

**ART COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF June 23, 2010
BEGINNING AT 2:00 P.M.**

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION:

**Klavon, Indovina, Cooper, Astorino,
Haskell, Mike Gable in place of Rob
Kaczorowski**

PRESENT OF THE STAFF:

Morton Brown, Noor Ismail

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Brown noted that the minutes of the May hearing were not completed and therefore could not be approved at this time.

B. Correspondence

C. Items for Review

a. Garfield Commons Flower Baskets: Conceptual and Final

Tisha Germany introduced herself as the executive for KBK Enterprises, the developer and owner of Garfield Commons. This is a newly developed housing community that is on the former site of Garfield Heights Public Housing Community in the east end of Pittsburgh. She stated that she is here today to request Conceptual and Final Approval for flower baskets that will be hung on City issued street poles that were installed this past fall on Fern and Fern Circle which are the main streets in the newly constructed community. Ms. Germany displayed a presentation showing what the site looked like when it was a public housing community.

She noted that KBK was awarded the contract to develop the community in May of 2006 and demolition by the housing authority started in 2007. Fern Street was a public street at the time and they are currently working on it to be approved back to the City. Ms. Germany displayed a site plan noting the pole locations and the Garfield Commons site as a whole. She further noted the location of the new Children's hospital and the Allegheny Cemetery as adjacent to this property. She stated further that they are currently under construction on Columbo Street where they are building an additional 45 homes and this fall, will begin building an additional 40 homes. She then displayed photos of what Fern Street looks like today, with the City light poles. She stated that they are proposing to have 2 flower baskets on each pole, and that there are 20 poles between Fern Street and Fern Circle. There will be 40 baskets total.

Ms. Klavon asked who would maintain the flower baskets.

Ms. Germany answered that they will have an agreement with the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy who will maintain and water the flowers, and store the baskets and hooks at the end of the season. The project will pay for that service.

Ms. Klavon stated to clarify that the developer is paying for all baskets and the WPC will maintain them for a fee.

Ms. Germany affirmed. She went on to state that in the app packet there is a budget provided by the WPC. It is intended that the project continue in the other phases of construction on all city issued poles throughout the community if the developer can afford to sustain this cost.

Mr. Brown commented that he did receive a letter of support from Ben Carlise from public works who will issue the permit.

Mr Brown asked a question about the other phases of planned development. He stated that he would like the Commission to consider approving the future phases of the project as well—if the Commission felt so inclined—just so that the applicant would not have to come back for approval for those phases. He went on to state that the motion should be clear to define specific streets/phases for this approval, however.

Ms. Klavon stated that the applicant should be prepared to remove the baskets if they fail. In the Southside, there has been a lot of bad luck with the flower baskets. Other places have worked out really well. Just be mindful of this contingency, that's all.

Ms. Haskell asked who would install the baskets.

Ms. Germany stated that the WPC would install as soon as approval is granted and a permit is issued.

Ms. Haskell asked how often the baskets will be refreshed with new plantings.

Ms. Germany stated that the WPC will water the baskets daily, which would be better than to rely on KBK staff that may get sick or miss one day. The contract would be for WPC to maintain the baskets on a daily basis.

Ms. Klavon asked Ms. Germany to make sure they do that on a daily basis.

Ms. Haskell asked if they will change the flowers in the fall?

Ms. Germany stated that the baskets will be taken down in the fall. They will store the baskets and the hooks and then in the spring the baskets will be reinstalled.

Dina Klavon asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on behalf, opposed, or in general of the project.

MOTION: to grant Conceptual and Final Approval on all phases of the Garfield Commons Flower Baskets and that all future phases of the project have approval for flower baskets as described in the hearing.

MOVED: Cooper

SECONDED: Indovina

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

b. National Aviary Signage: Conceptual and Final

Bill Kolano from Kolano Design introduced himself to present on behalf of the National Aviary for its signage project. Mr. Kolano stated that City Planning/Zoning have reviewed the designs for this project and have taken no issue with the project.

He went on to say that the project will also be presented to the Historic Review Commission on July 7th. Mr. Kolano and the Aviary also met with the Allegheny Commons Initiative (ACI) who has oversight and stewardship of the park in partnership with the City. Through these discussions, ACI/Alida Baker have requested some changes. These changes have been made, but ACI had not formally discussed the changes made at the time of the hearing.

Mr. Kolano began by displaying a site plan of the area and described the placement of the signage project around the Aviary property. He noted that Arch Street is the primary frontage of the Aviary and therefore the bulk of the main ID signage is placed accordingly. He went on to note that the section of the building that is signified by the dashed line on the site plan is the new addition to the building and that a sign we are that signifies the ID of the National Aviary will be placed at the section noted as the West entrance. Mr. Kolano went on to say that this entrance on Arch Street is primarily used for school students and school

buses which will line up at this location. The general public will tend to use the driveway that goes to the parking then enter the building through this half rounded area (pointed that out on the screen/site plan). He then stated that it is important to call out this entry point as a portal to gain access there. He then stated that the Commission will see later (on the screen) a smaller sign was proposed at this location which the ACI suggested be made as part of the large sign family planned for the Aviary.

Mr. Kolano made note that the designs call for regulatory signs for traffic control stop signs, yield signs and parking that occur around the entry and lot itself. He then noted a large sign intended to help people see the entry path, and small signs for the garden. Mr. Kolano also stated that the design inspiration for the sign system is an outgrowth of the architecture of the building itself along with the new building façade treatment and façade signage. He then noted the façade signage (previously approved by the Commission) showing the late 1950's-1960's aviation-inspired perforated screen in a wing shape. He went on to say that his firm liked this treatment very much and explored this aviation/aviary theme, materializing in a sort of folded paper—origami-like—bird form within the form of the land-based signage component.

Mr. Kolano noted that the signs now look like large origami, but instead of folded paper, these forms will be constructed out of “folded” aluminum. He then pointed out the primary identity sign as a yellow sign with yellow color on one face and silver on the reverse face. He further pointed out that you will be able to see the bend as it goes to the top and the sign and if one were looking at it from the side view it is actually a bit thicker at the bottom, getting thinner as it goes to the top.

He then stated that the façade signage letters that identify the National Aviary will be illuminated letters that will rest upon the perforated screen façade treatment and that these letters will be lighted from behind by LED lights. He further pointed out the design of the entrance signifiers and noted that they would be discreet vinyl signs above the door ways noting West Entrance, East Entrance, etc. The street regulatory signs (Stop, Yield, etc.) are standard PennDOT symbols and even though the uprights supporting these signs are a little unconventional, the signs themselves are standard so that visitors are seeing something that they are familiar with.

Mr. Kolano then elaborated on the small garden signs. He noted that the small sign that identifies the rose garden is just a simple folded metal piece that they will perch on top of extant brick columns.

Ms. Klavon asked Mr. Kolano to describe the construction of the sign as it pertains to how the lettering will be illuminated and constructed.

Mr. Kolano answered that the letter type will be a white plexiglass face illuminated from behind. It is a clean line construction where the face of the letter joins the reveal of the letter without any hardware being visible.

Ms. Klavon asked to clarify that the brick columns are existing, and if so, to point out on the site plan where they currently reside.

Mr. Kolano noted the existing columns at the entrance of the rose garden.

Mr. Kolano stated that this section of the property is really fenced in by a brick wall that is person-height. This entire portion of the parking lot side of the property is not visible from the park proper.

Ms. Haskell noted that there might be a discrepancy in the presentation with the documents within the application. She noted that in the application, there were blue parking signs but in the presentation this seemed to have changed.

