

**ART COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF February 24, 2010**  
**BEGINNING AT 2:00 P.M.**

**PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION:**

**Klavon, Cooper, Astorino, Haskell,  
Luckett, Rhor, Indovina, Gable in place  
of Kaczorowski**

**PRESENT OF THE STAFF:**

**Morton Brown, Noor Ismail**

**A. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Klavon asked for approval of minutes from January 27, 2010.

**MOTION: To approve meeting minutes for January 27, 2010.**

**MOVED: Cooper**

**SECONDED: Haskell**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

**B. Correspondence**

Mr. Brown stated that there was a supplemental letter from the Sports and Exhibition Authority for the Mazerowski Sculpture near PNC Park. He added that the letter includes options for future land conveyance to the City. He distributed copies of the letter to the Commission members for review.

**C. Items for Review**

a. **Morrow Park Construction Phase I**

Ms. Christine Brill of Studio for Spatial Practice distributed to the Commission additional letters of support for the project from the City of Pittsburgh and Bloomfield Citizens Corporation. She also directed the Commission to an updated rendering of the project.

Ms. Brill stated that this project has been before the Art Commission two other times. She explained that the first time they received Conceptual Approval of the Master Plan of the park and the second time they received Final Approval of the Master Plan of the park with a condition that they return with more details of the project as it moves forward. She added that this presentation seeks Final Approval for Phase I of the construction, which only includes the most southern triangle tip.

Ms. Brill directed the Commission to the application documents that show the welcome sign, planting areas, lighting, and entire park drawings. She explained that the sign is constructed much like a layer cake, so that if a piece needs to be fixed only that piece has to be removed. She added that the material for the front of the sign will be bronze-painted metal with the "Morrow Park" letters in integral plate of quarter-inch steel that is powder-coated, while the "Bloomfield" letters will be in stand-offs painted red and powder-coated. She mentioned that previous Art Commission concerns over the size of the "Bloomfield" letter was taken into concern and the size was reduced to six inches.

Ms. Brill showed a drawing of the sign in the context of the entire park, with sidewalks to the left and to the right. She stated that other elements throughout the park that are not included in Phase I, but in the record set, would include city standard water fountains, benches, Three Rivers bike rack, and trash receptacles. She added that the project will also address the sidewalks and lighting.

Ms. Brill directed the Commission to the lighting sheet, which includes an example of the two up-lights that will illuminate the sign, placed one foot to eighteen inches off the ground, hitting the sign from oblique

angles. She mentioned that the up-lights will be painted black and semi-hidden behind the grasses in the planting beds.

Ms. Brill showed two different planting options, stating that after consultation with urban gardeners and the Bloomfield Citizens Corporation, they chose the option that includes mostly grasses and sedum and required less maintenance.

Ms. Brill stated that another Art Commission concern they had addressed was safety of the “Bloomfield” sign. She mentioned that a layer of laminated tempered glass that has an inner white layer and rounded corners was added behind the “Morrow Park” letters. She distributed a sign example at the Hillman Cancer Center for reference.

Mr. Indovina asked about the status of the entire Morrow Park Plan.

Ms. Brill answered that they have funding at this time only for Phase I. She added that once this phase is completed, they may embark on further fundraising.

Ms. Klavon asked Mr. Brown if he could go over the Commission’s previous concerns about the project.

Mr. Brown directed the Commission to the points listed in the packet. He added that the project addressed all of the previous concerns of the Commission, in his opinion, and incorporated the appropriate changes, especially into the safety concerns of the sign.

Ms. Rhor mentioned the memorial already installed in the park and asked how the plan plays up the memorial visually or integrates the past memorial into the present.

Ms. Brill answered that the Master Plan serves the memorial better by widening the lawn area around the piece and including benches so visitors can sit and contemplate the piece rather than just walking by it. She added that in this phase there is a bronze backdrop as a referential piece.

Ms. Rhor stated that the project can activate the space differently than just mere contemplation.

Ms. Klavon asked the audience if there was anyone that wanted to speak on behalf or in opposition to the project.

