

ART COMMISSION

Minutes of the meeting Wednesday, May 23, 2018
Beginning at 2:00 p.m.

PRESENT OF THE COMMISSION: Indovina, Baskinger, Goulatia, Heidemann, Arimoto-Mercer, Moss, Gable, Ricks (arrived during the first presentation)

PRESENT OF THE STAFF: Guerra, Cavalline

AGENDA ITEMS COVERED IN THESE MINUTES

ITEM	PAGE
1. Life on Liberty Streetscape – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership	1 - 3
2. Strawberry Way Mural – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership	3 - 4
3. Frick Signage – Kolano Design	4 - 5
4. Bakery Square Pedestrian Bridge – Walnut Capital	5 - 6
5. Telecommunications Standards – CNX	6 - 9

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Roll call. Indovina asks for Commissioners to review and comment on the minutes. Moss asks for a line on page 12 to be clarified. Heidemann motions to approve the minutes with that amended clarification, seconded by Goulatia. Motion carried.

B. Correspondence

Guerra stated that there has been correspondence relating to the Stephen Foster Memorial that she will go over in the Staff Report.

C. Items for Review

- 1. *Life on Liberty Streetscape – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership (Conceptual/Final)***
Jeremy Waldrup, PDP
Jonathan Kline, Studio for Spatial Practice
Jen Gallagher, Studio for Spatial Practice

Waldrup describes the project, which is for a one-year intervention to expand and animate the pedestrian public realm along this block of Liberty. It is the next phase in a series of pilots designed to improve pedestrian, transit, and business experience on Liberty Ave. It includes large concrete blocks to delineate a pedestrian zone, flowering plants, a sequence of lighting elements, and a public art piece on the street surface. It will take place along the 900 block of Liberty Ave in Downtown.

Kline goes through the visual presentation. They have modified what was submitted by removing a large sculptural figure that some feared could be scary at night and might block oncoming traffic.

Arimoto-Mercer asks where the color palette came from, and Kline responds that there is a lot of grey nearby, and there goal was to brighten the environment. Arimoto-Mercer says that she finds the colors confusing as they match some nearby utility colors. Kline says that this is intentional as the graphics are derived from street signage. Arimoto-Mercer says that the directional

elements in the design add to the confusion and may lead pedestrians to stop in the street. She asks about the delineation of the crosswalk. Waldrup says that the crosswalk is brick on the concrete street and is marked for handicapped access.

Arimoto-Mercer asks about the gaps between concrete blocks and why pedestrians wouldn't walk through them. Kline hopes that common sense would lead people not to walk through them and there is a lot of precedent for this sort of delineation in other cities that to his knowledge have not led to pedestrian accidents.

Indovina notes that the actual crosswalk seems more hidden than the gaps in the blocks. Kline notes the curb cut and the pedestrian signage. Moss suggests that the graphics on the ground could emphasize the location of the crosswalk. Kline says that the paint pattern could be altered.

Moss asks how the dirt in the planters will be contained. Kline says that it would be contained on three sides, with Belgian blocks, a filter fabric and perforated pipe near the curb in the gutter zone. He says the dirt should not come out between the blocks. Goulatia asks if the blocks are held together in any way and what would happen if a vehicle bumps into them. Kline says they are just stacked but are very heavy and shouldn't move.

Indovina asks how this all relates to the normal drainage by the curb. Gallagher shows the detail of the pipe running by the curb.

Heidemann notes that there seems to be a lot of colors that visually compete, especially when taken into consideration with the Bae Bae's Kitchen Spark which will be installed just up the street.

Goulatia asks how they chose the mural elements. Kline says they started with the idea of signage and the animals were a playful way to show how the space could be occupied. Goulatia says the arrows pointing different directions are confusing and there is a lot of visual clutter.

Arimoto-Mercer says it could activate the space in a more subtle way. Kline says they could remove colors or reimagine the mural. Goulatia suggests an artistic mural. Kline says that they thought of this as an artistic mural that is graphically driven. They wanted it to be clear that this was a place for pedestrians.

Moss says that it is a good project that should be revisited with today's comments about the mural, the visual clutter, and the crosswalks.

Baskinger says there are some structural questions also. He asks that the applicants think about what the colors communicate, especially the yellow which seems to unintentionally lead directionally in some places and the intent could be misread. He says that they are missing technical drawings to help them understand the lighting fixtures. He also says there should be a rendering that shows all elements for a cohesive view. He asks what the graphic elements such as the bird, cat, etc are made of. Kline says they are ¼ plate steel with rounded edge, welded to a steel tube which will be bolted to the concrete block.

Indovina asks about the concrete blocks and if they are new or reused and what their texture is like. Kline says they are smooth precast concrete. Indovina says this type of block is used for retaining walls and usually only has one face exposed and in this case 5 faces would be.

