

**ART COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF September 22, 2010**  
**BEGINNING AT 2:00 P.M.**

**PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION:**

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

**PRESENT OF THE STAFF:**

**Morton Brown, Noor Ismail**

**A. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

The minutes from May and June were approved with an amendment stating that June's minutes were not approved by a full quorum of Commission members. Mr. Brown stated that the minutes of July were not able to be approved because they were not finished at this time.

**B. Correspondence**

There was no correspondence.

**C. Items for Review**

- a. City-owned Sculpture in Mellon Park: Conceptual
  - o Morton Brown, Public Art Division, City of Pittsburgh

Mr. Morton Brown introduced himself as the Public Art Manager for the City of Pittsburgh. He explained that this project was brought to the Art Commission in July and was tabled at that time. He stated he was there to re-present the project with a few minor modifications. He invited Lea Donatelli from The Office of Public Art (OPA) to explain how this project came about from her perspective.

Ms. Lea Donatelli introduced herself as the Program Manager of OPA. She said that in 2006, OPA, a partnership between the Department of City Planning and the Greater Pittsburgh Arts Council, developed a database of city-owned public sculpture. Prior to the creation of the Public Art Division and the Public Art Manager position, OPA provided technical assistance to the Department of City Planning. One project that OPA developed was the creation of a database of city-owned public artwork. Prior to the creation of this database, there was not a place within the City where the collection was documented.

Ms. Donatelli stated that to create this database, OPA researched Art Commission records, contacted various city departments, and spoke with several community organizations. An on-site assessment of each of artwork in the database was conducted using the Save Outdoor Sculpture! conservation assessment form. Save Outdoor Sculpture! is a program of Heritage Preservation, The National Institute for Conservation. Over 110 on-site assessments were conducted and photographs of the existing conditions and location of the artworks were entered into the database.

Ms. Donatelli further added that around this time, Councilman William Peduto received a call from one of his constituents, Peter Calaboyias, asking if there was any progress on locating his sculpture *Five Factors* that was once at the Squirrel Hill Library. The location of his sculpture was soon determined and an article in the Post Gazette showed Calaboyias standing atop his sculpture at the DPW Construction Division lot underneath the 62<sup>nd</sup> Street Bridge. From this article, OPA found artworks by Thomas Morandi, Edward Bordas, and James Myford. In order to mitigate any further damage to these artworks, OPA managed the relocation of the following sculptures to a city-owned indoor storage facility.

Ms. Donatelli said OPA then issued a Request for Proposals for conservators to perform conservation assessments on the above mentioned artworks. Intermuseum Conservation Association (ICA) was engaged to develop these reports.

Ms. Donatelli then stated that with the development of the database and the discovery of these artworks, it was evident that the City's public art collection was in dire need of attention. She said OPA worked with the Director of City Planning to write a grant to the Richard King Mellon Foundation for the conservation of these five artworks, along with twenty additional conservation assessments and educational programs relating to this conservation work. This grant application was submitted in June 2007.

Ms. Donatelli said that four out of the five artworks were originally installed at the Carnegie Library in Squirrel Hill, but were removed when the renovations to the library commenced. The fifth piece, *Steelcityscape* by Aaronel deRoy Gruber, was once installed on the portico of the City-County building, relocated and installed at the current site of the Convention Center, and then removed and placed in storage when construction for the new convention center began.

Ms. Donatelli said in December 2007, the Department of City Planning received a \$300,000 grant from the Richard King Mellon Foundation for the Public Art Division to conserve, restore and re-install the five above-mentioned artworks from the City's public art collection, conduct an additional 20 conservation assessments on works in the collection, and provide educational programming around the conservation efforts. With this grant, the City of Pittsburgh Public Art Division began a conservation effort on a nationally-recognized scale.

Ms. Donatelli then stated that the application to conserve and relocate the five artworks was presented to the Art Commission in February 2007 and was approved. She said three pieces (deRoy Gruber, Bordas, and Morandi) were sent to McKay Lodge Conservation Laboratory in Oberlin, Ohio for restoration and the other two (Calaboyias and Myford) were currently being restored by the artists.

Mr. Brown said he was really happy that OPA had stepped in to move this project forward. He explained that when he first took the position of Public Art Manager in February of 2009, these pieces had just been shipped to Oberlin, OH.

Mr. Brown stated there is an issue of timing. The RK Mellon grant was a two year grant that was meant to be diminished last year. However, RK Mellon allowed them a one-year extension given their employee turnover. He said they are expected to expend that grant by the end of this year. Additionally, the conservator has been graciously storing the pieces for the City of Pittsburgh for over six months. Mr. Brown said the conservator has not been charging them for storage, but believes this will run out very soon.

Mr. Brown then stated that since the artworks are owned by the City of Pittsburgh, and the original sites are no longer available, he could only consider City-owned property with which to re-site the sculptures. The criteria used to determine a good site for the sculptures were based upon visibility (both from a pedestrian and vehicular perspective), pedestrian accessibility, and sustainability.

Mr. Brown said his goal was to choose a location that is frequented and/or observed and cared for by a community group or City agents, which is essential. He explained placing a sculpture in a secluded location allows for graffiti, vandalism and theft, whereas in a well-trafficked and well-observed location community members will not only watch but call when and if something adverse occurs. This is especially the case if community support for the project is established at the start of the project.

Mr. Brown stated that Grandview Park was chosen as the site for the Myford sculpture, and three of the sculptures were proposed to go into Mellon Park. He said given the comments in the last Art Commission hearing, he decided to remove the blue cubed Caliboyias piece from consideration. He then displayed a map illustrating the green spaces in the City of Pittsburgh, stating that he is working in collaboration with the Open Space, Parks and Recreation portion of the Comprehension Plan for the City of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Brown stated that over 34 sites were investigated for possible placement of these sculptures, which he said are clearly listed in the application. He said the list includes both city owned sites and green spaces.

Mr. Brown then stated that there is a red abstract wall mounted piece also being conserved by Edward Bordas that he has not yet shown to the Art Commission, which also used to be on display at the Squirrel Hill Library. He said he was led to the Arlington Fire House, which he believes was designed by the Astorino group. He said that in choosing this building, he was really looking for that architectural context that the Bordas piece originally had. However, there is not much ground area around the building in which to place the other sculptures, and he found it would be tricky not to have these pieces compete with the architecture. He also noted that the façade of the Fire House was deteriorating, so Public Works has it on their list to refurbish later on in the future. Therefore, Mr. Brown felt placing this artwork on the Fire House at this time would be a wasteful expenditure of funds, especially when the Fire House itself needs reconstructing.

Mr. Brown also investigated a few of the Carnegie Libraries which are sitting on city property. (The buildings are generally not city property, but the parcel is.) He said he was again looking for an architectural context, in which he thought the historical building of the library would not be conducive to the modern sculptures. Additionally, there was not a lot of ground space surrounding the library to place the sculptures. He then stated that he thought the Morandi piece would fit well with the architecture of the Woods Run Carnegie Library. However, when he approached the Woods Run Library with this idea, he was informed that they had intentions on buying this land from the city. He also got the sense that they were not really in favor of the piece to begin with. So given these facts, he stayed away from this site.

