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A. Approval of Minutes
Roll call. Indovina asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from June 2020. Moss motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carried.

B. Correspondence (See Attachment B)
Minnaert says that a series of emails have been forwarded to the Commissioners regarding the Columbus statue. Indovina says they will discuss these in the Staff Report.

C. Items for Review
1. Small Cell Aesthetic Standards - Final Review

   Thomas Musgrove of Crown Castle explains the proposal, which is an amendment to the existing small cell design standards to provide a replacement for the ornamental light poles to make them fully integrated smart poles for antenna equipment.

   Indovina asks for clarification whether these standards will apply only for Crown Castle or for all carriers. Musgrove says that they would apply for all.

   Moss asks if there are stipulated requirements for the base of the pole. Musgrove says that those would be the standards that the City currently has. Moss asks if this proposal; should reference that, to be sure that someone can’t install a pole with a base that is too large. Musgrove says that detail can be added to this.

   Goulatia asks about the orientation of the light fixtures, whether they are parallel to the street or perpendicular. Musgrove says they will run parallel to avoid a safety issue with a truck driving by and clipping the fixtures.
Arimoto-Mercer asks what DOMI’s opinion is for these alterations. Lucas says that DOMI is supportive of the update of the guidelines so that they are applicable to everyone, instead of specific modifications to individual poles. She says that DOMI is comfortable with the proposed amendment as it entails general modifications that would be applicable to all companies. Arimoto-Mercer asks if there is a letter of support. Musgrove notes that Crown Castle submitted two letters of support, from the Pittsburgh Technology Council and the Downtown CDC. Arimoto-Mercer asks if DOMI has given a letter of support. Lucas says that DOMI is a co-applicant.

Moss asks for clarification on the co-location of multiple carriers, and notes that the application describes those additional carriers being mounted below the luminaires. He asks how that would be done. Musgrove says it would be a simple bracket mount, and there would be a port on the side of the pole. Moss confirms that the additional device would be mounted on the outside of the pole. Musgrove says yes, but that those would need to be shrouded. Moss asks if that shroud could confirm to the 14”x24” measurements given in the proposal. Musgrove says that it would depend on the type of the antenna, and that is why they added the bullet point about the City allowing reasonable variation of size to promote co-location. Moss asks how many devices could be mounted to a single pole. Musgrove goes over the submitted diagrams and shows where the equipment would be located. Moss says he has concerns about allowing these additional devices to be mounted on the pole at a lower level, and that it would be much better to keep the equipment on top.

Musgrove says that this design is based on feedback from the Commissioners from the last hearing, but that they can modify this design. Moss says he thinks it might be helpful to see an example of what it would look like if it was mounted on the side of the pole below the lamps, as opposed to on top. Indovina asks if this would look like a larger barrel, or like a box. Musgrove says it would look like a larger barrel. Moss says this is his concern, and that Musgrove didn’t answer whether there can be multiple barrels on a single pole. Musgrove says that co-location of carriers helps to keep from adding new poles and continually disrupting the streets and sidewalks. He says they fall back on what is technically feasible, so either mounting below the lamps or on top would both work, but that the top option would possibly work better and based on the Commission’s feedback seems like the better option. Arimoto-Mercer, Indovina, and Luckett say that would be their preference. Luckett asks how many carriers could potentially fit on one pole. Musgrove goes over the submitted diagrams and shows where the equipment would be located. Moss, Indovina, and Goulatia agree.

Parsakian asks if all the poles will be uniform as to how many carriers are on them. Musgrove says yes, but that carriers don’t all band together when creating the poles. Crown Castle will make a pole for a particular carrier, and then add the other carriers to that pole when needed. He says that there are three major carriers, and the poles would be designed for three major carriers.

Moss asks if the standards need to stipulate a maximum number of carriers and a maximum height. Musgrove says he will defer to the Commission on that. He also points out that the submitted proposal does include the foundation design, as mentioned by Moss earlier. Indovina says that it would be reasonable to include the conditions of maximum number of carriers and maximum height.

**MOTION:** Final Approval with the conditions that 1) no poles shall have more than three carriers; and 2) the poles will be a maximum height of twenty-four feet, including the shroud.

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

2. Swiftmile Charging Station - Conceptual Review  

Lolly Walsh of Move 412 introduces the project, which consists of charging stations for electric scooters to be located in the public right-of-way. The design is proposed to be a City standard.

Ted Sweeney of Spin describes the context of the project, in which mobility companies are working with DOMI on a pilot program for the creation of Mobility Hubs around the City. The goal of the pilot is to give people a variety of integrated non-motorized transportation options.

Goulatia asks what neighborhoods they are looking at for this program.

Tosh Chambers of DOMI says that they could potentially be in any neighborhood and the program wouldn’t be restricted by neighborhood, but for the first installations they are looking at neighborhoods that have a larger density of people and less existing transportation options.

Goulatia says that Sweeney mentioned that they were currently looking at specific neighborhoods and she asks what these are. Chambers says that the first neighborhoods that they are considering are Oakland, Hazelwood, Garfield, and Bloomfield. He says that a certain number of the installations will be allocated to neighborhoods that they are considering to be high need according the Port Authority’s Equity Index.

