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Please find attached Addendum 2, Determination of Effects of the Development Options Comparison Report (Options Report) that was provided to you on September 8, 2010 for the above project. The report and addendum have taken into account comments provided by Interested Parties (IP), the public, and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission’s Bureau of Historic Preservation (BHP).

As you know, the SEA initiated consultation in January 2010 with the BHP in compliance with the Pennsylvania State History Code. Since then, the SEA has conducted eight Interested Parties meetings and has solicited comments on two drafts of the Options Report, dated May and July 2010, respectively and one draft of the Effect Report dated June 2010 (draft reports). During Interested Party Meeting #8, we requested comments on these draft reports. We accepted comments from Interested Parties and the BHP through August 13, 2010. Finally, the SEA Board offered the public additional opportunity to comment in conjunction with its August 23, 2010 regular business meeting.

A record of comments, correspondence, articles and media reports were provided to you under separate cover on August 10, September 7 and 9 respectively. Comments submitted by the IPs on the draft reports as well as pertinent agency correspondence were provided to the Board on August 11, 2010 and are included in the final version of the Options Report, in Appendix I. The comments were analyzed and considered by Oxford-Chester and its subconsultants Michael Baker Jr., Inc. (Baker) and Oxford Real Estate Advisors in order to complete the Options Report.

The BHP’s August letter contains two key points. First, it states that “the SEA has adequately completed the consultation requirements of Chapter 5 of the State History Code.” Secondly, it provides advice to the SEA. That advice “is that the SEA should seriously consider delaying demolition of the Arena to allow for and in fact assist in the development of a more fully articulated economic and development opportunities for the Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment based in a context of adaptive reuse.”

We have considered that advice and have evaluated the effort it would take to implement the advice of the BHP. Delaying demolition would require the SEA to incur substantial carrying costs. The estimated monthly carrying costs (also known as holding costs) that were shared with Interested Parties in June 2010 ranged from approximately $76,000 to approximately $122,000. Based on actual costs incurred since the SEA took over the Arena in August, it is possible that the lower end of the range will be closer to $50,000 per month. The costs are more likely to be at the lower end of
the range if the Arena is simply maintained as a safe and secure facility; they are more likely to be at the higher end of the range if the Arena is maintained in a manner that would allow it to be reused. In any event, the carrying costs on an annual basis would be significant.

In addition to the costs that would accompany a delay, we do not believe that taking the time necessary to “more fully articulate economic and development opportunities” will result in a different conclusion than what is presented in the attached Options Report as articulated below.

The Options Report sets forth an economic analysis which compares the public benefit of a development concept like Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development with the public benefit of a development concept like Option 3 – Arena Reuse and Site Development. The results are compelling. They show that Option 5 has the potential to generate as much as $126 million in wage, real estate and parking taxes over 10 years, compared to $78 million potential generated by Option 3 – Arena Reuse and only $36 million potential generated by Option 6 – Restore Arena.

Pursuant to requests by interested parties and the public and in conjunction with finalizing the Options Report, we, along with our subconsultants Baker and Oxford Real Estate Advisors have analyzed whether changing assumptions of the economic analyses would result in material differences to the results. This exploration included adjustments to the operating costs, adjustments to the renovation costs, adjustments to the revenue generation and adjustments to the density surrounding the arena. The results of these adjustments do not change the conclusion that a plan similar to Option 5 will result in the greatest, and more likely public benefit.

It is not only the economic analysis that is compelling. As otherwise spelled out in the Options Report, any plan that involves reusing the existing Arena will create awkward development blocks, will create challenges to an overall plan due to the size and scale of the Arena, will continue the spatial divide between the Hill and the central business district, and will discourage investment by developers and lenders.

It is our considered opinion that the time necessary to “more fully articulate economic and development opportunities” will not result in a different conclusion than what is presented in the attached Options Report.

Additionally, we want to draw your attention to several of the comments received from IPs and briefly respond to the issues and concerns raised by the IPs.

1. Pittsburgh History & Landmarks (letter dated August 5, 2010). PHLF advises the SEA to delay the arena demolition until funds are secured and a Section 106 review process can be conducted. The SEA has received correspondence from the Federal Highway Administration (July 7, 2010) stating that at this time, there is no basis for FHWA to participate in Section 106 consultation. The SEA also received correspondence from the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (August 10, 2010). The Advisory Council letter states that “With regard to anticipatory demolition, the information provided about this undertaking does not establish that Section 110 (k) of the NHPA is applicable
since there does not appear to be an applicant that has carried out an activity that would require Section 106 review.” These letters are included in Appendix I of the attached Options Report. As these letters indicate, there is no certainty regarding the availability or timing of federal funding. We believe that the SEA’s best opportunity to induce public and private investment in the Lower Hill is to make a decision regarding the Civic Arena, which will enable the SEA to develop the plan for the infrastructure.

2. Reuse the Igloo! (letter and report dated August 6, 2010) and Preservation Pittsburgh (letter dated August 6, 2010). RTI submitted its comment letter accompanied by a report, which contained detailed comments on the Options Report. Preservation Pittsburgh submitted a letter that endorsed and reiterated the comments in the RTI report. We have included the RTI report in its entirety in Appendix I. We recommend that you review it directly. In this memorandum, we briefly respond to several of the themes in the RTI report.

- **Consultants.** RTI criticizes the objectivity and completeness of the work performed by SEA’s consultants. We recognize that, as part of this process, there have been many different views expressed. We commend and recognize the contributions made by RTI, PP, and their consultants, and believe that those contributions have enhanced the overall process. Naturally, there have been some differences in professional opinion. While it was not possible to achieve consensus, we believe that the process has been thorough and open and that the reports prepared by our subconsultants are accurate and complete.

- **Consultation Process.** RTI raises concerns about the consultation process. The State History Code offers no formal process for evaluating alternatives. We developed a reasonable decision-making process to receive and consider an array of suggestions and perspectives.

- **Financing Scenarios.** RTI suggests that the SEA and its consultants begin now to develop financing scenarios. The economic analysis included in the report shows a significant public benefit resulting from Option 5 that will be little changed by various financing plans.

- **Carrying Costs versus Operating Costs.** RTI suggests that operational/mothball costs are highly inflated. We need to differentiate between carrying costs (costs to keep the building safe and secure without occupants) and operational costs (costs where the building is occupied).

Carrying costs (or holding costs) are the minimum costs needed to maintain a safe and secure building with no occupants and include security, minimal snow and trash removal, utilities, and maintenance to ensure basic levels of functionality. The estimated monthly **carrying** costs (also known as holding costs) that were shared with Interested Parties in June 2010 ranged from $76k to $122k depending on the level of staffing and maintenance performed. The carrying costs have since been refined. It is now
anticipated that $50k to $96k/month is the range needed to ensure a safe, secure building with no occupants.

Appendix D, Financial Analysis contains annual operating costs ranging from $2.2M (Options 1, 3) to $3M (Option 6.) Operating costs are the costs to maintain and operate an occupied building and include higher levels of staffing, utilities, maintenance, cleaning, pest control, permits, equipment testing and insurance. Operating costs exclude event operations and concession operations.

- **Timing of Decision.** RTI proposes that the SEA table any official action relative to the Civic Arena, commission a new economic analysis, commit to "unifying disparate planning processes", commit to developing an RFP, continue public consultation, and perform additional analysis and consultation. Adopting these suggestions would substantially increase costs, would delay the economic benefits of redevelopment, and would prolong uncertainty. Currently, we believe that the site can be ‘development ready’ as early as Spring 2012. The impact of tabling the decision to demolish for one year is that the entire site would not be ‘development ready’ until Spring 2013 (or later). We believe that the sooner the site is ‘development ready’, the more likely it is that public and private investment in the area will be forthcoming. Furthermore, the costs to perform the additional analyses and undertake further consultation and to continue to hold the arena for an additional year could approach $1 million. We do not recommend adopting these suggestions.

In conclusion, we believe that the recommendations in the Options Report remain valid and the Options Report provides the SEA with the appropriate and necessary information to make an informed decision at this time. Again, it is our opinion that additional studies and time will not result in a different conclusion than what is presented in the attached Options Report.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Final Development Options Comparison Report, dated September 2010, re-states and supplements the first and second drafts, dated May and July 2010, respectively.

The Sports and Exhibition Authority (SEA) is the owner of the Civic Arena (the Arena), located on a 28-acre site and determined to be eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). A portion of the site is owned by the SEA and a portion is owned by the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh. With the construction of the Consol Energy Center completed, the continued use of the Civic Arena as a multi-purpose arena facility, supported by a major tenant, is no longer feasible. Preliminary plans call for the removal of the Civic Arena and redevelopment of the entire site with a mixed-use development. The potential exists for the future allocation of federal funds for the site redevelopment, but no federal funds have been provided for the redevelopment.

Since the Civic Arena is a NRHP-eligible site and preliminary development plans have the potential to result in an adverse effect to the arena building, compliance with the PA State History Code is required to evaluate measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate adverse effects to the historic resource. In lieu of specific guidance under the PA State History Code, the SEA has adopted a decision-making process that incorporates some aspects of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and the consultation process under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations found at 36 CFR 800 to provide structure to the process.

