



Division of Development Administration and Review

City of Pittsburgh, Department of City Planning

200 Ross Street, Third Floor

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Minutes of the Meeting of February 2, 2011

Beginning at 12:30 PM

200 Ross Street

First Floor Hearing Room

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

In Attendance:

<u>Members</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>Others (cont.)</u>
Noor Ismail	Makenzie Diehl	Larry Taularides	Terrence Marshall
Ernie Hogan		Angelique Bamberg	John Menniti
Linda McClellan		Scott Lieb	Gary English
Arthur Sheffield		Mike Barnard	Tom Gray
Joe Serrao		Jeff Slack	Carol Anthony
John Jennings		Cory Linfield	James Eash
		Josh Clyde	Matt Galluzzo
		Eli Rosennasser	Catherine Truslow
		Karen Loysen	Reginald Plato
		Sallyan Kluz	John Martine
		Alan Komm	Phillis Lavelle
		Francis Schmitt	Jason Harris
		Eloise McDonald	Diana Ames
		Elena Ramsey	Jon Colburn
		Nick Kyriazi	John Rudiak
		Rif Qureshi	Sala Udin
		Anne Nelson	Marimba Milliones
		Lindsey Pogson	Kimberly Ellis
		Carl Redwood	Alexander Reichwald
		Jason Matthews	Elizabeth Stoye
		Greg Vogt	

New Business

Approval of Minutes: In regards to the January 2011 minutes, Mr. Serrao moved to approve. Ms. McClellan seconded the motion, all members voted in favor.

Certificates of Appropriateness: In regards to the January 2011 Certificates of Appropriateness, Mr. Serrao moved to approve, Ms. Ismail seconded the motion, all members voted in favor.

Applications for Economic Hardship: None

Upcoming Demolitions:

- None

Adjourn: Ms. McClellan moved to adjourn, Mr. Serrao seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Discussion on hearing items follows on the attached pages.

Iron City Brewery

OWNER: Iron City Brewery, LLC 3340 Liberty Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15201	WARD:..... 6 th LOT & BLOCK:..... 26-A-300 INSPECTOR: JIM KING COUNCIL DISTRICT:	APPLICATION RECEIVED:12/15/2010 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Iron City Brewery, LLC 3340 Liberty Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15201	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
	ARCH. RATING:.....	
NATIONAL REGISTER:	LISTED..... <input type="checkbox"/>	ELIGIBLE..... <input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed Changes:

CONTINUED: Proposed demolition of “Pipe Shop” Building

Discussion:

1. Tim Hickman, CEO of Iron City Brewing Company, introduces himself. Mr. Hickman says they contacted Bill Callahan of PHMC, and believes they have a complete understanding of PHMC’s role moving forward. He says they have contacted an architect, and their future plans for the site are light industrial use and warehousing. He says they have walked through the steps of how these buildings would be listed on the National Register. He says the ICB site has buildings that were built after 1970, and those buildings will not be designated historic. He says tax credits are only good for buildings that were built 1936 and prior. He says there is also the caveat of economic hardship, and if anything can be done with a building.
2. Mr. Hickman says they have two issues, one of them being the Pipe Shop. He says they had someone determine how much it would cost to restore this building, \$750,000 for a 19 sq foot building, and there is no way they will spend this money. He says the second problem is buildings D & E which are filled with tanks. He says contractors have come in and their low bid is \$976,000. He says that amount would remove two walls. He says the “F” building abutted one of these buildings and has already been demolished; and they will now be able to remove a wall which was altered in 1951 to put the tanks in. He uses a map to point out the walls they are proposing to demolish. He says these walls could then be restored in the future, especially if it is nominated to the National Register. He says the current owners have instructed me to say that they are going to start marketing this site for industrial use and storage. They do not currently have any intention of nominating it for the National Register and seeking federal tax credits.
3. Mr. Jennings asks if only one wall was removed to put the tanks in, why do they need to remove two walls to take the tanks out. Mr. Hickman says the actually took two walls. He says they actually built a structure inside of a structure that would now block the path of removal. Mr. Serrao asks for clarification. Mr. Hickman uses the map to explain. Mr. Hickman says this building actually has no floor. He says after demolishing the two walls and removing the tanks you will simply have a shell. Mr. Hogan asks the age of this building. Mr. Hickman says 1901. Mr. Hickman says every building with the exception of the 1884 [Brewhouse] building, has been altered.
4. Mr. Hogan asks if Mr. Hickman has images of the building in question today. Mr. Hickman says the condition of this building has worsened since the last time they met. He says this is a freestanding building, and it will not damage any other buildings when it comes down.