Mr. Kolano stated that this was correct. The blue sign that is in the application packets were intended to be placed at the parking lot entry, but through subsequent discussion with ACI, they decided to repeat the larger yellow ID sign at that entry drive to make it more special.

Ms. Haskell asked then, if the blue parking sign would be at human height.

Mr. Kolano stated that the blue parking sign is actually removed from the proposal entirely now and replaced it with the yellow sign.

Mr. Brown asked if the white square Aviary ID signs along Ridge Avenue were intended to remain.

Mr. Kolano stated that those pre-existing signs were not a part of the scope of his work, but that he did understand that they would remain.

Mr. Brown stated that he thought that the new signage is quite attractive, but only draws more attention to very different "old" signs along Ridge Avenue. He stated that he was surprised that the new signage would go in without creating new signs for the Ridge Avenue location.

-----Blank on recording---

Ms. Haskell asked if the signage will be coordinated with the West Park signage?

Mr. Kolano stated that visually, there is an historic aspect to the signs within the historic part of the park and the Aviary building itself sits as a little exemption to if you will within Allegheny Commons. His firm and the Aviary staff recognize that the Aviary building was added in the 1950's and its architecture is not from a historic period in the way that the rest of the park is. He went on to say that there are more modern pieces of sculpture and so forth in the West Park area already, so his firm challenged itself to create signage with a more contemporary and sculptural nature that fit the architectural intent of the Aviary building. The Ridge Avenue signs are seen as physically separate and distant from the building, and are also a little more in keeping with the extant signage within the rest of the Allegheny Commons.

-----Blank on recording---

Mr. Indovina asked to clarify if the building façade lettering consists of individual discrete letters or whether these are on a backing.

Mr. Kolano stated that these were individual letters. Each letter is mounted directly to the perforated mesh screen.

Mr. Indovina stated that one could read them as individual letters with the LEDS behind.

Mr. Kolano stated that this was correct---one won't see any support bar or jump wiring letter to letter.

Mr. Indovina asked to clarify the height of the yellow signs-particularly to the spring (bent) point.

Mr. Kolano stated that the height of the sign is at 15 feet.

Mr. Indovina clarified that he was referring to the underside of the bent piece.

Mr. Kolano stated that he could safely say that it is about 8'6" to the bend of the top of the origami piece, as the letters on the sign façade all inclusive are 7'--10 ¾". He went on to correct himself that it would actually be about 12 feet high at this point. This would also make the lettering height within zoning regulations for text.

Mr. Indovina stated that he was just concerned as to how "reachable" the wing/bent piece was from a person's height. He saw this as a tempting piece for vandals or persons just horsing around. The height seems fine in this respect---out of reach.

Mr. Cooper asked to clarify that the E3 blue parking sign was currently removed from the signage plan.

Mr. Kolano stated that it was taken out of the mix. It is being replaced by the yellow sign.

Mr. Astorino stated generally that this signage proposal is pretty exciting and dynamic. He further asked just out of curiosity if the Aviary were going ahead with the theater along with the new building additions.

Mr. Kolano stated that they were.

Mr. Kolano stated that currently the penguin point area is open and the naming rights are just being announced for the theater addition--Just about the whole interior is to be configured.

Mr. Astorino clarified that the façade signage is on the exterior of that side of the building.

Mr. Kolano stated that this was correct.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any more questions on the project.

Ms. Klavon asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak on behalf, opposed, or in general of the project.

Ms. Alida Baker introduced herself on behalf of the Allegheny Commons Initiative (ACI). She stated that ACI has a good relationship with the Aviary, and that her group had worked on the building additions with them. For the signage package, however, ACI was given the design proposal just some days prior to the hearing and have not yet met formally to discuss the final designs and how this might affect the historic nature of the park and co-exist with the extant park signage. She noted that the signs seemed handsome, but the group needs to discuss them and relay its findings to the Aviary and Mr. Kolano. She asked that the Art Commission consider the oversight of ACI in this matter.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any other persons in the audience who would like to speak to the project.

Ms. Klavon stated that the applicant was missing the letters of support from ACI, and asked if there were any other members of the community that needed to weigh in on this.

Mr. Brown stated that the Allegheny Commons Initiative and the North Side Leadership Conference (which are linked) are the main community group who would need to voice approval on this. Public Works would also need to give some sense of support either at the hearing today or in writing prior. He went on to say that it was his understanding that ACI had been given the signage packet, made some comments, but had not yet responded as to its final approval of the signage packet.

Ms. Klavon stated that she would ask the question as to how the signage package would fit into the master plan for Allegheny Commons. She went on to say that she thinks the applicant answered this by stating that the signage is considered to be linked to the architecture of this 1950's modern era Aviary structure and that in this part of the Commons (West Park), there are more modern structures and sculpture that these "sculpture-like" signs could adhere to in context.

Mr. Indovina stated that the signage appears to coincide with the building architecture and the building within the park is not historic, so this is acceptable and appropriate in this case.

Ms. Haskell stated that the signs make nice forms.

Ms. Klavon stated that she liked them as well as sculptural pieces.

Mr. Brown stated that a modern piece of sculpture exists just a little bit further across the street near the corner of the park on Brighton and Ridge---a sculpture called *Five Factors*, by Peter Calaboyias---as well as Lake Elizabeth itself nearby---this end of the park does have some of these modern elements.

Mr. Cooper asked how the signs are fixed to the ground.

Mr. Kolano stated that there will be concrete footers placed in the ground and metal sleeves that will come up and the signs will go over the metal sleeves and then concealed fasteners will attach them to the bases. There will be about a 4 inch border of concrete flush with the ground. He went on to say that typically they would put some mulching material around the base so that lawn mowers won't hit it, or they will want to

keep the grass or the planting material a little away from the sign so that circulating cutters will not damage the sign.

Mr. Cooper clarified to say that the intent is that the sign should seem to just emerge from the ground as piece of aluminum. He went on to ask the thickness of the sign.

Mr. Kolano noted a cross section of the sign in the application. He stated that the sign is about 9 inches at the base and it tapers to 3 inches at the top. The folded element at the top continues to taper. He stated that his firm thought it would be a little flimsy if it was a just a single sheet of metal coming up and they just played with the design to give it some stability and volume.

Mr. Cooper stated that Mr. Kolano had used the term "sleeve" to describe the way the sign fits around its inner structure. He asked to clarify that this was like the cuff around this solid pole which would emerge from the base.

Mr. Kolano affirmed.

Ms. Klavon stated that the Commission should ask that they email more the construction details so that there would be a record of it.

Mr. Kolano stated that his firm is very big on trying to make no welds or fasteners visible on these fabricated signs. He noted that he had included details of similar signs he designed for Falling Water where it looks like these thickness of metals emerge out of the ground and is cleanly detailed as much as they can make it.

Ms. Haskell asked if these signs were impervious to strong winds and weather, because the sharp points could be dangerous if toppled or let fly in a bad windstorm.

Mr. Kolano stated that the signs were heavily fortified for this purpose and any of the signs at the ground were going to put a 2 inch radius on the point just in case someone may come in contact with them.

Mr. Cooper stated that the one blue sign at a child's height is removed from the proposal at this point---if not he would have been worried about that.

Mr. Kolano affirmed that the sign is no longer proposed.

Ms. Klavon stated that the applicant should have a meeting with the Allegheny Commons Initiative as part of the conditions of approval. She stated that it was important for this community group to be in support of the signage design for the Aviary.

