



CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*January 26, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by President Moss*

In Attendance

Moss  
Goulatia  
Loftness  
Parsakian  
Quintanilla  
Young

Hornstein (DPW)  
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash (Items 4-6)  
Minnaert  
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. South Side Park Trail	1-2
2. Small Cell Pole Replacement	2-4
3. Green Boulevard Phase 1	4
4. The Porch at Schenley Patio Roof & Greenhouse	4-5
5. Pirates Lower Riverwalk Monuments	5-6
6. Art in Parks: Sans façon & Steve Gurysh in Riverview Park	6
7. Saw Mill Run Salt Storage Facility	6-8

A. Approval of Minutes

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

B. Items for Review

**1. Side South Park Trail – South Side Community Council  
Conceptual/Final Review**

Joe Hackett of LaQuatra Bonci gives the presentation for a new ADA trail in South Side Park.

Moss notes that this is not a City-funded project and so does not require a Percent For Art. Hackett confirms this.

Loftness asks for a description of the vistas and the landscape material adjacent to the walks. Hackett describes the entry to the park, the landscape around the trails, and a visitor's viewing experience onsite. Loftness asks if a visitor would leave the trail and walk through the meadow. Hackett says that the plant material of the meadow will be higher than the trail so they hope that will deter visitors from walking through it. He also says they hope to later connect other trails of the park to this trail. Loftness asks if there is seating in the plan. Hackett says there is a small amount of seating adjacent to the parking lot.

Hornstein thanks Hackett for his work. He says he is concerned that pet owners may take their dogs off leash here. Hackett says the meadow plants will be kept fairly high so it is unlikely to be a place for dogs to run. Hornstein asks how big the meadow is. Hackett says about 15,000 square feet.

Quintanilla says it is more of a loop than a trail, and confirms that it may connect to other trails in the future. Hackett says yes. Quintanilla says it could be dangerous and asks if it will be lit. Hackett says no, but the community garden is adjacent and there are always people coming in and out. Quintanilla says with the taller plants it could be very secluded. Hackett says it is their hope that the space will be activated so that there will usually be numerous people onsite. Quintanilla asks if there is an opening in the fence allowing access from the garden. Hackett says no.

Hornstein asks that some simple signage be recommended that says dogs must be kept on leash, which the City could provide. He says that DPW would like to specify location of this signage.

Goulatia urges that they consider adding art. Loftness suggests a connection to the community garden and potentially a plan to add benches. Hackett says the South Side Community Council hopes to raise funds for more improvements in the future.

Lucas says that the City has draft Trail Standards for design elements, which they'd be happy to have further discussion about.

Moss summarizes that the Commission asks that signage be coordinated with DPW and that they have recommended the integration of art, connection to the community garden, and opportunities for seating.

#### **MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval**

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

## **2. Small Cell Pole Replacement – Extenet Systems Conceptual/Final Review**

Timothy Asta and Matt Sturgill of Extenet Systems present this project for the removal of an existing City of Pittsburgh streetlight and its replacement with a new pole to accommodate 4G and 5G antennas for multiple carriers.

Quintanilla asks if they can see what the existing poles look like. Asta describes the current poles and explains the difference between these and the proposed pole, and references the photos submitted in the application materials.

Loftness brings up the City's dark sky ordinance. Asta says they are attempting to comply with any dark sky mandates.

Goulatia asks if the lights will be higher than other lights on the street. Asta says the lights on this pole will be slightly lower, at 15' versus the current 18'. Goulatia says it should be at the same height as the existing poles. Goulatia asks if they can put structures on the roof of buildings instead of occupying the sidewalks. Asta says that if they mount the new luminaires at the same height as the current ones, they will have to increase the overall height as well. He says that the poles near the intersection are taller,

but the midblock ones are closer to the proposed height. He also says that buildings have a shielding effect from the signal being delivered to the end user at street level.

Loftness says the paddle at the top overwhelms the light fixtures, and asks how this lighting would change the distribution of light on the sidewalk. Moss asks why they can't reuse the existing luminaire, and why they are proposing two lights instead of one as currently exists. Asta says they have worked with City staff and there is flexibility in luminaire design but it may appear anomalous as it would be on a single side arm.

Sturgill references the City's small cell guidelines and says they were trying to match the approved two-luminaire design as much as possible. Lucas says that the two aspects of this application that did not conform to existing standards have to do with not matching the adjacent pole styles, and the height. She says the standard is for poles to not exceed 15% additional height when compared to the poles near it.

Goulatia says this pole looks very different from what exists and will stand out. She confirms that it is a replacement pole, and Asta says yes. Goulatia says it will change the aesthetics of the place. Quintanilla says that there could end up being three different pole styles near this intersection, which will look very busy. He says that the base diameter is significantly different. He says that he understands the need for the technology, but is uncomfortable with how different this pole is from the other poles in the vicinity.

Moss agrees with Goulatia and says they need to think of the pole in relation to the other poles on this block, particularly with the height of the luminaires and the banners. He says that the City may be moving toward different standards in the future, but for the sake of this review it is more important to maintain the character of this particular street. Moss says that even if the fixture were not able to be on top of the pole, this may be preferable if they were able to maintain the same fixture and the same height.

Goulatia asks if this equipment can be incorporated into one of the nearby taller poles.

Asta says they could attempt another design, but the proposed location is where they need to be from the perspective of the carriers. He says they were following the approved design for a two-luminaire as much as possible, and if it is more appropriate to have a single luminaire then they can redesign in that way.

Goulatia asks if the antenna has to be on top or if it can be below the luminaire. Asta says usually the antenna needs to be as high as possible for the network to function well. Loftness asks if there is a wireless node in the base as well, or only in the paddle at the top. Sturgill says the 4G technology needs to fit inside the base and so it needs to be at least 20", and at the top there are antennas and technology for 4G and 5G. He says they have done everything they can to make this pole as small as possible.

Loftness says she's not sure that the light pole is the best place for this equipment, and suggests nearby entrance canopies or rooftops. Sturgill says that from a location perspective, the carriers need to be at this intersection. He says that the antennas need to be below the roof line to minimize interference with other small cells. He also says there are traffic control signals at the intersection that they are not allowed to install on. Loftness asks if this could be negotiated with the City as it seems a more acceptable location. Sturgill says they would like to but the City will not consider this. Lucas says last week the City published new small cell guidelines that have opportunities to leverage equipment in those areas, so that the City is in compliance with new State requirements.

Sturgill says that in the small cell guidelines there is a design similar to what they are trying to replicate but it is only in 5G technology, and this pole is for both 4G and 5G, which is why it needs to be bigger.

Quintanilla asks if the pole will be black. Sturgill says the City standard is black, but they would use grey here because the other nearby poles are grey.

Goulatia says she also has a problem with the parking sign on the pole as it looks cluttered.

#### **MOTION: Table**

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

### **3. Green Boulevard Phase 1 – Department of Mobility and Infrastructure Conceptual/Final Review**

Mike Panzitta of DOMI introduces the project, which is the first phase of implementation of the Allegheny River Green Boulevard. Nina Chase of Merritt Chase gives the presentation for the project, which includes a shared-use pedestrian and bicycle path including site furniture and plantings.

Loftness says it's a great addition to Lawrenceville. She asks about the landscape materials. Chase says there is currently gravel from the railroad but the intention is to get as much planting as possible. She says that underneath and between the trees will be perennial planting. Loftness asks if the asphalt could be porous instead of impervious. Chase says they did not look at impervious, as pervious is the City standard. Panzitta says they discussed it, but due to the narrowness of the site it did not seem maintainable. Loftness says it would make sense for the asphalt to be lighter.

Loftness says she isn't a fan of bollards and asks what the intention of them is. Chase says the standard in the City is for trails to have bollards so that cars cannot drive onto the trail.

Parsakian asks what the width of the trail is. Chase says it varies from 8-10 feet wide. Panzitta says the walls were included to maximize the space without having to go onto the railroad property. Parsakian asks how tall the fence is. Chase says it is four feet, but the Durahold wall adds some height.

Parsakian notes that the project is proposing holding off on the Percent For Art project until a later time, and says that the entrances to the trail would be great opportunities for art. Minnaert says that PACD has had several conversations with the project team, and that this phase has a relatively small budget. They would like to wait until a later phase to engage artists in order to have more available funds. Panzitta says that they would like to have a project that would be consistent throughout the trail.

Goulatia agrees that the bollards are ugly and says they cause accidents instead of prevent them. She asks if there is an alternative. Panzitta says the proposed yellow bollards are the standard, but they can talk about this with the design team.

Quintanilla compliments it overall, but says the bollards should be reconsidered. Loftness suggest using bike racks.

**MOTION: Conceptual and Final Approval of Green Boulevard Phase 1, with the condition that the bollard design is revisited and receives further Art Commission approval.**

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

### **4. The Porch at Schenley Patio Roof & Greenhouse – Axis Architecture Conceptual/Final Review**

Craig Collins of Axis Architecture and Jesse Stock of Eat N Park Hospitality Group give the proposal for a new roof and shade system over the existing patio of The Porch at Schenley, and a small adjacent greenhouse to be used by the restaurant.

Loftness says she is worried about where water will go. She also questions the rolling shades, as it will be a small amount of time that the sun hits that part of the building. Moss asks if the greenhouse will

be used year-round. Collins says probably for nine months of the year. Loftness notes that it is not an enclosed structure. Collins says that it is not insulated or weather-proof. He also says that the roof will slope to drains that will be brought down the building and tied into the building's stormwater system. Loftness asks if that is in the drawings. Collins says no.

Loftness asks if the greenhouse is freestanding. Collins says yes, there would be about five feet between the greenhouse and the restaurant. She asks if one of the two knee walls will be taken out. Collins says that is an errant line in the plan and there is only one knee wall. Moss asks if the knee wall will remain, and asks what the dimensions of the greenhouse are. Collins says the dimensions are 8' wide by 24' long, and the knee wall would remain. Moss asks if the greenhouse has plumbing or heat. Collins says no.

Loftness says that this seems fine for Conceptual Review but not for Final Review. Moss notes that they would typically like to see material samples. He asks if there are specifications for the rolling shade material. Collins says not at this point. Moss asks if the rolling shade will be in a track, and Collins says yes and that it will come down between the columns.

Quintanilla clarifies where the entrance to the greenhouse is. He asks if the greenhouse can interact more with the adjacent amphitheater instead of being aligned with the sidewalk. Collins says they can investigate other locations, and that they had tried to make it more of a background feature. Quintanilla says that the greenhouse may be able to be a feature that adds liveliness to that space. He notes that the proposed front has a more industrial look as compared to the existing wood details. Collins says that the intent is to have it blend in instead of making much of a statement.

Parsakian asks if they have considered integrating the greenhouse into the design of the building, instead of having it be separate. Collins says that they have not up to this point, but they could take that into consideration. Parsakian says it doesn't look like it belongs there and they could rethink how the greenhouse interacts with the environment around it. Parsakian asks if the restaurant door that leads to the greenhouse is also a fire exit for the kitchen staff. Collins says it is a required egress from the restaurant. Parsakian asks if there's another way to make it connected, or if that is impossible. Collins says he does not know offhand. Stock says that the greenhouse was separated from the main building to get as much sun exposure as it could, and it was situated near the sidewalk because they wanted to highlight that fresh produce was being grown and used in the restaurant. Parsakian says he likes the mission, but questions the basic design of the greenhouse.

Moss says that if the mission of the greenhouse is being highlighted it makes sense to place it near the sidewalk, but in this case the design becomes more important. If the design is low cost and of rudimentary design, then it is probably better as less of a public element.

Loftness says that it looks like the greenhouse may be difficult to construct without taking out one or two existing trees. Loftness says she understands the need for a roof, but says they need to be sure they can insert it without removing a tree.

Goulatia says in India they have trees within spaces to bring the outdoors inside, and this may be something they can look at.

#### **MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

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

#### **5. Pirates Lower Riverwalk Monuments – Pittsburgh Pirates Courtesy Review**

Janet Marie Smith, design consultant to the Pittsburgh Pirates, presents this project which consists of two monument displays honoring Pittsburgh baseball players. The first is made up of representations of

player numbers that have been retired. The second is a series of baseball honoring Pittsburgh players who have been inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame.

Goulatia says she loves the attention to detail in the project. She asks how much space on the sidewalk the objects take up. Smith says they sit in the green space and do not intrude onto the public sidewalk. Goulatia asks if they have considered placing them more organically instead of in a row.

Loftness asks if they anticipate people sitting on the baseballs. Smith says it is possible, as they are concrete and it would not be damaging. Loftness says the project is whimsical and brings the activity of PNC Park down to the riverfront. She asks if the baseballs can be given a sense of stitched leather. Smith says the stitching will be raised so it will have that texture.

Quintanilla says that people should be able to interact with the numbers instead of walking through the landscaping. Smith says they will sit next to the ramp and so people could take pictures right beside them. Quintanilla says it could be worth it to create a base around the numbers so people can better interact with them.

Parsakian asks if there will be interactive plaques that would include braille or a QR code. Smith says the information on the retired numbers will be presented in English and Spanish, in some version for the vision impaired, and with a QR code for more information. Young asks what the size of the plaque on the numbers is. She says there is an opportunity to make it more visible. Smith says it is a placeholder and they will consider that when they size it. Goulatia asks if they have thought of putting the signage on the floor. Young says it is not disruptive placed on the side of the numbers.

Parsakian asks if there is a way to connect this to the Heinz History Center and the Roberto Clemente Museum. Smith says they have consulted with both of those organizations.

Quintanilla asks if the elements will be lit. Smith says the walkways are well lit and they are not proposing to add any illumination. Quintanilla says he can imagine the numbers popping if they were illuminated. Smith says they will consider that.

## **6. Art in Parks: Sans façon & Steve Gurysh in Riverview Park – Public Art & Civic Design Division Conceptual Review**

Tristan Surtees and Charles Blanc of Sans façon are joined by artist Steve Gurysh in presenting the initial development of a public art project in Riverview Park through the City's Art in Parks program.

Moss says he appreciates their thoughtful approach and says he thinks that this project should possibly be tabled and return for Conceptual Review when the ideas have been developed further. Loftness agrees. She says their previous work is fantastic but it is unclear what they would be proposing for this park. Moss says they have done a great job in researching the park and he is anxious to see what they come up with. Parsakian says he also appreciates their research, and compliments their earlier work. Young compliments their focus on community storytelling. Goulatia says she wishes the artists had more time to present, as she wants to hear more.

### **MOTION: Table**

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

## **7. Saw Mill Run Salt Storage Facility – Department of Public Works Conceptual/Final Review**

Felipe Palomo of DPW, Dana Klann of Civil & Environmental Consultants, and Ed Karl of Architectural Innovations present plans for the demolition of the existing salt storage facility and adjacent

building and construction of new Salt Storage Building, along with landscaping and stormwater management features. The project includes revisions made since being reviewed at the November 2021 Art Commission.

Moss thanks the applicants for revisiting the design and says it is clearly an improvement. He notes that there is a strong base with a lighter top half and asks why this scheme is not continued along the east façade. Karl says that is a challenging wall to frame due to the need to reinforce around the doorways. Moss agrees they may need more stability on that side.

Loftness says the design is much stronger. She asks if plants could be introduced around the east façade. She asks about the comfort station and whether something could be done to give workers inside more of a view. Karl says that minimal time will be spent in the comfort station, but they can consider this.

Goulatia asks if the bottom area is made of concrete. Karl says yes. Goulatia asks if there can be any more lightness added to the front (east) side. She says she does not understand the purpose of siding that imitates wood, and this ends up looking cheap.

Parsakian asks how translucent the fiberglass will be. Karl says that the FRP panels are translucent but not transparent. He says the polycarbonate is a clear plastic, but these panels cannot span as far. Parsakian asks which will be used. Karl says it will be transparent, but has a corrugated texture to it. Goulatia asks if the salt will affect the polycarbonate panels. Karl says that the lifespan of the polycarbonate will not be equal to the metal from their original design, and there will likely be some dust from the salt.

Loftness asks about the facia material. Karl says it is fiber cement composite panels. She says she loves the warmth and that it compliments the wood structure. She says it is important that it doesn't look like fake wood and it would've been good to see a sample.

Parsakian asks where they will see the Percent For Art. Palomo says that they have been exploring possibilities of an art project at the Seldom Seen Greenway entrance. Parsakian says the two blank walls at the entrance would be a good opportunity for public art. Loftness agrees.

Lisa Brown of Watersheds of South Pittsburgh makes public comment in opposition to the project due to environmental concerns regarding the adjacent stream.

Moss says that maintaining the location of the salt storage facility is an important consideration, but he does not think it is in the purview of the Art Commission. He says that the Commission is concerned with making sure that if the facility is built here, it is done so in the best way it can in regard to aesthetics.

Goulatia says she has reservations concerning the wood treatment, which she says would be better as stone; and the polycarbonate, which she says will look dirty.

Moss says that the materiality of the building's base could be explored further. Goulatia says she is also concerned with how large the structure is. Loftness says she doesn't think the applicants had much of a choice in the size, as they need the space to store the salt. She says that the size may actually reduce the amount of salt that ends up outside of the building. She agrees that it is not the Commission's purview to judge whether the facility should exist here, and says the applicants have done a good job being sensitive to the salt runoff. Parsakian notes that they addressed the location at their first hearing, and the applicant explained that there were no other viable sites.

Moss summarizes the comments as concerning 1) the design of the east façade, 2) landscaping around that façade, 3) the possibility of greater light/viewshed at the comfort station, 4) the color of the fiber cement siding so that it doesn't look like imitation wood, 5) further understanding of the specific materials of the polycarbonate and fiber cement, 6) further clarification on the use of the Percent For Art, and 7) what precautions are being made to reduce salt runoff. Moss states that he would consider giving this project Conceptual Approval but not Final.

Goulatia says that she knows the location of the facility is not in their purview, but she has reservations concerning salt runoff into the stream.