As part of this process, the SEA has provided an opportunity for participation by Interested Parties (IPs). IPs are groups or individuals with a demonstrated direct legal, economic or historical interest in the property. The IPs are involved in considerations of the historic resource, effects upon the resource, and measures to avoid or minimize adverse effects to the resource.

The consideration of measures to avoid or minimize impacts to the arena initially included the development and evaluation of six alternatives, which were later narrowed down to four: Option 1 - “Do Nothing”, Option 3 – Arena Reuse and Site Development, Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development, and Option 6 – Restore Arena to Original Design. Option 1 “Do Nothing” maintains the Arena in an unused state as a baseline condition for evaluation and comparison with other options.

Option 1 – “Do Nothing” involves closing or “mothballing” the Civic Arena. The Arena would remain unused indefinitely. Operational costs would be minimized, but baseline maintenance costs would still be required to keep the building from becoming derelict. Needed capital improvements and regular facility maintenance activities, beyond baseline, would be suspended. Under this option, the parking lots would be maintained and operated in support of the Consol Energy Center. It is assumed that this option would preserve the Civic Arena and would have no adverse effect on the historic character of the building.

Option 3 – Arena Reuse and Site Development involves the partial demolition of the Arena, the removal of the seating bowl and the retention of the dome’s support structure ring and retractable roof as preparation for future construction of a hotel facility and flexible open space where a variety of events or recreational activities can be held. This results in a minimized adverse effect to the historic resource. The Arena dome is envisioned to be kept in an open condition for the majority of the time and to be closed.
and reopened for scheduled events. High density mixed-use development is proposed for the remainder of the site with the densest development located between Lemieux Place and Crawford Avenue including one or more multi-story parking garages, shops and businesses along the outside of the garage structure, and multi-story residential units and a partial street grid located on top of the garages.

Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development would result in the removal of the Civic Arena and the construction of the mixed-use development for the entire 28-acre site. A street grid system would be constructed to establish a conventional urban block fabric. Wylie Avenue would extend between Crawford Street and Washington Place providing for east-west vehicular and pedestrian access through the site. Three north-south cross-streets for vehicular and pedestrian use would be provided for through-traffic between the perimeter roads of Bedford Avenue and Centre Avenue. Site grading and re-parceling would provide for nine separate development blocks. Each development block contains structured parking and on-street parking. Development scale/size and land use type would transition from mostly lower height residential uses near Crawford Street to higher building heights for entertainment, office and hotel uses towards Washington Place. A 150 unit hotel is proposed. Entertainment uses are also envisioned along Centre Avenue, adjacent to the Consol Energy Center.

Option 6 – Restore Arena to Original Design envisions the removal of the balconies, press box, super boxes, and A-level seats, that is, those elements added to the Arena during major remodels and a restoration of the facility to its 1961 vision. It also envisions addressing facility deficiencies that limit its competitiveness as a multi-purpose facility for smaller events. These deficiencies include inadequate compliance with ADA; inadequate safety features and accommodations; inadequate interior pedestrian circulation and egress; inadequate acoustics for spectator events; inefficient heating and cooling systems and building envelope that affect energy use; exterior pedestrian circulation challenges to ADA compliance; obsolete telecommunications, sound and video systems; and inadequate toilet and waste removal facilities. The existing parking lots would be maintained and operated to support the Civic Arena events, Consol Energy Center events, and general commuter parking needs. Other site development is not considered but could be considered similar to Option 3.

The process was supported by a team of experienced economists, planners, architects, historians, public involvement specialists, and environmental specialists (See Appendix G). Support was provided in the development and evaluation of alternatives, preparation of studies and reports, providing input during coordination meetings, and as helpers of the overall process. In addition to this technical support, the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission’s Bureau of Historic Preservation (BHP) consulted with the SEA during the process.

In the process, the effectiveness of each development option in addressing key need issues was evaluated. The key need issues were included under the broad categories of Design, Planning and Sustainability; Community Cohesion and Connectivity; Economic Development; and Affordability.

As a result of the process, including presentations, workshops, visits to the Civic Arena, coordination meetings, alternative refinements, and alternative development and evaluation, Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development was identified by the SEA consultants as the recommended development option for the following reasons:
• Removal of the Arena allows for the establishment of a street grid system that is reminiscent of the grid that pre-dated the Arena, consists of four through-streets for vehicular and pedestrian traffic and connections to the perimeter roads (Bedford Avenue, Crawford Avenue, Centre Avenue, and Washington Place), and effectively removes physical barriers and provides flexibility of access.
• Conventional urban blocks enhance the opportunity for the orderly grouping and segmentation of specific uses into an efficient and memorable land use pattern, effectively accommodate a high-density, mixed-use development, and allow for the location of parking garages and on-street parking throughout the development.
• Removal of the Arena allows for the adjustment of site gradients and the establishment of linear pedestrian corridors that, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, are more likely to be compliant with the American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA).
• Removal of the Arena results in a higher public economic benefit.
• Removal of the Arena does not require continued investment in the Arena.
• Conventional urban blocks that contribute to the marketability of the site are possible with the removal of the Arena.
• Removal of the Arena provides for an unencumbered development site with flexibility in grading.
• Removal of the Arena opens up development space in the center of the site and eliminates constraints along the edges of the site.

In other words, the existing Arena presents a challenge to proposed site development, marketing and construction strategies. Elevation varies more than 100 feet across the site between Crawford Avenue and Washington Place. The location of the Arena, more or less central to the site and at a lower elevation, restricts physical site development in terms of establishing an urban street grid system that provides flexibility of access; adjusting site grades to achieve linear pedestrian corridors with desirable grades of 8% or less which, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, are more likely to be ADA compliant; and establishing conventional urban blocks that support higher density and flexible mixed use development, promote the orderly grouping of land uses, and allow for the distribution of on-street and structured parking throughout.

The removal of the Arena results in an unencumbered development site and allows for the design and construction of a conventional linear street grid network providing for the efficient movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic, supplies, materials and services. The resulting nine individual urban blocks allows for greater flexibility in marketing, contracting and construction. An unencumbered construction site is more attractive to developers.

As otherwise articulated in the report, removal of the Arena, having an exterior footprint that occupies approximately 4 acres squarely in the center of the development site, allows for rational development and promotes investment by developers for the entire 28-acre site. We find that a reuse concept must be powerful enough to overcome the advantages of Option 5 by serving as a centerpiece for development of the site. Reuse considerations which keep the historic characteristic (the operational dome) require significant initial and ongoing public support and also fail to generate economic activity sufficient to justify forgoing redevelopment opportunities available with Option 5.
I. INTRODUCTION

In 1951, the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh (URA) announced its plans to renew the Lower Hill District to create a new Cultural Center. Plans were made to clear a portion of the primarily African-American neighborhood made up of residences and businesses, to make way for the new development. The portion that was cleared was a neighborhood of modest masonry residences and commercial blocks that includes Fullerton Street, Ridgway Street, Crawford Street, Bedford Avenue, Colwell Street, Pride Street, Fifth Avenue, Sixth Avenue, Wylie Avenue, and Tunnel Street. By 1956, about 1,600 families, or 8,500 people, were displaced as a result of these renewal endeavors. The new public auditorium, which became known as the Civic Arena and was deemed to be the centerpiece of the new cultural center, opened on September 17, 1961.

The auditorium design was an engineering feat in its day, and was hailed by the architectural and engineering community nationwide, winning national awards, such as the 1961 design award from the American Steel Construction Institute. Articles on the arena were also published in the most important design publications of the day, including Architectural Record, Engineering News Record, and Progressive Architecture. At the time of its construction, it featured the world’s largest retractable dome. The stainless-steel clad dome is composed of six retractable leaves anchored by a cantilevered frame and is supported by a ring girder to resist the thrust of the panels. The retractable dome was intended to provide open air concerts and events, and if inclement weather should arise, the dome was designed to close in 2.5 minutes with the push of a button. The arena was able to seat 7,500 to 13,000 people to meet the demands of various events. The arena originally housed the Civic Light Opera, hosted many concerts and exhibitions, and became the home of the Pittsburgh Penguins in 1967, a National Hockey League franchise. In 1999, the name of the arena was changed to Mellon Arena. On August 1, 2010 the name reverted back to the Civic Arena at the expiration of the naming rights agreement.

In 2001, the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission’s Bureau for Historic Preservation (BHP) (the State Historic Preservation Office) determined that the Arena is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for its significance in community planning and development for its association with a major period of urban renewal in Pittsburgh, as well as for its significance in architecture and engineering as an important example of mid-20th century design and of a large multi-purpose sports/entertainment facility of its era.