Mr. Brown stated he also looked at recreation centers and parking garages for possible locations. He said the Port Authority is a separate and distinct entity from the city, so if he were to put a piece on their property, there would probably have to be some sort of arrangement made. It is not just a straight exchange of land. He also worried about advertising issues similar to what occurred at the Pittsburgh International Airport last year.

Mr. Brown said he also looked at a lot of different parks, such as Arsenal Park in Lawrenceville, which has a beautiful reservoir that is no longer in use. He said he actually offered this site to a couple of the artists, but again decided to back away from this area not knowing what will happen with any future renovation projects. They also did not like the backdrop of an unused reservoir. Mr. Brown said he also backed away from Friendship Park, because he was told a project was pending for this park in 2009. He said he is not currently sure where this project is now.

Mr. Brown said he also looked at the West End Overlook as a possible location. He said there is a Modern architecture building that could play off well with the Modern sculptures. However, he was concerned over the secluded nature of the park. Additionally, the slope is very steep, so a lot of grading and landscaping would have to be done. Mr. Brown then stated that West End Park too is very secluded, and there is already a Frank Vittour sculpture at this location which he believes would conflict with the aforementioned sculptures.

Mr. Brown stated that he also considered Schenley Oval and Schenley Park, which has a similar character to his selected site, Mellon Square. However, Schenley Park has so much ad-hoc sports activities that this site simply would not be conducive to sculptures of such a large scale.

He also looked at the David Lawrence Convention Center, where *Steelcityscape* by Aaronel deRoy Gruber was last displayed. He said that currently the site contains a lot of machinery, and there is talk of developing paths and other infrastructures around the Convention Center. Mr. Brown said he did not like this site anyway, because while it allows for a lot of vehicular traffic, there is not much pedestrian traffic although he believes this will change when the paths are constructed.

Mr. Brown said that in September of 2009, he was able to secure a site for the Jim Myford sculpture in Grandview Park, which received both conceptual and final approval in June 2010 from the Art Commission. He stated the piece was donated by the Mayor to the park for its 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary. He also

mentioned that Councilwoman Kell-Smith and Councilman Krauss were very instrumental in getting this piece in this location.

After investigating each of the above sites, Mr. Brown decided to collect the three sculptures in Mellon Park at Fifth and Penn Avenues to afford the best visibility and potential for community ownership. He again stated that he has removed the Damianos piece from consideration. Mr. Brown said that he has spoken to Syl Damianos on several occasions, and he has expressed that he just wants his piece restored back to its original rust color. Mr. Damianos also stated that he is fine with relocation, but is also in favor of his piece remaining at its current location outside the Children's Museum.

Ms. Klavon asked for clarification if Mr. Damianos is in favor of his piece relocating.

Mr. Brown said he is in favor of it relocating, but he is also in favor of it staying exactly where it is. In fact, Mr. Brown said he believes Mr. Damianos would prefer his piece stay where it is, because it is in its original site.

Mr. Brown then showed a projected configuration of the sculptures in Mellon Park, and pointed out a Clark Winters sculpture near Reizenstein Elementary School. He said this piece gave the Park a context which drew him to this site for the other sculptures. He pointed out that Pittsburgh Center for the Arts which currently has some Tim Collin temporary sculptures is at a far distance from the site. He also pointed out the location of the Janet Zweig piece which he said a few Commission members asked him about last time.

Mr. Brown said the larger monumental sculptures will be placed at points that can be seen from great distances. Calaboyias' piece will be seen down Penn Avenue from Bakery Square. DeRoy Gruber's artwork will be seen from the approach of Fifth Avenue, and marks the main entrance to the park. And the Morandi artwork will be installed at the entrance at Penn Avenue along the path.

Mr. Brown said that after he selected this site in late 2009, he spoke to Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy and Councilman Peduto to see if they had any plans for this particular spot. Mr. Brown said there were no plans, although Councilman Peduto had led some envisioning initiatives on this parcel in the past.

After engaging PPC and Councilman Peduto, Mr. Brown stated he also held three community meetings in which the plans for this project were presented. The first meeting was held at the Shadyside Action Coalition Board Meeting on Thursday, April 8, 2010. At this meeting, the SAC Board was unanimously in favor of the project. The second meeting on June 14, 2010 was called by Councilman Peduto and involved a larger discussion of the Park as a whole. This meeting had approximately 100 persons in attendance from the Ellis School, North Point Breeze, Squirrel Hill, Shadyside Action Coalition, Larimer Consensus Group, East Liberty Development, and other additional community members from these neighborhoods. This presentation went well and very positive feedback was garnered from the community. There were some concerns raised as to graffiti and children climbing on the sculpture, but no one was opposed. A third meeting was held with on August 10, 2010 to discuss the placement of the sculptures and to discuss plans for a Master Plan for this section of Mellon Park.

Mr. Brown then stated that Councilman Peduto is planning to engage the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy in a Master Plan for this section of Mellon Park that will consider these sculptures, if approved by the Art Commission, an existing condition of the park as it seeks to augment the rest of the area.

Mr. Brown then stated that he was there at the Art Commission seeking Conceptual Approval upon which he will return with construction documents at his earliest ability.

Ms. Klavon asked the Art Commission if they had any questions.

Mr. Astorino thanked Mr. Brown and Ms. Donatelli for their comprehensive presentation. He then asked if they really thought people would be able to see the Caliboyias piece from Penn Ave, because it seems like a very long distance.

Mr. Brown said it is a long distance, but the piece itself is 10' tall, and an overall link is 25'. He said he thinks people will be able to see it.

Mr. Astorino then pointed out that the color on the Aaronel deRoy Gruber piece has changed several times, and asked what the original color was.

Mr. Brown said it was silver. He said he has spoken to the artist several times, and she has said the piece is supposed to be silver, but in the photographs it really looks white.

Ms. Slavick pointed out that in the photograph of the piece at the City Council building, the piece was pink.

Mr. Brown said that at some point it was painted pink and they did not really know why or by whom, but it is not supposed to be pink.

Mr. Astorino asked what then the intention was.

Mr. Brown said it was to return the piece back to its original color, silver.

Ms. Slavick noted that the Morandi piece was shown on the pathway, and asked if the other pieces would also be on the pathway.

Mr. Brown said that he did not want to take up the central green space because there are ad-hoc athletic activities and gatherings that occur there. Therefore, he tried to ring-around this central green space by staying close to the pedestrian path. He said he also does not want people to step off the path and onto a sculpture; therefore he is trying to give the pieces some separation from the path. He said that the Morandi piece will fit nicely into the triangle created by the splitting paths, and pedestrians will be able to easily get around it.

Ms. Slavick said that it just seems that the other sculptures are nicely set off by the grass, and the Morandi piece seems to be surrounded by asphalt. She said she did not know if this site served it as well as the other settings.