Iron City Brewery

5. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
6. Keith Cochran, Lawrenceville Stakeholders introduces himself. He says at the last meeting it was brought up that the State PHMC should be contacted, and he is concerned if that happened and what their opinion was. He says the Lawrenceville Stakeholders initiated the nomination for the ICB complex and it was a lot of work. He says they think these buildings are important, and have received letters of support from around the country. He says they also heard at the last meeting that there was a Master Plan for this site in the works to be funded by a few neighborhood groups and Iron City Brewing, LLC. He says he wonders if this happened and thought they were waiting until this was complete to consider any demolitions. He says on behalf of the Stakeholders they would prefer no buildings be demolished until the whole picture is clear.
7. Anne Nelson of Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation introduces herself and says they mirror the comments of the Stakeholders, that a formal determination from PHMC should be obtained. She says while buildings could have been altered over 100 years, they may not have been altered significantly enough to impact the historic integrity of all the buildings and PHMC in a week or two can provide a letter to that effect identifying if two walls torn off a building will impact that as well.
8. Mr. Hogan says the Commission has reached out to Michael Baker Corporation with regards to what the process would be and how to look at the site assembly and how an impending demolition due to health/safety issues would jeopardize a National Register nomination. He says they also reached out to a historic planner who is very familiar with the property and has a robust business here in Pittsburgh. He says they also had a discussion with PHMC. He says it is the Commission's understanding that because the building is so deteriorated and it is an alternative building, therefore if it were documented correctly, demolishing the building would not jeopardize any future standing for national designation and securing the tax credit for future restoration and development of the building.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao Motions to approve demolition with the condition that the building be documented as per the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards, including interior and exterior photographs and measured drawings, for repository to Carnegie Mellon University or the Heinz History Center.

Ms. McClellan..... Seconds the motion.

9. Ms. Ismail says she would like to see the Master Plan, with community involvement, come to fruition.
10. Mr. Hogan says the Commission is noting that they are encouraging Iron City Brewing to continue their relationship with the community, specifically in planning processes and for marketing to potential buyers and investors. He says they should also consider how this site integrates into the Master Plan for Lawrenceville.

All Members Voted in favor.

..... **Motion passes.**

OWNER: Duquesne Light Company 2825 New Beaver Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15233	WARD:..... 23 rd LOT & BLOCK:.....23-S-251 INSPECTOR: MARK SANDERS COUNCIL DISTRICT:	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 1/18/2011 SITE VISITS: CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
APPLICANT: Duquesne Light Company 2825 New Beaver Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15233	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
	ARCH. RATING:.....	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED..... ELIGIBLE.....

Proposed Changes:

Proposed demolition of existing garage and construction of new structure.

Discussion:

1. June Swanson, counsel to Duquesne Light, reports that Duquesne Light is in the process of upgrading transmissions around the City, which involves the underground system of pipes and conductors. She says the ones of concern today are those in the Allegheny East Commons Park, two of which are more than 35 years old. She says in order to achieve the upgrade Duquesne Light must have a valve station either in or near the park to monitor and control the system. She says the valve station is going to be comprised of pipes, valves, and electronic controls, and there will not be any pumps or high voltage equipment there. She says Duquesne Light has been working with East Allegheny Community Council for the past several months to determine the appropriate location and what the structure should look like. She points out the location on the projected map, and references photographs of the existing garage. She says the current structure has no architectural significance and does not contribute to the design principles of the district. She says it is not sturdy enough to use for the valve station, and the underground lines need to go underneath the structure which would require taking the whole foundation out. She says it is not feasible or cost-permitting to renovate the structure. She says Duquesne Light has engaged local architect Bob Baumbach to design the new structure.
2. Mr. Serrao confirms that the structure is a currently a garage. She says it is a non-used garage. She says there are two residences that front onto Cedar Avenue, but the property is currently owned by Duquesne Light and is not being used by anyone currently.
3. Mr. Hogan asks if the building in question and the residences are both owned by Duquesne Light. She says, yes, currently. Mr. Hogan asks if this building has also been put on the National Register and listed as contributing with this auxiliary structure. Ms. Swanson answers, not to the best of her knowledge.
4. Bob Baumbach, architect, introduces himself. He answers the previous question, acknowledging that the property has recently been subdivided. He says the source of inspiration for this building is a few block away – The Blacksmith’s Shop. He describes the building as light-industrial, and utilizes projected elevation drawings. He says there will be double carriage doors with bead board panels, masonry walls with segmented arches, and transom windows. He says the building will have a flat roof with a slight pitch, concealed by a parapet wall with crown mold and cornice detail. He describes the three side elevations, and that the fourth wall is adjacent to an existing building.

5. Ms. Swanson says that she forwarded an e-mail to Ms. Diehl from Ed Graf of East Allegheny Community Council, showing the organizations support for the project.
6. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
7. Nick Kyriazi introduces himself. He says that East Allegheny Community Council supports the demolition of the garage and new construction as presented.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao. Motions to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Jennings..... Seconds the motion.

All members Voted in favor.

