

**ART COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF July 28, 2010
BEGINNING AT 2:00 P.M.**

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION:

**Klavon, Luckett, Rhor, Indovina, Briggs,
Slavick, Mike Gable in place of Rob
Kaczorowski**

PRESENT OF THE STAFF:

Morton Brown, Noor Ismail

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the May and June hearings were not able to be approved as there was not a sufficient number of members present from those hearings to ensure a quorum.

B. Correspondence

Mr. Brown submitted letters of support for the *Diamond Diamonds* project, the Spring Hill Mosaic project, and the Mellon Park sculpture proposal.

C. Items for Review

- a. University of Pittsburgh Banners: Conceptual and Final
 - o Jim Williams, University of Pittsburgh

Jim Williams of the University of Pittsburgh introduced himself and displayed the artwork and site plan for the banners proposed for the University of Pittsburgh on Fifth and Forbes Avenues between Halket Street and Schenley Drive in Oakland. He went on to clarify that on Fifth Avenue, the scope is between Bellefield and Halket Avenue.

He noted that there will be a total of 20 banners—10 on Fifth and 10 on Forbes. He stated that the new design is to commemorate the 225 year anniversary of the University. He stated that the previous banners in these locations were to commemorate the 100th year anniversary of the University being in Oakland. He went on to note that the new banners would be replacing these old ones in the same locations.

Ms. Klavon asked Mike Gable if these banners had already come to Public Works for approval. Mr. Gable stated that he would not have seen them, but asked if the applicant had presented these to staff of Public Works.

Mr. Brown stated that he had corresponded with Ben Carlise of Public Works who is the permitting agent for street banners. He went on to say that Mr. Carlise has verified that these banners would be made to spec and that Public Works would take no issue with them pending Art Commission approval. Mr. Brown further added that non profit and educational entities are allowed to place indicia on banners, but commercial logos are not allowed.

Ms. Klavon stated that typically, there are dimensions and a notation of material included in the application to the Commission and there is no such indication within this proposal.

Mr. Williams stated that he had a sample of the material with him at the hearing, and he proceeded to present the sample to the Commission.

Mr. Gable pointed out that there was a letter from Mr. Carlise regarding the project within the application.

Mr. Indovina asked if this is the same number of banners that were in place previously.

Mr. Williams stated that this is correct and that they will be in the same locations where they have been in place for the last 15 to 20 years.

Mr. Indovina asked if they were the same sizes.

Mr. Williams stated that they are.

Ms. Lockett asked if they were the same material.

Mr. Williams stated that everything is the same.

Ms. Rhor asked if there were 10 on Forbes and 10 on Fifth and were the ones on Fifth to go all the way to Halket.

Mr. Williams stated that this is all correct, but the poles are staggered back and forth across the street.

Ms. Rhor asked if this placement passes the boundary of where Carlow College is located.

Mr. Williams stated that this was not the case as they have been placing banners in these locations since 1996.

Ms. Rhor stated that she just wanted to make sure because Carlow has banners on Fifth and Forbes near these same locations.

Ms. Rhor went on to ask who designed the banners.

Mr. Williams stated that the banners are created by a team of University staff.

Ms. Rhor asked if the design runs through a committee or panel for approval.

Mr. Williams stated that all designs such as this do pass through internal review, but he does not have the panel members' names or titles at this time. He stated that he could furnish this information at a later date if needed.

Ms. Rhor stated that the commemoration is a great piece of content, but she felt that the design was very text-heavy, and not as graphically interesting as previous banners in this location.

Mr. Williams displayed a banner from last year, and indicated that the new ones are pretty much the same as far as the text arrangement goes.

Ms. Rhor stated that she felt that there was too much text on the banners with respect to the fact that there would be 10 banners on each avenue. She asked if there were an opportunity for the University to revisit the design of the banners and perhaps reduce the text on some of the banners and/or redesign.

Mr. Williams stated that this could be done, but they want the banners to be placed as soon as possible so that they can be up prior to the beginning of the Fall semester.

Ms. Briggs stated that she had similar concerns, but would offer a suggestion. She asked that Mr. Williams speak to the committee in charge of the design and ask that they explore more graphic/higher quality design options for the banners.

Ms. Slavick asked to see the first design presented and compare it to the latest version. She stated that they would want to develop some consistency on the look of the banners, but she felt that the latest version was not overly text heavy for what it was trying to communicate and the way in which there seemed to be a hierarchy of the scale of the text. She stated that most persons would notice the most important, larger text first and then capture the rest as they were interested.

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

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

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss or make a motion for the project.

Ms. Luckett made the motion to approve.

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

MOVED: Luckett

SECONDED: Indovina

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- b. City Spray Parks: East Hills and Mellon Park: Conceptual and Final
 - o J. T. Sauer & Associates
 - o Duane Ashley, Director of Operations, City of Pittsburgh

Jim Sauer of J.T. Sauer Associates introduced himself and stated that he would present the East Hills and Mellon Spray Parks project on behalf of Citiparks.

Mr. Sauer stated that the City of Pittsburgh had completed a master plan studies over the past three years reviewing the pools within the city, many of which had been closed. The study tried to look at these locations and determine how the City could get use back out of those pools even though it was not in the budget to re-open the pools fully or outright.

He stated that Public Works had done a lot of research on spray parks, even down to the materials in which the spray parks are made. He went on to say that some spray parks have already been placed in areas such as Troy Hill which went in last year (2009), and Beechview that opened this year (2010). The Troy Hill pool was filled in because it was a hazard and in Beechview, the existing pool and pool house was demolished due to it being a significant hazard.

Mr. Sauer stated that today he is presenting the next two spray parks intended to be constructed at East Hills and Mellon Park.

Mr. Sauer began to describe the Mellon Park site first. He stated that there is an existing water feature in Mellon that the spray park will replace. He stated that this existing water feature looks sort of like a candle stick inside of a lipped construct and currently, kids can run and jump over the piece and run back out of the lipped area. He went on to say that the plan is to take this feature out and replace with in-ground and above ground spray elements and a slip resistant surface of the spray parks that have been used in the other locations within the city.

He then noted items A-F in the site plan documents that were examples of the spray elements. He noted that the elements all have individual names such as "Curvy Cool", the "Bubbler", the "Fill and Spill", etc. He stated that his group had led community meetings with children in which all of the available spray features were presented and the children were asked to prioritize their favorites. This list of favorites was used to determine which features were to be incorporated into the spray parks around the city. He stated that the "Fill and Spill" is probably the number one favorite of the elements. Mr. Sauer further described the layout of the park as having areas of concentration of the spray elements and areas that were more open, allowing children to run in those open areas along with seating areas where parents can sit close by and watch.

Mr. Sauer stated that this spray park will fit into the existing "dry" playground very nicely and incorporate a color-coated surface that will be much more safe and modern than the existing spray feature.

Mr. Sauer asked to turn to the images of the East Hills Park. He stated that the East Hills location is a closed pool location, and there have been three community meetings on this project already in which much

positive support from the community has been gleaned. He stated that the goal with this spray park is to reopen and better utilize the existing pool area that has been closed due its potential as a safety hazard. He noted that undergrowth and some trees would be removed so that there will be better visibility from the pool office to the new spray park. The existing pool will be filled and the spray park will be built upon it, starting with poured colored concrete shapes as its base surface, shade features and spray features.

He then noted a current spray feature here that is a safety hazard that will be filled in and removed, and the ensuing new feature will provide a safe, serviceable, sustainable, and accessible water feature. He then noted the Troy Hill site and described the spray element features that would go into these two new parks.

Mr. Sauer stated that the spray features will be activated by a touch sensor in the bollards of the park that will provide a savings of water usage. If there is no one in the park to touch the sensor, then there is no water usage. Since there is no standing water, there is no need for lifeguards thus saving a lot of overhead costs for the City and allowing the community to have a nice, safe water feature while staying within City budget means.

Ms. Klavon thanked him for the presentation and asked for questions from the Commission.

Ms. Luckett stated that she lives in the East End and is very excited about these spray parks as she has friends with kids who are going to love these new features. She went on to ask when would be the time of year in which they would have to close the spray parks and winterize them.

Mr. Sauer stated that he believes that they will open the spray parks in May or April when it is warm enough to do so, and then close them again in September/October when and if it gets too cold---cold enough to potentially hypertherm kids. The "season" for the spray parks is substantially longer than that of pools, however. He stated that the system is made to back drain and be easily winterized.

Ms. Luckett asked about the hours of operation of the spray parks.

Mr. Sauer stated that they would be open during standard park hours.

Ms. Luckett asked about the Mellon Park site. She asked if any of the existing playground equipment would be removed as part of this project.

Mr. Sauer stated that none of the existing playground equipment would be affected or removed for this project. He went on to say that the goal is for the spray park surface to match into the existing dry playground surface but not disrupt any of it. It should all look like one large, continuous use playground when complete.

Ms. Luckett asked about the material that is to be used for the ground surface.

Mr. Sauer stated that it was to be textured, colored concrete.

Ms. Luckett stated that there would tend to be some standing water on that surface.

Mr. Sauer stated that there will be a sloped draining system in the surface that will disallow any standing water.

Ms. Slavick stated that she was concerned about the provision of shade within the spray park. She stated that she saw some planned shelters, but asked how they might work.

Mr. Sauer stated that in the existing Troy Hill example, the standard shade structures are 10 x 10 feet.

Ms. Slavick asked if the two trees in the East Hills site would provide any shade for the park.

Mr. Sauer stated that he would guess that they would eventually when they are grown, and that this would be the goal.

Mr. Indovina asked if they were going to work around the existing trees in Mellon Park.

Mr. Sauer stated that they are going to work around existing trees except for the one dead tree which will be removed. He went on to say that removing this tree and one other would allow some sun to bathe the spray park. Without some sun in this area, the spray park would have a more limited season as it would be too cold at some point.

Ms. Klavon stated that it does look rather shady in the Mellon Park location.

Mr. Sauer pointed out an image of the existing park and noted the dead tree. He further noted that if they remove the dead tree and the one tree behind the park sign, it would greatly increase the sunlight into this area without disturbing any of the surrounding trees.

Mr. Indovina asked if the existing fence would be removed.

Mr. Sauer stated that it would not be removed.

Mr. Indovina stated that it appeared that there was also some asphalt paving that was in marginal condition and asked if it were going to be repaired or replaced.

Mr. Sauer stated that it would be gone. He then noted the existing asphalt and stated that it will all be removed as it is currently part of the existing spray feature that will be replaced by the new spray park. The new concrete will match right up to the existing playground surface and complete the two parks as one continuous space.

Ms. Slavick asked if the seating was within the spray area, or just outside of it.

Mr. Sauer stated that the seating is just outside of the spray area. He stated that the benches are strategically placed so that parents can allow toddlers to wander and be adventurous to a degree, but can also be easily accessed when and if they begin to teeter. He also noted that the benches are quite wide—as wide as the table in the hearing room—and would provide quite a substantial seating area.

Ms. Briggs asked if Mr. Sauer was a contractor to the project.

Mr. Sauer stated that he is the designer of the parks, hired by Citiparks. He went on to say that the project will go out to bid and a general contractor and a plumbing contractor will be selected to install the parks.

Ms. Briggs asked who J.T. Sauer was, then.

Mr. Brown stated that this is J. T. Sauer that she is speaking to, and he is the designer of the project.

Mr. Sauer stated that this is correct, but he is not pouring any concrete himself.

Ms. Briggs stated that she had some concerns given that this proposal is for conceptual and final approval. She stated that she has not been to any of the parks in person—and maybe that would have helped in this case---but she felt that even with the renderings and examples, she did not have enough information on materials and could think of 10 or 15 different ways in which these elements could exist physically. She stated that these concerns could perhaps be alleviated by her visiting the existing parks, but asked if there was more information available on the material selections.

Mr. Sauer stated that definitely a visit to Troy Hill would solve that, most likely. He went on to say that the materials were chosen for their slip-resistance and longevity. He went on to say that the research that was done between 2006 and 2008 indicated that one cannot have any type of surface that would allow bacteria or any kind of micro-organisms to grow. The other parks that were investigated that had a soft surface had a problem with this. The only regret that some of these other investigated sites had was that they had an ongoing battle with micro-organisms living within these soft surfaces to the point that they were considering ripping it out and replacing with concrete.

Mr. Sauer stated that the parks that they have done in Pittsburgh have supported a heavy-grooved concrete surface so that safety is ensured from a bacterial and slip-resistance perspective. He further added that the spray elements are also standards that are interchangeable to each of the parks so that the one or two maintenance workers who will oversee the apparatus will be able to have a standard system and means of repair and maintenance. He went on to say that the concrete surface is also very manageable for maintenance compared to the soft surface in that even if there were a broken bottle on the soft surface it could mean that the whole park would be shut down in order to remove and clean whereas the concrete surface could easily be broomed and/r sprayed off at will. The City staff that will oversee maintenance and safety of the spray parks will easily be able to care for this type of material versus the other soft alternatives. The spray features themselves were selected by the community members through the meetings that had ensued. The overall shapes of the surface was meant to be "fun", but also were meant to manage the spray and drain patterns.

Ms. Klavon stated that she wondered if Ms. Briggs was asking why the project came for conceptual and final at once, instead of coming first for conceptual and then final approval at a subsequent hearing.

Mr. Brown stated that any applicant is allowed to come before the Commission for conceptual and final approval at a single hearing if they wish to do so and if they have all of the required information for final review. Additionally, this project was pretty far along in its process when the applicant became aware that it was supposed to submit an application to the Art Commission.

Mr. Sauer stated that this is correct. The first duty he had was to work through the community process to ensure that they got what they wanted and that which would benefit the needs that they had. In this process, there was the intention and the obligation to get the spray parks built and operational this year so as to reopen these neighborhood amenities that have been closed for a time.

Mr. Brown stated that, as a reminder and for the benefit of the new Commissioners, the Commission had reviewed the signage for the Beechview Spray Park a couple of months ago and at that time it was made clear that there were a few of the spray parks that had already been installed. Citiparks was not aware that these projects were supposed to come before the Commission prior to that date, but have agreed that they would from here on. This is why these projects have gone very far down the road to completion thus far--- Citiparks was just not aware that they should come before the Commission. This is being rectified in part now, but there are still some of these parks that are still pretty far along in development.

Mr. Indovina asked what the schedule is for implementing this project.

Mr. Sauer stated their goal is to have Public Works engineers review their plans next week. From there, they will go through the bid process, advertise, and then hopefully begin construction.

Mr. Indovina asked when Mr. Sauer expected to have the plan completed.

Mr. Sauer said generally for the two sites they have, it will take approximately 60 days in order to complete each project. This could take longer, weather pending.

Mr. Indovina stated that the parks will most likely not be in operation this year.

Mr. Sauer confirmed that even though the project will be completed by the end of this year, there most likely will not be much time left in the season for which the spray parks could operate.