Hornstein says he understands that reservation, but it is important to point out that there are a lot of regulatory bodies looking at this project, including the State and the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority. The City will be complying with all guidance from these bodies regarding protecting the stream.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: Moss, Quintanilla, Young

OPPOSED: Goulatia

C. Correspondence

Minnaert notes the correspondence that the Commission received via email regarding the Extenet and Saw Mill Run Salt Storage applications.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Commission Officer Elections

**MOTION: Andrew Moss for Art Commission President**

MOVED BY: Goulatia

SECONDED BY: Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: Loftness, Parsakian, Young

OPPOSED: None

**MOTION: Sarika Goulatia for Art Commission Secretary**

MOVED BY: Loftness

SECONDED BY: Moss

IN FAVOR: Parsakian, Quintanilla, Young

OPPOSED: None

F. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert notes the Over-The-Counter applications from the last month that were forwarded to the Commission.

Minnaert describes two calls for art currently active through the City, which are for Arsenal Park and the Davis Avenue Bridge.

The Commissioners discuss the amount of time given to applicants to present, and whether some presentations can be given more time than others.

Dash says that Karen Abrams has been appointed as the new Director of City Planning. Dash says that he will be continuing in a newly-created position as Deputy Director of City Planning. He says that he anticipates continuing to work with the Art Commission.



Dash says that there have not been any discussions with the new administration in regards to new Commissioner appointments, and he expects the continuation of current Commissioner appointments.

G. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:24 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*February 23, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by President Moss*

In Attendance

Moss  
Goulatia  
Leach  
Loftness  
Parsakian  
Quintanilla  
Young

Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash  
Minnaert  
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Art in Parks: The Urban Conga in Highland Park	1-2
2. Medic 4 Station	2-3
3. Medic 4 Station Public Art Project	2-3
4. Moorhead Federal Building Security Improvements	3-5
5. Lower Hill PDD Streetscape and Public Space Improvements	5-6
6. Strawberry Way Mural	6-7
7. Three Sisters Bridges Interpretive Signage	7

A. Approval of Minutes

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from January 2022. Loftness motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Young. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Art in Parks: The Urban Conga in Highland Park – Public Art & Civic Design Division  
Final Review**

Ryan Swanson of the Urban Conga presents the proposal for the installation of a sculptural artwork in Highland Park as part of the City's Art in Parks program.

Parsakian says he is concerned for child safety and the distance between the pipes. Swanson says that they use the code standard of 4" between elements. Parsakian says the seating seems limited and asks about its usability as a table based on the surface texture and the pipes coming down underneath.

Swanson gives the dimensions to explain the usability and says there is about 19 ft of seating and 18 ft of tabletop components. He says that they are trying to limit the effects of the perforation on the use of the tabletop. Parsakian asks about children running and jumping on it and whether this was a community concern. Swanson says it was not a concern, and the perforation and powder coating will provide more grip for safety in case it is climbed on.

Goulatia asks what made them choose the color yellow and if the edges are sharp and could cause an injury. Swanson says the edges will be rounded and the powder coating softens the sharpness as well. He explains their reasoning behind the color choice including Pittsburgh references, an adaptive quality throughout the seasons, and its representation of positive emotions.

Loftness asks if undulating the horizontal forms was considered to allow more space to sit. He says that they explored various options of form. He explains the reasoning behind the final choice and that it allows for more open-ended use. Goulatia says the undulating is nice but she wishes there was more variation in height. Swanson says that was part of an initial design but they chose to keep it at one height based on community feedback. Moss clarifies that the comment was in reference to the horizontal areas being perfectly flat instead of having a curvature to them. Swanson says that they were concentrating on finding the right bridge between horizontal and vertical lines.

Quintanilla says that he is concerned that litter could be captured within the pockets made by the vertical bars. Swanson says this is what led them away from using a mesh. He says that they played with a lot of different ideas, including leaving more space open beneath, and they felt this design allowed for issues like litter to be managed while maintaining the flow of the design.

Goulatia says it looks like a musical instrument and asks if they considered adding elements that could be played with or were less static. Swanson says they did but they focused on creating a space for open-ended activity and play, and that this was in line with community feedback which pointed to a desire for spaces for socialization and connectivity.

Moss notes that the Highland Park Community Council provided a letter that expressed support but with the concern that maintenance issues should be addressed.

Leach says that in this case the community feedback has reduced the playful elements that she saw in their other works. Swanson discusses the open-ended activity that they saw as providing the playfulness in this piece. Parsakian says he sees it as a climbing structure and so sees it as playful and not static.

#### **MOTION: Final Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: Moss, Goulatia, Quintanilla, Young

OPPOSED: Leach

#### **2. Medic 4 Station – Department of Public Works Final Review**

**&**

#### **3. Medic 4 Station Public Art Project – Department of Public Works Conceptual Review**

Claire Mastroberardino of DPW presents the final design for a new station to support the City's EMS program, as well as the proposal for the location of the Percent For Art project associated with this new building construction.

Moss clarifies that no specific artwork is being proposed, just the location of the artwork. Mastroberardino says yes. Moss asks about the artist selection process. Mastroberardino says that it will be the same as for other City public art projects, and that it has not begun yet because they do not have a final budget. She says the community will be involved.

Goulatia urges them to think about something like a light installation, rather than a flat mural. Mastroberardino says they have to be careful how much they light the buildings with the City's Dark Sky ordinance, but they can look into the possibilities.

Loftness says the building design is very elegant, and says it is great that it uses passive house strategies and has a lot of window areas. She says that the artwork is critical for the aesthetics of the building and the white wall shown in the presentation shouldn't be what is implemented if the artwork is delayed. Mastroberardino says that the white in the rendering is simply an indicator of where the artwork is intended to be, there will not be any actual white space.

Quintanilla says he is concerned about the rock stone. Mastroberardino says that Zoning asked them to include some type of landscaping, and they are unclear what that will be, because public safety buildings must maintain their own landscaping. Quintanilla says they should not put landscaping there, and suggests paving it and adding a bench.

Young asks Mastroberardino to explain more about the community engagement for the art project. Mastroberardino says that she has not gone through this process before but will be working with the Public Art & Civic Design Division and the selected artist will work with the community. Young asks who in the community they will be working with. Mastroberardino says she has been working with the Perry Hilltop and Fineview RCOs, and community members have reached out through those organizations. Young says that as a community artist she appreciates that connections will exist for the selected artist to utilize and encourages Mastroberardino to continue thinking about how different community voices can be involved.

Moss compliments the building design and says it will be a great addition to this corner. He encourages Mastroberardino to explore all possibilities in regards to the medium of the art.

**MOTION: Final Approval – Medic 4 Station (Building)**

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

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval – Medic 4 Station Public Art Project**

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

**4. Moorhead Federal Building Security Improvements – General Services Administration Conceptual/Final Review**

Chris Kingsland of Gordon US, LLC, representing GSA, presents the proposal for security improvements in the right-of-way in compliance with regulations for federal buildings.

Moss asks if the Liberty Avenue bollards are being proposed with the white bands as shown. Kingsland says yes. Moss asks if they are reflective. Kingsland says yes. Moss asks if these are necessary. Kingsland says no.

Loftness says that safety barriers send a 'keep out' message, so it is better if they can be incorporated into the vocabulary of the urban landscape. She notes that the Grant St bollards do not have a white stripe and are more crafted, so maybe this style should be continued all around the building. She says she would like to see something more integrated. Kingsland says the stripes can be removed.

Charles Enos, of Onyx Group, agrees. Gabrielle Trout, of GSA, says that they are flexible on the bollards from a stylistic perspective, so they can remove the white stripe.

Quintanilla clarifies whether they are suggesting one style of bollard around the whole building. Trout says the newer-style bollards are taller, but they are trying to match the color. She notes that the post and beam will be different as well. Kingsland says the custom post and crash beam barrier and the swing gate will have the straight extruded tube-type bollards. The single standalone bollards are proposed to have architectural shrouds on top of them, which he says they can also do with the rest of the bollards.

Goulatia asks if the bollards will be different heights. Kingsland says yes, because the bollards on Grant St were installed according to a previous standard of 32". The increased current standard is 48" which does not allow a vehicle at impact speed to get over the barrier. Goulatia asks if they would replace the existing bollards. Kingsland says no. Goulatia asks if that is a possibility, as the height differences will be visually cluttered.

Loftness asks if 48" is a federal standard, as that is huge. Trout says the rating of the building classification mandates the crash rating of the bollards, which is why they are proposing the 48" bollards. Loftness says she spends a lot of time around federal buildings in Washington DC and she does not know of any that have 48" bollards at that density. Loftness says that the height and diameter of the bollards should be scaled back as far as they legally can while maintaining the security of the facility. Enos says that this federal standard is newer and so is greater than what is seen in a lot of buildings. He says that he agrees the visual impact should be minimized as much as possible, and that they can check the numbers again, but he is pretty sure this is what is required for this facility.

Quintanilla says he is concerned at the size and density of the bollards, and that they will not match the existing ones. He says that he is also concerned about the post and beam, as it will basically go over the sidewalk. Kingsland says the intent is to funnel people along the brick paver sidewalk closer to the road. Quintanilla says that people will take the shortest route so the swing gate will go over where they are walking. Moss says there is other sidewalk area and they would have to go around the swing gate. Loftness asks if the alternative would be a bollard that drops into the ground for occasional vehicle access. Kingsland says the strength of these bollards comes from the shallow foundation, and they cannot do one that would retract into the ground due to the existing utilities, or a removable bollard due to the amount of protection necessary by the federal standards.

Goulatia asks if the gate is black or white. Kingsland says black.

Goulatia asks if the bollards are equidistant. Kingsland says they are, unless they have to span site obstructions such as the fire hydrant. Moss asks what the dimensions of the bollards are. Kingsland says 4 ft high and 10 inches wide. He says they will be slightly wider if they add a shroud.

Loftness says she is reading the standards and it says they can be five feet apart, depending on the building height, and she says they could be thinner. She says that she didn't realize that a shroud would be put on top of the cylinder. She asks if the shrouded ones will be thicker than the Grant St bollards. Kingsland says yes, if the shroud is needed to match them aesthetically.

Loftness says the standards allow for a number of variations. Trout clarifies that there is not one universal federal safety standard, rather it is calculated based the building classification, the kinds of tenants in the building, the site conditions, and the topography. She says that GSA had hired Onyx to do a study to determine what bollard rating was required. She says that the study also addresses the speed and size of vehicles able to approach the building, and since there is a large amount of space at Grant and Liberty, this increases the force that the bollards must withstand. Based on the results of this study, they are required to use a bollard with a K12 rating, and she does not know if there is a smaller bollard that can meet this rating. Kingsland further explains that the rating system mandates that these bollards must withstand a 15,000 lb vehicle at 50 mph, which must stop within ten feet of interacting with the barrier. Whatever vendor they find to provide this must be certified, and the bollards must be able to have a shallow foundation.

Goulatia asks why the ones on Grant St wouldn't change if that's the requirement for the building. Kingsland says they were installed earlier and do not meet the current standards, but they provide more

protection than the current Liberty Ave bollards. He says the government is limited in how much they can do at this time based on budget.

Parsakian asks if the planters will remain. Kingsland say they will be removed.

Leach asks why there is so much space in front of the building. Kingsland says so that the anti-ram perimeter can be placed as far from the building as possible.

Loftness says that she acknowledges everything that has to be considered, but says she believes there are other, less bulky bollards that would meet this standard. Moss says the height is the main concern. Quintanilla says he doesn't understand why the swing gate needs to go over the sidewalk. Kingsland asks if there is a preferred alternative for the swing gate access. Enos asks if the gate can be moved further to the left. Kingsland says yes.

Goulatia says that it may be better to do bollards on Liberty that look completely different than the Grant St ones, rather than trying to match them but not matching them identically.

Loftness says they should double check other federal facilities to make sure they are using the smallest bollard possible so as not to clutter the streets. Trout says she has concerns about trying to match another facility. She says that the information that can be found through an internet search can be misleading, as the sizing of the bollards is site specific to each building, and include soil conditions, which are very poor at this building. She says the same building with the same traffic pattern may have a different required bollard rating due to the soil quality. She says they have looked at many alternatives to meet this requirement.

Goulatia asks if the color has to be black. Trout says the shroud can be flexible in its aesthetic.

Moss summarizes that they have concerns about the scale, and that the Commission is asking whether this is the absolute minimum size that can meet the requirements. Loftness says she would like to see the report that says the 4 ft bollard is required.

Quintanilla says the swing gate is a concern for him.

Goulatia says that they should remove the old planters and bollards in their renderings.

Moss summarizes that the Commission would like to know more about the report that has been discussed, the relocation of the swing gate, and would like to see modifications to the renderings.

#### **MOTION: Table**

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

### **5. Lower Hill PDD Streetscape and Public Space Improvements Conceptual/Final Review**

Cavalline gives a brief explanation of this project, which is for the design of a public plaza and right-of-way extension to be gifted to the City, along with streetscape standards for the greater area of development.

Craig Dunham of Dunham Regroup, Boris Kaplan of Buccini/Pollin Group, and Carolyn Sponza of Gensler Architects give the presentation.

Moss asks for clarification on the sizing of the areas, which Sponza gives.

Loftness says she appreciates the commitment to the streetscape standards, especially the increase of absorbent green spaces and tree canopy. Dunham gives more details on the stormwater strategies. Loftness says that it seems the green space could be expanded.

Moss asks if there are light fixtures in this zone. Sponza says there are two poles and small landscape lighting mounted in the planters.

Quintanilla asks if there are any seating areas. Sponza describes an accessible bench in the plaza. Quintanilla says it would be nice to have more benches. Sponza says there are other integrated benches within close proximity.

Loftness asks if there are steps leading up to the ramp. Sponza says yes, it is a low-grade ramp that does not require handrails and the steps act as a transition. Loftness says it may be better to have the ramp surrounded by landscaping rather than more concrete.

Parsakian asks if the plaza is meant to be the main entrance to the building. Sponza says yes, this is the main street-facing building entry.

Parsakian says more green space would be more welcoming. Moss points out the aerial rendering which has more landscape possibility than the site plan seems to. Quintanilla says the ramp shown would be great for kids, and adding more landscaping may provide unsafe areas.

Moss says it looks like a great addition overall and he would be fine with the project as-is or with more landscaping.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the recommendation that the applicant give consideration to more landscaping**

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

## **6. Strawberry Way Mural – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership Conceptual Review**

Morton Brown, consultant for PDP, presents the proposal for the limited-term installation of a hardscape mural.

Moss says this has been a great City project in the past. He asks why the mural won't be taken the whole way down to Liberty Ave. Morton says there were a lot of delivery trucks in that stretch of street and it was very difficult to keep the mural clean. He says that they have utilized the budget funds left from shortening the mural space in order to add the residency program.

Parsakian asks if the donated paint will be limited in color. Morton says they are not sure whether the paint will be donated or purchased, but the color choice will not be limited. Parsakian says that he understands the removal of the Smithfield to Liberty section, as it has less life and pedestrian usage than the other areas.

Goulatia asks if there is a way to extend the mural into the intersections. Morton says they can revisit that, but that in the past it was too difficult to maintain due to the car traffic. Goulatia asks if the nearby wall mural is part of this project. Morton says that it is not part of the project.

Young says there may be a way to use traffic paint to create something in the intersections. Morton says he will revisit that point with PDP. Goulatia asks if color can be added to the traffic paint. Young says it comes in several colors.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness  
SECONDED BY: Young  
RECUSED: Quintanilla  
IN FAVOR: Moss, Goulatia, Leach, Parsakian  
OPPOSED: None

**7. Three Sisters Bridges Interpretive Signage – Allegheny County Bridge Operations and Technical Services  
Conceptual Review**

Jesse Belfast of Michael Baker International presents this proposal for the location, size, and mounting of three informational signs to be placed along the railing near the Seventh Street Bridge.

Parsakian asks if there will be QR codes or Braille. Belfast says they do not plan to use QR codes as PennDOT has had problems with vandalism and people linking in and redirecting the user to different sites. He says the life of the sign is probably 10-15 years and there is also concern about maintaining the web links for that long. He says they have not discussed Braille but will talk about that with the consulting parties.

Parsakian asks about ADA accessibility. Belfast says they are within the upper limit of the ADA guidelines for readability. He says that when they have their public outreach meeting they will ask whether anyone has had any issues with the existing sign.

Loftness says the signage is informative and subtle. Belfast says they will return for approval of the final designs, and they are still working through what information themes will be incorporated.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness  
SECONDED BY: Leach  
RECUSED: Quintanilla  
IN FAVOR: Moss, Goulatia, Parsakian, Young

**C. Correspondence**

Minnaert says there was one item received that did not relate to today's agenda, which was forwarded to the Commission.

**D. Public Comment**

None.

**E. Director & Staff Report**

Young announces that she will be stepping down from the Commission at the end of March, due to no longer residing in Pittsburgh.

Minnaert says they have three Percent For Art projects that are currently in the artist selection phase.

Minnaert says that the Reconceptualization project for the Cantini Mosaic is expected to come before the Commission in the next few months.



Minnaert says that there will potentially be quite a few Art in Parks projects coming to Art Commission for review in the next few months.

Minnaert notes that they processed one Over-The-Counter review in the past month.

Dash thanks Young for her service and says that they do not yet have any updates on new Commissioner appointments but expects that information soon.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:46 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*March 23, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by President Moss*

In Attendance

Moss  
Leach (first three agenda items)  
Loftness  
Parsakian  
Quintanilla  
Young

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. Moorhead Federal Building Security Improvements	3-5
5. The Porch at Schenley Patio Roof & Greenhouse	5

A. Approval of Minutes

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from February 2022. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Quintanilla. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Art in Parks: OOA Designs in Emerald View Park – Public Art & Civic Design Division  
Final Review**

Oreen Cohen & Alison Zapata of OOA Designs present their proposal for a sculptural installation at Anchor Green Garden in Emerald View Park as part of the City's Art in Parks program.

Moss thanks them and says the transformation of the project has been wonderful and its evident they've put a lot of thought into it. He says the integration of the themes is very well done.

Loftness agrees and says the story that the project tells is very compelling. She asks how this background information will be communicated to the public, and asks if there will be lighting. Cohen says they'd like to do a QR code or signage to link to additional information. She says that they have explored

options for lighting but the expenses are very high for tapping into existing power, and solar power would require large equipment. She says that they think there is enough light from the streetlights.

Parsakian says that he appreciates their research and comments about the empowering nature of their theme of bread and roses.