Luckett asks what neighborhoods are designated to be high need. Chambers says that they are looking at the neighborhoods which are scoring in the top 20% of need for a number of demographics including race and income. He says that examples are the Hill District, Beltzhoover, Allentown, Homewood, Garfield, East Liberty, Larimer, and Sheraden.

Lucas asks if there is an engagement plan. Chambers says they are working on this. [Audio breaks up.] To clarify what Chambers was saying when the audio broke up, Lucas says that DOMI has a plan for outreach, and that they will be working with elected representatives, community groups, and adjacent properties.

Lucas says that the installations would be co-located with existing streetlights in order to power them, similar to Healthy Ride stations. She says that they are looking at transportation demand in determining placement, to fill mobility gaps.

Parsakian asks what the footprint of the unit is, and if six scooters would be standard.

Sweeney says that they would come in six and twelve-scooter versions. He says that the six-scooter version is ten feet. Arimoto-Mercer asks about the width. Arimoto-Mercer says that is a pretty large footprint. Lucas says for comparison this would fit into one standard car parking space. Parsakian says it is similar to a bike share footprint. Lucas says yes.

Parsakian says that Oakland and Bloomfield have a big demand, but in terms of marginalized communities it would be good to identify where need lies.

Walsh asks Chambers to talk more about the community identification criteria that was used and the phasing of the program. Chambers says that they have undergone a process to analyze and understand the transportation layout of each neighborhood and compare to demographics and have isolated neighborhoods that have a large population of people that could benefit to having more access to transit. They are looking at census block areas, which are smaller than whole neighborhoods. He notes that the scooters will be free range and will not be restricted to these docks. He says that they have identified the first five neighborhoods and five beyond that as future possibilities, and the exact number of stations they will install is still up in the air but may be around 20-25.
Parsakian asks if the scooters are electric or foot-powered. Chambers says they are electric. Parsakian asks how they operate up and down hills. Sweeney says they can handle about a ten percent grade, and deployments will relate to the hilliness of the area.

Goulatia asks if they have thought about solar-powered setups. Sweeney says that solar power is in the future of the design, but for this two-year pilot they are restrained to the technology that is ready to deploy. Parsakian says that the bike share units have solar power and it is not a large setup. Sweeney says that the difference is that these are electric scooters and the Healthy Ride bikes are pedal-powered. He says that as Healthy Ride bikes transition to electric they will also need to connect to an electric power source.

Arimoto-Mercer asks if the digital information screen is interactive. Sweeney says no. Arimoto-Mercer asks if they will have an app to find locations. Sweeney says that it will be accessible in a single app called Transit that is available to download now. Arimoto-Mercer asks if that is stated on the screen or in the signage. Sweeney says yes and the signage will also point to equity pricing programs.

Indovina says that the application mentioned that there are various providers and that the installation may look different than the proposed picture. Sweeney says that the e-scooters from Spin all have a black and orange color scheme so the exact scooter model will improve but will have the design scheme shown in the application. He points out that some pieces are modular and can be installed in any color, and for those pieces the Pittsburgh system has been done in a black and yellow scheme.

Indovina asks if the scooters can be left by people in any location. Chambers says yes, they can be docked at the station but they can also be left elsewhere. There will be regulations on how they can be parked, such as not being able to block the sidewalk or be parked on private property. Indovina asks if they have a kickstand. Sweeney say yes, and they are locked when not being ridden.

Parsakian says they present a nuisance factor in other cities where they are dropped all over, and asks how they will be kept out of the right-of-way. Chambers says it involves a number of components, but there will be instructions in the app and designated parking corrals. He says they can look into various solutions as the data comes in during the program.

Parsakian asks if there is a GPS on each of the units. Sweeney says yes, and this is a system that they operate in about 70 cities, so there is an infrastructure as to how this operates. He says there are employees who drive around all day picking up and replacing the scooters, and there are repercussions to users who do not end their trip in the required manner. He says that they can also incentivize users to park the scooters appropriately by offering discounts.

Parsakian asks if there are any Covid-related issues. Sweeney says that Covid has led many cities to ask them to scale up their operations as their system offers a socially-distanced method of transportation.

Parsakian asks what the gray box in the image is. Sweeney says that is power and metering equipment. He says that the box may not be necessary depending on where they are plugging into electric power.

Luckett asks if there is any consent given by users that the user is able to operate a motorized vehicle. She also asks how long their contracts with scooter companies are, as some companies have folded and left their equipment for the City to deal with. Sweeney says that upon sign-up, users are given a comprehensive set of documents that they have to consent to, including educational information and expectations of the user. He says there are age requirements but not a driver’s license requirement. Sweeney says that Spin is with the City for a two-year pilot, and is a subsidiary of Ford Motor Company, so he is assured in that way of their staying power.

Arimoto-Mercer says that this is a two-year project, and they have determined that a temporary project is a one-year duration. Minnaert says this would not fall under the definition of temporary. Arimoto-Mercer says that the applicant defined this as temporary in their application. Minnaert says that, per the art commission’s purview, this would be treated as longer term.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval
D. Adjournment
Motion to adjourn made by Parsakian and seconded by Moss. The meeting adjourned at 4:23 P.M.