Mr. Indovina asked what has been the maintenance experience for the spray parks already completed.

Mr. Sauer forwarded this question to Deputy Director Gable or Director Ashley. Director Duane Ashley was introduced to answer maintenance questions.

Mr. Ashley addressed the prior question as to why the Art Commission did not receive preliminary designs. He said there was some confusion as to whether or not this project was something that needed to come to the Art Commission in the first place. He went on to say that the spray parks are comprised of pre-fabricated units that would not allow for a lot of critique or modification in and of themselves, but certainly

the placement and landscaping elements were items that could be discussed. However, he stated that moving forward, he will make seeking Art Commission approval a regular process for these projects. He further noted that as these projects are brought in as a preliminary concept, the Commission could tell the designer what it wanted to see, and the department would make sure that they reached those benchmarks. He surmised that they will probably build 4 to 5 more of these structures in a seven year period as part of a master plan. The next planned site will be in Warrington, which will be similar to the build out of Troy Hill.

In regards to maintenance, Mr. Ashley said one of the characteristics for the spray parks strategized was low maintenance features, so they would not incur additional costs. In terms of staffing, there is one person, usually a lifeguard, on site just to provide any first aid needs if necessary. However, these parks were built so there would be minimal maintenance and minimal staffing. He said the beauty of these spray parks is that since they can extend the operating hours from that of a pool, and cost less to maintain and staff they are much more cost effective and can last longer into the season. The spray parks are set on timers, and they can turn off the master water supply when they winterize all of fountains and facilities throughout the city.

Mr. Ashley also added there was another companion piece to Mellon Park, which he said is probably not a good example for the Commission to observe since it is retrofit and even the existing modifications will not result in a huge facility. He suggested the Commission instead take a field trip to the East Hills, since this will be a challenging site for implementing a spray park. In regards to Mellon Park, he stated the asphalt and sidewalks are in several stages of disrepair, and the existing restroom adjacent to the spray park is also in bad shape. He said placing a spray park in this site and updating the façade on the restroom, for which there is funding, will fix this eyesore. Mr. Ashley said he will be conferring with Mr. Gable to come up with a suitable design, and they will bring it to the Commission.

Ms. Briggs asked how many of the 4 to 5 future spray parks will replace swimming pools, since so far, two out of the four have done so.

Mr. Ashley said the strategy is to figure out the best and highest use for pools that are already closed, and that this is also based upon demand. He went on to say that the intent is not to go around and close pools to replace them with spray parks. He stated that the Mayor made a decision in Act 47 in 2003 that would have Citiparks give (provide) a number of pools based on a right-sized approach to providing aquatic services for the city, which was a number of 14 pools city-wide. He further added that they are now at a number of 18 pools (provided), and does not anticipate that this number will grow anymore. He surmised that the success of the spray parks will further the lessening of numbers in attendance at swimming pools. The Troy Hill spray park has not only become a community asset, but is now a regional attraction—it is a huge hit with the community. Mr. Ashley went on to say that the pools will close themselves---if the numbers of attendance in a particular pool dwindle to a point, then it would not make sense to keep one open. However, they will not just simply come in and close a pool and open a spray park. They will talk to the community, as they are doing in Lawrenceville currently in regards to the Leslie Pool, for what the best and highest use of the site will be. It might be a spray park or something else.

Ms. Slavick asked if they have follow-up consultations with the users of the spray parks to see if all of the design features are adequate. Particularly, are there enough pavilions and trees to provide shade for parents and other community members when the spray parks are at their maximum usage?

Mr. Ashley said they have not, but probably should conduct some exit interviews as they shut down the pools for the season. He said he will tell the Parks Director this needs to be done, and that this information can be used in future planning. Mr. Ashley stated that the spray parks are very accessible as well in that he has a photo of a young man in braces wearing a raincoat enjoying the spray park already in use. Additionally, he had seen a television piece in which a young girl exclaimed that this was the best day in her life as she utilized one of the parks. He concluded to say that these are very compelling anecdotes for him as to the wide accessibility and accomplishment of the spray parks thus far.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any audience members present who would speak on behalf, opposed, or in general to the project.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Ms. Klavon asked if the applicant had made sure the plant material is nontoxic and that it doesn't attract bees.

Mr. Sauer stated that he will look at this to make sure, but he felt certain that all of the plant material is safe.

Ms. Rhor stated that this looks like it is going to be an ongoing project, and that she understands there is going to be a set type of features reused for health and safety reasons. However, she asked if they could think ahead to design the objects in a more artistic way, by perhaps working with an artist, contractors and designers to think of something more innovative for future spray parks.

Mr. Ashley said they did think about this at the onset until they went to market and actually priced the features. He said they are extraordinarily costly, and to do what Ms. Rhor was asking would mean they would have to do a special fabricated piece, which will double or triple the current budget. However, he said if there are any benefactors that are willing to fund a customized piece he would love to do it, but currently their budgets are set.

Mr. Sauer said in order to give you an idea of how expensive the pieces are, a fiberglass Harley-Davidson that shoots water is actually more expensive than a real Harley-Davidson, costing between \$18,000 and \$21,000.

Ms. Rhor stated that this begs the question, as to how much it would cost to rehabilitate a pool in comparison to creating the new spray parks. She stated that she understood that some pools had to be closed, but asked if the option of rehabilitation of existing pools could be raised in discussions internally and with the community.

Mr. Ashley said they did conduct a cost-benefit analysis to determine the value of a spray park versus rehabilitation of a swimming pool. Most of the swimming pools were built in the 1940's and 50's, so a number of facelifts had already been performed, and at some point you just run out of time. He said Mr. Gable will attest to that when they went to do crack repairs at McGee swimming pool, the total costs ended up being around \$350,000 when they found other infrastructure problems. Additionally, building a new pool is extremely expensive, while building a spray park from their experience is a one-time cost. They have not incurred one additional cost to utilize the spray park at Troy Hill, and it has been open for two seasons—basically, you turn the water on and it is what it is. He stated that you just don't have the infrastructure related problems you have with a pool with a spray park. Compelling information was provided to the communities before they went down this path that this was the best option. Mr. Ashley added that nevertheless, teaching kids how to swim is still part of his mission, and he would never consider closing Highland or Schenley Parks' swimming pools since there is a regional need. He stated that in areas where the attendance numbers were dwindling and coupled with budget and infrastructure/maintenance issues, these pools had to be closed and spray parks were and are a viable answer to that. He further added that some community members are coming out in community meetings as being against the closing of pools, but many others are praising the City for the spray park option. Many of the spray parks are becoming regional in scope. He concluded by saying that the pools in regional parks would never be closed as there is an inherent regional need at those locations.

Ms. Rhor said she understands the cost issues, and appreciates all of the interaction with the community and the spray park's accessibility features, but hoped they will still reach out to a benefactor or attempt to find another solution to approaching artist-designed elements of these spray parks.

Mr. Ashley stated that he understood and he thinks that there might be an opportunity soon at an undisclosed location to perhaps look into this further.

Ms. Rhor stated that she would like to see the City keep its commitment to public pools.

Mr. Ashley stated that he completely agreed and this can be demonstrated in the fact that the City committed to 14 open pools this season, and they are now at 18 open pools in 2010.

Ms. Klavon thanked Mr. Ashley for his testimony and stated to the Commission that the project is being considered for Conceptual and Final approval.

Mr. Indovina stated that on a conceptual level, he understood and agrees with the project, but particularly in the East Hills site—which is a fairly complex site—there does not appear to be a lot of information available. He stated that he is not suggesting that there be custom pieces added, but understanding that there could be a multitude of different arrangements of the standard elements and so forth, he felt a little uncomfortable with giving the East Hills site Final Approval with so little information.

Ms. Briggs agreed.

Ms. Rhor agreed.

Ms. Klavon stated that she did not agree. She asked Mr. Indovina what additional information he wished to see—that, this application had enough information to be considered Final Approval as per the application guidelines. She added that construction documents were submitted as part of the application and these seemed complete.

Ms. Briggs stated that each individual site has a landscape design, sidewalk design, playground design, etc.

Ms. Klavon stated that the individual site plan is included in the application for East Hills.

Ms. Briggs stated that she believes that there is no singular identity of the East Hills site—there is no consideration of that individual locale in regard to the design of the aforementioned elements.

Ms. Klavon stated that Ms. Briggs statement is different than the concern voiced by Mr. Indovina.

Mr. Indovina stated that perhaps his concern is based in the endeavor to digest the entirety of the proposal at one time.

Ms. Klavon stated that the Commission heard why the project is coming all at once for both Conceptual and Final (that, the project did not know that it had to come before the Commission until it was already pretty far down the road) and at this late date-and that the Commission can choose to accept that or not, but the documents seem to be in good order and a decision must be made upon the application presented.

Ms. Briggs stated that this is understood, but also as she understands, it is not the responsibility of the Commission that the applicant did not know of its purview until a certain time. She went on to say that the idea of a Conceptual design is to give the Commission a clear idea of the plantings and other items within the proposal. She stated that she thinks the spray parks are a great idea, but just needed more information. She went on to say that these projects seem very much like a McDonald's restaurant in which they are the same piece placed in each neighborhood with no variation. She stated that the neighborhoods of Pittsburgh deserve more consideration of individuality. She stated that there is supposed to be a space of time between Conceptual and Final approval.

Mr. Brown stated again that applicants are entitled to submit an application for both Conceptual and Final Approval in one fell swoop, but it is up to the Commission to approve the project in any case. He went on to say that it is not true that there must be a space of time between Conceptual and Final Approval as far as the procedural aspects of the Commission application and process go. However, with projects of this scale, the Commission does generally get them at a Conceptual stage first as the project managers usually want some feedback or nod from the Commission before they go down the road with construction documents. This just simply did not occur with this project for reasons already mentioned, but should not sway the decision on this issue alone.

Ms. Ismail stated that in this case, the applicant has chosen to go with pre-fabricated items and the general question to the Commission is about how these pieces fit into the site. She added that there is a site plan submitted along with all of the required documentation. If the Commission asks for modifications to this then the applicant will have to comply and come back for approval. However, the project as submitted has the required documents—it is up to the Commission to approve or deny.

Mr. Brown stated that this was absolutely correct. He thought, upon receiving the application, the applicant had all of the required documentation for Final Approval and he still believes that it does. He went on to say that if the Commission wishes to see further changes made to the project, then that is another story and within its right to request.

Ms. Lockett stated that she would also encourage the Commissioners to visit these sites ahead of time so that they can see the challenges of each first hand. She stated that she had visited some of the existing spray parks herself, and felt like this gave her a better understanding of the project.

Mr. Brown stated that it is also within the right of the Commission to state at this hearing that it wishes to conduct a site visit prior to rendering a decision on the project if it wished to do so.

Ms. Klavon stated that the applicant has also stated at the hearing that it will bring future projects before the Commission at an earlier, more conceptual stage as well, so she believed that there is an understanding moving forward.

Ms. Rhor stated that Ms. Briggs made some really good points and that perhaps a site visit is in order prior to making a decision on this as this is a big project and one that should consider neighborhood identity.

Ms. Lockett stated that the applicant did have a community process around these projects and she asked if that was correct.

Mr. Ashley stated that the community has actively participated in these projects for the past six months. He added that the community has actually designed these parks themselves. He went on to say that he would hate to go back to the community and ---with all due respect to the Commission---tell the community that the plans that they have made need to be changed because a group of people who have never been to the site decided that it needed to be changed or done away with. He added that it is ultimately up to the community to get what they want in this spray park process.

Ms. Briggs stated that she is not saying that the spray parks should not happen, she was just saying that there is more than one manufacturer, there is more than one type of facility, etc.

Mr. Ashley stated that he understands that, but there is a bid process in place that regulates how the City can offer these items out to bid to certain individuals. He went on to state that he thought he explained earlier that he understands how the projects did not come before the Commission at an earlier stage this time around, but he has now committed to rectifying this for the future. He stated that even if the Commission members wished to be present at the very first community design meeting, he would welcome them to be there. He stated that it was his experience that playgrounds had never gone before the Commission in the past and this was never an attempt to circumvent the system—it is just that these are playgrounds and by nature are pre-fabricated units that disallow design criticism. He concluded that when the Commission reviewed the signage for Beechview recently, that this was the first time that the question of the Commission's purview over spray parks was raised. At that point in time, the spray parks were very far underway—the community process predates all of this by six months or so. This is why the project is coming for Conceptual and Final at one time—because the project hurried itself to comply with the Commission process and still adhere to its timeline of getting these parks to the communities to which they were promised in this year.

Mr. Ashley stated that he would see the Commission again very soon as the Warrington spray park design phase is coming in a few weeks. He stated that if the Commission could give him some feedback and direction in the early design phase of Warrington, he would appreciate that. He noted that he loves the idea already mentioned of making each spray park more individualistic to each community. However, the existing budget has to be adhered to. If the will of the Commission is to greatly modify the project he will have to go back to the drawing board.

Ms. Klavon stated that she has been going back through the construction docs and the only plan that seems to be missing is the grading plan. She asked the applicant if there was a grading plan.

Mr. Sauer stated that they do have a grading plan and it should be included.

Ms. Klavon thought that she found it within the site plan, but noted that it was lacking.

Mr. Sauer stated that he could send that along after the hearing if needed.

Mr. Indovina stated that he would probably be okay with allowing this proposal to move forward with approval with the caveat that the next project come in as Conceptual Approval first, then Final Approval in a subsequent hearing.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval of the Mellon and East Hills Spray Park as submitted with the condition that future spray park projects are submitted at the Conceptual phase.

MOVED: Indovina

SECONDED: Slavick

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- c. Market Street *Diamond Diamonds* Project: Conceptual and Final
 - o Patty Burk, Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
 - o Carin Mincemoyer, Artist
 - o Renee Piechocki, Director, Office of Public Art
 - o Lea Donatelli, Program Manager, Office of Public Art

Katie Zawrotniak, standing in for Patty Burk of the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership (PDP), introduced herself and submitted two additional letters of support – one from a property owner and another from a resident who served on the selection committee.

Ms. Zawrotniak explained that in 2004, the Housing Department of the PDP did a streetscape study to figure out what next steps PDP should take in order to make Downtown a more livable place and more attractive to residents and developers. One of study's major recommendations was to create connections among the Cultural District, Market Square, and First Side, which would be the Sixth Street and Market Street Corridor. Ms. Zawrotniak stated it is one of the only places in the city where you can easily get from river to river. There is also a lot of green space.

Ms. Zawrotniak said the goal of this project is to improve the pedestrian interactivity and really take advantage of all the public and private investments in Market Square and the surrounding properties. In order to do that, PDP wanted to bring a piece of public art to improve pedestrian interaction, which was one of the suggestions in the 2004 study. Additionally, subsequent studies and focus groups conducted have concluded that the passageways are important and need to be clean, safe, attractive, fun, and of a great use.