Mr. Brown said that he, Renee Piechocki and Ms. Donatelli have grappled with this issue, and he was eager to hear the Art Commission's advice. He explained that he was trying to create a rhythm that a pedestrian walking along the path would come across a sculpture every so often, which is why he placed the Morandi piece down in its sector. However, he said he was still open to suggestions on the exact placing of the sculpture within that sector. He said his only problem with not placing the sculpture on the triangle is that it looks like something is supposed to be placed on the triangle.

Ms. Slavick said if there was more funding it would be nice to pull the paths a part to provide the piece more breathing room. She said from the current point of view, the piece looks very constricted and jammed into the space.

Mr. Brown pointed out that he was showing a Photoshop rendering and the sizes were not exact. He said his measurements indicate there will be green space around the piece.

Ms. Klavon stated that the space in the photograph without the sculpture looks entirely different.

Mr. Brown said the photograph is really deceiving, and that it appears that the slope is great but it really is not.

Ms. Klavon asked what the surface underneath the sculpture is.

Mr. Brown answered grass.

Ms. Lockett asked how big the plot of grass was.

Mr. Brown said the height of the triangle is about 26' and the base about 22 to 24' across.

Ms. Lockett asked how much space Mr. Brown surmised would surround the sculpture.

Mr. Brown said approximately a foot or two.

Ms. Briggs asked for clarification that one of the four pieces under the \$300,000 RK Mellon Grant was actually recreated.

Mr. Brown said two of the pieces were recreated: the Myford and the Caliboyias.

Ms. Briggs then asked OPA for clarification on their managing of the relocation of the artworks to the storage facility to issuing an RFP. She asked who made the decision to conserve and rebuild these four sculptures.

Ms. Donatelli said the RFP for conservation was done in 2006, so they could get an idea of the costs involved in conserving these artworks. These conservation assessments helped to inform the grant that they asked for from RK Mellon. She asked if Ms. Brigg's question was who decided to move forward with the rebuilding of the Myford and the Caliboyias.

Ms. Briggs clarified and said her question was whose idea was it to raise the money and conserve two pieces and completely rebuild two pieces for the city.

Ms. Donatelli said the idea to raise the money was then Director of City Planning's Pat Ford and Councilman Peduto. The decision to rebuild the two works was done in 2008 when Kim Baker was the Public Art Manager and she made the decision to move forward with the artists to rebuild the artworks because the efforts to conserve the damage would be more expensive. Ms. Donatelli said this was proposed to the Art Commission at that time and approved by the Art Commission.

Ms. Rohr thanked Mr. Brown for the comprehensive overview. She said she was not aware of the whole history of the site visits. She said this was very eye opening for someone new on the Art Commission.

Mr. Gable said he likes the idea of where the sculptures have been placed, but he is not sure if he is entirely sold on "which one in which place." He said that he would like to experience these pieces not only on foot, but while he is driving down Penn Ave, and suggested some thought be put into this.

Mr. Astorino agreed and said he would flip the locations of the deRoy Gruber and Caliboyias pieces. He said this is just a quick reaction.

Mr. Brown said all of these comments are good and not impossible to entertain. However, he said in the case of the Caliboyias piece he does run the risk of choosing a location that is too open. He said part of placing the pieces in relation to trees gives the works a frame of reference to its scale.

Ms. Klavon said she thought this would be too close to the baseball field.

Ms. Slavick said she actually likes the selected location, because the lateral placement suits the open space, whereas the entrance to the Park seems like a tighter space. She noted that they were judging from Photoshopped photographs, so it was difficult to tell.

Ms. Briggs said she thought it would be extremely helpful to Mr. Brown if the entire Art Commission just went on a site visit to help choose locations for the pieces after they give Conceptual Approval.

Mr. Brown said he welcomes that and requests it.

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 of the project.

Mr. Dan Gilmore introduced himself as the Chief of Staff for Councilman Bill Peduto. He read a letter written by Mr. Peduto in full support of the project that he wanted submitted for the record. He also submitted letters of support from the Shadyside Action Coalition and Enid and Harold Miller, who are residents of Point Breeze.

Mr. Vince Watchhorn introduced himself as the Associate Head of School at the Ellis School which is the immediate contiguous neighbor of Mellon Park. He said they feel this is a great opportunity educationally for their girls. He said they think it is a great opportunity to teach art outside the classroom and to give girls the opportunity to recognize what it is like to live with art, not just to see it as a special occasion in a classroom or a museum. He said they feel it would be a gift to have a “museum” of a certain type of sculpture right next door.

Mr. Watchhorn said that as a neighbor, he really sees this area growing as the Penn and Fifth Ave “Arts Corridor.” He said he likes the idea of people engaging with art as they walk through the park. He said it will be easy to see the prominence of these sculptures on the landscape. He stated that the Ellis School as an institution and he personally as a neighbor are very much in favor of this project.

Mr. Jule Bernard introduced himself as a partner at the architecture firm IKM Downtown, and a resident at 122 Elision Street. He said he is only three houses away from Mellon Park. He said he was there to voice his very enthusiastic support. He said that placing the sculptures around the perimeter of the park makes a lot of sense, since many kids use the central green space. He also added that when the Art Commission goes to do their site visit, they will be pleased to know a Coffee Tree Roasters has just opened up in Bakery Square.

Ms. Klavon asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in opposition to the project.

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

Ms. Briggs stated that she does not doubt for a second that there has not been a lot of hard work that has gone into writing the grants, finding the conservators, etc. However, taking these four, in her opinion, frankly mediocre examples of sculpture for that time and choosing to restore and rebuild them is a questionable decision. She understands this decision cannot be redone, but to spread these pieces throughout the city makes a strong statement about Pittsburgh’s perspective on contemporary Public Art. She said to place all of them in a prominent location developing in the City of Pittsburgh makes an even stronger statement about Pittsburgh’s idea of what is important in Contemporary Art, and that statement is looking backwards and not looking forwards, which she thinks is a dangerous thing they do not want to repeat. Ms. Briggs stated she feels she has a responsibility on this Commission to go on record and say this. She said she is not arguing that they should not approve this after all of the hard work that has gone into it. However, they do need to make forward-looking decisions.

Ms. Slavick said she thought Ms. Briggs stated this very well.

Ms. Klavon asked if there was a motion to approve.

Ms. Rohr said that she wanted to second Ms. Briggs’ earlier comment that a site visit be in order.

Ms. Lockett said that she wanted to go on record and say that she too wants Pittsburgh to be forward-looking in their future decisions.

Ms. Briggs made the motion to approve.

After the motion was made, Mike Gable from Public Works stated that there was this impression that Public Works may have not respected these pieces, but wanted to say that they were only doing what they

were asked. He stated they were asked to remove pieces from Carnegie Library in Squirrel Hill, and these were placed in their storage yard which was not a dump. He said the same was true of the sculpture on the City Council Portico. He said they were probably instrumental in moving it down to the Ford Duquesne median, but were once again asked to move the piece into storage where they have limited space. He stated that these pieces were not necessarily damaged from their lack of maintenance. In fact, the pieces were already in bad shape when Public Works was first asked to move them. In referencing the article, he said if the artist had called the right people, they could have easily told them the location of his piece. He then commended Noor Ismail, Mr. Brown, Ms. Piechocki and Ms. Donatelli for creating a database that accounts for all of the city's art and their locations.