Moss says that the City should consider how to protect the artwork from possible accidents due to the sharp curve of the street nearby, although they would not want a guardrail to block the view of the artwork. Cavalline says that they have discussed this with DOMI, who are poised to implement a 'slow curve' program at this location, which includes raised thermoplastic on the roadway to alert drivers to slow down while approaching the curve.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness

SECONDED BY: Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

**2. Art in Parks: Ali Ruffner & Gwen Sadler in Emerald View Park – Public Art & Civic Design  
Division  
Final Review**

Ali Ruffner & Gwen Sadler present their proposal for a sculptural installation in Emerald View Park as part of the City's Art in Parks program.

Loftness asks what the bench is made of, and whether the pedestals are boulder-like or have a flat table-like top. She asks whether the concrete pad is more of a tiled surface or mostly concrete with spots of color. She also asks if a person in a wheelchair can access it.

Ruffner says that wheelchairs, strollers, and bikes can access the space because there will be a graduated slope to access the concrete area. She says the bench is fiberglass finished in concrete, with a steel base. She says the pad is mostly mosaic tile rather than predominantly concrete. She says the color of the tiles, which will be signed by the students involved, will match the colors on the bench and the powder coating of the pedestals. Ruffner says the pedestals are more boulder-like and modular. She says the hands have been placed only on the tops since when placed on the sides they appeared too disembodied.

Moss asks if the tops of the pedestals are sloped to allow for drainage, and Ruffner says they are.

Young asks if there was consideration for how people experiencing homelessness would interact with the bench, and also asks if the hands will have diverse aspects such as varying fingernail length. Ruffner says they discussed with the students the possibility of using specific skin colors for the hands, and together with the students they decided on all gold. She says that the hands are all different in terms of features such as nails and jewelry, so this is an exciting element of the project when viewed up close. Ruffner says they have discussed how to make sure this wasn't anti-homeless architecture, and she expanded the bench three inches to be inclusive of bigger-bodied people or those who want to use the bench for a longer time. She says that the area is visited mostly by people using the trail so this will provide a place of rest. Ruffner also says there will be four solar lights around the base.

Parsakian asks if the bench will have drainage as it appears to have an inward slope. Ruffner says yes, and that it is a catalogue item that they are building the finishing treatment onto. She says she is working with a concrete company who is providing expertise for those aspects. Parsakian asks if the concrete pad will include expansion joints. Ruffner says yes, and that the shape will be organic and not square. Parsakian says that the concrete should not be one solid piece, so as to avoid problems in the future. Parsakian says he loves the colors and the thought they put into reimagining their original design. He thanks them for engaging the community.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

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

**3. Art in Parks: Hutabut LLC in Frick Park – Public Art & Civic Design Division  
Final Review**

Matthew Geller of Hutabut LLC presents his proposal for a sculptural work in Frick Park as part of the City's Art in Parks program.

Moss thanks Geller and says he appreciates the evolution of the project. He says the proposed siting is a positive change, and creates a great place to view the park landscape. He says the scale of the canopy is a lot more interesting and is more playful and abstract.

Moss asks about the colors mentioned in the presentation. Geller clarifies that he was referring to the negative spaces created in the canopy, through which different colors would be viewed at various times. Moss says he thinks the shadows of the sculpture will be a delightful element. Moss asks about the canopy measurement of 8' from the ground, and asks if this is concerning as being too low. Geller says that in the end he thinks it will be moved up a bit higher so that anyone standing on the bench can't reach it.

Loftness agrees that the revised canopy is much more whimsical and compelling. She asks if the yellow on the canopy interior is specular or the same yellow as the bench. She asks if it could be dangerous if someone stands on the benches and if signage is needed. Geller says the seat is only 18" off the ground, and the rotation isn't able to create a spin. He says that there will be a glow from the yellow interior, which will be painted instead of powder coated.

Joe Martin speaks from the audience and says the crown reminds him of blood. He says he doesn't understand the theme of a carousel if it doesn't function as a carousel.

Geller says that the red is a more brown-red, as opposed to bright red. He says he does not see the blood connection, and says the piece more references landscape. He says that the shape references a merry-go-round and does move in the wind. Moss says that he understands it as referencing the idea of a carousel but it isn't a literal carousel.

Moss asks how he arrived at the color choices. Geller says he looked for colors that worked well together and would work in different seasons. He says that he took into consideration that green and blue are filled in by nature through the negative spaces of the work.

Parsakian asks if the colors will be matte or reflective. Geller says he usually goes with semi-gloss, but may use high-gloss for inside the canopy.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness  
SECONDED BY: Parsakian  
IN FAVOR: Moss, Leach, Young  
OPPOSED: None  
ABSENT: Quintanilla

**4. Moorhead Federal Building Security Improvements – General Services Administration  
Conceptual/Final Review**

Chris Kingsland of Gordon US, LLC, representing GSA, presents the proposal for security improvements in the right-of-way in compliance with regulations for federal buildings. Also presenting are Gabrielle Trout of GSA and Charles Enos of the Onyx Group. The proposal represents a revision following the project being tabled at the February 2022 Art Commission hearing.

Moss asks for clarification on what size bollard is being proposed. Trout explains that they are proposing 48" bollards due to this being the only option that was able to be certified as well as being ADA-accessible.

Loftness asks how much excavation must occur at the edge of the street for these to be installed, and says there should be a significant planting plan to go along with the bollards. Kingsland says they do need to dig into the concrete but they are shallow foundations. Loftness asks if they will be working around the existing tree wells. Kingsland says they will be working around them by putting in the post-and-beam foundations. Loftness says that she is concerned that this creates a fortress quality to the urban street. Enos explains that there is no room for landscaping due to the amount of solid concrete necessary around the foundation. He says similar bollards are being installed around the country. Loftness asks if the bollards in one of the images are stainless steel or painted. Enos says they are painted. Loftness says that stainless steel would be better. Trout says they looked into that but the posts and beams are not available in stainless steel, so the colors would be mixed. It is also fairly cost-prohibitive. The building management has also said that they have had issues with stainless steel in other applications due to staining or denting. She says there is flexibility in the color for the painted bollards. Moss clarifies that they could specify a lighter grey color, and Trout says yes.

Moss says that he feels this is not a great solution for the city, but in understanding the need for the security improvement they do not seem to be presented with any other options. He says that in the question of the three different options for Grant Street, he would lean toward the top option (same style painted to match existing bollards), but does not feel strongly. Trout says that this was their recommendation. Parsakian says that he agrees, and that he understands that the need for security has to take precedence in this case over the aesthetics.

Loftness asks if there will be striping on the Grant Street bollards. Enos says they will not be striped. Trout says the striping was not intended as an aesthetic but was for the safety of drivers, and although it is recommended, they will remove it if necessary. Loftness says that if it is a reflective tape that goes on after installation, she would use one that matches the paint. Enos says it is painted, as the purpose is contrast. Loftness says this would draw attention to the bollards and they are trying to get people's attention away from them. Enos says that this is true for pedestrians, but they want drivers to see them.

Loftness says that Commissioner Quintanilla previously raised a concern that wheelchairs would not be able to get around the bollards on the walkway. Enos says there is 54" between each bollard, so a wheelchair would fit through. Loftness says it looks like someone in a wheelchair would have to go around one that is in the middle of the pathway. Enos says that they are not obstructing the pathway. Loftness says she doesn't see how a wheelchair could go by without going over the cobblestones. Enos says they will ensure there is not a bollard in the middle of the sidewalk so there will be a direct path. Kingsland says the plans show a bollard in the center of the 8' wide sidewalk. Loftness says it would be better to change the spacing so a wheelchair would not have to swerve. Enos asks if Kingsland can change the spacing to accommodate that, and Kingsland says yes.

Parsakian notes that they are coordinating with DOMI. Trout says that they have worked with DOMI, who has approved and supported the new design. Cavalline confirms that they have received DOMI's support for the project.

Quintanilla says that pedestrians should be the first consideration and the bollards should allow someone in a wheelchair to access the middle of the sidewalk. Enos says they can make that accommodation.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the conditions that 1) the bollards use the light grey finish; 2) the Grant Street bollards utilize the dark finish to match the existing ones, without striping; and 3) a clear path of travel for wheelchairs is maintained on the existing sidewalk by the garage.**

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

## **5. The Porch at Schenley Patio Roof & Greenhouse – Axis Architecture**

### **Final Review**

Craig Collins of Axis Architecture and Andrew Dunmire of Eat'n Park Hospitality Group present the proposal for a new roof and shade system over existing patio, as well as a small greenhouse to be used by the restaurant.

Moss appreciates that they have revisited the greenhouse plans. He asks for clarification on the placement and alignment of the greenhouse. He asks about the stone base shown in the images and if that will actually be implemented. Dunmire says that with the landscaping around the building they did not see that as necessary and so plan to go with a shallow foundation.

Loftness says she appreciates the roof being pulled back a bit and asks if they will put in a column to support it. Dunmire says yes. Loftness asks if this could have been done without a new column. Dunmire says they considered that but felt that the column was not an impediment. Moss says they need the columns to attach the roll-down screens to. Dunmire says yes. Loftness says she felt the column could be an impediment to the use of the space but that is more of an issue for the client.

Loftness asks about their plan to drain water from the roof into the tree. Dunmire says there is specialized soil around the trees, and the water will reach this soil. Loftness asks how the water gets there. Dunmire says ¼" per foot drains right from the roof edge. Moss asks if there is a gutter. Dunmire says no.

Loftness asks if the rolling shades fit inside the vertical column. Dunmire says no, they fit right outside of the beam. Loftness asks if a box will be seen in front of the beam. Dunmire says it is the same depth as the structure and will go from column to column. He says that it is a tube column as opposed to an I-beam. Loftness says this will have a different aesthetic than their original renderings. Moss asks if the screen will be on the inside or the outside. Dunmire says the outside. Moss asks if they could be mounted on the opposite side of the beam. Dunmire says that was their initial thought but that is more difficult to attach on the inside corners. Loftness suggests they do a scale model so they are sure it looks the way they intend.

Parsakian thanks the applicant for revisiting the greenhouse and says the new structure is very light and replicates the nearby cathedral.

### **MOTION: Final Approval**

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

## **C. Correspondence**

Minnaert notes that the Commission has received the following correspondence: 1) Report from the [XXX DATE] Development Activities Meeting held by Mount Washington Community Development Corporation for both Emerald View Park Art in Parks projects; 2) letter of support from Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy for OOA Designs' Art in Parks project; 3) letter of support from Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy for Ali Ruffner & Gwen Sadler's Art in Parks project; 4) letter of support from Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy for Hutabut LLC's Art in Parks project; 5) letter of comment from Tony Indovina

regarding Hutabut LLC's Art in Parks project; 6) letter of comment from Squirrel Hill Urban Coalition regarding Hutabut LLC's Art in Parks project.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert thanks Commissioner Young for her service. Moss also thanks her.

Minnaert notes that they have received no new information on the administration's filling of vacant Commissioner seats.

Minnaert says that they have many new art projects currently being planned through the Percent For Art program and are looking forward to their upcoming Art Commission reviews.

Parsakian says he was contacted by an artist who received Conceptual Approval regarding a possible site visit. Minnaert says that those kind of inquiries can be directed to PACD staff and they will help the artist navigate the next steps of the process.

Moss asks if there is any update to the Cantini mosaic. Minnaert says they are waiting for a draft of a lease agreement between Port Authority and the City in order to have enough information to bring the proposed location to the Art Commission for review.

Loftness asks if they should discuss the Fern Hollow Bridge. Moss says it is not an item for review, but the Art Commission has issued a letter to the Mayor and the Governor. He says they did not get a specific response to the letter. He says that he and the Planning Commission chair met with the staff of the Mayor's office for an update.

Loftness asks if a bridge project would normally come to the Commission, and if that is tied to funding. Moss says that it would come to the Commission if it is on City property, but that the Fern Hollow Bridge is unique due to the Emergency Order. Parsakian asks if the bridge will be owned by the state. Moss says it will be completed by PennDOT and transferred to the City. He says that the intent is for the historic gate houses to be maintained.

Loftness notes that the Commission has limited leeway for items such as the Moorhead bollards which are matters of security. Moss says he thinks they can push PennDOT to engage with the Commission on minor elements of the bridge such as the guardrails and lighting. Quintanilla says it appears there is little impact they are able to make. He says that even if this is a PennDOT project, if it is using public money it should be reviewed more extensively. Moss says if this had been a planned reconstruction of the bridge there would have been more public discourse and Art Commission review, but because of the Emergency Order and the need for a quick reconstruction this case is different. Moss says they should continue to push PennDOT to engage with the Commission on the details. Parsakian says this will come up a lot with future planned infrastructure reconstructions. Loftness says there should be a standard Art Commission review process for the details of bridges and in some cases for their engineering options.

Moss says that he suggested to the Mayor's staff that there could be an artistic intervention on the eventual concrete bridge supports. He notes there used to be a time when the Art Commission had a budget and instigated projects.

Parsakian says they all know guerilla artists who have created work that is now coming to the Art Commission.

Quintanilla says that they are allowing a highway bridge into their City, and even if they include art, this is not a bridge designed for people to walk on.

Loftness says there are still choices that can be impacted, such as the rails and lighting. She asks how they can intervene with the engineers in the decisions they are able to make.

Moss says they can possibly send a letter to PennDOT from the Art Commission requesting their involvement.

Minnaert says that PACD staff is not involved in the Fern Hollow Bridge discussions, but Dir Hornstein and Dir Lucas, who are both ex-officio Art Commission members, are involved. She notes that the review of municipal design and the integration of artwork are two related but distinct topics.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:26 P.M.





CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*April 27, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by President Moss*

In Attendance

Moss  
Loftness  
Parsakian  
Quintanilla

Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash  
Minnaert

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Brookline Community Mural	1-2
2. Arsenal Park Phase 1	2-3
3. Hazelwood Green Bus Shelters	3-4
4. Lincoln Place Fire & Medic Station	4-5
5. Carnegie Library Main Branch Renovations	5-6

A. Approval of Minutes

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from March 2022. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Loftness. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Brookline Community Mural – Brookline Together  
Final Review**

Blake Plavchak presents the proposal for a mural celebrating Brookline's history and residents.

Parsakian asks about the map in the mural's composition. Plavchak says that they wanted to try to represent the whole community. Parsakian says he is drawn to the right section depicting homes, and suggests that having another section of the homes instead of the map would strengthen the composition. He compliments the overall style of the mural.

Plavchak notes that local teens will help with the installation.

Project artist Randi Stewart says that the mural design changed several times during planning and agrees with Parsakian's comments. She says that a in design change could be submitted to the community.

Loftness says the houses are compelling but the rendering appears to be in the style of different artists. Stewart explains that the mural will be more painterly as the rendering is simplified. Loftness says it will be a great addition and advocates for applying the same style to the whole mural as is shown in the section with the houses.

Stewart notes that the wall includes a 90 degree angle so all parts of it will not be seen linearly at all times. Loftness asks if the wall includes doors. Stewart says there are both garage doors and man doors, so they used rectangles of colors to disguise them. Moss clarifies that the mural will continue over the doors, and Stewart says yes. Moss asks if they have considered the placement of mural elements given that at times the doors will be open. Stewart says yes. Loftness says it would be helpful to show that in the renderings.

Parsakian suggests reconsidering the map section.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

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

**2. Arsenal Park Phase 1 – Department of Public Works  
Final Review**

Andrea Ketzel of DPW, Eric Brightman of Pashek+MTR, and Howard Graves of Graves Design Group present the proposal for this renovation to Arsenal Park, including accessible entrances, play area, water play area, shelter, restroom, and stormwater/nature play elements.

Loftness asks for clarification on if the frame is wood or steel. Graves says that it is steel but it will all be clad in wood, except for the beams within the pavilion. She asks if the steel was cheaper than doing all wood. Graves says yes and it was less complicated. He says that the internal spans will be painted steel. Moss asks how they will curve the wood that will clad the beams. Graves says their size will make them relatively easy to bend.

Loftness asks about the colors of the play equipment and surfaces. Brightman says that the spray features will have a concrete base, but that the play surface will be in the colors shown, only a bit more muted as the color will have black dappled in. Loftness says she prefers it muted. Moss asks if the two areas will have different shades of blue as shown in the rendering, and Brightman says yes, but the shading shown in the renderings is meant to indicate topography. Loftness says it would be great if the manufacturers of play surfaces would create more subtle shading. Loftness says that the applicants need to pay attention to the detailing and keep as much natural material in the design as possible, as she has some worries that the contrast between natural and artificial materials could make the design not work as well.

Graves says that they have had some issues with pre-cast stone and will have to do several mock-ups, but are comfortable with how the wood detailing is turning out.

Parsakian asks about the longevity of the wood and steel surfaces. Graves says the wood will not be painted and will be allowed to age. Moss asks what kind of wood the cladding will be. Graves says cedar and the ceiling will be a plywood surface that can be painted. Parsakian asks what the longevity of the paint would be. Graves says it will not receive direct rain and he suspects ten years before it would need to be repainted.

Parsakian asks if collected rainwater will be repurposed for the landscaping. Brightman says that they are discussing incorporating the gutters into the raingarden but are not sure yet if that is possible. Loftness says it should be designed as a raingarden and that the stormwater should not just go into a drain. Parsakian agrees.

Loftness asks about the light fixtures and says they seem glaring. Graves says they looked at various options, but they are following the City's request for vandal-proof fixtures. Moss asks if he has a sample of the lighting. Graves says no but he can send that to them.

Moss says there are aspects of the renderings that do not seem to portray what the final visuals will be. Graves says the renderings depict the final design and the lighting in them was stipulated by the City. Brightman says that the lighting fixture is a recent change and it is a low profile fixture. Moss says that he is unclear on the painted steel and ceiling and if the colors shown represent the paint colors. Graves says that they haven't selected the exact colors yet. Ketzel says what is represented will be very similar to how it will look, and that it has been presented to the public in this form.

Quintanilla asks what will be over the columns. Graves explains the columns and how they are clad. He says the only thing that might be tweaked is changing the aluminum cap on the column base to a stone cap for longevity. Quintanilla asks if there will be a slope on it, and Graves says yes.

Loftness says that any substitutions made to what they're seeing should be reviewed. Moss says they would normally expect final specifications for a Final Review. Ketzel says the variability comes down to cost and what happens to the budget when it is bid out. She says that they have considered all of the Commission's comments that were made in Conceptual Review and would like to incorporate them, but it all comes down to cost.