Arimoto-Mercer confirms that Garrison Place is a one-way street.

Baskinger asks how this all gets removed in a year. Waldrup says that the blocks are not attached to the surface and can be removed, but their intent is to work with the City to incorporate it permanently. The paint can be power washed off the concrete. Baskinger says there are a lot of street painting projects and paint may not be the ideal material here if this is a permanent fixture. He suggests exploring vinyl graphics. Kline says that CMU used these and some failed very fast. He is not familiar enough with the product to know if it would work with their budget.

Arimoto-Mercer asks who will maintain the planters. Waldrup says that PDP will. Indovina asks about the particular plants, and Waldrup says their initial plan was for perennials, but they will have to see what plants work well.

Goulatia says the concrete blocks look rougher in the photographs than in the renderings and this could add to the visual clutter. Kline says stakeholders did not want the blocks to read as seating.

Kara Bailey, an audience member affiliated with Verizon, notes that there is a Verizon manhole system about 1.5 ft from this specific curb and they would need to know that they would have access. Kline says they tried to make sure there were no blocks that would interfere with manholes. Waldrup confirms that all manhole concerns have been addressed.

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with the condition that the applicants take into consideration the comments from the Commissioners in their revised submittal

MOVED BY Moss
SECONDED BY Goulatia
IN FAVOR All
OPPOSED None

CARRIED

2. ***Strawberry Way Mural – Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership
(Conceptual/Final)***
 Jeremy Waldrup, PDP
 Sallyann Kluz, Office of Public Art
 Julie Mallis, Artist

Waldrup describes the project, which is a new temporary artwork in the public right-of-way. This new thoroughfare mural will replace the existing one, which was installed in 2016 and was intended to last 2-3 years. The proposed new mural will also be intended to be in place for 2-3 years. The installation of this painting will begin in June.

Kluz describes the artist selection process, the project location, and the budget.

Mallis goes through the visual presentation and describes the mural, which she has designed and will implement in Strawberry Way. The mural will depict various kinds of fruit, with the questions “Who’s missing from your table?” and “Who gets to eat the most fruit?”. It is meant to be interactive, function as a game, and lead to thoughtful consideration of the questions.

Moss says it is great. Indovina commends the interesting color palette. Goulatia appreciates the questions. Arimoto says that it flows well, and is playful and clear. Baskinger suggests it should be framed as a provocation to see how people interact with it.

Indovina mentions the ADA Coordinator's question whether it will include interpretive panels in Braille. Kluz says they will work with PDP on the signage and that can be incorporated.

Moss asks if this will be painted over the previous mural. Kluz says much of Strawberry Way will be repaved by DOMI, some parts were not initially painted at all, other parts will be painted over.

MOTION: Final Approval

MOVED BY Heidemann
SECONDED BY Goulatia
IN FAVOR All
OPPOSED None

CARRIED

**3. Frick Signage – Kolano Design
(Conceptual/Final)
*Bill Kolano, Kolano Design***

Kolano describes the existing signage as too minimal and describes the proposed enhancements. The proposed signage is part of a larger wayfinding program of signs to be erected throughout the Frick site. This application is for an enhanced identification sign to better direct those arriving to the site in vehicles.

Moss clarifies that there is no lighting involved, which Kolano confirms.

Moss asks how the sign is supported, and Kolano says the posts go into the ground with their own foundation.

Baskinger asks if it is part of a larger program of signs. Kolano says that the original signage system is from 2009, and these are enhancements.

Arimoto-Mercer says that the openness of the design is fitting.

Gable states his support of the project, and notes for the record that the park is owned by the City of Pittsburgh and the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy is the City's private partner in managing the parks.

MOTION: Final Approval

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

CARRIED

4. Bakery Square Pedestrian Bridge – Walnut Capital (Conceptual)

Todd Reidbord, Walnut Capital

Tom Price, Strada Architecture

Claudia Saladin, Strada Architecture

Reidbord introduces himself and explains the overall project. The proposed project is an overhead enclosed pedestrian bridge connecting a new parking garage with an existing parking garage. It coincides with the development of the new garage as well as a new office building. The bridge will allow pedestrian access to Bakery Square without crossing Dahlem Place.

Price introduces himself as the architect for the project and explains the bridge in more detail. Saladin, the landscape architect, describes the project's relationship to the right-of-way and how the project makes the area safer for pedestrians.

Indovina confirms that Dahlem place dead-ends into Port Authority property and the bridge is only really visible to people using ht eproperty and bus drivers, and Reidbord confirms this.

Arimoto-Mercer asks if this property is open to the public, and Price says it's the first phase of what will hopefully be a Larimer Transit Center that will be used more heavily by the public, but yes the current project is open to the public as well.

