th Division Facility & Campus	1-4

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from March 2021. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Leach. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. DPW 4th Division Facility & Campus – Department of Public Works
Conceptual Review**

Calli Baker, Senior Project Manager, DPW, goes over the project, which is a proposed pedestrian walkway around a new maintenance facility to serve DPW's 4th Division. She is joined by Dana Klann of Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc. The project will include a Percent For Art component, which is proposed to be on or around the pedestrian walkway.

Leach notes that she lives across the street from this project. She asks if people will still be able to use the street which runs through the project area. Baker says no, that Matthews Avenue will not be accessible through the campus and they are working with DOMI to look into alternate traffic routes.

Leach says the current conditions are dangerous. She says that there are a lot of deer around nearby McKinley Park and asks if this will disrupt their pattern or was based on their path. Baker says no, that this layout was based on available space. Leach asks if the path will be flat or will follow the shape of the land. Baker says it will be flat or a very low slope to be as accessible as possible.

Leach asks what the community process was, as she did not know about the project. She asks if they sent out mailers. Baker says the City Council office spearheaded the meetings, but she is not sure if they sent out mailers. She says that is a good idea for the future.

Moss says he appreciates DPW bringing this project to Art Commission in its early stages. He indicates the route of the pedestrian path and asks if it could be changed so as not to create a blind spot for someone walking around the building. Baker says the path is not completely set yet. She says there is currently a large retaining wall at that corner, and they want to make the path a softer curve for visibility and safety. She notes there will also be lighting along the path.

Moss asks if the Art Commission will be reviewing the final design of the maintenance building. Baker says that she believes so and that they can show the Commission the building materials and choices, which the design team is trying to keep as minimal as possible in order to blend into the surroundings.

Quintanilla says that it seems that the location of the pathway moves the pedestrians off to the side. He says that it looks like an area that could end up being dangerous. He says that the placement looks like a reaction to what is there as opposed to thinking of the pedestrian and their connectivity.

Moss says that maybe the maintenance building can be designed so that it does not enclose the walkway so completely. He says that the lighting can also improve this situation.

Quintanilla suggests that it might be better to direct pedestrians north to Bausman Street.

Leach asks how tall the building will be. Baker says it will be partially one story, partially two. Leach asks if it would be possible to have the path go across the north of the building. Baker says this is where the DPW vehicles will be, and they want to keep pedestrians away from there for safety. Quintanilla says he appreciates this, but where the pedestrians are being routed is not ideal. Baker says they are limited to an extent due to the slope changes, as the project zone is basically in a valley. Quintanilla asks if they have thought of having the path lead the pedestrian north to Bausman Street. Baker says that this area is very steep and would not be able to be an accessible pathway. Quintanilla says that if it is accessible but unsafe, then no one will use it. Leach says that a lot of people who live nearby use Matthews Street to pass through this area.

Parsakian asks what the proposed width of the pathway would be. Klann says it is under development but will be 5-6 feet. Parsakian says he worries about the safety issue. He asks if the area behind the building would become a tunnel for the pedestrian path. Baker says that is what they would like to avoid. She says the slope changes quickly so they have to put up a retaining wall to make sure the width is large enough to be safe. She says they want to be sure to avoid an area that could be a place for criminal activity. Parsakian says it is an issue to put this area behind a building. He asks if they can put the building further north. Moss suggests moving it further east. Baker says that there are many utility lines running through this area and they need to avoid moving underground water lines. Klann says there are also gas and water lines under Matthews Avenue.

Parsakian asks about the elevation of the back of the building, and whether there are windows. Baker says there are windows and shows an elevation of the building in the presentation. She says that visibility is key, so it will not be a big blank wall facing the hillside. Parsakian asks if a protective tunnel could be part of the walkway. Moss says this sounds like it would be less safe. Baker says she would be concerned about hidden activities.

Leach asks if the building has to be square, or could the corners be rounded. Baker says they would lose interior space and this would decrease the functionality of the building. Parsakian asks if the building could be oriented differently. Baker says that due to the utility lines they are very limited as to where they could put the building on the site. Klann says they were originally looking at placing the building on the north side of the site, but that brought up issues related to disturbing the existing hillside. Leach asks if they could add additional space to the west side of the building. Klann says there may be a little space but there is existing topography to deal with. He says they may be able to change the path to remove the 90 degree angles. He points out in the renderings where the slope begins to get very steep.

Moss says that their objective is not to come up with a solution for the applicant but to give feedback, and hopefully the Commissioners' concerns will be considered as the planning goes through further design decisions. He says that as far as the artwork is concerned, he is not sure they can direct them to a specific approach to it, but that artwork as part of this pedestrian experience seems appropriate. He says reaching out to the community regarding the artwork is also a good idea.

Parsakian says he could see sculptural lighting for the art component, such as was done on the Highland Avenue bridge. He says the ground could also be an opportunity.

Young says that as they had previously discussed, if they moved the path back from the rear of the building it could make an interesting pedestrian path. She says that as far as the artwork goes, the ground and the lighting would be options, as well as on the back wall of the building. She says that to promote safety and a warm feeling as opposed to the cold grey wall, something as simple as color blocking could make a difference to how the space is perceived. Moss says this could also discourage graffiti. Young says that utilizing color blocking or a gradient would take the opposite approach to not wanting it to be seen, since this will be an area of pedestrian traffic.

Hornstein confirms that the site has perimeter fencing on it. Hornstein says as the walkway is up against this, there could be an opportunity for art on the fencing. Klann says that the fencing could be designed to make the space more inviting. Baker says they would also not want anything that would hinder the visibility of seeing through the fencing. Hornstein notes that the lighting will be critical for public safety and that he loves the idea of adding color or texture to the back of this building as it would be kind of a hidden treasure. Moss says that when they come back for Final Review they can present the entire building design.

Parsakian asks if the pathway will be lit by the interior lighting from the windows when the building is in use. Baker says yes, and that the lighting can also be put on timers.

Leach asks if there will be a lot of dust or dirt along the walkway if they have an open fence. Baker says all of the dust or dirt from trucks would be kept to inside the building or on the north side. She says there will be a mezzanine level above the walkway with offices and that the lower level will include a vehicle washing area inside so that dirt brought on site is dealt with. Leach asks if it will function as a dumping site as it used to. Baker says that it will not be like it used to be and they are trying to minimize the dumping.

Quintanilla asks if the walkway could be elevated so it is not between the wall and the building. Klann says unfortunately this would not be feasible due to the existing topography. They want to utilize the existing flat areas within the site and not disturb the integrity of the hillside. He says that if there was elevation of the walkway, the access points to the site would have to have a lot of elaborate ramps. Quintanilla says that color on the building and lighting will fade and stop working over time, and this area will become a place where crime happens.

Leach asks if the elevation of the pathway could be attached to the building. Klann says he doesn't know how it would be possible to attach it to the building or to create that level of increased and decreased elevation. He says you would have to carve it into the hillside like a hiking trail, which would be a more dangerous situation.

Baker asks if it would be helpful to have renderings and snapshots of that area for their next Art Commission review. Parsakian says it would be very helpful to have elevations.

Parsakian asks if the artist will be required to work with the community. Baker says that the artist could work with the community after they are selected, or there could be community engagement before the RFP for the artist is put out.

Young asks what neighborhoods were contacted for the community engagement so far. Baker says that she can't speak to this as it was through the Council office. Young says that all of the surrounding neighborhoods use McKinley Park, so they should all be considered when doing community engagement. Leach asks how they can ensure that the RFP is equitable and diverse, as many times the same people apply to RFPs over and over. She asks if there is a way to limit it to artists in the hilltop communities.

Baker says this is something DPW will have to work with the Public Art Division on. Young suggests she work with Neighborhood Allies, which has a lot of artist connections. Leach says that RE360 converted the Duquesne Light truck building into artist studios and there are lots of artists located in that building.

Klann says the colors and materials in the renderings are still preliminary.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval, with consideration given to the input of the Commission in future planning of the project.

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

C. Correspondence

Minnaert says that the Commissioners have been forwarded a letter requesting a loan of the Stephen Foster statue. She says that this letter has been forwarded to City Administration to determine whether there is an action to put in front of the Commission, which would come back at a later meeting.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert says that they are in the final stages of their call for artists for the Art in Parks project, for which they had a record 74 applicants. They also had a second RFP out for an Art in Parks project coordinator to work on documentation of the process. She says they convened a panel of seven individuals of diverse background and experience to review the applications. Once they finalize the artists they will move on to reviewing the applications for the coordinator, and they hope to include some of the artists in the coordinator selection.

Minnaert discusses the City of Pittsburgh collection assessment that they began last year. She says that they worked with a group of volunteers in the first phase of this project, and that this process has identified the need for both a knowledgeable and diverse advisory committee and a dedicated researcher. She says they are currently working on a plan for the second phase of this assessment.

Minnaert also gives an update on the Cantini Mosaic reconceptualization project. She gives a brief overview of the history of this project and says that the City is now working with E Holdings and key stakeholders on the reconceptualization to identify a location for the panels to be installed. She says they have a few more months of work on this phase of the project, and it will be coming to Art Commission at a later time with their findings and possible new locations.

Leach asks about the collection assessment and where that information will be able to be found. Minnaert says the entire inventory is on the website, and they will be keeping this information accessible to the public as well as being in PACD records. Moss confirms that this is accessible through the City website. Minnaert says yes, through the Department of City Planning portion of the pittsburghpa.gov website.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:58 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

May 26, 2021 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by President Moss

In Attendance

Moss
Goulatia
Leach
Parsakian
Young
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Garrison Canal	1-3

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from April 2021. Leach motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Parsakian. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Garrison Canal – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
Final Review**

Angelique Bamberg presents this project for Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership (PDP). This lighting installation by Andrea Polli was installed in 2018 as a temporary project. It was given Conceptual Approval for an extended installation in June of 2019. PDP has continued to maintain it and now seeks Final approval to extend the duration of the installation. It will remain under PDP ownership and stewardship, and they will obtain a street furnishing permit from the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure.

Leach asks why they made the decision not to donate the work to the City. Bamberg says that it was a complication and the City raised questions of necessity based on the indefinite lifespan of the installation. Leach says she was just curious as they have so few works by women artists.

Moss asks if the PDP has any expectation as to what will happen to the artwork after five years. Bamberg says they chose five years because it is the general lifespan of the LCD lights, and at that point they can reassess to decide if it should be kept up or removed.

Leach asks how often the lights have been replaced. Bamberg says they have not yet been replaced to her knowledge. Leach asks if they will be replaced. Bamberg says they have no plans to replace them for the duration of the five years.

Parsakian asks if there has been any conversation with the artist about another installation if this one is removed. He compares the work to Jane Haskell and says it is important to have another female artist represented downtown. Bamberg says she does not know if the PDP has had the conversation with the artist about another artwork. Parsakian asks if there is any collaboration with the Cultural Trust. Bamberg says that they support this installation. Parsakian says that in the past, works were commissioned during the Arts Festival that have become permanent, and asks if they would be involved in commissioning a new work. Bamberg says she can relay that question to the PDP.

Goulatia says she loves this installation. She says PDP does a lot of projects downtown and asks if there would be a potential for the PDP to do similar installations in other alleyways. Bamberg says she thinks so and that can be a part of the broader conversation with the PDP and the Cultural Trust. Parsakian says there was a sound installation in an alley next to the Benedum. He says they also do artist-designed bike racks.

Moss says he thinks a five-year extension for this artwork makes a lot of sense. He says it doesn't seem necessary to revisit this at an Art Commission hearing each year, but that a report to PACD staff on the condition of the installation each year would be appropriate.

MOTION: Final Approval to extend the installation for five years, with the condition that every year a report is sent to PACD staff on the condition of the light installation as well as the alleyway.

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

C. Correspondence

None.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Goulatia asks if they have heard anything more about the Columbus statue. Dash says there is no update as the legal proceedings are still ongoing.