Graves says they are confident with where they've ended up with the designs and the final materials will be budgetary decisions, but the visual will look as presented.

Minnaert suggests that any material changes could be given staff review if the Commission wished. Loftness says there are also detailing concerns that need to be represented, and they would like to see photographs of the details. Ketzel notes that DPW would not let the project proceed with details that are not durable or cannot be maintained.

Loftness asks where the electrical lines will be. Graves says that there will be outlets adjacent to the building but not within the enclosed space. Moss asks why they wouldn't put outlets on the columns. Ketzel says the City asks for lockable outlets which are available for use when someone has a permit for the shelter. Parsakian asks if the outlet is on the exterior or the interior of the building. Graves says it is on the exterior.

Loftness asks why the maintenance door is the same color as the bathroom door. Graves says it could be painted to match the stone. Loftness says there will need to be signage for the bathroom. Graves says there will be.

**MOTION: Final Approval, with the condition that PACD Staff review final materials selection, detailing of those materials, and roof drainage, and that staff inform Art Commission of any major changes to those materials and details.**

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

### **3. Hazelwood Green Bus Shelters – evolveEA Conceptual Review**

Daniel Klein of evolveEA, artists Carin Mincemoyer and Alisha Wormsley, and Sallyann Kluz of the Office For Public Art present the proposal for 8-10 artist-designed bus shelters within Hazelwood Green and along the local business corridor.

Moss commends the project and presentation. Parsakian compliments their team and process. Loftness agrees. She asks if there can be more greenery in the spaces around the shelters. She says she loves the word messaging but says the wording seems dense. She says that some of the ideas in their art

reminds her of Damien Hirsch which can be unnerving, and asks if that could make people uncomfortable. Mincemoyer says that they will probably be looking at using photographs on glass instead of actual artifacts, which can also be more easily changed out at a later date.

Lucas compliments the project and notes that DOMI submitted questions about the project which the applicant had previously answered. She says that it would be difficult for DOMI to maintain these shelters, but if they were maintained by others then DOMI would be supportive. She notes that if they are meant to be lit by the surrounding streetlights, the light may be disrupted by the solid roof which could lead to a darker space that is less comfortable and safe. She also wants to make sure that the project is being coordinated with Port Authority to make sure that there are no upcoming changes planned to the bus lines, and that accessibility is taken into consideration.

Klein says they are coordinating with the relevant agencies and that they are making sure that the shelters are moveable in case of any needed changes in the future. Kluz says that they have been working with Port Authority, DOMI, and PennDOT, as well as community stakeholders.

#### **MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

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

#### **4. Lincoln Place Fire & Medic Station – Department of Public Works Conceptual Review**

Claire Mastroberardino of the Department of Public Works and Roberto Vega-Peralta of AE7 present the proposal for a new fire & paramedic station to better support the Fire and EMS programs, incorporate current network and monitoring infrastructure, and utilize Passive House strategies to comply with code. The new building will replace the existing Fire Station 20 and Medic 12 and will include a Percent For Art project.

Moss says the building design seems appropriate and thoughtful. He says that there are opportunities for better integration of an art project. Mastroberardino discusses their considerations of the large parcel space and that she did not want an artist to be limited by the design of the building. Vega-Peralta says that they would like to consider the opportunities for the art budget being used for an amenity to the community that this large site could afford.

Loftness says that it is an elegant design. She says she is not convinced that the community can walk to this location and the possibilities of the large parcel space should be considered in terms of public and pedestrian space. She asks what might be planned for the rest of the site. Mastroberardino says they have discussed this with the community and they are still figuring out what the community wants for this area. She says that this programming would be passed along to another division or entity to plan.

Minnaert asks if there is a rough idea of the budget for the Percent For Art. Mastroberardino says that the total project budget is about twelve million.

Loftness says that this could be an addition to the neighborhood that brings people together and the design currently seems unfinished and too focused on parking. Mastroberardino says that the URA is involved with what happens with the rest of the site. Loftness says that their design team could do something that will inspire the future use of the site. Mastroberardino says they are limited in their scope. Moss says the overflow parking is also not part of their scope and he is concerned that the art component is attached to the future overflow parking site.

Parsakian asks if this also functions as a community center. Mastroberardino says there will be a community room to use for meetings. Parsakian asks if pedestrians would come to the building, and Mastroberardino says they could. Parsakian says it is not a pedestrian-friendly building and he'd like to see a connection from the doors to the sidewalk. Mastroberardino says that the first priority for the

building is as a firehouse and medic station. Parsakian says the Percent For Art should be an integral part of the building.

Parsakian asks if they will have a landscape plan. Vego-Peralta says yes. Parsakian asks if there is a floor plan. Mastroberardino says there is but they do not release the interiors of public safety buildings.

Moss asks if the parking could all be put on one side of the building to allow the building to be closer to the road. Mastroberardino says some of the parking will change before the design is finalized, but they want to separate the public parking from the personnel parking.

Vego-Peralta says there are a number of utilities near the street edge which would be a challenge if the building was placed closer to the street. He says that the site is also sloped, which dictated where the building entrances were placed.

The Commission asks that the applicant consider asking architects to take a deliberative look at the entire site, including pedestrian areas.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

**5. Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh Main Branch Renovations  
Conceptual Review**

Sergei Matveiev of elagin architecture and Ron Graziano of CLoP present the proposal for renovations including in-kind replacement of the deteriorated Schenley Plaza Grand Stair, a shaft-enclosed elevator, and new paved pedestrian routes.

Moss clarifies that they are lowering the entrance. Matveiev says yes and gives details on this. Loftness asks for clarification of the slope of the walkway.

Loftness says that the handicapped entrance is critical but is concerned that the paving looks more like circulation paths and less like a garden.

Matveiev gives clarification on the archway doors and the vestibule. Loftness asks if there will still be a step in the vestibule. Matveiev says the step will be eliminated. He discusses the entranceway and their options for the interior.

Loftness asks where the handicapped lift will bring someone. Matveiev shows where the lift will enter the vestibule. Loftness says that walking up a ramp and going over a step could be dangerous. Matveiev says they are eliminating the step. He says the bronze doors stay open during the day and the interior doors will automatically open.

Quintanilla says his concern is that the walkways would not be integrated into the symmetry of the building. Matveiev says that integrating a ramp into the stairs would not be approved by preservationists. He says that the walkways are placed to maintain the visual symmetry from Schenley Drive. Quintanilla says that the walkway does not work visually with the building's symmetry. Matveiev says he understands but the actual visual will read differently than the plan view.

Moss suggests that the landscaping could create a better pedestrian environment. Graziano says they are not opposed to landscaping if it was low maintenance. He says that the shortened entry path could be removed, but they think it will be a valuable amenity to people traveling from Forbes Ave and that it will visually disappear. Quintanilla says it will not disappear. Matveiev asks if the Commission is requesting that they soften the edges.

Loftness says that this is a good accessibility solution but not a landscape solution. Quintanilla asks if the walkway could come from the opposite side. Moss says that this would not serve the purpose of providing a shorter route. Quintanilla says that people also approach from that direction. Moss says they have another path there already. Matveiev says that this is the only way to include a walkway with a low enough slope to not need handrails.

Loftness says the walkway should be treated as a landscape design. Matveiev says they can put that in. Graziano agrees and says that the City just needs to be able to get a mower in to cut the grass.

The Commission asks that the applicant consider nesting the accessible paths into the landscaping.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval**

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

C. Correspondence

Minnaert notes that the Commission has received the following correspondence: A letter of support for the Lincoln Place Fire & Medic Station, and a letter regarding the art in Frick Park that was reviewed in March.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert notes that there were two Over-The-Counter reviews conducted this month, which were forwarded to the Commission.

Moss requests an update on the Fern Hollow Bridge.

Loftness notes the letter regarding the artwork in Frick Park and asks if they need to respond. Minnaert notes the process and deadlines for receiving correspondence prior to hearings and that this correspondence was received after that deadline. She says that it is no longer an item for decision on the agenda but that it can be discussed now if they wish. Moss agrees.

Loftness notes that some of the applicants at today's hearing did not provide up-to-date or finalized drawings. Moss says that they can request additional information from applicants. Parsakian says at in-person hearings they were able to see material samples. Quintanilla says that clear site plans are necessary to understand the applications.

The Commission discusses application requirements, the Commission's purview over landscaping, and landscaping as an art medium.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*May 25, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by Secretary Goulatia*

In Attendance

Goulatia  
Leach  
Loftness  
Parsakian  
Quintanilla

Newman (DPW)  
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash (Items 5-10)  
Minnaert  
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Strawberry Way Mural	1-2
2. Highland Park Super Playground Mosaics	2
3. Frick Park Extension Public Art	3
4. Art in Parks: Suphitsara Buttra-Coleman in Schenley Park	3-4
5. Sans façon & Steve Gurysh in Riverview Park	4-5
6. Pittsburgh Pedestrian Wayfinding Locations	5-7
7. Jane Seymour Open Heart Sculpture	7
8. Homewood Park	7-9
9. Enright Park	9
10. Salem's Art Park	9-10

A. Approval of Minutes

Goulatia asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from April 2022. Loftness motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Quintanilla. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Strawberry Way Mural – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership  
Final Review**

Morton Brown, consultant to PDP, presents the proposal for a limited-term (3 year) installation of a hardscape mural. He is joined by Jeremy Waldrup of PDP.

Parsakian compliments the project and the bringing together of students and artists. Loftness agrees and asks if it was possible to extend it to Liberty Ave. Waldrup says that the last mural iteration was extended to Liberty, but due to the high amount of truck traffic it presented a maintenance issue. He says they hope to develop another project for that area.

Goulatia asks if there was a way to incorporate a section of the mural within the crosswalks so as not to break up the composition. Waldrup says they considered this, but this would also require increased maintenance due to vehicular traffic. He says they'd like to find ways to extend the artwork off of the ground surface in these areas, without affecting the historic buildings nearby. Morton agrees and says that closing down William Penn Place for painting or repairs would be very disruptive, as well as being visually disruptive to the historic viewsheds when seen from other perspectives.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

MOVED BY: Leach  
SECONDED BY: Parsakian  
IN FAVOR: Goulatia, Loftness  
OPPOSED: None  
RECUSED: Quintanilla

**2. Highland Park Super Playground Mosaics – Highland Park Community Council  
Final Review**

Sabrina Culyba of HPCC presents this proposal for the installation of a community-led mosaic artwork as part of the new playground construction. She is joined by Andrea Ketzal of the Department of Public Works.

Goulatia asks how the guide to identifying the individual mosaics will be made available. Culyba says there will be a visual map online. Goulatia asks if they will use a QR code. Culyba says they will consider that. Goulatia asks why it is called the Super Playground. Culyba says this goes back to the original construction of the playground. Goulatia asks if they will change the style of the children's drawings as they make the mosaics. Culyba says the goal is to keep them within the spirit of what the children drew. Goulatia asks if they will keep the colors the kids used. Culyba says yes, the glass artists will replicate the drawings.

Quintanilla compliments the project. He says the colors of the mosaic sign are great, and wonders if the top should be an irregular edge to match the shapes of the flowers. Culyba says she is not sure how that would affect the secure mounting on the fence.

Parsakian asks if the lettering on the sign would be a mirrored glass. Culyba says yes, that they changed the white that is shown in the rendering to be mirrored, as it makes the letters stand out. Parsakian asks if the sign will be lit. Culyba says that was not discussed. Ketzal says that they did not include that as the parks are open from dawn to dusk. Parsakian says he loves the project and seeing the children's words and images come to life. Goulatia says that she'd like there to be online access to see the drawings. Culyba says this is available on the HPCC website. She says that they selected twelve images but they wanted to celebrate all of the artists, so all are shown online. Goulatia asks if the writing on the sign will also be in mosaic. Culyba says yes, that the shapes are cut from acrylic backing but each one will be done in mosaic by a different community member. Goulatia says it is a beautifully done project.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

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



### **3. Frick Park Extension Public Art – Tim Kaulen Final Review**

Tim Kaulen presents his proposal for a sculptural public art project to be located in a park space in the Summerset at Frick Park residential community.

Loftness asks about the colors. Kaulen says the base materials will start in darker tones but he will exaggerate the natural colors of the heron to have a whimsical quality. Loftness says she appreciates the concrete footer being buried.

Parsakian says he is reminded of Kaulen's installation at the Children's Museum and asks if it will be colorful like that sculpture. Kaulen says that one of the sculptures there is also a heron, but is made of acrylic signage so is much bolder. He says this sculpture will strike a balance between raw metal and color accents.

Parsakian asks what feedback he has gotten from the community. Kaulen says the community feedback leans toward a playful and colorful palette and the creation of a unique signature piece for the park.

Goulatia asks if he has considered using glass. Kaulen says there are some logistical concerns but he loves the idea. Goulatia mentions a public sculpture by OOA Designs which uses glass. Goulatia asks about the visibility of the base. Kaulen says the goal is for none of the concrete to be visible.

Goulatia asks what the pipe is for. Kaulen says he has asked for a pipe to be included in the foundation in case lighting is possible in the future.

Goulatia asks about the tree structure. Kaulen says it will be solid but will be an organic and tapered shape. Goulatia says that the edges should not be sharp in case it is climbed on, and it is important that guidelines be followed to ensure children cannot get their head stuck.

Quintanilla says he loves the sculpture and says it feels light and airy, so maybe the colors need not be so strong.

#### **MOTION: Final Approval**

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

### **4. Art in Parks: Suphitsara Buttra-Coleman in Schenley Park – Public Art & Civic Design Division Final Review**

Suphitsara Buttra-Coleman presents her proposal for paneled wall murals to be located at the Sportsplex in Schenley Park as part of the Art in Parks program.

Loftness says it is a lovely piece of art. She asks if it is possible that the substrate would be pulled apart, and Buttra-Coleman says no, that she is working with a company that handles heavy mountings. Goulatia asks if the panel is aluminum or acrylic. Buttra-Coleman says that the substrate is aluminum. Goulatia asks about the type of paint. Buttra-Coleman says that it is a high-gloss oil-based enamel and is weather resistant. Goulatia describes anti-graffiti coating and suggests using this.

Quintanilla says it's a fantastic idea. He says the area near the soccer field is mostly about sports and asks if another location was considered. Buttra-Coleman says that the mural needs a wall and there are not many in the park, and this location has a lot of people resting and walking nearby. Quintanilla says that a more contemplative area may be better. Buttra-Coleman says that they had considered another location but had all agreed on this location during earlier planning. Goulatia asks if Buttra-Coleman considered the wall by the tennis courts. She notes that the Commission discussed the current proposed

placement at an earlier meeting. Buttra-Coleman says she would like to put the artwork where people can see it from far away, which makes this a good location. Quintanilla says he is unsure of the context of birds near a soccer field. Goulatia says it should be in an airy space and asks if there is another possible location. Buttra-Coleman says that there was but notes that at the first Art Commission hearing the Commission agreed on this being the best location. Goulatia asks about the other sides of the building. Buttra-Coleman says there is not a lot of space on the other walls so she prefers these two.

Minnaert notes that the octagonal building is hard to represent in images, but the selected walls are not squarely facing the soccer field.

Loftness says that the Commission did give Conceptual Approval of this location with this subject matter previously, and says it would be a positive addition to the park. Parsakian agrees and says it will be an uplifting addition to a dull building. He notes that some previous public comment addressed whether the species were native. Buttra-Coleman says that in her design all depicted birds will be those that can be found in the park.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

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

**5. Sans façon & Steve Gurysh in Riverview Park – Public Art & Civic Design Division  
Conceptual Review**

Tristan Surtees and Charles Blanc of Sans facon, along with artist Steve Gurysh, present their proposal for a series of art installations to be located in Riverview Park as part of the Art in Parks program.

Loftness asks about the manpower needed to execute the projects. Surtees says that their collaboration with Tree Pittsburgh and the City Forester has been critical for elements of the project, and they will also be subcontracting a carver to do the fallen tree sculpture. Loftness asks for clarification on the sculpture. Surtees says the carver will work onsite and the tree will not be moved at all.

Loftness asks how the project is put together in a long-term sense. Surtees says that it is about discovery and the activation of the place rather than individual objects. He says that the monument will be a framing device that will lead to noticing the heritage trees. He says that the drawing instruments and map will expand this invitation to see this place through a different lens. Blanc notes that the artist film will also help to explain and connect these gestures. Gurysh says that a legacy of the project is the partnerships formed between the collaborators.

Leach asks why the tree markers are nine feet high. Surtees says that it is a combination of keeping them away from vandalism and also inviting viewers to look upward to get a sense of the magnitude of the trees. He says that it could be moved down a bit if desired.

Parsakian says he is very impressed with how the project connects together and how it addresses sustainability. He says that the shape of the park looks like a bird and asks if they've thought of tying that in.

Surtees says that Riverview Park is a special place and through the many conversations they've had they determined that instead of adding something to the park that needs to be cared for, their job was to help frame the existing processes of ecology and create new ways of looking. Parsakian says they are very successful at what they are trying to do and their storytelling is superb.

Goulatia asks what the monument is fabricated of. Surtees says it will be carved from an existing fallen tree. Goulatia asks if they'll be working with each fallen tree. Surtees says they will be working with one. Goulatia asks if they will be able to see the markers at nine feet high. Surtees says that they will

have to see how it looks after one is produced and hung, and if it is hard to see they will adjust it. Goulatia says it is a wonderful project.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

**6. Pittsburgh Pedestrian Wayfinding Locations – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership Conceptual/Final Review**

Kathryn Schlesinger of PDP presents the final locations for 164 assets of the wayfinding system. The design of the system previously received Final Approval, with the condition that the final locations were reviewed at a separate hearing. She is joined by Chris Watts of PDP and consultants John Nicholson and Zack Kaczmarek.

Loftness says that the amount of preparation they have done is very evident, as is the need for the signage. She says that she is concerned with the proliferation of poles and the coordination with other signage. Schlesinger says that they have made it a priority to utilize existing poles. She says that when there are a lot of existing assets they work to find solutions so as to reduce the amount of clutter. Watts adds that the cut sheet for each asset will make recommendations to reduce clutter in that area, and that each asset must be approved by the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure.

