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A. Approval of Minutes

Roll call. Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from August 2021. Parsakian motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Goulatia. All ayes. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

1. **Esser Plaza – South Side Community Council**
   
   Final Review

   Mike Clark of SSCC describes this project, which is for the renovation of Esser Plaza, including new pavers, lighting benches, planters, and landscaping. The project received Conceptual Approval in August 2021.

   Parsakian asks if the project will come back for approval of the artistic sign. Clark says yes, as they have not had the sign designed yet. He also says that a portion of their funding relies on the approval today.

   Quintanilla asks if he is correct in saying that the design and materials haven’t changed since the last hearing, but that the materials have met ADA standards and the neighbors have approved any noise
mitigation. Clark says that the design has changed and shows this in the presentation. He says they have adjusted the use of materials based on feedback from the last hearing, although all materials had previously met ADA standards.

Quintanilla says that pavement treatments can still be difficult for some people to cross even if they meet ADA standards and this was the Commission’s concern. He says that he used to live in Europe and European plazas are very minimalistic in terms of pavement details and furnishings. Clark says that the material being used for the pavement that crosses the plaza is very smooth with minimal joints. He says that other areas use bricks that will be reused from the current plaza. The whole design is the result of a three year process with the community.

Moss confirms that the design from the previous hearing had brickwork breaking up the central path through the plaza, and in the revised design it is now smooth concrete. Clark says that is correct.

**MOTION: Final Approval**

MOVED BY: Parsakian
SECONDED BY: Young
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

2. Allegheny Landing – Riverlife
   Conceptual Review

Dan McDowell of LaQuatra Bonci and Anna Leisher of Riverlife present this project, which is for a renovation plan for Allegheny Landing Park. The plan creates new accessible connections between the waterfront and the upper plaza and increases the overall programmable space.

Moss compliments Riverlife on the project. He asks about the number of sculptures on the property, which he thought was five but which was presented here as four. Leisher says that the Smythe sculpture is in two places but is considered to be one piece. Moss asks about the bike trail which goes through the property and how that is being taken into account. Leisher says they are looking into options for improved bike access through the site and are planning workshops to address this. Lucas asks that DOMI be included in those workshops. McDowell says that the various options for bike access will not change the overall plan design presented today.

Moss asks about the relocation of the Sugarman sculpture. McDowell says it will be shifted by about ten to twelve feet. He says that this will improve park connections and they are working with the Carnegie Museum and the artist’s family on this location shift.

Hornstein thanks the applicants and gives DPW’s support for the application.

Goulatia commends them on the project. She asks if the Sugarman sculptures will be reoriented. McDowell says it is the same setting but tightening the amount of space between the pieces. Goulatia says that this will have to be approved by the artist’s family. McDowell says that if it is agreed to, the tightening of the space around the artwork could make the area more accessible. He says that the sculptures were originally meant to be installed within a smaller space than they are currently, so this plan would actually get them closer to the original intent.

Quintanilla notes that the axis of the lawn is perpendicular to Isabella Street but does not line up with the view of the City. McDowell says it is lined up with the center point of the Smythe sculpture. Quintanilla asks if the plinth seating is part of the new plans. McDowell says yes. Quintanilla asks why they are aligned as they are and not centered on the City. McDowell says that it is in keeping consistent with the existing layout of the park, as changing the grading would be difficult. Quintanilla asks if they have reached out to the neighboring buildings to activate the space. Leisher says that Riverlife is a tenant of one of the buildings and is in regular communication with the owners of the buildings. McDowell says that the walls and shrubs have disconnected the upper space from the lower and they are building connections into the new plans that will provide possibilities for activation of both spaces. Quintanilla asks
if the stage will be in the circle by the river. McDowell says that is a piece of art, but the staging will be in that general area. Quintanilla says that bikers will need to be able to get through. Leisher says that stages have been set up in that area near the river in the past, but another possible location for a stage will be the western lawn.

Moss asks if the scope includes repairing the tile work of the Smythe piece. McDowell says this was done in 2016.

