

ART COMMISSION

Minutes of the meeting Wednesday, November 29, 2017
Beginning at 2:00 p.m.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION: Indovina, Baskinger, Goulatia, Heidemann, Lockett, Gable, Gastil

PRESENT OF THE STAFF: Guerra, Rearick

AGENDA ITEMS COVERED IN THESE MINUTES

ITEM	PAGE
1. Steps In Flux	1-3
2. City’s Edge	3-6
3. Pedestrian Wayfinding System	7-12
4. I-579 CAP-Cantini	12-15
5. I-579 CAP-Design Enhancements	15-33

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Roll call. Indovina asks for Commissioners to review the minutes. Goulatia asks for a correction on page 12 of the October minutes, the fifth line from the bottom, she would like to it to read “triangle motif” rather than “triangle part.” Baskinger points out that on page 27 Arimoto was spelled as *Arimoro* rather than *Arimoto*. Goulatia noted she would provide the missing sentence from page of the October minutes, when it is stated that the recording was too quiet to decipher.

Heidemann motioned to approve the minutes, Goulatia seconded. Motion carried.

B. Correspondence

Guerra stated that after the Stephen Foster hearing the Commissioners received correspondence. There were 9 letters: 7 were leave the statue as it is, 1 for removal, and 1 for reinterpretation. She stated that two other correspondences were received. The first was someone concerned about the selection of artists for the I-579 CAP project and the other letter was in support of saving the Cantini Mosaic work.

C. Items for Review

**1. Steps In Flux, City Step Activation Project
(Final)**

Brigette Davit, Project Manager and Catherine Drabkin, Project Partner

Davit introduced herself and Catherine Drabkin, stating they were before the Commission for final review of the Steps In Flux project. Davit stated a few changes had been made following the conceptual approval that was granted, and went through a general project review. The project is located in the Fineview neighborhood of the Northside. The steps are at the intersection of Biggs Avenue and Glenrose Street. The mural is a continuation of a series of step murals, the first of which was Steps In Motion, created by Catherine Drabkin on the Arch Street steps. Drabkin spoke about the Steps In Motion project, noting that it was exciting to have 50 volunteers to help with that project, and she has been taking the film made from that project to senior centers on the Northside. The Steps In Flux mural is heavily typographic based, with the text saying “The Only

Thing Constant Is Change,” which will be written on the steps. Davitt showed a before image along with a digital rendering of what the steps will look like after. Davit stated the type will rely on an anamorphic design, so as a person walks up the steps, only as they get to the top they’ll be able to read all of the words, they are not able to be seen from one vantage point. She says that in the original design the steps were painted all one color, which resulted in concerns about low vision pedestrian. Davit met with Richard Meritzer, the ADA Coordinator, and they talked about a few alternatives for the designs, and what is presented today is the one that Meritzer approved, which used a high contrast, monochromatic color palate for also color-blind users. She states that she thinks it increased the readability of the type in the end. Davit continued by showing existing condition photos and images of what the installation will be from various angles.

Indovina: I appreciate you making some changes to this based on our suggestions and also in conjunction with the ADA Coordinator, I think that is a very helpful thing to do. It looks like a great project.

Guerra: If you have any questions, the ADA Coordinator is here.

Baskinger: I have a couple of questions. One about the paint and what type of paint, and what the lifespan is on that. How long do you think it’ll be there before it starts to wear away?

Davit: I did research on mural paint. Chromacrylic is the #1 mural paint used by mural artists across the world, and then I’ve also included a mural shield which is to reduce the effects of fading and wear over time, and a graffiti coating which keeps people from spray painting on top of it or altering the state of it. Those have a 15-20 year warranty on them, so I’m hoping that this will last a number of decades. I live in Fineview, so I look forward to making sure that it is kept up over the course of the years for at least the life of what the coating is saying that it will last for.

Baskinger: The reason I ask that is because typically murals are on vertical surfaces and this will be really exposed to the elements and more wear.

Davit: The design also really relies on the actual exposed concrete as well, so the grey areas on the steps showing through with the black and white, which are the painted areas. So I’m limiting the amount of paint, hopefully also to help it last longer.

Baskinger: And then a follow-up to that. Will the whole pad be coated in the anti-graffiti or the graffiti resistant?

Davit: Yes. I put enough paint into the proposal to cover the steps completely.

Baskinger: It’s a clear coat, then?

Davit: It is.

Indovina asks for questions or comments and opens up public comment.

Goulatia: From a visual perspective I really like the graphic nature of it and I’m not sure if I’m too excited with the pattern blending in with it, but that’s just a comment.

Davit: Thank you.

Baskinger: Two more quick questions. Do you have an overview of what the whole graphic looks like?

Davit: This is what I have showing it just as you would see it from the bottom of the stairs. The entire, that was very difficult, I wasn't able to do that. But you can see the typography, that's the design of the typography which I created myself. Those are the actual words that will go up and around the stairs. The stairs have a bend in them and they're different lengths and so it was a lot to get them to kind of fit onto the stairs correctly so they'd still be readable.

Baskinger: Maybe this is a question for the ADA aspect of it, what sort of lighting conditions are around here and how does that factor into the monochromatic nature, because it looks like its mostly grey scale or white and black and concrete coming through. What does that do, in one of the slides it seems like there was a bit of flattening effect that can happen where the greys tend to blend with the vertical surfaces? Just above the purple, I don't know that that plays in, maybe ambient lighting or something may help that, it's just something that stood out to me given the color palate and context.

Drabkin: When we look at the center bottom panel, the subtleties of the grey, that's what's there now, that's the given. That's the unadorned, unchanged area.

Davit: There is a light that you can see, that is in the middle of the steps that illuminates them at night, and that is right around the area where that step is. And I want to add too that because this really is based on perspective, there's only one point where you would see it and it would look like that, and shifting left or right as you're moving up the stairs, everything is going to change and it would break apart. So it would only look like that from one particular place and as you move, it would change. And I don't know if Richard wanted to say anything.

Guerra: Richard, do you?

Meritzer: Not unless you have questions. I think it's a great project, we met a couple of times on this, I think its fine.

Indovina: If there's no further comments, they're here for final review. Indovina asks if someone would like to make a motion.

<u>MOTION:</u>	Final approval of the Steps In Flux Project		
MOVED BY	Heidemann	SECONDED BY	Goulatia
IN FAVOR	All		
OPPOSED	None		

CARRIED

**2. Strada and Midpoint-City's Edge
(Courtesy)**

Lawrence Fabbroni, Associate at Strada

Fabbroni introduced himself as an Associate from Strada and stated that he was joined by Terri Lee from Midpoint. Fabbroni stated that City's Edge is a nine story mixed-use project in Uptown, on what's commonly known as Lot F, which is a surface parking lot at the base of Pride Street, coming down from the Hill. He stated the site was originally RFP'd by the URA as a parking garage, and Midpoint came with a proposal to turn it into a mixed-use development. He stated there has been a lot of community outreach on the project with a wealth of support from the

community, while still working with some community groups in the Hill while moving forward with the public art component, and finalizing design on the project. Fabbroni said they'd like to activate Pride Street specifically. The site is a block off of Fifth Avenue, heading up into the Hill District from Uptown and the main intersection there is Pride Street, and the other streets are Stevenson Street and Coldwell Street. He showed some photos of existing conditions, with the site being a surface parking lot, where approximately 100 cars per day park. Fabbroni said that the program of the project is a 423 space garage with 106 residential units, with a large affordable component as well. He proceeded to show additional renderings, and then discussed specifically the public art elements of the project. Fabbroni said that the public art was to address both cultural identity within the neighborhoods as well as celebrates some of the history of the neighborhood. He showed a second level outdoor area for a daycare center, where they plan to put an art mural, working with a community artist to develop that mural. The other items are screening around the garage, where they see using perforated metal panels and using the perforations to create the images, so that it has a longer life than a painting. He stated that an integral part to the ownership of the public plaza that is being created, which helps to deal the topography, is a performance stage where there could be a place for community members to perform music or arts. Fabbroni proceeded to go through images related to the daycare mural as well as plaza images. He said they hope the lot in front of it becomes developed, but right now they know it'll be a prominent façade, so they want to treat it in a way that has more of an aesthetic appeal than just a garage. He showed what he said were they type of images they've been looking at, though they're going to work with community groups to actually choose images that they find most appealing and relevant to the history of the neighborhood. He showed the areas where the screens will be put on.

Indovina states that this would be a courtesy review because all images are on private property, though they do face the public realm. He then asks for questions or comments from the Commission.

Goulatia: How are you going to be choosing the artist? For the mural, and also, how are you deciding the images for the perforated screens?

Fabbroni: We've started working with the Hill CDC, which has an art committee. We were supposed to have a meeting which unfortunately had to be rescheduled due to a death in the woman's family, but to begin to talk about how we should select the artist and what the best way is, we're going to work with the community groups to do that.

Heidemann: Is the goal then to use an artist from that neighborhood, from the Hill?

Fabbroni: Yeah, that's the intent, to use a local artist to do that mural.

Goulatia: And even with the perforated screens, you'll have to see which images really work with it.

Fabbroni: Yeah, absolutely.

Goulatia: Have you seen anything like that before, have you done some research?

Fabbroni: Yeah, we've seen it successfully done but absolutely we're going to have to work with the manufacturer to make sure that the images are actually going to work at the scale and at the distances that you'll want them to be seen from.

Luckett: I'm just going to make an aesthetic comment. I feel like this is such a missed opportunity. I feel like this overall design is just uninspiring, and I wonder when have we, where did we kind of pivot away from inspiring design in this City? If you look at the last Century, we're known for our architecture and I see a lot of this new development as very underwhelming design. It doesn't have to be expensive to be really interesting and innovative, and although I applaud you for doing images that have to do with the influences of the folks in the community, I think about how you can use material and texture, on the exterior to really incorporate other things beyond just images. You can do abstract forms, there's just so much. I always like to challenge architects and engineers, developers, and construction workers to think beyond just the visual. To really incorporate a holistic approach when they're designing. I look at a lot of different buildings that are going on in other cities, I feel like Pittsburgh is missing the mark. We have all of these great technology companies here, we have all of these creative folks that live here and work here, yet I see buildings like this designed, and I'm like, wow-this could be anywhere. Because it's a lot of this kind of cut and paste, cut and paste. So that's my overall take on this design. Just think a little bit beyond what we're typically looking at as far as new construction goes in this City.