..... **Motion passes.**

OWNER: City of Pittsburgh	WARD:..... 16 th	APPLICATION RECEIVED: 1/18/2011
	LOT & BLOCK:..... 12-G-220	SITE VISITS:
APPLICANT: Loysen + Kreuthmeier Architects 5115 Penn Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15224	INSPECTOR:PAT BROWN	CERTIFICATES OF APP.:00-000
	COUNCIL DISTRICT:	
	ZONING CLASSIFICATION:	
	ARCH. RATING:.....	

NATIONAL REGISTER: LISTED..... ELIGIBLE.....

Proposed Changes:

Proposed rehabilitation/renovation of building.

Discussion:

1. Karen Loysen and Sallyan Kluz, architects, introduce themselves. Angelique Bamberg, historic preservation consultant, introduces herself. Ron Graziano and Ken Fox of Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh introduce themselves.
2. Ms. Loysen says the building is an Alden & Harlow design and opened in 1909. She says very little has been done to it in the last 100 years. She says one of the few things that has changed over the years is that the original entry stair was modified to have a stair to the left and a ramp to the right. She says both side and rear elevations are essentially the same aside from a security screen material on the windows. She says it is a brick building with a combination of cast-stone, wood, and sandstone trim. She says they do not intend to change the footprint of the building but to use the internal structure more effectively. Therefore, there will be little change to the exterior of the building.
3. Ms. Kluz says the roof was originally slate but was replaced with a cementitious shingle roof in the 50's or 60's. She says they will install a slate roof.
4. Ms. Loysen says they will be cleaning the existing stone and brick which is very intact but weathered. She says they will rebuild the parapet in its entirety, which has been water damaged. She says there have been a series of watershed devices installed, which they will remove and install a new copper gutter and downspout. She says they will be removing the windows for repair, re-painting, and re-glazing, then reinstallation. She says some of the brick has been repaired but was not custom fit to match the rest – they will be using custom fit in their repairs to match the original/existing.
5. Ms. Loysen says they will be restoring a grand staircase up to the front entrance of the building. She says they have referenced other Alden & Harlow libraries, and a grand staircase was typically present. Ms. Kluz says original drawings of this building included a grand staircase, which was replaced by the current stair and ramp formation. Ms. Loysen describes the proposed new configuration of the accessible ramp. She says they will also re-grade the front yard on both side, keeping it symmetrical, and utilize a very simple railing on the ramp and stair. She says there will be a small retaining wall behind the new mounding of earth. Ms. Kluz says the retaining wall would be concealed by plantings. Ms. Loysen says this also allows for lighting to be installed in

the ground to be projected onto the face of the building. Ms. Loysen says they have made the landings gracious enough so their can be outdoor seating.

- 6. Ms. Kluz says in order to make the Library fully accessible they will be introducing an elevator which will require construction of an elevator tower at the rear of the building. She says the elevator would be below the front roof line and therefore not visible from East Carson Street. She says it would be visible from the Birmingham Bridge, but would be clad in brick with a limestone and cast stone cap to match the existing.
- 7. Mr. Hogan asks how this will affect the existing rear windows. Ms. Kluz points out the two existing dormers, and the window which will become the opening to the elevator. Mr. Hogan asks if the lower windows are affected by the path of the elevator tower. Ms. Kluz says the elevator sits back so windows are not affected. Ms. Kluz says they are proposing to re-introduce skylights into the roof of the building which were included in the original plan. She explains that they will also change an existing rear window into a doorway for rear ingress/egress.
- 8. Mr. Hogan says the only thing he has concerns about is the introduction of the dormer in the front. Ms. Loysen says the drawing is misleading, and the dormer currently exists but sits behind the parapet.
- 9. Ms. Bamberg says they presented this comment to the East Carson Street Local Review Committee and they were in general support of the project. Ms. Bamberg asks for direction as to whether they would need to return to an HRC hearing or if they could submit final items to staff for approval. Mr. Hogan asks what those items would be. Ms. Bamberg says she is referring to paint colors for the windows primarily, as well as signage and lighting.
- 10. Ms. Kluz says the Library is transitioning to a geothermal system so the chimneys at the rear of the building will no longer be needed and will be removed. The bricks from the chimney will also be reused in repair.
- 11. Mr. Hogan asks for public comment.
- 12. John Martine of the South Side Local Review Committee introduces himself and says they are in general support of the project. He says the LRC made a recommendation that plantings utilized in 1909 be investigated, and that the skylights in the rear be ganged together to give the effect of a larger skylight, which more closely resembles the original.
- 13. Anne Nelson says PHLF as well as herself as a resident of South Side are in support of the project

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao..... Motions to approve with submittal of final details (including signage, lighting, and paint colors) to HRC staff.

Mr. Jennings..... Seconds the motion.

- 14. Mr. Hogan asks the Commission if they feel the railing detail, and signage should be presented to the HRC for final review. Ms. Loysen says the only new signage they are currently proposing is a lighted banner sign at the sidewalk.

All members..... Voted in favor.