Minnaert says that PACD staff has recently announced the eight artists and artist teams that they will be working with on the Art in Parks program over the next year. They simultaneously had a call out for a project coordinator to help to administer this program as well as oversee the documentation and storytelling aspects. They hope to finalize this award in the next few days. Moss asks if each of those projects will come before the Art Commission. Minnaert says yes, and that PACD has begun meeting with each artist and has explained Art Commission review as a part of their design development. Moss asks if these are meant to be permanent projects. Minnaert says yes.

Moss asks if there are any further updates on the Cantini mosaic. Minnaert says they are in the process of working to identify potential locations with the project consultants and key stakeholders.

Minnaert says that they are not anticipating a new Commissioner appointment in the near future, but that it remains important in their longer-term planning to fill all vacant Commission seats. Goulatia asks if Commissioner interviews have happened or if that is still pending. Minnaert says that community

members have been reached out to and that the vacant seat is an architect role, but that timing-wise it is challenging to fill that role right now. Goulatia says that former Commissioners Kary Arimoto-Mercer was a landscape architect and that was very helpful. Minnaert agrees it would be useful and asks the Commissioners to send along any names of prospective Commissioners if they have them. Dash says that given the results of the recent election it will likely be some time before that seat is filled.

Parsakian asks about the impact of the election on the Commission. Dash says that it is too early to say at this point, but that Commissioners terms are coterminous with the Mayoral term. Parsakian confirms that there would be no guarantee that they would continue as Commissioners after January. Dash says that there is no guarantee, but continuity is important.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:32 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

June 23, 2021 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by President Moss

In Attendance

Moss
Goulatia
Leach
Parsakian
Quintanilla
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Friendship Asphalt Art	1-2
2. Highland Park Super Playground	3-5

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from May 2021. Leach motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Friendship Asphalt Art – Friendship Community Group
Conceptual/Final Review**

Jennifer Haven of Friendship Community Group introduces the project, which is a hardscape mural to be installed in pedestrian bumpouts at the intersection of Roup Ave, S Fairmount St, and Harriet St in the Friendship neighborhood. The mural is being done in coordination with the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure's planned traffic-calming improvements to the intersection. Funds for the installation have been provided by a grant from Bloomberg Philanthropies with support from the City.

Project artists Tim Engelhardt and Randi Stewart give additional details on the proposed design and the community process.

Goulatia asks for clarification on the alignment of the images and what portions of the street will be painted, which Haven explains. Moss asks if the City is extending curbs or if the painted area can be driven over. Haven says the City will be putting up flex post bollards and that an emergency vehicle could drive over them.

Quintanilla says this is a scary intersection and the amount of thought put into this is awesome. Haven says that they are thankful to DOMI and to Bloomberg Philanthropies for the opportunity to improve the area. Quintanilla asks if holes and cracks in the street will be fixed before painting. Haven

says that they are using a special primer and a grip coat, and the artists have been working with a nationally-known asphalt painter. Haven says that PWSA just did a project at the northwest corner of the intersection and so flattened that section out. Haven says they do not expect any repaving or pothole filling, but that she doesn't think the area has significant potholes.

Goulatia says it looks beautiful. She asks for further clarification of the layout and alignment of the artwork.

Goulatia asks about the timeline. Haven says after Art Commission approval the artists will be ordering the product. Elly Fisher of Friendship Community Group says they plan on installing the project over a weekend, probably July 25-26.

Leach asks how the project addresses the safety of the intersection. Haven explains that narrowing the lanes and extending the curbs will slow the traffic down. She says they have been doing traffic counts and studying the speeding of the traffic and the compliance with the stop bars. She says that the placement of the stop bars currently does not allow full visibility of all other lanes, and so cars do not comply with them. She also says that pedestrian safety is very important, and currently there are not crosswalks at every crossing. The project will provide crosswalks at each crossing of the intersection, and make crossings shorter than they currently are. Leach asks if you could still drive over the painting. Haven says that you could if you drove over the bollards. Leach says she doesn't understand if that makes it safer. She says she has no sense of how it will look with the bollards.

Lucas acknowledges that some people do not respect the traffic controlling devices, but those being proposed are standard and the combination of the art with the flex posts will provide a greater sense of where not to drive. She says the measures being proposed will improve the pedestrian experience.

Goulatia says near where she lives there is an intersection with multiple stop signs and it causes confusion. She asks if DOMI thought of putting in a traffic light. Goulatia says she isn't a fan of the bollards and they destroy the visual impact. Lucas says they try to use every tool they have available, and some tools like a traffic light can represent several hundred thousand dollars of investment, so they are not always able to use that option. She says that the options being utilized at this intersection are good for what is currently possible.

Goulatia asks what color the bollards are. Haven says they have to use the style of bollards that DOMI provides, which are solid white flex posts. She says the flex posts will not go on the art itself. She says that if the project is successful perhaps in the future they can do something more permanent.

Quintanilla agrees that the bollards can be hideous, but that they do the needed job. He says that hopefully with this being a residential street and the geometry of the intersection being narrower, they will not have issues with people driving over them. He says he is excited for the project and that it should be a huge improvement.

Leach says she defers to the architects on the Commission, but asks if it would be preferable to have a large circle in the middle of the intersection as opposed to extending the curbs. Haven says they explored that, but that fire trucks would not be able to make that angle going around a circle. She says they are working within the spaces that have been engineered by DOMI.

Parsakian says that this is a nightmare intersection. He says he likes the Victorian nature of the artwork. He says that in the future a bumpout with a concrete sidewalk extension would be ideal, but that this is a good shorter-term solution. He compliments them on their detailed and thoughtful community engagement and design process work.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

MOVED BY: Goulatia

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

2. Highland Park Super Playground – Department of Public Works Conceptual/Final Review

Andrea Ketzel of the Department of Public Works and Nina Chase of Merritt Chase introduce the project, which is the full renovation of an existing playground. The renovation is grant-funded and includes the replacement of all play structures, play surfacing, and the addition of new site improvements including site furniture, entrance, trees, planting and public art. They are joined by Sabrina Culyba, a Highland Park resident and member of the Playground Committee. Culyba describes the public art projects, which would be done in collaboration with the Pittsburgh Glass Center and which would come for Final Approval at a future review.

Goulatia applauds the attention that they have given to the materials and the reuse of the trees. She says it is a beautiful project. She suggests that they use the drawings the children made during the planning process for the small mosaics.

Quintanilla agrees and says that it would be great to incorporate the kids' ideas in the art. He says the fencing feels very rectilinear and asks if they've thought of a more organic feel. He says he loves the theme with the ships and that it could be made to be more like a fantasy map. Chase says that's a great idea and that they went through different ideas with the play surface and ended up with this design so as to avoid being too prescriptive with how it would be interpreted.

Goulatia asks if it is wheelchair accessible. Chase says yes, that the current park has mulch which is not accessible and this play surface will be. She says they have utilized an inclusive play consultant in the design process. Goulatia says the signage could have Braille elements or audio features.

Leach asks if it has to be castles and ships, as it feels very colonial. She asks if there are other playgrounds that use skyscrapers and spaceships. Chase says that options were presented to the community in other themes or with no theme, but that the community wanted to maintain the original castle theme. She says they wanted to expand beyond it and so brought in the water and ship elements. Culyba says that the playground is very loved and the community thinks of the castle silhouette as iconic to the neighborhood.

Goulatia says she now sees the ships in a very dark way, like slave ships. Chase says they presented more architecturally abstract designs and looked at six or seven equipment manufacturers. Goulatia asks if they could have a conversation with the community about this, and whether that would change what they want to see. She says she can't see the park in any other way and it's an opportunity to change this narrative. Leach says she does not mean to put it in a dark light but this is what it looks like to her. She asks if there are other options. She says there are other beautiful places around the world that could be used in the design, but she realizes they are on a schedule.

Ketzel says they have limited budgets for these types of projects, and for this project they even have about three times the budget that they normally do. She says they have tried to go beyond the normal plastic playground and that the wooden aspect is very important to the community. She says that what has been brought up is a very valid thought and that it did not come up in their community process. She says that there are different ways to look at the elements. She says that the theme of this design has had an overwhelming positive response and it is late in the process to change it.

Leach says that in the world they live in there is one overwhelming narrative that drowns out the others. She says she is not deliberately trying to be negative but that is what she sees and she felt a need to say that. Ketzel says she appreciates that and it is important to discuss. Moss says if it is too late to change this design, then this project should have been brought to the Art Commission earlier. Ketzel says it was her understanding that they were to present the non-standard amenities to the Commission, not necessarily the municipal design.

Moss says the question of the theme is an important question and the community may not have been given this perspective. He says it should be taken back to the community group. Culyba says it could be taken back to the community or put on the EngagePGH platform. She says they can ask the community if

they still want the castles and ships, given the knowledge that others may see them in a different light. Chase suggests that this could be taken back to the playground committee, and they could discuss removing the ships.

Goulatia says that she would not have seen the ships in this light until it was brought up, but now it is how she sees them. She says that it is not too late to change the design and the narrative. Leach asks if they are considering how all children may see this. She says that castles can mean magic and mystery, but that it should be considered that playgrounds are for all. Ketzel confirms that they should take this back to the community and then return with those results. Moss says that would be appropriate.

Moss asks about relocating the toilets, and asks how that's being addressed. Ketzel says they are just relocating the existing portable toilets away from the entrance. Moss says it would be preferable to have a permanent restroom. Ketzel says she agrees, and that is a Citywide resource and maintenance issue. Goulatia asks if the maintenance of a permanent toilet is harder than a portable one. Ketzel says yes, and that the portable toilets are handled by a third party. She says there are also some issues concerning those larger spaces being open at night.

Monica Watt, former president of Highland Park Community Council, speaks from the audience. She says she has worked on the maintenance of the playground for the past twenty-five years and has been working with DPW on the redesign. She says she appreciates Leach sharing her perspective. She says they were thinking more of fairy tales and explorers and a broader perspective of ships, albeit a white perspective. She says these ships are pirate ships and have pirate flags on them. She says that Highland Park was 26% minority at the 2010 census and so considering how affluent it is, it is a diverse neighborhood. She speaks of how well-loved the playground is and that they chose the castle theme because of how important that aspect was to the community. She says they tried to be inclusive with their outreach and make sure everyone was aware of the design before construction.

Moss says a project of this size should probably come first for a conceptual review earlier in the process. Goulatia says she does not understand the comment about the neighborhood being affluent but diverse.

The Commission discusses possible approval options.

Chase asks if there is concern with the castles in addition to the ships, or if it is just the ships. Leach says it is how it looks together, and there are different ways to approach it. Culyba asks what ways they can move away from that narrative. Goulatia says that this narrative is a reality so if that is what the community wants, there could be a placard telling that history, but no one will want that in a playground. She says they have a chance to really look at this design and rethink it, even though that will be a lot of effort. Chase asks about the extent of change that would need to be made. Leach says the castles looking different from each other would be an option. Goulatia says that instead of ships they could have boats.

Ketzel says that they do need to think about some practical concerns, and that at this point they are at the end of their design funds and this would be pushing construction into the spring of 2022. She wants everyone to have realistic expectations about what that means.

Parsakian asks if the playground pieces are custom made or if they are essentially from a catalogue. Ketzel says they work with designers and are generally choosing from a catalogue but then making minor tweaks. She says that for instance, making each castle different could be very complicated. Parsakian suggests they could choose completely different options. Chase says yes, but that would require going back to the community and explaining that they were not going with the design they had chosen. Chase says that if it was just the ships that were problematic, that would be a simpler change. Parsakian asks if they can call the castles skyscrapers. Chase describes that they had referred to them as architectural elements and had modeled the lines somewhat from the roof lines of the existing playground. They simplified the aesthetic to give it less of a fort feel.

Goulatia says that the beauty of the project is that it has a cohesive feel to it, so if they are rethinking one element they need to rethink all of it. She says that it is more important that they do the right thing even if it pushes the project forward until next year.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval of the site plan for the Highland Park Super Playground, with the exception of the playground equipment, which should be thematically reconsidered and return to a future hearing.