Leach asks why the Hill District is not considered an asset. Watts says that this is not the way they feel, but that this project was conceived in 2013 as a result of neighborhood planning that was happening in Oakland, North Side, North Shore and Downtown. He says that they have had communications with the Hill CDC about options and they could integrate this into their system if they thought it was appropriate.

Parsakian asks if the project would be expanded to other neighborhoods in the future. Watts says that the project has been privately funded to this point and that the City or other community groups could seek funding for iterations of the system if they wished.

Goulatia says that isolating three neighborhoods highlights them from all others, and that it would be nice to incorporate other neighborhoods in this system to unify the City. Schlesinger says that an expansion of the project would be ideal and that advocating to the City for this would be the next steps. Watts says they have had communications with Port Authority to improve wayfinding as part of transportation channels as well, and that they would work with other neighborhoods who are interested in taking this on.

Dave Demko of Scenic Pittsburgh gives public comment in opposition to the project.

Cate Irvin of Oakland Business Improvement District gives public comment in support of the project.

Loftness asks if the signage identifies what neighborhood you are in. She says that City neighborhoods have rich character and it would be a shame to have a uniform system that does not acknowledge this. Watts says each asset will have neighborhood and district identifiers. He says that this was a point of discussion when the design was approved by the Art Commission in 2018.

Minnaert notes that the application is specifically for the locations, with the system and design being previously approved.

Watts adds that the locations are still subject to the review and approval of DOMI and PennDOT, and there are a lot of technical factors that determine the possible locations.

Goulatia says that she was the only Commissioner present when the design was approved in 2018 and says that a refresher may have been useful. She asks how the individual neighborhoods are being addressed. Schlesinger says that the design was not gone over extensively in the presentation under advisement of staff, as the design elements have already been approved. Loftness says she would like to see a mock-up of the signage from a pedestrian point of view, particularly in Oakland, to see if it is an enhancement. Watts says that in addition to the City reviews, due diligence was done with institutions in each neighborhood to review each asset and its location and these at times led to modifications based on their feedback.

Goulatia asks if the signs are different for each neighborhood or are generic. Watts says they were designed as a standard that could be used in any neighborhood across the City, but have pictograms and narratives that describe each neighborhood and district.

Parsakian notes the number of kiosks in each neighborhood and says that those are large items on a sidewalk. He asks how they justify placing that many items in each neighborhood. Watts says that there was a methodology to identify kiosk locations at key neighborhood gateways.

Lucas says that the applicant classified this as a City project, but clarifies that it is not in fact City-led, and that the specific choice of geographic locations are due to it being led by other organizations. She says that at the City they are committed to getting easily around the City and that wayfinding is an important component of that. She says that a critical mass of wayfinding assets is needed to make that kind of system work. She says that Art Commission approval of the locations is not the final step, but that DOMI will be reviewing the exact locations as part of the permit process to make sure that the signage is not in conflict with existing signage or has a negative impact on the usability of the public space. Parsakian says that it would be hard for the Commission to give a final approval when DOMI is still reviewing. Lucas says that from DOMI's perspective, Art Commission approval is one step of the process and that it would not be unusual for something to come to Art Commission prior to DOMI reviewing and issuing a permit.

Loftness asks if each location has been vetted with the owners of the buildings adjacent to the signs. Watts says that each location has been vetted within the community, with property owners, and stakeholders as much as possible. He says that all have had the opportunity to be engaged and is not sure what other forum would be appropriate to review the quantity of these assets. He says that the requirements from PennDOT are very stringent, so between that review and DOMI's review, each asset will be thoroughly vetted. He notes that this location review by Art Commission was a requirement of the previous concept and design approval. Schlesinger also says that the signage calls out locations within a ten to fifteen minute walk and does not just point to locations that can be seen adjacent to it.

Lucas notes that the reason items come to Art Commission to be placed in the right-of-way are when they are non-standard, whereas standardized items are routinely placed in the right-of-way utilizing DOMI review. She says that it is difficult for the Commission to offer feedback on 165 locations because typically in cases like this they would approve a design standard, with the final locations undergoing DOMI review.

Goulatia asks how far one sign is from another. Schlesinger says the directional signs are typically at opposite corners of intersections. Watts says there are roughly one set of signs or a kiosk on every other block. Goulatia says that is quite a lot. Schlesinger says many of them are being placed on existing assets. She says that info on each location was included in the full application.

The Commissioners discuss what is necessary for their complete review of the project locations. Minnaert confirms with the Commission that an additional month of review time with the submitted materials will be sufficient, and that the applicant can return for a decision the following month.

#### **MOTION: Table**

MOVED BY: Leach  
SECONDED BY: Parsakian  
IN FAVOR: Goulatia, Loftness  
OPPOSED: None  
RECUSED: Quintanilla

Lucas asks Watts if the decision today will have a negative impact on the federal grant received for the project. Watts says that in order to keep on track for the funding they would like to have a fully approved package by August.

**7. Jane Seymour Open Heart Sculpture – Mount Washington Community Development Corporation  
Conceptual Review**

Gordon Davidson of MW CDC presents the proposal for the installation of an Open Heart sculpture by Jane Seymour on a Mount Washington overlook.

Quintanilla says it's generally a great opportunity to bring in a piece of art, but that the overlooks should not have any pieces of art on them. He says that the platforms are meant to view the City as art, not host a piece of art. He suggests another location may be better for this piece.

Leach agrees and says that this art would conflict with a space that is used for many events as well as viewing the skyline. She suggests a nearby green space.

Loftness agrees and says that it would be a problematic location. She says that if a new location was chosen the new pedestal should be round as in the image.

Goulatia agrees. She says she is opposed to the artwork and notes that it is a design that the artist produces on a line of jewelry and other products.

Parsakian agrees and says he does not feel that this sculpture belongs anywhere in the City. He says it is not a unique piece of sculpture and it feels like this would demean the platforms, which are named after notable City figures. He says that the community has been overwhelmingly against this and is upset that the community group has not listened to their concerns. He says to put anything on the pedestals would block the view.

Goulatia says she is opposed to putting this sculpture anywhere in the City.

Jaye Gennuso gives public comment in opposition to the project.

Lisa Goedert gives public comment in opposition to the project.

Pat Gianella gives public comment in opposition to the project.

Dave Demko gives public comment in opposition to the project.

James Ackerman gives public comment in opposition to the project.

Davidson asks to give a final statement. He says that MW CDC cares what the community thinks and have followed City approval processes for a Conceptual Review. He says MW CDC would like to withdraw the proposal.

**MOTION: Denial**

MOVED BY: Parsakian

SECONDED BY: Quintanilla

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

**8. Homewood Park – Department of Public Works  
Conceptual Review**

Andrea Ketzel of DPW, along with Sara Zewde, James Smith, and Phil Syvertsen of Studio Zewde, present the proposal for the renovation plan of the existing Stargell Field and expansion of the park onto the previous Homewood School property. They are joined by Adria Longenderfer of Digsau. The proposed improvements include combined sports fields, cultural/performance space, playground and multi-purpose courts, stormwater management, and improved pedestrian connections.

Parsakian asks if the community wanted basketball courts. Zewde says that it came up a few times but that there was a strong preference for football. Parsakian asks if there will be a cover or utilities for the performance area. Zewde says the design is meant to accommodate the possibility of temporary cover. Parsakian says Pittsburgh is driven by the arts and a project this size should give consideration to the performing arts space. Zewde says that is possible.

Loftness compliments the project, its amenities, and its connection to the busway. She wonders if the football field could be designated as being for soccer and other sports as well. She says that the pool has not been given as beautiful a space and does not have grass next to it. She says the building is skewed toward the football field instead of the other activities. She says the project overall is very football-centric. Zewde says they are tailoring the building's roof to have a presence toward Hamilton Avenue. Loftness says the facades should be opened up.

Ketzel says they have worked very closely with Homewood Community Sports, who are the primary user and community liaison for the project. She says that football is the primary focus of the park and the community's use of the park. She says the building responds to the need to control access and views when there is a game. Goulatia says she agrees that safety comes first but asks if there is a way to make the pool seem less like an afterthought. She asks if the seating could be moved to create more open area for the pool and playground. She asks if the blue on the playground rendering is the actual color to be used. Zewde says the blue is the color of the play surface.

Goulatia says that the art should be integrated earlier and not be an afterthought. Ketzel says it is not an afterthought, but that the way the funding cycles work is that they need to have a finalized construction budget before they are able to hire artists using that funding, and the design of a project is underway before the construction budget is finalized. She mentions the walk of fame as being a community-driven part of the project which will be integral to the project.

Leach asks about lighting. Smith and Ketzel describe all of the locations of lighting. Goulatia asks if you can enter the field through the pool area. Ketzel says there is intentionally only one access point. Goulatia asks how big the pool is. Smith says there are two lap lanes and a play area. Leach asks if most of the lighting will be provided by lights on poles. Syvertsen says no and describes where it is integrated into the amphitheater, steps, pool, and other locations. Leach further clarifies where lighting poles are located. Smith says that the lighting designer has emphasized safety.

Goulatia asks if people can jump over the railing from the football field into the pool. Smith says that everything 30" or taller has a 42" guard rail. Goulatia asks if they can put grass around the pool. Ketzel says yes, the City has requested that the retaining wall be moved to create a larger grass area.

Leach asks if the bench is standard or was selected by the community. Ketzel says it is the standard right-of-way bench.

Parsakian says a children's area in the pool would be important. Goulatia adds that a sprinkler system would also be possible. Smith says that will be added and they will have more details later.

Mubarik Ismaeli gives public comment in support of the project. He describes the community-led process and what has been prioritized in the design.

Goulatia asks if they can include a track. Smith says that there is a walking area. Goulatia says they could make it more of a track with a surface that is better for running.

### **MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness

SECONDED BY: Leach  
IN FAVOR: All  
OPPOSED: None

## **9. Enright Park – Department of Public Works Conceptual Review**

Andrea Ketzel of DPW and Eric Brightman of Pashek+MTR present the proposal for the renovation of Enright Park. Improvements include the creation of open flexible space with a variety of uses, including play structures, courts, seating, shelter, and pedestrian connections.

Goulatia asks about the different materials. Brightman explains the various materials used. Goulatia points out a black railing and asks if it would be possible for it to be blue. Ketzel says that the images of equipment are just examples and that the color palette is referenced separately. Loftness says the materials look dated and she would like to see more planting. Ketzel says there will be a number of trees planted and they do what they can with perennial plantings, but they are limited to only installing what they are able to maintain. Leach says there are great offerings for the community but the design is not cohesive. Loftness suggests that the use of wood could be a cohesive element and that the metal that is introduced could be more modern. Ketzel says they are discussing public art on the fence and so that may be used to tie things together as well.

Ketzel says the community was fairly passionate about reusing the wood that was removed in the development and having a more natural aesthetic to the play equipment. Brightman points out the design of the ages 2-5 play space.

Parsakian says that the space is currently a sad and neglected piece of property and it needs brightening and more connection to the community. He says that he does not know what the community needs. He says that it is sad that the trees that were removed will be used as a memorial of things past. Brightman says that one thing the community wanted was a flexible lawn space. Ketzel says that all of the details of the project came from the community's feedback and the master plan.

Parsakian asked if there will be lighting. Ketzel says there will be lighting for safety but like other City parks it will be open from dusk to dawn and so there will not be other lighting.

Goulatia says that she understands that there are budgetary constraints but says that an RFP can be issued and an artist brought on from the beginning of the project. Ketzel says that there is actually not a way for them to do that. Minnaert speaks to this further and confirms that the City's procurement process dictates when they are able to bring on artists. She says they are hiring artists as early as possible for Percent For Art projects, and that DPW brings the project to them as early as they are able.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval, with the condition that consideration is given to lighting, cohesion, materials, and enrichment of the landscape.**

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

## **10. Salem's Art Park – MLK Mural Courtesy Review**

Kyle Holbrook of MLK Mural presents his project of an art park on the exterior grounds of Salem's Market, to include a series of murals, seating, sculptures, mosaics, and digital art.

Parsakian asks for clarification on the budget, which Holbrook gives. Parsakian asks if Holbrook is connecting with artists in the Hill. Holbrook says they will be working with all of the Hill organizations. Parsakian compliments the project.

Loftness says that its beautiful work and will animate the blank walls. She says that bringing in artists at \$3,000 seems to be low compensation. Holbrook says that food and board is taken care of in the compensation and that the artists will only be coming in for one week.

**MOTION: n/a**

C. Correspondence

The Commission previously received two letters of support for the Highland Park Super Playground Mosaics; two letters of support for the Strawberry Way Mural; a statement from Commissioner Moss opposing the Open Heart Sculpture; 28 community letters opposing the Open Heart sculpture; 1 community letter supporting the Open Heart sculpture; and 1 letter supporting the naming of a Grandview Overlook.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

None.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 P.M.





CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*June 22, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by President Moss*

In Attendance

Moss  
Goulatia  
Loftness  
Parsakian  
Quintanilla

Hornstein (DPW)  
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Minnaert  
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Pittsburgh Pedestrian Wayfinding Locations	1-3
2. South Side Park Public Art	3-4

A. Approval of Minutes

The approval of the minutes took place between the first and second Items for Review.

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from May 2022. Loftness motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Pittsburgh Pedestrian Wayfinding Locations – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership  
Final Decision**

The design of the wayfinding system previously received Final Approval, with the condition that the final locations were reviewed at a separate hearing. The locations were presented at the May 2022 hearing, at which time the Commission tabled the proposal in order to further review the locations and issue a decision. Chris Watts and Kathryn Schlesinger are present to represent PDP.

Moss says he recognizes that a lot has gone into this and that not only the Art Commission but other entities are giving it a thorough review, although each entity is looking at it for different reasons.

Jonathan Russell of Carnegie Museums gives public comment by reading a letter of support from Carnegie Museums President Steven Knapp.

Bob Reppe of Carnegie Mellon University gives public comment in support of the project.

Cate Irvin of Oakland Business Improvement District gives public comment in support of the project.

Todd Turner of UPMC gives public comment in support of the project.

Mike Madden of Pittsburgh Innovation District gives public comment in support of the project.

Georgia Petropoulos of Oakland Business Improvement District gives public comment in support of the project and speaks as a project partner about the process of arriving at the proposed locations.

Moss thanks Loftness for her work in reviewing the individual locations since the last hearing. He mentions that the reason for their review of the locations is because at the previous review in 2018, the Art Commission had concerns about the quantity and placement of the items. He says that the Commission is always concerned with preventing visual clutter and ensuring safety.

Loftness echoes Moss's statements and says that while the introduction of the wayfinding system is a benefit, she is looking at visual impact, safety issues, and redundancy of poles. She describes her review of the locations against these criteria. Specific points of her review are: 1) for any items on new poles, the possibility for them to be placed on an existing pole within twenty feet of the proposed site; 2) the possibility for adjacent visual clutter to be reduced when a new sign is put up; 3) pedestrians not being made to zigzag around street elements; and 4) the possibility of landscape materials around kiosks.

Moss agrees with Loftness's comments and estimates that about 2/3 of the proposed locations are acceptable, but about 1/3 fall under the questions posed by Loftness. He notes that it has been nearly four years since the previous Art Commission approval for this project, but that they want to take the time to make sure that they get it right. He suggests that Loftness's work be continued by an Art Commission task force that will come back to the Commission with a recommendation for approval or disapproval for each location.

Parsakian says that he has reviewed each location and agrees with the previous comments. He asks if the Cultural Trust is in support of the proposal. He supports the system as a whole but questions whether some of the locations would enhance the experience of a pedestrian.

Goulatia asks whether DOMI has a standard for how many poles can be in a given area. Lucas says that DOMI is invested in not having too many poles in the right-of-way. She says there is not a standard, but they utilize best practices for items such as bike racks or fire hydrants. She says that she understands the concerns for the number of signs, but says that for wayfinding to work, there has to be a critical amount of signage for the system to function.

Goulatia asks if DOMI will review each location. Lucas says yes, the items in the public right-of-way would be subject to DOMI approval before being reviewed by PennDOT. She also mentions that there is federal funding for this project and that DOMI is the recipient.

Watts thanks them for their thorough review. He says that the Cultural Trust has been a part of discussions since the beginning and have reviewed and approved of all locations. He says that the guiding principles stated by Loftness are the same principles that they have used throughout their planning and identification of the locations.

Moss says that if they were to approve this, it would be without a complete review by the Commission. He suggests that a few Commissioners conduct the thorough review and return to the Commission with a recommendation for each location.

Lucas says that there is over one million dollars of funding through PennDOT that DOMI is the recipient of, and they have a concern for timeliness. Moss says that it has been four years since the Commission asked them to return for location review. Lucas asks whether this shouldn't be reviewed as a Citywide standard, as it is cumbersome for the Commission to review this many locations, and the project has the goal of being expanded into other neighborhoods in the future. Moss says that they do not

normally review this many individual locations, but reiterates that in 2018 the Commission had concerns for the quantity of items.

Loftness asks why new poles are proposed for sites where there is an existing pole nearby. She says that would take care of a majority of the locations that there are issues with. She says that kiosks are another matter because they tend to be placed in critical paths. Moss agrees that all locations proposed for existing poles seem acceptable to him. Watts says that in regards to the timeline mentioned previously, they are required to follow federal guidelines in order to use federal funds, and there is an great amount of due diligence required by the neighborhood groups that were facilitating this project, particularly through the pandemic. They also spent a great deal of time considering each location according to criteria similar to that stated by Loftness, as well as other concerns. He says they'd welcome the chance to work with the Commission on each location, but there may be difficulty in their reviewing each location without the context of all of the previous stakeholder input that has led to each location decision.

Minnaert asks if it's possible to consider approving those locations that don't seem to have any issues. Moss asks if a partial approval is helpful to the applicant. Watts says it would be helpful. He asks if it is possible for them to have a work session to go over each location with a Commissioner.

Goulatia asks if they can approve the signage on existing poles. The other Commissioners agree. Parsakian states his concerns with some of the kiosks. He says that he will work with Loftness on the review of the other locations. Watts says they are glad to work on any path forward. He says that if there is an existing pole near to a proposed new pole, then there was always a reason that a new pole was proposed. He says that DOMI's final diligence and clearances will also be thorough and will take a considerable amount of time.