**MOTION: To grant conceptual approval of the project as submitted with the condition that a site visit be conducted by the Art Commission.**

**MOVED: Briggs**

**SECONDED: Astorino**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

- 
- b. Revitalization of Allegheny Square Park: Courtesy/Informational Update
  - Chris Siefert, Deputy Director, Children's Museum of Pittsburgh
  - Andrea Cochran, Andrea Cochran Landscape Architecture
  - Ned Kahn, Artist

Mr. Brown laid out the most recent site plans for the project from June and September.

Mr. Chris Siefert introduced himself as the Deputy Director of the Children's Museum of Pittsburgh. He said this will be the third time the Revitalization of Allegheny Square Park project has come to the Art Commission. First Review in September 2008 resulted in no ruling with specific conditions including a site visit. The second review in June 2009 resulted in Conceptual Approval with several conditions to be met. Mr. Siefert said he was here today for an informational courtesy review that was part of the Art Commission's conditions. He said they have just completed 100% design development, and are getting ready to move into their construction document phase. He said that he hopes they will be able to bring completed construction documents for final approval in February 2011. He said the city does not have a Master Plan for local parks and its budgetary constraints have prevented it from developing the park on its own, therefore it has encouraged partnerships like this one with the Museum.

Mr. Siefert introduced Jane Werner, the Executive Director, Children's Museum; Ned Kahn, the artist and a MacArthur Fellow and with whom the Children's Museum has had a long relationship; Andrea Cochran of Andrea Cochran Landscape Architecture, a San Francisco based firm and a recent finalist at the Cooper Hewett Design Awards; Jennifer Knot, the Project Manager at Andrea Cochran Landscape Architecture; and Dennis McCarthy, the Project Manager at the Children's Museum.

Mr. Siefert stated that the Children's Museum plans to revitalize Allegheny Public Square Park, which is currently a sunken concrete plaza designed in 1967 by William Brazer, and return the park to its former role of a central "town green" in the midst of an urban landscape. The proposed design builds on historic sightlines and circulation patterns, adding layers of sustainability and public art with contemporary uses.

Mr. Siefert said that due to the economy in 2007, 08 and 09, they really put the project into a holding pattern. It was not until this past Spring that they were able to get back to the project, as this was when they were given Conceptual Approval by the Art Commission. Mr. Siefert said that at that time they were at \$4 million of their \$6 million budget.

In 2007 they held a design competition that invited six design teams. A panel of ten chose Andrea Cochran's design as the winner. He said they have now just completed their design development phase.

Mr. Siefert said he hopes they will be mobilizing by next year, and dedicating the park in 2012. Mr. Siefert went on to say that the park is about 34,000 square feet, or about an acre in size. He said this site once marked the center of Allegheny City.

Ms. Andrea Cochran introduced herself. She said the goals of the project were to improve connections, honor the history of the site, create flexible spaces for a variety of users, increase green space, reduce paving, create a model of sustainability, improve security, and implement best practices in design and public art to create a community gathering space. She said these goals have come from both the Children's Museum and from their community meetings. She said they have held a number of community meetings and have revised the design over time to reflect the community's input.

Ms. Cochran said that originally the site sloped downward towards the river, so when the Allegheny Commons building was built, they raised the grade so they could create a parking garage underneath. They took what originally had been a flat level green space that marked the center of Allegheny City and turned it into a depression. She said they wanted to address this condition. They removed the retaining walls that blocked the views into the site for security reasons. They created level grades so you could see across the site, raising the grade so it would meet the level grade of the Allegheny Center, sloping down into the park. She said it really feels like a continuous space that addresses all of the conditions around it that are existing.

Ms. Cochran said that in the Community meetings it was revealed that in the Victorian times, this site was a square with a center fountain. Therefore, a design was created that was reminiscent of these corner entries into the park. However, instead of having a fountain with four pie shapes around it that really would not be usable spaces, they wanted to create a central usable space – a place for public art, gathering, etc. She added this is the sunniest part of the site and the greenest. As a result, they addressed the use of the space in a really contemporary manner.

Ms. Cochran showed a view from the Southeast corner of the Allegheny Center Office Building, and said the design provides an entry into the park from this Southern side. She explained the center of the park would serve as flexible space which would allow tables and chairs and other programming. She showed a model for seating 100 people for lunch, dining, events, etc. She added there are seat walls that extend throughout the entire park for additional seating. She said she also has a seating plan to hold 160 people to accommodate for potentially large groups.

Ms. Cochran then explained that from Children's Way, there would be three Bald Cypress trees that they would keep as was recommended in their study. She also showed the view of the seat walls from the Children's Way point of view. She said in general they have tried to use natural plant materials and do things low maintenance. She added that this area can become blazing hot so the trees will provide shade. Ms. Cochran said they have created a designated meadow area and forested area in their design.

She said that at the beginning they did extensive plant shade studies to see which plant materials would be the best, and determined the sunniest spots for gathering. She explained that the more urban parts of the space would have trees that are more typical of what you would find along a sidewalk. She said the meadow area will have plant materials that are more dry tolerant, allow for low water use, and can survive with less nutrients than other plants. She said they are trying to create a park that would not require a lot of chemicals to keep it going. In the woodland zone she said they are looking for trees and plant life that are native to the area around Allegheny River, such as birch trees, river birch, ferns, and native understory plants. However, they are still trying to keep this area very open so there would be no security issues. She said they also want to include a bio swale to retain storm water and delay it from going into the storm water systems. She said they would also like to include plants in the bio swale.

Ms. Cochran added that they are looking to buy materials locally in Pennsylvania or the Northeast.

She said in their studies, they realized due to the foot traffic in the meadow zone they cannot use a completely native mix of plant material, so they will be using a blend of fescues, rye grass, and clover, which is nitrogen fixing, fertilizing, and is also tough and easy maintenance.

Ms. Cochran reiterated again that in their design they created a very level space so it could easily be seen through for security purposes. She said in terms of lighting, they have been working with a lighting engineer on ways to light the park with pedestrian scaled fixtures. She said they wanted to create a lit path for people walking to the New Hazlett Theater in the evening.

Ms. Cochran stated that after she was selected as the landscape designer, she has been working extensively with Ned Kahn, the public artist, so it has been a really interactive piece.