Ms. Haskell complimented the project for following through on the design. She moved to grant final approval of Phase I of Morrow Park.

**MOTION: To grant Final Approval to Phase I Construction of Morrow Park.**

**MOVED: Haskell**

**SECONDED: Luckett**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

b. Bill Mazerowski Sculpture near PNC Park

Ms. Patty Paytas, Vice President of Community and Public Affairs for the Pirates team, introduced herself and the rest of the representatives of the project: Chris Hunter of the Operations Department, Aaron Lloyd of Astorino, Angelica Ciranni and Rosemary Carroll of the Sports and Exhibition Authority.

Mr. Brown distributed additional letters of support for the project. He stated that the SEA and the City Law Department reviewed the original conveyance agreement to determine if the land could be conveyed back partially, i.e. the parcel that this sculpture resides could be conveyed to the Pirates while the rest of the land could be conveyed to the City. He stated that this project is different than other SEA projects because it is possible that this parcel could be negotiated with the City to be deeded to the Pirates and not conveyed back

to the City—and that this was the most logical option—and therefore, at the request of the SEA it would not need to follow the same three-step process of review by the Commission.

Ms. Paytas stated that it is the project's intent to add a fourth bronze sculpture to PNC Park at the overlook area adjacent to the stadium. She stated that this new sculpture of Bill Mazeroski, a former Pittsburgh Pirate, commemorates the first-ever walk-off home run victory over the Yankees in the 1960 World Series. She stated that this project intends to improve the site of the sculpture making it a destination for fans instead of the concrete site it is now.

Ms. Paytas stated that the commissioned artist is Susan Wagner, the sculptor of the existing Roberto Clemente and Willie Stargell pieces also at the park. She directed the Commission to the maquette of the Mazeroski sculpture. She added that this year is the fiftieth anniversary of the home run and Mazeroski's 74<sup>th</sup> birthday, so having the sculpture revealed this September 5<sup>th</sup> would be ideal.

Ms. Paytas showed several images of the ballpark, including views of the other three sculptures. She directed the Commission to the proposed site of the sculpture on the map, the inspirational photo of Mazeroski rounding second base, and the color rendering of the site. She mentioned that the "406" brick wall is from the original Forbes Field, is currently on display inside the stadium, and is proposed to be incorporated into this site as a backdrop for the sculpture. Ms. Paytas stated that they had discussed the site with the Riverlife Task Force. She stated that the brick 'book ends' provides opportunity for donors to incorporate their names into the site. She added that unlike the Stargell site bricks that are hard to maintain, this application would have painted, cast aluminum ivy leaves on the brick wall of the site that would incorporate names of donors in text. She added that Matthews International will produce the work in conjunction with the designers of Astorino.

Ms. Paytas stated that the benches in the design are merely placeholders, as they work with the City on the placement and style. She added that the project managers liked the retro benches of the Morrow Park project (the City-standard wrought iron park bench). Ms. Paytas showed several documents and mentioned that the pose of the statue requires structural engineering to ensure its stability. She went on to present additional images of the park and the current statues and added that the original bronze maquettes of the Roberto Clemente statue are used for World Series National Awards. Ms. Paytas showed detail images and specs of the ivy leaf donor plaques made of cast aluminum with a diamond-shield coating. She mentioned that these will be easier to maintain and more visible than bricks on the ground plane.

Ms. Paytas stated that the project budget is \$450,000 and is privately-funded through the Pirates and Pirates Charities. She added that the annual maintenance budget is \$15,000 for all four statues. She added that the artist, Susan Wagner, comes to the park twice a year to maintain the sculptures and would also be responsible for the maintenance of this new piece.

Ms. Haskell asked if the sculptures were life-size or larger-than-life.

Ms. Paytas answered that the sculptures are larger-than-life and the Mazeroski statue will be twelve feet to the top of the head, fourteen and a half feet to the top of the helmet in his hand. She added that the other three sculptures are also twelve feet to the top of the head.

Ms. Haskell commented that the heights of the sculptures should keep this consistency.

Ms. Paytas answered that the heights and the same artist for three of the statues helps keep that consistency.

Ms. Haskell asked what artist created the Honus Wagner sculpture.