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

C. Correspondence

None.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert says that the Art in Parks program is underway and they will be bringing on the Program Coordinator shortly. The Public Art & Civic Design Division is also working on the South Side Park public art project, which will be starting community engagement soon. She says the division has also recently completed a collection assessment to help them evaluate conservation priorities.

Minnaert says they are nearing the end of the reconceptualization phase for the Cantini mosaic. They have been working with EHoldings and during the last month they have been having meeting with local stakeholders and community groups. They will soon be narrowing down potential sites and the project will come to Art Commission in the future.

Goulatia says that she is not sure the Highland Park playground project understood all of the Commissioner's comments and asks the division to help them with feedback if needed. Leach says that she wasn't aware of the potential fallout of communicating the lens of what the project looks like. Moss says that there was previously an application for a sculpture honoring Dr. Martin Luther King that could potentially have been considered very offensive, and so the Art Commission's role saved them that embarrassment. Goulatia thanks Leach for mentioning it and says that if the project comes back she won't vote in favor of it. She says that if it disrupts the timeline of the project then that is what will have to happen. Parsakian says it is important that they all voice their perspectives to educate the community on how they need to rethink their biases. Quintanilla says that he has done a lot of community engagement and says that it is a hard balance to hit. Goulatia says that what the community member said was problematic. Leach agrees. Quintanilla says that it is important for the public to see how much thought goes into these decisions. Leach says this is the difficult work and it might push timelines back. It is important to communicate how things can be seen, and if the community still wants the castles and ships, then it has at least been communicated.

Goulatia says if there is a catalogue, then it is easier for them to change their theme. Parsakian says they could also have gone to the wrong vendor, and there could be other vendors that have more enlightened thinking.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:19 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

July 28, 2021 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by President Moss

In Attendance

Moss
Goulatia
Leach
Parsakian
Quintanilla (for agenda items 1-4)
Young (for agenda items 1- 2)
Hornstein (DPW)
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Frick Park Extension Public Art	1-2
2. Robert E. Williams Memorial Park	2-4
3. Oliver Bath House	4-6
4. DPW 4 th Division Facility & Campus	6
5. Olympia Park Shelter House	6-7
6. Highland Park Super Playground	7-8

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from June 2021. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Young. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Frick Park Extension Public Art – Tim Kaulen
Conceptual Review**

Kaulen presents this public art project, which will be located in a park space located in the Summerset at Frick Park residential community. The land is currently owned by the URA. After completion of the park project, the City will take ownership of the land and it will be included as an extension of Frick Park. The park design received Final Art Commission Approval in October 2020.

Quintanilla confirms that they are discussing the placement of the artwork today. Kaulen says yes. Quintanilla says what he thinks is important is that the art pieces can be seen not only from inside the park but also from the roads leading to the park. He says the plans being presented do not show much of the context or long views of the park.

Leach asks if there is a reason those sites for the artwork were selected. Kaulen says they are contemplative locations that do not take away from the other amenities of the park. He says that putting the artwork in the middle of the green spaces would defeat the purpose of the spaces being multi-use. They selected sites that celebrated the serenity of the park.

Leach asks if the trees are already there. Kaulen says some are.

Goulatia says she lives in this neighborhood, and it is important to make sure that the sculptures do not become something that kids climb on. She says the locations are not the best, and she wishes the sculptures could be more visible. Leach asks if these will be like Tony Tasset's Magnolia Trees downtown, with the artwork being more visible in some seasons than others. Kaulen says there will be a harmony between manmade and natural elements, and he doesn't think the sculptures will be hidden, just sited thoughtfully within the natural setting. He suggests that there are ways to incorporate the landscaping to discourage climbing.

Parsakian asks if Kaulen has had meetings with the community. Kaulen says there have been two meetings, and the community has been very supportive and trusting of his process. He says he would like to have one more workshop with the neighborhood in developing the project. Parsakian says that he would prefer the sculptures not have concrete bases, but would defer to an engineer on making that call. Kaulen says it is typical to have a concrete pad as a counterbalance. Parsakian asks if he is using recycled materials. Kaulen says he is open to any aesthetic suggestions but will be coming back for approval of the design prior to production. Parsakian says that using recycled materials would elevate Kaulen's work.

Quintanilla says he is having trouble understanding the topography and street views from the submitted plans. He says he can't make comments on the placement of the art because he does not have enough information. Minnaert says that the park plan came for Art Commission approval the previous year and they could pull up those plans if it would help.

Kaulen says he would like to get approval for the general idea of three sculptures thoughtfully placed, with community consensus. He says that he's happy to meet on site to get any advice from the Commissioners on placement.

Moss agrees that it is hard to make a judgement on the placement of the sculptures, but that three sculptures in a park this size seems appropriate. He says he personally doesn't have any issues with the proposal.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval for artworks at the three locations

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

2. Robert E. Williams Memorial Park – Department of Public Works

Conceptual Review

Joe Adiutori Jr of the Department of Public Works introduces the project, which is for the demolition of the existing recreation building in Robert E. Williams Memorial Park and construction of new community facility with rooftop plaza, basketball court, playground, and parking. A Percent For Art project is being discussed and will be presented in the future. Naomi Williams of R3A Architecture goes through the presentation.

Moss says that the siting of the building makes sense with the topography of the park, and the roof access seems appropriate. He says it seems there is a missed opportunity in how the rooftop will be used. He says that if it was made into a green roof or divided into usable spaces it would be more dynamic.

Moss says that the basketball court, playground, and rooftop seem to be at the same level and perhaps the grade could be adjusted on the playground, or the basketball court lowered so as not to need such a large retaining wall.

Andrea Ketzel of DPW says that they presented a multi-level playground to the community, but they preferred it to all be on one level.

Quintanilla says that it's an exciting project and he thinks there will be a great view from the roof. He suggests that there be some protection from sun and weather for people using the roof. He asks why they have shifted the building so that it doesn't align with the park access. Williams says that the placement has to do partially with existing water lines from the reservoir above. Quintanilla encourages them to do something with the access coming from the existing park monument. Williams says this access currently continues up to the playground area.

Goulatia asks if this is a green building. Williams says they used sustainable practices within the budget that they had, but they are not going for LEED certification. Goulatia says that is a missed opportunity for the City. She asks why the siding is made to look like wood, and says that it should either be actual wood or just look like siding. Williams says they looked at materials that were durable but also cost-effective. Goulatia says that the artificial wood cheapens the building. Moss says he agrees that they shouldn't use materials that pretend to be something they are not.

Parsakian agrees that the roof should be more welcoming. He asks if the roof would support a tent, and also says that there will be a lot of skateboarding if they use pavers, which could be a liability concern.

Leach asks if the doors will be accessible. Williams says the building meets all ADA requirements, including an accessible mother's room. Leach asks how many mothers can fit into the mother's room. Williams says it is for single use. Leach suggests that they increase the capacity of the mother's room for those using the playground. Williams says this building is for rentals and events and will not be used by people visiting the playground. Leach asks if playground users can use the bathrooms in the building. Williams says no. Moss asks if they are providing other bathrooms for the park. Adiutori says they are following current operational processes by providing portable toilets. Cas Pellegrini of DPW says that the building and the surrounding playground do not operate as one unit, and they restrict rentals to the building so that the public can always access the playground.

Leach asks if handicapped accessibility is from the street or only from the parking lot. Williams says it is from the parking lot, because the steepness of the hills make the sidewalks inaccessible. She says there is accessible parking at the playground level and at the building.

Goulatia asks about the blue color in the renderings of the playground(?) and if that reflects the materials to be used. Ketzel says it is just the rendering, but those materials will be updated for the Final Review. Goulatia asks if there is an opportunity for an artist to design the surface. Ketzel says on the basketball court they can, but on the playground safety surfacing it would present a maintenance issue. Goulatia says this could be done on the terrace as well. Young agrees.

Pellegrini says that they have had an initial meeting with the Public Art & Civic Design Division about the Percent For Art project, and that they are determining whether the budget for the Percent For Art for the site itself should be different than the budget for the building. He says they'd like to bring an artist in to respond to the site plans as opposed to prescribing where the art should go.

Leach says that there is a similar building to this at the West End Overlook. She says the proposed building doesn't reflect the history of the Hill District. Pellegrini says that the art is undetermined at this point but they will be bringing the community in to gain their insights. Goulatia says if they are considering different budgets for the art, they should go with the higher budget. Moss says that the question is more whether to do a combined project or separate ones for the site and building. Pellegrini says they are looking for the Commission's guidance. Moss says that the Commission is not in the position to guide them as to how to incorporate the artwork, but he wishes their process had already been started so that

the art could be part of the Conceptual Review. Moss says their preference is that art be incorporated into the design and not added on afterwards.

Leach asks if it would be possible to have an image of Robert E. Williams on the front door.

Arbie Bankston speaks as a community member of the Upper Hill. He says that the community wants the roof to be functional and to use it as a space to watch their children in the playground; that they would like the playground and basketball court stay in the original locations, with green space on the hill behind them; and that they would like retaining walls, fencing, and steps to be minimized. He says the community would prefer the building to be usable year-round, including bathrooms accessible from outside. He says that the community voted to use the name "Schenley Heights Pavilion". He says that they would like to commemorate Robert E. Williams in some way, perhaps with art.

Quintanilla says that he understands that the topography of the City creates difficulties for people with mobility issues, but it seems like there is something wrong with a neighborhood park that has to be driven to. He says there could be a series of ramps to get to the roof.

Moss says that a ramp connecting the building to the play areas could have been incorporated. Parsakian says that the Port Authority creates ramps for its accessible hillsides, so it could be done. Quintanilla says that some people are able to deal with some steeper topography but steps could present a problem. Pellegrini agrees that they do not want to separate people with disabilities, and they have attempted to incorporate universal design as best they could, but the site is so steep that it presents significant challenges. He says the previous design did not address the needs of people with disabilities. Pellegrini says that in previous years, parking was not provided in parks at all.

Quintanilla says that parents with strollers and people with bikes would have a hard time getting to the top. Pellegrini says that they have not avoided the issue of people with disabilities, and they are still in the early stages of site design. He says they have considered a ramp coming up from the entrance at Adelaide St. He says they are pushing the limits of their budget but hopefully additional funds will come in to improve accessibility.

Leach says she used to live on Adelaide St and a ramp would be a good idea. She says its important to raise that extra money, and all residents should have access to this park. Pellegrini says they will make every effort they can.

Goulatia asks why there can't be a ramp next to the steps. Moss says it would be possible. Moss asks if landscaping is being designed for this project. Ketzal says she is the landscape architect and there is a civil engineer. She says they can't implement a lot of plant material due to maintenance issues but they will be planting some trees for shade. Moss asks how the deep depression for storm water will be planted. Ketzal says that hasn't been planned yet, but ideally they would have an agreement with PWSA which would allow them to create more of a storm water facility.

Moss says that Wightman Park came to them previously as a very well-integrated design, and that this project is very different. Ketzal says that park had a much higher budget, and PWSA was a funder for that project due to its prioritization of storm water management.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval, with further attention to be given to the design of the roofscape, the integration of art, the landscape details, and the accessibility throughout the site including the bathrooms.

MOVED BY: Moss

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

3. Oliver Bath House – Department of Public Works Conceptual/Final Review

Joe Adiutori Jr of DPW introduces the project, which is a partial renovation of the historic Oliver Bath House, including masonry, windows, fixtures, roofing, and mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems.

Elijah Dolly of Buchart Horn gives the presentation for this project. Chris Urban, also of Buchart Horn, and Bill Brennan, historic preservation specialist, are present as well. A Percent For Art project has been preliminarily discussed between DPW and PACD, but the applicants are concerned that locations for it are limited and that it will compete with the historic fabric of the building. Dolly points out several locations where art could be considered, but requests that the Percent For Art be used at another site so as not to compromise the historic integrity of the building.