As a result of the Arena’s unique dome-design and aging and inadequate infrastructure, which limited facility expansion options, the construction of the new Consol Energy Center began in 2008. The Consol Energy Center site is located south of Centre Avenue and the Civic Arena. As a result of preliminary plans to redevelop the Civic Arena site with the potential for impacting the historic arena, a Request to Initiate Consultation form was filed with the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission - Bureau of Historic Preservation (BHP) including a delineated Area of Potential Effect (APE) which is inclusive of the entire 28-acre site for use in the future assessment of cultural resources and the assessment of potential project effects to historic resources.

The Sports & Exhibition Authority (SEA) is the owner of the Civic Arena. The SEA, in coordination with the BHP, has identified individuals and organizations with a demonstrated interest (Interested Parties or IPs) in the Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment Project and its potential to affect historic properties. By email and letter, the SEA offered the opportunity to
participate in consultation regarding historic properties pursuant to Chapter 5 (the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Act) of the PA State History Code. A historic property is defined as a prehistoric or historic building, site, district, structure or object included in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

To meet the spirit and intent of the PA State History Code, the SEA requested the views of interested parties, as well as the public, on findings and determinations regarding historic properties for the Lower Hill Redevelopment Project. For this project, in addition to the SEA and the BHP, IPs included representatives of local governments and others. The goal of consultation was to identify historic resources potentially affected by the project, assess effects to historic resources, and consider ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties resulting from project implementation.

II. COORDINATION PLAN

Interested Party Process

Because the PA State History Code does not establish a process for public consultation and because state and federal funding may be sought for the redevelopment, the SEA adopted a decision-making process that was modeled on the consultation process used under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and also included elements of the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The NEPA process includes defining a purpose and need for a proposed project and considers a scope of alternatives that meet the purpose and need. Section 106 establishes a process that seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns through consultation among agencies and other parties with a demonstrated direct legal or economic relation to the project or affected properties, or that may be concerned with the project’s effects on historic properties. Through this process, the SEA sought input from interested parties on alternative development options for the 28-acre Civic Arena site.

The purpose of the Interested Party process is to consider feasible preservation possibilities for the continued use of the Civic Arena site given its cultural value as a historic resource eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

The SEA and BHP identified potential IPs and invited them (via letter or e-mail) to become involved in the process. Registration forms were provided to each potential IP for completion, review, and consideration by the SEA prior to extending IP membership. The initial IP meeting was held on January 19, 2010 and during this meeting IP members were provided a form soliciting the recommendation of additional groups or individuals who may also be appropriate for consideration to participate in the process. Throughout the process, additional IPs have been added, as appropriate. As of August 31, 2010, representatives from the following organizations had elected to become and were accepted as Interested Parties on the Civic Arena Project:

- AIA Pittsburgh
- Allegheny County Department of Economic Development
- Aquarian Bull Ventures, LLC
- B & R Contracting
- City of Pittsburgh, Department of Planning
- Civic Arena Action
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- Community (Freda Ellis, Gary English, Phyllis D. Ghafoor, Joanne Savinda)
- Contrarian Metal Resources
- DCK North America
- DRS Architects, Inc.
- Ebenezer Development Corporation
- Five Mile Development Group
- Heinz History Center
- Hill District Consensus Group
- Hill House Association
- Hill House Economic Development Corp.
- Historic Hill Institute
- Horizon Properties Group, LLC
- MacLachlan, Cornelius, and Filoni, Inc.
- McCormack Baron Salazar
- Office of Allegheny County Executive Dan Onorato
- Office of Honorable R. Daniel Lavelle
- Office of Honorable William Russell Robinson
- Office of Representative Jake Wheatley
- Pittsburgh City Council
- Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation
- Pittsburgh Penguins
- Preservation Pennsylvania
- Preservation Pittsburgh
- Reuse the Igloo!
- Uptown Partners
- Urban Redevelopment Authority

Other organizations involved in the consultation process include:

- Sports & Exhibition Authority
- Bureau for Historic Preservation
- PA Department of Transportation (PennDOT), Engineering District 11-0
- SEA Consultants (Michael Baker Jr., Inc., Oxford Real Estate Development, Oxford Chester LLC with Chronicle Consulting)

As of August 31, 2010, eight (8) Interested Party meetings, one Public Information Meeting and one Arena tour have been held to offer input on appropriate measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts to the Civic Arena. Written information was provided during or in advance of each meeting and detailed presentations were conducted. Meetings were conducted with power-point presentations and collaborative workshop assignments. Meeting agendas were prepared and provided in advance of each meeting. Meeting minutes were prepared in draft for review, comment and concurrence by the Interested Parties. Following each meeting, meeting minutes, reports, etc were posted on the SEA project website (www.pgh-sea.com) for access by the general public (Copies of the meeting minutes and a record of website postings are included in Appendix A).

Additionally, public testimony was received at SEA Public Board Meetings in June and July 2010 and on August 23, 2010. Additional comments were solicited from and received from IPs through August 6, 2010 and are included in Appendix I.
Public Involvement

A Public Open House Plans Display was held on May 13, 2010. The meeting event was advertised in a newspaper of local circulation, on the SEA’s project website, and through meeting notices provided to Interested Party members for community distribution. The purpose of the Plans Display was to present the Purpose and Needs Statement, options under consideration, and a comparison of those options to the public for discussion and comment. The meeting was held in the affected community neighborhood, located adjacent to the Civic Arena to provide an opportunity for public input into the process.

The public input that was received on the Purpose and Needs Statement related to reuse options for the Arena, preference for the options presented, and issues of impact minimization and mitigation. The Plans Display was attended by 56 people and 18 comment forms were completed and returned. A summary of the completed comment forms is contained in Appendix C.

Direct correspondence to the SEA and comments on blogs, in newspapers, on radio and television stations and other outlets was reviewed and considered by the SEA and circulated to the SEA Consultants for review and consideration. Indices of these items are contained in Appendices E and F.

Additionally, public testimony was given at public Board Meetings of the SEA in June and July 2010 and more extensively on August 23, 2010.
III. PURPOSE AND NEED

A Purpose and Need Statement was prepared for this project in collaboration with the Interested Parties and was presented to the general public on May 13, 2010, for review and comment. Comments were incorporated into the finalized version of the Purpose and Need Statement which is included in this report as Appendix B*.

Purpose Statement
The purpose statement for the Interested Party process was established through coordination with process participants and the BHP. The purpose has been defined as follows:

“The purpose is to consider feasible preservation possibilities for the continued use of the Civic Arena site given its cultural value as a historic resource eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.”

Need Statement:
To assist the Interested Parties in the development, evaluation and comparison of development options, the following Need Statement was developed based on coordination with Interested Parties and the BHP. In the planning and evaluation of development options that avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects to the Civic Arena, there is a need to consider the following:

- **Design, Planning and Sustainability**
  - Compatible with community assets (including Consol Energy Center)
  - Harmony with the surrounding community
  - Community fabric that pre-dated the Arena
  - Urban design
  - Green (environmental and economic sustainability)
  - Effect on historic resources

- **Community Cohesion and Connectivity**
  - Physical and visual barriers between the Hill District and the Central Business District
  - Pedestrian and transit connections

- **Economic Development**
  - Economic benefit
  - Employment and housing opportunities
  - Tax revenue
  - Asset to the community and City

- **Affordability**
  - Feasible and reasonable
  - Financially prudent

*Note: the purpose statement defined the purpose of the study process, whereas under NEPA the purpose statement defines the purpose of the project.*
IV. AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT

An Area of Potential Effects (APE) was developed through consultation with the BHP. The APE is the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist (See Figure 1).

Background research conducted for the project revealed the following previously identified NRHP-eligible resource within the proposed APE:

- Civic Arena

V. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY & DETERMINATION OF EFFECTS REPORTS

A Determination of Eligibility Report was not prepared since the Civic Arena is the only building within the APE and it has previously been determined eligible for listing on the NRHP by the BHP.

A Determination of Effects Report has been prepared to address the project’s potential effects upon historic resources within the APE and is included in Addendum 2.

VI. DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

A variety of development options was considered to avoid or minimize the potential adverse effects to the Arena. These options were developed and evaluated in collaboration with the Interested Parties. The following options were developed and evaluated:

- Option 1 - “Do Nothing” (Mothball Arena)
- Option 2 - Preserve Arena (for Continued Use as Multi-Purpose Arena)
- Option 3 - Arena Reuse and Site Development
- Option 4 - Restructure Arena (for Continued Use as Multi-Purpose Arena)
- Option 5 - Arena Demolition and Site Development
- Option 6 - Restore Arena to Original Condition

A description of these development options is presented below.