Ms. Zawrotniak displayed an old photograph of Market Square, and clarified the scope would be the corridor where the Fairmont, 3 PNC Triangle Park, and Market Street intersect. She also showed surrounding viewpoints from Heinz Hall, the Buhl Buildings, and the Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation project on the opposite end.

Lea Donatelli of the Office of Public Art (OPA) stated OPA assisted PDP with the artist selection process for a public artwork in the Market Street corridor. OPA helped PDP develop an RFQ that was circulated nationally and locally. They also helped to create a selection committee made up of representatives from the PDP, Downtown residents, property owners along Market Street, Morton Brown, the Public Art Manager, and arts professionals within the city of Pittsburgh. The selection committee reviewed a host of applications that came from all over the country, interviewed selected finalists, and finally selected Carin Mincemoyer as the artist.

Renee Piechocki of OPA then stated that after they picked Ms. Mincemoyer, they went through design development and a community review process. Ms. Mincemoyer, once selected, went under contract with the PDP, and was given 6 to 8 weeks to come up with several designs. Ms. Mincemoyer met several times with the Design Committee, which consisted of local business owners, Morton Brown, and arts

professionals who reviewed and eventually selected one of her designs. Ms. Piechocki stated that the PDP was particularly excited about the design brought forth to the Arts Commission today, because they felt the work took something historic from Market Square and expressed it in a really contemporary way. The Design Committee and PDP's goal was not to add another historic artwork, but to create something contemporary and of our time. Ms. Mincemoyer was able to make something contemporary while referring to the historic elements of the site.

Ms. Piechocki also added that this is not a permanent commission. The \$19,500 budget restricts them in the types of materials they can use, so this will be a temporary project they hope will last for ten years. At this point, they believe the work will be owned and maintained by the PDP, and after the ten year period they hope the work will sustain for a few more years if it is still in good condition, or be returned to the artist.

Ms. Mincemoyer said that as she was researching the history of the site, one of the things she read about Market Square was that it used to be called "The Diamond" and that Forbes Avenue was known as Diamond Street. She explained that a lot of her artwork explores our relationship with the natural world, and she therefore tends to juxtapose the organic with the artificial.

Ms. Mincemoyer said that her proposal is to hang three sculptures over the street that will function similar to chandeliers and will be suspended over the street by steel cables that will be attached to the facades of the buildings on either side. The black lines of the molecular structure of the diamond will be steel tubing which will be powder coated a light color, and hung within them will be Plexiglas diamonds which will be laser cut and put together. Ms. Mincemoyer then passed around a sample of a diamond to the Art Commission, which she explained will be approximately eight inches high. She said they are currently working on a lighting plan, but the current thought is to put LED lighting within each structure, and an LED light focused on each of the diamonds.

Ms. Klavon asked Ms. Mincemoyer how she planned to do this.

Ms. Mincemoyer then produced a sample light to show the Art Commission. She said what they believe they will have to do is alter the diamond by cutting off the top and placing the LED light in such a way that it will glow down into the Plexi glass and catch the edges. She also pointed out that lighting designer, Hal Hilbish, was present at the hearing if the Commission had any more specific lighting questions.

She then displayed a three-dimensional model of what one of the chandeliers might look like through PowerPoint. The largest model was 6 feet 5 inches wide and 2 feet 5 inches high. Ms. Mincemoyer stated the three chandeliers will vary in size and shape. Ms. Mincemoyer added that she is currently working with an engineer to determine the places on the buildings that are structurally sound to hang the cables. They also do not want to harm any architectural elements that are on the facades. She then stated that she is thinking about doing a light color on the steel tubing so they will be less visible during the day, and then during the night, the night sky will allow it to have more presence.

Ms. Klavon asked Ms. Mincemoyer if she thought about doing different sizes or if they will all be the same size.

Ms. Mincemoyer stated she is planning to make the diamonds all the same size, and that the molecular structure will change between the three sculptures.

Ms. Klavon asked if the sculptures will be able to move.

Ms. Mincemoyer stated she believes they will be able to swing, but not rotate. She then displayed some proposed anchor sites that they are still investigating to see if they will work from an engineering perspective. She said the engineer suggested she use an eye-bolt as an anchor from the brick and through the steel. She said it will be visually simpler than the first plate she proposed she would use. She said the cable anchors will be approximately 28 feet from the ground, and the lowest part of the sculptures should be around 22 feet from the ground.

Ms. Slavick asked if all of the structures would be at the same height or staggered.

Ms. Mincemoyer stated that the cables will all be at the same height, so the diamonds should be close to the same height. She explained she does not want to hang the diamonds far down from the cable, because she does not want them to swing in the wind.

Ms. Donatelli went on to explain some of the meetings that they have had. She said they met with Ben Carlise and DPW to review the project. She said she has also spoken with a traffic engineer in DPW to make sure the clearances are proper. Ms. Donatelli said she has also met with building inspectors to figure out what they need to do when they go to get their permits.

Ms. Donatelli said they also went to the Historic Review Commission's July 7th hearing, and received a certificate for the appropriateness of this site, so approval has been granted. She also added that most recently they met with members of Councilman Lavelle and Councilman Kraus' offices. (The proposed site is in Councilman Lavelle's district, and Councilman Kraus is the chair of the Public Works Committee.) Ms. Donatelli stated both offices were very supportive of the project.

Ms. Lockett stated that she thought the work was beautiful. She then asked if they had considered hazard conditions in consideration of last year's harsh winter. What would happen if snow were to accumulate or icicles were to form on the sculptures?

Ms. Mincemoyer said they are currently in the process of working with an engineer to figure this out.

Ms. Lockett also asked if these structures will be able to withstand wind.

Ms. Mincemoyer said that unlike the prototypes, the actual structures will be glued together. She said she chose this material (Plexi glass) because it is supposed to stand up to weather and sun. She also added the steel grid is going to make the structures extremely strong, so they should hold up really well under ice. The attachment to the cable, the sizing of the cable, and the anchors will all be passed by an engineer before it goes to fabrication.

Ms. Rohr noted that in the concept drawings the sculptures get lost in the streetscape. Ms. Klavon agreed.

Ms. Piechocki pointed out that none of the construction seen in the photo is currently there now.

Ms. Mincemoyer said the sizes will vary, and it is difficult to do a concept drawing via pencil sketch.

Mr. Indovina said that personally he is fine with it, and that he is always in favor of anything that activates the Downtown area and the street. He said he thinks the lighting is an important element and that this will look "cool" if the lighting works out well.

Ms. Briggs prefaced that she is not sure what the correct protocol is. She stated she agrees changing the anchor from the plate to the eye-bolt is a smart one. She said she also understands how the artist is going to use the cables, and added if Ms. Mincemoyer hangs the cables correctly she should not have any cable sag. However, she has no idea how each chandelier will be connected to the cable.

Ms. Mincemoyer replied she thought she included a cut sheet for a shaft collar. She then explained that what she is considering is a "weld-able" shaft collar that has not yet been approved by the engineers.

Ms. Briggs then asked how each chandelier will be connected to the space frame. She also added that considering how delicate the pieces are, a quarter inch cable cord with an electric cable attached to it is going to read heavily going across the street. Ms. Briggs said she would be interested in more detailed information about these aspects before final approval. She added conceptual approval seems kind of obvious.

Ms. Mincemoyer said she is thinking about making a heavy duty steel hook to hook over the steel frame so that the pieces can swing, and stated the electric wiring will be internal within the steel frame. That is why they will be using tubing instead of rod for the frame, that way they can run all of the wiring through the

tube. The plan is then to run the wiring to the point of the “v” so they can draw the electricity from a single source.

Renee Piechocki thanked Ms. Briggs for her questions. She then stated that they were hoping to get conceptual and final approval today, so that the construction schedule for this project could get underway as soon as possible. She asked if Ms. Briggs would consider just giving her concerns as feedback. Ms. Piechocki added that Ms. Mincemoyer is working with Hal Hilbish who is a really great lighting designer and did the lighting for Market Square. Ms. Piechocki also stated that the Art Commission is not meeting in August, so if they have to wait for final approval in September it will push their installation date up until January. She said they are really hoping to get this up in November or December, and possibly as early as Light Up Night.

Ms. Lockett made a suggestion about Ms. Briggs’ lighting concern, and suggested they have Mr. Morton Brown and his staff take a look at the lighting plans, since she would not want to hold this up until September.

Ms. Klavon said that what they do sometimes is allow the project proposers to submit a drawing in more detail to Mr. Brown who could then email it to the Art Commission members.

Mr. Brown explained that legally they are not allowed to discuss or decide projects via email, but follow-up items can certainly be sent out.

Ms. Briggs added that she does not want to hold up the project, but it is just a matter of the fact that the detail that she understands is necessary to conceptually and finally approve a project was not in the packet provided in her evaluation.

Ms. Klavon asked Mr. Hal Hilbish to speak on the lighting.

Mr. Hilbish introduced himself as the project’s lighting consultant. He said they will be using hollow tubing through which all of their wiring will be chased. He added that this will be low voltage cabling so it will be minimal and will chase along the support cables. Mr. Hilbish stated that they also share the same concerns as Ms. Briggs and want the chandeliers to be the strong visual elements so they do not see any clunky structure there. He added that he would not do it if it was not going to be quiet. He said he feels very confident they will be able to keep this clean and simple. He stated the drivers for the LED’s will either be on the interior of the buildings or on the roofs of the buildings, so they will not need to have any real mechanical or electrical components other than wiring from the LED’s.

Ms. Rohr asked if they are planning to have any signage even though this is only a 10 year project.

Lea Donatelli stated yes they are.

Ms. Piechocki added the signage will be interpretive, similar to the one located on Strawberry Way. She said they can bring the design of the signage and the script later.

Mr. Brown stated if the signage is going on private property the Art Commission does not have any purview over it anyway.

Ms. Noor Ismail stated this will be a zoning issue.

Mr. Brown said they will definitely want to check with someone about the size and placement of the signage. Ms. Piechocki agreed.

Ms. Briggs also added that her only other concern which has nothing to do with the design of the project, was the idea that “since we have a small budget we will therefore use cheap materials that may or may not last.” Ms. Briggs stated she feels this is a questionable approach for public art in any dense urban environment.

Ms. Mincemoyer stated that she chose the materials because she felt they were the right materials for the project, and that they should last for the term of the project.

Ms. Zawrotniak said that with their requests, they wanted a temporary project to adhere to the historical notion that Market Square is a constantly evolving place. So one of the reasons why they are interested in temporary projects is the fact they will be able to do a lot more in the future which is part of the nature of Market Square. She said ten years from now this may be a great opportunity to bring in a different perspective on this space. She said they are particularly excited about the artist's combination of the historic with the contemporary in her work.

Ms. Briggs commented that she feels the project is undermined if they take the approach that they were constrained because of the budget.

Ms. Donatelli responded by saying they asked Ms. Mincemoyer to work within a \$19,500 budget and make sure the materials last for a lifespan of 10 years. She explained they did this to avoid commissioning a work that would end up costing \$300,000. Therefore, given Ms. Mincemoyer's past work and experience, she felt very comfortable that she could work within this budget and find lasting, durable materials. She said that the cost of lighting projects goes up considerably, so she felt that Ms. Mincemoyer did a great job of selecting very good materials and designing a simple, elegant solution by incorporating LED's and other structural elements.

Mr. Indovina stated that there was a previous comment that the material they selected was tested to see if it would be resistant to weatherization.

Ms. Donatelli agreed and said this was the Plexi glass material.

Ms. Mincemoyer added that "Objects" is the brand of the Plexi glass, and that it is an acrylic product.

Mr. Indovina noted that this material will be very resistant.

Ms. Klavon then turned to the audience to see if there was anyone who wanted to speak on behalf of the project.

Natalie Byrd introduced herself and stated she loves the project and cannot wait to go Downtown to see it. She added she knows several of the people involved, and is certain that she knows it is going to look perfect.

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

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss or make a motion for the project. She reiterated they can ask PDP to submit more materials if they feel it is necessary, and submit these to Mr. Brown who would then email it to the Art Commission.

Ms. Slavick stated that they accept the conceptual and final approval, and ask that they submit follow-up visualization to Mr. Brown regarding the wiring.

Ms. Slavick made the motion to approve.

MOTION: To grant Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership conceptual and final approval for placing Carin Mincemoyer's Diamonds Diamond piece in Market Square.

MOVED: Slavick

SECONDED: Lockett

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- d. Mazerowski Plaque at Forbes Field Wall: Conceptual and Final
 - o Susan Rademacher, Parks Curator, Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy
 - o Fred Bonci, La Quatra Bonci Associates

Susan Rademacher of the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy (PPC) introduced herself, and said she was pleased to present their “Maz Plaque” project idea. She said the idea for this mini project came out of a growing relationship over the last couple of years that originated with the development of Schenley Plaza. This is when they became aware of the annual celebration of the 1960 winning World Series. Ms. Rademacher stated that this is a pretty amazing cultural phenomenon where the actual game is relived by playing a live recording as though it was really happening in the moment. Through this, PPC became more aware of the iconic remnant of the old Forbes Field wall.

Ms. Rademacher stated they began a relationship with the Pittsburgh Pirates to specifically celebrate the upcoming anniversary, and out of these discussions grew the idea of permanently marking the site with some interpretation on ‘what is that piece of brick wall?,’ ‘what happened here?,’ ‘who was “Maz?,” and ‘why did he become so emblematic because of this event?’

Ms. Rademacher then clarified that PPC was there at the Art Commission that day for both conceptual and final approval. She added that she thinks this is quite a simple installation. She stated they are too dealing with time restraints because October 13th is D-Day, and for the celebration they would love to have this project installed by that point. However, she said they first wanted to hear the Art Commission’s feedback on the project.

Ms. Rademacher stated they have run this project past Mike Radley and Mike Gable and have received indications of support from both. She also passed out copies of letters of support from Bill Peduto and Frank Coonelly from the Pittsburgh Pirates.

Next, Natalie Byrd from LaQuatra Bonci Architects introduced herself, and stated they are working with PPC as the landscape architect to design the plaque and the memorial spot. She explained it will be a pretty simple installation. Their plan is to remove a section of the sidewalk from a joint to a joint. They will only install two materials: some granite pavers and some banding of exposed aggregate solely for blending back into the concrete. She explained they would like the plaque to look integrated even though the granite will be brand new. Ms. Byrd stated the plaque will have a historic photograph which will not be on the sidewalk so people do not step on it, and will also protect it from snow removal and salt.

Ms. Byrd then displayed the text that will go on the plaque. She explained that if you walk towards the plaque at the proposed location and look up slightly to the left, you will be able to see the remnants of the Forbes Field wall. Ms. Byrd then went on to state that the installation detail will consist of a granite paver on a dry packed base and concrete aggregate. She said they also do not want to put any mortar in the joints.

Ms. Klavon then asked if there were any questions among the Art Commission members.

Ms. Briggs asked for clarification if there were going to use two different colors of granite.

