

**ART COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2009  
BEGINNING AT 2:00 P.M.**

**PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION:**

**Klavon, Indovina, Cooper, Astorino,  
Haskell, Serrao**

**PRESENT OF THE STAFF:**

**Noor Ismail  
Morton Brown**

**A. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Klavon asked for approval of minutes. The minutes for August 26, 2009 were approved by Doug Cooper and seconded by Jane Haskell.

**B. Correspondence**

Mr. Brown noted no correspondence.

**C. Items for Review**

**a. Mural on Eliza Furnace Trail near Hot Metal Bridge**

- o Eric Shiner, The Andy Warhol Museum

Mr. Brown noted that the retaining wall for the mural is owned by PennDot and therefore is not under purview of the Art Commission. However, PennDot has requested that the Art Commission provide Courtesy Review which would contribute to PennDot's assessment and approval.

Ms. Klavon explained rules for presentation to the applicants.

Mr. Shiner introduced himself as the Milton Fine Curator of Art of the Andy Warhol Museum and the project submitted for review: a mural on the Eliza Furnace Trail across from the Hot Metal Bridge by artist Shepard Fairey. This temporary mural would coincide with the exhibition of the artist's work at the Andy Warhol Museum which would open in late October, 2009 and run through January 2010. Mr. Fairey is a well-known American street artist that started making fine art 20 years ago when he attended RISD for graphic design. Mr. Fairey is the creator of the "Obey Giant" motif that has been his signature artwork for many years, as well as the Obama "Hope Poster" that has helped catapult the artist into the mainstream psyche.

Mr. Shiner passed the book/exhibition catalogue for the Shepard Fairey exhibit to the Commission for review. He mentioned that when this traveling exhibition of Fairey's opened at the Boston Institute of Contemporary Art, it had 120,000 visitors during its six month run. Half of that turn-out for the three-month run in Pittsburgh would be outstanding.

Mr. Shiner went on to say that Mr. Fairey came to Pittsburgh three weeks ago, and one of the murals created during his stay can be seen on the Rosa Villa building near the Warhol Museum. Mr. Fairey works with a variety of large-scale imagery (10-12 feet tall by 6-8 feet wide) and collages of smaller hand-printed posters to create temporary "wheat paste" murals. The artist uses ripping and shredding to expose layers beneath to look like old wallpaper. An example of these murals can be found on the Sprout Fund office building in Garfield on Penn Avenue. The series of murals in Pittsburgh are about peace and make anti-war statements that provoke viewers to make up their own mind about these issues.

Mr. Shiner showed another example of a Fairey mural on the Benedum Center downtown. He mentioned that for this series, they worked in collaboration with the Sprout Fund, the Pittsburgh Cultural Trust and other organizations to make these murals happen. Mr. Shiner showed a final example of a mural on the Astorino Building (1<sup>st</sup> and Wood) of an "incredibly beautiful" goddess. The project submitted at this

hearing is a large-scale mural (100 ft width that can be extended) on a PennDot-owned retaining wall of 376 Parkway along the Eliza Furnace Trail across from the Hot Metal Bridge.

Mr. Shiner presented a mock-up of the proposed mural that will start just below the top lip of the retaining wall and continue to about five feet above ground level. Mr. Shiner mentioned that the Department of Public Works oversees the right of way for the ground beneath the wall (as it is City-owned), while PennDot owns the wall. Mr. Shiner stated that the project has gained permission from the Public Works to allow the artist and crew working on the mural in the right of way at the time of this presentation.

Mr. Shiner stated that he is asking Courtesy Approval from the Art Commission for this project as a prerequisite of approval from PennDot for this project.

Mr. Shiner went on to say that due to the temporary nature of these murals, a life-span of approximately 2 to 3 years could be expected for this project.

Mr. Shiner stated that the Warhol Museum would powerwash away the murals when the Commission and/or PennDot would like the mural to be taken down (whether it's at the end of the project or at the end of the lifespan of the mural). Mr. Shiner stated that he had discussed with Mr. Brown the Public Art Manager and PennDot the possibility of developing a plan to replace the mural with another artist's work when Mr. Fairey's mural has reached its end.

Mr. Shiner re-iterated that the proposed mural will be culturally-sensitive, not of strong war messages, and lean towards peace.