Option 1 - “Do Nothing” (Mothball Arena)

Description
This option involves closing or “mothballing” the Civic Arena. The Arena would remain unused indefinitely. Operational costs would be minimized, but baseline maintenance costs would still be required to keep the building from becoming derelict. Needed capital improvements and regular facility maintenance activities, beyond baseline, would be suspended. Under this option, the parking lots would be maintained and operated in support of the Consol Energy Center. It is assumed that this option would preserve the Civic Arena and would have no adverse effect on the historic character of the building. See Figure 2
Option 2 - Preserve Arena (for Continued Use as Multi-Purpose Arena)

Description
This option was developed and evaluated as an alternative to constructing the Consol Energy Center. The Civic Arena has physical deficiencies that limit its continued competitiveness as a multi-purpose facility. These deficiencies, as detailed in a study by HOK in 2001 include high maintenance and operational costs; structural constraints to restructuring for expansion due to its unique dome design; restricted truck loading facility which poorly accommodates larger events; inability to logistically accommodate the expanding size of events and to effectively compete with alternative regional venue facilities; inadequate concourse and ticket sales facilities; inadequate compliance with the ADA; inadequate safety features and accommodations; inadequate interior pedestrian circulation and egress; inadequate acoustics for spectator events; inefficient heating and cooling systems and building envelope that affect energy use; exterior pedestrian circulation challenges to ADA; obsolete telecommunications, sound and video systems; and inadequate toilet and waste removal facilities. See Figure 3.

Option 3 - Arena Reuse and Site Development

Description
This option envisions the preservation of the functioning Arena dome through restructuring as a center piece to a moderate density mixed-use development of the remainder of the 28-acre site. The restructuring of the Arena would involve the removal of the existing seating bowl to provide for flexible open-space that could host a variety of entertainment and community events that would not be in competition with surrounding event centers. A hotel facility, of approximately 150 units, is envisioned to be housed under the dome as a unique showcase destination to be complemented by the regular and ceremonial opening and closing of the Arena dome.

Under this option, Lemieux Place would remain largely undisturbed connecting Bedford Avenue with Centre Avenue. To the east of Lemieux Place, would be two multi-story parking structures separated by an extended Wylie Avenue as a stepped pedestrian corridor. The parking structures would be faced with a variety of commercial, retail, and entertainment establishments. Residential and open-space development would be included on the top of the parking structures with park-like belvederes located along the western edge of the structures, about 70 ft above Lemieux Place, with views of the Arena and city beyond.

Development is also planned to the west of Lemieux Place and around the Arena. One residential and one commercial three to five story building is envisioned along both Bedford and Centre Avenues, to the north and south of the Arena, respectively. The Arena-facing sides of these buildings are envisioned to complement the curved-shape of the Arena dome. The area to the west of the Arena, between the Arena and Washington Place, would be part of a continuous green/open-space corridor that extends to the east through the Arena, beneath the hotel development within the Arena via a pedestrian portico, connecting with the stepped Wylie Avenue pedestrian corridor, and connecting with Crawford Avenue.

The program components of this conceptual plan are based on coordination with Interested Parties to more completely understand the vision and to establish agreed upon assumptions. Based on this understanding, Option 3 – Arena Reuse and Site Development includes the following general program elements:

Housing: 481 residential units including 232 for-sale units and 249 for-rent units
Retail: 185,000 sq. ft. of retail space
Office: 510,000 sq. ft. of Class “A” office space
Hospitality: 150 hotel units envisioned within the Arena
Parking: 2,117 spaces within the 4-level garage, structured and surface parking
Open Space: 94,100 sq. ft. of public open space located within / around the Arena

East-west vehicular access is accommodated by existing perimeter roads including Bedford and Centre Avenues. No east-west vehicular access through the site is provided. Access to the parking structures to the east of Lemieux Place is achieved from perimeter roads. Several small streets are included on the top of the parking structure to provide access for residential buildings and open-space. These streets do not provide vehicular connection with the perimeter roads (Bedford Avenue or Centre Avenue), or Lemieux Place. See Figure 4.

This option includes partial demolition of the Arena to remove the seating bowl and reconstruct the interior of the Arena for future development and proposed recreational use. It is assumed that the functioning arena dome structure is retained in place. Option 3, would likely result in an adverse effect to the building, although retention of the character defining element (the stainless steel dome as an operable roof) would minimize the adverse effect.

Option 4 - Restructure Arena (for Continued Use as Multi-Purpose Arena)

Description
This option was developed and evaluated as a restructuring of the Civic Arena in an attempt to address facility deficiencies and was considered as an alternative to constructing the Consol Energy Center. Under this option, two adjacent dome panels would be elevated and supported from beneath as an extended horizontal roof. It would result in an expansion of the existing facility while maintaining much of the dome structure. Although this option provided for an increase of new arena suites, it was not successful in addressing many of the noted deficiencies of the facility that limited its continued competitiveness as a multi-purpose facility. These deficiencies, as detailed in a study by HOK in 2001 include high maintenance costs; structural constraints to restructuring for expansion due to its unique dome design; restricted truck loading facility which poorly accommodates larger events; inability to logistically accommodate the expanding size of events and to effectively compete with alternative regional venue facilities; inadequate concourse and ticket sales facilities; inadequate compliance with ADA; inadequate safety features and accommodations; inadequate interior pedestrian circulation and egress; inadequate acoustics for spectator events; inefficient heating and cooling systems and building envelope that affect energy use; exterior pedestrian circulation challenges to ADA compliance; obsolete telecommunications, sound and video systems; and inadequate toilet and waste removal facilities. See Figure 5.

This option includes partial demolition of the Arena. Option 4 would likely result in an adverse effect to the building, although retention of some character defining elements (portions of the stainless steel dome) would “minimize the adverse effect”.
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Option 5 - Arena Demolition and Site Development

Description
This option envisions the removal of the Civic Arena and the construction of the mixed-use development for the entire 28-acre site. A street grid system would be constructed to establish a conventional urban block fabric. Site grading and re-parceling would provide for nine separate development blocks. Each development block contains structured parking and/or surface parking facilities. Development scale/size and land use type would transition from mostly lower height residential uses near Crawford Street to higher building heights for entertainment, office and hotel uses towards Washington Place. A 150 unit hotel is proposed. Entertainment uses are also envisioned along Centre Avenue, adjacent to the Consol Energy Center.

Wylie Avenue extends between Crawford Street and Washington Place providing for east-west vehicular and pedestrian access through the site. Three north-south cross-streets for vehicular and pedestrian use would be provided for through-traffic between the perimeter roads of Bedford Avenue and Centre Avenue. Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development includes the following general program elements:

- **Housing:** 1,191 residential units including 206 for-sale units and 985 for-rent units
- **Retail:** 208,750 sq. ft. of retail space associated with neighborhood, theatre and entertainment
- **Office:** 608,550 sq. ft. of Class “A” office space
- **Hospitality:** 150 hotel units
- **Parking:** 2,145 spaces with a combination of structured and surface parking facilities
- **Open Space:** 57,560 sq. ft. of public open space located along pedestrian corridors throughout

This option includes full demolition of the Arena resulting in an adverse effect on the historic resource. See Figure 6.

Option 6 – Restore Arena to Original Condition

Description
This option envisions the restoration of the entire facility to its original 1961 design as 10,500 seat spectator facility. This concept was suggested by one of the Interested Parties to compete with the new Consol Energy Center as well as other venues in Pittsburgh in order to drive down ticket prices for attendees.

Under this option the balconies, press box, super boxes and A-level seats would be removed to restore the facility to its 1961 vision. Restoration would also address facility deficiencies that limit its competitiveness as a multi-purpose facility including inadequate compliance with ADA; inadequate safety features and accommodations; inadequate interior pedestrian circulation and egress; inadequate acoustics for spectator events; inefficient heating and cooling systems and building envelope that affect energy use; exterior pedestrian circulation challenges to ADA compliance; obsolete telecommunications, sound and video systems; and inadequate toilet and waste removal facilities.

Lemieux Place would remain as is connecting Bedford Avenue with Centre Avenue and the existing parking lots would be maintained and operated in support of the Civic Arena events,
Consol Energy Center events, and general commuter parking needs. Other site development is not considered but could be considered similar to Option 3.

| Housing:     | None       |
| Retail:      | Undetermined sq. ft. of retail space within the Civic Arena |
| Office:      | None       |
| Hospitality: | None       |
| Parking:     | 2,470 spaces |
| Open Space:  | Undetermined sq. ft. of public open space located within / around the Arena |

East-west vehicular access is accommodated by existing perimeter roads including Bedford and Centre Avenues. No east-west vehicular access through the site is provided. It is assumed that this option would preserve the Civic Arena and would have an adverse effect on the historic character of the building.

**Development Options Advanced for Further Analysis**

Options 2 and 4 were initially evaluated in regard to their suitability for National Hockey League games and as alternatives to the construction of the Consol Energy Center. Consol Energy Center was constructed to address deficiencies of the Civic Arena that could not be adequately addressed through building expansion and through efforts to structurally expand beyond the confines of the Arena dome structure. As a result of the analysis, it was concluded that the continued use of the Arena as a multi-purpose facility had many drawbacks including:

- Structural constraints to restructuring and expansion
- Restricted truck loading facility
- Inability to accommodate ever increasing size of competitive venues
- Inadequate concourse and ticket sales facilities
- Inadequate ADA and safety features
- Inadequate toilet and waste removal facilities
- Inefficient rigging and inadequate load capacity
- Inefficient circulation
- Inefficient mechanical and electrical systems
- Inefficient utility infrastructure (electrical and plumbing capacity)

Therefore, no further consideration was given to Options 2 and 4. Options 1, 3 and 5 were advanced for further consideration. Option 6 was later added for consideration.
VII. DEVELOPMENT OPTION EVALUATION AND COMPARISON

Each option advanced for further consideration was evaluated on the relative extent to which each option addresses the identified need statements. Analysis was conducted for Options 1, 3 and 5 during a series of workshops where Interested Parties evaluated the extent that each option addressed the need statement. Option 6 was suggested during IP Meeting #7, subsequent to the workshops where Options 1, 3 and 5 were evaluated by the IPs. Due to Option 6’s plan similarity to the other options under consideration, analysis results were applied accordingly. The rationale that was applied during the option evaluation process is summarized below.