Ms. Paytas answered that the artist was Frank Vittor.

Mr. Cooper asked about the maquette's likeness, if it was supposed to embody the posture of the famous pose and the likeness of Mazeroski.

Ms. Paytas answered that the likeness of Mazerowski has been challenging since many fans know him as a 74-year-old man, rather than a 24-year-old. She stated that the artist is paying special attention to the likeness and is still tweaking the facial portrait.

Mr. Cooper stated that more work needs to be done on the sculpture. He stated that his torso and legs should be thicker and added that the face needs to be specially considered. He added that the body of the sculpture doesn't seem to be going forward, but rather leaning backward.

Ms. Paytas stated that the leaning issues might have to do with the engineering to keep it standing up.

Mr. Cooper answered that there should be a way to create the sense of lightness and engineered to stand up.

Ms. Rhor agreed with Mr. Cooper's point, saying she does not get the sense of victory, but rather the sense of Mazerowski slipping on something from the pose.

Mr. Brown pointed out that his torso in the photograph leans forward a hair and the maquette does not. He added that by correcting this, the engineering may be improved by carrying the weight over his knees.

Mr. Astorino asked about the status of the clay sculpture.

Ms. Paytas answered that they are working on the enlargement right now.

Mr. Astorino stated that the likeness and posture will be easier to correct in the 1:1 twelve-foot enlargement. He asked if they were worried about the bricks of the "406" wall being taken or defaced, if it became known that this was the original.

Mr. Hunter answered that there is 24-hour security and video on the pieces.

Mr. Astorino stated that security of the piece was his only concern and that possibly a replica of it would work in the site instead.

Mr. Hunter added that currently the piece is open to the public every day and there have been no incidents.

Mr. Indovina stated that he assumed the different leaves represented different levels in donations and asked how the leaves will be affixed to the wall. He commented that more organic, less linear placement of the leaves would be a nicer look and would better reference ivy on the brick.

Ms. Paytas answered that the placement of the leaves is something they are working on.

Mr. Lloyd added that the staggered five by five inch grid placement solved the problem of visitors turning their head to read the leaves and made finding their (donor designation) leaf easier.

Mr. Indovina commented that the thrill of discovery in finding your leaf could be a fun aspect.

Mr. Brown asked about the second base plaque, noting that it is not shown in the rendering.

Ms. Paytas answered that there will be aggregate concrete around the site and an over-sized second base plaque with historical information about the homerun moment.

Ms. Klavon expressed concern over the ivy leaves as well and suggested a simplified design. She asked how the leaves would be attached.

Mr. Hunter answered that each leaf will have two cast studs that are drilled in an epoxy set on the wall for secure placement.

Ms. Paytas asked Ms. Klavon to clarify what she meant by a simplified design.

Ms. Klavon answered that the leaves are really busy and simpler is better. She mentioned the Stargell piece has something that draws you to it with merely the stadium as his backdrop. She added that the Mazeroski site might be too fussy, though she understands the Forbes Field concept, it might be too encumbered.

Ms. Lockett asked if they had thought of connecting the stems of the ivy.

Ms. Paytas answered that they had not yet considered that as an option.

Ms. Klavon asked if this could be an artist's project to create a truly beautiful ivy fixture to improve the natural flow of it.

Mr. Indovina suggested that the ivy could simply be an armature and donor leaves can be attached as they are bought.

Mr. Brown stated that he could direct Ms. Paytas to some resources to find artists for this project if she so desired.

Mr. Astorino stated that the ivy is a good idea, but the simplification of design should be considered. He added that they should go for natural and organic, rather than formal/memorial.

Mr. Indovina commended Susan Wagner's work.

Ms. Klavon asked if the walls were even necessary to the site.

Ms. Paytas answered that fans want to be apart of the project and they want to pay for the project, so the Pirates want to create some opportunity for the fans to be involved. She agreed that they could look at different ways to do the leaves.

Ms. Klavon asked the audience if there was anyone to speak on behalf of, in opposition, or in general about the project.