Ms. Haskell asked what kind of paint would be used.

Mr. Shiner answered that it will be collage. All images will be printed on paper, then wheat-paste (wallpaper paste) will be used to adhere the paper to the wall. This process dries quickly and is easy to remove.

Ms. Haskell asked if the artist and crew will come with the pre-determined designs.

Mr. Shiner explained that they will come with the large, main images and have small posters on hand to fill in as needed---the process will be "slightly organic."

Mr. Indovina asked what happens when the mural gets old.

Mr. Shiner answered that as water and the elements take their toll on the piece, it will start to peel off the wall in areas and that when this occurs, they will make the decision to remove the piece.

Mr. Brown asked if the paper is coated.

Mr. Shiner answered that it is already coated with an acrylic gloss that helps to keep the paper alive for a longer period of time.

Mr. Indovina asked if the mock-up images represent the extent of the mural or if it will be longer.

Mr. Shiner explained that they plan on 100 x 12 feet size for the initial stage (this would take one day), but they could go further if everyone agrees to increase it to a 2-3 day project.

Ms. Haskell asked if the images are printed in Fairey's studio.

Mr. Shiner answered yes, and added that Mr. Fairey's prints at no cost to the city, PennDot, or the Museum.

Mr. Brown mentioned that he had just received an email from PennDot that stated that a pre-requisite of their approval might be for the Warhol Museum to paint the wall to the left of the proposed mural location

(toward Bates Street) to cover the existing graffiti in that area. Mr. Brown asked that the Commission consider this scenario and submit an opinion on this matter.

Mr. Brown stated that he believed that if the wall were painted in this way it would only provide a blank canvas for further graffiti and look out of place once the mural was removed.

Mr. Cooper thought that the painted area would alter the context of the piece and would be contrary to the way Mr. Fairey works. He went on to say that typically, Fairey's works are placed on rough walls—in unexpected, naturally urban places—and to paint a frame around or to one side of the piece would diminish the artwork's intent.

Mr. Cooper stated that to prioritize their options would be to say: (1) leave the mural as is, (2): extend the proposed mural, and the (3) least desirable option: paint area to the left as suggested by PennDot.

Mr. Astorino asked if there would be other graffiti artists that might tag on top of Mr. Fairey's mural.

Mr. Shiner compared Mr. Fairey to the "Godfather" of graffiti artists, and thought that there was an unwritten code that would not permit people to tag on top of his work. Mr. Shiner stated that Fairey has had very, very few instances of graffiti occurring over his murals.

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

**MOTION: To support project as submitted as part of Courtesy Review.**

**MOVED: Ms. Haskell**

**SECONDED: Mr. Indovina**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**NA**

**b. Mellon Park Walled Garden Restoration Project Revision**

- o Susan Rademacher, Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy

Ms. Klavon stated that Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy already received Conceptual and Final Approval for the Mellon Park Walled Garden Restoration Project, but Susan Rademacher of the PPC was at the hearing to present revisions to the Mellon Park restoration plan for Art Commission review and approval.

Ms. Klavon asked Ms. Rademacher to present the difference between the first presentation and the current design.

Ms. Rademacher and began by showing pictures of the current in-progress installation of the fiber-optic cables for the artwork portion of the park renovation. She mentioned that nothing has changed as far as installation, but what has changed is the overall location, when they discovered that the survey was inaccurate and had a 5 to 7 feet variance in the length of the lawn panel and the length of the flanking walks.

Ms. Rademacher went on to say that they shifted the entire artwork star field in its correct arrangement 5 feet to the right (to the East), since the viewing platform also had to be shifted 5 feet back. They wanted to maintain the spatial relationship between the viewing location and the star field. A bonus to this shift: the stars are further away from the fountain at the left (West) end of the garden and will provide more space around the fountain for wedding ceremonies, and this design does not require cutting into the hill and exposing tree roots, as originally expected.

Ms. Rademacher mentioned that this new design also involved pushing the stairs back and eliminating the first set of risers. They will install a sandstone portion of the walkway, creating a landing at the bottom of the stairs.

Mr. Astorino asked if the star pattern in the artwork was the same as previously submitted, just shifted.