**MOTION: 1) Final Approval for the items of the Pittsburgh Pedestrian Wayfinding program which are sited on an existing light pole or existing traffic signal pole. 2) Table the proposal for the items at all other locations.**

The Commission will establish a task force to further review these remaining items and provide a recommendation to the Commission at the next hearing.

MOVED BY: Moss  
SECONDED BY: Loftness  
IN FAVOR: Goulatia, Parsakian  
OPPOSED: None  
RECUSED: Quintanilla

## **2. South Side Park Public Art – Public Art & Civic Design Division Conceptual Review**

Artist Carin Mincemoyer presents her proposal for a Percent For Art project in coordination with Phase 1 renovations of South Side Park.

Goulatia asks if the mirrored surface is aluminum. Mincemoyer says the dome will probably be stainless steel, or possibly aluminum. She says it will depend on what is durable and economical. Goulatia asks if she has thought of light emanating from it at night. Mincemoyer says that hadn't been considered, but light from above may be better if lighting was incorporated. Loftness says there could be Dark Sky issues if it was lit from below. Loftness says that they do not have a final list of materials. She says that Mincemoyer should think through maintenance over time.

Goulatia asks if she has considered the metal dome just sitting on the ground, so that leaves aren't collected. Mincemoyer says that she would address this by the shape of the lip before eliminating the well completely. Goulatia asks how big this will be. Mincemoyer says that the interior diameter would be six feet wide and it would be three feet high.

Moss says it's a lovely idea and he is in support conceptually. He says that people will inevitably climb on it so it will need to support that.

Parsakian compliments the project. He encourages using a metal chrome finish for longevity.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

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

C. Correspondence

Minnaert notes that there is a cut-off for monthly correspondence and they received several pieces for last month's agenda items that were received after the cut-off and forwarded to the Commission with the next batch. She notes a letter regarding designs for a City flag which was appropriately forwarded on to the administration.

Loftness mentions correspondence addressing the approved Art in Parks project at the Schenley Sportsplex. They discuss the location of this Art in Parks project, which was approved at the previous month's hearing, and the need for maintenance of the bathroom building. Minnaert says that she will follow up with DPW on the matter.

Minnaert says there were no Over-The-Counter reviews in the last month.

Loftness asks if they are able to share their findings and comments with the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership before the next hearing to give them time to respond. Minnaert says she will follow up on this.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Cavalline mentions the asphalt art mural that had been installed on Ellsworth Avenue in 2018. He says that in addition to the substantial wear from traffic, part of the artwork has been paved over, so the artwork has likely reached the end of its lifespan. He says that they would like to move forward with cleaning or repaving the area. Loftness asks if a new piece can be commissioned. Cavalline says it is possible, but there is not a program in place to fund a new piece of artwork currently. Parsakian notes the importance of the artwork and location as a commemoration of queer history. They discuss the procedures and possibilities of limited-term art and the possibilities of a new piece of artwork at this location. The Art Commission discusses advocating for a more permanent commemorative artwork at this location.

They discuss the number of projects at the last hearing and the possibility of limiting the number of applicants each month.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*July 29, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by President Moss*

In Attendance

Moss  
Goulatia  
Leach  
Loftness  
Parsakian

Martinez (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash  
Minnaert  
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Pittsburgh Pedestrian Wayfinding Locations	1-2
2. Bus Rapid Transit System	2-3
3. East Commons Community Garden	3-4
4. Art in Parks – Sans facon in Riverview Park	4-5
5. Art in Parks – Ginger Brooks Takahashi in Schenley Park	5-6
6. Cantini Mural	6

A. Approval of Minutes

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from June 2022. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Leach. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Pittsburgh Pedestrian Wayfinding Locations – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership  
Final Decision**

Chris Watts of Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership gives a summary of the review process for this project thus far, including final approval at the June 2022 hearing for locations on existing light poles or traffic signal poles, and the Commission establishing a committee to further review the remaining items and provide a recommendation for the Commission at today's hearing. The committee (Loftness and Parsakian) also met with the applicant to gain further explanation for the proposed location decisions.

Loftness says that there were clear explanations as to why many of the signs could not be attached to existing poles. She says they hope that some of the assets can still be located on existing poles to

eliminate visual clutter, although they recognize that this is not possible in many cases. She says that safety issues should be addressed by DOMI in the final review process, and says that they feel strongly that new concrete should not be poured.

Parsakian adds particulars for specific instances that drew their concern.

Loftness says that a motion should also include approval by major institutions in cases where the assets are placed adjacent to them.

Watts addresses their comments and says they are acceptable and in line with their plans. He says that some of the locations in question will be implemented at a later time after engagement with neighboring institutions.

Moss notes that DOMI will be reviewing all locations in regard to pedestrian safety.

Parsakian asks if the North Side locations will be delayed, and Watts says that yes, the North Side assets will be deployed in a secondary round following community feedback.

**MOTION: 1) Final Approval, with the conditions that 1) Wherever possible, existing poles be given preference over new poles; 2) DOMI will ensure that kiosks do not pose any pedestrian safety issues; 3) Replacing existing green space with new poured concrete should be avoided; 4) Phipps Conservatory, the National Aviary, and the Carnegie Museums should review and approve the placement of those kiosks sited next to their facilities.**

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

## **2. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) System - Pittsburgh Regional Transit Final Review**

Denis Ott of PRT, Steve Auterman of the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure, and Osborne Anthony of AECOM give the presentation for infrastructure changes to the Fifth and Forbes Avenues corridor between Downtown, Uptown, and Oakland neighborhoods, including a system of 24 stations/pairs connecting over 7 miles of dedicated transit lanes and a public art program.

Loftness asks for clarification on the locations, and Auterman explains the layout of station structures. Loftness says that she appreciates the elegant design, but the size of the structures creates a visual wall. She says she is not comfortable with taking out trees, and that the vending machines are bulky and are outdated technology. Moss agrees and says that the application materials do not have enough detail.

Ott says that they have a lot of procurement requirements to work through due to the federal funding, which means that they cannot source a final manufacturer for the shelters until all approvals are in place, which means that the final design might be slightly different than what is presented. Moss says that greater detail needs to be shown for Final Approval. Auterman says they can provide greater structural detail, although this may change based on the manufacturer. He reiterates that they are unable to provide a final design until after they have secured the funding, which requires the Commission's Final Approval.

Moss says that they would typically need to see more design details for Final Approval, even if they are not the final manufacturer details. He says after they receive Final Approval, the applicant can submit the final manufacturer details for staff approval to show that they have not deviated from what was approved. Loftness says they need the drawings to show the exact sizes and locations of the structures so that they can tell what impact they would have on the surroundings. Auterman says they can provide this.

Parsakian asks if there are twenty-four shelters, and Ott says yes. Parsakian says that more detail is needed for how each shelter fits into its environment. He says that the number of seats depicted in the

shelters is not sufficient. He agrees that the vending technology will soon be out of date. He says that the electrical box is a big monolith.

Ott says the shelter size and seating is based on boarding numbers from each station, and as the shelters gets larger there is more seating.

Parsakian says that the vending unit shouldn't block the site of oncoming buses. Ott says that they have to provide a way for people to pay their fare with cash, and paying on the bus slows the buses down and makes their timing less reliable. She says this is the reason that they have the vending units.

Anthony says there are a lot of functional elements that must be incorporated into the structure, so they are competing for real estate, and also need to provide adequate ADA-accessible room for passengers to board and alight. He says the vending machines are really in the only available space and are not deep enough to block an oncoming bus. Moss asks if they can put the machines on the other side of the glass panel. Anthony says that the designs will be adapted according to each site, so they could do that at the site shown on screen but they don't have the ability to do so at every station. He says they are not able to share with the Art Commission every site condition that will be encountered. Moss asks why not. Auterman says they have CAD drawings for every location, but it is onerous for them to provide graphic renderings of each site. He also mentions that the sidewalk will be expanded at each location.

Moss asks about the Market Square location, and Auterman says that it is not actually in Market Square, but right outside of it.

Goulatia asks if they can put in solar charging stations. Ott says they had conversations about it, but the stations themselves need to be attached to the electrical grid, so solar panels would not provide much benefit and would be a maintenance and safety concern. Loftness asks if there can be a charge point for phones. Ott says that they have discussed this but there were concerns about loitering. She says new buses have charging points on them. Loftness asks about the transparency of the glazing. Anthony says you can look through the glazing. He says the frit is only at the canopy and is for shade.

Moss says the Commission is asking for more detail. He says that all of the images shown were on a flat grade and he is interested in seeing how the design is modified for those instances.

**MOTION: Table**

MOVED BY: Moss

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: Leach, Loftness

OPPOSED: None

ABSENT: Goulatia

**3. East Commons Community Garden – East Allegheny Community Council  
Final Review (continuation of garden installation)  
Conceptual/Final Review (garden shelter and asphalt art)**

Dennis Ginther of EACC presents the conditions of the garden installation that previously was approved in 2018.

Parsakian asks why the asphalt wasn't removed when the garden was created. Ginther says this maintained accessibility at the site, and there would also have been a cost issue.

Loftness says this is a great addition to the neighborhood.

Goulatia asks if they can change the colors.

**MOTION: Final Approval for the continuation of the garden installation**

MOVED BY: Parsakian

SECONDED BY: Goulatia  
IN FAVOR: All  
OPPOSED: None

Ginther gives proposals for a garden shelter and asphalt art. He says that the shed is existing and was part of the original installation and was donated by 84 Lumber. He says that the proposed shelter would be in the same style and would expand their ability to host community events.

Loftness notes that the new shelter is larger than the shed.

Moss asks if there is any lighting for the shelter. Ginther says they do not have any electricity but they bring in generators when they have a dinner there.

Loftness asks where they project movies. Ginther says they put a portable screen on the fence. Loftness says the new structure is far away from the shed and doesn't look coordinated, but these problems are minor and she doesn't have an issue with the proposal.

Leach asks if the shelter is large enough for their needs. Ginther says it is big enough for most events and that for larger events they may use tents as well.

Ginther describes the community process that led to these two proposals. He says that the colors of the asphalt art represent the life cycles of plants, and the circles would create a meandering path through the garden.

Goulatia asks if the shelter is shielded from the rain. Ginther says that it will help, but for larger rainstorms the events would be canceled anyway.

Goulatia suggests revisiting the colors on the original shed. Ginther says they can probably paint it.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval for the garden shelter and asphalt art**

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

**4. Art in Parks: Sans facon in Riverview Park – Public Art & Civic Design Division  
Final Review**

Tristan Surtees and Charles Blanc of Sans facon, along with artist Steve Gurysh, present their proposal for installation of multi-phased artwork in Riverview Park, as part of the City's Art in Parks program.

Loftness says the project is brilliant and sophisticated. She asks how they will communicate the events of the project to the public. Surtees says they will be sharing widely through the people and groups involved with the park, and events will also be captured on film.

Parsakian compliments the project and asks if they will be talking about the indigenous tribes from the area's history. Surtees said they were cognizant of that consideration and did outreach, but decided to focus their project on the history since the area became a park, rather than telling the entire story of the land. He says that there is information on this in the visitor's center, which he hopes people will interact with. Goulatia says they should rethink this and should incorporate the history of Native Americans. Goulatia asks how the tools will be shared. Surtees says that they will be seen at the visitor's center and used by the groups who do work in the park.

**MOTION: Final Approval**



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

## **5. Art in Parks: Ginger Brooks Takahashi in Schenley Park – Public Art & Civic Design Division Final Review**

Sarah Minnaert of PACD presents Ginger Brooks Takahashi's proposal for a public artwork in Schenley Park, as part of the City's Art in Parks program.

Goulatia asks about the materials. Minnaert says it is sandstone, and the wooden part of the runnel is black locust. Goulatia mentions a sample from Takahashi's first presentation. Cavalline says this was a reference image from another artist's work, and that the sandstone she is proposing is visually similar to the surrounding stones at the project location.

Loftness compliments the project. She says she is bothered by the rectilinear shapes which seem industrial rather than natural. She questions if there will be more water than the channels can hold. Minnaert says that Takahashi has partnered with Ethos Collaborative to understand the water flow at the site and that this has informed the design. She says there will be a pipe coming from underground to direct the water through. Cavalline notes that the water source is a seep and is not necessarily a strong flow.

Goulatia says they would need to see the materials. She questions the structure of the pipes and channels. This is discussed, referencing the slides. Parsakian asks if the runnel would be underground. Minnaert and Cavalline note that the runnel is at ground level and is even with the ground. Minnaert says that this will be a trail improvement as it will keep water from covering the trail. Moss notes this is a common strategy for trail maintenance.

Leach recalls an image from Takahashi's first presentation and says those images of stone were square. She says the question now is whether the edges will be rounded.

Parsakian says it is an incredible project. Loftness says that a more natural look will be more appropriate than an industrial look.

Loftness asks if there is a reason that the end piece is slightly wider than the other pieces. They discuss the configuration of the stones in the proposal. Goulatia asks if the top stone could be eliminated and there could just be a pipe. Minnaert says there could be, but this is an intentional design that incorporates carved language on the end stone.

Moss says that it appears the stones are meant to be clean cut. Minnaert says that it likely has to do with the renderings. She notes if there are minor concerns, they could be expressed as a condition on the approval. Goulatia says the materials shown in the first presentation were more organic.

Parsakian asks about the timeline. Minnaert says that the Art in Parks projects need to be completed this year.

Moss asks what considerations being discussed would affect whether or not the Commissioners would approve the project. Goulatia says that the color of sandstone is not a concern, and that the industrial shape would be evened out by nature in the end. She says that the rectilinear nature of the stones looks off.

Loftness compares the rectilinear stones with the more organic stones to be laid at the head of the runnels.

Leach asks if the intention is that the environment will wear the sharp edges down. She says she is not bothered by the edges. Parsakian says that it will be in the forest and enveloped by nature, so it will

not be a clean, pristine piece of stone but will be a constantly changing installation. He says they are being too critical with the details.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

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

**6. Cantini Relocation – Public Art & Civic Design Division  
Conceptual/Final Review**

Sarah Minnaert of PACD presents the relocation of the Cantini Mosaic, a City-owned artwork. She gives background on the artwork, its removal from its original location, and the process that has led to the new proposed location at the Steel Plaza T Station.

Moss says that he is glad this work is being reinstalled. He says he wishes it could be in a more public space, but that the new site will probably get more foot traffic than the original site. Goulatia says this is a great location for it and is more breathable than the original site. Loftness says the better lighting in the new space will make a big difference.

Parsakian asks about the background wall treatment. Minnaert says there was intentionality to the background and to how the panels were positioned. Parsakian asks if they will use the original background. Minnaert says this was not preserved but will be used as an inspiration source for the new background.

Leach asks if the background will be the same white marble. Minnaert says it will be similar. Parsakian asks if the background was stone or marble. Cavalline says it was marble. Goulatia asks about the background shown in the rendering. Minnaert says there will be an engineer and designer engaged for the new installation, so this has not yet been designed. She describes how the panels will be mounted.

Loftness asks if the current wall tile in the hallway site will be replaced. Minnaert says it will remain in adjacent areas but there will be a new wall surface behind the panels. Loftness asks about the orthogonal tiles shown in the rendering. Minnaert says this is not a design rendering, it is just a concept rendering to show the location. Goulatia asks about the floor. Minnaert says the floor will not change as a part of this project. Goulatia says there is extra space at the end of the hallway. Minnaert says the dimensions of the original tunnel and the new hallway are fairly close but not exactly the same, and that the space on the end can be used for interpretive signage.

Cavalline notes the language used in the Character Defining Features document regarding the background wall. Goulatia asks if they can use distressed marble for the background. Cavalline says these details will be determined through the design process and they can take those notes to the designer. Minnaert says that the specific approval today is for the location.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the recommendation for a background treatment that honors the spirit of the original installation**

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

**C. Correspondence**

Minnaert notes that correspondence relating to today's agenda items has been sent to the Commission.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert says that updated guidelines for Art Commission applications have recently been posted. Moss says that these should be used by applicants as a baseline of what materials must be provided, although they as Commissioners can choose what may not be necessary in each circumstance.

Moss asks about the Fern Hollow Bridge and asks if the public art project will come to the Art Commission for review. Minnaert says yes. They note that there has been no additional conversation about the design of the bridge, and construction has begun.

Parsakian says that he met with Councilperson Strassberger to discuss a permanent piece of public art at Ellsworth Ave to commemorate LGBTQ history.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:57 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*August 24, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by Vice-President Goulatia*

In Attendance

Goulatia  
Loftness  
Parsakian  
Quintanilla

Hornstein (DPW)  
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Dash  
Minnaert  
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) System	1-4
2. Merchant Street Bridge Sign	4-5
3. Alta Via Market Square	5-6
4. Fern Hollow Bridge Public Art (John Peña)	6
5. Fern Hollow Bridge Public Art (Carin Mincemoyer)	6-7

A. Approval of Minutes

Goulatia asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from July 2022. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Loftness. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) System – Pittsburgh Regional Transit  
Final Review**

Steve Auterman of the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure, Denise Ott of Pittsburgh Regional Transit, and David Haines of AECOM are on hand for Commissioner comments on this project, which consists of infrastructure changes to the Fifth and Forbes Avenues corridor between Downtown, Uptown, and Oakland neighborhoods, including a system of 24 stations/pairs connecting over 7 miles of dedicated transit lanes, and a public art program. Commissioners Loftness and Parsakian discuss their review of the proposed shelters, including comments which were previously sent to the applicant and the applicant's responses to those comments. Based on their review, Loftness and Parsakian give their current recommendations for potential motions of approval.

Minnaert summarizes that out of the total proposed stations, Loftness and Parsakian are recommending 18 to be approved, with six others requiring further discussion today. Parsakian says that there are also a few overall design details that they still want to discuss today. Minnaert suggests beginning with verifying the stations that can be given approval, and then discussing the six that have concerns.

Loftness begins with a list of ten stations that should be fine for approval, although she wishes that some of them could be phased since they are very long. They discuss the location of the Market Square shelter. Quintanilla says that considering the need of riders and the minimalist design of the shelters, he thinks the Market Square shelter is appropriate. Besides Market Square (location #3), Loftness also lists locations 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 15, 18, 20, and 22 as being fine for approval, though she says they are large and will change the visible appearance of the City.