Moss confirms that they have provided possible sites for artwork, but that their preference is not to include it for this project. Dolly says that is their recommendation, but they didn't want to come without options. Brennan says they are seeking the Commission's input on this.

Quintanilla agrees that the building is itself a piece of art and something shouldn't be forced on it, but he says there are ways to use art in other manners, such as planters. Moss agrees and encourages the project to use the Percent For Art on site. He gives the example of the metal railing outside of the building and says he is sure there are other opportunities to include art without compromising the architectural integrity. Goulatia cites the Louvre as an example of how it could be done well. She says a mural wouldn't be a good idea but suggests something complementary on the wall facing the hotel.

Parsakian agrees that the railing is a possibility. He says the building has a lot of history and that he is very grateful it is being restored.

Leach asks if there is a reason that they want to use the Percent For Art elsewhere, and asks where it would then be used. Dolly says they do not want to distract from the historic character, and that the existing options for artwork are not highly visible. He says they have discussed the railing but since it is always viewed with the rest of the façade they did not consider it a good option. Leach asks where they would use the Percent For Art if not here. Dolly says they do not have a site selected, but they thought the funds could be better used somewhere else. Brennan says their concern with the railing was that it would distract from the façade. Leach says it seems like they think art is a detraction. Brennan says the building is art, and putting something in front of it would detract from both. Leach and Moss disagree. Leach says she is not sure if the building is art, but that an artist would be capable of producing artwork that complements the building.

Quintanilla says small interventions may be a solution. Dolly says that they have discussed options like the railing and the lanterns that will be created by artisans, but that artists need to have a certain amount of leeway that they feel has ruled out artists working here.

Goulatia disagrees and says that she thinks there is always a way to incorporate art in a way that doesn't compete with the building.

Leach says art shouldn't be forced on something but that artists are sensitive enough to be able to incorporate it.

Moss says that artist-designed lanterns are a possibility, but if they are meant to closely replicate the historic image then it is not an appropriate use for the Percent For Art.

Parsakian asks if they intend to remove the railing. Dolly says it will be replaced in some way. Parsakian says it could be artist-designed in a subtle way so as not to distract. Dolly says yes, but that everything they do on this building has to be approved by both the State Historic Preservation Office and the Historic Review Commission. Leach asks if the railing was originally part of the design. Dolly says no. Leach asks why it needs to be incorporated. Brennan says the sidewalk is narrow and it is for safety.

Goulatia suggests bike racks for the art project. Dolly says they have discussed this, and if they were included they would be best on Bingham St, because 10th St is very narrow. He says they have talked to the City and they do not see a lot of bike traffic at this location.

Moss says he is concerned with setting a precedent to push the Percent For Art to other sites. He says the art could be done in small iterations as they all seem to be in agreement that they do not want the art to compromise the integrity of the facade. Goulatia agrees and cites the examples of the dandelions near the Brewhouse, or suggests manhole covers.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with consideration given to how to use the Percent For Art as an integral part of the project.

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

4. DPW 4th Division Facility & Campus – Department of Public Works Final Review

Calli Baker of DPW describes the project. It is for a new maintenance facility and supporting assets to serve DPW's 4th Division. The project will include a new building, landscaping and stormwater management features, traffic pattern changes, an outdoor material storage area, parking areas, a pedestrian-friendly pathway, and yard debris drop-off area. The project previously received Conceptual Art Commission Approval in April 2021(?), and a Percent For Art project is being planned.

Moss says that the changes made to the pedestrian path appear to be an improvement.

Parsakian suggests that the public art project have something to do with lighting.

Quintanilla says that lighting is a critical component to the pathway to make it seem inviting.

MOTION: Final Approval

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

5. Olympia Park Shelter House – Department of Public Works Conceptual/Final Review

Calli Baker of DPW presents this proposal for the partial demolition and rebuild of the multi-purpose park building, including exterior doors, paint, and two possible options for windows. A Percent For Art project is being preliminarily discussed.

Moss says he is pleased the City is working to keep and restore this building. He states that the larger windows are preferable but the construction cost challenges are understandable.

Leach asks how free they can be with the paint color when restoring historic places. Baker says this building is not a designated historic structure so they have some leeway. She says that the original photos they have are black and white, but you can tell that the paint is light in color. She says they are trying to keep the color subtle and complementary to the brick. Leach says Pittsburgh can look very grey during the day and asks if they can't have a different color, like turquoise. Moss says there are no restrictions on the color they can paint it. Baker says the building renovation will happen before the park redesign, but that they wanted to it to fit within the context of the park Master Plan.

Moss says the roof is quite prominent when approaching the building, and asks about the exhaust fans. Baker says that most have been removed and they are still finishing the HVAC design, but currently there only needs to be one or two vents on the roof. Moss asks if there will be a new roof. Baker says there is already a new roof on the building as of a couple of years ago.

Goulatia asks how much the cost difference is between the small and large windows. She asks if the Percent For Art budget would compensate for the windows. Baker says she does not know and they are still working on costs from the contractors.

Parsakian says he is a fan of Arts and Crafts buildings and says they take their colors from nature, so turquoise may not be appropriate. He understands wanting to bring more color to the city, but in this case he would want a restoration that keeps the original architect's intent. He asks about the railings, and Baker says that the railings along the steps will be repaired but kept as is. Parsakian asks if that would be an opportunity for Percent For Art. He asks about the railing on the deck, and Baker says it would be a mix of wood and composite to keep it as simple as possible. Parsakian says it should not look like something too new on the building that doesn't belong.

Leach asks if there is a way to keep the windows full size. Baker says that the large windows are preferred but it will depend on cost. Parsakian says the small and large options are hard to discuss without knowing the cost difference.

Moss says the Commission has a clear preference for the larger window option and reiterates the need to keep the back deck from looking too new and out of place. He asks that the detailing for the deck be brought to staff for a final review.

Moss asks if Option A (larger windows) would require a smaller amount of masonry work. Baker says Option B (smaller windows) would take less masonry work. Leach asks if the windows need to be done now. Baker says yes, as part of the full scope of work. Leach asks what the lighting is like inside the building. Baker says that Option B would still give more lighting than there currently is, as they are opening up some previously blocked openings. The interior lighting is still being designed.

Parsakian asks about the construction timeline, and Baker says they are hoping to begin before the end of the year and finish in the spring.

Moss says putting in the full size windows would make a substantial difference to the building. Baker shows the original full size window openings from 1912. Goulatia says if you don't do justice to the restoration then it is pointless.

MOTION: Final Approval, using Window Option A as presented, with the Percent For Art project to return to a future hearing.

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

6. Highland Park Super Playground – Department of Public Works Final Review

Andrea Ketzel of DPW presents the design revisions for the playground equipment for this project and the community engagement strategy they have been employing, which included a series of storybook readings for children. The full project is a renovation of the existing playground and includes the replacement of all play structures, play surfacing, and the addition of new site improvements including site furniture, entrance, and landscaping. In June 2021, the project received Conceptual/Final Approval of the site plan for the Highland Park Super Playground, with the exception of the playground equipment, which should be thematically reconsidered and return to a future hearing.

Goulatia thanks Ketzel for the changes made. She asks if the slides will be grey or if they can be colored. Ketzel says they are aluminum, and could be colored if plastic. She says testing showed aluminum gets less hot than the plastic.

Leach thanks Ketzel and says she loves the colors and the addition of sea creatures. Goulatia asks if there can be QR codes in the park to access the storybooks. Leach asks about the climbing features on the boats, and Ketzel explains the climbing features and the transfer station that will allow children with disabilities to access the higher levels.

Goulatia asks if the shade sail could have color. Ketzel says they would have to look into it but she assumes they can be colored. Parsakian asks if they can incorporate an experience in the playground for blind children. He says he is concerned there are not enough benches. Ketzel says they hear the need for seating a lot from parents. She is unsure of the exact number of benches to be included but can be sure to take a look at that aspect of the project.

Goulatia asks if there could be a button to play audio books. Ketzel says they can talk to their accessibility consultant. Parsakian suggests they visit the School for the Blind in Oakland to see how they address accessibility.

Goulatia mentions musical instruments that she saw as part of a public park in Copenhagen as a way for visually challenged people to engage with playgrounds.

MOTION: Final Approval, with the consideration of adding extra benches

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

C. Correspondence

None.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert discusses the Cantini Mosaic Reconceptualization Project and says that they will be holding a public meeting on August 2 to gather public comments. She gives a brief overview of the project.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:07 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

August 25, 2021 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by President Moss

In Attendance

Moss
Parsakian
Quintanilla
Young
Hornstein (DPW)
Lucas

Staff Present

Dash (agenda items 2-6)
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Roof Restoration Project	1-2
2. Esser Plaza	2-3
3. Chartiers Spray Park	3
4. Fifth & Dinwiddie Pedestrian Bridge	4
5. Emerald View Park Master Plan	5-6

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from July 2021. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Quintanilla. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Roof Restoration Project – Phipps Conservatory
Conceptual/Final Review**

Brad Clauss of Phipps Conservatory gives the presentation for this project, which is for the restoration of the glazing systems in the Broderie and East Rooms of the Conservatory. This includes the fitting of each room with modern safety glass and refurbishment of the ribbed support structures.

Moss thanks him for the presentation and says that Phipps has done a great job with this facility. He says that for Final Approval they normally ask for greater detail of the construction, but that he has great trust in what Phipps is doing based on previous work and he assumes this is nearly identical work to what was done in their West Wing. Clauss says yes, it is the same work specifications.

Young asks if there is any consideration for place making during the construction period. Clauss says that what is housed in these rooms is easily transferred to other spaces, and this has been their approach through past renovations.

Quintanilla says they are doing fantastic work. He asks if the new LED lighting they've installed will be continued into other rooms. Clauss says that some portions of the old conservatory have been migrated to LED, but it is hard work to coordinate. He says they have received a grant and by the time the restoration work is complete, all their rooms will be converted.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

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

**2. Esser Plaza – South Side Community Council
Conceptual Review**

Kitty Vagley of South Side Community Council gives the presentation for this project, which is for the renovation of Esser Plaza at East Carson Street and 12th Street, and includes new pavers, lights, benches, planters, and landscaping.

Parsakian says he knows the history of the plaza and worked with the artist of the adjacent mural. He asks if they are doing restoration of the mural. Vagley says they are not yet, as the building has changed ownership and the new owner has not been cooperative, and there are no legal agreements relating to the mural. Parsakian asks if they are relocating the adjacent bike station. Vagley says they are not sure. Parsakian encourages Vagley to look at Victorian ideas for the signage because of the historic nature of Carson Street's buildings.

Quintanilla says his concern in small spaces like this is to make sure not to create a transitional space. He says that the existing design has a central area, but the proposed design becomes more of a transitional space. He asks if this was intentional. Vagley says that one area of the pavers is designed to be a bandstand area for live performance. She says it is their intent for the plaza to be a community gathering spot, but they want it to be open in the style of European squares. Quintanilla says he understands the intent but their design creates spaces for moving through and does not create internal space.

Lucas asks if they have considered the accessibility of the materials used. Vagley says that all of the pavers were selected in consideration of safety and traction. Lucas says that a lot of texture on pavers may be uncomfortable to those in wheelchairs or strollers. Lucas says that it would be good if they can maximize permeable surfaces to control storm water. She also says that the bike share station may change its format but will likely be staying in that location.

Moss notes that from the plans it looks like the more textured pavers are relatively limited in their use in the design. He says that someone with a stroller has the option of going around the perimeter where it is smoother but if they cross diagonally they will go across more textured pavers.

Parsakian asks if it would make more sense to relocate the stage area to a different corner. He asks if a bordering street is accessible to traffic. Vagley says yes. He says that bands would prefer to unload their equipment there than on Carson Street. He asks if the stage will be elevated. Vagley says it was just a suggestion for a performance space, and would probably be no more than ten times a year. Parsakian says they should think more about bringing life to the plaza through performing arts. Vagley says they are committed to doing that.