Fabroni: Ok. It's obviously a much larger discussion and I'd be happy to have that more with you outside of here too. And point noted. I think there's a lot of people that are very happy with where we've gotten to with this design, but yeah, I think there's always room to push further. That's what we hopefully try to do.

Baskinger: I'll build on that comment. I think that what you've done with the site, is there's an attempt to integrate it with the existing topography, which is nice rather than just flattening and throwing a building up. There is some integration there with how it fits that landscape. I want to echo the sentiment that I think there is an opportunity to not only physically integrate it with the context but conceptually integrate it with the community. And I think that the screens and the mural, and so forth, they're really nice sentiments but they feel applied as they're situated here. And so it's sort of like there's a building with bumper stickers on it. So maybe part of the opportunity is to look at the materiality and the way that integrates with those images, to situate it better, so that it feels like this building has not only grown out of the ground but grown out of the community. Without destroying the concept and efficiency, and everything you've put behind it. So things I'd question are the use of colors and certain materials that put those images forward or send them backwards, so that when you're on the street you do feel like that is part of the building or that it is a storefront display, which distances you from the building. So I think there's opportunities to explore that. And then also how bold the statement is, the thing that catches my eye, are the yellow colors. Which break up the form very nicely but maybe there's an opportunity to link that with some of the other graphical elements in the building itself.

Fabroni: The details of all of this are all still being worked out. I'll take your comments and we'll see, I mean that's why we're here.

Goulatia: I echo both of their comments. It just feels like a bunch of other buildings that I see in East Liberty and it just looks like one more in the same way. It would be nice to do something different. I think that the idea with the perforated metal is great. Maybe to do those images on the side instead, kind of break it up and do something like that instead of the yellow column would be a way to go. Integrating it more aesthetically and conceptually would be a great way to go.

Indovina: Building on those comments a little bit, our purview as Commissioners is art in the public realm. But I think there is an opportunity here to integrate this art a little bit more with the building. It does feel a little bit pasted on and perhaps a little bit of an afterthought. It would be nice to see it be more of a cohesive part of the overall design. Although this is a courtesy review,

you're suggesting images and what the mural might be. From my part I would like to see what those are before we, well I guess we don't have the final review or final approval of this, but I would be interested in seeing what those are as those are developed.

Fabbroni: Sure. I don't see any reason, we'll figure out what the venue is-if you want me to come back here or to send something. I don't think anyone has a problem with that.

Indovina: Again, I would encourage that whatever those images are, to be integrated into the building as opposed to being applied to it. I'm not sure how you do that, I'm not suggesting we pick up the brush and paint your painting, but give that some thought.

Baskinger: I just want a clarification, this may or may not come back to us, we don't have to approve it because it's on private property.

Indovina: That's correct. This is a courtesy review.

Baskinger: So they're reaching out to us.

Indovina: That is correct, which we appreciate.

Baskinger: That's pretty key here, because this is a moment. I think you guys can really use this as a moment to teach other developers and architects in the City of how to treat the City. I mean, you guys can actually take a stance that you're using the building as a reflector of the community. If that's the way that you're intending to go because, for what you've raised already, how far can you take it within the parameters of your project but also to make a statement because again, we are developing in very quick ways and it is kind of neutral all around the City. Is that our legacy or is it something more meaningful. So I think you guys are in a really unique position to do something meaningful, which is exciting.

Heidemann: And it actually means even more because you don't have to.

Indovina: Since again, this is a courtesy review, there's no action that we need to take. So we certainly appreciate you taking the time and the effort to come and talk to us, and look forward to whatever enhancements or developments take place.

Fabbroni: Thanks a lot everyone.

Gable: Just one question, what level of LEED certification are you seeking?

Fabbroni: This building will not be a LEED project. We are going to be enterprise green communities certified. That's what's happening.

Indovina: Thank you.

MOTION: Courtesy Review, no motion needed.

3. Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership-Pedestrian Wayfinding System (Courtesy)

Jeremy Waldrup, President & CEO of PDP and Justin Miller, DOMI

Waldrup introduced himself and said he is present on behalf of the wayfinding advisory committee. Along with the presentation, the wayfinding project brought life-size signage for review. Waldrup gave the definition of wayfinding to begin. He stated that stakeholders have said there is a need for better signage and this presentation is the attempt to begin to address that systematically. Waldrup said the wayfinding committee is made up of civic, cultural, and transportation organizations in Oakland, the Northshore, North Side, and Downtown Pittsburgh. He said those neighborhoods represent the largest concentration of regional scale destinations in Pittsburgh. He showed a map of the area in which they have been working to identify a signage system to support and serve. He said the project started in the fall of 2014, building from the work of Oakland in their efforts to create some comprehensive wayfinding and signage systems as part of their effort. Waldrup said they built a GIS sign database, looking at all of the signs in those four neighborhoods, and are very aware of clutter. They want to remove as much duplicative signage as they can as a part of the process. There are over 10,000 signs in the database that are geocoded, with photos of each. There is a wayfinding strategy document that was composed and released to the public in August of 2015 which outlines the goals and objective of the effort. Waldrup stated this is the second time before the commission. He then showed photos of the City's current wayfinding signage. There is a color coded vehicular oriented system, but it will not tell the best way to get to places via foot. He stated that the current color coding system is not intuitive and it bunches some of the neighborhoods together into the same colors. Waldrup referenced signage from other cities used during research. They have mapped approximately 140 neighborhood destinations that will be a part of the four neighborhoods within the system. Waldrup said the design team has identified key points where pedestrian decisions are made, and outlined them as key locations. The project will dig into each and every site to look at current conditions, what's in the sidewalk at each, and look at transportation and bus stop infrastructure that may make signage problematic. He then discussed the signage vs the kiosk locations, for Downtown, the North Shore, North Side, and Oakland. Miller from the Department of Mobility and Infrastructure said the process has been iterative, looking to speak to pedestrians in a way the current wayfinding system does not. Miller introduced the typeface designed for the project, Whitney Narrow Medium, stating it is essentially designed specifically for wayfinding programs. It is designed to be legible from a distance and can be compact to allow more text on the sign. The current system uses Helvetica, which he said suffers in terms of compactness. Where it previously did not allow for more than one line of text, now more can be squeezed into just a single line. Miller noted the full-scale size of the kiosks and identifying the neighborhood in which you are, along with providing major destinations and directions of the broader network. Miller then drew attention to the map examples and discussed looking at the image from various lighting conditions. Miller discussed being able to recognize elements. He talked about the varying types of signage and the indication of distance from signage to destinations, with location at multi-modal points. He stated that they're working to be as space efficient as possible with the varying types of signs. Miller discussed the color scheme utilized in the signage as well as addressed testing the signage in real world conditions, including a charrette. He said that outside, the colors began to get washed out and the color became difficult to read in some cases. Miller said most people preferred the simplified but highly legible black background with white text. He said it is a design that a lot of other cities have used. Waldrup said they went out into the streets with the signs on weekdays, weekends, and during PITT games. The team complied the feedback. Waldrup said the team is underway with the sign development process, and will come back to the Art Commission with a final design. The team is also going to show the design to the institutions that will be shown on the signage. Waldrup said in business improvement districts, areas with

respective taxing districts are committed to support the project but they are talking to the City sign shop, to have much of the system be maintained by the City sign shop. They are leaning towards a private company doing the install and then maintenance being done by City staff.

Indovina states that the Commission is on a bit of a time constraint for the day and asks that if the Commissioners have comments, to please make them brief. He then tells Waldrup and Miller that the Commission looks forward to seeing the final product.

Baskinger: When they come back we'll have a say in this?

Guerra: But they're here today, so you can make recommendations before they come again.

Heidemann: This what you're showing here, the prototype, is this what you used when you were testing out in the community? Is this the exact design?

Waldrup: Yes, initially through the charrette process we took all of the various colors out there. And that's when we quickly determined on a bright sunny day that some of these colors were just not legible. But this is what we took out for the individual assessments in each of the four neighborhoods.

Heidemann: You guys did a really nice job decreasing the visual clutter that we talked about the last time. I'm still, at least from here, knowing that you would experience this much closer, I'm still having a little bit of a hard time with visibility in terms of not seeing a whole lot of contrast in between the light and the dark in the mapping section. That's just how I'm experiencing it from here, maybe it would feel different out there, but from here it still seems like it would be hard to tell what's going on and it doesn't necessarily pull me in to engage with the map. But I think its overall a much, much cleaner design. I just still have some issues with the potential lack of contrast within the map.

Baskinger: I would agree with that. I want to commend you guys in doing a very thorough job. I know ARUP, I know people who work there, and I've been in signage and wayfinding for most of my career. They're good. They do very efficient work. I don't know that this project necessarily is about efficiency though. The thing that strikes me, especially given the last project which we saw, there's a certain generic quality to this and the way you guys tested the typeface and the look and feel of it, its sort of like a smaller version of road signs. And if that's the goal for people to walk by very quickly and orient themselves then it's an efficient solution. I would just caution you to not go down that route when you have an opportunity to use signage to enhance the sense of place making. There's nothing about this system that says Pittsburgh or relates to the neighborhoods. And I understand the need to be somewhat generic to appeal and fit with all of the diversity of contexts but there is an opportunity here. Even down to the selection of the typeface, there can be a greater narrative here. The origins of the typeface, the color palette and so forth can have a much deeper story which can add to that sense of place. So, I have less an issue with these totems here and more about the modular system looking like it's right off the shelf. That it can be from anywhere, and I would just really really caution you not to fall into something that's affordable driven by cost-driven parameters today, that will be ripped up in the next 15 years because we don't like it anymore. You have an opportunity to really set messaging for this City moving for the next 25 or 30 years. It's a prime time for this City to do this and the thinking is really solid, it's just that the expression of that thinking lacks the human element, in my opinion. So if you can look into that, that would be a huge benefit.

Indovina: I'd just like to echo Katherine's comment about the legibility of the map. The dark on dark to me is difficult to read. I think I would suggest revisiting that.

Gable: The original wayfinding signage stays also? And that is for us a revenue producer also, so is this going to be a revenue producer?

Waldrup: No, we do not see a pay to play model.

Gable: So who decides what destinations get put on the signs?