Parsakian says he walks through this space often and is glad they are opening up the upper terrace. He asks what the grade of the lawn is. McDowell says the slope is five or six to one, and that is not supposed to be changed.

Quintanilla clarifies aspects of the scope of work, including removing trees. McDowell says many trees there are in bad condition. Quintanilla asks if there will be shading for the seating areas. McDowell says that there was a concern about keeping the viewsheds open. Quintanilla says that if the areas are exposed to the sun they will not be very inviting. Moss says there is a lot of seating in the upper terrace with shade. Leisher says they had higher vegetation in previous versions of this design but it was removed to retain the views, and they are working toward a balance of comfort and visibility.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

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

3. **Brookline Community Mural – Brookline Together**

Caitlin McNulty of Brookline Together presents this project, which is for a mural in Brookline Memorial Park. The wall is on a structure containing recently renovated bathrooms and concession stands, and faces the Dek hockey rink. The conceptual design for the mural is by Engelhardt Designs.

Parsakian asks if only a section of the wall will contain the mural. McNulty says that the original plan was for the mural to take up the entire wall, but they decided to focus on one section because of the maintenance involved, and to leave the other areas free to be usable for banners and signs related to games at the field. Parsakian asks how big the mural will be. McNulty says it will span twenty feet. Goulatia asks how big the mural will be and where it will be placed. McNulty shows where it will be placed and says it will be twenty feet long by fifteen feet high.

Goulatia says she loves the idea of the mural but is disappointed that it will not take up the whole wall. She asks if there is an artist involved. McNulty says Engelhardt Designs would create the design for the mural. She says the plan is to paint the rest of the wall in corresponding colors, but not to install the mural on the entire wall as it is broken up by doorways. She says the space is heavily used by sports teams and they would like to hang brackets for banners on the other walls. Goulatia asks if the doorways are used. McNulty says yes. Goulatia says they should work with the artist to design the doors and other walls to make it cohesive with the mural. McNulty says they have discussed incorporating some elements of the mural onto other areas of the wall. Goulatia says the artist should be consulted for this.

Moss says that he was under the impression that the presented image was not the final design. McNulty says that is correct.

Lucas says that the bike racks in front of the wall are not very attractive or functional and there could be an opportunity for better bike racks. Parsakian asks if DPW will repair the whole wall. McNulty says they will address the whole wall. Parsakian notes that some cinderblocks on the wall do not match and should be painted to blend in. McNulty says that was from a previous repair. Parsakian says that the mural should address the entire wall.
Young says there are creative ways to work with the artist to expand the mural to the whole wall. She suggests that other elements such as tables or garbage cans could be incorporated into the overall design.

Quintanilla says the idea is fantastic and will really add to the park. He asks if there is any possibility for lighting. McNulty says there are lights above the wall as well as off of the Dek hockey rink, so the area is fairly well-lit, but they can look into it further to see if there can be any additional lighting. He says that painting the bike racks could tie it all together, as well as painting the doors.

Goulatia suggests looking at the mural that Young recently completed as well as a mural at Bob O’Connor Plaza in Squirrel Hill.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

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

4. **Brookline Gateway Sign – Brookline Together Conceptual/Final Review**

Caitlin McNulty of Brookline Together presents this replacement of a neighborhood gateway sign. The existing sign has been in place for nearly 30 years. She says that the funding for this project must be expended by the end of October.

Goulatia asks what the material of the original sign is. McNulty says it is a stone base with a metal sign, and the front has a resin cast. Goulatia says the proposed vinyl sign looks cheap and the current sign has much more presence. She asks if the current sign can be restored. McNulty says the funding could be used to restore the sign. She agrees that the current sign has more presence. She says that they are not able to move the current sign due to the electrical box, but could change the landscaping.

Moss agrees that the proposed sign is disappointing. He asks about the proposed lighting. McNulty says that new lights are needed on the ground level regardless of whether the old sign is kept or a new sign installed.