Rationale for Option Evaluation and Comparison

Four (4) options (including Option 1 – “Do Nothing”) were advanced for further analysis as to the relative extent to which each option addresses the identified needs set forth in the Purpose and Need Statement. This analysis was conducted by the Interested Parties for the first two major need categories, “Design, Planning and Sustainability” and “Community Cohesion and Connectivity”. The Interested Parties were asked to work collaboratively, cooperatively and objectively in assessing the extent to which each of the development options addressed each specific need consideration.

The Interested Parties conducted this analysis in a workshop setting of two groups of eight (8) to ten (10) members. Each group was provided forms to record its discussions and rationale as to the extent to which each option addressed the specific need. A rating system of low, moderate and high was available for the Interested Party members to reflect their evaluation. The purpose of rating the effectiveness was to foster meaningful discussion as to the relative effectiveness of each option in addressing an established need consideration. The explanation or comments accompanying the rating informed the findings of this report.

Process helpers assisted each group to keep discussion moving forward, assist in recording discussions and to promote objectivity. Maps were provided to each group to aid in discussions and clarification of each option under consideration.

The analysis of the “Economic Development” need category was conducted by Oxford Real Estate Advisors (OREA) and provided to the Interested Parties during IP Meeting #5. In preparing the analysis, a coordination meeting was conducted with the main proponent of Option 3 to ensure an equitable evaluation. A brief presentation of the economic analysis’ preliminary conclusions was provided, including the assumptions and notes relating to the analysis. Discussion on the analysis and preliminary conclusions was included on the agenda for the following meeting after meaningful review and consideration could be conducted.

The rationale for the evaluation and comparison of the options with respect to each of the need categories is as follows:

Design, Planning and Sustainability
This need category considers the issues related to the proposed options under consideration and their respective ability to “fit-in” with the past, existing and planned urban environment. Comparative analysis was conducted in consideration of the following issues:
Compatibility with Community Assets – The development of the existing 28-acre the Civic Arena site, should not be in conflict or competition with the existing and proposed community assets. The Consol Energy Center site is located on the opposite side of Centre Avenue, immediately south of the Civic Arena, and is the planned site for NHL hockey and special events (concerts, circuses, etc) some of which were held at the Civic Arena through July 2010. The Consol Energy Center is compatible with and not in competition with the various other venues such as the David L. Lawrence Convention Center, Peterson Events Center, the AJ Palumbo Center, August Wilson Center, Star Lake Amphitheater and North Shore Entertainment Complex. The options should complement the existing and proposed community assets.

Harmony with Surrounding Community – The development of the existing Civic Arena site should harmonize with and complement the physical attributes of the surrounding communities. The site is located between the Hill District and the downtown area. The redevelopment should consider an appropriate transition in development scale and land use composition between the Hill District and the Center City.

Historic Community Fabric – The historic lower Hill District's street grid system and urban fabric was displaced by the construction of the Civic Arena and parking areas in the early 1960's. The redevelopment of the site should strive to emulate the historic street system and urban fabric to the extent practicable in consideration of the need to accommodate contemporary development trends and the needs of vehicular traffic.

Urban Design – The redevelopment of the APE should consider the physical issues of parcel layout and constructability, the type and location of parking facilities to effectively serve development, and the total area of proposed mixed-use development and percentages of use/types. The option should plan to promote effective construction and staging approaches as well as flexibility of parcel contracting.

Parking plan strategies should address the needs of street level commercial and retail development, general mixed-use development, and the Consol Energy Center including consideration of the total number of parking spaces, structured parking spaces, residential parking and street level parking.

Mixed-use development is anticipated to best provide desired community benefits of increased employment opportunities, retail and commercial opportunities, and hotel and housing opportunities. The total area of proposed mixed-use development, breakdown by percentages of mixed-use-types, and total number of housing units and breakdown by housing type should be considered.

Green (Environmental and Economic Sustainability) – Green technologies and LEED building approaches emphasize issues of sustainability in the short and long-term. Options should consider overall energy efficiencies through the reuse of existing structures, short and long-term benefits, minimizing maintenance costs, and promoting the establishment of green spaces.

Effect on Historic Resources - the Civic Arena is eligible for listing on the NRHP for its engineering significance and for its significance in community planning and development. Options should seek to avoid adversely affecting the Civic Arena.
Community Cohesion and Connectivity
This need category considers the issues related to the ability of the proposed option to remove physical barriers, comply with ADA goals, and to enhance transit connections. Existing access between the Hill District and downtown is constrained by the presence of the Civic Arena and associated parking lots, topography, circumferential roadways, and major roadway corridors. Visual barriers may result from development spatial patterns that do not maximize potential view corridors between the Hill District and downtown as well as views within the APE.

The existing Civic Arena site directs vehicular traffic around the site on Centre Avenue, to the south, Crawford Avenue, to the east, and Bedford Avenue, to the north. The depressed Interstate 576 (Crosstown Expressway) corridor, located to the west of the site, is a major physical barrier between the Hill District and downtown. Mario Lemieux Place provides access through the site, connecting Centre Avenue with Bedford Avenue. Access between the Hill District and downtown by circumferential roads and Mario Lemieux Place all converge with Washington Place, at the crossing of I-576. A cover/park structure over the depressed I-576 corridor, to the west of the site, is under conceptual consideration by others. The options for the site are assumed to complement the cover/park facility and not preclude the future realization of this conceptual project. Comparative analysis is conducted in consideration of the following issues:

- Physical Barriers – The options should consider the removal of physical barriers between the Hill District and downtown to the extent possible.
- Visual Barriers – The options should consider maximizing to the extent possible visual corridors between the Hill District and downtown as well as enhancing visual corridors within the site.
- Pedestrian and Transit Connections – The options should maximize compliance with ADA goals of allowing for the maximum participation in the development experience. In addition, the options should consider enhancing potential transit connections.

Economic Development
This need category considers the issues related to the proposed option’s ability to generate economic benefit, provide employment and housing opportunities for the community, generate tax revenue, and to be an overall economic benefit to the community and City.

The analysis of the “Economic Development” need category was conducted by OREA and provided to the Interested Parties during IP Meeting #5, see Appendix D. A brief presentation of the economic analysis’ preliminary conclusions was also provided, including the assumptions and notes relating to the analysis. Discussion on the analysis and preliminary conclusions was included on the agenda for the following meeting after meaningful review and consideration could be conducted.

Comparative analysis was conducted in consideration of the following issues:

- Economic Benefit – The options should consider the economic benefit to the community and City including public costs, economic return on public investment, and tax revenue generated.
Employment and Housing Opportunities – The options should consider the number and type of housing opportunities, temporary and permanent employment opportunities, and annual wages projections.

Asset to Community and City – The options should consider the overall benefit to the community and City including economic, employment, housing, removal of barriers, etc.

Affordability
This need category considers the issues related to the overall affordability of the proposed options. Affordability would be evaluated in qualitative terms involving considerations of feasibility, reasonableness and financial prudence. Comparative analysis is conducted in consideration of the following issues:

- Feasible and Reasonable – The feasibility of an option considers the overall ability of the option to be delivered or implemented as planned, applying normal or conventional design and construction practices. Reasonableness relates to the basic assumptions of the option and whether these assumptions potentially affect the option’s delivery or implementation. Issues affecting an option’s feasibility and reasonableness should be considered.

- Financially Prudent - The financial prudence relates to the collective consideration of all of the above need factors and problems that could affect the ability to deliver the program in the identification of the most prudent or best option for advancement and investment.

A summary of the evaluations and comparisons of each of the options considered is presented in the following pages and on the Options Comparison Matrix (See Figure 7). The key differences between options are highlighted. Justification is provided for the comparative advantages and disadvantages between options.

Development Option Evaluation and Comparison Summary

Option 1 - “Do Nothing” (Mothball Arena)

Option 1: Design, Planning and Sustainability

Option 1 – “Do Nothing” under this need category was evaluated as generally low relative to the option’s ability to address the identified needs considerations. The Civic Arena under this option was viewed as not being compatible with the existing community assets. Although not directly in competition with the Consol Energy Center or the other arena or special event venues of the City, the Civic Arena’s “moth-balled” status under this option is also not supportive of these venues. Likewise, the Civic Arena was not considered in harmony with the land use and scale of the surrounding community. However, the parking lots of the Civic Arena were viewed as being compatible with and supportive of the Consol Energy Center’s needs for parking during events.