Quintanilla says Carson Street is very noisy so they could think about mitigating the sound that comes from the street into the plaza through landscaping or some other means. Vagley says it would be a big ask as that is a very noisy street.

Moss says the project is here for Conceptual Review but they could move it forward as Conceptual/Final if they choose.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval, with the design concepts to be revisited according to the comments of the Commissioners, and the signage returning as a separate review.

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

3. Chartiers Spray Park – Department of Public Works Conceptual/Final Review

Andrea Ketzel of the Department of Public Works introduces the project, which is for the renovation project including the replacement of all play structures, spray features, and play surfacing, as well as upgraded signage, picnic tables, benches, and waste receptacles. Bryan Hanes of Studio Bryan Hanes gives the presentation outlining the design details.

Moss asks for more details about the Percent For Art component. Ketzel says that it is intended for the splash pad, like Paulson Spray Park. Moss asks if there is any work to be done on the existing structures. Hanes says that there will not be anything done to the structures but the equipment for the water features will be placed inside the concession stand building. Ketzel says that there may be some cosmetic improvements to the pavilion but that is not a part of the current scope of work.

Parsakian asks about the materials for the benches and picnic tables and how many of them there are. Hanes says they are using the City standard benches and tables. He says there are four new benches around the upper play area and two picnic tables in the existing pavilion. He says that the splash pad will be concrete, the path will be asphalt, the play surface is poured-in-place, and there are concrete steps. Parsakian asks if the poured-in-place is recycled rubber, and Hanes says yes. Parsakian says it is important to have as many benches as possible.

Lucas asks how people will enter the area and asks about parking and transit shelter options. Ketzel says they have a proposed accessible parking spot. She does not know about the closest bus stop and says they can work with DOMI on that. Ketzel says they have not included bike racks but they can add those in.

Young asks if there was any consideration for asphalt art in regards to wayfinding throughout the park. Ketzel says they have not released the RFP yet for the public art and they could consider that.

Parsakian asks if the park will be open at certain hours and whether lighting is required. Ketzel says lighting is not required and they unfortunately do not usually have the budget for it. She says park hours are dawn to dusk and that there will be no lighting associated with the playground.

Quintanilla says he assumes that parallel parking would be out of the question. Ketzel says that their scope of work is limited to the playground and spray park. She says that most users of the park are walking from nearby, but they have heard from the community that parking for football is an issue. She says that they are meeting the requirements of their scope by providing an ADA-accessible spot and do not have the budget required to address parking for the entire park. Hanes clarifies that there will be two accessible parking spots.

Quintanilla says that having artwork on the splash pad will add a new dimension to it in a great way.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the Percent For Art project returning as a separate review.

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

4. Fifth & Dinwiddie Pedestrian Bridge – GBBN Architects Conceptual/Final Review

Quintanilla recuses himself from reviewing this project due to a possible conflict of interest.

Amanda Markovic of GBBN Architects introduces the project, which is for a pedestrian bridge over the public right-of-way as part of a large mixed-use development. Stephen Mrdjenovich of GBBN Architects gives the presentation.

Moss asks about the width of Our Way, the alley that the pedestrian bridge passes over. Markovic says that the roadway is currently 15 feet wide, and will be increased to 20 feet. Mrdjenovich says that building to building it is 48-49 feet.

Derek Tillman, the property owner, describes the programming of the site.

Moss asks where the community events would be taking place. Mrdjenovich says that the road would be closed temporarily during events to create pedestrian space.

Moss says it looks like a good and thoughtful addition to the neighborhood and the public space.

Parsakian asks if the roof of the bridge is accessible. Mrdjenovich says only for maintenance, not for the public. He shows in the presentation where the building includes a roof that the public can access. Lucas asks if this is space for the public or for tenants. Mrdjenovich says that rooftop area is for tenants, but they want the rest of the outdoor space to feel open and welcoming to the public.

Parsakian asks if they will have electric lighting for the outdoor events. Mrdjenovich says there will be exterior power receptacles, as well as public wi-fi in both plazas. Parsakian asks if there will be street furniture. Mrdjenovich describes the stadium seating benches, as well as café tables and children's seating in various areas.

Parsakian says he is familiar with Charlotte and Mo and is glad they are engaging them as artists. Mrdjenovich says they are also engaging with Pittsburgh Glass Center.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

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

5. Emerald View Park Master Plan – Department of City Planning Courtesy Review

Moss confirms that this project is coming to the Commission for Courtesy Review because it is a Master Plan and there is no physical construction proposed. Kara Smith of the Department of City Planning says yes, and any implementations would come to Art Commission for Conceptual and Final Reviews.

Smith gives the presentation of the Master Plan for Emerald View Park. The Master Plan is meant to communicate the community's vision, outline goals, and guide planning for future park implementations.

Parsakian asks if the plan addresses the history of indigenous peoples on the land of the park, and why it is called Emerald View Park. Smith says the Master Plan includes a timeline that includes Native American history, although they do not have a lot of information about it. She says it also discusses the industrial history of the area. She says that 'Emerald View Park' is a recent name created from community input.

Parsakian asks if any of the trails are Native American trails. Smith says not that they are able to say with certainty. Parsakian says that it would be a good acknowledgment to find that history.

Quintanilla says it is a fun project and says there is a lot of history that could be explored. Smith agrees and says that there is a lot more of the history included in the Master Plan. Quintanilla suggests using virtual reality.

MOTION: n/a

C. Correspondence

None.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert says that they currently have a call out for artists for the Homewood Park Public Art project.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:19 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

September 22, 2021 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by President Moss

In Attendance

Moss
Goulatia
Parsakian
Quintanilla
Young
Hornstein (DPW)
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Esser Plaza	1-2
2. Allegheny Landing	2-3
3. Brookline Community Mural	3-4
4. Brookline Gateway Sign	4
5. Carnegie Library Banners	5
6. Medic 4	5-6
7. Fire Station 8	6-7
8. Stephen Foster Loan	7-8

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from August 2021. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Esser Plaza – South Side Community Council
Final Review**

Mike Clark of SSCC describes this project, which is for the renovation of Esser Plaza, including new pavers, lighting benches, planters, and landscaping. The project received Conceptual Approval in August 2021.

Parsakian asks if the project will come back for approval of the artistic sign. Clark says yes, as they have not had the sign designed yet. He also says that a portion of their funding relies on the approval today.

Quintanilla asks if he is correct in saying that the design and materials haven't changed since the last hearing, but that the materials have met ADA standards and the neighbors have approved any noise

mitigation. Clark says that the design has changed and shows this in the presentation. He says they have adjusted the use of materials based on feedback from the last hearing, although all materials had previously met ADA standards.

Quintanilla says that pavement treatments can still be difficult for some people to cross even if they meet ADA standards and this was the Commission's concern. He says that he used to live in Europe and European plazas are very minimalistic in terms of pavement details and furnishings. Clark says that the material being used for the pavement that crosses the plaza is very smooth with minimal joints. He says that other areas use bricks that will be reused from the current plaza. The whole design is the result of a three year process with the community.

Moss confirms that the design from the previous hearing had brickwork breaking up the central path through the plaza, and in the revised design it is now smooth concrete. Clark says that is correct.

MOTION: Final Approval

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

2. Allegheny Landing – Riverlife Conceptual Review

Dan McDowell of LaQuatra Bonci and Anna Leisher of Riverlife present this project, which is for a renovation plan for Allegheny Landing Park. The plan creates new accessible connections between the waterfront and the upper plaza and increases the overall programmable space.

Moss compliments Riverlife on the project. He asks about the number of sculptures on the property, which he thought was five but which was presented here as four. Leisher says that the Smythe sculpture is in two places but is considered to be one piece. Moss asks about the bike trail which goes through the property and how that is being taken into account. Leisher says they are looking into options for improved bike access through the site and are planning workshops to address this. Lucas asks that DOMI be included in those workshops. McDowell says that the various options for bike access will not change the overall plan design presented today.

Moss asks about the relocation of the Sugarman sculpture. McDowell says it will be shifted by about ten to twelve feet. He says that this will improve park connections and they are working with the Carnegie Museum and the artist's family on this location shift.

Hornstein thanks the applicants and gives DPW's support for the application.

Goulatia commends them on the project. She asks if the Sugarman sculptures will be reoriented. McDowell says it is the same setting but tightening the amount of space between the pieces. Goulatia says that this will have to be approved by the artist's family. McDowell says that if it is agreed to, the tightening of the space around the artwork could make the area more accessible. He says that the sculptures were originally meant to be installed within a smaller space than they are currently, so this plan would actually get them closer to the original intent.

Quintanilla notes that the axis of the lawn is perpendicular to Isabella Street but does not line up with the view of the City. McDowell says it is lined up with the center point of the Smythe sculpture. Quintanilla asks if the plinth seating is part of the new plans. McDowell says yes. Quintanilla asks why they are aligned as they are and not centered on the City. McDowell says that it is in keeping consistent with the existing layout of the park, as changing the grading would be difficult. Quintanilla asks if they have reached out to the neighboring buildings to activate the space. Leisher says that Riverlife is a tenant of one of the buildings and is in regular communication with the owners of the buildings. McDowell says that the walls and shrubs have disconnected the upper space from the lower and they are building connections into the new plans that will provide possibilities for activation of both spaces. Quintanilla asks

if the stage will be in the circle by the river. McDowell says that is a piece of art, but the staging will be in that general area. Quintanilla says that bikers will need to be able to get through. Leisher says that stages have been set up in that area near the river in the past, but another possible location for a stage will be the western lawn.

Moss asks if the scope includes repairing the tile work of the Smythe piece. McDowell says this was done in 2016.

Parsakian says he walks through this space often and is glad they are opening up the upper terrace. He asks what the grade of the lawn is. McDowell says the slope is five or six to one, and that is not supposed to be changed.

Quintanilla clarifies aspects of the scope of work, including removing trees. McDowell says many trees there are in bad condition. Quintanilla asks if there will be shading for the seating areas. McDowell says that there was a concern about keeping the viewsheds open. Quintanilla says that if the areas are exposed to the sun they will not be very inviting. Moss says there is a lot of seating in the upper terrace with shade. Leisher says they had higher vegetation in previous versions of this design but it was removed to retain the views, and they are working toward a balance of comfort and visibility.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

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

3. Brookline Community Mural – Brookline Together Conceptual Review

Caitlin McNulty of Brookline Together presents this project, which is for a mural in Brookline Memorial Park. The wall is on a structure containing recently renovated bathrooms and concession stands, and faces the Dek hockey rink. The conceptual design for the mural is by Engelhardt Designs.

Parsakian asks if only a section of the wall will contain the mural. McNulty says that the original plan was for the mural to take up the entire wall, but they decided to focus on one section because of the maintenance involved, and to leave the other areas free to be usable for banners and signs related to games at the field. Parsakian asks how big the mural will be. McNulty says it will span twenty feet. Goulatia asks how big the mural will be and where it will be placed. McNulty shows where it will be placed and says it will be twenty feet long by fifteen feet high.

Goulatia says she loves the idea of the mural but is disappointed that it will not take up the whole wall. She asks if there is an artist involved. McNulty says Engelhardt Designs would create the design for the mural. She says the plan is to paint the rest of the wall in corresponding colors, but not to install the mural on the entire wall as it is broken up by doorways. She says the space is heavily used by sports teams and they would like to hang brackets for banners on the other walls. Goulatia asks if the doorways are used. McNulty says yes. Goulatia says they should work with the artist to design the doors and other walls to make it cohesive with the mural. McNulty says they have discussed incorporating some elements of the mural onto other areas of the wall. Goulatia says the artist should be consulted for this.

Moss says that he was under the impression that the presented image was not the final design. McNulty says that is correct.

Lucas says that the bike racks in front of the wall are not very attractive or functional and there could be an opportunity for better bike racks. Parsakian asks if DPW will repair the whole wall. McNulty says they will address the whole wall. Parsakian notes that some cinderblocks on the wall do not match and should be painted to blend in. McNulty says that was from a previous repair. Parsakian says that the mural should address the entire wall.