Mr. Kolano stated that his firm is committed to make it work and will do so.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final approval for the project as proposed with the condition that the applicant receive favorable endorsement of the project from the Allegheny Commons Initiative and provide endorsement letter, as well as provide further construction detail schematics to staff.

MOVED: Indovina

SECONDED: Haskell

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

c. Northeast Common Restoration Project of Allegheny Commons: Final

Alida Baker of the Allegheny Commons Initiative introduced herself and stated that this project should seem familiar to the Commission as it received Conceptual Approval in December of 2009. She went on to say that the project is here today to provide final documentation on what ACI are referring to as "Segment 1" of the Northeast Common Project because they have the funding to go ahead with the first leg only.

Ms. Baker stated that they are requesting Final Approval on Segment 1 which begins at East Ohio Street and comes up just short of the fountain area. She went on to say that she would begin by discussing features that are planned to be installed in the park if the Commission does not remember from December. She also noted the signage package for the park (extant signage examples that were not being proposed at the hearing, but that she had in hand to show in relation to the previous matter/hearing item of the Aviary signs).

Ms Klavon stated that it is much different from the Aviary signage.

Ms. Baker stated that it is indeed different and the master plan states that ACI would work with the Aviary to coordinate signage. She then began to run through images of the fixtures planned for the park renovation: light fixture, trash can, bench, and perimeter railing with a mulch bed beneath it. She then noted an example of the stone dust that flanks the center promenade. She went on to say that there were two issues that were of some concern to the Commission at the last hearing. She stated that Nancy Nancy Lonnett-Roman of Pashek Associates will speak to those in a moment. One issue is the nature of the paths and the other is the composition of the tree alley. She then turned the floor over to Ms. Lonnett-Roman to go over technical questions.

Ms. Nancy Lonnett-Roman introduced herself and stated that she would review both the paths and the trees. She began by stating that the paths are a bituminous path with an aggregate surface rolled into it. She went on to say that the idea is to create an aged weathered appearance, but a smooth surface for strollers and ease of accessibility for walking. She then displayed an example of the effect that they are going to achieve on the bituminous pathways within the main promenade path and in the diagonal paths as noted in the site plan. She stated that at the last presentation the Commission had asked whether we considered permeable paving. She went on to say that they did have that discussion in terms of permeable paving, but in this case the paths drain toward the edges into the tree areas and into the lawn so that water is being absorbed.

She added that this is not a parking lot where water is going directly into the inlets where they felt permeable paving would be most beneficial. She stated that they also had discussions with the City and they were concerned about the potential maintenance of permeable paving for the pathways in the park. Not so much for salting in the winter time but these paths--given all the trees that are there--there are a lot of twigs that fall leaves that fall that gets crushed as people walk and vehicles pass over it that gets embedded into the permeable paving. This area is used or could be use quite a bit for the farmers market and other events. She stated that this was the thinking behind not using permeable paving in this area.

Ms. Lonnett-Roman stated that in terms of the trees--they did meet with the City Forester and reviewed what he would permit in terms of removals. She then proposed a new tree planting plan based on that. Based on our last presentation to the Art Commission, the Commission had requested using more groupings of similar species and we balanced that with avoiding doing a mono-culture which the City Forestry was concerned about. She indicated that in the plan provided to the Commission, basically along Union Place, there is a pretty good existing alley of Sycamore and London Plain Trees and that they are in-filling a little bit into that row with new trees (points out on screen). The dark green on the site plan will be some in-filling of some additional of the same Sycamore and London Plains.

She went on to describe that existing along Cedar Avenue currently is mostly is Sweet Gum and Red Maple and that they plan on adding Red Maple into that length as well where trees are removed or missing. In the

center promenade on the southern portion we are proposing a grouping of Tulip Trees; in the center portion we are proposing a grouping of London Plain Trees because there are quite a few existing larger London Plain Trees in that area already; and then in the northern section of this segment they are proposing Prospector Elms which are similar to the trees that were used in the pilot project on the opposite side of East Ohio Street. She went on to state that the long term plan is that as the existing trees of different species in these segments, or sections or groups die they would replace them with the same tree that we are trying to establish as an alley. She then asked if there were any questions or comments on the paving or the trees?

Ms. Klavon asked what was the original paving.

Ms. Baker stated that it was actually bituminous. This information was gleaned from a historic document pertaining to the City of Allegheny.

Nancy Lonnert-Roman stated that it was actually a bituminous path with a roll aggregate surface, which is exactly what is being proposed at this time.

Ms. Klavon asked to clarify that the applicant will now need to come back to the Commission for the next (fountain) phase of the project when it has the funding to do so?

Ms. Baker affirmed.

Ms. Klavon asked to clarify that the plan is having less existing trees removed in this new plan.

Ms. Lonnert-Roman stated that this was correct. She went on to say that when they walked with the City Forester in the park, there were less trees that will be removed and replaced as they previously submitted. The City Forester wanted the group to retain more than previously thought.

Morton Brown asked to confirm that the group had met with the City Forester and that he had approved this current proposed plan.

Ms. Lonnert-Roman stated that they submitted this to him and he was in concurrence with it.

Mike Gable stated that Public Works is also reviewing the document and the City Forester will be a part of that review and comment process. He went on to say that Public Works has been working with Pashek and the North Side Group all along on the project.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any further questions from the Commission.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were anyone in the audience who would like to speak on behalf of the project? Oppose the project? In general?

Ms. Lonnert-Roman stated that they are hoping to go out to bid in July and hope to have it built before the end of the year.

MOTION: To grant final approval to the project as submitted.

MOVED: Haskell

SECONDED: Cooper

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

d. Mellon Square Renovation: Conceptual

Susan Rademacher introduced herself as the Parks Curator of the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy (PPC). She stated that they are here today to ask for Conceptual Review of the Mellon Square preservation, interpretation and management plan. The PPC has been involved with Mellon Square since the invitation from the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership--which based on our work primarily in Schenley Plaza--asked the PPC to take a look at Mellon Square and work on a plan for its revitalization. Because it is such an important lynch pin in the success of that area of Downtown. She stated that the PPC began its learning process with a public lecture by Charles Birnbaum of the Cultural Landscape Foundation in January of 2007, and then began fund raising for the planning monies that was needed. With the completion of fund raising we engaged Heritage Landscapes represented today by Patricia O'Donnell, Principal of Heritage Landscapes. Heritage performed a leadership function for this plan that we are presenting today with a multi disciplinary team. Heritage has been involved with many PPC and City projects in the four regional parks and in Mellon Park over the last 12 years. The plan was completed in 2009 and the community engagement process of the Learning Discovery Symposium that the PPC held--all as detailed in the narrative of the application. Since the PPC has completed the plan they have been fundraising to implement that plan. The goal is 7 million dollars for capital and 4 million dollars for maintenance fund.

Mellon Square has gone through a cycle of investment and decline primarily because there has not been the commitment of maintenance resources. The availability of those resources have been touch and go over the years. This is why you have inevitable decline, and this is why it is so important that the maintenance fund is a perpetual maintenance fund for these types of projects. To date, the PPC have funds in hand for Phase 1 only which will be 2 million dollars in capital investment 1 million dollars in maintenance funding.

This will allow the PPC to start to provide a certain level of maintenance. A complete level of maintenance will be in place when we have the fully funded maintenance plan. The PPC also are currently concluding stages of a license, operating and management agreement with the City.

Ms. Rademacher then introduced Patricia O'Donnell of Heritage Landscapes to describe the plan.