Ms. Rademacher affirmed, and stated that when the project is finished, as built drawings will reflect the shifted star pattern and the correct dimensions, but at this time she is displaying the 100% construction drawings.

Ms. Rademacher went on to present what they call the entry terrace. Here the octagonal planter stuck out into the walkway and blocked the driving path for park maintenance, so would have forced them to drive out of the paving area, onto the lawn by three to five feet which would have rutted the lawn. The grades were not correct, so the areas flanking the steps at the bottom of the octagon have a much steeper grade than surveyed. The new drawing reflected the change where the octagon was brought closer the steps to get it away from the driving path and they eliminated two benches, leaving only two benches in that area instead of four. Retaining walls would have been necessary to keep all four benches and the original grade of stairs, which would have been heavy-handed.

Ms. Rademacher stated that the sandstone edging was originally spec'ed at 16 inches, but for cost-saving measures and to eliminate confusion as walkways, they have been reduced to 12 inches.

For other cost-saving measures, Ms. Rademacher stated that they have chosen to go with their base-bid of crushed limestone rather than sandstone around the octagon planter. The crushed limestone has proven itself to be a durable, easy to maintain and park-appropriate material in its use in Schenley Plaza and other sites in the City. The PPC does not have enough funding for sandstone now, but hope to install it in the future. The crushed limestone will allow for the sandstone to be installed at a future date. Ms. Rademacher went on to state and display images of how they changed from stone to City park-standard benches within the walled garden. She went on to say that Public Works and project partners all agreed to the change in benches, and noted that the park-standard bench would actually allow a visitor more comfortable seating by means of back support that the original type of bench did not provide.

Ms. Rademacher displayed an illustrative image to show the medallion/interpretive piece that explains the artwork on the lawn. The medallion is located on the ground at grade on the observation point of the garden overlooking the lawn area. Ms. Rademacher also presented images that described how the inscriptions will be handled on the steps and risers. The riser of the steps will have inscribed the words "Mellon Park Walled Garden". On the adjacent left plinth will be inscribed with the date of 1929 and the words "Garden designed by Nataly and Geifert (sp) for Richard B. Mellon", which is the date of the walled garden's original creation and on the right plinth "2009, Restoration in Memory of Anne Katherine Seamans", since it is an important date for the family as it is the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Annie's death and the bulk of the construction will be completed in Fall 2009 (even though there will be additional plantings added in Spring of 2010 and the lawn will not be open to the public until that time).

Ms. Rademacher then displayed an image of the interpretive plaque done in stainless steel that states the location of the stars in the sky, as well as date and time of Annie's birth. The rectangle in the plaque representing the lawn artwork will be raised about 1/8<sup>th</sup> or 1/4 inch above the surface of the medallion, and the stars that exist(ed) in the night sky that were not featured in the lawn artwork would be included in the medallion as well in order to show the entire sky from this vantage point. The PPC website will have a complete list of stars and planets, however the stars will not be named on the interpretive signage in lieu of a more simplified image. The interpretive medallion does indicate outlines of constellation figures, however.

Mr. Cooper asked how much cost was saved by changing to the City-standard benches.

Ms. Rademacher answered that straight benches cost between \$6,000 and \$8,000. They saved something to the effect of \$100,000 by using the City standard. The project partners agreed that in the future the wooden benches could be replaced with stone slabs when and if funding became available. Ms. Rademacher stated that part of these cost savings measures were introduced so that the project could meet its goals for a maintenance fund for the garden, which was critical, she added.

Mr. Cooper stated that he understood the need for this change, but stated that this was his principal regret of the project—that these benches were substituted.

Ms. Rademacher stated the partners agreed that when and if funding is available, they would look into replacing the wooden benches with angled limestone slabs as an alternative to the original stone benches.

Ms. Klavon asked if the benches Ms. Rademacher described (the slabs) were of a similar type as those found in Katz Plaza.

Ms. Rademacher stated that they were similar to those.

Ms. Klavon asked if the Seamans family had been involved with the change of benches, and if so, did they approve.

Ms. Rademacher answered that they were very involved in the bench discussion and that they like the alternate stone benches, but are comfortable with the wooden benches. She went on to say that they have left over soil to re-grade the lawn area in front of the garden. The PPC also discovered a shale layer that is great for drainage and allowed them to not have to put in gravel, therefore saving costs.