Waldrup: It was a process that we went through with each community that the City was a part of. Really looking at kind of publically accessible venues and their attendance. Obviously some of the really small destinations were cut just because when you look at the hierarchy and when they would be placed, they may make it to one sign which at that point doesn't really make much sense. But I think if there are specific destinations that a neighborhood needed, if folks were consistently lost, it could be added to that. And that's where we're really requiring and utilizing neighborhood specific knowledge.

Gable: And is there a limit to the number on these signs, is it three, is it five, is it seven?

Waldrup: I think it would depend on the length of the actual words that you're putting on there and how much they're stacked. But yeah there certainly is requirements just from a legibility standpoint you can't get too high. And of course there's limits on how low you can go. We don't see double stacking signs and frankly haven't identified, ARUP hasn't identified places where that's going to be a big issue. It's mostly in Oakland where you might have some really large institutions right on top of one another with really long names. And getting folks comfortable with this, what we know this is your official name, this what people call you, and this is what will be on the signage system.

Gable: The last comment, I know this isn't the final product, but Downtown and Northside are not neighborhoods, right?

Waldrup: I think that's arguable.

Gable: They're not officially neighborhoods, right? Central business, Northside's not a neighborhood. It's not one of the ninety neighborhoods.

Waldrup: Is Downtown not one of the ninety neighborhoods?

Gable: No, it's the Central Business District. It's referred to as Downtown. I'm just curious what goes up on the sign, is it going to be what people call it or is going to be what is listed? You've referenced neighborhoods so I just want to clarify, that's all.

Waldrup: As the head of the Downtown Partnership, I was not aware that Downtown was not a neighborhood. I would argue that we should maybe change that rather than our signage system.

Gable: I mean that's what it's referred to. I could go onto Oakland and ask which Oakland it's going to be because there are four Oakland's.

Waldrup: That sounds like a problem that maybe the City should tackle.

Gable: I was just curious that's all.

Gastil: It's a good question, thanks Director Gable, and we will follow-up.

Waldrup: I'd like to petition to City Planning become the ninety-first neighborhood if that is required.

Baskinger: I have a question about materials. What are you proposing, are these painted panels? What's the substrate, what's the coating? How flexible is it?

Miller: That's a discussion that we're kind of in the middle of having now, so I don't have a firm answer for you on that yet. We're trying to strike the balance between quality and durability, and what we can maintain affordably. Because I think one of the down sides of our current way finder system is it's thorough but the sign materials are custom shapes and so the prices are a little bit higher. They've lasted quite a long time, I think their design life was seven to ten years and here we are like 25 years later, and many of them are still out there. Some in better shape than others, so I think we're trying to strike that balance and I think as Jeremy mentioned, we'd like to try and have something that should the destination change, or a sign get knocked down or something like that, these things do happen and will happen, that the City sign shop can respond rather than having to contract it out every time. But I don't have a final answer for you yet on the materials. We definitely will have that next time we will come back.

Baskinger: One final question and it's more of a comment. Do you still have the presentation up? You show in example projects, your reference projects, the Chicago Parks District signage which was a project that I worked on years ago. When that was rolled out they were painted panels with vinyl. And the reason we did that was to see if the messaging was correct with the names and so forth, so it could easily be undone. It proved that very quickly people picked the stuff off, which was not great. But just think about how much text, testing the type sizes, testing the graphics, testing the icons and so forth, that if there's a contingency in your plan to do, think about how much messaging is too much. Because I'd hate to invest in this and say this is it, it's all done, and then get it out there and it doesn't work. Or it doesn't work as expected and you're locked in. So just a contingency for flexibility in the early stages so that you can tune it to get it right for the long term.

Waldrup: One of the things we're looking at too, and it's more dictated by funding, will be the phasing of this project and if we only get 25% of what we're looking for, what's that first phase of the project that goes out. Is it a specific neighborhood, or is it a specific sign type that gets out there first and that could be a good opportunity to do some of that.

Luckett: Remind me how many neighborhoods are included.

Waldrup: Its four neighborhoods.

Luckett: And what are they?

Waldrup: The Northside, if that's a neighborhood. Well I guess there's two neighborhoods, there's the North Shore and Oakland and then whatever the Northside and Downtown are.

Gastil: The Central Business District. Director Gable has once again proven that he knows Pittsburgh. That is called the Central Business District. There are in fact four Oakland's as described in the way we currently sign them. There are neighborhoods within the Northside. I think that in the end it will probably be at least 10 neighborhoods as within the formally defined 90 neighborhoods.

Waldrup: We did peel off the North Shore and the Northside. Initially it was all going to be the Northside but we added the North Shore because when you look at the North Shore destinations they kind of overwhelm anything else on the Northside, so by differentiating it by providing a new neighborhood with this, it gave those locations more prominence in the system.

Luckett: I think it would be really good to have guiding principles associated with this because it seems like you all are struggling to identify what's what. If you're looking at mapping and what areas geographically we're talking about, I think it would be really great just for you all to have that. Because it is a bit confusing for me. Also I was just looking at the Cultural District, Downtown, Northshore, PNC Park, the Warhol, Point State Park, Gateway Station, Convention Center, Pittsburgh History Center not Pittsburgh Heinz History Center...and I know you said for certain reasons why.

Waldrup: That would actually say Heinz.

Luckett: I was just interested, wow PNC but not Heinz, so there's just the consistency as well, so I think guiding principles would really help reinforce whatever it is, whichever direction you're going with.

Waldrup: That would actually say Heinz. I think that is what this document kind of articulates in some detail. But one thing to remember too is we're just looking at regional scope destinations which many neighborhoods don't have any.

Luckett: Now when you say regional scale, can you break that down for me?

Waldrup: Yeah, these 140 kind of Tier I, II, and III destinations that are open to the general public. So many of your Northside neighborhoods might not have any of those. And when you look at this map here, you can see the particular corridors that we see signage located on, which is just something to remember when it comes to where these signs will be located. We're not sending folks down every street, you won't see these on every street, it will be kind of high traffic areas. We'll be directing folks to commercial districts as much as we possibly can, to get them to walk through these corridors that we want to promote. Does that make sense?

Luckett: Yes and no. It all depends on what you put in there. Just getting back to what Mike (Gable) was asking, it's a very valid question. Sorting that out I think is really important.

Miller: I think maybe a part of this is how we refer to these areas rather than neighborhoods, which can be depending on who you ask and the time of day, is a contentious subject. I don't think we want to delve too much into neighborhood names and identities but these are more like signage geographies. These are larger clusters of where destinations can be found. Like the broader definition of Oakland rather than...

Luckett: But once again, you have to really clarify that because for you it might mean one thing but then for somebody else it might mean another thing, so to clarify that is imperative.

Goulatia: Also, the original signage is still going to exist right, which is color coded? And this is not. So is there a way to incorporate that, through a line or something, that will also give the sign some distinct feature but also connect, so people have a correlation?

Waldrup: Not really because in the current coloring system, the Northside is all one color, Downtown connects to Oakland so Uptown is eliminated. You could differentiate to a system that doesn't necessary make sense today or you could just leave it alone and that's kind of what we've decided makes the most sense. Because if you see here, the colors are no longer. Station Square and Mt. Washington are the same color, which clearly those are very different places.

Goulatia: Yes but that signage is not going to be changing, so....

Miller: We wrestled with this issue because we initially looked at this completely holistically including an automobile oriented signage system, which would replace what we have today. So we wanted to prioritize the pedestrian network which is something that we don't currently have. We don't have signage that speaks to pedestrians, so we wanted to put that first and foremost. I think the intent will be as these signs...so many of them are so well past their design limit...that we would replace them with a new standard that is an issue that we have not brought before you today because it's not something that is completely designed or funded, but the long-term goal I think would be to replace that with something else that is more in keeping with this design scheme.

Indovina: I think this whole thing is a very important element. This is probably one of the more important elements we've had before us, even though this is a courtesy review. Strictly speaking, we don't have purview, but I would encourage you to come back and present as you go along your development process.

Guerra: It is in your purview, but today they are here for a courtesy review and briefing of their process.

Indovina: I think there's a lot of questions that have been raised today just in the initial review, some very overarching, holistic questions, some specific questions. Again, I would really encourage you to come back multiple times. We would appreciate it, this is something that I think the Commission has a really vested interest in and this is a really important element for the City. I think having a pedestrian wayfinding system is tremendously important. I can't tell you how many times now that Pittsburgh is a tourist destination, I see people standing on the street looking at their phone wondering where to go. So I think this is a very very important process. So again, I encourage you to come back often.

MOTION: Courtesy Review, no motion needed.

**4. Sports and Exhibition Authority, Cantini Tunnel Mosaic
 (Courtesy)
 Doug Straley, Project Executive**

Straley introduced himself and stated that the Authority has been working with the City of Pittsburgh staff regarding the Virgil Cantini mosaic that is located in the underpass under Bigelow Boulevard. He stated that Ray (Gastil) and Yesica (Guerra) have briefed the Commission prior in the year, but the SEA would like to provide an update to the Commission prior to coming for any kind of formal action by the Commission, probably next year. He stated