This option was not viewed as being compatible with re-establishing the street grid pattern and land use pattern of the Hill District that was destroyed when the Civic Arena was constructed.

From a Green (environmental and economic) perspective, “moth-balling” of the Civic Arena was evaluated relatively low in addressing this needs category since the Arena would continue to
incur costs associated with general site upkeep, minimal maintenance, and heating/cooling life-support without significant future public benefit to be derived from the building.

A High value was assessed for the preservation of the Civic Arena with an assumed no adverse effect to the historic building and the preservation of the building’s intrinsic historic values. From an urban design perspective, the preservation of the Civic Arena was considered as an urban design asset.

Option 1: Community Cohesion and Connectivity

Option 1 – “Do Nothing” under this need category was evaluated as low since there would be no physical change related to the removal of physical barriers and visual barriers between the Hill District and the City, respectively.

Option 1: Economic Development

A financial analysis, including economic benefit, tax revenue and as an asset to the community and City, was conducted for Option 1.

- Economic benefit issues, including the total public economic benefit, public entity’s return on investment, and net public benefit after subsidies, were considered. The economic benefit is as follows:
  - $0 (potential state/local infrastructure)
  - $2,300,000 (net public benefit after subsidies)
  - $2,300,000 (total public economic benefit)

- Employment opportunities associated with Option 1 – Do Nothing (Mothball Arena) would be negligible.

- Housing opportunities would not exist under this option.

- Parking Tax revenue by Year-10, total gross public economic benefits, Arena operating cost by Year-10, and total public economic benefits, were considered. The tax-related economic benefits are as follows:
  - $21,000,000 (parking taxes by Year-10)
  - $21,000,000 (sub-total gross public economic benefits)
  - ($18,700,000) (Arena operating cost by Year-10)
  - $2,300,000 (total public economic benefits) (*)

(*) Note: Also shown above in Economic Benefit issues

- Option 1 would not be an economic asset to the community or City. Housing and employment opportunities would not be created. It is estimated that only $2,300,000 total public economic benefit could be realized over a 10-year period under this option.

Option 1: Affordability

Option 1 was evaluated under the need category as follows:

- Option 1 can be feasibly delivered from the perspective that only minimal action is required for its implementation. However, Option 1 is not a reasonable option. Over a
10-year period, annual operational and maintenance costs of $18,700,000 would all but offset the parking tax revenue of $21,000,000 and is unacceptable.

- Option 1 is not financially prudent because of the above considerations.

**Option 3 - Arena Reuse and Site Development**

**Option 3: Design, Planning and Sustainability**

Option 3 was evaluated under the need category as follows:

- Compatibility with community assets with the Arena Reuse and Site Development plan, were considered and determined to be addressed at a high level of effectiveness. The proposed perimeter or edges of the mixed-use development were determined highly compatible with the adjacent community assets.

- Harmony with the surrounding community, including land use type and transition of scale between the Hill District and City, were considered to be of a high level of effectiveness. The proposed development includes a concentration of residential land use near Crawford Avenue and transitions to taller commercial and office type uses towards the City.

- Historic community fabric, including reestablishing the street grid pattern and urban design that pre-dated the Arena construction, were considered and determined to be addressed at a moderate level of effectiveness. Lemieux Place remains as the only interior street connection between Bedford and Centre Avenues. Wylie Avenue is extended between Crawford Avenue and Washington Street as a pedestrian corridor. Webster Avenue is extended across Crawford Avenue, but does not connect with Lemieux Place. A partial street grid system is included on top of the structured parking garage including Webster Avenue and Fulton Avenue, but these streets are not continuous and do not connect with Lemieux Place or the Wylie Avenue pedestrian corridor (Note: a potential redesign of Fulton Avenue may provide the opportunity for continuity across the Wylie Avenue pedestrian corridor).

- Urban design issues, including constructability and issues of density, massing, access, and scale (DMAS), were considered and determined to be addressed at a moderate/high level of effectiveness. Preservation of the Arena poses development constraints due to the existing grade/slope between the Arena and Crawford Avenue. The elevations of the Arena and Crawford Avenue act as vertical control points that restrict construction approaches and opportunities requiring benching or stepped site grading. The Arena is showcased as an urban focal design element. The size and location of the Arena central to the property, presents a challenge to the massing and scaling of the proposed surrounding site development. Other issues relating to urban design included the need for ventilation systems for the large closed-in parking garages and the poor tree survival rates associated with the landscaping design proposed for the green space located on top of the structured parking garages.

- Green (Environmental and Economic) issues, including short-term / long-term energy conservation and public green space and open space resources, were considered and determined to be addressed at a moderate/high level of effectiveness. The repurposing
of the Arena would preserve the embodied energy and materials of the original structure for short-term energy efficiency, although partial demolition would be, required as part of repurposing of the structure. Long-term, the Arena would be an open-air facility not requiring environmental temperature control but continued maintenance of the structure would be required. The development of the remainder of the site is assumed to comply with LEED standards to maximize resource and energy efficiency. The open space proposed in and around the Arena would be flexible for seasonal and special events.

- Historic Resources issues, including the anticipated effect on the historic building and the intangible resource value, were considered. The repurposing of the Arena may constitute a minimized adverse effect according to Section 106 of the NHPA criteria. Issues related to the significance of the Arena as a historic resource include the Arena as a product of its time, an iconic structure reflective of Pittsburgh and its citizens, a remnant of the Urban Renewal era of the 1960’s, and the impact of the Arena construction to the urban fabric that pre-dated the Arena.

Option 3: Community Cohesion and Connectivity

Option 3 was evaluated under the need category as follows:

- Physical barrier issues, including the removal of barriers between the Hill District and the City and within the development site, were considered and determined to be addressed at a low/moderate level of effectiveness. The proposed partial or discontinuous street grid, including the extension of Wylie Avenue as a pedestrian corridor, retaining Lemieux Place, and the extensions of Fulton / Webster Avenues on top of the parking garages without connections with Lemieux Place, does not effectively reduce the existing physical barriers between the Hill District and the City. The partial street network relies on the existing Bedford and Centre Avenues for vehicular access between the Hill District and the City. The Wylie Avenue pedestrian corridor would be a 12% grade which, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, is not ADA compliant. ADA access between Crawford Avenue and Lemieux Place would be via elevators at the face of the Crawford Overlook envisioned in Option 3.

- Visual barriers issues, including views between the Hill District and the City and views within the development site, were considered and determined to be addressed at a moderate level of effectiveness. The proposed Crawford Overlook, a park setting along the edge of the multi-story parking garage structure, provides an overlook of the Lemieux Place, Arena, proposed office/commercial buildings ringing the Arena, and the City. From the City, the view of the Crawford Overlook and residential housing would be partially obscured by the presence of the Arena and office/commercial buildings proposed to either side of the Arena. However, while the Arena is in its open position, the prominence of the Crawford Overlook would be more apparent. Within the development site, views along the Wylie Avenue pedestrian corridor and Lemieux Place would have the Arena as a visual focal point.

- Pedestrian and transit connection issues, including ADA compliance and enhanced connection opportunities, were considered and determined to be addressed at a moderate level of effectiveness. Due to the existing vertical control points presented by the elevations of the existing Arena and Crawford Avenue, Wylie Avenue is envisioned as a stepped pedestrian corridor with a grade of approximately 12% which, based on a
broad brush level of analysis and available information, is above the ADA 8% criteria. Elevators are proposed to accommodate pedestrians from the top of the Crawford Overlook to Lemieux Place. Transit opportunities exist along the site’s perimeter roads including Crawford Avenue, Centre Avenue and Bedford Avenue.

Option 3: Economic Development

A financial analysis, including economic benefit, employment opportunities, housing opportunities, tax revenue, potential historic tax credits and as an asset to the community and City, was conducted for Option 3, see Appendix D. The preliminary financial analysis results were provided to the Interested Party members during meeting #5, for review and comment and have been updated to reflect comments provided during meeting #8.

- Economic benefit issues, including the total public economic benefit, potential state / local infrastructure (Arena Reuse subsidy), public entity’s return on investment, and net public benefit after subsidies, were considered. The economic benefit is as follows:
  - $26,300,000 (potential state/local infrastructure)
  - $51,300,000 (net public benefit after subsidies)
  - $77,600,000 (total public economic benefit)

- Employment opportunities, including temporary construction (jobs and wages), permanent development (jobs by year-10 and annual wages by Year-10), and total project costs/construction and permanent jobs, were considered. Option 3 would result in an estimated 2,795 temporary construction jobs and 2,498 permanent jobs by Year-10 of the analysis projection. The financial benefit related to job creation based on a $295,000,000 project cost over 10 years is as follows:
  - $106,200,000 (temporary construction wages)
  - $121,200,000 (permanent annual wages by Year-10)
  - $295,000,000 (total project costs by Year-10)

- Housing opportunities, including residential housing for sale and rent, were considered. Option 3 would result in an estimated 481 total residential housing units, consisting of 232 housing units for sale and 249 housing units for rent.