Ricks asks about the pedestrian experience in the existing garage. Price says it lands at that spot because it is only about 20 feet to the elevator core. He says that they will have to eliminate one or two parking spaces, but there will be a pedestrian connection right to the core where you can take elevators to ground level. Indovina asks if they needed the bridge to hit the existing garage above the speed ramp, and Reidbord says yes, and it worked out well with the way the elevator cores line up with one another.

Arimoto-Mercer asks if the Commission will also be discussing the nine-story building on the site and Indovina says that is not their purview. Arimoto-Mercer notes that they have letters of support but it would be helpful to have the Parks Conservancy weigh in as the property abuts the park. Guerra says this would be the purview of the City. Reidbord says they have been through CDAP and will be at Planning Commission in June. Arimoto-mercator asks about a buffer between the building and the park and Reidbord says that those matters are part of the whole Bakery Square Master Plan and they are compliant.

Reidbord asks if its possible to get Final Approval at this hearing. Indovina says usually this would require more technical materials in the application, and what has been presented is fairly conceptual. Price shows the Commission some materials. Moss asks about the colors involved, and Price explains the colors of the metals and paint.

Ricks asks if they have considered putting a green roof on the bridge, as a consideration to address stormwater issues, and Price states that they are collecting the water from the roof and they have stormwater management below the garage, but the green roof on the bridge would not be seen and accessing it for maintenance would be difficult.

Ricks states that DOMI has no objections.

MOTION: Final Approval

MOVED BY Moss
SECONDED BY Heidemann
IN FAVOR All
OPPOSED None

CARRIED

**5. Telecommunications Standards – CNX
(Final)
Dave George, CNX**

George introduces himself and gives his presentation for Small Cell Aesthetic Standards for Telecommunications for the City of Pittsburgh. He had given a presentation and received Conceptual Approval at the previous month's hearing. He presents the standards which have been revised after the Commissioner's comments.

Moss confirms that sidewalks that are ten feet wide or less will not be permitted to have a large pedestal-base pole, and George says that is correct.

Ricks confirms that those areas would have new or existing poles, not a combination pole, and George says that is correct, these would replace existing City poles.

Indovina clarifies that once the standards are adopted they would be under the purview of DOMI and only exceptions would come to Art Commission, and George says yes.

Moss asks about benchmark documentation from other cities, and George says that there are some images in the packet of examples of cities that do not have standards. He recognizes the need going forward for pictures with human scale examples, but he does not have any to show currently.

Moss says his main concern is with the ground-mounted equipment base. He asks when a provider can choose what type of pole they install. George replies that if the sidewalk is greater than ten feet, the provider can choose either a pedestal base or an integrated pole. Moss asks if the pedestal base is the least expensive. Kara Bailey, audience member and Verizon representative, says that it is more expensive.

Baskinger says that there needs to be a rule set for when types of poles are allowed or not allowed. George says that right now the new pole with external mounts would only be allowed when the sidewalk is ten feet or less, and when the sidewalk is greater than ten feet the external mounts would not be allowed, and only the pedestal base or integrated pole would be allowed. Baskinger says they need a scheme that allows them to designate a preferred pole that should be used in all instances except where it is precluded because of sidewalk space, in which case the side-mounted pole is a viable option.

Moss says that the preferred pole is the fully integrated, and Indovina agrees. Baskinger and Goulatia reiterate the three types of poles for clarification.

Indovina says that it seems there are a lot of sidewalks under ten feet, and in those cases it would default to the side-mounted poles which are the least desirable. Moss points out that it also has the least impact on a pedestrian.

Ricks states that DOMI standards require that poles be two feet back from the base of the curb, so larger poles can start to reach further into the middle of the sidewalk.

Indovina asks if the base of the fully integrated pole is also two feet in diameter, and George says this is correct.

Baskinger says the photographs and the CAD models are very different and the proportions seem to change. Baskinger says that the proportions of the shrouds and the distribution of the volume may be more important than the actual cubic volume. He asks if there is a driving factor as to what dictates the proportions. George says that the City requested co-locations so that multiple carriers can be located on the same pole, and the recommended 11 cubic foot is the smallest dimensional radio shroud that can support colocation. Baskinger confirms this is driven by current hardware and the need for the equipment to have breathability.

Indovina asks if it would make sense to set dimensions for how much clear space there must be on the sidewalk instead of the ten foot sidewalk standard. Ricks says that on a ten foot sidewalk you're very compromised in having usable space especially once about 4.5 ft are taken up with a pole and the space between the pole and the curb. Indovina says that with some older poles it may be less than two feet between the pole and the curb.

Bailey says that an earlier comment referenced the City's 37,000+ poles, and she says the vast majority of these are not capable of holding the small cell equipment. She says that they have the option to replace poles that are incapable of holding the equipment but there are questions of implementation when new poles have to be set back two feet and the sidewalk is already only ten feet wide. Moss asks if they would be requesting to replace poles in the exact same location as the existing pole. Bailey says that's what they have done at every small cell location in Pittsburgh that she has overseen. She says that new locations can run into problems, such as being dug over an existing basement. Ricks notes that the guidelines says two feet from the curb but there needs to be some flexibility as it is an old city.