Ms. Rademacher replied the lighter beige indicates granite pieces, and the darker tone indicates an exposed aggregate concrete. She said they wanted to create a place for the viewer to be with this plaque and information, and have something that was not as abrupt as one brand new material in the cement. She added the aggregate will act as sort of a bridge.

Ms. Slavick asked for clarification on the bronze plaque and the photograph. She wondered if it was a photo-engraving or a relief.

Ms. Rademacher replied there will be a slight relief to the photo, and stated it is an engraving directly from a historic photograph of Mazerowski crossing home plate. She said they have also talked to Matthews Bronze, which is a local firm, about fabricating the photo.

Mr. Indovina asked for clarification on the location, because what they have shows it on Hillman Library side.

Ms. Rademacher noted the diagram she passed out contained a mistake. She stated the correct location will be on the sidewalk on the Schenley merry-go-round, fountain side of the street.

Ms. Klavon then stated that she likes the idea of the three different materials, but why not use a different granite color instead of the exposed aggregate?

Ms. Rademacher replied that Fred Bonci, who designed the project and is out of town that week, proposed the exposed aggregate which PPC gave conceptual approval. She said that the exposed aggregate will carry both tones from the existing granite and tones from the sidewalk. That way it will not look like it “landed from outer space,” but will look like it was knit into the fabric of the larger setting.

Ms. Klavon said that she is a fan of exposed aggregate, but feels that in this case, it will look shockingly different alongside the granite since it is a lesser material.

Ms. Rademacher then added that the exposed aggregate is the same material used on the Merry Schenley fountain paving which is in the same vicinity, so there is a consistent use of material.

Ms. Klavon then agreed the choice of this material makes sense.

Mr. Indovina advised that the PPC should be concerned about the longevity of such a small piece of exposed aggregate for a monumental type plaque.

Ms. Rademacher then asked if they were to do two different colors of granite, instead of using the aggregate, would the Art Commission think the bi-color would still be appealing.

Mr. Indovina replied yes.

Ms. Slavick added that she likes the contrast between the smooth and the rough, so if they were to use granite they could get a rough type as opposed to one with high sheen.

Ms. Klavon stated they would have to get granite with a rough surface because of the paving anyway.

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

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss or make a motion for the project. She asked if anyone wanted clarification on the materials being used before granting conceptual and final approval.

Ms. Briggs said she thinks it will be fine if those are the materials the designer suggested. She does believe it is possible to do this project very well with exposed aggregate.

Ms. Briggs motioned to approve.

MOTION: To grant Conceptual and Final Approval for installing the “Maz Plaque” in Schenley Plaza on the street side of Merry Schenley Fountain.

MOVED: Dee Briggs

SECONDED: Rhor??

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- e. Mellon Square Renovation Phase I: Conceptual
 - o Susan Rademacher, Parks Curator, Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy
 - o Patricia O'Donnell, Heritage Landscapes

Susan Rademacher of the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy reintroduced herself, and thanked the Commission for the chance to come back and present the design for Phase I of the renovation of Mellon Square. Since they last met with the Commission, Ms. Rademacher explained they have succeeded in putting together a team led by Heritage Landscapes' Patricia O'Donnell. The team also includes Pfaffmann Associates for architecture, Hilbish McGee for lighting design, Atlantic Engineering, and Mortar and Ink for graphic design. She also passed out letters of support from the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, the Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership, the Omni William Penn, and Saks Fifth Avenue.

Patricia O'Donnell of Heritage Landscapes then introduced herself. She said that last month when they met with the Art Commission, they spoke about the overall plan for Mellon Square. In this last meeting, they also explained how this is a very important Modernist piece of work designed by Simons and Simons and is described by Mitchell and Richie as one of the keystones of Renaissance One in Pittsburgh. Ms. O'Donnell said that in their narrative they also explain the four benchmark directives – to recapture the character of the Modern master work, to match the original to the greatest degree possible, to meet the principles of the project, and to solve failures and dysfunctions.

Ms. O'Donnell stated they have seen Mellon Square go through two cycles: "first build," and a substantial "rebuild" in 1987. The issue now is to avoid the 25 year implosion, because the rebuild was succeeded by several years of decline and some conditions that were really unacceptable. Ms. O'Donnell said they are at a similar point now. They are approximately 20 years past the 1987-89 work, and they are currently looking for ways to solve failures and dysfunctions.

Ms. O'Donnell explained throughout the original design, there was a use of high quality durable-use materials, and also a degree of innovation. She said at the time this was built it was an urban plaza built over the top of commercial users and a six-story underground garage. The whole notion was to allow a large density of cars into Downtown in a way that would demonstrate the ability to work and conduct commerce in Downtown. High quality durable materials were used originally, but the details for example, water proofing and constant vibration due to the park sitting on a subterranean structure, were overlooked. Ms. O'Donnell said that when they stood on the cascades at Mellon Square they saw there was a constant level of shimmy happening, so they recognized that these structures will have to put up with a degree of vibration.

Ms. O'Donnell then noted that in order to be comparable to the design, they will need to specifically target the character and qualities of the elements of the composition. Then they will need to consider the costs of the maintainability and life cycle of the changes.

Ms. O'Donnell said they looked at the condition of Mellon Square today, and targeted for Phase I the areas with greatest deterioration and the areas that would make the biggest difference to the appearance of liveliness and appearance of good care within Mellon Square. She then displayed a picture of the cascade which she said is an interesting Modernist take on an Italian garden cascade from an antique. It had granite steps on both sides with sets on Smithfield St. and 6th Ave, and Smithfield St and Oliver St. She then pointed out the terrace, the sweetgum planter, and an interpretive wall on the storefront below the canopy. She explained this plan is from the Mellon Square preservation, management and interpretation plan. Since that time, Ms. O'Donnell stated they have assembled the team and have gone through the concept design process, which they have brought today. She then displayed a drawing from the original design cascade on the right that shows an occupied terrace. She said this is one of the strongest areas of failure. It is an inaccessible terrace today, and is used for homeless and vagrant occupation. She said they are looking to solve the issue of this terrace that is viewed from the Oliver building and other surrounding buildings in terms of its use and function.

Ms. O'Donnell then stated the concept plan they have developed since they have assembled their team was to integrate this terrace with the original design and the sweetgum planter making one opening rather than the two seen in the report from the last frame of her PowerPoint. She pointed out that the original design used angles of the Harlequin paving, which she said was quite innovative at the time, along with an

exposed marble surface, and includes a terrazzo on top of the concrete which all relate to the Golden Triangle of Renaissance One. She further noted that the entry point has fairly spacious turf panels with under-drains and a canopy with a green roof and sedum planting at just the right depth. Ms. O'Donnell stated they are very interested in incorporating good water cycle and good water use, using storm drainage effectively, and minimizing irrigation. They also plan to retain planters at the foreground – one that is for seeding and will act as an overlook onto the cascade, and one that functions as a backdrop for a space where small-scale concerts and events can be held particularly in the daytime. These are now held elsewhere in Mellon Square.

Ms. O'Donnell broke down the steps of Phase I. The cascade will be rebuilt and made more durable, planters will be retained in detail with accordance to the original, mineral salts from the granite steps will be removed, damaged steps, guiderails and handrails, which are also in the Modernist stylistic approach will be repaired and replaced, and an accessible terrace will be built. Ms. O'Donnell also showed the 1959 period plan, which showed a detail of the plantings. She said it is very important to them to make sure the sweetgum planter entry is not visible from the entryway of William Penn, which is also where the Kenneth Snelson sculpture is sitting. During this Phase, the sculpture, the crab apple planter and the rest of the square will be protected from the work.

Ms. O'Donnell then showed a picture of the original cascade and stated they will remove the plant materials, build up the insulation, waterproof and under-drain, build a turf with an engineered soil and have the sedum on the canopy with a metal and glass guiderail. She showed an example of tempered glass panels with designs they are considering for the gate with the Harlequin detail in mesh. They plan to use the same three rows of shrubs and to replant the sweetgum planter as original.

Ms. O'Donnell pointed out a panel on the left of the storefronts where AAA and Port Authority are located under the canopy. She said one of the issues since the 1950's has been that this area is too dark and "forbidding," especially because the material used for the exterior is black granite. She said Pittsburgh Parking Authority and AAA who rent the property on which the wall is located are both willing to allow them to put an interpretive wall in this location to tell the story of Mellon Square, a "Modern masterpiece." The concept for the wall is to start with a panel on Renaissance One which will include verbiage on the "Point" and Downtown, and will also show some of the concepts that were presented in the late 1940's that led to the Renaissance One work. The next panel would then show the as-built condition. The next panel will talk about issues in the 1980's, and the last panel will document the restoration and rehabilitation cycle in regards to incorporation of green technologies, proper water cycles and plant health. Ms. O'Donnell said they will also install a lean rail along the wall, which she explained, due to the bus stop is a frequently used corner.

Ms. O'Donnell then stated that one of the key concepts of the design of Mellon Square that has deteriorated over the last 25 years have been the plantings. She showed the Art Commission a soil profile of engineered soil which was twelve inches of root zone mix that was 80 percent sand, 15 percent clay loam and 5 percent high organic Dakota peat harvested in sustainable manner in Minnesota. She said this is a root zone mix that will support the plant growth. She then showed the Commission a bridging mix for drainage, and a sample of # 57 stone, all of which will be prewashed. She further added this mix has also been tested at Schenley Plaza, and noted that Phil Gruszka who is the project manager at PPC, is also very "into this stuff." Ms. O'Donnell then explained that PPC will adhere to a policy that the plants in Mellon Square be treated as bonsais; moreover, the inputs and outputs will be very controlled in the planter environments. She stated proper depths of root zone mix will be used for different sizes of plants. She said they will also properly manage the water by turning off irrigation when there is rain, and installing a proper drainage system. This way they can maintain the plants without punching them up with extra nutrients. Additionally, because the water will not overload the biotic cycles, the plants will be maintained in a bonsai process. Ms. O'Donnell stated this will prevent a big extra growth of plants followed by a failure cycle which in turn would cause them to then replant in the same cycle.

She said the interpretive wall will be located on the Parklane Haosiery site. The signage of Parklane Hosiery will have a period font, and this will be the same font used for the wall. She also stated that the lighting design they are proposing will use a 1950's lighting effect. This will help them achieve character and durability at the same time. She then pointed out that Hal Hilbish and Rob Pfaffmann were present at the hearing to answer specific questions in regards to lighting and architecture.

Ms. O'Donnell then stated the PPC currently has a concept design for the lighting that will use the handrail, the planter wall, and the original lighting replaced along the stairs. Today they have moonlighting and stainless steel plaques. They will replace the lights in the planter walls with LED lights, so that they will be more durable and provide lighting for safety on the stairs at the same time. They would also have light that is night sky compliant at the same time. She once again pointed out that they will have planter lights, railing and wall lights, step lights, and lighting for the cascade. The two lighting effects are one to flow light along the face of the basin to make it sparkle, and second to flow light from the basin and above to light the entire fountain system. Those two effects seen on the original plants will be replicated in this lighting approach. Ms. O'Donnell said they are looking to bring the Art Commission drawings in September, and they would be very pleased for input at this point.

Ms. Klavon asked for clarification if they were planning on changing the material for the cascade for which Ms. O'Donnell did not provide information.

Ms. O'Donnell replied they are working with a fabricator to do a fiber glass prototype on one of the basins. She explained they are concerned about failure and the constant vibration. She explained they are hoping to use a material that is slightly more forgiving and more elastic than concrete, because they know the concrete that is at the site now has failed. However, they are interested in replicating the effect of the cement. She explained one of the effects that is very important in the historic plan is the lightness of the basins which viewers do not experience today. She explained the historic basins were light beige, light turquoise, and light green in a panel system which created a cascade that was bright. Now they have edge walls of the same dark granite and a "bathel" in the cascades. As a result, the cascades feel like walls instead of the intended light cantilever basin. Ms. O'Donnell offered a number of historic images to show possible ideas of the material.

Ms. Klavon commented that PPC is still working on choosing the materials.

Ms. O'Donnell said yes they are still working this through, and felt for concept design it was appropriate to test the material.

Ms. Klavon agreed and stated material selection can just be added as a condition to their final decision. She then asked if they had decided the material for the paving on the new designed piece.

Ms. O'Donnell said yes, and pointed out that they are looking to score it.

Ms. Klavon then asked why they chose to just use one of the angles of the Harlequin design when scoring the pavement.

Ms. O'Donnell answered they wanted this to be fairly clearly differentiated. She said they were thinking they would just use concrete and seed the surface lightly with one color of the Harlequin, feeling it is inappropriate to replicate the detail of the Harlequin paving.

Ms. Klavon then noted that in the original design, one of John Simons' signatures was playing with geometric rectangular shape designs. She asked if their plan was not to stay true to this in their new plan.

Ms. O'Donnell replied that the intent is to make the new design subtly related to the original design. Further, the goal is not to make it a complete replication of the original, but also not to use a sledgehammer approach. She then explained the sweetgum planter will have the green-gray granite all the way around it and the fabrication of the gate will include the Harlequin mesh of the double triangles elongated as a pattern. Despite all of this, Ms. O'Donnell added that they were still certainly willing to hear the Art Commission's thoughts on the paving.

Ms. Klavon asked if the sweetgum planter was indeed a new planter.

Ms. O'Donnell replied that sweetgum was part of the original. She said they would be making one slice behind it for crab apples. She said the last time they showed the planters to the Commission they had two slices, but have since consolidated this down to one, thinking one entry would be fine.

Ms. Klavon commented that she likes the occupancy, and thought this was a really great idea. She also stated she likes the turf panels, but noted that the seating around the perimeter of Mellon Square is used a lot.

Ms. O'Donnell said the idea of avoiding placing seating around the edge is to encourage people to view the stairs, the street, and the cascade.

Ms. Klavon asked should this area be turf.

Ms. O'Donnell replied that more seating would be good, but answered that the real issue is flexible space. She further explained that the sweetgum planter was removed in the 1987 renovation to create a stage, so they do recognize that music, art, drama, etc. need a home in Mellon Square. Therefore, the open paving would need to be a flexible space so people can choose to stand along the rail or sit on the lawn. This way you could still have a small event in the space and it would work very effectively. She stated they could even cover the lawns for a large event. The lawns, she explained, would be made of a good compact resistant soil with good under-drainage will withstand a degree of use.

Ms. Rademacher then stated that she wanted to add just a couple points. First, the PPC does contemplate having movable tables and chairs on the terrace, and the idea of the bank end seating against the planters is so that it could also function with tables and chairs in different arrangements. She therefore agreed that the design is quite flexible, and that using the soil profile for the turf allows tables and chairs to be situated on the turf as in Schenley Plaza with really no impact. She said the turf may be a different surface, but it can be used in a really fluid way. Another point, Ms. Rademacher noted is that in the lower stairs at the corner of Smithfield Street and 6th Avenue, they are looking at two ways to invite people up into the plaza. The first is to bring a few photographs or graphic images or displays up the wall along the steps. The pieces would be the same size as the granite squares. The second would be vines dripping down from a large planter at the end, the idea being to draw peoples' eyes up to the plaza and encourage them to explore.