that the I-579 Park, which will be discussed further in the next presentation, houses the Cantini where it currently is, which exists in a tunnel near Bigelow. For background he said, there is both Federal and State funding sources included in both the design and construction of the CAP Park. HDR and their sub consultant La Quatra are doing the design, which he references will be seen during the next presentation. The project will be bid through PennDOT. PennDOT will oversee the constructions and the City will hold the contracts and own and maintain the park after the construction is complete. Straley says he wants to first mention that the first thing that was done when starting the design on the overall park was to look at whether or not they could keep the tunnel that was existing, where the artwork is housed. Straley stated that HDR and La Quatra did an analysis and it impacts the functionality of the overall park by maintaining that tunnel. He stated that the pathway to the tunnel is currently not ADA accessible and they would lose a significant amount of functional space by trying to maintain that in relation to the rest of the overall park. Straley said that what the current park design provides is ADA accessibility from one end of the park to the other, and gets people to the intersection, which is part of the project at Chatham and Bigelow. That will have pedestrian crossing with an ADA pathway that will take visitors toward the USX Tower, which is where the tunnel leads today. He stated that they also feel the pathways in the park plan are safer pathways than the current tunnel location, which is somewhat dark in that area. Straley says that what he thinks the Commission heard in the last briefing is that they (SEA) in the CAP park design have a space for approximately 3 of the Cantini mosaics panels, there are 28 in total. Straley stated that they looked at whether or not they could remove and reuse all of them in the park design, but unfortunately he said there is not a retaining wall that is large enough to hold all of that artwork and the amount that it would cost to build such a wall into the design is approximately \$350,000. He said that what they are willing to do and what they are going to do is to remove if possible, as part of the construction project, remove all 28 of the mosaics. Straley says they haven't done any testing on how easily the mosaics will come off of the tunnel walls. He says that what they're saying is that they're willing to work with the City, it's a city artwork, determining what's the best use of all 28 panels. He restated that the project can use 3 panels in the project and put the 25 somewhere else or they can locate an area where all 28 could be relocated as a whole artwork. He said more discussions need to be had with parties in regard to that as well. Straley said that in 2015, because it is Federal money, they had to go through a process and fill out a category exclusion in relation to the artwork. He said it was approved at the time however since that time, someone has raised an issue with the Cantini being historically eligible, and so the next step through a 106 process is to have a sub consultant to HDR (Christine Davis) do an analysis of whether or not the Cantini would meet the eligibility criteria of the national register of historic places. He stated that to get her (Davis) to do this, a supplement must be approved through PennDOT. Straley said that over the last couple of weeks that is what the SEA has been working on, trying to get the supplement approved so that Davis can begin that work. He says that he thinks that work will take a couple of weeks, and then the SEA will submit it to PennDOT and PHMC and they will have up to 30 days to review it. Straley stated that they want to get that feedback before coming to the Commission for any kind of formal action on what is going to happen next, as well as have some more conversations with people that are interested in the artwork to see what can be determined as the best possible relocation of some or all of it, or whatever is decided at that time.

Indovina: I appreciate you guys stepping up and trying to resolve this in some fashion. We've had some discussions about this piece in the past. It's been somewhat unclear as to what could be done, so we certainly appreciate your efforts.

Gastil: Could you or someone from your team actually make sure the people know where the tunnel is now on the plan? I just want people to understand where it sits today.

Straley uses the presentation to show on the screen where the tunnel is located. He indicates on the screen where the tunnel can be entered from on both sides.

Gastil: Thank you, I just wanted to make sure they all saw that.

Straley: We aren't showing it in the next presentation, but we do have a small wall where we could put 3 of the panels (he then indicates on the screen where that would be located).

Goulatia: Is it on both walls of the tunnel?

Straley: It is. We were going to do a test actually to determine how easily they came off, but because we're in Section 106 we aren't able at this time to do a test, until we're through that process because again, we don't want anything to get damaged inadvertently, not knowing exactly how it's going to come off. Even though I know the City has already done photo documentation of the artwork as well as an appraisal of the artwork.

Goulatia: So is the tunnel going to be...what's happening with the tunnel?

Straley: It could basically get filled in. So we're trying to bring all of these grades, right now it goes down and under and those grades fall away. We're bringing this all up to around the same grade, even though we have some grade change across the site. So it's a fill situation in this area where you would have to get down to the tunnel. And then we're allowing pedestrians to cross here (showing on screen), ADA wise, have an ADA pathway to get down there which currently doesn't exist.

Indovina asks if there are any comments and says that certainly the Commission looks forward to the next steps and what the 106 determination shows.

Goulatia: We have a question in the audience.

Indovina asks the individual to identify herself.

Melissa Marinaro identifies herself from the Heinz History Center.

Marinaro: We have the Cantini archive so I just wanted you, both the Committee and Douglas, to be aware that we have the plans for this particular artwork. So if there are questions about how it was installed or the materials that were used to install it for the purpose of deinstallation, you can come to our archive and you can see those plans, and that might be helpful in assessing how the material might potentially respond to removal. So I just wanted to make sure that goes on the record so you know where to find it. Our archive is open Wednesday through Saturday, 10:00 AM- 5:00 PM. You can contact anyone at the History Center and they can give you more details on how to access that.

Baskinger: Is there any logic for keeping these pieces together versus separating them? Has anyone done any historical archeology on the pieces and the intent within?

Gastil: We have looked closely at the work as well as done historic documentation, because this as you know this, the decision was that it really didn't look like the tunnel could stay, so we've been looking closely at it. The work is meant to work together. The pieces are inter-related. Others with more knowledge than I may say that there's a very specific narrative, but in any case, they're intentional in terms of their placement and their relationship to each other. There

is also an intention in terms of if this is related to the overall urban redevelopment that was happening at this site. And those are all things that I think will be part of what is Section 106 review and so forth, and determining all of these things. We fully expect when it actually comes before the Commission again, we expect people will testify about that and they have certainly indicated that they hope to do so. We also will assist the SEA in terms of any sort of meetings as part of their historic group, they'll need, there will be some interaction with folks that have a strong knowledge and interest in these, and we'll work together to have those meetings, which will happen presumably prior to when this comes back to the Commission for your review. But the basic gesture is that it was a body of work that was done intentionally at this site. The passage is City property, that's why these are in fact public works.

Goulatia: And there's no way to keep them as they are?

Gastil: I think that's something that will be part of, or maybe discussed more fully. I think that Doug laid out, that's my understanding.

Straley: That's correct.

Gastil: Because that's a discussion. There may be folks that state that that's not the case. I think the plan is basically like there's no way to achieve the park as proposed with having that tunnel there, because you can't have the levels if you've cut into it, with this tunnel. But there may also be structural and other reasons. As Doug mentioned there's also the ADA issue that the way the path is currently construed would have to be remade in terms of tunnel, because it's too steep coming into the tunnel from both sides. That said, that's all part of the work that will be the reporting out of the full report when it comes back. Our sense as a staff was that it wasn't going to be possible, but at that the same time all of those questions may be reiterated by the public in the process, and we'll address them.

Jeff Slack approaches the podium and introduces himself.

Slack: I happen to be Chair of the State Historic Preservation Board although I'm not officially here in that capacity today. I just wanted to add a little more detail that part of that Section 106 review will include what's called an alternative analysis. There will be a formal process where there will be open dialogue to look at other alternatives and the ultimate goal of the Section 106 process is to see if we can avoid negative impact; if not, minimize the negative impact; if not, then mitigate that impact through some of the options that were discussed, like could we find a place to put the mural in its entirety someplace else.

Indovina states that at this point the agenda moves onto the final review of design enhancements for the site.

5. Sports and Exhibition Authority, I-579 CAP (Final)

Fred Bonci, Founder at LaQuatra Bonci, Dan McDowell, Senior Associate at LaQuatra Bonci, Sallyann Kluz, Associate Director at Office of Public Art, Lake Byrd, Design Enhancement Project Manager, Kimberly Ellis, and Amir Rashidd, Project Artists

Sallyann Kluz introduces herself from the Office of Public Art. She states that she is part of the team that will talk about the artist designed enhancements for the I-579 CAP project. Kluz says that the Commission has become familiar with the park itself, as the project has come through

the Commission several months ago for final approval. The team has also been before the Commission previously for conceptual approval of the design enhancements, so they are now before the Commission to give an update and request final approval for design enhancements. Kluz said that as a brief overview of the project, the SEA and La Quatra Bonci in the early design phases, in working with the community had identified a desire to have artist designed features integrated into the park itself. Kluz says that the way in which it is being accomplished through the funding streams was to do an open call for artists to work in conjunction with La Quatra Bonci, to create artist designed enhancements through the park, so they are not freestanding artwork, but rather places where artists have participated in developing items or features within the park. Kluz states that it won't preclude opportunities down the road for additional artworks to be introduced to the park, or for temporary artwork and activations, but it really gets artists participating in the process during the early phases. She said that the Office of Public Art facilitated an open request for qualifications back in the fall of 2016, seeking as part of that RFQ the identification of up to three community based artists and one coordinating artist, to collaborate with the design team. She said the selection team for that process included several design members, visual arts professionals, and stakeholders which first reviewed the artist qualifications to create a short list, and then held interviews to select the artists that would work on the project, which lead to the selection of the artists that would work on the team that will be presenting today: Dr. Kim Ellis, Amir Rashidd, and Jan Rosen-Queralt. Lake Byrd was retained as the design consultant to facilitate the process with the artists, the community, and the design team as well. Kluz stated that during the selection process the community members particularly cited the desire to see ecological or environmentally based arts as one of the themes as well as the integration of community vision, which can be seen as themes in each of the artists' works. Kluz said that to kick off the design process the SEA and La Quatra Bonci hosted a multi-day charrette to familiarize the artists with the park design and to generate the initial concepts for the work. She said that two key themes that emerged from the intensive work session became the driving factors in the artist designed enhancements. The first of those themes is that the park said Kluz, while it should recognize and celebrate the past and the legacy of the Hill District, and recognize richness of that history, it should be decidedly futuristic looking and speak to the future of the Hill, the future of the community, and the future of its connections with Downtown. She also said that one of the most inspirational themes that arose was that the park decidedly center African-American and Black experience throughout. Kluz then turned the presentation over to Lake Byrd to talk about the overall community process. Byrd gave a recap of the community process that was presented during conceptual review, which kicked off December of 2016 and went on through April of 2017. Byrd stated that since the last time the project came before the Art Commission, they continued to engage the community. She said that many Hill District residents were identified to be a part of the design thinking process, also noting that open houses were held at the Carnegie Library as well as Crazy Mocha, to allow others to be involved in the design process. Byrd stated that the artist who worked with the project from Baltimore came in on several occasions. Byrd introduced Bonci to talk about the park design, prior to continuing discussion about the design enhancements. Bonci stated that in addition to the process that went through the artists, he wanted to remind everyone that the park itself went through a public process as well, engaging the Hill District neighborhood groups in programming and design of the park, and out of those grew the arts process. He referred to the presentation to identify the CAP park location. He discussed creating better accessibility given the pathways, which he said will lead to another discussion about the Cantini and the tunnel. Bonci stated that the Lower Hill is 28 acres, which was part of the FLDP. He said that projects are being discussed, with one being an entertainment district, which 22.2 acres may be part of. Bonci said that the design itself is into the final construction drawing phase, which was given final approval on the park design. He said that the park has had minor tweaks, which were primarily based on how the art has