..... **Motion passes.**

Wigman House – Preliminary Determination

WIGMAN HOUSE - HISTORIC NOMINATION STAFF REPORT

Name of Property Wigman House
Address of Property 1425 Brownsville Road
Property Owner..... Grace McClory
Nominated by: Carrick-Overbrook Historical Society
Date Received: 30 December 2010
Parcel No.:..... 60-G-168
Ward: 29th
Zoning Classification: R2-L
Neighborhood Carrick
Bldg. Inspector: Ken Seisek
Council District: 4 - Rudiak

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION:

1. Act on the Preliminary Determination of Eligibility for Historic Designation (2 February 2011)
2. Conduct a public hearing for the Historic Designation (2 March 2011)
3. Review the Report prepared by staff for the property in question, and make a recommendation to the City Council on the Historic Designation (6 April 2011)

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

4. Conduct a public hearing for the Historic Designation
5. Review the recommendations of the Historic Review Commission and make a recommendation to the City Council on the Historic Designation

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE CITY COUNCIL:

6. Conduct a public hearing for the Historic Designation
7. Review the recommendations of the Historic Review Commission and the City Planning Commission and take action on the Historic Designation

TIMELINE:

Nomination:	<i>Civic Arena</i>	Notes	Occurred	Must Occur Before
Nomination Submitted			30-Dec-10 <i>With Check</i>	
Date of Notice sent to Property Owner			3-Jan-11	<i>4-Jan-11</i>
Date of Notice Sent to each Owner of Record			N/A	<i>9-Jan-11</i>
Date of Preliminary Determination Hearing			2-Feb-11	<i>13-Feb-11</i>
Date of Public Hearing			2-Mar-11	
Date of HRC's Recommendation			6-Apr-11	
Date of PC Briefing				
Date of PC's Recommendation				
Date Recommendations sent to CC			30-May-11	<i>30-May-11</i>
Date of City Council Hearing				
Date of Adoption by City Council				<i>27-Sep-11</i>
Mayor Signs				
Effective Date				

Wigman House – Preliminary Determination

Discussion:

1. John Rudiak and Carol Anthony of the Carrick-Overbrook Historical Society introduce themselves. Mr. Rudiak says they have submitted this nomination for the Wigman House, which neighbors refer to as the crown jewel of Carrick. Mr. Rudiak says they heard that there were intentions to knock the house down and build a parking lot. He says the house was built around 1902, according to Hopkins Maps. He says the house sits on at the intersection of Brownsville Road and The Boulevard. He says the land was originally owned by Ferdinand Benz, a very wealthy South Side banker. Mr. Benz’s banking partner built a mansion down the street on the Boulevard. Mr. Rudiak says Wigman, of Wigman Lumber Company, had the house built. He says in 1904 Carrick was highlighted as being one of the competitors with the East End, as a neighborhood for wealthy South Side businessmen. He says this is the last remaining Queen Anne Style home in Carrick. He says there were previously three or four, but they have since been demolished. He says one of these belonged to John Philips who built the home for \$35,000 in the late 19th Century. He says there was also a home at 2117 Brownsville Road that was very similar to the house in question, but it was demolished in 1950. He says this home has only gone through three owners, and virtually no modifications have taken place on the interior or exterior. He says this house has all the elements of a Queen Anne style home. He describes the interior woodwork, and stained glass windows which they believe to be built by G.W. Sodder. He says Mr. Sodder was working in the area at the time of the home’s construction. He says they are requesting historic landmark designation because it is the only remaining house of this style in the South Hills which they are aware of.
2. Mr. Hogan asks if there was consideration for any other houses in the neighborhood to be included. Mr. Rudiak says all those homes are gone. Mr. Rudiak says many community members describe seeing this house as the highlight of their day. He says this house is located across the street from the South Side cemetery, which was referenced in 1904 as the “romantic” South Side cemetery.
3. Mr. Hogan asks if the owner of the property is present. They are not. Mr. Hogan asks if the owner is in agreement with the nomination. Mr. Rudiak says they have not expressed an opinion either way.
4. Carol Anthony says the property owner’s only objection was that someone who was interested in buying it intended to tear it down, and she does not want it torn down.

MOTION:

Mr. Serrao. Motions to approve the preliminary determination of the nomination.

Ms. McClellan..... Seconds the motion.

All members..... Voted in favor.