Mr. Ned Kahn introduced himself as the artist of the public art piece. He said he was the artist who years ago designed the addition to the Children's Museum. He said he collaborated with the architects to develop the kinetic skin of the building. He said as the park project plans were evolving, Chris Siefert and Ms. Jane Werner asked him to think about creating something that would act as a complement to his piece. Mr. Kahn displayed a close up of the kinetic skin on the Children's Museum and explained that they were basically white acrylic hinges that move in the wind with semi translucent coating that reveal what the atmosphere is doing at any given moment. He said the title of the piece is "The Articulated Cloud." It was the suggestion of a cloud that had been digitized by being cut into architectural grid-like pieces but then allowed to be animated by the air currents. He said the piece he came up with for the park was a play on this digitized type cloud, which included a series of vertical poles that create the suggestion of an architectural space, even though unlike a building it is completely permeable to light, wind, and people passing through. However, the suggestion of a cube created by the stainless steel polls would also be complemented by poles with mist sprayers that would create a curtain of fog in a spherical shape. He explained that whenever there would be wind the sphere would be transformed or morphed from whatever the air currents were doing. He also showed examples of fog pieces he had designed in other cities such as Los Angeles, CA and Louisville, KY.

Mr. Kahn then showed the Art Commission some videos of the kinetic sculptures he has created around the country. He explained that the technology for cloud misting has been used extensively, and are used for purposes of outdoor cooling in places like Phoenix, AZ.

Ms. Cochran stated that part of the park will be precast concrete pavers. She said they will be accessible from underneath if pieces need to be removed for the sculpture. She said the concrete would have contrast bands of stone or concrete pavers, which will be the main paving materials. She said they have not selected the colors for the pavers, but will probably choose something in the lighter, warmer range. She said the pavers are 10 by 22". She added the vertical poles are 32' high and 4' apart to allow for ADA accessibility between the poles. She said the site walls are meant to be made out of blue stone from New York state because it is harder than the blue stone in Pennsylvania. She said the idea is to have quotations engraved into the stone wall from the native sons and daughters of the North Side like Gertrude Stein.

She said they will use light materials such as steel and cable for the guiderails and handrails. She said they will have pre-bought benches along the rights of way along with recycling and trash receptacles, bicycle racks, tree grates where trees are in paving. She said they will also have additional lighting from the Pittsburgh standard right-of-way lights that will be used to light the sculpture such as bollards, up lights, blue LED lights, and wall lights. Ms. Cochran said they are still working out a way to mark the historic center of Allegheny City.

Mr. Siefert then explained the intent going forward. He said first he wanted to discuss a maintenance agreement and plan between the City for the park. He said it is their intent to work with the City on this agreement. He said they have begun the process with a memorandum of understanding that would outline roles and responsibilities. As part of their fundraising he said they are creating a large maintenance fund which is now \$400,000 and will earn interest that can be drawn down on, similar to an endowment but not exactly. The fund will be used to conserve the art work and other features if designated in the agreement not under the City's purview.

Mr. Siefert went on to say that the Children's Museum has hosted at least a dozen community discussions and meetings with various officials and leaders to develop a working program for the park throughout

2006, 2007 and 2008. He said the meetings have been wide ranging, from nearly 100 residents and community stakeholders in attendance to maybe a dozen during several church meetings.

Mr. Siefert added that he has collaborated with many other nonprofits in the city, such as OPA, who presented a lecture by the artist Ned Kahn. He said they were also able to work with a local public school adjacent to the museum, and he and Doug Suismon were able to talk about the history of the park in various history classes.

Ms. Klavon commented that she thought they did a great job, and asked the Art Commission if they had any questions.

Ms. Briggs asked if they intended for the mist to be running 24 hours a day.

Mr. Siefert said the idea is to pulse it, so it will be completely tunable. He said their thought was that it would run for a few minutes, shut off for a few minutes, and so on and so forth. He said this would start early in the morning and be turned off late at night. He said they will also run it throughout the year. The poles will be heated so it will be able to run during the winter. He said in the summer it will be a cooling mist, and in the winter, it will be a warming mist.

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

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

Mr. Gable asked how the moisture will not freeze. He said anything that uses water is a high maintenance aspect.

Mr. Siefert said they have been working on this answer.

Mr. Gable stated that he will have to see this in answer guaranteed in writing.

Ms. Cochran explained that the piece will be on a pedestal paving system so the water can run between the pavers, and there would be no chance of puddling. She also stated that the artist informed her that a large percentage of the misting will be happening near the tops of the poles so most of the mist will evaporate before it reaches the ground. She said if water does fall downwards, the idea is to have it fall within the paving system.

Mr. Gable pointed out that in one of the photos of the children running around there was water on the ground.

Ms. Cochran said that the piece he was referring to was very low to the ground.

Mr. Gable stated that the thing that would seal the deal for him was if they could tell him that some other Northeastern city has run something like this project in freezing weather.

Ms. Klavon asked if they could use heated pavers instead during the winter.

Mr. Gable said this would be an option.

Mr. Seifert stated that they are working with some extensive engineering to run heat trace up the pipes and keep the water from freezing within the system. He said that once the water leaves the nozzle and drifts and floats away like a fog cloud should, it will initially be 9 feet above the ground. However, they are also working with the engineers on the paving in case water drips down to the ground. Mr. Seifert also added that if it does freeze they can always turn it off. He said this is one way to approach it.

Ms. Klavon asked why they would not just heat the paving.

Mr. Seifert said they could look into that.

Mr. Kahn stated this will take a lot of energy to heat all of the pavers.

Ms. Klavon clarified and said to heat just one area.

Mr. Kahn said this would still be a large area. He said they will put a heat trace on the system so it can still run while it is cold, as it is a completely programmable system which will be sensitive to temperature. Therefore, if it is cold in the morning, the heat trace will turn on before the system turns on. Likewise, if conditions turn to a certain temperature where they know it is going to be a hazard, it will not turn on. He said there will be a little experimentation, but they will not create a system that will be a hazard to the public.

Ms. Klavon said she thinks they should keep it on all the time.

Mr. Kahn said they would love to do that, but it is an issue of energy conservation. He said they are doing a solar concert every Wednesday, and are not using more energy than they need to.

Mr. Indovina said he thinks the pipe sculpture is interesting by itself, and it would not bother him a bit to see it without steam.

Ms. Rohr said she disagrees. She said she has reservations about the fog and mist, but also questions the configuration of the pipes in the space. She said together with the site walls and benches, it becomes a visual context that is almost prohibitive to this community gathering, which was one of the stated goals for the space. Ms. Rohr said the piece in L.A. does look warm and inviting, and she knows that it is in accordance to ADA standards, being 4' apart. However, she said this project looks prohibitive to her.

Ms. Klavon said she is the total opposite. She said she thinks this would be very interesting, and if she were a kid she would want to run through it. She added even as an adult she would want to run through it.

Mr. Seifert said that during one of the community meetings, a 65 year old gentleman named Dennis said he too wants to run through it.

Ms. Lockett asked how high the cloud formation would be.

Mr. Kahn said the bottom is about 9' above the ground.

Mr. Astorino said he thinks this is a very exciting project and he commends them. He said he thinks the way it is designed is really terrific. He added that turning the system off in the winter is not really a problem, because the park is not really used during this time anyway.

Ms. Slavick commented that this is exactly the forward looking project that Dee Briggs was speaking about earlier. She also wanted to commend in addition to the design and artist, the entire process for how much community input they received. She said it seems like everyone is very invested in this project, and she thinks this is a really model example of how public art should and can develop.

