ART COMMISSION

Minutes of the meeting on Wednesday, June 24, 2020
Beginning at 2:00 p.m.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION: Indovina, Arimoto-Mercer, Baskinger, Goulatia, Luckett, Moss, Parsakian, Gable, Lucas (for DOMI)

PRESENT OF THE STAFF: Dash, Minnaert, Cavalline

AGENDA ITEMS COVERED IN THESE MINUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Great Allegheny Passage Trail Markers – Regional Trail Corporation</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pauline Hanauer Rosenberg Historic Marker – Matthew Falcone</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Allegheny Landing Gate - Riverlife</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Roll call. Indovina asks for Commissioners to review and comment on the minutes from February 2020. Arimoto-Mercer motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Parsakian. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Correspondence

Minnaert says that within the last few days the Division has had a number of public comments relating to the Columbus statue. One is addressed to the Commission and will be shared with them.

C. Items for Review

1. Great Allegheny Passage Trail Markers – Regional Trail Corporation
   (Conceptual/Final)
   Linda McKenna Boxx, RTC

Boxx describes the project, which is for four non-permanent mileposts to be installed along the trail. These are needed due to an ongoing reassessment of the trail to correct inaccurate mile measurements.

Indovina asks how long these will be in place. Boxx says they are hoping to resolve the issue of measuring within a month or two. They need to get permission from a property owner to pass through his property.
Goulatia asks what material the temporary markers are made of. Boxx says it is a vinyl composite called carsonite, and it is quite durable. The vinyl lettering is professionally made and installed. Goulatia notes that some of them are leaning in the pictures. Boxx says they were just sitting on cinderblocks for the pictures, and will be anchored securely in the ground when installed.

Luckett says she is an avid cyclist and asks if the markers are currently up. Boxx says some are in place outside of the City, but the four shown here are not up. Within the City the original granite markers are up, but are at incorrect distances. Luckett asks if any of these temporary posts are up currently to test them out. Boxx says they have mile markers 130-144 installed, and only the last four which are within the City of Pittsburgh are not installed.

Arimoto-Mercer mentions Boxx’s plan to cover the existing granite posts and asks if it might be beneficial to have some sort of explanation so that someone does not uncover them. Boxx says they have had discussions within their team about putting a notification up to that effect, as they have had people remove the vinyl coverings.

Goulatia asks if they can temporarily remove the granite markers to avoid confusion. Boxx says they don’t want to have to move the granite markers more than necessary as they are large, set in concrete, and easily damaged, so they prefer to keep them where they are until they have the alignment resolved.

Moss confirms that the long term plan is to move the granite markers to the new locations in which they will be temporarily placing the vinyl markers. Boxx says this is dependent on the private property owner and if they can negotiate a right-of-way through his property.

Luckett asks if there is a way to continue moving the project forward around the property concerns as this is a matter of public health and well-being. Boxx says the mile markers will be in different places depending on whether they can go through that property. Luckett asks how many markers are needed for that property. Boxx says it is between mileposts 129 and 130. Indovina confirms that it is a matter of the length of the trail varying depending on this property owner, and Boxx says yes.

Luckett asks what the hesitation is on the part of the property owner. Boxx says that he is an industrial property owner and is concerned about safety and liability. Luckett asks if they have mileposts on any other private property. Boxx says they do not, and this one would require an easement. Luckett asks how much of the property is involved. Boxx says about a quarter mile.

Goulatia asks if it wouldn’t make sense to just bypass the property. Boxx says that the area going around the property is prone to slips and they have had to put about a quarter million dollars in repairs to stabilize the hillside. Utilizing the private property would save them considerable time and money.

Parsakian clarifies that at this time there is no trail going through this private property. Boxx says that is correct.

Baskinger asks how they noticed that the trail markers were measured incorrectly. Boxx says that they did not correspond with the railroad markers and they received complaints from cyclists and runners who noticed that the miles did not match up. They then hired a surveyor to calculate the correct mileage. Baskinger clarifies the parameters of the project with Boxx, and
then asks about the timespan of the temporary markers. Boxx says that two years would give them ample time to resolve the issues.

Indovina says that two years seems like a long time. He suggests the applicant return in one year if they have not resolved the issue then. Boxx says that is reasonable. Baskinger adds that a one-year limit presents the urgency to the property owner.

Arimoto-Mercer clarifies that the Art Commission’s definition of temporary is one year. Cavalline says that yes, the purview of the Art Commission is for projects of a year or more, and that temporary projects are under one year.

Gable notes that the trails fall under DOMI’s purview, so DPW does not need to provide a support letter for this project. Cavalline asks if DOMI supports the project. Kim Lucas says that DOMI supports the project for the one-year time frame suggested by the Commission.

**MOTION:** Conceptual/Final Approval for no more than one year, with the applicant requested to seek further approval if the project will be up for more than one year.