- Tax revenue issues, including local / state wage taxes for temporary construction jobs, local / state wage taxes and real estate taxes by Year-10, total gross public economic benefits, Arena operating cost by Year-10, and total public economic benefits, were considered. The tax-related economic benefits are as follows:
  - $ 3,900,000 (local / state wage taxes for temporary construction jobs)
  - $34,900,000 (local / state wage taxes by Year-10)
  - $45,600,000 (real estate taxes by Year-10)
  - $ 6,200,000 (parking taxes)
  - $90,600,000 (sub-total gross public economic benefits)
  - (-$13,000,000) (Arena operating cost by Year-10)
  - $77,600,000 (total public economic benefits)$Note: Also shown above in Economic Benefit issues
Option 3 could be an asset to the community and City. Increased housing and employment opportunities would be created. Additionally, it is estimated that a $77,600,000 total public economic benefit could be realized over a 10-year period under this option.

Evaluation of refinements was assisted by OREA which was directed to consider the effect of these refinements on the economic analysis. These refinements include the following:

- Increase the mixed-use development densities of Option 3 to be similar to Option 5
- Eliminate the hotel from the Arena footprint and:
  - Leave the surrounding Option 3 densities the same (lower density as shown in the existing Option 3 plans), but provide a public park in the arena footprint to be used for the Three Rivers Arts Festival, the local community and the surrounding businesses; or
  - Relocate the hotel to outside of the Arena footprint, but within the Area of Potential Effect and provide a public park in the arena footprint. Retain the ring of the Arena which supports the roof, and retain the roof.
- Eliminate and/or relocate the hotel and provide an indoor market in the arena footprint.
- Increase the residential density to match Option 5 and reduce the operating costs to $410,000 annually and shift the hotel to later development period.

In evaluation of these proposed refinements, it was agreed that the refinements would be considered conceptually, without commensurate changes to figures, plans, and renderings previously prepared for Option 3.

The findings are as follows:

- Increases to development density in Option 3 would result in a higher public economic benefit than the lower density analysis but still significantly less than Option 5. Maintenance and operation costs associated with the Arena reuse would still be required. The harmony with the surrounding community and urban design issues may be affected by the higher scale of buildings to accommodate the increased density.

- Eliminating the hotel and providing a public park in the arena footprint would result in the loss of the anticipated hotel (thereby reducing job creation and tax benefits) previously considered under Option 3. Although difficult to quantify, it is acknowledged that incorporating green spaces into development plans may increase the value of the development. Creation of a large park is not inconsistent with a similar refinement that could be made to Option 5 but a determination of optimum size of a park or parks based upon the needs to be served would be required. (Additional consideration of a public park is found in the Addendum.)

Relocating the hotel elsewhere in the APE would either increase the development density or displace other programmatic uses (thereby reducing job creation and tax benefits.) If it increased the development density, there would be no change to the economic analysis, but the harmony with the surrounding community and urban design issues may be affected by the higher scale of buildings to accommodate the increased
density. If it displaces other programmatic uses, it would result in a greater disparity in the economic analysis.

All other advantages and disadvantages of the respective options presented in this report are unchanged.

- Eliminating the hotel and providing an indoor/outdoor market in the arena footprint would result in reduced job creation and tax benefits and would also require an additional public cost to renovate/construct the space.

All other advantages and disadvantages of the respective options presented in this draft report are unchanged.

- Increasing the residential density, reducing the operating costs and shifting the hotel to later development period raises the Public Economic Benefit of Option 3 but does not approach the level of Public Economic Benefit of Option 5. The other advantages and disadvantages were not studied.

**Option 3: Affordability**

Option 3 was evaluated under the need category as follows:

- Without regard to related cost, it is assumed that this option can be feasibly delivered using sound engineering and construction approaches. The basic concept of the plan is to adapt the dome structure from a multi-purpose Arena facility to a flexible public open space to accommodate small size special events that would not compete with other community assets. A 150-unit hotel facility is also planned within the Arena. The basic concept of the plan (i.e., the Arena marketed as a central element of the development plan and a destination point for tourism and local congregation area) appears reasonable. The routine opening and closing of the Arena’s retractable dome roof (if possible) would be a central attraction.

- This option has potential issues related to financial prudence that could affect the plan’s overall attractiveness to investors and developers. Historically, the opening and closing of the dome has been problematic, whether this difficulty is due to its basic design or its irregular use is undetermined. Cost associated with the dome’s continued operation and maintenance will be a consideration. Issues of snow-loading and weatherization associated with open dome scenario and the effects on roof support arm, electronics and machinery would need to be studied and addressed. Vehicular access within the site is not greatly improved over the “Do Nothing” Option. Lemieux Place would remain as the main vehicular corridor within the property. Access between the Hill District and downtown would continue along the perimeter Bedford and Centre Avenues. The partial street grid within the site is located on top of the proposed multi-story parking garages, at the same level as Crawford Avenue, and does not connect with Lemieux Place. The main travel corridor through the site in an east/west direction is the pedestrian-only Wylie Avenue steps. Movement of goods and services within the site would be restricted. Construction of the mixed-use development within the site would be constrained by the presence of the Arena. Available space between the Arena and Bedford and Centre Avenues, where multi-story office and commercial buildings are proposed, is limited. The 150-unit hotel within the Arena represents a non-conventional design that is less operationally efficient, and overall more costly.
Option 5 (Demolition) - Arena Demolition and Site Development

Option 5: Design, Planning and Sustainability

Option 5 was evaluated under the need category as follows:

- Compatibility with community assets was considered and determined to be addressed at a high level of effectiveness. The proposed perimeter or edges of the mixed-use development was determined highly compatible with the adjacent community assets.

- Harmony with the surrounding community, including land use type and transition of scale between the Hill District and City, was considered to be at a high level of effectiveness. The proposed development includes a concentration of residential use near Crawford Avenue and transitions to taller commercial, office and entertainment-type uses towards the City. The demolition of the Arena allows for a cleared construction site and a high potential for site development to be conducted harmoniously with the surrounding community.

- Historic community fabric, including restoring the street grid and urban pattern that pre-dated the Arena construction, was considered and determined to be addressed at a high level of effectiveness. Wylie Avenue is extended between Crawford Street and Washington Place providing for east/west vehicular and pedestrian access through the site. Three north/south cross-streets for vehicular and pedestrian uses are provided between the perimeter roads of Bedford and Centre Avenues. The resulting street grid provides for the establishment of nine urban blocks. The historic urban fabric is re-established, to the extent practicable while also addressing current planning criteria and current automobile design requirements within an urban setting.

- Urban design issues, including constructability and issues of density, massing, access, and scale (DMAS), were considered and determined to be addressed at a high level of effectiveness. With the removal of the Arena, the space constraints to construction are minimized. The vertical control point posed by the existing Arena is no longer a constraint to site design and construction. Benching and terracing of the site is not required. Wylie Avenue can be constructed with an 8% grade and, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, is more likely to be ADA compliant. DMAS is more flexible using the entire site without the Arena. The development plan incorporates a conventional urban design with a tree-lined street grid and development blocks.

- Green (Environmental and Economic) issues, including short-term / long-term energy conservation and public green space and open space resources, were considered and determined to be addressed at a moderate level of effectiveness. The removal of the Arena foregoes the embodied energy and materials of the original structure for short-term energy efficiency. However, the demolition debris would be recycled as appropriate for limited short-term energy efficiency. The development of the remainder of the site is assumed to comply with LEED standards to maximize resource and energy efficiency. Public green and open space is proposed along the edges of the development and pedestrian corridors.
Historic Resource issues, including the anticipated effect on the historic structure and the intangible resource value, were considered. The demolition of the Arena would be an adverse effect under Section 106 of the NHPA criteria. The intangible issues related to the significance of the Arena as a historic resource would be lost; however, the historic community fabric that pre-dated the Arena would be, to some extent, re-established.

Option 5: Community Cohesion and Connectivity

Option 5 was evaluated under the need category as follows:

- Physical Barriers issues, including the removal of barriers between the Hill District and the downtown and within the development site, were considered and determined to be addressed at a high level of effectiveness. The Arena would be removed and Wylie Avenue would be extended between Crawford Street and Washington Place providing for east/west vehicular and pedestrian access through the site. Three north/south cross-streets for vehicular and pedestrian use would be provided between the perimeter roads of Bedford and Centre Avenues. All streets and pedestrian corridors would be at an 8% grade or less.

- Visual barrier issues, including views between the Hill District and the City and views within the development site, were considered and determined to be addressed at a moderate level of effectiveness. Within the development site, open views along the linear street corridors of proposed Wylie Avenue, Lemieux Place, Logan Street and Fulton Avenue would be available. Additionally, views from Crawford Avenue would be enhanced by the removal of the Arena dome and support truss for this viewshed.