Parsakian says the new sign is an uninspired design, and wishes that more attention was paid to the idea of welcoming people to a community. He says it looks like a 'For Sale' sign. McNulty says she agrees and hopes that the Commission does not pass this motion. Parsakian asks for clarification about the electrical box. McNulty says it is attached to the back of the current sign and provides electricity to the site. Parsakian asks if they can run a conduit to new lighting fixtures. McNulty says they can. Parsakian says that the sign is too far back. McNulty says it is currently a bit difficult to see, and the funding could be used to clear back the brush and re-landscape to improve visibility.

Goulatia asks if there is a way to restore the current sign. Moss says they could build a new frame and reuse the existing sign face. McNulty says this is correct. Goulatia suggests that is what the funds should be used for. Parsakian asks about the texture, and McNulty says it is resin.

Moss says that if the motion today is denied and the current sign would instead be repaired, this would not need Art Commission approval; however if a new sign was proposed then it would require another review.

**MOTION: Denial**

MOVED BY: Goulatia  
SECONDED BY: Quintanilla  
IN FAVOR: Moss  
OPPOSED: None
5. **Carnegie Library Banners – Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh
Conceptual Review**

Sergei Matveiev of Elagin Architecture and Mike Cerce of Carnegie Library present this proposal for pole banners mounted on 8 lamp posts next to Carnegie Library. Banners will be programmed to coincide with library events and will be changed periodically.

Moss clarifies that the banners will be at a height of fourteen feet, and Matveiev says yes.

Goulatia asks if the banners are printed yet. Cerce says no. Goulatia comments on one of the fonts and says that it does not go with the image. Cerce says that font is the branded typeface for the library, so they would not want to change the font, but they may be able to adjust the contrast. Goulatia asks if the banners could switch, so that all the banners of one kind are not on the same side of the street. Cerce says there are many opportunities to diversify the design if that is the concern. Goulatia says she means alternating the banners. Cerce says yes they can do that.

Quintanilla thanks the library for what they do. He asks if the banners can be bigger or longer since the library is so important. Cerce says they might not want to go wider than two feet so as not to be hit by passing trucks, but they are open to a longer length. Matveiev says that the sign companies have a standard template, and there are also questions about what the handle hardware can support. Quintanilla says since the building is so grand, the banners should also be.

Parsakian asks if the same historic image will be used on every banner. Cerce says this image has been used at all seventeen library locations. Parsakian says the font hides the majority of the building in the image. Matveiev says the image is the original building, not the current one. Cerce says they wanted an image from the original 1895 building and there are not many images from that era.

Young asked if they considered using artwork from the “125” cards commissioned by artists in designing these banners. Cerce says they considered this and they are using that artwork in other ways into the future.

Moss notes that the application says Conceptual/Final, but they are on the agenda for Conceptual. Matveiev says they changed this because their Development Activities Meeting is still outstanding. Moss says he would not have an issue with this application proceeding as Conceptual/Final provided that they fulfill that community obligation. Parsakian, Young, and Goulatia say that they agree.

**MOTION:** Conceptual/Final Approval, with the condition that the required Development Activities Meeting is held.

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

6. **Medic 4 – Department of Public Works
Conceptual Review**

Claire Mastroberardino of DPW and Roberto Vega Peralta of AE7 give the presentation for this project, which is for a new one-story structure on the corner of Lafayette and Federal Street Extension. It will house EMS operations and garage space for four ambulances. The building will utilize Passive House strategies.

Moss says it is a nice design for the building. He says the neighborhood sign seems like a separate project and asks if they are proposing to use the Percent For Art funds for the new neighborhood sign. Mastroberardino says yes, that the new building will displace the previous sign and a new sign is something the community had asked about. Moss suggests that the Percent For Art could be used in a
way that is more integrated to the building and the sign could be addressed separately. He says that the wall which contains the large “4” could potentially be a site for artwork. Mastroberardino says that is a good idea. Peralta agrees and says the only issue with that wall is the visibility, as the sign location is at a more visible spot. Moss says that the wall could be treated as its own artistic intervention apart from signage. Peralta and Mastroberardino say this could be a good idea.

Moss asks if, considering the slope of the ground, if it would be easy for someone to jump onto the roof of this building. Peralta says that what is shown is the current topography and they are working with Langan Civil Engineering to reduce the slope.