..... **Motion passes.**

Civic Arena – Public Hearing

CIVIC ARENA - HISTORIC NOMINATION STAFF REPORT

Name of PropertyCivic Arena
Address of Property66 Mario Lemieux Place
Property Owner.....Sports & Exhibition Authority/Pittsburgh Arena Real Estate Redevelopment LP
Nominated by:Eloise McDonald
Date Received:23 November 2010
Parcel No.:.....2-C-400
Ward:3rd
Zoning Classification:GT-E
NeighborhoodCentral Business District/Hill District
Bldg. Inspector:Bob Molyneaux
Council District:6 - R. Daniel Lavelle

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE HISTORIC REVIEW COMMISSION:

8. Act on the Preliminary Determination of Eligibility for Historic Designation (5 January 2011)
9. Conduct a public hearing for the Historic Designation (2 February 2011)
10. Review the Report prepared by staff for the property in question, and make a recommendation to the City Council on the Historic Designation (2 March 2011)

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

11. Conduct a public hearing for the Historic Designation
12. Review the recommendations of the Historic Review Commission and make a recommendation to the City Council on the Historic Designation

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED BY THE CITY COUNCIL:

13. Conduct a public hearing for the Historic Designation
14. Review the recommendations of the Historic Review Commission and the City Planning Commission and take action on the Historic Designation

TIMELINE:

Nomination:	<i>Civic Arena</i>	Notes	Occurred	Must Occur Before
Nomination Submitted			23-Nov-10 <i>With Check</i>	
Date of Notice sent to Property Owner			29-Nov-10	2-Dec-10
Date of Notice Sent to each Owner of Record			N/A	1-Aug-10
Date of Preliminary Determination Hearing			5-Jan-11	7-Jan-11
Date of Public Hearing			2-Feb-11	
Date of HRC's Recommendation			2-Mar-11	
Date of PC Briefing				
Date of PC's Recommendation				
Date Recommendations sent to CC			23-Apr-11	23-Apr-11
Date of City Council Hearing				
Date of Adoption by City Council				21-Aug-11
Mayor Signs				
Effective Date				

Civic Arena – Public Hearing

Discussion:

A full transcript is available by contacting Network Deposition Services.

1. Mr. Hogan addressed the Commission’s procedures for this agenda item. Mr. Hogan says they will now ask for the presentation of the nominator(s), who have as much time as needed to speak.
2. Mr. Hogan asks the owner(s) if they will be following the nominator’s presentation. They answer yes.
3. Mr. Hogan says the public comment period will then proceed following the owner(s) presentation. He says members of the public will be given three minutes for testimony, at which time the court reporter will raise her hands, and no further comments will be on the record.
4. Mr. Hogan says after the public comment period, the Commission will allow the nominator(s) and owner(s) to make closing remarks. Mr. Hogan says the Commission does not wish to hear cross-examination.
5. Mr. Hogan asks that everyone who testifies identifies themselves by name and address and states their position on the nomination.
6. Scott Lieb, President of Preservation Pittsburgh, and introduces himself as a co-nominator of the Civic Arena, along with Eloise McDonald and Rob Pfaffman. Mr. Lieb gives an introduction to the nomination, and an overview of the points the nominating party will cover with various speakers in their upcoming presentation.
7. Eloise McDonald introduces herself. She says she believes the Civic Arena meets the criteria for historical status, and she hopes the Commission will take into consideration their personal feelings as to what they believe to be historic. She says she feels the Civic Arena is a venue which should have never been closed, and that it could still benefit the Hill District and The City of Pittsburgh.
8. Derek Wahila, introduces himself, and says he will speak about the first criterion for which the Civic Arena was nominated, “Its location as a site of a significant historic or prehistoric event or activity”. He says concerts, sporting events, cultural performances, entertainment acts, and national politicians have all filled the dome with their energy, activities, oratory, and talent.
9. Laura Schwartz, introduces herself as a board member at Preservation Pittsburgh, and says she will speak about the second criterion for which the Civic Arena was nominated, “Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the cultural, historic, architectural, archaeological, or related aspects of the development of the City of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States”. Ms. Schwartz says Pittsburgh has not always been on the list of most livable cities, she says it was once referred to as the smoky city and was one of the worst places to inhabit. She says with the help of several notable civic leaders Pittsburgh got a second chance. She says Richard King Mellon and David Lawrence formed the Allegheny Conference on Community Development which commissioned modern, innovative buildings such as the Civic Auditorium. She says Edgar Kaufman, a wealthy visionary who loved Pittsburgh, helped to raise the area’s cultural standards by helping to design the Civic Auditorium. She says Kaufman called on Frank Lloyd Wright for preliminary design proposals for a recreational development for the citizens of Pittsburgh, which was to include a new home for the Civic Light Opera.
10. Peter Margattai, introduces himself as an architect and the Vice-President of Preservation Pittsburgh, and says he will speak about the third criterion for which the Civic Arena was nominated, “Its exemplification of an architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship”. He says architects in Pittsburgh were charged with designing a structure that served multiple purposes, to be used by 12,000 people and span four acres. He says the typical dome construction, which had been used for centuries was not capable of serving these purposes. He says instead