developed and how the project has tried to integrate the art within the program. Bonci said that the circulation patterns remain the same with their major diagonals, with the accessibility pathways capturing the major traffic, whether event or neighborhood traffic, and puts them in a major walkway system with a major entry plaza. Bonci showed the upper tier as the primary piece of the CAP Park as well as the lower piece. He stated that minor changes have been made to the art pieces since the previous presentation, including this history walls which have moved closer to the architectural enclosure. They have tried to simplify and consolidate it to make it more cohesive to the design of the park. The classroom area remains where it was previously. He restated that all of the artwork has been consolidated into one particular piece of land, with the emerging expansion of a piece of artwork that Kim Ellis was developing, the educational and wayfinding systems within the park; becoming an iconic gateway which interprets storm water as well. He states that in the PennDOT area of the park, what is funded is a terrace, which will have the potential in the future for a pavilion and a stage. With the provided infrastructure within the existing budget, the pavilions themselves are not in the current budget, though designed in concept. Bonci said that is the same with the water feature, which is consistent with what was presented in the previous presentation. He continued on to break down the artwork pieces within the park; totems remain as previously presented, history walls consolidated into one architectural piece, the gardens and classroom remain, the Sankofa bird representation remains as well as tinted concrete, the storm water capture remains with drainage into storm water management system. Bonci continued with the wayfinding signage and turned over the presentation Kim Ellis. She proceeded to discuss the history wall component, consistent with the previous presentation. Ellis discussed the concept of Keisha, which emerged as a "tour guide" to represent hope and fun. Keisha is the representation of a young child, which identifies wayfinding potentials throughout the site. Ellis continued to show each Keisha sign that will be integrated throughout the park and then went on to describe the content on the history walls, which was consistent with the previous presentation as well. She stated that the focus was on the space being a crossroads of the City of Pittsburgh, including transportation, choosing to honor the history of the historic Hill District, with Martin Delaney as well as Frankie Pace. Ellis stated that Pace emerged since Pittsburgh had the first URA, and Pace was one of the first to protest how urban renewal was being reenacted. Byrd approached the podium to do one last review of all artistic elements and text on the panels, which were consistent with the previous presentation of the artistic elements. Bonci approached the podium to discuss the materials that were to be used for the artistic elements.

Indovina asks if there are any questions or comments from the Commission.

Luckett: Wow, this has evolved even more. This is stronger, I commend you all. Question-Fred, could you show where the interpretive horizontal panels, and also the totems, where those are, please?

Bonci: Yes, the totems are right here (showing on the presentation screen.) What we thought with those when Lake was developing the concept of the various heights of tables, was that people could rest coffee cups on them, etc. Hopefully in the future we get this pavilion here with restrooms (showing on presentation screen,) this we're hoping is the outdoor space for a café. So we can have movable furniture but we can also make those a playful piece of the outdoor furnishings as well, that in the winter there is still some kind of neat thing that you could do with them. And what was the....

Luckett: The horizontal panels.

Bonci: The picture we showed of them?

Luckett: Yes, and the pictures of the 18th and 19th Century figures.

Bonci: Ok, that is right here (on presentation screen,) that is the little arbor and the history walls, the Delaney and the Pace, right there. So if you remember the arbor, it's really under an arbor and what we did was place that as a direct entry to the classroom so we're trying to tie these two pieces of art together. And that is a gateway, because in the future we're hoping that this development will have another walk here fronting this development with a pathway directly to it. So we're trying to make that a gateway to that parcel as well. So it's a two-sided garden structure, it has the sign panels on this side, which are in glass that will be illuminated and on the backside it has a grid like that one picture that we probably hurried through, that has architectural pattern on the back, that could have lines on it as well, so it becomes more like a garden like structure. And that is again a steel structure as well. And then there were seat wall with writing on it that Amir is doing, that are these wall right in here (on presentation screen.) Do I need to go back to an image?

Luckett: I just had a question about the totem and those horizontal structures that kind of look like steps, how much weight do they support?

Bonci: Well everything is out of steel, so one of the things we're looking at, those are probably going to be 3-4 inches thick and we're working with fabricators, in fact it's almost like a planter design where you're crimping the edges to get that strength and there will be internal support.

Luckett: So if someone were a child stepping on them?

Bonci: There's a lot of things that the mechanisms, this is directly tied into that mechanism that actually is almost like a rotating mechanism. So they're secured into that post, so if somebody is going to do it, they're tipping it entirely. I imagine somebody could like run a car into them or decide that they're going to do something crazy with it, but the intent is to make them really, really durable, so they're not anything thin. We're thinking of them as being very, very durable pieces.

Luckett: Ok

Heidemann: It's hard to tell from the text from before and after, but looking at sort of the comments, reminding the group of some, there were some concerns about the amount of text in those wall panels. Was there editing or reduction of that text since then?

Bonci: Since the last time you saw it there was a lot of editing and independent review. Renee can speak to that more. We really tried to distill it down and we're caught between two things. People can fill into this if they want. One is enough text to tell the story. And another is editing it so much that the full story is not told, so we think we've finally reached the happy balance and I'll let Renee and others talk about that. The other thing that I think that, since we're still in construction drawing, that we want to work on is right now we're showing that type. We could play around with different type size, faces as well, to sort of make words bigger and that's the next step but we think the text is at the right point where we need it. Whether it's artistically expressed or not, is still something we're working on.

Heidemann: Yes. This idea just popped. Because there's so much and you're going to get people that are totally engaged with the text and you're going to get people passing by. What

ways to highlight and almost tell a story, even in impact words, to bring it more cohesive for the causal passerby.

Bonci: And that's one of the things that we've talked about, do we highlight certain areas. One of the things that we showed, that is a little bit hard to see, but it's in your packet. In Boston along one of the streets, where they used all of their bus stops and enclosures around transformers to interpret history. And you could see a run of text, but what they did was they highlighted certain parts on the side or whatever, so those are the kinds of things we've been looking at and we're conscious of that. So if somebody does want to read it, they can. Somebody else is going to get something out of it anyway.

Indovina: The classroom area, is that intended to be a formal classroom where there would be a teacher and student group or is that kind of a self-interpretive, self-taught area?

Bonci: We're leaving it open to whatever happens there. There's two parts to that. One is itself educational and it's self-play, so a parent with two kids can go there and it's just free-form, pick-up, play the musical instruments. The other thing is you could actually have a school group go there, sit around the walls, and have a formal story time or formal lecture. So when there's a festival there or a neighborhood event happening, it could be a place for small music or stories. So we tried to design it both ways and Amir was very conscious of wanting it to be flexible enough that it would be fun if there was not a formal event, but if there was, that it could be used also for group education. You can probably get about 25 kids around those two lower circle areas, which is daycarish size or a small group of people who would want to do that. And there's a lot of grass around it, the kids could sit around the slope around it and do something a little bit bigger with it. So trying to make it look informal, so if nothing is happening there, it doesn't look like wasted space. We're trying to be conscious of making it feel good when there's not an event happening. That image does not have the future buildings in it, which will be the next generation of those events, but that's what would be built as part of the PennDOT project.

Goulatia: (Looking at illustration that was handed out.) This rendering is for which part?

Bonci: That is, if you go back to the plan, if you were standing here (points to screen), if you're looking down the seat wall and in the seat wall in the distance is the arbor, it has the history panel, you're looking across them down towards the City. So you're standing right here looking down. And on the left should be the totems.

Baskinger: I really commend the intent of this project. It's a functional asset for this City and really sets a tone for public parks moving forward. I think it's really substantive in that way. The criticism I have though, is that the intent and messaging and narrative is somewhat frustrated by the elements that are there. The cultural elements that are co-located in this curated natural context, that they're somewhat at odds with each other. The only coherence of these elements within the space is that they're there, and there's not a real conscious thought about the integration into the built or the natural environment. So some of the criticisms I have about type and image and verticality and materiality, that's all secondary to the idea that these are so different than furniture, and I think that my own critique is that it impairs the depth of the narrative that they're supposed to carry. And I don't disagree with them as artistic pieces, but the co-location really makes this eclectic disparate set of narratives that I have a hard time making sense of when I look at it in this way. Perhaps when I move through the space that you know, seeing one at a time, I'll feel differently as I move through which can certainly work. But you know, I'm just sort of curious and I know you went through a lengthy development process

on this. What sort of thoughts or what sort of challenges did you face, and how did you give some thought to integration vs just co-location?

Bonci: Well, others can speak to this as well, I think that this has been a process that we've come back through a number of times. We had artwork that was scattered throughout this whole area that we thought was even less related to the site or integrated within the site. And one of the things that as the artists started working together more and more and our team changed a little bit as well, and Lake picked up some of the other work, was to try to figure out how do we still take some of the expressions that all the process we went through with the neighborhood residents and the people who were involved in the process, liking the totems and taller images that meant something culturally, as well as making sure that we conveyed the history text. One of the things that we didn't want to do was put things into the ground where people had to walk over them or not have them at a place where they were at eye-level to read them. So we really looked at since this was hub of activity-to try and place them, that when you're walking by that these are things you pass by or you can enter at the history wall a garden room, to be able to interpret that. The totems become icons but they also become usable pieces of furniture, so we tried to sort of think about, how those things that people really liked became part of the furnishing of the park. So in some sense they are looked at as furniture. This one here is integrated directly into the topography of the site and again trying to trying to think of other dual role of being path side places to sit, because there's going to be a building here that you don't turn your back to something but you face it, but also how do you take advantage and made an amphitheater out of it that looks over gardens or allows for education or something to happen. This is separated from the event lawn because we're hoping that kid's events can happen over here while something else is happening. So we're trying to think about how the park landscape can respond to artwork and also where kids events can be. Furnishings, they may not be like some art, totally engaged in it, but I think when you're trying to tell the story of history, you're having people look at photographs or look at other things, there's not a lot of ways to do that without trying to get them where people can see them at eye level and not have people bending over or make it feel like it's a secondary piece. A lot of interpretive signs are below you and you have to decide if you even want to see them. We tried as a team, what gives them some iconic presence in the park but also what blends them as an easy thing to use as a furnishing in the park or an element in the park that you walk through. So I'm hoping that I'm answering your question.

Renee Piechocki approaches the podium.