Ms. Briggs then noted that Ms. O'Donnell introduced this project as up for conceptual approval, but the document says for conceptual and final.

Ms. O'Donnell replied the agenda says 'concept.'

The rest of the Art Commission noted this was an error and agreed that it should say 'concept.'

Ms. Briggs replied she just wanted to be sure.

Mr. Indovina asked how they arrived at the decision to have only a single entrance point to the terrace.

Ms. O'Donnell responded by saying one of the goals was to preserve as much of the rear planter as possible, but using two entrances forced them to keep the sizes of the planters small. Additionally, in their discussions about the variety of uses such as dollying in musical instruments, they moved toward a wider opening. They also angled the ten foot wide opening so that it would be less apparent from the street, but will easily afford movement of large movable items such as chairs and tables. She said they are also looking at putting a gate on the face of the entrance so they can retain the plane of the planter from the opposite edge, so the closed gate with the Harlequin mesh will read as part of the planter wall. Closing Mellon Square by closing the gate will also allow them to keep movable furniture in the plaza.

Mr. Indovina asked if they see fairly intense activities and events happening in the square. If so, what sort of capacity is possible on the terrace?

Ms. O'Donnell replied that in reviewing the history, they found there has been something of a summer concert series throughout the history of Mellon Square. She said the space is about 180' by 20.' The capacity standing is approximately for 200 people, and the capacity for seating is around 120. She added that if you wanted to do a lunch, concert, or something casual you have a pretty good capacity for doing it. Additionally with the green roof, she feels this can be a very successful urban space.

Ms. Briggs asked if the sole reason for the gate is so things can be locked inside Mellon Square when it is closed.

Ms. O'Donnell replied the secondary reason is to retain the edge of the planter, and give the space flexibility for programming. She said if someone wanted to have an event there, you could have a person at the gate or close the gate.

Ms. Klavon asked how the gate will move.

Ms. O'Donnell said they are talking about making it swing in only one direction, so it will not be an impediment on the other side. Also by using the triangular form, it is very strong.

Ms. Slavick asked if the gate will stay open when the plaza is open.

Ms. O'Donnell said yes unless if in some rare moment there was a permitted event that was more limited access. The idea is not to have a gate that people would have to open to go into the plaza, because it is an area they want people to use. She also added it is not their intention to restrict programming, and they do not believe that this is the only place where events happen in the square. Ms. O'Donnell stated that the original purpose of the Square was to be a quiet oasis, so they do not see it as a place where there will be daily lively activities, but they do want to host activities that will engage Downtown workers and residents on evenings and weekends.

Ms. Rademacher added that they know from Holly White's work, that movable furniture is very much an encouragement for people to enjoy a space. She stated that the notion of movable furniture is nothing new, and has been used for 30 years in urban design.

Ms. Klavick responded by stating that Holly White did not fence her design off.

Ms. Briggs stated that she does not have any issue with movable furniture, but she does not find the gate very convincing as either an idea or concept. She added that there are many elements to the designs and plans that are very well considered and will be quite beautiful, but they should give as much care to the design of the gate as they have to soil that was shown. She said gates carry a lot of weight, and suggest this notion of "stay out" or "stay in" to the public. Therefore, if it is really a required element, (though she would argue that it is not), she would give it a great deal more architectural and design consideration than it has gotten.

Ms. O'Donnell said thanks, good comment.

Mr. Indovina stated that the smaller turf panel in its location bothers him. He said it seems this would be a much more flexible, usable space if it picked up one of the colors of the new paving and was more of a hard-scape. He said this was a personal reaction.

Ms. O'Donnell said that this was a good point. They were thinking more green is better.

Ms. Slavick said that if there is going to be movable elements she likes the soft element of the grass, and likes the green.

Ms. Klavon asked about the one planter on the end. She noted that unlike the rest of the design which has a lot of symmetry, symmetry is missing from this particular piece.

Ms. O'Donnell said they were purposeful in doing so, but understands what Ms. Klavon is saying.

Ms. Klavon further noted that the same opportunities are not given at both corners of the planters, and wondered if these should be the same.

Ms. Rademacher said that they have spent a lot of time exploring this question, and imagines when they go into design development they will continue to explore this point. In the discussions, one of the things noted is that this is one of the noisiest ends in the whole square, so they wanted as much of a planting buffer as

they could have as well as a strong green presence. Whereas at the other end, the intent is to maximize the usable space and to celebrate the cascade, which is a new vantage point that has not been provided before.

Ms. Klavon said that she wonders if this should be green lawn then.

Ms. Briggs said she actually likes the difference in the character, noting the one end is a quieter area that overlooks the cascade, and the other end looks out onto the street. She said she would actually argue that the idea or concept works very well.

Ms. Rademacher stated that the historic is very symmetrical.

Ms. Briggs said that in her view, in the entire park she does not see a lot of symmetry, so she is not sure if it really is a central theme.

Ms. Rademacher said John Simons is dealing with both symmetry and asymmetry here. His framing of the big basin with two beds just on two sides, and running of the lindens and the honey locust plant contain this consistent symmetry. She explained the heart of the design will be a big basin, which is a future project. However, the beautiful cantilever edge is what they do not currently have of the water feature. The other thing they are also going to be working on is isolating the vibration problem and working with the materials for a good durable connection.

Ms. Klavon asked how high the planter wall will be.

Ms. O'Donnell said that it is about 56 inches, approximately shoulder height.

Ms. Briggs said that when they come back for final approval, one of the things that frustrates her is the quality of the details of public spaces. She said one thing the Commission is going to want to see is detailed information on benches, handrails, etc. As an example, she said using the word "metal" is a bit broad. She then stated that she wanted to bring up an issue no one else on the Commission seemed to want to talk about – the interpretative wall.

Ms. Rademacher said she was willing to talk about it and was interested in what they had to say. She then went onto state that this is a very robust story with the whole notion of Pittsburgh as sort of the avant garde for urban renewal. She said Pittsburgh "kind of did it in a good way," but we also know it had bad ripples and would offset people and where they lived. However, the issue of urban renewal from Renaissance One was really born here.

Mr. Indovina said that the image of that is that it is at odds with the rest of the work. He said the image of the interpretative wall going up the stairs is very jarring.

Ms. Rademacher said the panels are 36 inch squares, so the issue was to use a grid, but she agreed this was fine. She said this would be an easy thing not to do, and it is really about the robustness and richness of the story.

Mr. Indovina said that the park tells its own story very well. He said the interpretive wall seems like overkill.

Ms. Briggs said she agrees with this in concept, and would advise them to have their graphic designers spend a lot more time working on this before they present it again. She said in comparison to the rest of the plaza which is really exquisite, it is lacking. She explained she understands that the interpretive wall so far is just an idea, but if it is going to be designed that it be as meticulously designed as the rest of the square. But she does agree with the concept that the interpretive wall is not necessary.

Ms. Klavon asked to see the one perspective from the 1940's that Ms. O'Donnell showed in her PowerPoint. She noted that the black granite wraps all the way around and up the stairs from the storefronts.

Ms. O'Donnell then stated that in the detail of the frontage, Hilbish McGee has worked out a way to solve the problem of many nesting pigeons, and irregular signage on the façade. She explained the idea was to create an internally lit, but with very nice materials, reels, probably made of etched glass, and to put the letters in metal relief in the foreground. They would then up light the canopy from the ribbon of the sign, which would do a better job of getting rid of the diversity of signs and also get rid of the pigeons nesting.

Ms. Slavick asked if the heat and color of the lighting would have anything to do with the color on the cascade.

Ms. O'Donnell said she thinks they should have a degree of harmony, because she wants a degree of integration. Their goal is to tonally relate to the palate of the park, particularly that of the cascades with the light pastel values, and the lighting splaying over those. She said Hal Hilbish and Rick McGee have been "waxing about" these issues in their discussions.

Ms. Briggs said she has not been a part of the previous discussions of the whole idea, and therefore asked if there is a part of the phasing that will look at the design of the entire strip of the commercial enterprises.

Ms. O'Donnell said in the interest of time and budget interests, and trying to get Phase I brought forward, they may view this piece and the treatment of the canopy as the sample and then continue. PPC is partnering effectively with the Pittsburgh Parking Authority, but it is the Parking Authority's building. Therefore, this a partnership issue to work with them on the ongoing lighting work. Additionally they feel the lighting at the end of the garage is a distraction, and they want to work through this issue. They also feel the lighting along the street hits at a level inside the park. Ms. O'Donnell said that they are thus testing materials.

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

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss or make a motion for the project.

Mr. Indovina said it sounds like the concept itself is on track, but many details need to be worked out, including some significant points.

Ms. Rhor asked if they could have PPC come to the Commission again with new plans for the gate and reevaluation of the signage.

Mr. Brown answered that they can give them conceptual approval and ask them to bring those materials again, or they could grant them conceptual approval and have them bring these materials in conjunction with final review.

Ms. Klavon stated that if they waited for the materials until final review, PPC would continue with their construction documents which would be a big effort.

Mr. Indovina said then if there is a fundamental issue it should be addressed.

Ms. O'Donnell said she wanted to add a small comment. She said the signage face is divisible, and it could happen at a different time and a different pace. The rest of the work really is one set of construction documents. The lighting and signage could really be a separate project. She suggested that they could go ahead with the rest of the project and bring them back the signage wall later if they would so choose.

Ms. Rhor said that if they do go ahead and grant conceptual approval that she would take the signage part out.

Ms. Klavon then noted that one of the things they are still testing out is the material for the cascade, which she thinks is critical.

Ms. Briggs noted that even though this is a big project, the construction documents will be done in AutoCAD so things can be easily changed. She added that it is her understanding that PPC would still have to come before the Commission for final review before anything can be constructed or ordered. Therefore,

asking them to bring this information for final review with the full understanding that they may or may not approve it is an option.

Mr. Brown responded by saying they generally try to be kind to the applicant in that way. They do not want them to go so far down the road that it would cost a lot of money to make changes to their plan. However, he said Mr. Briggs was right and they can absolutely do that.

Ms. Slavick asked if while they are developing things, if they can provide the plans and specs as they are in the process of doing it.

Mr. Brown said yes, the applicant could bring back the plans for the gate alone as part of an info update during the process of development.

Ms. Rademacher replied their work schedule is to return with CD's in September. At that time if there are other elements that need further design or development, they will come back the Art Commission again with those things.

Ms. Rhor again said she was ok with granting conceptual approval on the condition they take the signage out.

Ms. Briggs stated that it appears Ms. Klavon seems to have some concerns about approving certain features of this project on a conceptual level.

Ms. Klavon said they have had situations in the past where they need to be careful about what they are saying and what they are doing. She said you do not want to get into the situation where they are telling the applicant to do a lot of changes when they have spent a lot of design time. They need to be clear about what direction they give them today, because it would be unfair to everyone to have them come back and the Art Commission say they do not like it. She added if their process had an additional hearing between conceptual and final review it would be different.

Mr. Brown stated that the applicant can come back to the Art Commission for informational hearings at any time. In this case, however, the applicant is planning to come back for final approval with construction documents in September, so any delay will result in an overall delay of their project.

Ms. Luckett asked if what they were stating is that they want more consideration given to the water feature.

Ms. Klavon said they also need site materials, type size, that kind of thing.

Ms. Luckett added railing and gate.

Ms. Klavon stated she thought even the design itself needed more consideration.

Ms. Briggs stated that this project seems a bit further along than conceptual design approval, and she is thankful for how much information there is. However, she thinks it is understood that for final approval there will be a drawing that calls out materials, and sections on how to put things together for everything. That is what would be in the construction documents.

Ms. Klavon agreed.

Ms. Briggs said having this amount of detail is not something they would ever expect or demand from an applicant at the conceptual level in the design phase.

Ms. Rademacher added that she thought it was safe to say that this is a Modern masterpiece they are all trying to honor and put into a better time cycle where it can be more maintained and durable. She reiterated that they are cognizant of the principles they are working under and are trying to do this in "a very good way." She noted that the planning document they presented last time is now running over 400 pages long. She said they have done two years worth of work to build the planning basis.

Ms. Klavon stated they can do conceptual approval with conditions, such as taking out the signage piece.

Mr. Indovina stated that they he would exclude the signage piece completely. He said they should grant conceptual approval with conditions for additional plans on the gate, construction details on the cascade, and further thought on the lighting.

Ms. Klavon then asked Ms. O'Donnell if they wanted to make the railing and tempered glass panel see-through.

Ms. O'Donnell replied they wanted this to be transparent because they are trying to have the read be of the block of the building, the steps and the canopy. They are looking for those historical elements to hold the weight and give the greatest visual impression on the form.

Ms. Klavon asked if they looked at other types of railing.

Ms. O'Donnell said they looked at glass, mesh, and extending the stone. They tried making it solid, but felt this unbalanced the canopy.

Ms. Klavon said that sometimes these tend to look "cheeky."

Ms. O'Donnell replied that Hilbish and McGee are looking to light these panels from the side to set a bit of the glow during the night, which is another invitation to use Mellon Square.

Ms. Lockett said she sees Ms. Klavon's point, but it is just a matter of opinion for her.

Ms. Klavon agreed it is a matter of opinion, but is not sure about the railing.

Ms. O'Donnell said their hope is to enliven a formally not useable space where there is a lot of building vacancy surrounding it, such as the Oliver Building.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to make a motion.

Mr. Indovina made the motion for conceptual approval of Mellon Square, excluding the interpretative panels and signage, with the condition that additional information be provided regarding the gates and all materials in general, along with further consideration for the glass handrail.

Ms. Rhor said that the list of conditions has gotten so long that would it be better to table the project, and ask them to come back for conceptual approval again with all of the information.

Ms. Briggs stated she did not think this was necessary. She said she thought they had more information than needed for conceptual approval.

Mr. Brown added that they have deliberated with these issues before, particularly with that of the Schenley Plaza Restaurant, where they required them to come back with a more detailed landscaping plan. But they agreed that they could then come back for final approval if they brought all the requested materials. He said in PPC's case, a lot of the material definitions would come at final.

Ms. O'Donnell said they have already defined a lot of these materials in the packet.

Mr. Brown noted that it seems PPC is willing to come back and have these concerns addressed in September, unless there was something egregious that they were really worried about.

Ms. Briggs then made the motion to approve with the interpretative wall taken out.

Ms. Klavon stated that Mr. Indovina already had a motion on the table.

Mr. Indovina continued his motion, and added he thought they should be specific on some of the issues.

Ms. Rhor wanted clarification that they wanted lighting taken off as well.

Mr. Indovina confirmed this.