Patricia O'Donnell introduced herself as the Principal from Heritage Landscapes. She began by stating that Mellon Square is a nationally significant historic design landscape. It's the first modern garden plaza above a garage. She stated that the square was initially considered in the mid 1940's and noted an image that is one of a number of images that comes from the 1947 Kaufmann exhibit--that was mounted in the Kaufmann Department Store--called "Pittsburgh in Progress". She stated that this was re-envisioned in particular the core of the city which was later given the name The Golden Triangle. It was a precursor of a major urban development process and the parallel green space that was created at the same time was the Point State Park. So we have those two icons of Pittsburgh landscapes that were created simultaneously in this envisioning--"Pittsburgh In Progress". In 1949 Richard King Mellon commissioned Simons and Simons, John Ornsby...Simons and his brother and Mitchell and Richie, Dolan Richie--particularly a collaborator with John Simons--to work on this commission and to develop it. She noted the as-built plan from 1955 and stated that from '49 to '55 they put it all together. She noted some really concepts that are important to the plan. She stated that she studied the early sketches---and that she has a very detail report to that effect-- but EPD had early sketches...and went on to say that most of these sketches gives them the indication that the square was designed with a core and a series of layers and that the core was suppose to be a like a forest pool surrounded by native plants and that beyond that there were more urban plants or slightly more urban and in the last row—a real city edge.

Ms. O'Donnell went on to say that the idea of this landscape was slightly concentric, informally symmetrical but balanced---both derived both from Western ideas and Asian oriental influences. It is quite an interesting piece of work; it was intended to be seen from above in a superior view from the surrounding buildings. It was contemporaneous with the building of Alcoa and US Steel. She stated that looking down on the park from those tall new buildings was an important aspect of its experience. Additionally the way it was created the park slopes up from the William Penn down to Smithfield so it has one row of commercial facing Smithfield, it also creates an interior experience of expectancy as you move up the grade and work

through these layers of design. She went on to say that in a very confined space it's making some really clear kinds of experiential qualities and was conceived by John Simons to be a platform, a structure, an island, a space, a focal center, a civic monument, a gathering space and an oasis---he had a pretty big program, sort of an agenda for that space. She went on to state that they have examined the existing conditions---and that they also have some great historic images---(She noted an image of opening day---and noted the only shop that gives them a sense of the night lighting effect. She then noted that one can see what happens with the triangle pavement--the points are quite bright, there was low louvered lighting on the sides of all the planters, and it picked up this real almost like a cloth woven pattern in the night lighting affects.

She went on to say that the two water features are very important to this space. She stated that those of you who know only the features since post 1987 see much heavier features with granite gladding. These were visually lighter with a beige, green and light blue tile surface and a very beautiful cantilevered edge to each of the features that lent real grace to them that made them very important to that role of central elements and active water elements in the space. She then stated that the existing condition plans show us some interesting changes in 1982---she believed was the same year that Kenneth Snelson's piece that sits in this lawn panel was positioned in the park--there was a conditions assessment by EPD in which they found a number of serious issues, there was also considerable leakage into the subterranean garage. In 1987, the work that was done by EPD was basically to lift, re-waterproof and to replace much of the park--they made two significant changes during that time (points out on screen) one row of trees were removed for a stage, essentially for the concerts and noon time events that happened in the square. She noted that this is quite a different aesthetic with the fountain as it exists the open lawn and this Snelson piece than was originally intended as this graceful edged pool with the forest trees around it. She noted that we need to recognize that shift over time.

She then stated that today, part of our mission was to recognize and detail the deterioration---we have a lot of concrete deterioration, we have quite a bit of terrazzo deterioration, there are as far as the recent study by the PPC the structural slab is intact, but much of what we see on the surface has degraded in various ways. She then stated that they have a landscape treatment plan---it basically looks to recapture the character and qualities of the historic. We're working with three preservation treatments as defined by the Secretary of Interior: *preserve* the things that are good keep them repair them as necessary but basically keep them. *Restore* things that are degraded in their original details. When possible *replace* things that are missing in their original details. She also stated that they will rehabilitate to accommodate new uses and considerations. She pointed out that there is one area where they are applying rehabilitation (pointing it out on the screen) where it was designed as rows of under story shrubs in sun its original design. It was redesigned with tougher shrub materials including Uwanamus, Compacta which is a basically an invasive species, on that terrace. The terrace is not really very successful. It also has social issues and uses that are problematic including homeless living space at an area above sight lines and viewed from adjacent the buildings---often we find various elements of that activity when we go out and look through and inventory that area. She went on to say that the interesting thing is in that first slide that she showed--the 1947 plan--this particular area is a terrace overlook in the initially in envisioned designs.

She went on to say that at some point during the design process this(overlook) was changed out in relationship to the liveliness and the vibrance--that's the conceptual design sketch (pointing to a sketch presented). That is an overlook terrace (pointing out on sketches) where the people are standing on that level--that's the area that is planted with shrub---which is inaccessible today and problematic. The solution in our preservation treatment and management plan is to open that to pedestrian traffic.

Ms. Klavon asked if she has this in the existing condition.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that they do.

Peter Viteredo of Heritage Landscapes displayed the 1950's built image.

Mr. Cooper clarified that this is the 50's built.

Ms. O'Donnell confirmed that this is the built and that it is pretty close but for the shrubs at the outer terrace.

Mr. Cooper clarified that this is not accessible.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that this is correct. One would have to climb up a wall to get into that planting and it was intended to be only viewed from above. She went on to say that this would be a change of use as it is intended to support stronger more vibrant ongoing use of Mellon Square. She went on to say that this is the only change from the original plan---everything else within the square is intended to be recaptured in detail. She went on to say that within the process we've particularly worked closely with the city of Pittsburgh Department Public Works, the Parking Authority that manages the garage below, Pittsburgh History and Landmarks has given us a letter of support for today, and the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership has been in communication with us. She went on to say that they have also worked with the city arts program and have been under significant and ongoing discussions about this Snelson piece. The concept is to recapture the park and relocate this Snelson to a suitable site with a sound and effective selection process--not to take it away and put it in storage. The removal of the piece is not proposed to be done in Phase 1 of the renovation-- it is proposed to be protected during this phase. She then stated that they would be happy to entertain any questions.

Ms. O'Donnell concluded by showing one more slide describing the phasing drawing. She stated that the phasing drawing for Phase 1--which is the funded piece at this time---incorporates the terrace piece, the cascade and the steps, and all the elements facing Smithfield Street including the canopy, potentially also working with the Parking Authority to do some store front upgrade so that the frontage is more cohesive.

Ms. Klavon asked to clarify the sections to be worked on were 4,2 and 7 on the site plan.

Ms. O'Donnell corrected to say that in their sequence it is actually 2 & 4.

Susan Rademacher (pointing it out on the screen) pointed at the highlighted area.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that the double steps--both of which are deteriorated, have an excessive amount of mineral salt deposition on the steps which is not particularly sightly or safe. She went on to say that they have ongoing drainage issues so they are trying to solve particularly for that end and one of the reasons this is over the habitable space, so this really comes up in the priorities because the commercial frontage is under these areas. She also noted that the cascade is a welcoming element derived from Italian cascades done in a very modernist and wonderful way and has significant deterioration. Additionally the two fountain mechanical systems are completely separate so we can do the cascades while the main fountain system remains in place.