Ms. Angelica Ciranni stated that the SEA believes it's appropriate to have Susan Wagner as the artist for this sculpture since it is a nice complement to the other sculptures at the stadium. She added that the project is a great enhancement for this area of the park that is under-used.

Ms. Renee Piechocki introduced herself as the Director of the Office of Public Art and a North Side resident who uses the path around the sculpture site often. She stated several positive aspects of the project: this bronze figure continues the vocabulary that already exists around the park and once completed, this new site will make a place out of a non-place. Ms. Piechocki stated that she has concerns over the 'fake' Forbes Field wall concept and that it would make more sense to place the "406" wall back with the original wall in Oakland. She expressed concern over the over-sized scale of the Mazeroski sculpture compared to the wall. She mentioned that she sits on the Riverlife Design Committee, and that there have been recent discussions among that group about how the brick walls would block views of the river. She asked if the Forbes Field wall and ivy could be somewhat permeable so visitors could see through to the river.

Ms. Piechocki reiterated that the bronze sculpture is appropriate and matches the vocabulary already established at the park, but the creation of a "fake place" differentiates this site from the rest. She added that a more elegant approach to referencing Forbes Field, maybe similar to the Clemente site, would be more appropriate. Ms. Piechocki stated that the design of the ivy leaves looks unprofessional, clunky, and not of the same quality as the other sculpture sites within and around the stadium. She expressed concern over the donor-recognition labels placed on top of each leaf. Ms. Piechocki suggested as a possible solution using the simple aluminum material, matching it to the handrail, and attaching the leaves to the handrail.

Ms. Piechocki asked about the placement of the benches, stating that the seats should be close to the river rather than closer to the street.

Ms. Klavon agreed with Ms. Piechocki that there is not much issue over the sculpture, but over the brick walls and the ivy.

Mr. Brown stated that the Commission could either offer a favorable or unfavorable endorsement of this project for Courtesy Review. He added that the bench placement is in City Right of Way, so would need to return to the Art Commission when this placement and style was finalized.

Ms. Ismail asked if they will work with Public Works to approve standards.

Ms. Paytas answered yes.

Mr. Brown stated that the Commission could move to allow staff to approve City standard benches, bike racks and other streetscape items, if they felt comfortable doing so.

Ms. Klavon asked if they considered the site without the wall.

Ms. Paytas answered that they have not considered the site without the wall. She stated that the wall enhances the view of the statue to the city and brings the “406” wall out where it can be appreciated.

Mr. Astorino directed the Commission to the letter of support from Lisa Schroeder of Riverlife that does not say anything about the wall’s potential blocking of the river. He added that he likes the wall, because it recreates Forbes Field—which does not exist anymore--and recreates a moment in history. He reiterated his concern about the ivy and asked them to make them more natural.

Ms. Paytas stated that they will explore other options for the ivy.

Ms. Klavon asked the other commissioners to make comments about the wall.

Mr. Cooper agreed with Ms. Piechocki’s view on the wall. He stated that the Clemente base abstracts the world of a baseball park and creates a place that abstracts the idea of the game, while this site exists at a literal level that might diminish the site instead of ennobling the concept. He stated that he likes the placement of the statue, since it feels like he’s coming from somewhere, like the river, and relates the statue to the surroundings. He stated that he doesn’t think it needs the other elements: less is more.

Ms. Rhor agreed with Mr. Cooper’s comments about the site concept being too literal. She added that the scale issue might make the site laughable rather than celebratory. She stated that the wall idea should just be forgotten. She related a story of her students visiting the park and expressing their love of the Clemente statue since it stands on its own and means something much more eternal than just the pose.

Ms. Haskell stated that if the figure is in motion and the walls are static, maybe the walls stop the feeling of expansion and motion.

Ms. Lockett stated that she has mixed feelings about the site. She suggested staining the tops of the walls (so that the light colored stone does not make a delineating line) to keep the visitors looking up.

Mr. Indovina stated his disagreement with his colleagues, stating that the walls were integral to that moment and that period in history.

Mr. Astorino stated that there are two distinctive moments of this historic event: the moment the ball went over the wall and the image of ‘Maz’ celebrating.