Ms. Rohr asked if this was the only work going into the park that has been commissioned at this point.

Mr. Seifert said at this point yes. He said earlier in the process they had invited another artist named Edwin Hamilton, a stone sculptor who was raised in either Butler or Beaver County. He said frankly it was a matter of budgeting, and was a very hard decision to make. He said they would, however, welcome this opportunity as it presented itself.

Ms. Lockett asked what their anticipated maintenance costs were, noting the endowment in place.

Mr. Seifert said they will draw upwards of five percent on this fund every year, and based on a good market year this would be approximately up to \$20,000 per year. He said this would only be for things that would go beyond the purview of the city's maintenance, since this is a city park. He said they are working with the city on roles and responsibilities. He said for the current Ned Kahn piece at the Children's Museum they also budgeted with a similar type fund and have since put in \$3,000 from its inception in 2004. Mr. Seifert said this was due to untypical high speed winds damaging the flaps. Otherwise, he vouched that Ned Kahn's pieces are very maintenance friendly.

Mr. Seifert said that they will be receiving 15 percent extra nozzles that are screwed in from the ends of the pipes. He said if a pipe gets clogged, you can simply replace it with a new nozzle, and use a vinegar based bath to clean the old nozzle for future rotation. He said the piece also has a water softening system built into it that will prevent any of the hard deposit from building up.

Ms. Briggs said she seconds everything everyone else has said, and thinks this is a really wonderful project. She said the level of design for the landscape design is very high, and the sculpture is an excellent proposal. She said she is convinced that the execution of this project will be very high as well. Ms. Briggs then advised them to provide the resources to convince everyone of the Commission that this piece will be able to survive the winter. She said in the lighting photos they suggest that there is no sunlight, plant life, etc, so the mist could be the real activator of the space. She said she thinks it will be wonderful if it operated the whole year round.

Mr. Indovina asked for clarification on where the flexible use area would be.

Mr. Gable stated once again that he would need convincing that the water on the pipes will not be an issue in the winter.

Mr. Brown said to Mr. Mike Gable that he knows they are about to begin working on a legal agreement between the Children's Museum and the city, and asked if the parcel was part of URA property.

Mr. Gable said yes.

Mr. Brown asked if this would cause any delay or difficulty for the Children's Museum in the legal agreement to access this space.

Mr. Gable said the URA is currently making provisions to hand the parcel over to the city, which should have been done 34 years ago.

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

Mr. Nick Garazi introduced himself as a resident of Deustchtown, and said he would like to speak in opposition to the project. He stated he does feel bad after hearing about the process the Children's Museum underwent to realize this project. He said he appreciates their sensitivity to the site and commends them for all of their hard work. He said his only motivation is that he likes beautiful things and he would like to see beautiful things remain.

Mr. Garazi pointed out in photographs that he had taken in 1976 - 77, during the time in which he was a resident at Allegheny Center that many people would lounge around the fountain when it was operating. He said that running water does attract people, which is a trade off for the huge maintenance that is required. He also pointed out that busloads of children would visit this site as well.

Mr. Garazi then read an excerpt by former mayor David Lawrence, who at the time was the head of the URA, introducing the international design competition. He said the jury was headed by Hideo Sasaki, the landscape architect and Chairman of landscape architecture at Harvard University, Henry J. Heinz II, Gordon Bunshaft, the designer of the Lieber House and the NYC Hirschorn Museum, Don K. Richie, architect and designer of Mellon Square and the Civic Arena, Allegheny Center and Three Rivers stadium, and William Brasier who won the design unanimously out of 304 other designs.

Mr. Garazi also pointed out the Northwest portion of the park which he said the Children's Museum turned into a parking lot and is similar in size to Allegheny Square. He said he did not know why they could not place their new park in this location, which is also equally adjacent to Allegheny Square. He said that Allegheny Center Parking garage has 2500 spaces, thousands of which are vacant on a daily basis. He also suggested that the city deed over Allegheny Square to Allegheny Center, whom he said he was sure would maintain it.

Renee Piechocki introduced herself as the director of the Office of Public Art, and spoke in opposition to the project. She said her feedback was not intended to be negative criticism of the artist and his body of work or the Children's Museum. She apologized for how awkward this was, because she values everyone as colleagues. She said that OPA is fans of their work, and especially Ned Kahn's piece located at the Children's Museum directly across the walkway from this proposed work.

Ms. Piechocki stated that OPA's concern was the process used to select the artist. She said everyone knows they are very process oriented at OPA. She said she wanted to address two issues, first, the precedence the Art Commission wants to establish in regards to the acceptance of commissioned works of art for public property, and second, the appearance this work will have when the fog blower is not working.

Ms. Piechocki stated that it is their understanding that the process to select Ned Kahn for this site was an internal curatorial process led by the Children's Museum staff unlike the extensive and public process they used to select the landscape architect. She said there was not an open public process organized for the \$600,000 piece that is going to be located on public property. She said while a direct invitational process is certainly acceptable for private property, OPA questions it as a best practice for public property, especially for projects of this scale and this amount of impact. She pointed out that some of the criticism with the tribute to Children's project on the North Shore included the complete lack of public process to select the artist who created the Fred Rogers sculpture, another privately funded project on SEA property. Alternatively, and learning from the struggles around that work, the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy helped develop a national RFQ to select an artist for the \$50,000 commission for the walled garden at Mellon Park. She said this was a very inclusive and low cost process that resulted in the selection of Janet Zweig by a panel of stakeholders and community representatives to place her on a design team with LaQuatra Bonci architects to collaborate on what is very ultimately a successful work of art in a public park. She said the selection process was raised as a concern by former Art Commission member Louise Hall in a June 2009 meeting. Ms. Piechocki stated that OPA suggested the Art Commission continue to expect the artist selection to have a public process component for commissioned work to be located on city property. She said best practices to consider include an open call method, curatorial selection of a group of finalists whose qualifications and proposals will be reviewed by a group of panelists which includes project stakeholders and arts professionals, including the city's Public Art Manager.

Ms. Piechocki said that OPA has recently been asked by several community members and foundations to advise them about best practices and methods they should use to commission future works of art for public property. She said they continuously recommend a peer panel be used to select artists from a pool of applications. She said this is in line with Americans for the Art's Public Art Network best practices document which is the nation's only service program for the field of Public Art. Ms. Piechocki stated she is on the Board of Directors. She said that OPA feels this is an important element for the Art Commission to consider in the review of this proposal. She then stated, selection process aside, in the June 2009 meeting, Commission members Hall and Jane Haskell raised questions about the design and the sculpture for this site. She said OPA shares this concern. After the 2009 meeting she said they met with Chris Siefert at the Children's Museum to tour the site and encouraged him to share this feedback with the artist about this sculpture. She said she was disappointed that the artwork was essentially the same piece that was presented in 2008 and 2009.