Susan Rademacher stated that she would like to add that one of the appeals of doing this in a phased approach is that we can develop the correct mechanicals in details and systems such as the in-planter lighting which we intend to restore using the LED lighting system. So we can develop all those standards and materials and details then in the future phases will be applied through out the rest of the square. The other element that is part of Phase 1 is the installation of a permanent interpretive exhibit wall that would be at street level along Smithfield between the Sixth Avenue Stairs and the entrance to the AAA office building. So there is a nice big slab of black granite that used to be windows and now would have basically the story--not just of Mellon Square and its design but it's role in the Pittsburgh Renaissance.

Ms. Klavon asked to clarify that the group is not here today for the interpretive panel.

Ms. Rademacher stated that they were not here for that today but that work would be done in Phase 1. The intention would be to come back with detail plans. The PPC would return with a detailed conceptual design for Phase 1 and the follow up with subsequent phases.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that the Conceptual Approval today is for the overall plan approach to restore the overall square. She stated that they are just trying to be informative and let the Commission know that there is Phase 1 funding and that they will be back soon with Phase 1 detailing.

Ms. Haskell stated that number seven encompasses the whole periphery of the plaza.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that this is correct.

Ms. Haskell asked if that part of phase one.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that it is not.

Mr. Cooper stated to clarify that the applicant is not asking for approval of Phase 1, that this is an overview.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that they are simply presenting this as an overview.

Mr. Astorino stated this is a conceptual overview.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that this is correct.

Ms. Rademacher stated that they had understood through conversations with Morton that it will be best to really present the entire—whole--picture before we ask the Commission to really grab a web and hopefully approve Phase 1 plans. She went on to say that they would expect to come back shortly--as she mentioned earlier--they are assembling the design team right now, they just selected architects and graphic design consultants for the interpretive wall. They plan to very shortly be selecting the engineers and the fountain and the lighting members of the team and then they will proceed into the detailed design work.

Ms. Klavon stated that her only concern is the interpretive wall because the Commission is not seeing that piece. She asked the applicant to understand that the Commission is not able to see or understand a piece of the plan that is being talked about.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that the plan document as it exists simply says that wall is an opportunity to do interpreting messaging--That is what this plan is and that is what we are asking you to accept--not the design of the wall or anything about it--Just that this is good to interpret this and that is a likely location.

Ms. Haskell asked about the relationship with the Snelson and the Museum and its removal.

Ms. Rademacher stated that they began a conversation with the Carnegie Museum of Art in November of 2009 in which they explained the concept of restoring Mellon Square. The PPC expressed its appreciation and we know that this Snelson is really an important sculpture this is representative piece in Pittsburgh and is much loved. It did a very important thing for the square when it was placed there because it was at a time when trees were dying and there really was a need for something and so we have been in conversation since then--it is a very cooperative relationship and we have begun to outline a process for developing the criteria essentially a plan for where the sculpture would be moved to when that time comes.

She went on to say that some of the things that have been talked about included a representative panel that would develop the criteria with input from the sculptor, then look at feasible locations with involvement by the Planning Department and then the relocation would proceed from there. There is no intention to remove the sculpture from Mellon Square until such time as it has a new place to go. This would be done according to a cooperative plan that they are currently designing with the Carnegie Museum of Art. The PPC would support the expense of the relocation of the piece.

Ms. Haskell asked if it is definitive that it would be removed eventually or is there a possibility that it might be removed.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that she thinks at this point the planning document indicates that the place where the Snelson is currently located removes an important element of the original design of Mellon Square.

Ms. Klavon asked what the planning document is that is being referred to.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that it is this report.

Ms. Klavon asked who created the report.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that it is her work.

Ms. Klavon asked if the report and planning document were accepted by anyone from the City.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that it doesn't require that process as it was done collaboratively with the City through Public Works in particular as a stakeholder and with the other stakeholders that we mentioned. The agreement that Susan referred to with the process of the City working with the PPC was given City Council approval in December of 2009.

Ms. Klavon stated that a question is though, is still on the sculpture. She went on to say that she thinks in general it's a great idea, but the applicant needs to be very careful and this project and sculpture relocation incurs a lot of money. She went on to state that--like in the Allegheny Commons for example--John Simons designed the Lake Elizabeth element which was odd for that historic park--- it was a 1960's kind of design in the middle of Allegheny Commons. She went on to say that she thought there was a discussion at the time as to whether it was appropriate or not. She further stated that this makes her think of this situation as well where this sculpture was placed in this park and they didn't really necessarily jive with the original intent, but it did add something to the park in some ways and as you stated it is kind of a beloved piece by a lot of people. She concluded by stating that this is why we're cautious about it and its place.

Ms. O'Donnell asked to respond to that for a second. She stated that she understands the redesign of Lake Elizabeth. It actually was in the context of other elements of the Simons and Simons design work that were not carried out. So the Lake Elizabeth is kind of this isolated element of Simons and Simons within the altered and partially remaining 19th century landscape of the Commons. So it is quite different because we have the historical layer of the Commons, we have the historical layer of the Aviary and its early days and we have the historical layer of the mid-20th century of Simons and Simons there. The issue here at Mellon Square is that it is all one era, all one design and a very important work and all the pieces of it were carried out initially and remained intact until the early 1980's.

Ms. Klavon stated that this is the other thing that adds to the whole. John Simons was alive and well and participated in the 1987 redesign of Mellon Square. She asked Ms. O'Donnell to speak to this from her expertise.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that actually she thought that Simons—while he participated to a degree and his firm participated in that work--the oral histories that we did and the documents that we looked at from the 1987 period was that the changes that were made were made under protest by that firm in that work. They did not want to remove the tree and put in the stage, they did not want to make a significant change to the main fountain. They preferred to retain the original design, there were cost issues, there were use issues, there were client issues that altered their approach and that was across all those that we spoke to in the documents that were consulted which included the full sets of specifications and drawings for both of those eras--1955 and 1987. The finding is that the work that is most important is that initial build. In the spirit and character of the Pittsburgh Renaissance 1 and it's origins of city rebuilding.

Mr. Cooper asked that while it's not in this Phase 1, what will be your approach to the fountain--where the rim was thickened up it was a much thinner rim as you described as he remembers.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that this is one of the points that Susan made that she forgot which I appreciate, is the testing of techniques. She stated that they have seen in this cycle of build and decline and build and decline which all of us certainly lament and that one of the issues has been that the fountains were having structural issues in the 1980's and now they are having structural issues again. They are actually looking at some alternative materials and some alternative techniques to ensure a greater durability. The intent for this build is to make the materials as durable with every joint and every element with a longer life span so that they can be managed more affectively without structural failures and surface failures and aesthetic loss over time and without constant highly detailed work to be doing repairs. One of the things they are looking at is to look at alternative materials and techniques for either the pre-casting in stronger concrete with different better re-bars or casting the cascade basins in fiberglass or other possible alternative materials that will have better repair-ability and a better life span and better weathering. One of the things that is a bit unique about this is that they are not building a landscape on the ground--it's constantly vibrating. So there are

some interesting issues, it's just not freeze-thaw cycles, it's just the fact that it is over a subterranean garage and its moving all the time.

Ms. Haskell asked how Ms. O'Donnell envisions the use of the plaza when the changes have been made--- because they had to remove the stage and the area for viewing. She asked if it is being used now for a lot of concerts, etc.