Additionally, the wire mesh for underground support of the lighting of the artwork in the lawn was reduced from being large sheets that covered the entire surface area, to individual sheets that supported each fixture. All of the aforementioned reductions and by the fact that the PPC managed the project contractors directly, added to a substantial cost saving to allow the project to retain its intended quality while providing that it would get done in a timely fashion and with appropriate budget for maintenance.

Ms. Klavon asked if there were any in the audience that would speak in favor of or opposed to the project.

**MOTION: To grant Final approval of the project changes as submitted.**

**MOVED: Mr. Serrao**

**SECONDED: Mr. Cooper**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

**d. MLK Mosaic Mural on Allegheny County Jail**

- Lucas Stock, MLK Community Mural Project
- Nicolas Atkins, MLK Community Mural Project

No motion was made since the applicants were not present and did not submit complete designs.

Mr. Brown mentioned that he did not receive complete and quality drawings, and therefore agreed with the applicant that final designs would be presented at the hearing.

The Commission agreed that it could not review the project with incomplete drawings and with the applicant absent.

Mr. Brown noted that Bob Ziller, the artist that had been engaged by the MLK Mural Project for design and creation of the proposed artwork for this project was in the audience, and asked Mr. Ziller if he were there to speak on behalf of the project.

Mr. Ziller stated that he was confused by this process and did not know exactly what was presented in the Art Commission application.

Mr. Brown stated that the MLK project (Ed Rawson) had submitted an application for Courtesy Review of the proposed mosaic mural at the Allegheny County Jail with a design that appeared to be made with

crayon or colored pencil. Mr. Brown went on to say that when the application was delivered in person by Mr. Rawson, that Mr. Brown had stated at that time that the design did not place the artwork in context of the site, and was not of a quality that the Commission could critique.

Mr. Rawson agreed to bring a contextual rendering and material samples to the hearing, which he did not do.

Mr. Brown went on to say that he did not include the drawings in the Art Commission packet for prior review, but did have copies of it on hand at the hearing.

Mr. Ziller asked why the drawings were not included in the packets.

Mr. Brown stated that he did not include the drawings in the packets that were mailed to the Commission prior to the hearing as they were of poor quality and did not indicate where they were to be placed within the context of the proposed site---these were drawings made of crayon or colored pencil that did not fully indicate the design, color, material to be used (no sense of the mosaic tile), or the context of its placement onsite.

Mr. Ziller stated that he was told last evening by Nicolas Atkins of MLK that his design was not going to be presented at the hearing today, so he was confused by the entire process.

Mr. Astorino stated that since the applicant is not present, this proposal must be tabled.

The Commission agreed.

Mr. Brown stated to Mr. Ziller that since the applicant is not present and requested materials are not to be presented, this application is tabled. He went on to say that since this is Courtesy Review—being that the Allegheny County Jail property is not in Art Commission purview—this project can move of its own accord without Art Commission review. However, if the applicant wishes to proceed with Art Commission review, it must resubmit for a subsequent hearing.

Public Comment:

Mr. Bob Ziller suggested adding artist contracts to the criteria of Art Commission submissions.

Ms. Klavon agreed with the potential inclusion of this requirement.

**MOTION: Tabled**

**MOVED:**

**SECONDED:**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**NA**

**e. City-Owned Sculpture installation in Grandview Park**

- o Morton Brown, Public Art Manager, City of Pittsburgh

Mr. Astorino asked if the piece was in storage.

Mr. Brown answered that the piece is in conservation now, but originally was installed at the Squirrel Hill Library. He went on to say that in February 2007 the City received a conservation grant from RK Mellon to conserve this and four other sculptures of the City's collection. All five sculptures went into conservation around February 2009. Three pieces: the Bordas, deRoy Gruber, and Morandi are currently in conservation at McKay Lodge Conservation in Oberlin, Ohio and almost completed, while the other two will be conserved by the artists who created them (Calaboyias and Myford). Mr. Brown noted that McKay

Lodge will also install the three pieces they conserved and that Myford and Calaboyias will be involved in installing their own pieces.