Parsakian asks if there is any landscaping or green space included in the plan. Mastroberardino says that there will be low-maintenance landscape around the building. Peralta says that an earlier plan idea was to include low-retention soil to capture rainwater. Parsakian asks if the building will qualify for Net Zero. Mastroberardino says yes.

Quintanilla says that instead of the signage they could create an art piece that engages more with the community, utilizing the landscape area on the corner. Mastroberardino says she will bring that up with the community next week.

Parsakian says that the wall that contains the “4” would be an exciting opportunity for artists.

Quintanilla reiterates his suggestion that the art utilize the landscaped area on the corner in a way that engages the community, or as another idea some kind of art that hides the parking from the street. Mastroberardino says that the community was glad they moved the parking to a less visible area, and was interested in lighting that brightened up the space as well.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

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

7. **Fire Station 8 – Department of Public Works Conceptual Review**

Claire Mastroberardino of DPW and Roberto Vega Peralta of AE7 present this proposal for the renovation of the existing building using an inside-out retrofit to retain the historic limestone facades. The current proposal represents a redirection of strategies to address Commission and public concerns from previous hearings. A Percent For Art project is conceptually proposed as a multi-part sculptural installation and will be presented separately to Commission for review/approval.

Moss thanks Mastroberardino for the reconsideration of this project after previous Commissioner comments, and says it is a tremendous improvement to the approach. Mastroberardino says they are working with great architects. Moss asks if the project team changed. Mastroberardino says no, that AE7 had been brought on board as the interior architects and they expanded their scope to encompass the fenestrations and additional designs.

Moss says that the art piece that runs up through the building as a vertical element is an intriguing idea and he is interested to see how it materializes. He asks if the light wells are spaces that can be occupied. Mastroberardino says that there will be floors in the light wells and one will be a communicating area between the firefighter’s bunk and the first floor. She says they will each be well lit with a skylight.

Quintanilla says they have done a great job. He says it is always a struggle to incorporate modern needs into older buildings but is glad they were able to figure it out.
Parsakian congratulates them on finding a creative way to solve this problem. He asks if they will be coming back once they finalize the window replacement. Mastroberardino says yes. He asks if they will come back about the art piece. Mastroberardino says yes.

Goulatia commends them on thinking the project through. She asks if the light wells are plain glass. Mastroberardino says it is brick in the interior with windows in it. Goulatia asks what is on the roof of the light well. Mastroberardino says they are open now but they will be covering them with passive house energy-efficient skylights. Goulatia asks if this is the natural light that will go into the building. Mastroberardino says yes, and they are adding some windows as well. Goulatia says a light installation could be fantastic in the light wells. Mastroberardino says the new dark sky ordinance may not allow that. Goulatia says that the art piece sounds exciting. Peralta says that the concept is community based and represents a moment of healing. Parsakian asks if they will ask the community for feedback on the art. Mastroberardino says yes.

Goulatia asks if there is a plan for the RFP. Minnaert says they will work together to draft the language for the RFP and work within the City’s solicitation process.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Parsakian
SECONDED BY: Quintanilla
IN FAVOR: Moss
OPPOSED: None

8. **Stephen Foster Loan – Department of City Planning**

   Conceptual/Final Review

   Sarah Minnaert of the Public Art & Civic Design Division of DCP proposes this loan of the Stephen Foster statue to exhibition organizer LAXART for a temporary exhibition at the Museum of Contemporary Art in 2023. The exhibition will place de-commissioned monuments alongside responsive contemporary artworks.

   Moss asks how long the statue would be on loan. Minnaert says they do not have exact dates, but it would be temporary, with the exhibition lasting probably 3-6 months and added time for shipping and storage. Moss asks if there will be a legal agreement. Minnaert says yes, the Art Commission approval today will allow the City to move into loan negotiation and a legal agreement between LAXART and the City.