Ms. Rademacher stated that the primary programs that are offered there are within a concert series by Citiparks and also the PPC runs a concert series that picks up where Citiparks schedule leaves off. The PPC also has a docent leading tours every two weeks, the PPC has an audio tour in place so that when you are in the plaza you can dial a number on your cell phone and listen to one of nine recordings about different aspects of the history and design of Mellon Square. The creation of the open air terrace above Smithfield does provide some new options for programming, such as lunch time gatherings or perhaps some small event rentals, and after-work gatherings. The PPC really wants to engage downtown workers and downtown residents because that's a growing population and through some funding that they have for outreach and civic engagement they are looking into doing more programming. The original intention of Richard King Mellon and the design team was for Mellon Square to be an oasis: a place of calm and refreshment, a place to get recharged going to work coming home, going to lunch--that sort of thing. The intent is that this character of the place is not lost. This is one of the reasons why it's so important to recapture that oasis at the heart of Mellon Square where there is this pool and visitors are surrounded by this sort of more naturalistic vegetation, instead of a lawn with a sculpture in it because that vegetation gives you that sense of separation from the city and of an oasis.

Mr. Astorino stated that he has one global question and then he wants to come back and ask specific questions if he could. He stated that it is his understanding that--as it stands today--changes that the PPC is proposing--because the Commission is asked to look at it conceptually overall--is around the cascading fountain proposed to change back to it's original state. He went on to state that there is a plan to adjust the front of the planter--as was mentioned--so that the PPC can have activities in the front terrace---so one can connect to and then the trees are proposed to be replaced and the stage is meant to be replaced. He stated that there was also some comment about the rectangular pool changes from the way it exists now. He stated that he didn't quite understand that, but asked were these the four major things that are proposed to be changed from what exists today.

Ms. O'Donnell confirmed that this was correct.

Mr. Astorino stated in regard to the fountain cascade: He stated that he understands what is proposed in trying to lighten it up it as it is a little heavy and he agrees with all of that. He asked the applicant to tell the Commission about the material---Will the plan be to go back to the original material that was there?

Ms. Rademacher stated the goal is to recapture the original form, while exploring different alternative materials for lightness, for responding better to vibration, and for managing the hydraulics systems.

Mr. Astorino asked why they would not go back to the original material. Mr. Astorino stated that for instance there were originally little 1 x 1 tiles on the cascade fountain and asked why wouldn't they want to go back with this.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that there are a number of failure issues that accrued to the 1955 design. One of them is failure in the concrete itself and one is failure in the tile which happened with happened within nine months of the original build.

Mr. Astorino stated that that was 1955 and this is now 2010. There must be new materials with the same aesthetic that could be used.

Ms. O'Donnell stated yes, Dowel Richie replaced all the tiles and then the tiles again failed in the 1982 assessment and the 1987 rebuild. She went on to say that there is another piece of failure if you know the basin today have a thin piece of metal that is functioning as a baffle, that baffle was put in because the basin has a very nice graceful shape but the side walls were not quite high enough to avoid a lot of over splash. She went on to say that there was a lot of over splash onto the edges and on to the planters along

the sides and onto the steps. The plan now for this is that they are going to work with the fountain consultant to improve the techniques of flow and the water dynamic, because the intent is that the flow is continuously dropping from the top pool down the five cascades to the one at the bottom. She further stated that these functional problems---she thought what was stated in this documents is to repair the character qualities of likeness, visual intent, and sound and motion of water that was there originally but do it in better materials so that failures can be avoided or done away with.

Mr. Astorino asked if they have abandoned notion of the little tiles.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that they have essentially abandoned the small tile affixed due to the dual problems of freeze-thaw and vibration, however, this does not mean that they will not test something and see if somebody has a better widget.

Ms. Rademacher stated that what has not been abandoned is the color palette and they have very detailed drawings of exactly how the original tiles and colors were laid out and what they want to do is find that right combination of materials including surface treatment that will give us that color effect. This is the goal.

Mr. Astorino stated that he just thinks that to maintain and to follow through with everything that is being talked about---the restoration of this is obviously very important aspect---to lose any of the historic or aesthetic details along the way would be a terrible thing for me to lose personally.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that they are not asking for project approval today, they are just asking for the concept approval of recapturing it originally and authentically.

Mr. Astorino stated that he understood exactly what they are asking for today. He was just giving his opinion. He stated that he would really urge the applicant to look at and explore that possibility of that restoration because---he agreed with the restoration and thinks it's a great thing. He further asked the applicant to speak more about the rectangular fountain. He asked the applicant to point out the changes proposed---from what exists now to what is planned to be changed.

Ms. Klavon stated that it is probably best to see it on the plan image.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that the image displays the original site.

Mr. Astorino asked how the site exists today.

Ms. Klavon noted the one in the middle.

Ms. O'Donnell noted a secondary of plenum, two layers of granite and this whole seat wall has notched edges to afford a few more seats.

Mr. Astorino clarified that they are looking to have that floating pool.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that they prefer the floating pool with the likeness and qualities that it has that match the cascades.

Mr. Astorino stated that he understood. He went on to ask if they plan to put back and repair the existing terrazzo.

Ms. Rademacher stated that this was correct. The company that did the original install is still active and the plan is two-fold: One is to repair what needs to be repaired and then to have a regular annualized program of cleaning and sealing. She went on to say that while they want to put the tree back where the stage currently is--in the box where it was originally designed---they are planning to locate electrical service in actually at least three points around the square that will be sufficient for a band or musical performance or event. The plan is to use the plaza level rather than taking an element out and creating a stage. They still envision plenty of opportunities for programming and public entertainment.

Mr. Astorino thanked the applicant for answering his questions.

Ms. Haskell asked if the group has a timeline for when the entire project should be completed and how many phases there are.

Ms. Rademacher stated that one could see from this document that here were identified seven components that were logical scopes of work. They have been looking at those as three phases, and essentially the first phase is as they described and highlighted there the second phase would essentially be everything except the central fountain pool and the planting beds immediately around it. This is all depending on of course, fundraising and they would love to say in five years time, they would be finished but that's always a little bit of a moving target. The Phase I goal is to be under construction in earnest in 2011 and hopefully completed in 2011.

Mr. Cooper asked if the applicant had a good sense as to why the terrazzo in various places has failed.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that it is almost all drainage issues.

Mr. Cooper asked if the ceiling is causing this.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that this was not the problem. The problem is that water is actually puddling and then having the water sit on top of the terrazzo and it is because the drains are either clogged or the lines have failed. She went on to say that they have mapped every part of where the terrazzo has failed. She noted that it is a little different within the plaza then it is on the perimeter side walk.

Mr. Cooper then asked if part of the plan then, involves some way of doing better maintenance on the drainage.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that this is correct. She went on to say that what Susan started with was this whole thing of funding for capital and long term on-going maintenance so the idea was that a four million dollar fund is drawn on annually from interest only, the capital is retained so that the maintenance is an on-going process, so it would be incorrect to indicate disinterest on the part of the City--it's more of an issue of too much to do. The City has one person in this park from 7:00am in the morning until 2:30pm in the afternoon. When the fountain is on he is manually monitoring them. The goal is to make the system to work better so that the space can sing again. In this case all of this has been worked in partnership with the City of Pittsburgh particularly Mike Gable and his Department of Public Works and the goal is to continue in that partnership mode with Pittsburgh Downtown partners and History and Landmarks and others. There is also eventual goal to place this property on the National Register and perhaps achieve National Landmark status.

Mr. Cooper asked about the rectangular fountain. He asked to clarify that the 1980 alterations were not just a change in design but also was addressing some deterioration. He asked what was the attribution to the problem and why was it deteriorating at that time of the 1980's.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that the very largest highlight of the issues of deterioration was water seepage to the areas below. This is one of the most heavily used and most dependable downtown garages and the seepage from the entire square through whatever water proofing was state of the art in 1955 was failed. The pivotal problem that sparked the 1980's work was leakage.