Mr. Brown stated that he has identified potential sites for all five sculptures but has not gone through a community process with all of them yet—therefore, he was not presenting these to the Commission as yet. Since the Myford piece was to be located in Grandview Park, and since the Park’s 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration was to occur on October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2009, Mr. Brown went ahead with garnering support from the community and artist so that if the Commission approved conceptually today, the piece could be touted as a “gift” to the community at its upcoming celebration.

Mr. Brown stated that he will work with the Office of Neighborhood Initiatives and Neighborhood Planners to garner support for all five pieces, planning for installation in Spring 2010 (March to June). Mr. Brown went on to say that he would bring all five sculptures back in Winter/Spring with construction drawings as well as community support before applying for Final approval.

Mr. Brown mentioned that he had met with the artist, Jim Myford, and the Grandview community (Mt. Washington CDC, Friends of Grandview, and Allentown Neighborhood Association) on August 10 and 24 and presented plans and contextual renderings of the sculpture located in the park. The community and the artist were very enthusiastic, and supported the piece at this location without reservation.

The group had even met onsite for a walk through of the park to make sure of this exact location.

Ms. Klavon asked if the sculpture was too close to the road

Mr. Brown answered that it is not close to a road, but a pedestrian walkway where cars are not supposed to drive. He mentioned that this specific location selection was intended to draw people into the park, so as not to conflict with the historic stone wall entrance or the view from the overlook area, and to correspond to the modernist-era adjacent band shelter.

Mr. Brown mentioned the fact that this community has a very interested, involved and vigilant group of volunteers that actively watch the area, take care of graffiti when it occurs, and support a local caretaker of the park that has maintained the area for over 35 years. He went on to say that all of the above makes him feel comfortable that placing the sculpture in this location will afford its well-being for many years to come.

Ms. Klavon asked about the artist.

Mr. Brown explained that Jim Myford is a local Pittsburgh abstract expressionist who taught at Slippery Rock University for over 30 years until he retired. Morandi was a cohort of the artists of the other four sculptures that will installed in the Spring of 2010.

Mr. Brown presented additional letters of support for this project from the Director of Parks and Recreation Duane Ashley and from the Allentown Neighborhood Association to supplement those of Public Works, Mt. Washington CDC, and others that had been sent with the application packets to the Commission prior to the hearing.

**MOTION: To grant Conceptual approval of this project as submitted.**

**MOVED: Mr. Indovina**

**SECONDED: Ms. Haskell**

**IN FAVOR: All**

**OPPOSED: None**

**CARRIED**

## Staff Report

Ms. Klavon stated that she had been speaking with Morton Brown about the need to clear up some questions around Art Commission purview of certain areas such as streetscape, noting that this has been a confusing and vague area in City code that continues to cause apprehension in the review of certain projects.

Ms. Klavon started the discussion of the Art Commission Bylaws and the Commission's purview of review, particularly streetscapes. She mentioned an example of a recently reviewed project in the Hill District that was a little confusing.

Mr. Brown pointed out and read 175.06 in code to demonstrate that the Art Commission has purview over "lines and prospect of the streets". He read the passage aloud that stated, "The Art Commission, acting by a quorum of appointed members, shall have the like power and jurisdiction over any arch, bridge, building, fence or approach which is to be the property of, and is proposed to be erected or placed by, any public service corporation in any street, highway or public place, for any purpose of corporation, and within the lines of any street, avenue, park or public place, and visible to the eye. Among the purposes of the Commission is to secure, so far as may be reasonably practicable, the free light, air and prospect of the streets and open spaces of the city, and to prevent the obstruction of the same by unsightly structures, though lawfully erected. For that purpose the Commission is authorized to devise and recommend for adoption by Council ordinance, the designs and regulations as may tend to prevent the unsightly occupation of the streets and open spaces, and, so far as may be practicable, to promote the beautification of the streets and open spaces."

Mr. Brown then noted that prior discussions with the City Law Department and Public Works has indicated that the Art Commission would review of renovations to sidewalk and streetscape components when there is a substantial or aesthetic change from its original state. However, he went on to say that it was noted in these discussions that the Law Department stated that if the streetscape was simply replaced with City-standard items that were originally at this location (in the case of the Bakery Square street-widening), then there would be no need for Art Commission review.