Ms. Lockett stated that as a student at Pitt, she was not given a context for the remaining wall of Forbes Field on Pitt’s campus in Oakland but maybe this site will.

Ms. Paytas mentioned the second base historical plaque that would tell the story of the homerun to visitors unaware of the moment.

Ms. Piechocki stated that if the site was successful, the plaque would not be needed to explain it.

Mr. Brown asked about the over-sized second base and its scale (since the base was not shown in the contextual drawings), because if it was a different scale than the figure or wall there would be three different scales within this site.

Mr. Hunter answered that the base is in scale with the statue.

Ms. Klavon stated that if the benches are part of the streetscape, they should be City standard, but if they're part of the site, should be of that time period.

Ms. Klavon asked for a motion for the site.

Mr. Brown asked for a motion for the streetscape elements.

**MOTION: To grant Favorable Endorsement of the statue and site, provided that the applicant takes into account the concerns expressed in the minutes about the statue, the leaves, and the wall.**

**MOVED: Indovina**

**SECONDED: Cooper**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

**MOTION: To grant Conceptual Approval of streetscape elements.**

**MOVED: Indovina**

**SECONDED: Rohr**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

c. Fowler Park Gymnasium

Mr. Brown introduced the project and stated that the Pittsburgh Project leases the property of Fowler Park from the City. He stated that the applicant will present existing projects, including artwork, today since they were unaware at the time that the projects needed to be approved by the Art Commission. He added that they are seeking conceptual approval for the Master Plan and Conceptual and Final Approval for the proposed construction of the new gymnasium.

Ms. Klavon asked if the project has been presented to any other commissions.

Mr. Brown answered no and added that other commissions would not have purview over this site.

Ms. Klavon asked how far along the project is and if the project is on a schedule for the gymnasium.

Mr. Brown answered that they are at construction document phase and are on a schedule for construction of the gym, pending Art Commission approval. He added that the project has passed through Public Works review and the applicant has supplied a letter of support from them which states no adverse affect to the project, but does ask for certain documents of the applicant as the project proceeds.

Ms. Rosemeyer introduced the Pittsburgh Project organization, the terms of the lease, items that have been added to the park in the past (including an amphitheater, artwork, and gazebo), and the proposed gymnasium. She distributed additional project documents to the Commission. She stated that the Pittsburgh Project is a community development organization on the North Side within the Perry South neighborhood. She added that the Project serves as a resource organization for the distressed community. She stated that the Pittsburgh Project's Purpose Statement is to develop servant leaders and uphold the dignity of vulnerable homeowners so that all residents of Pittsburgh can live a safe, helpful and healthy life.

Ms. Rosemeyer stated that the Project has a housing repair program, a youth development program, and a community outreach program to fulfill their purpose statement. She stated that the Project also strives to renew and create community assets. Ms. Rosemeyer explained that the City intended to close the Fowler Park pool, so the Pittsburgh Project signed a 15-year lease with the City in 2006 to manage the park and pool. She stated that they acquired funding resources from DCNR by creating a Master Plan for the park with community input. Ms. Rosemeyer stated that the community wanted new playground equipment and a gymnasium. She mentioned that the funding source for the 2007 playground project was Kaboom, a national foundation.

Ms. Rosemeyer mentioned that a turn-around at the end of an alley was neglected, unlit, and cut off from sight views. She stated that the Project built a gazebo and amphitheater in this space to save it from the illegal and illicit activities that plagued the space previously. She added that they planted trees around the area and cleaned out the horse-shoe shaped mound surrounding the amphitheater. Ms. Rosemeyer stated that the Project created a Peace Garden with a grant from the Children's Museum Charm Bracelet project. She stated that the grant was specifically to commission three local artists to create work to be placed in the garden. She directed the Commission to the RFP that was sent out to artists through the Sprout Fund and GPAC. She stated that a neighborhood committee reviewed the artwork submissions, interviewed four artists, and chose two artists to create work for \$5,000. She explained that one piece was done by Anire Mosley, contained international symbols from around the world, made of wood, and is about 8-10 feet high. She added that the other piece was a series of four pieces done by Sandy Kessler Kaminski, in which each piece displays quotations etched onto plexi-glass from famous peacemakers around the world that were chosen by community members. She added that both pieces are secured to concrete blocks embedded into the ground.