   Quintanilla asks if they will need to protect the statue’s platform from being exposed to the environment. Minnaert says that the exhibition will be indoors, but the exhibition organizers will be working with a company to ensure safe transport and setup. Quintanilla says he was talking about the pedestal. Minnaert says the sculpture is not presently installed outdoors, it is in City storage. Parsakian asks if they are taking only the statue or also the plinth. Minnaert says she does not know that but will find out as they move into the loan contract phase. Goulatia says the plinth is an important part of the work, and asks if it is still at Schenley Plaza. Parsakian says no, it is all in storage.

   Chris Zurawsky speaks from the audience in favor of rejecting the loan request.

   Chris Lynch of the Foster Memorial at the Center For American Music speaks from the audience in favor of approving the loan request.

   Kathryn Miller Haines of the Center For American Music speaks from the audience in favor of approving the loan request.

   Quintanilla asks if language about the correct contextualization of the statue’s history needs to be added to the loan contract. Young says she was also thinking that.

   Moss says that they had a special hearing a few years ago to specifically address the statue, and the Art Commission made the decision to have it removed. Moss says it may be worthwhile for them to ask that a statement from the Art Commission be included to give the point of view of the Commission and
why the statue was removed. Parsakian says he does not know the curator of this exhibition but expects they will be concerned with the history of the statue, and says he would love if the Commission’s contextualization could be included along with the exhibition’s description of the statue.

Minnaert mentions that there is a publication that will accompany the exhibition and so there should be multiple ways that a greater depth of detail around the sculpture’s history can be included in the exhibition’s discourse.

Goulatia says it would be wise to send a statement, and says she has no issues with the loan of the statue as long as they take care of it.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval, with the condition that a statement by the Commissioners be included in the exhibition materials.**

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

Moss asks if Minnaert should prepare the statement for the Commission to review. Minnaert says she can suggest a selection of documentation materials. Moss says it may be better for it to just be a paragraph or two that they have drafted. Minnaert agrees. Parsakian says one or two paragraphs would be easier for them to include in exhibition materials, and asks who should write it. The Commission discusses how to write the statement, and Minnaert suggests that someone from the LAXART curatorial team could have a conversation with the Commission. Parsakian says that is a good idea, and Minnaert says she will discuss this with the exhibition organizers. Goulatia says another approach would be for LAXART to send them the narrative they are working with and the Commission could give their thoughts on it. Parsakian says it should start with the Commission and could be done through email. Moss says that compiling the comments of the Commission from the previous two hearings would be helpful. Goulatia says that news articles would also be helpful. Parsakian says that the statement should be coming from them. Cavalline says he will gather those sources for them to review.

C. **Correspondence**

None.

D. **Public Comment**

None.

E. **Director & Staff Report**

Minnaert says there are no updates on the ongoing litigation around the Columbus statue. She says that PACD has been working with DPW to readdress the protective wrapping on the statue.

Minnaert says they will soon be moving into the artist selection phase for the Homewood Park Public Art RFP.

Minnaert says they currently have a call for artists open for a public art project at Chartiers Spray Park.

Minnaert brings forward the proposal for an over the counter review process to increase the efficiency of the Art Commission’s reviews and approvals. She describes the projects that would be eligible for this review and states that all projects reviewed in this manner could be put into the next month’s Art Commission staff report.
Moss says this is a good proposal, including the monthly summary. Parsakian agrees, and says it will save them a lot of time. Minnaert says it will be similar to processes used by other boards and commissions and they will try to communicate the process to applicants in a similar way as well. Goulatia says that there should always be transparency, and Minnaert says that the process will not be used to fast-track applications, but to use the Commission's expertise in the most efficient and focused ways. She says that the next step will be including some language in the Art Commission bylaws to reference the over the counter process. They discuss creating language to reference this process in the bylaws, which will be brought to the Commission to approve at next month's meeting. Goulatia says they had previously discussed changes to Chapter 175 of the City Code which did not go into effect. Minnaert says that the bylaws are the operating guide for the Commission, and can be updated much more easily. She says that there was language in the proposed draft of Chapter 175 which did not functionally align with how the City operates, specifically with regard to trust funds and how funding could be assigned. She says that due to the Code having been updated in pieces over time, the overall language of the Code is inconsistent and a meaningful change should revise the chapter holistically.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:09 P.M.