Ms. Piechocki further stated she simply feels this artwork is not representative of Ned Kahn's best work. She said she feels the large field of metal poles dominates the lightness of the fog. She said she is also concerned with the appearance of the sculpture when the fog is not working. She said if the fog is not working, the magic of the sculpture disappears. She said this is the situation the Pittsburgh International

Airport is facing with their steam sculpture by international renowned artist Robert Morris which has never worked properly. Without the steam component the sculpture is essentially a series of concrete boxes filled with rocks. She said the work is integrated into the architecture of the parking garage and does not appear to be a work of art with this missing component.

She said despite the Children Museum's promise to raise a maintenance endowment and to maintain the work for the city, there will certainly be times when the sculpture is not working, and that is the nature of artworks with moving parts or water to break. She said sometimes they break for extended periods of time. She said ideally a sculpture looks just as good with or without water or fog in this case. She said OPA does not feel this sculpture is currently designed as a strong work without the fog component, unlike the artist's previous work that he showed in a different location. She said without the fog in this other piece, the components of the sculpture blend back into the landscape. She said in the Children Museum's case, this element really dominates it. She said this looks like an object in the plaza, a really backwards public artwork in her opinion.

Ms. Piechocki also pointed out that in the September 2008 meeting, Commissioner Haskell asked if there had been any mechanical or electrical issues with works of this nature, and Mr. Siefert said there had not been any major maintenance costs or problems with any of the artist's current work to date. However, there are examples of the artist's work being in several states of disrepair which is certainly not the fault of the artist such as the cloud Rings piece in Louisville, KY. She said that Program Manager, Lea Donatelli has family in Louisville, and only one out of the three times she has visited has just one of the pieces in this sculpture emitted fog. She said she is not mentioning this because she does not believe the artist is capable of creating a low maintenance work, or denies the Children's Museum has the capability to maintain the artwork, but the city ultimately owns the artwork and will have to deal with the maintenance and they feel this project relies too heavily on the fog feature to maintain interest in the sculpture.

She said she thinks the landscape has evolved phenomenally since the last presentation, but she questions how it fits into the park's Master Plan by the Northside Leadership Conference.

Ms. Klavon thanked Mr. Garazi and Ms. Piechocki for their input. She said that this was different because the Children's Museum was here for an informational update. She said the Art Commission was not there to give approval, but was there to give them good feedback. She said they have already gone through Conceptual Approval so they are already working on construction documents.

Mr. Brown said that the motion from the last hearing was that the Art Commission would grant conceptual approval for the project as submitted with the following conditions:

- 1) The Commission shall continue to review and finalization of the artwork quality, quantity, typology, and process of selecting and placing the artwork in the park
- 2) The applicant continues investigation of general site conditions and access
- 3) Refining and further defining the landscape plan
- 4) The applicant waives any potential time limit of Conceptual approval
- 5) The applicant will present to the Commission as necessary until Final approval is granted on all components of the plan

Ms. Klavon asked if they had a copy of the plan that was submitted to them at that time that was approved.

Mr. Brown said that the plan submitted in September 2008 was the same one submitted in June.

Ms. Klavon asked if the sculpture remained the same.

Mr. Siefert said yes.

Ms. Klavon then asked how the Commission felt about Nick Garazi's reasons for his opposition to the piece. She said that unlike the photographs Mr. Garazi had shown, she has not personally seen anyone using this park. She said it is in disrepair and it feels like you are descending into a pit.

Mr. Astorino said that in this whole process he sees beauty in that everybody has their own opinion about things, and opinions are different about art, architecture, landscape architecture, and certainly the period of time when something is built. He said that they looked at some of that sculpture today, which is simply not done today as things change. He said when you look at the people who worked on that square before, it is a very impressive group, obviously, and he knew a few of them. He said he thinks for its time, this piece was probably a really bold statement. However, he looks at it now as things have changed. He said he is okay with the fact that they are moving away from the current piece. He said if it was historic in nature, then it might be a different situation, but he does not see any historic significance to it. He said he also thinks there are better opportunities to use this park such as the present design, so he supports the present design.

Ms. Slavick said she is sympathetic to a lot of the arguments, and she thinks they do have to balance preservation of their own history even through its unpopular phases, which she noted sounds a little contradictory given some of her earlier comments about the Mellon Park sculpture, but they also have to look forward. She said for her it comes down to the question of what is the actual current use of that space, and as a former Northsider, that whole area was just so foreboding, so inhospitable, that she thinks this plan would do a lot to revive this space given that it is not very frequently used now.

Mr. Indovina said this is a large question between preservation and moving forward. He said the current plan replaced a previous plan, which he thought was very well done at the time. He said it was based on 1963 ideals and projected uses. He said in his opinion it was designed as a very intense urban park space, and not a soft park, but a hard one. He said he thinks the intent of Allegheny Center was that it was going to be a very intensely used space with the Allegheny Center Mall, the Office Buildings, and the apartments, but it really did not come to fruition. He said that some of the ideas that shaped the landscape architecture were really found not to be valid which has happened again and again in architecture over the years. He said he thinks this new design really reflects a little bit more proper use of the space since it is a softer use and less intense use, and as a result will probably be used more. Mr. Indovina said he supports the design. And while it is a shame to see a well designed piece of architecture go away, sometimes life must move on.

Ms. Klavon asked the Commission to discuss Ms. Piechocki's comment that there was not a public process for selecting the artist.

Ms. Rohr stated that she thought this was a very significant point to bring up given that they want to go ahead with a really well developed plan. She said she understands the preservation argument and usually tends to go in that direction, but thinks use is important so they want to move ahead with the current plan that is going to be well thought out. However, she does feel that the selection process for a public space is a huge issue. She said the lack of that process is something to take into account. She said she had mentioned that she did have some reservations about the sculpture itself, and she thinks this comes on top of that.

Ms. Briggs asked if there were guidelines that are to be followed by any entity that is commissioning a piece of artwork for a public space that exists.

Mr. Brown said that there is nothing written, but he and Ms. Piechocki are currently telling everyone that if they are planning to do something on public property they want a public process, such as an invitational competition. However, they have nothing written down and it is up to the Commission to make this decision. He said if the Art Commission wants to halt this project and require an RFQ from this artist, they can do that. He said the prior minutes and prior decision allowed for that. He said the Commission could say the process is fine for now, but in the future they would like to see other processes in place. He said they would like to see this in writing, but currently this is not the case.

Ms. Briggs said that she very much agrees with a public process, but her interpretation of a public process is something the Children's Museum has already followed. She said the public has been involved, not the process of selecting the artist, but in the process of developing the work. The relationship with the artist from previous projects is also very public. She said she does not think it would be very appropriate for the Commission after giving Conceptual Approval to tell the Children's Museum that they need to go back and

take a different process for selecting the artist. She said that she does not think this Commission should be telling individual entities one at a time how they should be commissioning their artists. She said if the City of Pittsburgh wants to acquire any private entity commissioning a piece of work for public property that process needs to be written down. She said, secondly, although she agrees with the spirit of a public process, she does not agree that a public call and public process for choosing an artist always yields the best project. She historically, when there is a singular vision, with financial backing behind it, and a lot of enthusiasm, amazing works of art and architecture can happen. And when they are pulled through a public process it can destroy the vision and the quality of what is completed.