MOTION: To grant Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy conceptual approval for Mellon Square, excluding the interpretative panels and signage, with the condition that additional information be provided regarding the gates and all materials in general, along with further consideration for the glass handrail

MOVED: Indovina

SECONDED: Rhor

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- f. Spring Hill Art Sign: Final
 - o Linda Wallen, Artist, Spring Hill Community
 - o Justin Mazzei, Manchester Craftsmen's Guild

Linda Wallen introduced herself as the artist, and added that she has lived on Spring Hill since 1983. She then showed a photograph of a hillside where they would like to build a wall. Last year they built a mosaic mural which now needs a home. Across from this lot is a fire station which has become a community center. She then showed some photographs of two her properties that were built in conjunction with Manchester Craftsmen's Guild.

Ms. Wallen said they then had the idea to create something for the history of Spring Hill, and began interviewing early German immigrants who revealed they brought a lot of hunting material to the area. Then they decided to work with children to create a mural. Ms. Wallen showed a panel of the mural which depicted a spring for the 'spring' in Spring Hill which is right next to the lot where they want to build the wall. She said the spring is currently closed, but they hope this spring will eventually be refurbished and open to the public. She explained that the panels were currently being stored in the fire station across from the lot.

Ms. Wallen said that this was originally a charm bracelet project and that there are a lot of people involved in the process. She then said the next step is to have DPW clear the site. She also added DPW stated they would dig the hole and pour the cement. Then the project manager would take over from there to install the piece. She said they want to use a cement block with a split face surface.

Ms. Wallen said the Civic League is behind them 100%. She said there has also been a lot of community backing, and they have even started a \$200 savings account for future maintenance of the piece. Community members even helped to make some of the tiles to be used to frame the mosaic. Ms. Wallen then showed several letters of support from community members, and added they have been in the community newsletter several times. She then explained that the mural is about 20 feet across and the entire wall would be approximately 25 feet across. She said Werner Krup was available to answer any questions about the structure of the wall.

Ms. Wallen said they raised \$2,167 by going door to door, for which they will buy materials. She said the Project Manager has put together a budget for the project which includes cost of materials and labor. She added they believe the labor will be donated. She said there is a professional bricklayer who resides in Spring Hill who said he would be willing to help put up the wall, as well as other community volunteers. She added the kids from Manchester Craftsmen's Guild also wanted to be present for when they build the wall. Ms. Wallen stated that right now they have enough money to cover the materials.

Ms. Wallen stated that Mike Gable and Kevin Quigley of Public Works said they could throw boulders on the lot to make it more presentable. She said they do not have money to landscape the area right now, but the community members are not interested in having the property landscaped anyway.

Ms. Klavon asked if this was the entryway to the community.

Ms. Wallen said it actually the heart of her community. The old fire station is in the center, and this lot is really in the middle.

Ms. Klavon asked why they would not want to put it on a building.

Ms. Wallen said it was originally designed to go on the old fire station, but they were told it was not possible. After, they could not find a suitable building to place it.

Mr. Brown stated they originally came to him for permission to place the mural on the fire station, but it was determined that the retaining wall would crumble if they placed the mural onto it.

Ms. Klavon asked if they could put it on the fire station itself.

Mr. Brown further explained there was no location on the fire station itself to put it, and added again that the retaining wall was in terrible condition.

Mr. Indovina stated that when this project came for conceptual approval there were concerns over the steel beams and stucco in the wall.

Mr. Brown stated that last time the direction of the Commission was to investigate different types of finish for the wall itself. Initially from last time, Spring Hill was to present a different type of material for the wall.

Ms. Wallen said they brought more precise drawings, a list of materials, and a budget.

Mr. Brown asked if there was text on the wall at some point as in the original application.

Ms. Wallen said that in border tiles, three tiles will say "Spring Hill," but she did not include this into her drawing.

Ms. Slavick asked for clarification on two of the items on the right and left of the drawing.

Ms. Wallen replied that Ms. Slavick was looking at the old un-photoshopped version from the Spring, and those items are not in the current drawings. These indicated brass plaques which they have since taken out. She explained there was no budget, and it was decided they were not necessary.

Ms. Briggs asked what the property behind the lot looks like.

Ms. Wallen explained there is a rise made of stone.

Ms. Klavon asked for the height of the wall with the foundation.

Mr. Indovina found in the application the applicant wrote the wall would be six feet high and the foundation would be 32' by 3' by 2'.

Mr. Gable stated the Public Works is putting the foundation in, and teased that at least the Art Commission knows this portion will be done right.

Mr. Brown stated that they did cover a lot of the structural stuff last time. At this point, it is really just about the aesthetics and the finish of the wall.

Ms. Slavick asked if the cement block they intended to use was like the kind one could buy at Home Depot.

Mr. Indovina stated that the applicant said that the cement was split faced, and therefore textured.

Mr. Brown stated he did not think Ms. Slavick's question was bad, and he himself asked the applicant to further explain this in their application.

Ms. Rohr asked for clarification that Ms. Wallen would be taking care of the maintenance.

Ms. Wallen said yes.

Ms. Rohr asked if they thought the \$200 budget they currently have can cover this.

Ms. Wallen said having taken care of her own mosaic walls for the past sixteen years, she knows the \$200 will cover this. She said she has spent a little over \$30 on silicon coating.

Ms. Rohr asked if there would be some kind of agreement.

Mr. Brown explained that if they give final approval, they would then issue a license and maintenance agreement with Ms. Wallen or the Spring Hill Community. He said from his understanding, the \$200 is in an interest bearing account.

Ms. Wallen said this was correct.

Ms. Rohr asked that even though as of now there was no landscaping plan, if they still intended to place plantings around the wall.

Ms. Wallen said yes, there was a plan to place some plants around the wall to prevent people from sitting on the wall or playing with the wall. She said they have a friend at Urban Landscape who said at the end of the season she may be able to donate some plantings to them. If they do plantings, the Steel City Boxing folks at the fire station who maintain the plants in the public garden by the Western Conservancy, also agreed to maintain the plants around the wall.

Ms. Rohr said this could also be added to the contract.

Ms. Klavon said that she would not add any shrubbery. Instead she would add a bed of day lilies, something simple like that.

Ms. Wallen agreed with this idea, and said it is a question of budget.

Ms. Klavon said that they should let the mosaic speak for itself.

Ms. Wallen agreed the shrubs were ugly.

Mr. Brown asked if there was a cost effective ground cover Ms. Klavon would suggest.

Ms. Klavon stated she would suggest something indigenous such as day lilies, perennials, or sedges.

Ms. Wallen asked about the winter.

Ms. Klavon said there would be nothing, just mulch.

Ms. Briggs stated she thought the mosaic looked fantastic, and it is often in the detail of the mosaic that you really learn the story. Therefore, people will want to get close to it, so a path would be more conducive. She stated the greatest downfall of the project is that they just need more money to do all of the things they want to do. However, this may happen in the future, for which she feels confident. She said something needs to happen with the gravel lot.

Ms. Wallen agreed and said people park their cars in the lot, and leave their trash there. She said the mural would reclaim the corner and make it more than just a dump.

time for placement. He went on to say that Peter Calaboyias was contracted with directly to fully re-create his piece entitled *Five Factors*.

Ms. Slavick asked to clarify that the sculpture was being re-created.

Mr. Brown stated that this was correct. He clarified that the Morandi and deRoy Gruber pieces were able to be restored, but the Calaboyias piece was found to be beyond repair and a decision was made by his predecessor—and was approved by the Commission—to be re-created. The artist was to take the original, use it as a form, re-fabricate the piece perfectly and then destroy the original. The new piece was to be regarded as an original. He went on to state that this was also the case with the Jim Myford sculpture that was approved for final placement at last month's hearing of the Commission.

Mr. Brown stated that the Calaboyias piece and the Morandi piece were originally located at the Squirrel Hill Library. They were removed from that location and became the property of the City some time ago. He went on to say that the deRoy Gruber piece was originally located on the portico of the City-County Building, then relocated to the area currently occupied by the convention center. It was finally relocated to a Public Works facility when the new convention center was being built. Mr. Brown noted that all of these pieces are in the final stages of being restored at this time. He went on to say again that upon visiting the pieces in restoration at McKay Lodge Conservation, he was taken aback at the beauty of the pieces—particularly the Morandi piece which he himself had never seen in person before this time. He stated that the Morandi piece has a brushed surface that is clearcoated giving it an almost prismatic appearance. He noted that the images shown at the hearing do not give the piece justice as to its beauty, nor do the images clearly describe the sub-base of the piece—a recessed plinth that allows the piece to “float” about a foot or two above the earth.

Mr. Brown proceeded to describe his process of selecting Mellon Park as the proposed site for the sculptures. He passed to the Commission a map (prepared by the City GIS Department) showing the entire existing City-owned public art collection in small blue dots, with the newly proposed sculpture locations highlighted in larger multi-colored dots in Mellon Park. He noted that the City has not mapped every piece of art in Pittsburgh, but it has mapped its existing collection of public artworks. He explained that when he began his term in office one and a half years ago, the restoration of the artworks was largely already underway, and that his priority was to find new locations for the pieces.

Mr. Brown stated that when he began exploring potential sites for the pieces, he attempted to look at places on the map where there were no “blue dots”, or existing City-owned artworks. Mr. Brown stated that this section of the East End is an established center of art with the Pittsburgh Center for the Arts just down the road which has a history of temporary and long term sculpture installations and the nearby Clark Winter sculpture at Reizenstein School that is of a similar style and time period to the proposed sculptures.

Mr. Brown also noted that this section of Mellon Park--between Fifth and Penn Avenue—is somewhat under-utilized in his opinion, and that he hoped to dress the park up and entice new residents and users of the new Bakery Square Development and the newly proposed Spray Park to enter and experience this wonderful green space that would be transformed into a kind of “sculpture park”.

Mr. Brown then revisited the overhead site plan to describe the proposed placement of each sculpture. He began by further describing the placement of the Forbes Road Monument within the grove of trees. He noted that there are several “alcoves” that afford nice intimate settings for the monument and/or sculptures to reside in.

Ms. Slavick noted that the Forbes Road monument needed a place like this that would afford viewers an up-close viewing range.

Mr. Brown noted the location of benches nearby to the Forbes Road Monument and in other parts of the park, and displayed the location of the pedestrian path that ran parallel to Penn Avenue from Fifth to Reizenstein School, and the circular pedestrian path within the center of the park parcel. He noted that the placement of the sculptures was purposeful to form a “necklace” around this center pedestrian path in order to preserve the central green space which is often used for ad-hoc athletic events and other gatherings. Mr. Brown gave further explanation as to the specific siting of the Calaboyias piece by noting its relationship to

the baseball field and its prominence in this open space making it visible from a distance away down Penn Avenue and the Bakery Square area. He also noted that this was the most level space within the park, and was very open giving the rather monumental sculpture the “berth” that it demands.

Mr. Brown noted the proposed locations for the Damianos piece. He displayed several images of the piece superimposed into site photos. The proposed locations were placed at the secondary entrance to the park off of Penn Avenue/from the Reizenstein side. Mr. Brown went on to say that he is still on the fence about relocating the Damianos to this space and would seek the Commission’s direction further on this piece after he had described the other pieces’ placement.

He then displayed the proposed location for the Morandi piece, just outside of a grove of trees nearest to the intersection of Fifth and Penn. He also displayed images of the deRoy Gruber piece at its proposed location at the main entrance to the park. He went on to say that he was trying to create a sense of rhythm in the way the sculptures were placed. The two largest sculptures were placed so that their “weight” would seem balanced in almost a symmetrical way, and the experience of a pedestrian walking through the space would rhythmically come across the pieces in a “balanced” way.

Mr. Brown stated that he needed the direction of the Commission on the Damianos piece at this location. He stated that he initially started thinking about relocating the Damianos piece from its current location in Allegheny Square because some time ago the Children’s Museum had presented its plans to renovate the land in front of the Museum that included the possibility that the Damianos piece would be relocated either to another place within the square or elsewhere in the City. He also stated that initially the Children’s Museum had set aside funds to restore and relocate the piece. He went on to say that currently, the Children’s Museum has revised its plans and is no longer requesting that the piece be moved due to its plans for renovation of the square. He stated that the Children’s Museum has also stated that it still holds money for the restoration of the piece, but the budget for this is quite lower than originally planned—the current budget would not be sufficient for restoration, let alone relocation. Even though the piece will not be affected by the plans for renovation, Mr. Brown stated that he fears that the piece will seem overly imposing in the space as it currently resides in the middle of a sidewalk and upon a large pedestal. The current location is already overly imposing, and he feared that once the other side of the square is “opened up” in the new renovation, this piece of art will seem like a visual and physical barrier to users who wish to traverse the square in a straight line.

Mr. Brown went on to say that there has been an ongoing discussion with the Northside community that the street may be reopened one day where the Damianos currently resides. There are no concrete plans for this at this time, but Mr. Brown stated that he had thought he would be proactive on this front and utilize the grant money that he has in hand today to restore and relocate the piece for all of the above reasons. Mr. Brown also noted that the existing Clark Winter artwork in front of Reizenstein School (and adjacent to Mellon Park) was of a similar style and period to the Damianos. This was another reason that he thought to relocate the piece to Mellon Park. He felt that this would provide a linkage of the sculpture park to the extant artwork and provide a concentration of period pieces in a single location.

Mr. Brown stated that it is typical of City policy to require any community group who may propose a renovation or relocation of City property (or a proposal to place new objects on City property) to provide all funding and maintenance for said project. This policy made Mr. Brown pause in regard to his using grant money for this purpose. However, at this date and time, the Children’s Museum is not requesting that the piece be relocated. Given the above, Mr. Brown was seeking direction from the Commission on this matter.

Ms. Klavon asked if Mr. Brown had any other pieces from the City’s collection in mind to place in Mellon Park if the Damianos piece were removed from consideration.

Mr. Brown stated that he was considering a piece by Josefa Filkosky that currently resides in Paulson Pool as a likely candidate, but that he had not made any plans to that affect. This was just a piece that was on the list of pieces for assessment—and that this pool is closed, slated not to be reopened. The piece is of a similar period and type to the others as well. He stated that this was the same artist who had created the orange abstract piece in the Gateway Center median on Liberty downtown entitled *Pipe Dream*. Mr. Brown answered to say that he does not have a concrete plan to replace the Damianos, however, at this location if it is not of interest to the Commission to place it here.

Ms. Klavon asked if all of the pieces were similar in being from the same time period.

Mr. Brown answered that they were.

Mr. Indovina affirmed.

Ms. Klavon stated that she liked the fact that there were five sculptures rather than four sculptures proposed.

Mr. Brown agreed and stated that he does not like even numbers in art---an odd number of objects has always been more interesting and more appropriate to arrangements such as this.

Mr. Brown stated that he is not really considering the Forbes Road monument as part of the “period” collection of artworks as it is a monument and not an artwork. He went on to say that the way the monument will be placed within the grove of trees, a visitor can choose to ignore it, or walk right up to it, sit on a bench beside it or move on---there will be no sight-line issues with this piece and the artworks. They will be together but this one is sort of set alone.

