



Ms. Mary Conturo
Executive Director
Sports & Exhibition Authority
The Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue Suite 2750
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Subject: Section 106 and Agenda for Interested Parties Meeting #7

June 8, 2010

We are writing because we are concerned, based on the Agenda for IP Meeting #7, that you have abandoned the agreed-upon Section 106 process and are skipping from a Draft Alternatives Analysis to a grossly premature discussion of Mitigation Measures. Your discussion of Mitigation at this stage in the Interested Parties Process can only be viewed as a foregone conclusion calling for demolition.

Having agreed on Section 106 as the review process, you are required to seek (in order) ways to avoid, then to minimize and *lastly* to mitigate adverse effects to the Arena. Your Draft Options Report (Alternatives Analysis) is not final and has not been reviewed by the Bureau for Historic Preservation (BHP)—**yet you are already prepared to discuss mitigation.**

The Effect Report has not been released to Interested Parties, and is at best, only a draft that has not seen the light of the required public participation process. Like the Draft Options Report, it is not final and has not been reviewed by BHP—**yet you are already prepared to discuss mitigation.**

If you were adhering in good faith to Section 106 procedures, both the Options Report and the Effects Report would be reviewed by BHP to determine if you both adequately sought *and* adequately assessed alternatives.

At that point, if BHP were to agree to the finding that avoiding an adverse effect was not feasible, then, and only then, would consultation be initiated *with* BHP to discuss ways to *minimize* potential adverse effects.

Lastly, and only after all of these steps of the Section 106 process are complete, would discussion with BHP about possible mitigation begin.

Therefore, we are requesting the following:

1. That all requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended through 2006) be adhered to, particularly Section 106.



2. That BHP's *Guidance for Consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office under Section 106 of NHPA* be adhered to—particularly the requirement for immediate consultation with BHP if an adverse effect is determined *prior* to initiation of any discussion of mitigation.
3. That discussion about mitigation measures as part of the Interested Parties Process occur only after the Options Report and Effect Report have been reviewed by BHP in their final form, comment from BHP has been reviewed by Interested Parties, and discussion of ways to minimize potential adverse effects has taken place.

We expect a written response from the SEA regarding its commitment to follow appropriate process and the sequence of steps that we have outlined.

Sincerely,

Jeff Slack, AICP, Preservation Planner
on Behalf of the Steering Committee of Reuse the Igloo!

Mr. Robert Pfaffmann, AIA, AICP, Architect & Planner
Mr. Scott Leib, Software Executive and President, Preservation Pittsburgh
Mr. David Bear, Studio for Creative Inquiry, CMU
Dr. Earl Childs, DMD
Ms. Connie Cantor, Artist
Mr. David Conrad, Actor
Mr. John Axtell, Attorney
Mr. Todd Poole, Economic Planner, 4ward Planning
Ms. Audrey Reichblum, Publisher
Mr. Charlie Humphrey, Arts Administrator
Ms. Rebecca Moller, Management Consultant
Mr. Jason Harris, Retail Management
Mr. Stephen George, FAIA, Former URA and Airport Executive Director
Mr. Syl Damianos, FAIA Architect, fmr President of AIA
Ms. Mary Robson, Architect
Ms. Russell Guest, Architect
Mr. Casey Schlaegle, Past President AIAS, University of Pittsburgh
Ms. Sarah Radelet, Executive Director, Performing Arts Non-profit
Mr. Phil Hundley, AIA DRS Architects (successor firm to Mitchell & Ritchey)
Ms. Laura Schwartz, Preservation Planner
Ms. Jennifer Baron, Musician, Artist & Writer