Young says there are creative ways to work with the artist to expand the mural to the whole wall. She suggests that other elements such as tables or garbage cans could be incorporated into the overall design.

Quintanilla says the idea is fantastic and will really add to the park. He asks if there is any possibility for lighting. McNulty says there are lights above the wall as well as off of the Dek hockey rink, so the area is fairly well-lit, but they can look into it further to see if there can be any additional lighting. He says that painting the bike racks could tie it all together, as well as painting the doors.

Goulatia suggests looking at the mural that Young recently completed as well as a mural at Bob O'Connor Plaza in Squirrel Hill.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

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

4. Brookline Gateway Sign – Brookline Together Conceptual/Final Review

Caitlin McNulty of Brookline Together presents this replacement of a neighborhood gateway sign. The existing sign has been in place for nearly 30 years. She says that the funding for this project must be expended by the end of October.

Goulatia asks what the material of the original sign is. McNulty says it is a stone base with a metal sign, and the front has a resin cast. Goulatia says the proposed vinyl sign looks cheap and the current sign has much more presence. She asks if the current sign can be restored. McNulty says the funding could be used to restore the sign. She agrees that the current sign has more presence. She says that they are not able to move the current sign due to the electrical box, but could change the landscaping.

Moss agrees that the proposed sign is disappointing. He asks about the proposed lighting. McNulty says that new lights are needed on the ground level regardless of whether the old sign is kept or a new sign installed.

Parsakian says the new sign is an uninspired design, and wishes that more attention was paid to the idea of welcoming people to a community. He says it looks like a 'For Sale' sign. McNulty says she agrees and hopes that the Commission does not pass this motion. Parsakian asks for clarification about the electrical box. McNulty says it is attached to the back of the current sign and provides electricity to the site. Parsakian asks if they can run a conduit to new lighting fixtures. McNulty says they can. Parsakian says that the sign is too far back. McNulty says it is currently a bit difficult to see, and the funding could be used to clear back the brush and re-landscape to improve visibility.

Goulatia asks if there is a way to restore the current sign. Moss says they could build a new frame and reuse the existing sign face. McNulty says this is correct. Goulatia suggests that is what the funds should be used for. Parsakian asks about the texture, and McNulty says it is resin.

Moss says that if the motion today is denied and the current sign would instead be repaired, this would not need Art Commission approval; however if a new sign was proposed then it would require another review.

MOTION: Denial

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

5. Carnegie Library Banners – Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh Conceptual Review

Sergei Matveiev of Elagin Architecture and Mike Cerce of Carnegie Library present this proposal for pole banners mounted on 8 lamp posts next to Carnegie Library. Banners will be programmed to coincide with library events and will be changed periodically.

Moss clarifies that the banners will be at a height of fourteen feet, and Matveiev says yes.

Goulatia asks if the banners are printed yet. Cerce says no. Goulatia comments on one of the fonts and says that it does not go with the image. Cerce says that font is the branded typeface for the library, so they would not want to change the font, but they may be able to adjust the contrast. Goulatia asks if the banners could switch, so that all the banners of one kind are not on the same side of the street. Cerce says there are many opportunities to diversify the design if that is the concern. Goulatia says she means alternating the banners. Cerce says yes they can do that.

Quintanilla thanks the library for what they do. He asks if the banners can be bigger or longer since the library is so important. Cerce says they might not want to go wider than two feet so as not to be hit by passing trucks, but they are open to a longer length. Matveiev says that the sign companies have a standard template, and there are also questions about what the handle hardware can support. Quintanilla says since the building is so grand, the banners should also be.

Parsakian asks if the same historic image will be used on every banner. Cerce says this image has been used at all seventeen library locations. Parsakian says the font hides the majority of the building in the image. Matveiev says the image is the original building, not the current one. Cerce says they wanted an image from the original 1895 building and there are not many images from that era.

Young asked if they considered using artwork from the “125” cards commissioned by artists in designing these banners. Cerce says they considered this and they are using that artwork in other ways into the future.

Moss notes that the application says Conceptual/Final, but they are on the agenda for Conceptual. Matveiev says they changed this because their Development Activities Meeting is still outstanding. Moss says he would not have an issue with this application proceeding as Conceptual/Final provided that they fulfill that community obligation. Parsakian, Young, and Goulatia say that they agree.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the condition that the required Development Activities Meeting is held.

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

6. Medic 4 – Department of Public Works Conceptual Review

Claire Mastroberardino of DPW and Roberto Vega Peralta of AE7 give the presentation for this project, which is for a new one-story structure on the corner of Lafayette and Federal Street Extension. It will house EMS operations and garage space for four ambulances. The building will utilize Passive House strategies.

Moss says it is a nice design for the building. He says the neighborhood sign seems like a separate project and asks if they are proposing to use the Percent For Art funds for the new neighborhood sign. Mastroberardino says yes, that the new building will displace the previous sign and a new sign is something the community had asked about. Moss suggests that the Percent For Art could be used in a

way that is more integrated to the building and the sign could be addressed separately. He says that the wall which contains the large “4” could potentially be a site for artwork. Mastroberardino says that is a good idea. Peralta agrees and says the only issue with that wall is the visibility, as the sign location is at a more visible spot. Moss says that the wall could be treated as its own artistic intervention apart from signage. Peralta and Mastroberardino say this could be a good idea.

Moss asks if, considering the slope of the ground, if it would be easy for someone to jump onto the roof of this building. Peralta says that what is shown is the current topography and they are working with Langan Civil Engineering to reduce the slope.

Parsakian asks if there is any landscaping or green space included in the plan. Mastroberardino says that there will be low-maintenance landscape around the building. Peralta says that an earlier plan idea was to include low-retention soil to capture rainwater. Parsakian asks if the building will qualify for Net Zero. Mastroberardino says yes.

Quintanilla says that instead of the signage they could create an art piece that engages more with the community, utilizing the landscape area on the corner. Mastroberardino says she will bring that up with the community next week.

Parsakian says that the wall that contains the “4” would be an exciting opportunity for artists.

Quintanilla reiterates his suggestion that the art utilize the landscaped area on the corner in a way that engages the community, or as another idea some kind of art that hides the parking from the street. Mastroberardino says that the community was glad they moved the parking to a less visible area, and was interested in lighting that brightened up the space as well.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

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

7. Fire Station 8 – Department of Public Works Conceptual Review

Claire Mastroberardino of DPW and Roberto Vega Peralta of AE7 present this proposal for the renovation of the existing building using an inside-out retrofit to retain the historic limestone facades. The current proposal represents a redirection of strategies to address Commission and public concerns from previous hearings. A Percent For Art project is conceptually proposed as a multi-part sculptural installation and will be presented separately to Commission for review/approval.

Moss thanks Mastroberardino for the reconsideration of this project after previous Commissioner comments, and says it is a tremendous improvement to the approach. Mastroberardino says they are working with great architects. Moss asks if the project team changed. Mastroberardino says no, that AE7 had been brought on board as the interior architects and they expanded their scope to encompass the fenestrations and additional designs.

Moss says that the art piece that runs up through the building as a vertical element is an intriguing idea and he is interested to see how it materializes. He asks if the light wells are spaces that can be occupied. Mastroberardino says that there will be floors in the light wells and one will be a communicating area between the firefighter’s bunk and the first floor. She says they will each be well lit with a skylight.

Quintanilla says they have done a great job. He says it is always a struggle to incorporate modern needs into older buildings but is glad they were able to figure it out.

Parsakian congratulates them on finding a creative way to solve this problem. He asks if they will be coming back once they finalize the window replacement. Mastroberardino says yes. He asks if they will come back about the art piece. Mastroberardino says yes.

Goulatia commends them on thinking the project through. She asks if the light wells are plain glass. Mastroberardino says it is brick in the interior with windows in it. Goulatia asks what is on the roof of the light well. Mastroberardino says they are open now but they will be covering them with passive house energy-efficient skylights. Goulatia asks if this is the natural light that will go into the building. Mastroberardino says yes, and they are adding some windows as well. Goulatia says a light installation could be fantastic in the light wells. Mastroberardino says the new dark sky ordinance may not allow that. Goulatia says that the art piece sounds exciting. Peralta says that the concept is community based and represents a moment of healing. Parsakian asks if they will ask the community for feedback on the art. Mastroberardino says yes. Goulatia asks if there is a plan for the RFP. Minnaert says they will work together to draft the language for the RFP and work within the City's solicitation process.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

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

8. Stephen Foster Loan – Department of City Planning Conceptual/Final Review

Sarah Minnaert of the Public Art & Civic Design Division of DCP proposes this loan of the Stephen Foster statue to exhibition organizer LAXART for a temporary exhibition at the Museum of Contemporary Art in 2023. The exhibition will place de-commissioned monuments alongside responsive contemporary artworks.

Moss asks how long the statue would be on loan. Minnaert says they do not have exact dates, but it would be temporary, with the exhibition lasting probably 3-6 months and added time for shipping and storage. Moss asks if there will be a legal agreement. Minnaert says yes, the Art Commission approval today will allow the City to move into loan negotiation and a legal agreement between LAXART and the City.

Quintanilla asks if they will need to protect the statue's platform from being exposed to the environment. Minnaert says that the exhibition will be indoors, but the exhibition organizers will be working with a company to ensure safe transport and setup. Quintanilla says he was talking about the pedestal. Minnaert says the sculpture is not presently installed outdoors, it is in City storage. Parsakian asks if they are taking only the statue or also the plinth. Minnaert says she does not know that but will find out as they move into the loan contract phase. Goulatia says the plinth is an important part of the work, and asks if it is still at Schenley Plaza. Parsakian says no, it is all in storage.

Chris Zurawsky speaks from the audience in favor of rejecting the loan request.

Chris Lynch of the Foster Memorial at the Center For American Music speaks from the audience in favor of approving the loan request.

Kathryn Miller Haines of the Center For American Music speaks from the audience in favor of approving the loan request.

Quintanilla asks if language about the correct contextualization of the statue's history needs to be added to the loan contract. Young says she was also thinking that.

Moss says that they had a special hearing a few years ago to specifically address the statue, and the Art Commission made the decision to have it removed. Moss says it may be worthwhile for them to ask that a statement from the Art Commission be included to give the point of view of the Commission and

why the statue was removed. Parsakian says he does not know the curator of this exhibition but expects they will be concerned with the history of the statue, and says he would love if the Commission's contextualization could be included along with the exhibition's description of the statue.

Minnaert mentions that there is a publication that will accompany the exhibition and so there should be multiple ways that a greater depth of detail around the sculpture's history can be included in the exhibition's discourse.

Goulatia says it would be wise to send a statement, and says she has no issues with the loan of the statue as long as they take care of it.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the condition that a statement by the Commissioners be included in the exhibition materials.

MOVED BY: Parsakian

SECONDED BY: Goulatia

IN FAVOR: Moss

OPPOSED: None

Moss asks if Minnaert should prepare the statement for the Commission to review. Minnaert says she can suggest a selection of documentation materials. Moss says it may be better for it to just be a paragraph or two that they have drafted. Minnaert agrees. Parsakian says one or two paragraphs would be easier for them to include in exhibition materials, and asks who should write it. The Commission discusses how to write the statement, and Minnaert suggests that someone from the LAXART curatorial team could have a conversation with the Commission. Parsakian says that is a good idea, and Minnaert says she will discuss this with the exhibition organizers. Goulatia says another approach would be for LAXART to send them the narrative they are working with and the Commission could give their thoughts on it. Parsakian says it should start with the Commission and could be done through email. Moss says that compiling the comments of the Commission from the previous two hearings would be helpful. Goulatia says that news articles would also be helpful. Parsakian says that the statement should be coming from them. Cavalline says he will gather those sources for them to review.

C. Correspondence

None.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert says there are no updates on the ongoing litigation around the Columbus statue. She says that PACD has been working with DPW to readdress the protective wrapping on the statue.