Civic Arena – Public Hearing

- Pittsburgh architects and engineers formed an entirely new and innovative structural concept that allowed the dome to retract. He says the only dome in the world that is similar to that of the Civic Arena was recently built in Fukuoka, Japan. He says the designers of that dome actually came
11. Rob Pfaffmann, AIA, AICP of Reuse the Igloo introduces himself and says that he and John F Olyer, PE, Structural Engineer, will speak about the fourth criterion for which the Civic Arena was nominated, “Its identification as the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder whose individual work is significant in the history or development of the City of Pittsburgh, the State of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States”. Mr. Olyer says for the last 19 years he has been teaching at Pitt in the engineering department, he says prior to that he worked for Dravo Corporation as an engineer. He says he is a member History and Heritage Society, part of the American Society of Civil Engineers. He says he remembers being a young engineer in the 1950s and being excited about the Civic Auditorium project. He says everyone wanted to be a part of a project that was the biggest, best or first of its kind, and the Arena met all those criteria.
 12. Mr. Pfaffman speaks about the important architects, engineers, and builders involved in the project. He references Amman & Whitney; he also speaks about Mitchell & Ritchey, who worked on other noteworthy projects such as Three Rivers Stadium, the Alcoa Building, and Mellon Square. He says Edgar Kaufman had a vision to show the world that the skies had cleared in Pittsburgh, by opening the dome’s roof on national television. He references construction drawings and images of the internal mechanics of the Arena.
 13. Jeff Slack, AICP of Pfaffman & Associates, introduces himself. Mr. Slack says the Civic Arena is significant under criterion 5 because it is the “Exemplification of planning and urban design techniques”. He says a cultural acropolis was envisioned for the Hill District as part of the Cities’ first renaissance, the massive post-World War II program of revitalization and flood and smoke control. The proposed center for the arts included a public auditorium, as well as opera house and symphony hall theatres and art museums, luxury hotels, and offices. He says this plan did not become a reality, and blame can be laid at the feet of one of the most innovative but ultimately devastating urban design techniques ever employed in this country – urban renewal.
 14. Franklin Toker, architectural historian introduces himself and says he will be commenting on the Civic Arena’s significance under criterion 10 “Its unique location and distinctive physical appearance or presence representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the City of Pittsburgh”. Mr. Toker references the Roman term “genius loci”, used to describe buildings that exemplify the genius/spirit of a particular place. He says we could call buildings that grasp the spirit of their place civic icons. He says the civic icon of Paris is the Eifel Tower, and of London, the Houses of Parliament, etc. He says it is significant that none of the buildings referenced were loved at the beginning. He says the Civic Arena is the most representative building now standing in the City of Pittsburgh.
 15. Harold Shetter, a former union metal sheet worker from Local 12 in Pittsburgh who worked on the roof of the dome, introduces himself. He says the Civic Arena’s roof has been and always will be the easiest to maintain due to the fact that it is all stainless steel. It is a design that was patented by Overly Design of Greensburg, PA. He says the most famous example of this style of roof is the Chrysler Building in New York City.
 16. Mr. Pfaffman plays a video clip from the Rick Sebak’s *Engineered & Invented in Pittsburgh*.
 17. Mr. Pfaffman plays a video clip of testimony from actor and civic leader David Conrad.
 18. Mr. Lieb gives closing remarks.
 19. Shawn Gallagher, counsel to Sports & Exhibition Authority, introduces himself. He says on November 23, 2010 the Pittsburgh Planning Commission unanimously approved the SEA’s plan for the demolition of the Civic Arena. He says the decision made by the SEA was the result of a nine month long process in which alternatives to demolition were studied and considered. He says the Pennsylvania Bureau for Historic Preservation and over 30 interested parties were involved in this process. He says the SEA was advised to demolish and redevelop the site, and this was not a decision of choice but of necessity. He says this nomination