Mr. Indovina stated that the piece being placed in the grove of trees is perfect.

Ms. Briggs stated that it is fine to consider the monument to be its own thing and to allow it its own space in this way.

Mr. Indovina stated that he believed that the idea of a sculpture park is great and that the whole will be greater than the sum of its parts. He went on to say that the pieces would have more impact collected here together than they would scattered around the city.

Ms. Slavick stated that in terms of dealing with the space and what you have to deal with the proposal is perfect. However, she voiced the concern that given the location and the fact that there is new development across the street, the sculptures—all being from the same time period of the 1970’s—immediately will give the space a dated quality. She went on to say that there ought to be something more contemporary at this location, although she stated that she does not know what alternatives are feasible in this case.

Mr. Brown stated that the City’s art collection has gaps in it---it largely (with a few exceptions) consists of pieces from the 1970’s, 1980’s and then jumps back to the 1800’s with a few war memorials and monuments interspersed from those time periods of the wars.

Mr. Indovina stated that this is correct---the City hasn’t really acquired more contemporary pieces.

Mr. Brown stated that this is true with a few exceptions.

Ms. Briggs stated that she agreed with Ms. Slavick’s concerns, and added that this grouping of sculptures provides a snapshot of when Pittsburgh was strong. The grouping of sculptures, then is sort of looking backwards rather than looking forward.

Ms. Slavick stated that the proposed grouping of these sculptures in this location is an example of what is being decried right now as “plop art”—that the pieces are placed in a location without any context to that location. She stated that the pieces may have had a relationship to their original locations—she had no idea if they did or did not—but stated that these do not in this location.

Ms. Briggs stated that this was also her question about the Damianos piece—she asked if that piece was made for that site (where it currently resides in Allegheny Square).

Mr. Brown stated that the Damianos piece was designed for that space originally. He stated that the piece currently suffers from a lack of maintenance in the overgrown shrubs and so forth, but the placement of that piece in the middle of the pedestrian path seems rather imposing now, especially with the plans for renovation adjacent to it.

Ms. Briggs, acknowledged this but stated that the philosophy of siting the piece in this way—imposing as it might be—is still a more contemporary way of siting sculpture than placing sculpture in the field. She stated that the original intent of the piece was to place it in Allegheny Square—and potentially was intentional to provide a presence and give the piece its power, and she would not use its current position as a reason to move it. She stated that it makes sense for the other pieces to be re-located as there is no original location for them to return to, but to re-locate the Damianos on the basis provided and without a plan for the current site in Allegheny Square upon its removal would not be acceptable to her.

Mr. Brown stated that Ms. Briggs hit upon part of his concern as well. He did acknowledge that there was clearly some strategic thinking on the placement of the Damianos piece, although he himself does not believe that its current site works well for the piece. He also acknowledged Ms. Briggs' other concern that there would have to be some agreement on what to do with the “hole” that would be left when that piece was removed. He went on to say that one of his larger concerns—and he did not know if the Commission had considered this—but he is always mindful of the “haves” and “have-nots” in the City and to take a piece of art away from one and “give it” to another is a concern as well.

Ms. Slavick stated that when she mentioned before about “alternatives” she did not mean to ask if there were alternative sculptures, but rather questioned whether there were alternative sites for these sculptures. She went on to say that when she was interviewed by City Council during her appointment to the Commission, many Council members voiced concern and enthusiasm to add public art to their districts. She stated that some of them complained that the East End and Downtown are “art-heavy”, but many of the other neighborhoods have little or nothing. Ms. Slavick asked if there were any other sites where these sculptures could go, and has this proposal gone before any members of the community.

Mr. Brown stated that there are five letters of support presented at the hearing from community members and three from City officials including Councilman Peduto. He stated that Councilman Peduto has been involved for a long time in the restoration of the artwork and now to relocate them in his district. He has worked with the Councilman to have large community meetings regarding this project. One recent meeting had approximately 150 residents in attendance from Shadyside, East Liberty, North Point Breeze, Squirrel Hill and Larimer. He stated that he also had presented to and gained unanimous support from the Shadyside Action Coalition on the matter and a letter from that group was presented at the hearing.

Mr. Brown went on to say that he has visited and considered dozens of sites around the city for the relocation of these pieces. He stated that he has been working on this project for over one year. He went on to say that he strongly empathizes with Council members and community members in areas such as the West End and Sheridan who may have little in the way of cultural amenities and public art but one of his biggest fears is to place these sculptures in areas of the city that are not well observed by residents, where they may not be a strong community group that would develop a sense of ownership on the pieces and that who would help watch for and report acts of vandalism.

He went on to say that he has been under siege of late in dealing with acts of graffiti and vandalism on City-owned artworks and memorials. He noted that some of these acts were perpetrated in well-observed areas such as the Columbus sculpture in front of Phipps Conservatory. Another act was perpetrated on a piece on the North Shore in which the piece was actually stolen. It was later recovered, but the point is that perhaps no public space is safe but for the pieces that were recently restored, and being that the pieces had led a “hard life”, and that there has been so much money and time spent on their restoration he greatly worried about placing these pieces in any outlying areas of the city. He went on to say that he would work with other areas of the city that were mentioned on other projects, but for these pieces, he needed to ensure their safety and well being as best he could. Mr. Brown stated that the living artists who had created these pieces were also a factor in the decision to relocate the pieces at this location. He gave Calaboyias and de Roy Gruber many options of sites—Westinghouse Park and Mt. Washington were two such options, that were flatly denied by both artists. He stated that he wished to please these artists as best he could out of respect for them and their pieces, and this was no easy task as they both wished to have their pieces in the most prominent of locations—and understandably so.

Mr. Brown went on to say that he does not perceive any further options of potential sites for these sculptures given the aforementioned reasons for this site selection and the negotiation of the two artists.

Ms. Slavick asked what would happen if the Commission did not approve this proposal.

Mr. Brown stated that he would get into trouble with the artists involved, as the City is under contract with Peter Calaboyias, at least, and if the project is delayed or denied at this point there could be a breach of contract. He also noted that the grant must be spent by the end of the year, or it might have to be returned to the foundation. This grant had already been given a one year extension due to the turnover in the Public Art Manager position and at that time, it was understood that the extension was only for one year and was given rather reluctantly at that.

Ms. Slavick stated that this is understood, but this project is a major deal. This is such a prominent location that this becomes a major image issue for the city. She went on to say that this whole notion of a dated concentration of sculptures is a problem for her.

Mr. Brown asked to respond to that. He stated that he does not mean to be argumentative, but if this artwork is what the City has in its collection, what is her suggestion—to break the pieces up and site them in separate locations?

Ms. Lockett stated this says a lot about how we view art in Pittsburgh. If it is true that we stopped acquiring art for the City's collection in the 1970's or 1980's then this is telling of how the City views art.

Mr. Brown interjected that there have been commissions more recent than this—some very recent but there is a large number from the 70's and 80's.

Ms. Lockett stated that this is understood, but the contemporary work does not outweigh the sheer volume of work produced in the 70's and 80's.

Ms. Slavick stated that on the one hand she commends the concentration of the sculptures because at least there is an aesthetic linkage, but because there is that concentration in this very prominent location it does send this signal that is like “Why?”--“Why here at this location... Why this kind of art—now—at this time at this location?” “Why is this art being placed in this location which it was not created for?” She went on to say that she feels the bind that you (Mr. Brown) or we (the Commission) are in, but that this proposal just doesn't sit right with her.

Ms. Klavon asked if Mr. Brown had thought of different spaces for the pieces.

Mr. Brown stated that yes (he reiterated as Ms. Klavon had left the room momentarily during the time that he discussed this previously) he had worked on this project for over a year and had visited and considered dozens of locations within the city. This was the only site that he had found that served the needs of the artwork, the artists and the community.

Ms. Klavon stated that the odd thing for her is that this is a very active recreation space; there is a baseball field, playground, etc...and now there is this other thinking for the use of part of this space. She went on to say that now that the Commission is thinking so intellectually about this proposal, that perhaps locating the pieces in the space is a good way to educate the public about art.

Ms. Briggs stated that this would be a good opportunity to educate people about art in this location, particularly about art made in the 70's, but—and she thought this is what Ms. Slavick was getting at—this is a very narrow period and scope of sculpture so the education, too would be very narrow and specific to that time period.

Ms. Slavick stated that she has no problem with art being in this space and the siting is fantastic as it does preserve the central open space, but the works proposed are dated.

Ms. Briggs agreed that there is an image issue here.

Mr. Brown stated that what he is saying is these are the sculptures that we have and this is the site that he selected. He went on to say that he has gone way down the road with the community on this proposal,

because he needed community support in order to present that to the Commission at this time. He stated that if the Commission feels strongly negative about this proposal, he would of course comply with that decision, but there would not be any other new art for this location any time in the near future as the scope of the grant—which is the only funding source available—does not allow for the commissioning of new artwork for this parcel or any other. He stated that maybe it is the preference of the Commission to look at other locations for these pieces, but if it is suggested that there should be more contemporary pieces interspersed with these pieces at this location---this is not going to happen at this time.

Mr. Indovina stated that the “other” new pieces do not exist.

Ms. Luckett affirmed this point.

Mr. Brown affirmed.

Ms. Luckett went on to say that this was one of her concerns as well when she first saw this proposal. She feared that this would say to the public that the City has not embraced any art since the 1980's.

Mr. Indovina stated that the other thing is that the pieces are all large scale, abstract pieces.

Ms. Luckett stated that the other thing is that she lives in the East End and drives by this location every day. Ms. Luckett stated that to place these pieces in the East End may seem a little elitist in that the East End does get a lot of attention from the City and developers with bike lanes, etc. She asked if Mr. Brown had thought of other locations—perhaps areas in the West End or others that do not have as much cultural amenities.

Mr. Brown stated that this was exactly what he addressed earlier.

Ms. Luckett stated that she was sorry that she missed that, as she had to step out of the hearing earlier.

Mr. Brown stated that he had traveled all over the West End and other neighborhoods. He stated that he used to run the Sprout program and in that position he had visited the vast majority of all Pittsburgh neighborhoods—he knows many neighborhoods very well at this point. He also stated that he must only consider City-owned property for locating City-owned artwork as well, so this narrows the options quite a bit. He stated that he empathizes with the comment, but with these pieces—having spent a tremendous amount of time and money to restore them, and by the fact that they have led a hard life already, he really fears placing them in locations that are not well observed and well trafficked. This is not to say that locations in places in Carrick or the West End are not well observed enough, but in his travels suitable City property in these neighborhoods has not been forthcoming.

Ms. Slavick stated that another factor with that is that in those neighborhoods, City parcels are most likely smaller in scale and the pieces are likely to again have no connection to those spaces.

Mr. Brown said that this was correct.

Ms. Ismail stated that this has never been an elitist activity. She stated that they have looked at other sites for wall-based existing sculpture as well and there has been no suitable City-owned sites. She went on to say that on this proposal, Mr. Brown has had so much support and so many community meetings that there is no seeming distaste from the community at large.

Mr. Brown stated that he has had various community meetings and several letters of support for the project were presented at the hearing. He stated that this particular community is very excited about receiving these pieces at this location.

Ms. Luckett stated that she would just caution Mr. Brown in that many Council members have expressed concern that their districts do not have the cultural amenities that the East End and Downtown do and they wish to see this change. If this project moves forward, he should be prepared for criticism to this affect.

Mr. Brown stated that some Council members have already tried to work on this project with him. He had driven around the West End for instance, with staff members from Theresa Kail-Smith's office looking for

locations. He stated that he knows this is a hard situation, but he has not found a suitable location in these areas. Mr. Brown stated that he does hear the Commission on this and does take this to heart.

Mr. Brown went on to say that at the last community meeting called by Councilman Peduto on June 14th (and this is the meeting that many of the letters of support are in response to), the Councilman had invited many City administrators to attend and speak to all of the things that are planned for this location in Mellon Park. He stated that along with himself, there was Mike Gable (Deputy Director of Public Works), Dick Skrinjar (Citiparks), Lisa Ceoffe (Urban Forester), Stephen Patchan (Bike/Ped Coordinator) and the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy in attendance. At this meeting it was announced that the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy would be engaged by Councilman Peduto to provide a master plan for this area of Mellon Park.

Mr. Indovina asked if it were for the entire Mellon Park or just this triangle.

Mr. Brown stated that is was for this triangle only—the area between Fifth and Penn.

Ms. Slavick asked what this means then, to either project.

Mr. Brown stated that he has a very congenial relationship with both the PPC and the Councilman, but this came as a surprise to him as he specifically asked both entities whether there were any plans to this affect before he started down the road with the sculpture proposal. He stated that he would have greatly paused on selecting this site if there were any plans such as this because it provides the potential for delay and would require careful coordination. To be made aware of these plans at this late date was very concerning to him as the master planning process is not funded and has not begun, so to coordinate the plans for the sculpture with the planning process is quirky at best. He stated that this is a wrinkle in this proposal, and places him in a tight spot. He stated that he would not step in front of a master planning project like this—and in the end it could be a great benefit to the area—but in some ways it does not make sense to proceed with a sculpture park when a planning process for the parcel may be forthcoming.

Mr. Brown went on to say that given the circumstances, he cannot wait until the planning process commences or is completed. Therefore, he has agreed with the community, Councilman Peduto and the PPC that the sculptures—if approved by the Art Commission—would be considered as existing conditions within the master plan and the plan would basically then work around the artwork.

Ms. Briggs interjected and asked if she should leave momentarily to pay the parking attendant.

Ms. Klavon stated that this is what she just did.

Mr. Indovina asked if this project needed action as he also had a previous engagement and needed to leave.

Ms. Briggs asked if the Commission could table this project at this time.

Ms. Ismail stated that the project is on a timeline and given that the Commission is in recess in August and September is the next hearing date, the project could run the risk of losing its funding if it becomes delayed further. She further stated that the artworks are ready to be delivered from the conservator and staff has already been over the city in considering other sites.

Ms. Rhor asked if that was the issue here, that the sculptures have to be placed or else the City loses its funding. Ms. Rhor asked to clarify that there are two issues here: 1) the pieces have to be placed or the project loses its funding and 2) the Damianos piece needs to be decided upon as to its removal to the new location.

Mr. Brown stated that the Damianos can certainly stay where it is if that is the will of the Commission, but he needs a decision and/or direction on the other pieces so that the grant money can be spent before the end of the year. If it is not, then there is real danger that the funding will have to be returned.

Ms. Rhor asked if Mr. Brown really feels that he has scoured the city in looking for alternative locations for these pieces.

Mr. Brown stated that this is correct.

Ms. Slavick asked to clarify that the funding is for the restoration and relocation of the pieces.

Mr. Brown stated that this is correct.

Ms. Slavick asked if there is an understanding that this is a permanent relocation.