Piechocki: I'm Renee Piechocki from the Office of Public Art. I'd love to just hop in on Fred's articulate response to that. One of the things that he did not mention, although he said many things I would say, is the really important need to underscore the fact that this is all happening with Federal money, where artwork is not allowed and you have to respond to PennDOT standards for what can be constructed. And so what I'd like to emphasize is what an amazing crew this is, that we have a design team that was excited about working with the artists and looking at all of the elements in the park. This stands in direct contrast to the Walter Hood Landscape at the arena that has never been built, because not enough money has been raised. So it is incredibly important that this design team took advantage of the opportunities they had, to look at every single element in this park and see if they could underscore some of the desire of the community, to see themselves represented in this park. And so while things may look like furniture, it's because that's what PennDOT is going to let us build. And I really appreciate that all of the artists were on board for answering the question, if we're going to put furniture and seats in the park, how do we have that reflect black experience. If we're going to have to put concrete paths in the park, how do we have that reflect black experience? And so I just think

that framework is incredibly important to understand why the design enhancements look like this and will be completely integrated into the construction documents. And so while there are many, many elements, they are all, many of them are in fact very subtle, it leaves a lot of opportunity for future permanent or temporary art, should the City's Public Art Division wish to do so.

Byrd: I just want to comment really quickly. I want to speak to that as well, really briefly. When we think about parks, parks can lean towards being more of a museum where you pass through, but one of the things that came out of this process of engaging the artists was not creating a space where you just pass through, but creating opportunities where you do stop and stay. And so, though I wouldn't use the term furniture, I think furniture is also considered art and it's considered an opportunity to invite people in welcome them in, and I think what we have here and what we've done is create furnishings if you will, that are integrated into this space and actually do flow with the context going back to using the seating walls, really thinking about the context around us, and thinking about the opportunity where we can have that outdoor classroom experience, what's really needed to encourage that type of activity. We couldn't really control the program of what happens afterwards, but we surely could create an opportunity to encourage that type of experience where people have the amenities and the functionality. I think that was important to the functionality of this space, not something we just look at, but something that we actually interact with and I think art that's usable as well.

Indovina: Who will own and maintain all of these elements?

Guerra: The City.

Straley: We've met with Director Gable.

Guerra: His letter of support (Director Gable) states that the drawings and everything needs to be shared with him before.

Baskinger: So is there a meta-level narrative that can be expressed in the park somewhere? This is a momentous type venture, so who tells the story of the park and where does that get expressed so that when people go to this space, they see that there was a design process around this, that it was community led, that it was integrated in this way?

Ellis: I have question about your question. What part, well I'm a story teller, often times in the specific you find the universal. As I explained in my discussion about the history walls, we start off temporally 19th Century, 20th Century, 21st Century. We start off with local Pittsburgh history, literally the development of the URA, the fact that the Lower Hill was multi-cultural and then become largely an African-America community which it still is to this day. We talk about transportation, literally, I mean it's the fun stuff, right? Like the walking paths and the foot paths and the water flow and the bird with flight. I'm curious about your question around the meta-narrative and what you think is missing or what you would like to see.

Baskinger: The story behind this concept.

Ellis: Okay.

Baskinger: Who is the group that came together? Who are the architects? How did the community come together in this way to create this? Not stories that are in there, there's no

disagreement with that. It's the design process that led us to this. Because again, this is a unique feature for this City. And there will be others like this, this will be imitated.

Ellis: Yes.

Baskinger: We need to tell that story, about people working together in unique ways to yield something like this.

Bonci: To be honest with you, it would be great to have that. Millennium Park in Chicago has that sort of thing near their Founder's Wall, where people who donated really talk about how that came about and the process that they went through. We didn't really think about that, we were really concentrating on telling the history of the neighborhood. That's something that I think, as we do final design, we could look at where those kind of things would be and maybe that becomes part of a bigger interpretation system that sort of celebrates public open space in Pittsburgh. I think it's an excellent point, we were focused on an art process so to be honest with you, we didn't really come to that but I appreciate that question. I think it's a very compelling one. Thank you.

Goulatia: I have a quick question. What is that area, the triangular? (Speaking of a grey area on the planning document.)

Bonci: The triangle is a parcel that is not owned by the URA, the City, or the park. It cannot be part of the park because it is part of the 28 acre development that is part of the Lower Hill Development. This is one parcel that they've retained, they've always retained, the parking lot is there right now. It's always been part of that land. However the people who are looking at, one of the developers that is looking at that, is looking at a complimentary development that will complement the park. So we're engaging with them so he understands the design of the park. It's an ongoing discussion but we're trying to set it up for that to be a complimentary building to the park. So right now we're showing it as not developed because we don't own it so we can't do anything for it.

Indovina: Any further comments or questions?

Luckett: I just want to make a comment about what Mark said. I think I see your point, however I see that this should be a standard. We shouldn't even have to put language that speaks to this process because I feel like this should be a standard. This shouldn't even be discussed because this should be happening on all levels. But I see your point, I do. I see your point however I'm just saying, this should be a standard for how we go about designing, how we go about building, community, all of that. Because I think it tends to be, because this land is such a deeply problematic, all of that land over there, is deeply problematic-historical, economic, social, so I think this is a great example, I do think though that this should be something that should be just a standard thing.

Indovina: Well this project has come back to us many many times, they've been very thoroughly engaged in the Commission and they've layered the design piece by piece. So, I think this was perhaps before your time on the Commission, but there were explanations of what the various areas of the park were intended to do, and what the reason were both practical and artistic and social reasons, for some of the way that the park is organized. I think it certainly is a valid question, but to my mind I believe that was addressed through their whole design process and I think it's come to a good conclusion from a physical standpoint, a design standpoint, and a social standpoint.

Bonci: And I just want to say that because we've come here often, it helped our art process as well and it helped bring clarity to it because when we first came there were a lot of ideas out there, and I think one of the things we heard the group say is that we need to be clear about the story, we need to be more direct, so I think the process has been improved because we had the dialogue. And it helped us I think, get to a point where we're at today.

Indovina: I think I saw a hand back there. If you could come up and identify yourself please.

Phyllis Ghafoor: Among some of the achievements I've had is a Master of Urban and Regional Planning, a Master of Business Administration for Carlow, assorted of technology degrees from Community College, and my Bachelor's Degree is in Art/Art Therapy and Psychology. So I not only do art, I have taught art and I've taught art to handicapped people with multiple handicapped conditions, which is a great challenge. The reason why I'm here today and I agree with your assessment, to an extent, I have a letter and nobody talked about, to Rob Indovina.

Guerra: We mentioned your letter at the beginning.

Ghafoor: At the beginning, I'm sorry I couldn't be here. We have a hard time getting down here. At first glance, it does some wonderful things but I think where you're getting to, and I'm not going to make this long because I don't have a lot of voice left, this is one part of a preliminary land development, preliminary land use development plan. I think that was before your time. It also has to go through a final land use development plan, and that will be contingent upon either most of the parcels around it being completed or I think G, which is directly to the West, Northwest. Once that's done, then the entire site kicks into a final land use development plan. So it's not finished yet. But the bigger piece that you seem to be confused by, this is part of a large Lower Hill land use development plan, which was reviewed by 40 people before any of these people, we fought almost until May of 2016 to have the community be partly African-American. Because I go back in the project before the Civic Arena was demolished, until that point, I was able to share my email addresses to bring more blacks into review of the plan. That they chose to have designers a part of it, was not my responsibility neither was sharing my email addresses which was taken credit by one of their consultants in an email, so it's been a struggle all along to have input. I was one of the six finalists and anybody who has ever done art, in going through review, knows that you could be disqualified. But the review process was so weird. I don't think, when I say weird, it broke down from being a part of a bigger picture to what you have now. It should've had pieces of that larger plan. There's going to be more artwork up there. But in the end, I hope that the process is more fair, we're given more than 2 days to respond to an RFP, and it truly celebrates not just black life, but life period. Because before I came here I wanted to see who settled Pittsburgh. Why was this even closed off, you know the rationale and it happened to be, that European groups and African Americans from the South came north to find better conditions. And that that means is, what bothers me, and I'm not going to read all the sections, that it violates namely the overview and planning history, the legacy and place making, it is not required as open space for the project but it goes without saying that H and I are connected under the same final land use development plan, therefore what was established by 40 people before this day. Before this day. Before these people existed. And these are wonderful people, wonderful professionals, I respect them, but you can't chop off pieces of stuff, a history of a whole site and expect to turn out okay. I see the tons of work that has gone into this so my bigger feeling is that it should be approved but it should be approved with conditions and I'll tell you why.

Luckett: I just wanted to let you know, you do get only so much time to respond.

Ghafoor: Okay, okay. Everybody had tons of time.

Luckett: But as a person coming in that's not part of the actual presentation, as a public citizen you do have only so much time. Just so you know.

Ghafoor: Ok so let me wrap it up, because I don't have a lot of voice left. There were about 10 Western European groups that should have been...

Indovina: Let me just stop you there for a second because what's before us the presentation that we've heard. The process that's behind it is really not part of our purview.

Ghafoor: I'm really not finished with the rest of the sentence. Unless these groups have a kiosk, have a decorative rock in the ground saying that the Italians were here, any child walking through this or any person walking through this, would have a problem not seeing themselves. Because in actuality both groups, Western Europeans and African Americans from the South, came in at the same time. And I think that it takes us, when I was younger, I wanted everything black. I didn't care if it hurt anybody or people were left out, so it comes an anomaly for a black person to want others to be included in this signage and into this plan somewhere.

Indovina: Okay, thank you.

Ghafoor: Along the wall somewhere.

Indovina: I think we heard your point, thank you very much. Anybody else like to make a comment? And we'd like to ask you to limit it to 2 minutes please.

It will be brief, said Terri Baltimore as she introduced herself.

Baltimore: I work at the Hill House and have been in the neighborhood for 25 years, and I just want to say that I respect this process because I've listened to you do the review this afternoon and the one thing I heard very clearly is that you were looking for innovation and inclusivity, and this process not only created this beautiful park but it gave artists from the neighborhood an opportunity to be part of the design team. So they were sitting at the table thinking through how they can represent the neighborhood in their art through this process. A process that was very challenging when you consider that they were not putting art in this space. But they had to work with the team so that the art was integrated into the design of the space. So I think as you pointed out earlier, this should not be the anomaly, this should not be the one-off. This should be the expectation that communities are clearly a part of the process and the artist's in the community are included in the process and given every opportunity to get commissions to do incredible work like this.

Indovina: Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to make a comment? Seeing none, so this is before us for final review. As I understand it the construction drawings are in process, is that correct?