He went on to say that the literal language of the code did insinuate that the Art Commission would have purview over "structures" in the right of way and that he was not clear on items in ROW at grade.

Mr. Serrao interpreted the code as the Art Commission is allowed to "propose legislation" that council approves on specific items, and therefore does not have regulation over the streets, but could recommend code amendments to this effect. He stated that this is contrary to what he thought until he read this just now.

Ms. Klavon stated that the bylaws reflect the "lines of the streets" language in code and therefore support the idea that the Art Commission does have purview.

Mr. Serrao stated that the language in code that states: "For that purpose the Commission is authorized to devise and recommend for adoption by Council ordinance, the designs and regulations as may tend to prevent the unsightly occupation of the streets and open spaces, and, so far as may be practicable, to promote the beautification of the streets and open spaces" is accurate, but there is no clear piece of code that assigns purview over the streets currently.

Mr. Cooper stated that the passage is poorly written, but if one reads the first portion of 175.06, it does indicate jurisdiction over streets.

Ms. Haskell asked if this would pertain to a large mural that would encroach on the public's view.

Mr. Brown answered yes, he thought it was not clearly defined but that right could be invoked as it disturbs a "visual corridor" even on private property. The way he interprets this "view corridor/visible to the eye" language is that when something like a large billboard might get erected—on private property—that clearly disturbs a major view corridor in the city, it would be the right of the Art Commission to bring the party

responsible for the billboard in for review and potentially request its relocation. He went on to say that the Commission would definitely have to act like this on an extreme case and that he did not know how its decision would be carried out legally, but this was his interpretation of the language in code.

The group concluded that they have the right over what is listed in the code, and that they have the right to fight private proposals by going to Council with recommendations of Code amendment and/or new legislation.

Mr. Brown suggested that the language needs to be revised in Code and re-written for clarity by working with the Law Department and having the code amended by Council. The process would be as follows: The Public Art Manager would work with the Commission and the Law Department on crafting new language for Art Commission Code. Once the Commission and the Law Department were agreed, then these proposed Code changes would be discussed at a regular Art Commission hearing, before being submitted to City Council for approval. Once City Council approves, the Code is replaced with the new language.

Mr. Serrao added that bodies like CDAP, HRC, etc. were not around when this code was written, so it is time to revise the language to include these bodies and have a holistic approach.

Mr. Brown mentioned that the Permits Plus System online is being updated and will include the Art Commission application, which will allow all applications and associated permits to be tracked by those who deal with them, meaning: Applications will not be able to proceed without prerequisite documentation and sign off from various City Departments, and Zoning, BBI, Public Works, etc, will all be notified as apps and permits come in and gain approval, limiting the ability of anything slipping through the cracks.

Mr. Brown then stated that there is another issue that has arisen. Councilman Peduto had recently contacted Mr. Brown, stating that he had an issue with the fact that the Oakland Task Force Banners had been approved by the Public Art Manager instead of being approved in a public hearing before the Art Commission.

Mr. Brown reminded the Commission that in July, he had sent the Oakland Task Force Banner application to the Commission via email and asked for staff review instead of review in that month's hearing due to an unusually large amount of applicants for that month's hearing. He went on to state that in Art Commission bylaws, it clearly states "In cases where the Art Commission has developed standards for elements within its jurisdiction, such as street banners, the Director may request that the application be sent for a staff review instead of Art Commission approval". He also included that Director Ismail had sanctioned this request and agreed with the proposed course of action.

Mr. Brown stated that he presented this information to the Councilman, but Councilman Peduto was not satisfied. Councilman Peduto stated that he himself had created banner policies and procedures for the Art Commission back in 2001 and asserted that the current Art Commission Bylaws are in conflict with City Code as Code states that all Art Commission applicants must go before the Commission in a public hearing.

Mr. Brown went on to say that Councilman Peduto then placed this question to the City Law Department for interpretation and ruling. Mr. Brown had sent his own argument to the Law Department as well. There has been no ruling on this at the time of this hearing.

The Commission agreed that Mr. Brown had acted in a forthright manner on all fronts of this issue.

Mr. Astorino suggested that this issue be tabled pending interpretation from the Law Department.

All agreed.

**Meeting Adjourned**