Civic Arena – Public Hearing

- raises the same claims for historic significance as the previous nomination which was rejected by the HRC, Planning Commission, and City Council in 2002. He says he would like to submit the historic nomination as Exhibit A and the SEA's response to the nomination as Exhibit B.\
20. Councilman Daniel Lavelle, resident of the Hill District and elected official representing District 6 where the Civic Arena resides, introduces himself. He says during the approximately one year that he has served on Pittsburgh's City Council the fate of the Civic Arena has been of primary concern. He says the decision to demolish or preserve the Civic Arena brought to the surface the 50 year long urban renewal/removal programs in the country. He says lest we forget, the Arena was built after the relocation of approximately 8,000 families, business, churches and organizations. He says the Civic Arena represents failed public policy and the deterrence of economic viability for the Hill District community.
 21. Harry Johnson of Councilman Lavelle's office reads a letter into the record on behalf of Howard Graves, former Historic Review Commission Member.
 22. Jeffrey Letwin, board member of Visit Pittsburgh and former Pittsburgh Planning Commission member, introduces himself. Mr. Gallagher says the nominator claims the Civic Arena defines Pittsburgh's skyline. Mr. Letwin says he totally disagrees with that statement. He references the Visit Pittsburgh visitor's guide which does not identify the Arena at all in Pittsburgh's skyline. He says you cannot see the Arena from PNC Park or Mt. Washington, and it is not a tourist attraction.
 23. Benjamin Kelley of Oxford Development Company introduces himself. He states that HOK Sport now Populous Architects designed three of the arenas in the City. He says that Populous Architects were asked to evaluate the Civic Arena prior to the construction of the new arena. Mr. Kelley reads a letter onto the record on behalf of Wayne London, principal at Populous Architects.
 24. Rob Goodman, Assistant General Manager of Consol Energy Center and formerly Mellon Arena, introduces himself. He reads a letter into the record on behalf of Jay Roberts, General Manager, of Consol Energy Center and formerly Mellon Arena.
 25. Dusty Kirk, counsel to the Pittsburgh Penguins, introduces herself. She says the HRC has heard much about parking and if the Arena is torn down it will become a grassy field or surface parking and remain undeveloped, and that is not the intent of the SEA or the Pittsburgh Penguins. She says there are two planning processes which are occurring – The Hill District Master Plan and the concept plan which the Penguins are beginning next week with the City of Pittsburgh.
 26. Don Carter, formerly of Urban Design Associates Architecture Firm, introduces himself. Mr. Carter references urban design and historic preservation projects with which he has participated. He says they have been working with Penguins for 10 years, and they started off doing studies for a site for a new arena. He says they also did at least six versions of urban design site plans for the 28-acre site in the Lower Hill District. He says they consulted with community leaders in the Hill District as well as elected officials, and were continually getting favorable reviews of redeveloping the site without the Civic Arena. Mr. Carter presents a design plan for the site.
 27. Patty Folan of AECOM Economics, formerly Economics Research Associates introduces herself and outlines her education and experiences. Ms. Folan says they have also been working on plan with the Pittsburgh Penguins since 2001 and they think the present plan is mixed used development that's supportive from a market and financial perspective. She says they looked at National Case Studies such as other sites which are anchored by an arena, and supply and demand conditions within the Pittsburgh metro area. She says most strongly they came up with a demand for approximately 1,000 housing units both for sale and rental.
 28. Ms. Kirk asks Mr. Carter to comment on the preservation/retention of the Civic Arena. Mr. Carter says the Civic Arena never should have been built on this site and it now takes up prime developable land. He says it does not have an economically viable reuse.

Civic Arena – Public Hearing

29. DeWitt Walton, employee of the United Steel Workers Union, introduces himself. He says he chose to live in the Hill District when his family moved to Pittsburgh in 1995. He says the biggest issue in the Hill District right now is sustaining jobs, and if we want to advance our community we need to create family sustaining jobs and that can only happen if the Civic Arena comes down.
30. Larry Castonguay of Oxford Development Company/Oxford Real Estate Advisors, introduces himself. Mr. Castonguay submits a plan prepared by Oxford Real Estate Advisors assessing the economically viability of redevelopment plans for this site. He says the plan includes an analysis of if the Arena were to “mothball”. He says mothballing is the present condition of the Arena, a place not for public use purposes. He says it is currently costing the SEA approximately \$50,000 a month to maintain basic holding costs, so it doesn’t further deteriorate.
31. Mary Conturo, Executive Director of the Sports & Exhibition Authority, introduces herself. She says the SEA is a public body formed by the City and the County and it is responsible for owning and operating public auditoriums, exhibition halls, and sporting facilities. Ms. Conturo says the SEA took on a lengthy process to review possible alternative to demolition, which included the State Bureau for Historic Preservation. She says there were eight meetings over the nine month period and a public hearing held by the SEA. She says there was an options report developed by consultants to the SEA which had an end result of a recommendation for demolishing the Arena and replacing it with mixed-use development. Ms. Conturo says the State BHP has state in writing that the SEA has satisfied the requirements of the State History Code.
32. Mr. Hogan calls for public comment.
33. Alan Dunn, architect, testifies **in favor** of the nomination of the Arena. He says he wrote a byline in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette requesting plans for adaptive re-use of the Arena, and the one that garnered the most attention was a waterpark, which they are calling the “Waterdome”.
34. Barbara Mcnees, President of the Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce (an affiliate of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development), testifies **against** the nomination of the Arena. She says the Chamber concurs with the SEA’s decision for demolition of the Arena and redevelopment of the site as the best option.
35. Jay Schaffer testifies **in favor** of the nomination. He says he has traveled all around the world and the saddest thing is to see things that are missing, and he is afraid that is what they will have here.
36. Kimberly Ellis, Hill District resident and Executive Director of Historic Hill Institute, testifies **against** the nomination. She says the Civic Arena is the largest standing structure representing poor urban planning and failed public policy.
37. Angela Howze, of the Hill District Consensus Group, testifies **against** the nomination. She says even though she had good times in the Civic Arena every time she stepped inside she remembered it was once her grandmother’s home.
38. Gary English testifies **in favor** of the nomination. Mr. English presents letters which he received from fellow supporters of the nomination which could not be present.
39. Reginald Plato testifies **in favor** of the nomination. He says the present Civic Arena should continue to exist as an eminent testimonial to the duplicity, lies, and infinite racism, and prejudices that live and thrive in the Jim Crow City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County PA.
40. Mr. Pfaffman presents a letter to the Commission on behalf of John Martine of Preservation Pennsylvania. Mr. Martine’s testimony is **in favor** of nomination.