Bonci: We just sent our 90% sets to PennDOT last month and our 100% is due sometime in December.

Indovina: So I would suggest two things: 1. I think that the Cantini issue is still somewhat unresolved at this point and I think there are some questions that have come up in discussion and comments by the Commission, I would suggest that we make the final approval subject to

review and approval of the Construction documents both by staff perhaps by the Commission and by DPW for final approval to be finalized.

Luckett: And was there any discussion about the Cantini? Because would that affect construction drawings?

Indovina: Yes. So the final resolution of the location and just what's happening with that.

Luckett: What's the timeframe on the Cantini component?

Straley (not speaking at the microphone, some words may be lost): It'll take a couple of weeks to determine the eligibility and then we would submit that to PennDOT. If it was determined not eligible it would be the end of the process. If it is eligible it goes to Jeff Slack's earlier comment, then there would have to be a plan submitted what we would do with it, which we're saying right now we're taking it all off. We'd be trying to remove them as long as they don't get damaged in the process and we feel with that submission that we've got some preliminary indication from PennDOT that there wouldn't be an adverse effect and that be the end. The only other step would be determining what the City would want to do with those, keep them together, put some here, put some somewhere else, store some. Those possibilities can continue to play out because they wouldn't impact the design in any way.

Luckett: So there's no consideration at this point in time to integrate any component or the full Cantini, if it's determined that

Straley (not speaking at the microphone, some words may be lost): We don't have a space and we'd have to build basically a faux wall to put it on and that's \$350,000 and that we're not willing to do right now. We don't have the money for and we don't even think that's a really good use of space, it would affect the functionality of the park to put another wall somewhere. We are ponying up an extra \$115,000 just to take it down as part of our construction project to save all of the pieces. The plan that we show with 3 panels being used is around \$46,000 with the approximate appraised value. We're trying to make concessions here to make people comfortable with what's going on in the process.

Luckett: You're not doing it because it might be the right thing to do?

Straley: Well hopefully....

Luckett: I'm asking the question.

Unannounced individual from the audience: How about if somebody comes up with the money?

Rearick: If anybody else is speaking, can you please come to the microphone?

Luckett: Yes, please come to the microphone.

Brittany Reilly approaches the podium and introduces herself.

Reilly: I am a curator and art historian. I have an organization Design Nation, I offer public programming and provide services that contribute to the preservation of public art and design, I've done extensive research on Virgil Cantini, have been in conversation with his daughter Lisa Cantini Seguin, and engaged the public in walking tours where we have explored a range of

Virgil's public works and namely the mosaic tunnel to raise awareness about its location. I just want to emphasize an appropriate definition of what we're calling the artwork, because his artwork in this underpass is not a random collection of 20-some individual panels but it's a comprehensive installation of 2 long compositions, and so the artist intention for both the public experience of the work and how it should be again experienced in walking through, could be considered as 2 ribbons, 2 compositions which are even described in original articles with one composition evoking an abstract city-scape and the other an aerial perspective of urban typography. So these are not again panels that once kind of dismembered and presented as say 3 kind, kind of allow that comprehensive experience. Again the individual panels are 5-6 feet each and they're installed in a particular way which can, as the contact from Heinz has mentioned, can be seen in the extensive file on the mosaics. And kind of regarding the installation, so just one more comment. Cantini was absolutely instrumental in furthering arts education, artistic practice, and a place for public art in Pittsburgh. So he's more than, he's a locally, regionally, and nationally recognized artist so again dismembering what's considered to be his greatest work of public art, described as an artistic and technical feat, and certainly the only of its kind, he has a number of enameled large-scale murals around the University of Pittsburgh, but point me to another large-scale, mid-century mosaic done by Cantini or any other artist in this region and I'll stand corrected. But kind of taking this apart is certainly no way to acknowledge or thank Cantini for his great impact on arts education. He was an advocate of the public arts during his career and won accolades in attention to his work upon his death in 2009, including many from Pittsburgh organizations; one of the 100 primary members of Tomorrow in Time Magazine in 1953; Artist of the Year in our own Center for the Arts in 1956; and in 1957 receiving the Guggenheim Study Abroad. So I'm enjoying this presentation but in so capturing, where are these history walls? How are we kind of representing all artists and Cantini as an Italian immigrant who came here in 1930, raised his family on South Craig Street, where he had his home and studio, and 2 daughters. Now Lisa continues to manage his estate. So can we find a way to have Virgil Cantini represented as part of this story, by either having the tunnel remain as is and having that integrated into the park design, or having a completely relocated? Not as a parcel, which completely fails to-that is not preserving the artwork. Because you are then not actually following the definition of what this artwork is. So just a bit on now an alternative position and the timing is interesting to me because you know, this sends a message to Virgil Cantini's former students and his colleagues, and his family, and citizens, and international visitors, that there's not a place for this artwork that represents this mid-century period and his impact. There just wasn't a wall that long enough, I would push to understand why can't there be a wall designed that is long enough? Why can't the tunnel be made to be accessible? Yes I would agree, when you go there now, I visit it at least once a week, it does feel dim, it does feel underutilized, but this is an opportunity to actually re-elevate this Cantini work that has the power to appeal to a broad range of age grounds. That's the power of this kind of modern artwork. Thank you.

Goulatia: I have a quick question for you. Are the panels, the mosaics, meant to face each other, as per his original?

Reilly: Well in it being a corridor intended for pedestrians, Cantini describes it as something that you're kind of moving through. The 2 compositions are considered and described as separate but if you could understand, it's like when you're in this corridor you're of course experiencing both on your peripheral as you pass by, though I would also at least one whole length would be more valuable than simple one cut-out piece. But ideally the entire experience passing through is described as the artwork in its entirety. And I believe there is more than 20 panels, I would say...28?

Indovina: Thank you.

Piechocki: I didn't realize we were going to have comment on the Cantini available so I just want to make a quick comment. The relocation of the Cantini panels was on the mind of the design team of this CAP project from the very beginning. And as you've heard from Doug, in the beginning there were only very, very limited resources to relocate a number of panels. I am really, we were very excited that the SEA was able to allocate an additional \$100,000 to the removal of all of the panels. Many of the new members, new for me, members of the Art Commission may not be aware of the City's excellent history of relocating works of art in its own collection. There are in fact, very few works of art in this City that are in the exact location where they were first commissioned. The most recent being the number of sculptures that are in Mellon Park on the corner of Fifth Avenue and Penn. I support the idea of relocating all of the panels, I hope that the City will consider the best location for this project maybe not be in this park at the exact site. A site that's not a tunnel quite frankly would be excellent. But in a City of bridges, and tunnels, and pedestrian underpasses, there certainly walls that could accommodate all of the panels, that are in the City's purview. I just, I just want to say I support the saving of the work and the identification of a new spot, through the 106 process. I don't know that building a wall within this park in the current design would best serve the project, but I hope that the Cantini can be saved. Thank you.

Luckett: Thanks Renee for that. I mean, I'm really from the beginning, I mean going to PITT and knowing about Cantini, I'm all in favor for saving it and relocating it. And I'm thankful that SEA has stepped up and money available, I think it's the right thing to do. So, that's the reason I had asked about, okay-the Cantini is still there-so what are we doing about moving forward with that in the timeframe for the assessment and what does that look like, because you said three weeks, but are we looking at six weeks?

Straley (not speaking at the microphone, some words may be lost): We get a report on eligibility or not eligibility...and then they have 30 days to review that, and then based upon that determination, determines the next path....(cannot decipher)

Luckett: So if the construction drawings and everything is finalized and approved, then what's the timeframe for the park construction? What would that look like?

Straley: Currently May of next year.

Luckett: Okay, May of 2018. So, you would have then between now and April to figure something out as far as determining where, removing the Cantini and then figuring out where to relocate it, right?

Guerra: Well it's actually under your purview.

Luckett: I'm putting that out there, because I want clarity.

Ghafoor is making comments from the back of the room-cannot decipher.

Guerra: They're going to come to you, just like we did with Stephen Foster, and your purview is removal, relocation, or alteration. So they have to come to you and present and then you have the purview to decide.

Luckett: Okay.

Rearick: Again, anybody that is speaking, please come to the microphone so that we can hear you and it appears on the minutes.

Ghafoor continues speaking from the back of the room, somewhat undecipherable: I sent a letter and nobody responded to it from here. So how fair are you trying to be? (Continues speaking, but cannot be heard.)

Indovina: Excuse me, somebody has the floor.

Reilly: I just, we've used the word eligible a lot and I just want to know for the sake of having it on record, can you define what eligibility is when you talk about this next process we're going to go through?

Straley (beings speaking not at the microphone): I'm not the expert...Christine Davis....

Luckett: You need to step up to the microphone.

Straley: As part of HDR's team, they will have an expert, Christine Davis. I do not know and I do not want to gander a guess at what the criteria exactly is for eligibility or not eligibility. And again, it's related to the PennDOT Federal process, not an overall historic designation or anything like that. So, I cannot give you that answer today.

Luckett: So there are funds in place to remove the Cantini?

Guerra: From the SEA.

Luckett: From the SEA, correct? Yes.

Straley: We're finding those funds.

Indovina: That is a step forward from what we've heard in the past, that there weren't funds to remove and/or preserve it.

Guerra: Yes. Now there's no money from the City to relocate.

Luckett: Communication is critical.

Goulatia: And if they're eligible to be removed, then what?

Straley: No, no, no. It's not eligibility for removal. It's the determination if there's, if we have to go the next step, if there's an adverse impact because they're of a certain nature. And so until we know if they qualify, if they don't qualify, you don't have to do anything else. The section 106 case would be closed on the Federal level.

Indovina: But at that point they would have been removed and preserved.

Straley: Well at that point they don't really even take a stance. Because they weren't eligible. We are saving them no matter what, whether they say it is eligible or not.

Luckett: Great. That's perfect. So I'm in favor of removing it and finding an alternative location.

Guerra: Wait, hold it. But today you're not voting for that.

Luckett: Okay, thanks for making that clarification.

Guerra: Today you're just voting for design enhancements.

Luckett: But it's tied together though.

Guerra: So you can do that with the condition as it was said.

Luckett: Okay, thank you Yesica.

Someone from the audience asks if they can make a comment.

Guerra: I just have to say, there's an event happening here soon. So we have to really move forward.