Goulatia says that the designs are minimalist. She asks about the ticket station. Loftness says there is a lot of visual clutter. Goulatia says there are only three seats. Loftness says that most other cities are using bench seating. Goulatia asks if there will be more than one electrical cabinet for the larger stations. Ott says that each station will have one electric cabinet regardless of the station's size, but some stations will have more than one ticket machine. Loftness asks if riders can use smart tickets. Ott says yes.

Loftness lists seven more stations that could be approved but that there are concerns with accessibility and pedestrian flow. These stations were 1, 7, 8, 11, 19, 23, and 24. Parsakian says these seven could be approved with the knowledge that DOMI will be reviewing and approving the pedestrian concerns.

The discussion proceeds to the final six stations, which are 2 (Steel Plaza), 12 (Fifth & Chesterfield), 14 (Fifth & Bigelow/Soldiers & Sailors), 21 (Forbes & Jumonville), 25 (Forbes & Bouquet), and 26 (Forbes & Bigelow/Schenley Plaza).

They discuss Steel Plaza. Loftness says it is a visual block. She says it needs to be phased by building a 60 foot station, not a 120 foot station, and then see how it goes. Quintanilla says that the adjacent plaza is internal and so the station blocking it is not detrimental. He says that it is very windy there and he does not have a problem with the proposed size due to the amount of users and pedestrians. Auterman notes that the Commissioners had suggested this be a gull-wing station, and says that there is not room for this without removing a lane of traffic. Loftness says that this is a major pedestrian thoroughfare. Quintanilla notes that this is adjacent to the entrance to the T. Goulatia asks about the renderings in the application and that the metal bars are not shown on them. Auterman notes that these are basic renderings to show massing and location. Ott says that the Steel Plaza station will be a big transfer point to people using the T. Parsakian says that this station could be approved, as he understands that ridership is increasing, and that many other stops will be eliminated. Loftness says that in general three stops will be eliminated for every one new stop.

They discuss the Soldiers and Sailors (Fifth & Bigelow) station, which Loftness says should not be located there as it blocks the view. Auterman says that the station will be replacing current on-street parking, and the station will not block the view from pedestrians on the sidewalk, and they do not believe it will significantly block the view from across the street. Loftness says that if a film wanted to shoot with Soldiers & Sailors as a backdrop, this would get in the way. Parsakian says that this is the shelter he has the most concern about.

Quintanilla asks what percentage of room along the street the station takes up. Ott says 20%. Quintanilla says that in Europe they often put stations in front of historic buildings in order for people to use them as meeting places. He says that he is thinking of the importance of the station to users, and that he doesn't think that the visual clutter would be too much. Loftness says this station should be moved to another location. Ott describes the process of public input that led them to the current locations. Loftness says the public engagement did not include these renderings.

They discuss the Chesterfield station. Loftness asks what the intention of such a large station is. Auterman says the sizes are based on ridership demand, and the 60 foot shelter is the smallest size that accommodates the needs for this location. Auterman also notes this is a walk-through station. Parsakian says that he is not as concerned about this shelter. Loftness says that they were not familiar with the

concept of a walkthrough shelter. Ott describes this as not having side walls to eliminate obstruction. They discuss the placement of the existing shelter and the proposed shelter. Loftness says this could be dangerous if it is not recessed enough.

Quintanilla says he has often seen people at this stop overflowing the current shelter, and so he thinks that the need is there for more shelter.

They discuss the Jumonville station. Loftness questions the future urban development of the site. Auterman says that it is currently adjacent to a UPMC shuttle parking lot. He says that the BRT stations are located at corners because it does not inhibit entrances to properties, as these must be located away from corners due to DOMI regulations. He also says that for future development, an adjacent transit stop may be appealing.

Lucas notes that Loftness has noted current shelters being eight feet long, but she believes that the current standard is actually fifteen feet. Dash mentions changes made to the zoning code for the Uptown Public Realm District relating to future development.

The discussion is moved to the Forbes & Bouquet (Central Oakland) and Forbes & Bigelow (Schenley Plaza) locations. Loftness says the Schenley Plaza location is a beautiful vista and these shelters would be in front of that. Parsakian notes that the proposal at this location is for two 60 foot stations. Loftness notes that there are Pitt bus stations nearby. Loftness says that at the Central Oakland location, students often gather on the adjacent retaining wall. Parsakian notes that Pitt is going to redesign that plaza so the area may be different soon. Loftness says that these two stations, along with Soldiers & Sailors, should be moved and come back to Art Commission at a later date. Goulatia says that the renderings should include everything on the street.

Auterman says that at Schenley Plaza, the station is being installed on an extended sidewalk that will replace on-street parking. He says the area will be more open and it should not affect views or enjoyment of the park. He says that they do not know what Pitt will do at Central Oakland but they have requested the BRT stop be at this location.

Loftness says she doesn't think the shelters are similar in scale to parked cars. Auterman says that without the cars there will be more access to the sidewalk and the park. Loftness says that these three stations should return to Art Commission with a better mock-up.

Quintanilla says that at Central Oakland, they do not know what Pitt intends to do, and as an architect he does not find the building there interesting. He says that the people who sit on the retaining wall are typically waiting for a bus, and so he would not mind this bus station being there. Parsakian says that the Central Oakland and Schenley Plaza stations are only a block apart. Loftness says that a better location would be at Hillman Library, between these two locations. Loftness says that they could approve Central Oakland and just leave Soldiers & Sailors and Schenley Plaza as the locations that they have concerns about.

Ott asks for clarification about the concerns. Loftness says it is both location and size. Ott says that the locations were decided very early on in the process and were coordinated with all utility companies and stakeholders. She says that changing locations would delay the project substantially. She also says that PRT feels strongly that these are the correct sizes for the intended ridership. Loftness says that these two stations should be relocated or resized.

Auterman speaks of the high ridership demands of the Central Oakland and Schenley Plaza stations, especially with the intended consolidation of stops. Loftness compares the size to other cities who use smaller stations and says this will change the face of the city.

Minnaert summarizes the discussion thus far as being in favor of the approval of all but the Soldiers & Sailors station and the Schenley Plaza station. She asks the applicant team what possibilities exist if these two are not approved. Auterman says that they can possibly provide better renderings and further rationale for these stations, and asks what the process would be for that to come back to the Commission. Minnaert asks if alternate sizes or locations are possible, as this answer will determine future process. Auterman says that changing size is the easier task and is something they can look into.

He says that changing location is a much more substantial effort. Ott says that if they look at new locations, there will be at least a year delay.

Goulatia asks if the Schenley Plaza station and the Soldiers & Sailors Plaza can be moved or resized. Auterman says that changing the size would be the easiest path. He says that moving a few feet is an engineering question but moving to another block would take public process. Goulatia asks if they are able to phase the project. Auterman says the funding for the project needs to be all in one go. Loftness says changing the 120 foot shelters to 60 foot shelters would not substantially change their budget request.

The Commissioners discuss potential approval motions. Loftness states that phasing is an easy solution. Quintanilla says that the extra space will make a big difference to riders needing shelter and that it accounts for people wanting to be distanced from others as they wait. He says that phasing would be a good option but only if it didn't affect the project. He says that the shelters would not affect long views of what is behind them.

Goulatia asks if they need to see renderings of different sizes for the two Bigelow stations and if this could determine their approval. Ott says that they have worked for five years to get the funding for this project, and if they do not build the full size stations now, there is no guarantee they will ever get the funding to increase the size. Loftness asks if the entire budget is federal funds. Ott says it is over half and the rest is County, City, and Port Authority. She says it sounds very easy to say that they can phase it, but that it is not as easy as it sounds. She says that any grant funding not used now will need to be returned, so it cannot be used later.

Parsakian suggests a more open design might be a solution for these two stations. Quintanilla says there is a reason for the glass wall, and they are trying to find a different solution when this is actually something functional that the public needs.

Minnaert asks the Commission for a motion. Loftness says they have given a lot of concessions and they are asking for a size reduction for these two shelters. Quintanilla says that the shelters need to be whatever size they have to be based on the number of people who need to use them.

**MOTION: Final Approval of 21 stations for the Bus Rapid Transit System as proposed; excluding the stations in front of 1) Soldiers & Sailors Memorial and 2) Schenley Plaza. The stations in front of 1) Soldiers & Sailors Memorial and 2) Schenley Plaza are approved under the condition that their size is reduced by 50%.**

MOVED BY: Loftness  
SECONDED BY: Parsakian  
IN FAVOR: Goulatia  
OPPOSED: Quintanilla

Parsakian asks if the applicants can return with a revision or more information if they wish to still pursue the larger station. Dash says the proposal was not denied so they should be able to return. Cavalline agrees.

## **2. Merchant Street Bridge Sign – Norfolk Southern Corporation Conceptual/Final Review**

Timothy Zinn of Michael Baker International gives the presentation for an informational sign describing the history of the Merchant Street Bridge.

Goulatia asks if the sign will have an antique patina look. Zinn says that the patina is part of the background design of the sign. Goulatia says there is a lot of writing and asks if it can be cleaned up. Zinn says it was developed in accordance with the National Park Service standards for interpretive signage. He says that this is their second version of the design after input from the consulting parties.

Loftness asks who the audience is for the sign, as it is low and the text is small. Loftness says she has no issue with the location but says that there doesn't seem to be a specific message. Zinn says that the bridge is fairly standard and is not very unique, but they tried to highlight the engineering aspects. He says the sign will be four feet wide, so it will be pretty readable. Goulatia says she wishes the text had subheadings. She says there is a lot of visual clutter. Zinn says they could add subheadings. Loftness says they should get an educator to edit the text.

Parsakian asks about the materials. Zinn says it's a fiberglass-embedded panel and will be similar to existing signs on the riverfront trails. Parsakian notes the size is actually 24" x 36".

Loftness asks if this is part of a series. Zinn says no, it was part of the mitigation process due to the requirements of the historic code. Loftness asks what was removed and what was replaced. Zinn says the existing bridge will be removed and replaced in its entirety but they will be reusing the abutments and the ornamental railings. He says the replacement bridge will look similar. Loftness says the preservation efforts are a more interesting story for the sign text. Goulatia says the design layout is not engaging.

Parsakian says that he would prefer a heavier visual impact and editing might help make people more engaged.

#### **MOTION: Table**

MOVED BY: Loftness

SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: Goulatia

RECUSED: Quintanilla

### **3. Alta Via Market Square – Rothschild Doyno Collaborative Conceptual/Final Review**

Daniel Rothschild of Rothschild Doyno Collaborative gives the presentation for the renovation of outdoor dining area of the new Alta Via restaurant, including terrace and covered porch. The restaurant is on private property but the terrace extends into the public right-of-way.

Loftness says that the Art Commission should allow for outdoor dining whenever possible. She says that the applicant did a good job picking up the architectural cues, but she finds it very dark. She says the planters should be lower. Rothschild says that what looks like dark windows in the rendering is actually completely open. They discuss window placements on the façade of the building. He says that they have many options with the green color so if a change is recommended, they can share options with the Commission. Rothschild clarifies that when the windows are pulled up, there is nothing blocking the view into the restaurant. Rothschild further explains the renderings and the adjustments that could be made in the height of the planters. Loftness says she would have the plants dribble over.

Goulatia says that it is a visually heavy structure. She asks what the material of the green walls is. Rothschild says it is Azek. He says that when CDAP and the neighborhood looked at this, it was very important to tie all the elements together and for it to be cohesive and unified.

Quintanilla agrees that the planters will limit the visual impact and connection to the space. He says that the green is pleasant but as it is attached to a dark building, something punchier would work well.

Parsakian asks if the proposed door is similar to Mad Mex, and Rothschild says yes. Rothschild confirms that is in the plane of the building, not the addition. Parsakian asks if the patio will be winterized. Rothschild says they will have heaters in them. Parsakian asks about how the lighting will impact Market Square. Rothschild says there will be gentle pin lights on strings. Parsakian asks if the sign will be back lit. Rothschild says they do not have a sign concept yet. Parsakian asks how people access the restaurant. Rothschild explains the layout of the entrances.

Goulatia asks where the Percent For Art would be incorporated. Minnaert notes that although they always encourage public art, the Percent For Art does not apply here as this is not City funding.



Rothschild says public art is a great goal and there are opportunities for this. Parsakian says there is an opportunity with the planters.

Loftness says if the goal was to tie in to PPG then there would be bright white snap lines, and part of the reason it feels dark and squat is because the strong band is dark and large.

**MOTION: Conceptual and Final Approval, with the recommendation to rethink the height of the planter boxes and the overall color, and to give consideration to the inclusion of artwork.**

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

#### **4(a). Fern Hollow Bridge Public Art by John Peña – Office for Public Art Conceptual Review**

Sallyann Kluz of the Office for Public Art and artist John Peña give the presentation for integrated artwork to be coordinated with the construction of the new Fern Hollow Bridge.

Loftness says it is a fascinating project and will be very exciting. She says she hopes it can be even more three-dimensional. She says that the text on the guardrail may be hard to read for bikers, so the texts may possibly be better positioned if they switched sides. Goulatia agrees and asks about the staining. Peña says they are working on prototypes to test but is imagining it to be more subtle. Goulatia says it's a beautiful project.

Parsakian clarifies that one side of the bridge will be for bikers and pedestrians and one will just be for pedestrians. He asks how the text will be laid out on the rail and says he would like it to run the length of the rail as opposed to being a block of text. He asks if road salt will compromise the design. Peña says those are considerations they are looking into. Goulatia asks if the text is sand-blasted. Peña says sand-blasting would have to occur earlier in the process and would only be able to be done on the vertical wall of the shared use path. Parsakian encourages Peña to make the text progressive as you move across the bridge.

Loftness asks if the site lines to Frick Park are being maintained. Kluz says that it is being designed to meet engineering requirements as well as maintaining site lines. She says the height of the concrete is only two feet.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

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

#### **4(b). Fern Hollow Bridge Public Art by Carin Mincemoyer – Office for Public Art Conceptual Review**

Sallyann Kluz of the Office for Public Art and artist Carin Mincemoyer give the presentation for integrated artwork to be coordinated with the construction of the new Fern Hollow Bridge. She presents two possibilities: an arch below the bridge and a meander on the pedestrian trail.

Goulatia asks how large the domes of the arch are and if there is anything under them. Mincemoyer says that there would be nothing below the domes except possibly a wire to keep them from swinging. She says they are about 44" in diameter. Parsakian confirms that the domes are hollow.

Parsakian comments on the arch and references Christo and Jeanne-Claude installations. He says that both artists' projects reference history. He says that the idea of the trail meander is also great. He says that he fears he may not want to spend a lot of time under the bridge as its scale will be so large.

Loftness says both ideas are strong. She says there will need to be a path below, so artwork on the path would be valuable. She says that the rain chain of the arch would interact with nature and would be exciting to walk underneath. She suggests exploring the kinetic nature of the arch.

Goulatia says that if the idea was for both artists' work to speak to each other, then the trail concept has a lot of possibilities. She says it feels more intrinsic.

Loftness says the bridge frames are evocative of Japanese trestle paths. She wonders if the arch can be even bolder and less delicate.

Mincemoyer says that her idea with the trail was to be present and engaging, but not overpowering and distracting.

Goulatia says it would be possible to turn the domes upside down to make the nature motifs more visible. Mincemoyer says that they would then have birds nesting in them and they would collect water and debris. Goulatia asks about the height of the domes. Mincemoyer says that they would be 40-45 feet. Loftness suggests trying different scales to get the effect that is desired.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

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

C. Correspondence

Minnaert notes that there was one new Over-The-Counter approval this month.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

None.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:53 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*September 28, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by President Moss*

In Attendance

Moss  
Goulatia  
Loftness  
Parsakian

Staff Present

Minnaert  
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Merchant Street Bridge Sign	1-2
2. City-County Building Historical Sign	2-3
3. Art in Parks: Marlana Adele Vassar in Highland Park	3-4
4. Friendship Asphalt Art	4

A. Approval of Minutes

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from August 2022. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Merchant Street Bridge Sign – Norfolk Southern Corporation  
Conceptual/Final Review**

Timothy Zinn of Michael Baker International gives the presentation for an informational sign describing the history of the Merchant Street Bridge. The project had been tabled at a previous hearing and the proposal has now been revised.

Moss asks if there will still be a landscaped strip when they install the new sidewalk, and if so, will the sign be on the landscaping or the sidewalk. Zinn says the landscaped strip will be eliminated. Loftness says that isn't a good thing in terms of managing water.

Loftness says she likes the title blocks. She asks about the height of the sign and if the height is in consideration of ADA accessibility. Zinn says yes. Jesse Belfast of Michael Baker International says that this follows the National Park Service guidelines.

Goulatia says the layout is improved since the last hearing. She asks how big each photograph in the layout is. Zinn says he doesn't have measurements for the individual pictures, but the whole sign is 24" x 36". Moss guesses they're at least five inches across.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval**

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

**2. City-County Building Historical Sign – Department of Public Works  
Conceptual/Final Review**

James Hill gives the presentation for an informational sign describing the history of the City-County Building.

Goulatia says she loves the way the sign tells the history of the building, but feels that the last column of the sign doesn't aesthetically match, as the colors in that column are more vibrant. She suggests toning down the colors of this column. Loftness says that another option would be to brighten up the colors on the rest of the sign.

Loftness asks if this sign is the same size as the existing sign about the County Courthouse that is installed nearby. Hill says yes. Loftness says that they should use the same mounting as the Courthouse sign, with two legs instead of four. Hill says they can make that change.

Parsakian says that the Courthouse sign has a lot of rust, and asks if this sign will have the same issues. He asks if there will be any renovation of the Courthouse sign. Hill says the Courthouse sign is metal, whereas this sign is not, so it should not have the same issues. He says that sign is owned by the County so he can't speak to its maintenance. Parsakian asks if Braille is being considered. Hill says they can look into that to see if it's possible.

Loftness wonders if Art Commission should request that the City and County collaborate on future informational signage. Hill says that he believes the Courthouse sign is an exception and that generally the County does not put up informational signage within the City.

Jesse Belfast gives public comment. He says that one of the images of the courthouse on the sign is from a later time than indicated and suggests resources for finding images. He also suggests making more reference to the combination of City and County functions within the building, and suggests eliminating references to architectural details that are not pictured.