Ms. Haskell stated that a lot of the problems really have developed because this property is over a garage rather than being on the ground.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that this was correct. She went on to say that that she meant not to say that any twenty-five year old park wouldn't have any deterioration issues but it is different here. It is different because it's over a structure.

Mr. Indovina stated that this problem not only stretched the technology of the day, it even stretches the technology of today.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that this was correct.

Mr. Indovina stated that he had some general thoughts and questions. He stated that on one hand the applicant seems to want to restore the park to precisely the condition that it was when it was conceived, yet they are making a major change to it with adding this open terrace. He stated that he sees that there was a precedent to this that was considered in the original design development but it was also rejected in part of that design process. He stated that he would want the applicant to think about that terrace or what that space is or should be very, very carefully in the context of the overall park.

He stated that one other thing is that this is a significant piece of architecture obviously, but it also is a living part of the urban fabric of the city and it gets used by people every day. He went on to say that he would like some consideration or thought or report on exactly how the current uses inform the restoration. He stated further that there are concerts there, there are gatherings, people do sit there and have their lunch and he is sure that this was part of the original concept of the park and would like to see how that is addressed in this restoration. He further noted that there are technical issues that are going to change the design. Even within the two pictures presented that show the stairs as they were originally built and the stairs as they were in 1987 they had added hand rails down the middle of the stairs because current codes don't allow open stairs. He went on to say that those kinds of things—he thinks—are going to come in play. He concluded by saying that if one is going to do something with that number four terrace, how is the paving done there, is the over all paving pattern extended and those kinds of detail questions—he would like to ask.

Ms. O'Donnell thanked the Commission for its detailed requests. She went on to say that within that context detailed answers are not always forthcoming because the design process that was planned is a planning document and it is not at the level of detail design development. She further added that the notion of the terrace is one that actually looks at the space that is most disused, abused, and a failure, so the notion to rethink comes from 50 plus years of failure. The rest of Mellon Square has seen variety over time considerable use and in response to the questions about use they did a number of onsite observations and mapped the movements through the square: how people move, where they stop, where they look, etc.

She stated that they made these observations at morning rush, on the way to work, at lunch time, end of day, and even at seven o'clock at night. She further added that this is anecdotal evidence but these are appropriate environmental behavioral mapping tools used to understand what folks were doing. They knew from this how many people were eating, how many people were sitting and chatting, what was happening. She went on to say that essentially the (again) anecdotal finding is that the intent of Richard King Mellon remains. It is an oasis in the city, it's a place where people choose to either walk through, or walk through and wait or be within that space for some short amount of time, some times for a longer amount of time. The visitation sequence is throughout the day, more in the morning, noon time, and the end of day, then in the mid morning or mid afternoon or evening. There are some interesting changes of course, and on the third question about public health, safety and welfare kinds of issues--the handrails---actually, the issue of the handrails came up prior to the 1980's. The side handrails that are original are mounted on the walls and they are of the same materials as the ones that have been placed in the interior of the stair to make it easier for people get up into the space. She stated that when dealing with public health, safety and welfare within the historic space you make the best and most appropriate resolution and add to enhance public health, safety and welfare to the needs.

Ms. Rademacher added that just like that in all of the PPC's stakeholder engagement through the Downtown Partnership with City agencies, Parking Authority, the William Penn etc., the Smithfield frontage was universally derided as the worse part of Mellon Square: the part that needed the most attention, both the store front, the darkness underneath the canopy, the kind of poor signage as well as the dereliction of the roof top above. She further added that there were also a lot of complaints of continued leakage from that roof area--there is some dispute about how true that is, but--- where the real sources are-- - but that was universally the part of the square that everyone they had been consulted and had given input wanted us to look at. When the PPC brought back these ideas, it was sort of discovered that precedent brought back the idea it was very well received. It was felt that there was a good basis upon which to include that as a plan and then proceed into design. She concluded by saying that of course the design phase which as I said we are just beginning to embark on the intention of course is to bring that back in great detail for very careful consideration by the Art Commission.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that the general approach to rehabilitation is to make accommodation of contemporary uses that are compatibles and don't overstage the original.

Ms. Klavon stated that with Ms. O'Donnell's experience maybe she can cite another project where it was an historic project that was changed during a renovation process.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that there were many these in her area of expertise where she has had over 23 years of work and over 400 projects. She stated that right now her firm is working on the National Mall--and changing it--and working with team, a multi inter-disciplinary team, to deal with the problems of compaction on the lawn from 25 million visitors to make a better edge and to sort out some of those related issues. She added that they always come up against the issues of public health, safety and welfare and accommodation of contemporary needs within a construct of rehabilitation as a philosophy that is appropriate within the Secretary of Interior's standards.

Ms. Klavon stated that they did make an historic landscape architecture plaque a few years ago with Charles, and asked if this doesn't mean something in this case.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that actually the plaque is, according to Charles who worked with us on this, is really for the Simons and Simons, Mitchell and Richie original design not necessarily what remains today.

Ms. Klavon asked if the plaque would help designate as a National Historic Landmark.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that recognition of any kind often assists in preservation listings, but the real issue with this particular Mellon Square is its precedent-setting nature and its early time in which it was completed. Envisioned in the mid 40s is really early for this kind of public square. It is one of the first of its kind in the country. The two other related issues are integrity---to the degree to which it expresses its original design and significance--the importance of it as a work. These two things are really very strong here.

Ms. Klavon clarified to say that she thinks what Mr. Indovina and others are alluding to is the question as to if the square is changed from its original design as is suggested by the plan, would this have an adverse affect to the historical designation or integrity of the piece?

Ms. O'Donnell stated that she had worked on the Old Fields in the Indianapolis Museum of Art over a period of just under 10 years. The museum came to respect and embrace Old Fields, a 25 acre estate as their largest curatorial object. She stated that her firm made significant changes with the team architects, Hillier, to the original arcade and garages to accommodate a visitor center. She went on to say that while they actually restored in detail authentically reconstructed the adjacent Percival Gallagher Garden. In treating that particular place they used both restoration and rehabilitation and this also helped them gain National Historic Landmark status. They are one of four homestead landscapes that are NHL.

Ms. Klavon suggested that perhaps the restorative plan---once approved--should be adopted in some fashion, perhaps through Council so that the design of the square remains intact and so that 1987 doesn't happen again.

Mr. Astorino stated that you have to push for that and it will happen. He went on to say that it is important that we push for that. He went on to say that he agreed with Mr. Indovina in that we have to do everything that we can to have this as a National Historic monument. This serves the City of Pittsburgh extremely well, and he thought this should be the goal. He further added that even if he agrees on a functional or aesthetic grounds with the concept of using the front terrace, if this change stood in the way of an historic designation he would not do it.

Ms. Klavon stated that there is a little gap here that there are no materials defined. Usually, at the Conceptual stage there are defined materials. Perhaps there should be another stage of review if the project is going to be reviewed this way.

Mr. Indovina suggested that a Conceptual Approval could be granted on the basis of approving the concept of the renovation as a whole---that this is an agreeable project in concept.

Ms. Rademacher stated that they were not planning to come back for Final Approval as the next step, but rather to return for Conceptual Approval of Phase 1 of the renovation.

Mr. Brown stated that he has been coaching the PPC and other applicants to come before the Art Commission at the earliest stages of projects such as this so that the applicants could get a preliminary nod from the Commission before going too far down the road.