Mr. Brown stated that this would most definitely be a permanent relocation.

Ms. Rhor stated that she now understood that this is a permanent relocation.

Mr. Indovina stated that if the money is expended to relocate, there would be no money to relocate again.

Ms. Slavick asked if the pieces needed to be moved again—assuming there is a new plan for this parcel later on—what would it take to do this? She asked if the cost for restoration is completed and done, then what would be the cost of relocating again in the future?

Mr. Brown stated that the restoration of five pieces total is about \$150,000. This includes installation costs for the Myford and Calaboyias, but does not include installation costs for the others. There is also a wall-based sculpture by Edward Bordas that is included in the restoration cost, but its installation costs have not yet been assessed. He stated that he did not come prepared today with the installation costs broken out of the budget, but that he recollects off the top of his head that the Calaboyias and Myford contracts were for about \$45,000 each which included restoration and re-installation. He reiterated that the grant was for \$300,000 and was meant to pay for the restoration and relocation of these pieces, and to provide conservation assessments for a number of other pieces in the City's collection.

Ms. Ismail asked to clarify that all of the pieces are being held in the same place.

Mr. Brown stated that this was correct with the exception of the Calaboyias piece---Mr. Calaboyias is restoring his own piece and has it kept here in Pittsburgh.

Ms. Klavon stated that she needed to get everyone back on track. She confirmed that Mr. Brown is requesting for Conceptual Approval today. Ms. Klavon stated that the options for the Commission are to table the project, or to accept the project for conceptual approval...

Mr. Indovina stated that the only other option is to vote it down—to deny.

Mr. Brown stated that if the Commission denies without conditions, that this would require him to only reapply after one year has passed. He asked that this option not be taken.

Ms. Rhor asked when the pieces are coming back to Pittsburgh.

Mr. Brown stated that the pieces will return when he gives the greenlight to do so. He stated that the Conservator is storing them currently at no charge, but this situation cannot last much longer.

Ms. Klavon stated that the Commission needed to go to the audience for comment. Seeing that there were no audience members present, the hearing proceeded without public comment.

Ms. Ismail stated that this project has been discussed so many times over—even within the staff and Director's report section of prior Art Commission hearings—and there has never been any objections before this time. Given this, we have moved forward with the community process and involving the Councilperson and it is her feeling that the project is a little far out of the gate at this point to start over. She asked the Commission to consider this point as it decides on the matter.

Many of the Commission members asked to clarify that this project was discussed at the Art Commission before.

Ms. Klavon stated that she did not recall this. Ms. Rhor concurred.

Ms. Ismail stated that it was discussed during the Director's report section of a prior Art Commission hearing and that she remembers this well.

Ms. Klavon stated that this might be true, but this site was never discussed.

Ms. Ismail stated that it was.

Mr. Brown stated that he had never projected any images or made a formal proposal, but he had talked about it at least on one occasion that Ms. Ismail was referencing, if not others.

Ms. Briggs asked why the project was not discussed or approved conceptually much earlier in the process. Ms. Briggs stated that there is not much information in the application and not much has happened in the project—other than photographing the area—other than Mr. Brown doing a lot of leg-work—and making this decision to site the pieces here. She stated that it seemed to her that the “big idea” of the project could have been discussed before Mr. Brown did all of the leg work and had gone down the road with the community and so forth.

Ms. Klavon stated that the big idea was vetted long ago in the acquiring of the grant.

Mr. Indovina stated that he liked the big idea, but the mixture of the pieces seems to be an issue.

Ms. Briggs stated that she and Ms. Slavick are new to this process, but feels that there are lots of reasons to pause on this proposal. She stated that she agreed with Ms. Slavick that this is a gigantic statement about the identity of Pittsburgh, for better or for worse and for an area that is rapidly developing. She stated that if she was asked in a vacuum to provide her opinion on which pieces of art would best represent the identity of Pittsburgh, it would not be these sculptures in this place. She stated that this is where she and Ms. Slavick are feeling the most resistance to this proposal.

Ms. Slavick stated that her heart is wrenching because she understands how much has been invested in this proposal, but she does not want to see projects get approval just because they have “gone too far down the road”.

---various Commissioners speaking simultaneously---

Ms. Ismail stated that the project has not occurred in a vacuum. This project has been vetted through a community process and has been discussed with the Commission before—with no opposition.

Ms. Slavick stated that she is not getting the understanding that the other “older Commissioners” recall that this project was ever discussed.

Ms. Rhor stated that she was not aware of this project before this proposal was submitted this month. She stated that she was aware of the grant—and she is relatively new to the Commission as well—but she had never heard this project discussed before today's hearing. She concurred with Ms. Slavick's assertion that the Commission cannot approve a project because it has gone too far down the road. She mentioned the decision to table the Schenley Plaza restaurant—and how that was a hard decision because that applicant as well was on a timeline—but all worked out better for the project in the end and the applicant was pleased with the result. Some of the same issues were at hand with that project as well, such as the “identity of Pittsburgh”, prominent location, etc. She stated that this is what they are here for is to figure out what is that next step rather than where have we been.

She went on to say that the City's collection is heavily populated with pieces of this type and style and there aren't many options for other pieces to be considered. She stated that she is also very cognizant of the argument stated by the other Commissioners of the problems associated with the pieces going into this area for the demographics and development happening in that area. She stated that this is a tricky situation in that you have these pieces and have to put them somewhere—there are also pressures of funding and so

forth to consider—but she wondered if there should be a larger discussion similar to that of the Schenley Plaza restaurant as this was a good case and outcome. This discussion was not only about the restaurant, but a discussion of what we want to see Pittsburgh become—a growing art-sphere with high quality developments. She stated that even though Mr. Brown has been at this project for a year, it is still new to her, and she would like to have a larger discussion.

Ms. Slavick stated that she feels that this project just needs more discussion and thinking applied to it.

Ms. Klavon asked why Ms. Slavick and others feel that the sculpture park would be such a “statement” for Pittsburgh.

Ms. Slavick stated that this was due to the fact that all of the sculptures are from a certain decade, they are all hard metal, they are all abstract (except for the Forbes Road piece), and they all typify a kind of public art that frankly, is really out of fashion and she stated that she is not talking about a trend...

Ms. Klavon asked if she was saying that it would be better not to re-commission the pieces.

Ms. Slavick stated that already has been done, and she did not want to go there.

Ms. Rhor asked if it were possible to work within the proposed master plan for the park in order to determine new contemporary artwork to be embedded in that plan.

Mr. Brown stated yes, but if they do not have funding for the plan itself currently, how are they going to fund artwork as well—and what would be the timing of such?

Ms. Klavon stated that some groups have proposed memorial projects for the parks of late, and this would be a worry for her—that any new “artworks” might take on this manifestation which would be problematic.

Mr. Brown stated that all of what was just said is possible, but what he really needs from the Commission is clear direction on this proposal. He stated that if the Commission is saying that a collection of 1970’s art in this single location is distasteful, and that the preference is to break them up and find new separate locations then he is going to go down that road. If the preference is to keep the pieces at this location with modifications to the proposal, then he will go down that road as fast as he can to make ends meet before the end of the year. In either case, he stated the need for direction as he must redouble his efforts to see this through within the time and budget constraints that he has.

Ms. Slavick stated that she is not saying that it is distasteful to have the pieces as a collection, and aesthetically, she does believe that they function as a cluster. She stated that she believed Mr. Brown that there are not very many options for breaking the pieces up into separate locations. She stated that her question is really whether the pieces should be placed in this prominent location—which has an undetermined plan perhaps coming to fruition soon and all of this new development going on around and in it and within a community that is already art-heavy in its demographics—she was not sure that this was the right site. She went on to say that because this proposal is so new to her, she has not even had time to absorb it. She stated that given the funding constraints—she did not know if it were possible, but in the Netherlands there is a sculpture park that has sculpture very similar to this within it. These sculptures at this park are within a bicycle-laned park where people can stop and look at each one and each piece is sort of nestled in the forest along this path. She asked if there were places along the bike trails for these pieces here in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Brown stated that his proposal is to place these sculptures along a pedestrian path in Mellon Park. He asked what makes it different to place the pieces along a bike path. Would the latter be more secluded?

Ms. Klavon stated that Ms. Slavick was saying that the bike path would be more linear, whereas the Mellon Park site is more in the round.

Ms. Slavick stated that this was correct and in this way, the sculptures could be spaced three miles apart. She went on to say that there are recognized problems with the sculpture concentration on the North Shore and she is not advocating for that either...

Ms. Briggs stated that the parking attendant seems to be leaving (looking out the window) and she must leave.

Ms. Klavon stated that there still is a quorum at this point, but several Commissioners must leave soon given the lengthy nature of the agenda.

Ms. Slavick asked if it would be detrimental to the project if it were tabled at this time.

Mr. Brown stated that none of the Commission's feedback is going to coincide with his plans at this point, so he asked for direction from the Commission on moving forward.

Ms. Ismail stated that the Commission must understand that the sculptures can only reside on City-owned properties, as well so this limits the options that are available. Ms. Ismail stated that there were always some concerns about locating the pieces in Mellon Park and several sites—including the West End—were investigated, only to point back to the Mellon Park location in the end. She stated that the limitations to this project are that we need to get this done quickly as it has been hanging on for over a year at this point just for the relocation piece and this needs to be done and the money spent before the end of this year or else we might lose the funding. Additionally, these pieces have already been conserved and now need to be removed from their current locations at the conservator because they cannot be stored indefinitely and again, City-owned parcels are the only possible locations—of which we do not have a lot of right now that are not already spoken for in terms of planning or development.

Ms. Slavick stated that this brings up another question. She asked how many spaces like this are left in the city for use in commissioning new works of art.

Ms. Ismail stated that this cannot be a consideration for this parcel at this time as there are no monies with which to commission new artworks currently, and this proposal does not include new works but rather is for the relocation of these existing pieces.

Ms. Slavick asked how many spaces like this does the city have left in the case that thirty years or so down the line the city decided to commission new pieces of art for its property in like manner to this project.

Mr. Brown stated that questions such as this should be answered through the public art component of the comprehensive plan that is about to commence. He stated that this is a valid question, but sometimes one has to make a decision, stick with it, and make it right in situations like this.

Ms. Ismail stated that it is like buying an elephant that you cannot feed.

Ms. Rhor stated that Mr. Brown first posited this proposal as a sculpture park. She went on to say that in thinking of this from an art historical or curatorial perspective, in what ways would this become a sculpture park? She asked Mr. Brown if he were planning to engage the public in a different way once the sculptures were introduced to this parcel. She asked if there were some sort of engagement forum for the public, such as the notion that sculpture could be aligned with a bike path.

Mr. Brown stated that he could not envision further engagement of the public in this location other than to arrange the sculptures along the pedestrian path as they were proposed. He went on to say that he was planning to hold an artist lecture series in conjunction with the installation of the sculptures that would help raise awareness and public inclusion around the sculpture installation and hopefully develop a sense of ownership along with that awareness and education on the importance of these works as local history/local artists connection. He noted that there will be signage, lighting and so forth, but there were no other forms of public engagement that he could envision for this place.

Mr. Brown stated that he is hearing that the project needs to be tabled at this point.

Ms. Klavon stated that she thought so as well.

Mr. Brown stated that this is fine, but the question is about how to proceed with the project as it comes back to the Commission. He asked for direction from the Commission. He asked if the Commission would like him to investigate individual sites for the pieces. He stated that he has about a dozen folders, maps and data back at the office with information on the sites that were investigated as part of this process. He stated that he can go back to that, although this has been looked at very carefully and the living artists had also been asked to decide on these sites, which adds a layer of complexity.

Ms. Klavon stated that she would have to defer to the two artists on the Commission as this is not her area of expertise.

Mr. Indovina stated that he is an architect, and would also have to defer to the two artists on the Commission on this point.

Ms. Klavon stated that she would have never thought that having these pieces collected together was a bad thing.

Ms. Slavick stated that she did not want to be misunderstood. She stated that she was not saying that having the pieces together was a bad thing.

Mr. Brown stated that this is what he heard.

Ms. Briggs stated that this was not the point.

Ms. Slavick stated that she had said multiple times that the layout and consideration of the placement of the pieces was very good and well-considered. She stated that she was not arguing that point. She stated that her problem with this is that it is placing a particular period, aesthetic, and style of artwork in this very prominent location in Mellon Park that will send a signal to visitors. She went on to say that these pieces will seem new to a lot of people and will send a message to them that this is the state of contemporary art in Pittsburgh. She stated that this is especially concerning because she feels that there is a very limited opportunity to utilize a public space for this scale of a project in the future.

Mr. Brown stated that he can guarantee that he will not place these pieces in non-prominent locations for all of the reasons he mentioned before.

Ms. Slavick stated that she is not saying that the pieces should be hidden away.

Mr. Brown stated that if he were to place one or all of these in the middle of a place like Sheridan, anyone might look at these and think that these are brand new sculptures, the like of which they have never seen before. He went on to say that he was just saying that you might get that reaction from anyone no matter where you place these pieces. Mr. Brown stated that he thought he understood what Ms. Slavick was saying, but again, these are the pieces that the City has in its collection and he did not believe that one would ever escape this perceived problem in any neighborhood site. Mr. Brown stated that he does not know how to ever get away from this problem, even if you placed the pieces in individual sites, rather than a collection.

Ms. Rhor asked where the Janet Zweig piece was located in relation to this proposed site in Mellon Park. Mr. Brown stated that the Janet Zweig piece is located within the Walled Garden, just behind the Pittsburgh Center for the Arts, just off of Shady and Fifth Avenues. The proposed sculpture site is down the road (Fifth Avenue) from PCA at Fifth and Penn Avenues, basically.

Ms. Slavick stated that she is not even saying “no” to the project, but she is requesting more time to consider it by tabling the project at this time.

Mr. Indovina stated that he concurred as it was pointless to keep debating and discussing these points at this time.

Ms. Klavon stated that she needed a motion to table this proposal.

---several Commissioners speaking on the side---

Ms. Slavick stated that she is not against the project, it is just that this is a big proposal that needs more consideration.

Ms. Klavon stated again that a motion to table is needed.

Mr. Indovina moved to table the project until a later date.

Ms. Briggs seconded.

MOTION: To table the project.

MOVED: Indovina

SECONDED: Briggs

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

- h. Restoration of Caliguiri Map: Final
 - o Morton Brown, Public Art Division

Mr. Brown stated that at the request of the Commission from Conceptual Review of this project, he had investigated anti-skater devices for the Caliguiri Map. Seeing no such devices that could be applied without disrupting the intended aesthetic of the piece, he reported that he would propose to restore the piece as is without anti-skater devices. He went on to say that opening up the ventilation holes and screening them from behind should take care of the oxidation and foreign matter that has been a problem.

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

MOVED: Indovina

SECONDED: Briggs

IN FAVOR: All

OPPOSED: None

CARRIED

Meeting Adjourned