Hill says that the language can be simplified if that is something the Commission feels strongly about, but that the language all references the façade, which will be visible in front of the sign. He says he will check the accuracy of the images, but that the images aren't referencing previous County courthouses, they are referencing previous buildings that have served as City Hall. He says that though the City-County Building is shared by the City and the County, it does not serve as the County's center of government.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the conditions that 1) the structure be identical to the nearby County Courthouse sign, with two supporting arms; and 2) that the color intensity be modified to be more consistent throughout the design**

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

Moss encourages Hill to consider the comments by Commissioners and the public that were not required parts of the motion, and says that it would be good for staff to take a final look at the plans to make sure it complies with the motion.

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

Marlana Adele Vassar presents her proposal for a sculptural artwork in Highland Park as part of the City's Art in Parks program.

Goulatia asks if the forms on the sculpture will have sharp edges. Vassar says that the final refinement on the metal will include smoothing out of edges. Loftness asks for clarification on the form of the sculpture. She asks what the story presented by the sculpture is.

[Technical difficulties temporarily interrupt the conversation.]

Vassar says that the design of the sculpture plays off of existing sculpture within the park that addresses the interaction of humans with nature. She describes the figure's dress as being made of flowers and tree bark, and that the figure is holding a small rabbit. Loftness asks if it is intended to be a child. Vassar says that for the theme she wanted the figure to be small, but did not want the figure to be less than four feet tall due to the surrounding plants.

Parsakian references the conceptual images and says that some of them were more childlike, and some of the innocence may have been lost in creating a more columned shape. He asks about Vassar's process. Vassar says that when creating the maquette, she had to be aware that deeper folds and depth in the figure would be more difficult to be successfully realized in bronze.

Parsakian references the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy's comments regarding the symmetry of the park. Vassar says that due to the budget, the sizes would have to be reduced to create two. Parsakian says he is not suggesting this, but rather the possibility of another sculpture in the future. Loftness says an alternative would be to move this sculpture off-center and nearer to the trees. She says that the original drawings were a little more childlike than the current representation. She encourages Vassar to keep in mind the intention of showing a child in nature.

Goulatia says that bronze can be hollow on the inside and a more flowing form would look beautiful, as shown in her concept sketches. She says the flowers and rabbit may be getting lost in the current model.

Minnaert says that the project is time-bound due to the grant funding, and that there have been complications due to the pandemic's effect on fabrication schedules and costs.

Moss says that the Commission is asking for another iteration of the sculpture's design. He asks if there is time to do more design work. Vassar says that there would be at least three months once the final design is given to the fabricator, so it would be in spring of next year. Loftness says they would like to see another iteration that captures the essence of the concept sketches. Moss asks if a final design being sent to the fabricators by the end of the year will satisfy the funding requirements. Minnaert says it is a bit more complicated than that, but that they have been able to have conversations about the grant completion timeline for this particular project due to fabrication setbacks.

Loftness says that the design should possibly not be so symmetrical and the placement of the sculpture could be explored once it is complete, as it may benefit from not being placed on the axis of the park. Goulatia says that the concept sketches had more flowing forms and that this would not visually require the same amount of symmetry as the current proposal which has a straighter shape.

#### **MOTION: Table**

MOVED BY: Loftness

SECONDED BY: Goulatia

IN FAVOR: All  
OPPOSED: None

#### **4. Friendship Asphalt Art – Bloomfield Development Corporation Conceptual/Final Review**

Sam Spearing of Bloomfield Development Corporation presents the proposal for limited-term artwork on the streetscape on either side of Friendship Park.

Goulatia confirms that the surface will not be slippery. Spearing says that DOMI will be reviewing and approving their materials, including the non-slip additive. Loftness asks what the longevity is for the proposed bio-based paint. Spearing says that he believes it is similar to regular traffic paint.

Loftness says it's a lovely project and applauds them on creating a project that is educational and fun.

Goulatia says she appreciates that the crosswalk is incorporated into the artwork.

#### **MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval**

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

The artists, Ann Rosenthal and JoAnn Moran, speak to the longevity of the paint. Moran says that it is comparative to standard traffic paint. She says that projects generally last a few years before they need maintenance, but it depends on the amount of traffic. Rosenthal says they will be layering the paint, which will also address possible degradation. Loftness asks about the process, and Rosenthal says that there will be stencils and rollers used, but the details will be hand-painted.

Rosenthal discusses the praying mantis included in the design, which has special significance to one of the neighbors. She says that the community will help with the painting.

#### **C. Correspondence**

Minnaert describes the correspondence that was sent to the Commissioners, consisting of support letters for the projects being reviewed, and one letter from a citizen regarding Station Square. She says there were no Over-The-Counter reviews this month.

#### **D. Public Comment**

None.

#### **E. Director & Staff Report**

None.

The Commissioners discuss whether the City should be putting together general guidelines regarding signage and the need for a graphic designer to critique signage. They discuss signage that can unify and distinguish neighborhoods in the City.

Loftness speaks about the approval given to the BRT project at a previous hearing.

Parsakian brings up the need for guidelines stating what elements of projects they should and shouldn't be reviewing, which the Commissioners discuss.

Loftness discusses streetscape projects happening around the University of Pittsburgh that previously came to the Art Commission.

The Commissioners discuss projects of differing scopes and the time spent on them at Commission hearings, and the number of applications at each hearing.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:39 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*October 26, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. Meeting called to order by President Moss*

In Attendance

Moss  
Goulatia  
Loftness  
Parsakian  
Quintanilla  
Newman (DPW)  
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present

Minnaert  
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

Item	Page Number
1. Fern Hollow Bridge Public Art by John Peña	1-3
2. Davis Avenue Bridge	3-4

A. Approval of Minutes

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from September 2022. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

**1. Fern Hollow Bridge Public Art by John Peña – Office for Public Art  
Final Review**

Derek Reese of OPA and artist John Peña give the presentation for integrated artwork to be coordinated with the construction of the new Fern Hollow Bridge.

Goulatia asks if Braille will be incorporated, and asks if the imagery from the concrete can be included on the informational signage. Peña says yes, he'll be working with a graphic designer on the signage. Loftness asks if the plaques are only in the bike lane. Peña says yes, that it is a shared use path for bikes and pedestrians. Loftness questions why the stronger imagery is in the shared lane. She says she wishes there was continuity of information and imagery on both sides.

Peña asks if they think the information should be on the flat rail on the pedestrian side, and Loftness says yes. Goulatia says for clarification for where the rub rail will be and where the artwork will be placed, which Peña gives. She says the information should be on both sides. Loftness says she doesn't see how bikers will read the information and that the design should extend onto the shared use path. Peña says



that the shared use surface was not in the scope. Mike Szurley of PennDOT says that this surface will have an epoxy polymer so it cannot be etched. Szurley says he can talk with their contractor to see what could be applied to the shared use path.

Quintanilla says that he thinks the experience will be lost on the shared side, and on the pedestrian side it could be dangerous to stop and read a plaque. He asks how big the font will be. He says the writing might be hard to see if the font is too small. Peña says they will be able to prototype on site to see how everything will look, and Reese says that they will be employing a designer for the plaques to ensure readability and accessibility. Parsakian suggests using a color to continue the pattern on the shared use path.

The Commissioners discuss the safety of the shared use path and the pedestrian sidewalk.

Ken Doyno speaks from the audience in support of the proposal.

Moss says that the comments so far have suggested extending the artwork across the shared use path and including plaques on both sides.

Quintanilla asks how far down the concrete will be etched. Peña says it is a small amount, less than 1/8", and it will be the stain that is emphasizing the design. Quintanilla asks how durable this will be. Peña says he would have to ask the contractor for exact numbers. Reese says it is a very shallow etch that basically just changes the texture of the surface. Szurley says they will also be applying a protective coating.

Goulatia asks if they can pour concrete in sections of the shared pathway. Szurley says they would not be able to do that at this point. Loftness asks if the epoxy could be stained. Szurley says he is not sure. Goulatia asks if they can continue the epoxy onto the concrete.

The Commissioners discuss approval options and the possible timeline of the project returning to the Commission to address the location of the artwork. Reese mentions that the location of the artwork hasn't changed since the project received Conceptual Approval and the current comments were not given at that time, but they will address any concerns moving forward. Goulatia says the proposed location wasn't her understanding at the Conceptual Review. John says it has not changed, but the additional visuals submitted may have clarified it.

Szurley says they are on an expedited schedule, and that the etching and staining will be done in the spring.

Minnaert mentions the timing necessary if an additional review is required this year. Parsakian asks if their questions can be resolved by the next meeting. Peña says he doesn't think so given the submission deadline. Quintanilla says that what they need to know is what can happen on the shared use path.

The Commissioners discuss possible approvals. Parsakian asks when the epoxy would be poured. Szurley says by the end of the year. Parsakian asks what color is planned for the epoxy. Szurley says it has a brown tone.

Moss suggests a requirement that the art extend onto the shared use path with another hearing if that is not possible.

Lucas reminds the Commission that the project is PennDOT's even though it will be owned by the City, and is being done under an emergency order. She says that because of the requirements of the funding, anything that delays the bridge's opening should not be considered.

Loftness says that the airport has a high-quality floor installation. She says that changing the shared use path shouldn't delay the road construction.

Reese says that they can get them more information, but that it wouldn't be possible for them to return to a hearing until January. He reiterates that the project has not changed since Conceptual Approval was given.

**MOTION: Final Approval with the condition that signage be included on both sides of the bridge and be edited for scale to increase readability, and the recommendation that the artwork continue in some form horizontally across the shared use pathway. The Commission asks that the applicant return to a future hearing to give a courtesy update.**

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

## **2. Davis Avenue Bridge – Department of Mobility and Infrastructure Conceptual Review**

Zachary Workman of DOMI and Ryan Whittington of HNTB give the presentation for the reconstruction of the Davis Avenue Bridge, to provide pedestrian and bicycle access from Brighton Heights and Marshall-Shadeland into Riverview Park.

Moss asks about the material of the primary vertical supports. Whittington says they are steel and will sit on concrete pedestals.

Loftness asks if there will be lines to denote where bikes and pedestrians should be. She asks why the steel railing is at eye level as it will obstruct views. Workman says the current plan is to have a dashed center line on the pavement, which is the standard that is being implemented around the city. Whittington says they are not separating it into three lanes because each would be too narrow.

Moss asks if the height of the steel is six feet. Whittington says it is about 6.5 feet above the deck. He says the additional height was implemented in order to avoid having a fence over it. He says that the materials are prefabricated and they are not raising or lowering the surface height from the adjoining roads.

Parsakian asks for clarifications on the dimensions. Whittington confirms that the railing is 3.5 feet high and the truss is higher. Moss asks if there will be a gap between the railing and truss. Whittington says yes. Loftness says safety can be provided through height or depth. She says the bridge is a great addition to the neighborhood. She says the bike lane should be smaller than the pedestrian lane.

Quintanilla says that the gap between the railing and the truss provides a window to see the view. He asks if it is a requirement to have striping for bikes and pedestrians. Lucas says it is not a requirement and many trails do not have them. She says that they want the lines to be as flexible as possible to accommodate various slow-speed vehicles such as recumbent bicycles. Quintanilla asks if they can put a sign at the entrance to the bridge asking everyone to dismount. Lucas says no, and they want to make sure that the space can be used for both recreation and transportation. She says she thinks there will be ample space for safe passage. Parsakian asks if there is a requirement to have an epoxy surface. Workman says that treatment is more necessary for vehicular bridges where traffic and road salt would cause additional wear on the surface. Parsakian says that the shared use path from the Fern Hollow Bridge project used epoxy but it seems to not be necessary here. Workman says that in this project it is blended into the concrete to make it more durable.

Parsakian asks if there was a discussion about more fencing to decrease litter being thrown over the bridge. Workman says that security fencing would detract from the experience of using the bridge and their hope is that in building something nice that the public will respect it. Workman says they looked at applying chain link inside of the truss and eliminated it for purposes of visibility. He says if there is an issue it can be added in the future.

### **MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness  
SECONDED BY: Parsakian

IN FAVOR: All  
OPPOSED: None

C. Correspondence

Minnaert describes the correspondence that was sent to the Commissioners, consisting of support letters for the projects being reviewed, and one letter from a citizen regarding the Christopher Columbus statue. She says there was one Over-The-Counter review this month.

D. Public Comment

None.

E. Director & Staff Report

Minnaert says that there has been no new information given regarding the Columbus statue. She reminds Commissioners that the November meeting is earlier in the month than normal due to the Thanksgiving holiday, and that there is no December meeting. She says that the installations for the Art in Parks program are underway; and that preparation work is being done for the Cantini mosaic reinstallation. She says that January will be the meeting where the Art Commission President and Secretary will be elected or re-elected, for a one year term.

Moss says that they should discuss these officer positions next month, and that he is happy to continue as President or step aside if someone else is interested.

Goulatia asks if there has been any information given on new Commissioner appointments, and Minnaert says there has not.

Goulatia thanks former Commissioner Christiane Leach for her service.

Quintanilla asks if hearings will stay virtual or be moving to in-person. Minnaert says that the Department of City Planning has recently moved completely out of their offices at Ross Street, and there will be a Commission hearing room at their new location, though she does not know when the move-in will be.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:43 P.M.



CITY OF PITTSBURGH  
**Art Commission**

*Minutes of November 16, 2022*

I. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Moss

II. Roll Call

Commissioners present: Moss, Goulatia, Loftness, Parsakian

Staff present: Hornstein, Martinez, Minnaert, Cavalline

III. Approval of Commission Minutes

**Motion:** Approval of minutes of October 26, 2022

Moved by: Parsakian

Seconded by: Goulatia

In favor: All

Opposed: None

IV. Items for Review

1. Marlana Adele Vassar in Highland Park

Applicant: Department of City Planning

Representative: Marlana Adele Vassar, artist

Final Review

Vassar presents the project.

Loftness asks about the 3D printing and about this being done at a small scale. Vassar references the maquettes and explains the process.

Parsakian and Moss compliment the project.

Loftness asks about the size of the base. Vassar says the base is 1 ft above ground and the total size is five ft.

Goulatia says to make sure there are no sharp edges. She asks about the timeline. Vassar says that she hopes it will be between April and May.

Loftness asks about the color. Vassar discusses the patina color. Goulatia suggests patina colors.

**Motion:** Approval, with the request to update the Commission with choice of patina

Moved by: Goulatia

Seconded by: Parsakian

In favor: All

Opposed: None

2. Homewood Park

Applicant: Department of Public Works

Representatives: Andrea Ketzel, DPW; Phil Syvertsen, Studio Zewde; James Smith, Studio Zewde

Final Review

Ketzel and Syvertsen present the project.

Moss notes the complexity of the project.

Loftness compliments some elements of the project. She says that the fence should not be opaque, and she doesn't think there should be three buildings. She also comments on the width of the plaza.

Syvertsen and Smith discuss the needs of the facility and why the proposed design decisions were made. Ryan Drummond of Digsau Architecture discusses the 3D renderings.

Loftness questions the need for a tall opaque fence. Mubarik Ismaeli of Homewood Community Sports addresses the need for public safety that led to their request for this type of fence. The Commissioners discuss the details of this need for safety.

Hornstein reiterates the community process that has led to the current design, including the fence.

Parsakian asks about the capacity to accommodate the crowds. Ismaeli explains the flow of people on game days. Parsakian asks about vendors. Ketzel says there will be a concession stand.

Moss says that he doesn't feel he could give an approval to this project. He goes over the issues the Commission has brought up. Loftness says the plaza should be reconsidered. Moss says the park space is very distinct from the sports area.

Goulatia says she thinks the football field should be vertical. Loftness asks if the baseball field will also be closed in. Syvertsen describes the fence.

Derrick Tillman speaks from the audience in favor of the project and the community process that has gone on to lead to the design.

Moss suggests tabling. The Commissioners describe the additional details needed. Ketzel says that these details were included in the submitted application. Moss asks about the lighting. Ketzel says that it is City standard. The Commissioners discuss the pathways and fencing.

**Motion:** Table

Moved by: Moss

Seconded by: Loftness

In favor: All

Opposed: None

3. Freedom Corner

Applicant: Department of Public Works

Representative: Harvey Butts, DPW

Conceptual Review

Butts presents the project.

Loftness asks about the materials of the sidewalk. Butts explains. Loftness suggests using granite. Loftness asks if there is a landscape plan. Butts says no. Loftness suggests a landscape plan instead of bollards.

Parsakian asks about the site's use. They discuss the history of the site and the details included in the design. Parsakian agrees with using granite and having landscaping.

Goulatia discuss the seating and asks if they can include more. They discuss the kiosk which was never completed. Loftness suggests standard metal benches instead of granite.

They discuss including more information on the history of the site.

**Motion:** Approval, with the suggestion for consideration of landscaping, additional seating, granite pavement, and etched names of contributing community members.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

In favor: All

Opposed: None

4. Pittsburgh Zoo & PPG Aquarium Entrance Renovation

Applicant: LGA Partners

Representatives: Kayle Langford, LGA; John Evans, LGA; Brad Smith, Pittsburgh Zoo

Conceptual Review

Langford and Evans describe the project.

Parsakian says the design is cold and dated. Loftness asks about the ticketing area and the restrooms. She says that the design is not welcoming.

They discuss the overall design scheme. Parsakian and Loftness say it should be more playful and referential to the zoo.

Loftness asks about the entryway. Langford describes the paths leading to the entrance. Loftness says she is concerned about traffic flow.

Loftness asks about the toilets and says they should have more playful imagery. Loftness asks about the interior lighting. Langford describes it.

Smith describes the energy structure and the opportunities for energy education. He describes the stormwater management.

Loftness reiterates the areas that the Commission feels could be improved.

**Motion:** Table

Moved by: Goulatia

Seconded by:

In favor: All

Opposed: None

V. Correspondence

1. Received Correspondence: None
2. Public Comment: None

VI. Director's Report

Minnaert discusses the ongoing Art in Parks projects, the vacant Commissioner seats, and the upcoming January meeting where Commission officers are elected. Cavalline describes the status of the City Collection Equity Audit.

Loftness comments on the Homewood Park project. They discuss this project, the concern for safety, and the level of public engagement that has been held.

VII. Adjournment

The Meeting was adjourned by Moss at 5:00 p.m.