Ms. Rosemeyer directed the Commission to images of the proposed site for the gymnasium. She stated that Public Works would like the Project to inform them of all details, so that when the City takes over the gym they are well-prepared and have all pertinent records. She added that the gymnasium will look similar to the guest house already located on the site with 8-feet of masonry on the bottom, silver aluminum above, and red accents throughout. Ms. Rosemeyer mentioned the year-round basketball program that the Project runs. She stated that the gymnasium will be an asset to the neighborhood for this program, for community group meetings, for senior citizens, for the entire community.

Ms. Haskell asked where the participants of the basketball program currently play.

Ms. Rosemeyer answered that the Project currently rents space from schools.

Ms. Haskell asked where the gym will be placed.

Ms. Rosemeyer answered that the gym will be placed on top of the current outdoor courts and they will build new outdoor courts adjacent to this area at a later date.

Ms. Klavon asked how they will fund this project.

Ms. Rosemeyer answered that they received private grants, a State Department of Community and Economic Development, and another State grants to build the gymnasium.

Mr. Gable stated that the City's relationship with the Pittsburgh Project has been fulfilled as per the agreement and Public Works is on board with the proposal. He added that the Project is present in the park and watching the park, and therefore is making a difference in this area.

Ms. Lockett stated that she commends the Project for their efforts in the community.

Mr. Astorino agreed and commended the Project's efforts.

Ms. Klavon asked the audience for comments in support, opposed or in general about the project.

Ms. Piechocki added that the park contains a Percent for Art project artwork by Jim Myford—the piece looks like a mini Stonehenge—and should be respected as new artworks are placed.

Ms. Rhor asked for clarification regarding the Approvals requested.

Mr. Brown explained that there needs to be a decision about the gymnasium, about the Master Plan, and about the artwork. He advised that the Commission decide on Conceptual and/or Final approval of the gym and Master Plan, and the artwork needs to come back to the Commission with more information provided so that the Commission can decide whether or not to accept the artwork as is and into the City's collection.

Ms. Klavon commented that the artwork looks temporary, implying that the Commission might not have to review it for acceptance into the Collection.

Ms. Rosemeyer asked what was meant by the comment that the artwork looks temporary.

Ms. Klavon answered that the pieces look like they won't last forever-- being built out of wood and plexi-glass--so in comparison to much of the City's Collection of stone and steel/bronze, the works in the Peace Garden are made of more temporary materials and will not last indefinitely.

Mr. Indovina stated that if Public Works is happy with the construction and details, he doesn't have issue with the gym.

Mr. Gable stated that Public Works is happy and will continue to work with the Pittsburgh Project on this project.

Mr. Astorino for clarification of the green area along Kenwood Avenue.

Ms. Rosemeyer explained that the green is actually a steep hill.

Ms. Rhor asked what the graffiti mural noted on the Master Plan is.

Ms. Rosemeyer answered that that was intended to be on the rock face near the gymnasium, but will most likely not be included in the final plan.

Ms. Klavon suggested they update the Master Plan to reflect changes already made, and changes to proposed projects.

**MOTION: To grant Final Approval for construction of gymnasium.**

**MOVED: Haskell**

**SECONDED: Astorino**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

**MOTION: To grant Conceptual Approval to the site plan, with particular attention paid to the artwork and the peace garden when they return for Final Approval.**

**MOVED: Haskell**

**SECONDED: Astorino**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

d. North Shore Saloon Palm Trees

Mr. Brown explained that the pictures included in the proposal were taken when the palm trees were erected in August of 2009 before being taken down as requested by Public Works.

Mr. Pitterich introduced himself as owner of the North Shore Saloon and explained that the palm trees fit with the shore/beach theme of the saloon. He stated that lights would run from the trees to the building in a rectangular formation. He added that tables made from wooden barrels, plexi-glass and sand will be placed at the base of the tree to carry on the beach theme.