Minnaert says they will soon be moving into the artist selection phase for the Homewood Park Public Art RFP.

Minnaert says they currently have a call for artists open for a public art project at Chartiers Spray Park.

Minnaert brings forward the proposal for an over the counter review process to increase the efficiency of the Art Commission's reviews and approvals. She describes the projects that would be eligible for this review and states that all projects reviewed in this manner could be put into the next month's Art Commission staff report.

Moss says this is a good proposal, including the monthly summary. Parsakian agrees, and says it will save them a lot of time. Minnaert says it will be similar to processes used by other boards and commissions and they will try to communicate the process to applicants in a similar way as well. Goulatia says that there should always be transparency, and Minnaert says that the process will not be used to fast-track applications, but to use the Commission's expertise in the most efficient and focused ways. She says that the next step will be including some language in the Art Commission bylaws to reference the over the counter process. They discuss creating language to reference this process in the bylaws, which will be brought to the Commission to approve at next month's meeting. Goulatia says they had previously discussed changes to Chapter 175 of the City Code which did not go into effect. Minnaert says that the bylaws are the operating guide for the Commission, and can be updated much more easily. She says that there was language in the proposed draft of Chapter 175 which did not functionally align with how the City operates, specifically with regard to trust funds and how funding could be assigned. She says that due to the Code having been updated in pieces over time, the overall language of the Code is inconsistent and a meaningful change should revise the chapter holistically.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:09 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

October 27, 2021 at 3:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by Secretary Goulatia

In Attendance

Moss (agenda items 4-6)
Goulatia
Leach
Parsakian
Young (agenda items 1-4)
Hornstein (DPW)
Lucas (DOMI) (agenda items 5-6)

Staff Present

Dash (agenda items 2-6)
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Belasco T-Station Renovation	1-2
2. Three Rivers Stadium Informational Markers	2
3. Regional Parks Signage Update	2-3
4. Art in Parks: The Urban Conga	3-4
5. Art in Parks: Marlana Adele Vassar	4
6. Art in Parks: fAli Rufner & Gwen Sadler	5

A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Goulatia asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from September 2021. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Young. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Belasco T-Station Renovation – Port Authority of Allegheny County
Conceptual/Final Review**

Julio Hernandez of CDM Smith and John Binsse of Port Authority give the presentation for this project, which is for the renovation of the current inaccessible low-platform T stop into an accessible high-platform station.

Leach asks if there will be lighting. Hernandez says yes and describes the lighting on site. Leach asks if the canopies are steel and glass, and asks if artists can be involved in the design of the glass. Hernandez says that etched graphics on the glass are being considered.

Parsakian asks about a wheelchair area in the renderings and if it can be moved so as to not interfere with the steps. Hernandez says the locations have been switched in the final construction documents. Parsakian asks if there is a warning signal for approaching trains. Hernandez says there is a lighted

signal pole with sound. Parsakian asks if there is Braille on the signage. Hernandez says they have not addressed that yet but they will consider it moving forward.

Leach asks if the ticketing location will be the same as in the renderings. Hernandez says that area has been removed from the platform and located on the inbound side.

Goulatia asks if they will consider Braille for all projects or just this one. Hernandez says they will implement it into this project and look into it for future projects. Binsse says they already include Braille on any directional signage.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

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

**2. Three Rivers Stadium Informational Markers – Office of the Mayor
Conceptual/Final Review**

James Hill presents this presentation for three informational markers recognizing the original locations of the home plate, pitcher's mound, and second base of the former Three Rivers Stadium, as well as an explanatory sign.

Parsakian asks if there will be any recognition of the architects who designed Three Rivers Stadium. Hill says there were not plans for that but it is a good point. Parsakian asks if the plaque is two-sided or one-sided. Hill says it is one-sided as the back of it is a parking lot with a landscaped area around the edge. Parsakian asks if there will be Braille or a QR code to provide more background information. Hill says they will implement Braille and the QR code is a good idea.

Leach asks about the materials of the plaques. Hill says the plaques will be aluminum but will be set in blue stone. He says he doesn't think there is a specific reason that there are different colors of aluminum used. Leach asks why the explanatory sign will be in bronze and not aluminum. Hill says he is not sure but speculates that it is so that it is more impactful, and says he can get back to them on that if needed.

Goulatia agrees with Leach that the aluminum should be the same color, and asks if they can get more clarification on how the blue stone will appear. Hill says that the stone will be about an inch border set into the pavement around the plaques. Goulatia asks if the aluminum will get dented. Hill says not as far as he understands, because it will be lying flat.

Leach asks if the plaques are engraved or printed. Hill says engraved.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

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

**3. Regional Parks Signage Update – Office of the Mayor
Conceptual/Final Review**

Hill presents this update to the Regional Park Signage Standards to increase readability, reflect current branding systems, and recognize contributing organizations.

Parsakian asks if Braille or QR codes will be used. Hill says that he believes Braille is used in the trailer header signs, but not in the signs that hang at a taller height. He says that what they are proposing is re-skinning the existing signs, but if they are able to incorporate Braille they are happy to. He says it is his intention to put QR codes that link to the website.

MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval

MOVED BY: Leach
SECONDED BY: Young
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

**4. Art in Parks: The Urban Conga – Department of City Planning
Conceptual Review**

Sarah Minnaert of the Department of City Planning introduces the project, which is for the initial development of a public art project in Highland Park through the City's Art in Parks program. Ryan Swanson of The Urban Conga discusses the engagement and planning for this project as well as some proposed locations.

Parsakian says he appreciates the thoughtful community process. He notes that the proposed location on Mt. Bigelow is often used for community activities. Swanson says that the community conversation included discussion of how the artwork could be a part of activities that take place instead of a detraction.

Leach asks how they have engaged with the community and how they plan to in the future. Swanson explains the community engagement to date.

Goulatia asks if they can put art in all of the proposed locations. Swanson says it would be stretching the budget but they have thought about it. He says that those are the kind of conversations they plan to have now that these possible locations have been identified. Goulatia says that spreading it out could activate the space.

Parsakian notes that there is another Highland Park artist in the Art in Parks program and asks if that splits the fee. Minnaert says that the artists do not share a budget between them, but are each given a separate budget from the \$100,000 that was allocated to each park.

Young says she also appreciates the community engagement. She asks if there has been any consideration of the historical art pieces in the park. Swanson says that they were surprised that this subject did not come up often in the community engagements, and says there was more focus on responsive, educational, and playful art that allows the community to assert their voices.

Goulatia asks if there could be a conflict with there being more than one artist looking at Highland Park locations. Minnaert says that The Urban Conga and the other Highland Park artist, Marlena Vassar, have been in communication with each other from the beginning. Swanson says that from their conversations so far they are looking at different spaces in the park.

Leach says that community engagement can mean different things and asks who they are actually engaging with and how they can ensure that all neighboring communities are engaged. Swanson says they are trying to be as inclusive as possible and reach out to many organizations as Highland Park is a regional park that is used by a diverse number of communities. The Urban Conga tries to have an extended participatory design process to create something used and celebrated by everyone in the space. Leach asks how people find the Engage page. Swanson says it is on the City website but they have put it out through social media as well. Minnaert explains the minimum modes of community engagement that the City is promoting for each project in addition to the other engagements that each artist chooses to do.

Moss asks how someone might be aware of these projects if they are not connected to social media. He suggests posting in the park. Swanson says that they have been planning on flyer as a next step.

Shaman Pomaj Chakmam Yajalaji introduces themselves as Grand Council Member of the Iroquois Confederacy of Aboriginal American People, Co-Chair of the Pittsburgh Food Council's Urban Agriculture Working Group, member of the Three River Agricultural Land Initiative, and member of the Negley Run Watershed Task Force, and speaks from the audience about the inclusion of Native American voices in the project planning.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

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

**5. Art in Parks: Marlana Adele Vassar – Department of City Planning
Conceptual Review**

Marlana Adele Vassar presents conceptual plans for a public art project in Highland Park through the City's Art in Parks program. She discusses the planning and community feedback stages of the process and presents conceptual plans for a sculptural work.

Leach asks what the size will be. Vassar says she would like to have the figure of a child be life-size.

Moss compliments the project and says he'd love to see the sculptures in bronze. Leach agrees and suggests they be at the entrance to the park.

Goulatia confirms that they will be three-dimensional, and Vassar says yes. Vassar says an approval for the location will help with the scaling. Goulatia agrees with the other Commissioners' comments and says it is beautiful.

Parsakian says he is pleased that the proposal is for a sculpture and that it reminds him of the Alice in Wonderland sculpture in Central Park. He asks if Vassar envisions it being a sculpture that children play on and around. Vassar says possibly, but with the size being too small to climb on it may be more of a photo opportunity than a play spot. Parsakian says he'd love to see the public engage with the sculpture and if it is bronze it will allow for this more. He says they should consider the location. Goulatia says it should be in a prominent location.

Leach says she hopes there can be miniature versions sold in the future. Vassar says that she would love to but is unsure if the City allows copies to be made. Goulatia says that a few small changes will make it a different piece of art. Minnaert says she is sure there are ways for Vassar to translate this in a way that aligns with City agreements.

Parsakian asks if Vassar has done cost analysis. Vassar says she has explored fabricator options. She says she has looked into materials other than bronze in case bronze does not align with the budget. Parsakian asks if the City has fabricators that other artists have used. Minnaert says that the program has a partnership with Casey Droege Cultural Productions as artist coordinator who is able to help artists with those details. Parsakian says they can recommend other artists who have worked in bronze.

Goulatia says she is looking forward to seeing this and would like to see it large and in bronze.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

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

6. Art in Parks: Ali Ruffner & Gwen Sadler – Department of City Planning Conceptual Review

Ali Ruffner and Gwen Sadler introduce themselves and present their conceptual proposal for a public art project in Emerald View Park, including the community engagement they have done with students at Brashear High School.

Moss appreciates their work with students. He asks about the scale and construction of the proposed sculpture. Ruffner says it would be steel and approximately 9-10 feet. She says they are working with a structural architect on plans. Moss says he is concerned that this location is not engaging with the park and says there is an opportunity to place this artwork within the park landscape. He says the idea of the house is intriguing and wonders if the hands on the roof will be visible. Sadler says that she doesn't think the height would be too great to see the hands. She views the platforms as high-accessibility spaces that have a lot of visitors but not many features to engage with.

Leach says she walks there nearly every day and the platforms are very engaged. She says there are also houses there that would have their views obstructed by this project. She suggests some of the nearby parklets or an area to the right of the trolley as possible locations. Ruffner says that they can be flexible in terms of their location and have some other locations in mind, including the bandstand in Grandview Park. Leach asks if the piece can be activated with lighting or if the hands could be placed inside the piece. Ruffner says that those are possibilities.

Goulatia says she loves the hands and their work with the students. She says the hands coming out of the roof seem like they are trapped or asking for help. Moss agrees. Goulatia says it might be problematic to have a structure placed to obstruct the views from the overlook.

Parsakian agrees that the location is an issue and there should be more location options presented. He says that the view of the City is the way people engage with the space. He says he loves the hands and the artists' engagement process. He suggests the hands could hang from the inside of the roof with lighting to dramatize it. He notes the proposed piece reflects the historic houses of the hillside and the cable cars that were used for the coal mines and says there are a lot of possibilities to explore with this structure.

Goulatia says she'd love if the hands were able to be touched. Parsakian says that the aluminum of the hands allows for a neutrality of gender and color.

Moss summarizes that the Commission loves the idea of the hands as well as the reference to the hillside houses. He wonders if the hands could connect houses together. He says the seeds of the idea are lovely and it just needs some additional work. Sadler says that they worked with wire sculptures with the students and there are possibilities of placing the hands inside the structure as well as including a wire or thread motif. She also notes the conversation they had with the students about the monument crisis and that they would like their art piece to reflect this. She notes that the Commission has indicated that they might like the artwork's location to be in a less-used area of the park that could draw people to it. Moss says that the Commission has said no to the overlook platform as a location but does not want it to be hidden. Sadler says that the other location they mentioned was the bandstand area. Ruffner says they can focus on this location.