Goulatia says the integrated pole doesn't look as big. George says they can go all the way up, but usually are just wider up to six or seven feet. However, the standards do not call for them only going up to that height limitation. Goulatia asks if that standard can be applied (a height limitation for the wider section of the integrated pole), and Moss agrees. Moss also says the size limitation for the pedestal pole is very large and asks if it can be reduced. George says it can be reduced, but that will also limit the amount of carriers that can go into it.

Goulatia asks how far apart the poles are. George says that they can be as far apart as existing city poles. Goulatia asks how close they need to be to provide their service. George says quite close and getting closer as technology changes. He states that probably about 150-200 small cell antennas will be required across the four carriers.

Baskinger asks what limits how many carriers can be on a pole, and George states it is the hardware, primarily the radio. He says that even with 11 cubic feet, you may not always be able to fit two carriers in.

Goulatia asks if it wouldn't make sense to have every pole replaced with an integrated pole or whichever pole is chosen, to maximize the use of all space. George says you will probably end up with this scenario anyway, as the majority of poles could not take the weight otherwise. Goulatia thinks that multiple styles in the same space would be ugly, so it may help to limit the styles within the same visual space. George says that you could limit the type of poles, but it will limit the coverage as it will be limiting what carriers can do in the city, as the stealth poles are much more costly than the side mounted poles.

Baskinger asks how easy they are to remove if the technology changes. George says that the pedestal bases can be removed, and the integrated poles would remain as they are. He doesn't anticipate the need for less physical technology as of now, but he does recommend frequent inspections to keep current on what equipment or pole space is no longer functional.

Goulatia asks who bears the cost for the poles. George says the providers and the carriers. Goulatia asks if they prefer to share poles to share the cost, and George says they prefer single carrier poles.

Ricks asks about the standalone poles that are not streetlights or other city utilities. George says these are all replacements for existing poles, there are no new city poles going up with these standards.

Moss asks if the ground mounted could be smaller. George says yes, but you could only fit one carrier.

Baskinger asks if DOMI will create a typology of poles and when they are used. Ricks says that they could do that, but that she believes they are all of the opinion that although none of these options is necessarily desirable, they are trying to find the least obtrusive, and DOMI would appreciate the Commission's statement on which pole is the least undesirable. Indovina clarifies that the poles come to DOMI for review and approval.

Moss says the pedestal base is the one he has the most issue with. Baskinger asks if they can revisit in a year. George says that in his opinion this document will require revision within a year.

Kevin Trupeik, audience member and representative of Extenet Systems, says that 5G technology will require more density in the cities, and that that technology is just getting started and will take 6-7 years to get fully deployed.

George says the some of the recommendations in the standards are driven by being commercially reasonable.

Guerra says that DOMI should drive the review process in the future, as they are the department implementing it.

MOTION: Final Approval with the recommendation that 1) integrated poles are preferred for primary installation, with side mounted modular poles and pedestal poles being second and third options, depending on condition and context; and 2) that the Commission requests a one-year review presentation by DOMI.

MOVED BY Baskinger
SECONDED BY Heidemann
IN FAVOR All
OPPOSED None

CARRIED

D. Staff Report

Guerra says that the day after the previous Art Commission, the Stephen Foster statue was removed, with the help of the Department of Public Works. It is now in Highland Park in a crate. There have been various public comments received by the PA+CD Division, both for and against. PA+CD has also received inquiries from locations in other states interested in acquiring the statue. It has been brought up to the Mayor, who requests that for the next year they seek a new home for the statue within the City of Pittsburgh.

Moss says he is disappointed that the media misinterpreted why they decided to remove the statue.

Guerra talks about the Women in Public Art initiative organized by the Mayor's office, which held five public meetings to discuss a replacement statue for the space where the Stephen Foster statute stood. Guerra says that the organizers of this initiative will be coming in front of the Art Commission, probably next month, to give a brief on where they are with the project. Goulatia says that it may be more desirable to talk about alternatives for the space other than replacing one statue with another. Guerra notes that the Commissioners can bring up these sorts of comments to them when they present.

Guerra also talks about the Cantini Mosaic Tunnel. The I-579 Cap project came before the Art Commission and was approved, but people have brought up concerns about the preservation of the Cantini work. Section 106 found that it is a significant work of art and are now looking into whether the tunnel itself will be considered significant, since the artwork was made specifically for the tunnel environment. Comments are being accepted currently by PennDoT and the historians, and we are waiting for their report before we can go further with discussions about the work's removal.

Meeting Adjourned