Reilly: Okay, this is one sentence to clarify eligibility. The section 106 requires that to identify if there's a historic resource on the site that may be affected by the project. So, there is a review that will be underway of the Cantini mosaics to understand if they are eligible as a historic resource, that's eligible for the national register of historic places. They do not have to be listed on the national register, but if they are found eligible, then that will lead to the more kind of rigorous review of what mitigation, and to avoid adverse effects on the mosaics. So I hope that clarifies for anyone that does not understand that process. I have a question. A test has not yet been done to understand if these panels can even be removed. Following the 106 process, if it's found they cannot be removed because of technical limits, that they would crumble and fall apart, then what? Is there an option that they must stay in place, because then they will literally be buried?

Indovina: I think that's beyond our purview at this point.

Luckett: Yeah.

Ghafoor approaches the podium.

Indovina: If you have something new to add, if you could keep it brief please.

Ghafoor: I have a comment of this Commission because I submitted the letter September 29th, and I was here last month, and I was here in October. This is the thing. I have concerns. I would want to be part of any briefing because this is going to come up as a final development plan. And I appreciate, if somebody who can write, get back in touch with me and let me know the progress of this project. That's all I'm asking.

Luckett: Just so you know, we have a duty. There are minutes that are publically posted on the City website.

Ghafoor now from the back of the room: I didn't find out about the October cancelation until I physically came down here. So I'm saying, your process isn't all that great either and I need to know what's going on.

Luckett: Okay, thank you very much.

Ghafoor continues from the back of the room but could not be heard.

Indovina: Okay. Back to our business. So before us we have a submission for final review. We've certainly had a lot of discussion about what is in that design as well as the issue with the Cantini. I think that we can make a motion that qualifies it to take those concerns into account. If someone can craft that. Volunteers?

Luckett: Sure. I will. So right now the construction drawings are at 90%. And there's no December Art Commission?

Guerra: No.

Luckett: But we've seen 90%, we've received them. Are you all okay with them going to staff for review? I mean,

Guerra: I don't have that.

Luckett: You don't?

Guerra: This is a critical design, this is a critical park for the City. I do not hold that purview. And I'm making that clear. That's a lot of responsibility.

Luckett: Thank you. So, they'll have to come back then for a submission of the final construction drawings.

Guerra: Remember, what you need to focus right now is the design enhancements. You can approve the design enhancements but then you can put a condition that contingent to the final park, whenever the section 106 is decided, then they can come and show you that and talk to you.

Luckett: Well for me you don't need to do a condition, you can just say you can come back with everything in place. And I'm not talking about the Cantini, I'm talking about the designs that we see today.

Guerra: The whole as a park again with the design enhancements.

Luckett: I think sometimes we do conditions and we really don't need them, because you really need to just put everything together and resubmit.

Guerra: Yeah.

Luckett: This is final review but we're still not at the final phase. So I'm just, I'm talking this through so we're all on the same page here because I'm still a little, need some clarifications here because what we reviewed, there's still some things that need to be worked out. And I'm not talking about the Cantini. I mean, what we've talked about today for me, I'm okay with, however the construction drawings aren't finished. Right?

Piechocki (speaking from the back of the room): They can't finish until they get approval.

Luckett: I didn't hear you Renee.

Piechocki: They can't be finished until we get final design approval.

Straley: Excuse me, our next step would be to go to Planning Commission. And Planning Commission is asking for your approval to go to Planning Commission.

Luckett: So right now I'm okay with what was presented today. The updates that you presented today, I'm fine with. We just don't have the construction, so that's the next phase after that. If this is approved today, then the next step would be to get the final construction drawings, right?

Straley: Then you go to Planning Commission and see if they have any changes.

Luckett: That's fine.

Heidemann: Don't we not have purview over the construction drawings? We only have purview of the design concepts.

Luckett: Right, yes.

Heidemann: So we can vote on that today.

Luckett: They're still part of the application process.

Indovina: So I guess we can approve the final designs as they stand at this point and ask that they resubmit the final drawings for our review as part of the overall approval.

Luckett: Right, exactly.

Indovina: We don't want to hold anything up.

Luckett: Right, yes, yes. Okay. So, the motion on the table is to approve the final review for design enhancements. And then is there-subject to anything?

Goulatia: Yes, the Cantini.

Indovina: Well, can we make a separate motion regarding the Cantini?

Guerra: Section 106 is what is holding this.

Indovina: Well exactly, the motion would be to ask for a report on the 106 review because that will be the beginning of another review process for relocation of that.

Goulatia: But if it cannot be relocated then the park has to be redesigned based on the Cantini, right?

Luckett: Or not. It could be or not.

Goulatia: But then it will be destroyed, and I'm not in favor of the destruction.

Luckett: Once again, with the 106.

Indovina: Well, I guess that's yeah, what we don't know. At this point, what's part of the plan and the design is to remove and preserve the Cantini elements.

Goulatia: Right.

Luckett: They have funds to remove it. But we don't know what is going to happen. We don't know if it's going to crumble, we don't know any of that because you have to do the testing, you still have to go through that whole process.

Goulatia: Then the design needs to change.

Baskinger: That's not our purview right now, it is to approve the design as it is, right?

Indovina: Yes, the design enhancements. That park design has been approved. This is for the design enhancements. The Cantini is really separate issue at this point.

Luckett: Yeah. I mean that's the kind of tricky piece.

(The Commissioners continued discussing, but it wasn't entirely decipherable due to cut-off sentences.)

Guerra: You gave final approval.

Indovina: Yes, final approval of the design.

Guerra: Of the whole park.

Indovina: Removing the tunnel.

Guerra: This is now just the design enhancements.

Indovina: We can't go back and change a previous approval. So this is strictly for the design enhancements.

Luckett: Yes. So a motion to approve the final review for design enhancements.

Reilly: Excuse me, don't the design enhancements include the placement of 2 of the Cantini pieces? (Pointing to an image of the park design in printed form, which had photos of the Cantini included.)

Straley: No. That's illustrative, saying we could to it.

Reilly: But it is not part of this?

Luckett: It's not.

Guerra: No, it's not. Again, the whole Cantini is going to come by itself in front of the Commission. And they have to decide remove, relocated.

Goulatia: Or keep.

Indovina: Yes, that's possible.

(The Commissioners continued discussing, but it wasn't entirely decipherable due to cut-off sentences.)

Goulatia: That's what my question is-it has to be contingent on the 106, right?

Baskinger: No, we can't. We vote on this now. And then it gets reopened if the Cantini interferes with this plan as it is.

Indovina: That's correct,

(The Commissioners continued discussing, but it wasn't entirely decipherable due to cut-off sentences.)

Indovina: So we have a motion on the floor, of the final review of the design enhancements for the CAP Park.

<u>MOTION:</u>	Final approval of the design enhancement for the CAP Park.		
MOVED BY	Luckett	SECONDED BY	Goulatia
IN FAVOR	All		
OPPOSED	None		

CARRIED

Indovina: I think we can next address the Cantini.

Goulatia: My question is, the design cannot be approved if the Cantini needs to be relocated.

Indovina: Yes, then they'll have to come back.

Baskinger: But this is a necessary step to move the design forward. So the plan is in place so that if the Cantini, if everything gets worked out, it doesn't stall them. If the Cantini becomes an impediment, then that's another discourse that starts.

Indovina: Correct. So I think there should be a motion that they submit the results of the 106 review for our review.

Guerra: Yes.

Luckett: Do you want me to put that out there.

Indovina: Sure

Straley: I don't know if you need a motion, we're coming back.

Guerra: Yes, yes, great.

Indovina: Well, in that case I think we are through. We can move on.

D. Staff Report

Guerra: We can go really quick on this because there's another event. And actually one of the problems that has been is that we have treat this as separate pieces.

Goulatia: It should've been contingent on the park design.

Luckett: It never was when it came, so that is why we're kind of like in a circle right now. If the whole piece would be the park, the design enhancements, and the Cantini all as one whole application, we just divided in three because of the funding. That is why we're here right now, which it is problematic, but we'll work on it whenever.

Luckett: If you had to do it all over again, it would be due diligence on the front end.

Guerra: In my defense, I came into this project. I've been trying to create process.

Luckett: It's not your fault. I'm glad that now SEA is going to save them.

Guerra: We need to do really quick the report.

Indovina to crowd: I wonder if you can take your conversations outside, we're still in session here.

Guerra: So just to give you a really quick update, I spoke to you a while ago about the Clark Winter work. So now it's been removed from the site, from Bakery Square.

Luckett: It's a wreck.

Guerra: PCA took it. They are actually restoring it and we're in conversations with them because they want to donate it to the City. I was, I spoke to the Law Department. We couldn't take it as it was, it's a huge expense. So they are restoring it and then they want it relocated in Mellon Park, so it might come in front of you in the near future. And then the other one, the paints that were found at the Library, those actually were removed and right now we still don't know if we own them or not. The Law Department is still trying to figure that out. But they have been in contact with us trying to figure out what to do. So they've been removed and they right now are at the Heinz History Center just to save them and to preserve them for now until we decide what's going to happen with them and who really owns them. And then another, this is good news, hopefully for everyone. We finally, after putting multiple times the RFP for telecommunications, we have now a company that is going to be working with us to develop the aesthetics guidelines for telecommunications. I asked Mark if he could help us to also see a little bit of that process, that company is called CNX and it will be interesting to have his eye on what are they proposing to us before they come here to you for a final proposal for what are we going to be looking for with those guidelines. I think that's it, I sent to you that map that Rachel and I have been working on. The inventory, the podcast, all of that is part of a bigger project. And then the Art Plan that I mentioned too in my email, that I'm going to send it to you and then from there you can see part of the work that we're doing already. We haven't released the Art Plan and we're hoping to release it next year for multiple reasons that have to do with Mayor initiatives and all other stuff, but we're already working on some of the implementation of the map, the podcasts, and other stuff that we're doing. I'll send you that for comments. And then, Mark was asking more about the Comprehensive Plan and I said all of that is explained within the (Art) Plan. I know this one was a tough one and there's another project that actually came to us last week, which is the Bigelow project, and then want to do some process like this, also

treat the whole design of Bigelow as a separate thing from the art, and looking at where are we at right now, that is something that we will definitely have to decide-you will have to decide as a Commission if you want to start seeing projects like that-chopped in pieces or no, if you want as a whole. Today the CAP was a complicated decision.

Meeting Adjourned