Leach asks how much of the idea was informed by the students. Ruffner says that after casting the hands the idea of the house and roof came up in conversations with Sadler and with the students, and that the students chose the composition of the proposed structure. She says that the placement of the hands will have to be done in a very intentional way and they may need to have more conversation with the students. Leach asks if the hands can be different sizes, as that might change the interpretation of the hands trying to escape the house. Goulatia says that this could lead to other problems of whose hand is bigger than others. She says she loves the ideas of the row house and the hands, but not the placement of the hands. Parsakian says that possibly the hands could support the roof.

No Motion

C. Correspondence

None.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert goes over a proposed change to the Art Commission bylaws describing the Over-The-Counter review process.

MOTION: Approval of bylaw change

MOVED BY: Parsakian

SECONDED BY: Moss

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:32 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH
Art Commission

December 8, 2021 at 2:00 P.M., Meeting called to order by President Moss

In Attendance

Moss
Leach
Loftness (arrived during first presentation)
Parsakian
Quintanilla (arrived during first presentation)
Young
Hornstein (DPW)
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Art in Parks: OOA Designs in Emerald View Park	1-2
2. Art in Parks: Ali Ruffner & Gwen Sadler in Emerald View Park	2-3
3. Art in Parks: Hutabut LLC in Frick Park	3
4. Art in Parks: Marlana Adele Vassar in Emerald View Park	4
5. Lawn & Ophelia Green Infrastructure Project	4-5

A. Items for Review

**1. Art in Parks: OOA Designs in Emerald View Park – Department of City Planning
Conceptual Review**

Oreen Cohen of OOA Designs gives the presentation for the planning of a public art project in Emerald View Park, with a proposed location in the park space at the intersection of Grandview Ave and PJ McArdle Roadway.

Moss thanks Cohen and notes that OOA has taken many of the Commission's previous comments into consideration. He says that he understands the intention of the heart (option #1) but still feels it is too literal. He appreciates the other two options (#2 and #3) and says they could be beautiful sculptures. He says the location also makes sense. He asks what the approximate height would be for the other two options. Cohen says about ten feet. Moss asks if OOA has a strong preference between options #2 and #3. Cohen says they like both and would like to spend some more time on the site and do more research. Moss says the lighting is a detail that needs to be studied carefully.

Parsakian says he is drawn to option #2 and says the way it addresses the history of women in the steel industry is a powerful statement. He says he loves the materials they are using and asks if the sculpture would be an interactive space that people could walk through. Cohen says yes and the spacing

would allow wheelchair access. Parsakian asks if the public will get a sense that the sculpture is honoring women in the steel industry. Cohen says she has reached out to the Rivers of Steel archives and she wants to research this more and incorporate some relevant imagery cut into the steel. Parsakian asks if there are any women of color that worked in the steel mills. Cohen says she hopes to be able to research this more.

Leach thanks OOA for responding to the previous suggestions. She says she is also drawn to option #2.

Loftness asks if they will be doing mockups on site to give a sense of scale. She says it is a compelling idea and wonders how they will let the shape of it evolve onsite. Cohen says they have discussed whether the shape would be better in a circle or on a diagonal and they will be working with maquettes as part of their process.

Leach mentions the artist Fran Gialamas as a good resource, as she has done a lot of work celebrating women and women of color who worked in steel mills. She says the location they've selected could really benefit from this work, as it is fairly dark and an illuminated sculpture would work well.

Loftness says that the red shown in option #3 evokes the steel mills and wonders if that could be integrated into option #2. She also says she is unsure of the canopy on option #2 and asks if there needs to be a roof element and how could that relate to the message of the piece. Cohen says they will think about that.

Moss says option #3 will be understood by the public as referring to the steel industry, and #2 may not be communicated as easily. He says if they go with option #2 they may need to work toward delivering that message clearly.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with the condition that the artists pursue a combination of the ideas presented as options #2 and #3

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

2. Art in Parks: Ali Ruffner & Gwen Sadler in Emerald View Park – Department of City Planning Conceptual Review

Ali Ruffner and Gwen Sadler present their proposal for a public art project in Emerald View Park, with several possible locations.

Parsakian says he loves the first site and the integration of the existing boulders. He says they should be careful with the positioning of the hands. He asks if the back is stainless steel. Ruffner says it will be aluminum. Parsakian asks if it will absorb heat in the summer. Sadler says it will not absorb heat more than any other material. Parsakian says he loves the colorization and says that the rainbow colors are a way to embrace various people's identities. Sadler says they will be careful with the hands, and the ones they have molded so far are all in expressive gestures. Parsakian thanks them for reimagining the project and says it is a huge improvement.

Moss says they should think of the overall height of the piece and suggests it be lower rather than higher. He says that visitors will likely want to interact with the hands. He says that they mentioned concrete and aluminum as materials and says they should be considerate of materials that people will want to sit on or interact with. Sadler says that they haven't narrowed down the exact materials yet and are influenced by the slope of the hillside in thinking about the materials and the angles they can create with them. Ruffner says they will be doing comparisons with existing public sculptures in determining materials and will be keeping the sculpture low enough to maintain the view of the city and trees.

Loftness says that both sides of the wall will need to be designed. She says she likes the stones emerging from the concrete. She says if they colorize both the aluminum wall and the concrete base there may be an awkward colocation. She says she might prefer the starkness of the bare concrete, although it may not stay white as this would be liable to be tagged with graffiti.

Leach says she also likes the cleanness of the concrete, and suggests there could be a way to imprint hands in it. She asks why the hands have to be on top. She asks if there is a way to integrate wayfinding. Ruffner says that she likes the idea of incorporating the hands into wayfinding, and says there is some signage there already but she would like to incorporate some more that includes the names of the students involved.

Young asks for clarification of what the space looks like. Sadler explains the orientation of the site. Ruffner describes the disparate layout of Emerald View Park and how it contains a number of small trailheads and pull-offs with views of the city through the trees. Sadler says they are interested in utilizing what already exists in these spaces in their planning, and Ruffner says they are mindful of working with the vistas and not hiding them.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval

MOVED BY: Loftness
SECONDED BY: Quintanilla
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

**3. Art in Parks: Hutabut LLC in Frick Park – Department of City Planning
Conceptual Review**

Matthew Geller of Hutabut LLC describes the proposal of a public art project in Frick Park, including proposed locations.

Moss says that what the proposal is lacking is how the sculpture relates to Pittsburgh and Frick Park. Moss says that a direct way to address this could be within the shapes in the crown of the piece. Geller says he can consider that, although the piece is presented as a folly.

Loftness says for the Commission to understand how the colors relate to the object, they need to see the colors rendered on the structure of the work. She says the presented canopy ideas do not seem to relate to Pittsburgh, the park, or a carousel, so that aspect of the design should be worked on. She addresses the movement of the seats and describes pivoting benches that are on the Carnegie Mellon campus. Geller says he will show the colors at the next review. He says the movement Loftness is describing is possible but his idea for the piece was more contemplative and should possibly not be overly active. He is concerned that the mechanism to make it turn more would be expensive, but he will look into it. Geller says the design of the canopy is not finished and will be given more thought.

Geller says (in regards to the pivoting CMU bench) that this is an entirely different mechanism and there may be safety issues.

Moss sums up the comments as clarification on the incorporation of the colors, further iteration of the canopy design, and further opportunity for dynamic/kinetic movement.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval, with the conditions that 1) additional dynamic elements be considered for the canopy; 2) additional movement be considered overall; and 3) the color scheme be presented on the renderings for Final Approval

MOVED BY: Leach
SECONDED BY: Quintanilla
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

4. Art in Parks: Marlana Adele Vassar in Highland Park – Department of City Planning Final Review

Vassar gives her presentation for a public art project in Highland Park, with a proposed location in the main entry garden.

Loftness asks about the materials, and whether the sculpture is 3D or 2D. Vassar says it is 3D and it would be made out of bronze. Loftness confirms it would be a hollow bronze statue. Vassar says yes. Loftness asks what the circumference would be, and what the base would look like. Vassar says she originally had the bottom as circular, but it may need to be slightly narrowed for this location. She says it would be no more than 3' on the bottom.

Moss says he does not feel the application has the complete details needed for Final Approval.

Loftness says she thinks the statue will be a delightful addition to the park, but there are still a few unresolved questions, such as what it looks like from all angles and what coloration the bronze will be. Moss adds that they also need details about the foundation and how it is attached.

Parsakian says he thinks it is great but they would like to see more detail.

Leach says that the gaze of the sculpture meets the viewers eyes, while the earlier renderings were more introspective, and asks if there was a reason for the change. Vassar says most of the design changes were due to not knowing where the final location would be. She says she had considered changing it back and can reconsider that as she moves forward.

Parsakian says showing a human next to the piece for scale would help.

MOTION: Table

MOVED BY: Moss

SECONDED BY: Leach

IN FAVOR: Loftness, Parsakian, Young

OPPOSED: None

5. Lawn & Ophelia Green Infrastructure Project – Pittsburgh Water & Sewer Authority Final Review

Maria Natoli of PWSA and Damion Weiss of Ethos Collaborative describe the proposal for a rain garden, seat walls, and landscaping to replace decommissioned playground equipment. The green infrastructure elements will capture and manage stormwater.

Loftness clarifies that there is hard pavement currently on site that will be replaced with gravel. Weiss says this is correct. Loftness asks if there is a reason the walkways are so wide at the north end. Weiss says that there are existing retaining walls there which they would not be touching, and there is an area to the east of the rain garden which would be a focal point and gathering space. He says the wider areas are due to the rain garden taking an oval shape and the retaining walls enclosing that space. Loftness says it is great to turn these underutilized areas into rain gardens and says the landscaping is beautiful. She says she is always concerned when there's too much pavement. She says the less pavement that is included, the more effective the rain gardens are. Natoli mentions that the pavement areas are sloped to direct runoff.

Parsakian asks if the concrete that is removed will be reused as gravel. Weiss says he doesn't have a lot of experience with that process but they could consider it. Natoli says she does not know if the contractors have the ability to do that. Parsakian says he doesn't know if its possible either but wanted to bring it up for sustainability. He says he loves the possibility of the sandstone benches.

Millie Sass, resident of Oakcliffe, speaks from the audience. She says she appreciates the inclusion of color in the project. She asks if there will be mowing on the site. She asks if there will be any development across Ophelia St, as the plans show trees there. She says she doesn't like the stone seats as they are hard and cold. She asks what a bumpout is and if they will lose parking. She asks if the community is allowed to replace plants in the garden. She asks if they can expect wading in the pool.

Weiss says there will be occasional mowing. He says the water in the collection area would be expected to drain in 2-3 days and they wouldn't encourage wading. He says regarding planting he would defer to the City, though PWSA would be maintaining the garden. He says he would prefer that the plants be allowed to establish themselves before replacing them is considered. He says that the area at the top doesn't have a lot of stormwater functionality so it could be reimagined in the future, which would be up to the City. Weiss says the bumpouts are no longer included in the design so no parking will be lost. He says the choice of stone bench was for aesthetics and durability. Natoli says that City Planning has said they can save the benches from the park and reinstall them in a different location.

MOTION: Final Approval

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

B. Approval of Minutes

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from November 2021. Loftness motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Quintanilla. All ayes. Motion carries.

C. Correspondence

None.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert says that they conducted one Over-The-Counter review since the last hearing, which the Commission received a summary of via email.

Minnaert says that there is currently a public art solicitation for Homewood Park Public Art, which is open on the City's procurement website. She says she will share the relevant links for the Commission to see and share with their networks.

Dash says that this is the last Commission meeting of the year and of Mayor Peduto's term. He passes on the Mayor's thanks and appreciation to the Commission for their service during his administration. He says that he has had no discussions with the incoming administration regarding a change in the Commission, but if any new information arises they will be informed. He discusses expectations for the new year and the transition to the new administration.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:22 P.M.