Civic Arena – Public Hearing

41. Jake Wheatley, State Representative for the 19th Legislative District which includes the Hill District, testifies **against** the nomination. He says the majority of elected representation of the Hill District is in agreement that this community deserves to have a vital voice in what will be the future for itself and the City, such as they did not have a voice when the Civic Arena was first built.
42. Phyllis Ghafour, Hill District resident, testifies **against** the nomination. She says her issue is whose history are we preserving and why. She says she was seven years old when the Civic Arena was built, and continues to live in the Hill District.
43. Sala Udin testifies **against** the nomination. He says he is testifying as one of the 8,000 families that was removed from the Lower Hill District when the Civic Arena was built.
44. Marimba Milliones, board chair for the Hill Community Development Corporation, testifies **against** the nomination. She says the very need for a CDC in the Hill District is a direct outgrowth of the tragedy that happened nearly 50 years ago. She says the Commission has the power to make those injustices a permanent part of Pittsburgh's future, or to put this historic review in the proper context. She says it is no coincidence that only a few preservationists have come out in support of the Civic Arena.
45. Jason Harris testifies **in favor** of the nomination. He says he is a taxpayer and a citizen and that is who he represents today. He says we do not need another Arena, but this building can be re-used to make the community better.
46. Josh Clyde testifies **in favor** of the nomination. He says while Mary Conturo testified that the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission took place in the public process, she did not mention that the PHMC repeatedly expressed serious concerns with the methodology that the SEA used to evaluate options for reusing the Civic Arena.
47. Anne Nelson of Pittsburgh History & Landmarks testifies **in favor** of the nomination. She says the Civic Arena was part of the project conceived by Edgar Kaufman and it was designed by James Mitchell of Mitchell & Ritchey which was the premier architectural firm during the City's renaissance. She says PHLF supported the Arena's designation in 2003, particularly under criterion 3. Ms. Nelson presents a position paper on behalf of PHLF. Ms. Nelson says they believe there is a possibility of jeopardizing the future use of federal funds for the redevelopment of the entire 28-acre site, if S106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is not complied with. She says the State History Code requirement was recently completed by the SEA but does not fulfill the requirements and processes that are clearly defined in the S106 Regulations.
48. Eric Roberson, Hill District resident, testifies **against** the nomination. He says removing the Arena and connecting the Hill District to the rest of Downtown would be a great opportunity for the community to access downtown.
49. Brenda Tate, Hill District resident, testifies **against** the nomination. Ms. Tate says she is a lifelong resident of the Hill District and a member of the Hill District Consensus Group. She says she is in support of the development of the Lower Hill and any development that will benefit her community.
50. Phillis Lavelle, Hill District resident of 37 years, testifies **against** the nomination. Ms. Lavelle says she is not a structural expert or historian, but she is a very proud Hill District resident. She says she is president of the Schenley Heights Collaborative that is committed to developing a wholesome community in their area of the City. She says she also works as a realtor in the community. She says the Civic Arena is not occupied and is an eyesore for many, and it is now time to tear the building down and throw it away.

Civic Arena – Public Hearing

51. Victor Roque testifies **against** the nomination, and in support of demolition, saying it is a part of the redevelopment plans for the Hill District, as proposed by the Penguins.
52. Melissa McSwigan testifies **in favor** of the nomination. She poses the question, will demolishing the Civic Arena right the past wrongs, or can the building be a renewed icon for Pittsburgh that reminds us of past injustices while being part of an exciting new development for the Lower Hill. She says she is in favor of the Arena's reuse and doesn't believe it has to be antagonistic.
53. Mr. Hogan calls for closing remarks from the nominator(s).
54. Mr. Lieb says the SEA showed images of redevelopment plans, and he would like to make it clear that Preservation Pittsburgh is also in favor of redeveloping the Lower Hill, as they are not satisfied with the Civic Arena as is, as it is surrounded by a sea of parking. He says they chose not to present reuse ideas today because that is an issue for the Planning Commission. He says the charge for the HRC is to examine the criteria and if the Arena is eligible for historic designation under those criteria.
55. Mr. Hogan calls for closing remarks from the owner(s).
56. Mr. Gallagher says there were public comments in regard to S106 and anticipatory demolition, but that is not an issue here and he refers the Commission to Exhibit 13. He says the SEA does not believe the Arena meets the minimum criteria. He says even if the Commission did find the Arena to meet one of the criteria for designation, it is clearly not worthy of preservation. He says it would cost millions of dollars to open the door for any reuse. He respectfully requests that the Commission denies the nomination.