Ms. Klavon said she agrees. She said she also thinks that the sculpture is not “plop art” but feels it is integral part of the design and reads with the trees. She said she thinks the Children’s Museum has done a really great job, and that the design has evolved from the Conceptual phases to what they are seeing now into a really nice project. She said that she thought at first there were too many artists involved and she thinks the simplicity of it is better.

Ms. Briggs said that although she thinks the water happening all year and that opportunity for the level of delight in activation would be perfect, she thinks the sculpture as it has been described and as she has seen the detailing of other work that Mr. Kahn has done with or without the water, with lighting and natural lighting can continue to be a very exciting and provocative work if it turns out that the water is not able to be turned on.

Ms. Rohr said she disagrees totally. She said she sees something that is not inviting and disrupts the space and visually really works against the landscaping. She said this is her personal opinion. She said she thinks the water is an important part of this, and if it is gone this would be a big issue from her perspective. She said as far as public process, she agrees that this has gone past the stage of Conceptual and they are not going to go backwards on this decision. She also added there are many ways to define public process, and obviously it is multivalent, so it is going to be difficult to codify one process. However, she does think there was a public process for choosing the landscape design in the urban design plan and she does not think the same rubric was used when thinking about the artist, which is her point of contention. She said she thinks Ms. Piechocki stated this very eloquently. She said those rigors are where she is seeing a disconnect, because there are two distinct processes that were used. She said she thinks a similar process could have been used in selecting the artist as there was in selecting the landscape designer.

Mr. Indovina asked if this sculpture and concept were part of the original response to the competition or was it added at later date.

Ms. Klavon said it was changed.

Mr. Siefert said when they started the project they invited Ned Kahn to be part of the team to generate some ideas about what could happen. Mr. Kahn and his ideas were offered to the design teams, and the design teams came back with their designs integrating Ned Kahn’s piece at the time. After a recommendation was made that Andrea Cochran be the landscape designer, the team was formalized. At that time a more rigorous community process with stakeholder meetings took place, which is where the project really evolved with the artist’s design. He said the changes they made to the landscape design and the artwork had a lot to do with the input they received from stakeholders.

Ms. Jane Werner introduced herself as the director of the Children’s Museum. She said they were very interested in how the sculpture integrated with the landscape architecture because they did not want to do plop art, they wanted it to be as part of the whole package. She said that is why they went into the competition with an artist in mind and kind of an idea of what it might look like.

Ms. Slavick said she wanted to respond to Ms. Piechocki too. She said in the larger picture she agrees there should be a consistent process, but also knowing that the city right now does not have any funding to commission new works, there is kind of an awkward gap where how can new work get created and commissioned and still go through some kind of public process even though it is not city-sponsored. She said admittedly it is a very awkward scenario. She said she thinks something wonderful has come out of

this one to everybody's credit and best intentions, even though it may not be the ideal, formal way moving forward.

Ms. Piechocki said that the OPA was founded in 2005 as a partnership between the city and GPAC to solve this problem. Because they are aware the city does not commission its own work, there needed to be an entity to help establish best practices in the field here in Pittsburgh. She said their uphill battle everyday is working with the private sector when they are working on public land to follow national best practices. Thus, even if the City of Pittsburgh does not have written guidelines and procedures, what OPA and Kim Baker, the previous Public Art Manager and Pat Ford, the previous Planning Director, have done is consistently worked with private partners to encourage them to go through a public process. She agreed it is awkward and cited this is why they have the Cold Com foundation saying we bought this sculpture and are putting here versus the Parks Conservancy who did work with OPA and did the whole process. She said she thinks this is an important thing for the Commission to consider, because they are going to be looking in the next year projects they are working on that they do not even know about yet, that are dealing with these issues.

Ms. Piechocki again said this was awkward because she thinks Ned Kahn is a great artist, and since she lives across from the park, she is very excited the park is going to be renovated. However, she said it was important for the Art Commission to consider how they will equally deal with applicants.

Ms. Briggs asked if the Children's Museum had any specific questions for the Art Commission about moving forward.

Mr. Siefert said he would like the Commission to reflect on the five conditions Mr. Brown outlined. He said he thinks the one condition that is missing is the agreement with the city that came from a previous meeting with the Commission. He also wanted them to address if they are moving in the right direction, particularly with the first three conditions which have to do with the review and finalization of the artwork, the general investigation of site conditions access and further redefining the landscape plan. Mr. Siefert said that was really what he hoped to get out of today.

Mr. Brown said there is no motion made, but if there are any concerns the Art Commission could bring those up.

Ms. Klavon stated that it seems the majority of the Commission members are in agreement with what they have seen today.

Mr. Astorino stated that it is still a public process and it has to be voted on in the next phase. He said given that this is an informational hearing, he thinks it is hard to judge the five points right now. He said he does not see anything that would preclude him, since he did vote to give the project Conceptual Approval, he does not see anything now that would change that. However, he has not seen the final drawings. He said the Art Commission has not received anything today to give the Children's Museum "their blessing." He said they do not know this at this time, and it has to go through the public process.

Ms. Briggs said she thinks what is being asked is has the Children's Museum met the conditions for full conceptual approval, so they can now move forward for final approval.

Mr. Astorino said that he thinks they have, but he has not seen the final document.

Ms. Briggs said this is just for Conceptual Approval.

Mr. Astorino said that when they come for final approval, they could still change something. He said, again you cannot vote on it until you see final documents.

Ms. Klavon said that what Mr. Siefert is asking is, are they moving in the right direction, and the Commission is saying that they are.

Ms. Rohr said that it seems like there have been significant changes to landscape and to the investigation of the general site visits in regard to access, so in that regard, from her perspective, this has changed. However, she has heard that the artwork has not changed at all.

Ms. Klavon said they did not ask it change.

Ms. Rohr noted that the conditions asked the Art Commission to review the quality and quantity, so they really did not ask for any changes in the first condition or the process.

Mr. Brown said that from the June hearing, former Commission members had asked about the selection process, quantity of the artwork, so in his opinion, the Commission has already considered these aspects. He said what the Art Commission was seeing now is the removal of the Ed Hamilton piece.

Ms. Klavon said that she is hearing that the Children's Museum is going in the right direction.

Ms. Slavick said that if anyone at the table has not identified problems with what has been presented, then the Children's Museum is going in the right direction. She said yes, there is a question about the original process, but that is water under the bridge. It is something that needs to be addressed, but not here.

Mr. Siefert also pointed out in the last Meeting Minutes that it was stated that they would make themselves available when they could to regularly update the Art Commission. Due to their project phasing with their architects and artists here in town on this date it just seemed like a great opportunity for a courtesy update.

Ms. Klavon said that she appreciates it.

**MOTION: No motion made as this was an informational update. However, it was confirmed by the Commission that it saw no issues with the plans as submitted.**

**Meeting Adjourned**