Mr. Astorino stated that this then, is an overall concept of the project, and that the applicant is coming back for Phase 1 conceptual review and he is comfortable with that. The only one issue he had with the proposal was the interpretive wall, in that there were no details provided for its exact look and placement. He went on to say, however, that he is okay with this overall conceptual plan knowing that Phase 1 will return at a conceptual phase.

Ms. Klavon asked if anyone in the audience would speak on behalf of the project.

Ms. Kitty Julian and Dan Byers from the Carnegie Museum of Art(CMA)approached the table and introduced themselves. Ms. Julian stated that the CMA is supportive of the Parks Conservancy and its plans to restore the Mellon Square. She went on to say that the CMA is working closely with the PPC on the relocation of the Snelson sculpture that is currently owned by the CMA. She went on to say that there are several issues yet to be worked out with the relocation of the Snelson and several meetings have been held on these issues.

She went on to say that it is the request of CMA that a full plan for de-installation, conservation, and re-installation at another site for the Snelson be presented to the Art Commission before de-installation occurs. The CMA will continue to work with the PPC on these plans, understanding that the cost for conservation, storage, de-installation and re-installation will be covered by the PPC. The CMA also looks forward to contacting Snelson and presenting the plan for relocation of his piece. Ms. Julian went on to say that there are some concerns of ensuring the safety of the piece while the restoration of the Square is in progress, safety of the piece in its new location, accessibility of the piece in its new location, and the approval of Snelson for the new location of the piece. She concluded and thanked the Commission.

Dan Byers introduced himself as the Associate Curator of Contemporary Art of CMA, and stated that it is his responsibility for the care and maintenance of the Snelson piece. He went on to say that the PPC has brought the CMA into this process very early on and he has been involved in discussions on the project on numerous occasions. He has been supportive of the project as a whole—including the relocation of the Snelson. Mr. Byers stated that he will continue to work closely with the PPC in order to find a new site for the sculpture that is accessible, safe and contextual for the piece. He went on to say that the CMA conservator will be involved in designing protective fencing for the piece during the renovation of Phase 1, and will ensure the piece will be safe during its relocation.

Ms. Haskell asked if there were a formal agreement in place between the CMA and PPC that describes the relationship and responsibilities of each to this project.

Mr. Byers stated that the piece is on permanent loan, and that the CMA needs to develop a working process with the PPC, over the next few years as they get closer to the Phase 2 of the project.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any other persons from the audience that would like to speak on behalf, opposed, or in general.

Ms. Klavon then asked the Commission for discussion and/or a motion.

Mr. Indovina stated that the motion for Conceptual Approval of the overall plan should include direction that as the applicant returns for Conceptual Approval of Phase 1, the applicant should present more details on the cascade fountain, interpretive panels, etc.

Ms. Haskell stated that there should also be language in the motion about the relationship between the CMA and the PPC regarding the Snelson relocation.

Ms. Brown stated that he would also add that the City should be a part of the ongoing discussions of relocation of the Snelson as well.

Mr. Indovina made a motion for Conceptual Approval of the overall concept of restoration of the entire Mellon Square to its original 1955 plan with the following conditions:

- 1) The Snelson sculpture will not be moved without plans and funding for its relocation have been secured and presented to and approved by the Art Commission, Mr. Snelson, the PPC and the CMA
- 2) The applicant will return for Conceptual Approval of Phase 1 (and all subsequent phases) of the project with further details as outlined in the discussion: cascade fountain, interpretive panels, material selection, etc.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual Approval of the overall concept of restoration of the entire Mellon Square to its original 1955 plan with the following conditions:

- 3) **The Snelson sculpture will not be moved without plans and funding for its relocation have been secured and presented to and approved by the Art Commission, Mr. Snelson, the PPC and the CMA**
- 4) **The applicant will return for Conceptual Approval of Phase 1 (and all subsequent phases) of the project with further details as outlined in the discussion: cascade fountain, interpretive panels, material selection, etc.**

MOVED: Indovina

SECONDED: Astorino

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

e. City-owned Sculpture in Grandview Park: Final

Mr. Morton Brown introduced himself and Mr. Jim Myford into the record. Mr. Brown stated that he had presented and received Conceptual Approval of this project in September, 2009. He went on to say that this City-owned sculpture has been restored by Jim Myford, the original creator of the piece.

Mr. Brown stated that the piece was in a most degraded condition when it was recovered, and Mr. Myford was charged with basically re-creating the piece totally, using the original as a form then destroying the original when finished. The newly created piece is exact to the original, even down to the exposed grinding marks on its surface.

Mr. Brown noted some photos of the piece in its final restorative stages. He went on to note the aluminum base plate in the photos. Mr. Brown stated that the piece and base are made of aluminum and coated with a clear sealer called Coricone 1700 that will prevent oxidation on its surface. Mr. Myford has used this clear coat on many sculptures over the past 20 or so years with great results.

Mr. Brown noted the renderings in the packet and reminded the Commission of the proposed location within Grandview Park. Mr. Brown noted that the renderings do not accurately reflect the base, however, in that (and he noted the structural base drawings) the concrete sub-base will actually be about 12 inches high (with 24 inches of concrete below ground) from ground level with the aluminum base following and finally the sculpture itself. The overall height of the sculpture, then, would be about 9 feet.

Mr. Myford began to speak about the aluminum base plate that he consistently uses in many of his sculptures. He noted photographs of his previous work within the application document as examples. He

spoke about the brushed finish of the sculptures made by a grinding wheel that add “life” and brightness to the pieces.

Mr. Brown noted the mounting hardware and procedures planned for installation. He went on to state that he had originally planned to deliver a lighting, landscaping and signage plan to the Commission today, but has not been able to accomplish this. He went on to state, however, that neither the artist nor he truly believes that any landscaping is needed here. He will work on lighting the piece from an adjacent light pole in the area.

The signage will most likely be in the form of a bright aluminum or stainless plaque, black letters, approximately 5 by 7 inches, and mounted on the concrete base.

Ms. Klavon asked Mr. Myford to describe his inspiration for the piece.

Mr. Myford stated that the original piece was located at the Carnegie Library in Squirrel Hill. It was a cast aluminum piece (solid), and weighed approximately 2,000 pounds. The new piece is equal in form, size, and finish to the old one, but it is a fabricated piece—hollow, and welded together pieces of ¼ inch plate aluminum, weighing 700 pounds. The aluminum base plate is approximately 300 pounds. He stated that he had never done a replica of a piece—especially one that was completed so long ago in 1973. He went on to say that looking back he should have created the original in this fashion (fabrication, instead of casting).

He stated that the original maquette for the piece is owned by Elsie Hillman, who was on the original selection committee for the Library artwork commission.

He went on to say that the piece expresses a feeling of forms/figures reaching into space. The verticality of the piece has an energy to it---and he does not do many horizontal pieces as he like the energy of the vertical. Because it is abstract, the viewer is asked to bring something to the piece instead of the piece telling the viewer what it is. He went on to say that the two most influential sculptures to him were Henry Moore and Barbara Hepworth. He had spent two days at these artists’ studios and homes as a young artist.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any further questions.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were anyone from the audience that would like to speak on behalf, opposed, or in general to the project.

Mr. Brown noted that the audience members consisted of three members of the Grandview Park community: Ilyssa Manspeizer of the Mt. Washington CDC, Diane Delmer of the Friends of Grandview, and Tom Brady of Friends of Grandview and Mt. Washington CDC.

MOTION: To grant Final Approval of the project as submitted.

MOVED: Astorino

SECONDED: Haskell

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

Meeting Adjourned