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

2. Pauline Hanauer Rosenberg Historic Marker – Matthew Falcone

*(Conceptual/Final)*

*Matthew Falcone*

Falcone describes the desire for a Historic Marker in front of his home, which is Rosenberg’s former residence. Rosenberg founded the National Council of Jewish Women, and had many notable achievements as an advocate of education, child labor laws, suffrage, and public health. The Historic Marker is granted by the State and has a uniform appearance. Falcone shares the proposed text for the marker.

Luckett says it is great that he is doing this, and asks if Falcone has notified his neighbors. Falcone says yes, and that he has also presented at community meetings and had the project published in local publications. He has received a lot of support.

Arimoto-Mercer comments on the placement of the pole, and asks how close to the curb it is. Falcone says it would not be on the curb but would be close to the street. Arimoto-Mercer asks how wide the sidewalk is. Falcone says he is not sure, but they are fairly narrow, probably about 6 or 7 feet. Arimoto-Mercer asks Director Gable how close the poles can be to parking areas. Gable says he is unsure but that City staff will be installing the pole, and they know where installations need to go to comply with the needs of pedestrians, traffic, and ADA requirements. Lucas says she wondered about this as well, but that she trusts DPW staff to judge this. She also mentions that there is a tree box a few feet away, and suggests that the pole be placed closer to the tree box so as to only narrow the pedestrian space in one area.

Indovina asks if this requires DOMI approval. Lucas says that she would expect this to require a permit, unless it is a DPW collaboration and considered a City project.
Parsakian asks about the orientation of the sign. Falcone says that he used a nearby Historic Marker as a model for the angle, which allows both pedestrians and vehicles to see the marker. Parsakian says it would be great if these markers utilized a QR code so that people are able to look up more information about Rosenberg. He asks if this can be added. Falcone says the signs are regulated by the State, so he is unsure if that can be changed, but he mentions that he has submitted for the house to be on the National and City Historic Registries, which would provide a plaque for the building. Parsakian asks if the plaque on the building would be through the History and Landmarks Foundation. Falcone says that is a separate organization, and the registries would be through the National Park Service and the City’s Historic Review Commission.

Luckett asks if there’s any way to incorporate Braille on the marker. Falcone says he does not know but he’s happy to inquire with the state, and mentions that the National Council of Jewish Women did historic work with the blind. Moss says that it may be impractical at the sign’s height. Luckett says other cities have put it on the pole. Parsakian says the Braille is a good idea.

Goulatia asks if the new porch being installed on this property is wider than surrounding ones. Falcone says no, that the current porch replacement is in-kind and will be the same width as the original.

Goulatia asks if there are two trees on the street and if the pole can be equidistant between them. Falcone says there is not another tree but there is a light pole, and equidistant between them would align the pole between two houses. Goulatia says that the QR code is a good idea and asks if this can be presented on the porch. Falcone says he will talk to the Historic Review Commission to see how information could be included appropriately.

Arimoto-Mercer asks if this is a one-way street, and Falcone says yes. Arimoto-Mercer asks if it can be angled the other way to face oncoming cars. Falcone says yes.

Cavalline clarifies that DOMI supports the project. Lucas gives DOMI’s support.

**MOTION:** Conceptual/Final Approval, with consideration given to the comments of the Commission.

MOVED BY: Arimoto-Mercer
SECONDED BY: Moss
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

### 3. Allegheny Landing Gate - Riverlife (Conceptual/Final)

*Anna Leisher, Riverlife*

*Colin Butt, Technique Architectural Products*

Leisher describes the project, which is a new gate to replace a temporary gate that has been installed to prevent park users from accessing a staircase that leads down to a removed portion of the dock.
Indovina asks about the future fencing Leisher mentioned in her presentation, and asks where that would go. Leisher shows where there currently are hanging chains between bollards, and says that these would not prevent a pedestrian from falling over the edge. The fencing would go between those bollards. Goulatia asks what the bollards would be made from in the future. Leisher says the wood would be removed from the bollards and be replaced with iron.

Indovina notes that this application is limited to the gate. Arimoto-Mercer asks about the project’s Art Commission application stating that the pattern of the gate references something in Pittsburgh’s history. Leisher says that this was not mentioned in the application. Arimoto-Mercer asks how the bollards and the gate will be tied together. Leisher says there was a vertical tie-in that was designed, but she is unsure of the details.

Goulatia asks what the bollards in the pictures are made of. Leisher says they are cement. Moss asks if there will be a latch to hold the gate open. Leisher says yes.

Parsakian asks what the height of the railing is. Butt says it is 42 inches.

Leisher mentions that LaQuatra Bonci created the gate design shown in the presentation.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval**

MOVED BY: Goulatia
SECONDED BY: Luckett
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

Meeting Adjourned