Mr. Pitterich stated that the palm trees are made of smooth steel tubes with rubber palm leaves 9-feet off the ground. He added that the trees are anchored to the ground with a steel plate and four bolts in each corner and plastic with sand on top to prevent tripping. Mr. Pitterich explained that he would maintain the trees and absorb all the costs. He added that he hopes they last for a few years.

Mr. Brown stated that the palm trees do not fall under the street café ordinance since they would be permanent. He mentioned that the placement of the trees is negotiable with Mr. Pitterich and Public Works. He directed the Commission to emails from Ben Carleese that states that Public Works and Councilman Labell would approve this project if it is approved by the Art Commission.

Ms. Haskell asked what would happen to the trees during the winter months when the tables would go inside.

Mr. Pitterich answered that the palm trees would stay and the tables would be taken into the saloon.

Mr. Indovina asked how long he anticipates the palm trees to be up.

Mr. Pitterich answered that he would imagine them up a couple years. He added that he could take them down for the winter months and just have them up during the spring and summer months.

Mr. Indovina asked if they are more temporary then.

Mr. Pitterich answered that they were not permanent, just bolted to the ground. He added that they trees can withstand up to 90 miles per hour winds.

Ms. Klavon asked if the trees were in Public Right Away.

Mr. Pitterich answered that the placement of the trees was moved closer to the building to allow access.

Ms. Klavon asked about liability if an accident with the trees should occur.

Mr. Pitterich answered that it would be his responsibility.

Ms. Klavon stated that the trees need to work with streetscape design guidelines.

Mr. Astorino asked about Public Works stance on this project.

Mr. Brown answered that Public Works is ready to issue an encroachment permit if the Art Commission approves the project and then it would go before Council.

Mr. Astorino asked if the trees would obstruct Public Works' daily work.

Mr. Brown answered that the placement of the trees is fine for ADA and Public Works purposes.

Mr. Astorino stated that this would be an aesthetic issue, rather than a legal issue.

Mr. Cooper stated that he approves of the concept but is concerned by the potential safety risk.

Ms. Haskell asked if he considered planting real trees like the ones planted a few storefronts down from the saloon.

Mr. Pitterich answered that real trees couldn't be palms and so wouldn't match the beach theme of the saloon.

Ms. Klavon stated that approving this project might open the City up to other people's whims, like ducks on the sidewalk.

Ms. Lockett asked what would happen if the saloon went out of business.

Mr. Pitterich answered that the trees could be taken down in the case of the saloon going out of business.

Ms. Klavon stated that the project might be more appropriate if it was temporary.

Mr. Pitterich answered that he could take the palm trees down during the winter months (November through March) if it would make the Commission more comfortable.

Mr. Astorino stated that he is conflicted between concern for the precedent they would set in approving this project and excitement about the playful nature of the project.

Mr. Indovina asked if they could make it a temporary installation then.

Mr. Pitterich answered that he would be agreeable to that.

Ms. Klavon stated that temporary installation would quell their safety concerns.

Mr. Cooper agreed with making the installation temporary to reduce risk of safety hazards.

Mr. Astorino stated that the City needs to have vitality *and* standards.

Mr. Pitterich asked if temporary would be defined as de-installation during winter months.

The Commission answered yes, temporary would be to take the palm trees down during winter months.

Ms. Ismail asked if the Commission could be specific in defining temporary.

Ms. Haskell suggested the baseball season for installation of the palm trees.

Mr. Pitterich agreed that from March to November/late October would be an ideal time to have the palm trees up.

The Commission agreed with that time-frame.

Mr. Cooper added that there are often big snow storms in March, though, and suggested an April 1 start date instead.

Mr. Pitterich agreed about snow storms in March and cited St. Patrick's Day as a day of potential risk with the palm trees. He agreed to April 1 to the end of October.

Ms. Klavon asked the audience for comments in support of, in opposition to, or in general about the project.

**MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval of Palm Trees for a seasonal period of April 1 to October 31, provided that the Department of Public Works approves the project for safety.**

**MOVED: Astorino**

**SECONDED: Cooper**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

**Meeting Adjourned**