- Pedestrian and transit connection issues, including ADA compliance and enhanced transit connection opportunities, were considered and determined to be addressed at a moderate/high level of effectiveness. With the removal of the Arena and associated vertical control points, the proposed Wylie Avenue extension for vehicular and pedestrian traffic can be accommodated with an 8% grade and, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, offers a better likelihood of ADA compliant access throughout the site. Transit opportunities are enhanced along the site’s perimeter roads including Crawford Avenue, Centre Avenue and Bedford Avenue.

Option 5: Economic Development

A financial analysis, including economic benefit, employment opportunities, housing opportunities, tax revenue and as an asset to the community and City, was conducted for Option 5, see Appendix D. The analysis was based on information presented by Urban Design Associates at Interested Party Meeting #3. The preliminary financial analysis results were provided to the Interested Party members, during meeting #5, for review and comment. A portion of Interested Party Meeting #6 was dedicated to discussion of the analysis and its refinement.

- Economic benefit issues, including the total public economic benefit, potential state/local infrastructure, public entity’s return on investment, and net public benefit after subsidies, were considered. The economic benefit is as follows:
  - $28,400,000 (potential state/local infrastructure)
  - $98,100,000 (net public benefit after subsidies)
$126,500,000 (total public economic benefit)

- Employment opportunities, including temporary construction (jobs and wages), permanent development (jobs by Year-10 and annual wages by Year-10), and total project costs/construction and permanent jobs, were considered. Option 5 would result in an estimated 3,887 temporary construction jobs and 2,940 permanent jobs by Year-10 of the analysis projection. The financial benefit related to job creation based on a $410,329,000 project cost over 10 years is as follows:
  - $147,718,000 (temporary construction wages)
  - $143,687,000 (permanent annual wages by Year-10)
  - $410,329,000 (total project costs by Year-10)

- Housing opportunities, including residential housing for sale and rent, were considered. An estimated 1,191 total residential housing units, consisting of 206 housing units for sale and 985 housing units for rent.

- Tax revenue issues, including local / state wage taxes for temporary construction jobs, local / state wage taxes and real estate taxes by Year-10, total gross public economic benefits, and total public economic benefits, were considered. The tax-related economic benefits are as follows:
  - $5,600,000 (local/state wage taxes for temporary construction jobs)
  - $41,300,000 (local/state wage taxes by Year-10)
  - $73,300,000 (real estate taxes by Year-10)
  - $6,300,000 (parking taxes)
  - $126,500,000 (sub-total gross public economic benefits)
  - $126,500,000 (total public economic benefits) (*)

  (*) Note: Also shown above in Economic Benefit issues

- In summary, Option 5 would be an asset to the community and City. Increased housing and employment opportunities would be created. Additionally, it is estimated that a $126,500,000 total public economic benefit could be realized over a 10-year period under this option.

Option 5: Affordability

Option 5 was evaluated under the need category as follows:

- Without regard to related cost, it is assumed that this option can be feasibly delivered from a construction perspective. The basic concept of the plan is to remove the Arena, establish a street grid system, and market and develop the nine resulting urban blocks. Conventional construction approaches would be required. Due to the nine separate blocks and street grid system for vehicles and pedestrians, much flexibility exists in the overall marketability and implementation of the plan. The basic concept of the plan also appears to be reasonable. The plan promotes a conventional urban street and block pattern with mixed-use development and an entertainment center nearest to downtown. Parking accommodations are dispersed throughout the development supporting its amenities.
The plan has no potential issues related to financial prudence that could affect the plan’s overall attractiveness to investors and developers. A street grid system is provided allowing for flexibility of access. The street grid connects with the all perimeter roads including Bedford Avenue, Centre Avenue, Crawford Avenue, and Washington Place. All proposed street corridors are pedestrian friendly and, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, are more likely to be ADA compliant. The movement of goods and services is not restricted. Constraints to site development are minimized. The proposed nine separate urban blocks enhance the marketability, constructability, and overall attractiveness to investors.

Option 6 – Restore Arena to Original Design

Option 6: Design, Planning and Sustainability

Similar to the evaluation for Option 1 – “Do Nothing”, Option 6 under this need category is considered as generally low relative to the option’s ability to address the identified needs considerations. The Civic Arena under this option is not compatible with the existing community assets. The restored arena would be in competition with the Consol Energy Center or the other arena or special event venues of the City. Likewise, a restored Civic Arena was not considered to be in harmony with the land use and scale of the surrounding community. However, the parking lots of the Civic Arena were viewed as being compatible with and supportive of the Consol Energy Center’s needs for parking during events.

From a Green (environmental and economic) perspective, a restored Civic Arena is considered moderate/high in addressing this needs category. The cost incurred in restoring the Arena including addressing facility deficiencies and energy conservation issues would offset much of the embodied energy gains of building reuse. Cost of restoration is estimated at $95,700,000 with an annual operating cost of $3,000,000.

A high value is considered for the preservation of the Civic Arena with an assumed no adverse effect to the historic building and the preservation of the building’s intrinsic historic value. From an urban design perspective, the preservation of the Civic Arena is considered as an urban design asset.

Option 6: Community Cohesion and Connectivity

Similar to the evaluation for Option 1 – “Do Nothing”, Option 6 under this need category is considered as low since there would be no physical change related to the removal of physical barriers and visual barriers between the Hill District and the City, respectively.

Option 6: Economic Development

This option involves restoring the Civic Arena as a spectator facility in competition with other existing spectator venues. Major capital improvements of $95,700,000 and annual operational costs of $3,000,000 would be required. Operating revenue may help to offset, but would likely not fully cover the annual operating costs. Under this option, the parking lots would be maintained and secured in support of the Civic Arena events, Consol Energy Center events and general commuter needs.
A financial analysis, including economic benefit, employment opportunities, housing opportunities, tax revenue, potential historic tax credits and as an asset to the community and City, was conducted for Option 6, see Appendix D.

- Economic benefit issues, including the total public economic benefit, potential state / local infrastructure (Arena Reuse subsidy), public entity’s return on investment, and net public benefit after subsidies, were considered. The economic benefit is as follows:
  - $95,700,000 (potential state/local infrastructure)
  - ($59,200,000) (net public benefit after subsidies)
  - $36,500,000 (total public economic benefit)

- Employment opportunities, including temporary construction (jobs and wages), permanent development (jobs by Year-10 and annual wages by Year-10), and total project costs/construction and permanent jobs, were considered. Option 6 would result in an estimated 907 temporary construction jobs and 400 permanent jobs by Year-10 of the analysis projection. The financial benefit related to job creation on a $95,700,000 project cost over 10 years is as follows:
  - $34,450,000 (temporary construction wages)
  - $10,000,000 (permanent annual wages by Year-10)
  - $95,700,000 (total project costs by Year-10)

- Tax revenue issues, including local / state wage taxes for temporary construction jobs, local / state wage taxes and real estate taxes by Year-10, total gross public economic benefits, operating cost by Year-10, and total public economic benefits, were considered. The tax-related economic benefits are as follows:
  - $1,300,000 (local / state wage taxes for temporary construction jobs)
  - $3,800,000 (local / state wage taxes by Year-10)
  - $8,300,000 (amusement tax by Year-10)
  - $24,600,000 (parking tax by Year-10)
  - $0 (real estate taxes by Year-10)
  - $38,000,000 (sub-total gross public economic benefits)
  - ($1,500,000) (Arena operating cost by Year-10)
  - $36,500,000 (total public economic benefits)

Note: Also shown above in Economic Benefit issues

- Option 6 could be a minimal economic asset to the community and City. Housing opportunities would not be created. Some employment opportunities would be created. Additionally, it is estimated that a $36,500,000 total public economic benefit could be realized over a 10-year period under this option but would require an initial public investment of $95,700,000, thus erasing any economic benefit for the public.

**Option 6: Affordability**

Option 6 was evaluated under the need category as follows:

- Without regard to related cost, it is assumed that this option can be feasibly delivered from a construction perspective. The basic concept of the plan is to restore the Arena to its 1961 condition and operate the facility for spectator events in competition with the Consol Energy Center and other spectator event venues. The basic concept is to preserve the Civic Arena for continued use as well as its associated parking.
This option has potential issues related to financial prudence, marketability to a developer and the continued investment in the Arena. The Civic Arena was constructed in the late 1950s for $22 million. Over the years, debt was issued to fund various capital improvements. In 1974, $4 million was issued to add balcony seating, lavatories and concession areas; and in 1985, $12 million was issued for a facility-wide renovation that included the addition of super boxes. Throughout the 1990s, nearly $30 million was issued for a variety of repairs and improvements that included a press box expansion, refurbishment of the dome, HVAC upgrades, new ramps, new lighting, escalator replacement, club seats and lounges and five new pods for expanded concourses and concessions. There is currently $9.3 million in debt outstanding.

The cost associated with the restoration of the Arena to its original condition is estimated to be $95,700,000 with an annual operating cost of $3,000,000 and projected annual revenue of over $2,000,000.

Historically, the opening and closing of the dome has been problematic, whether this difficulty is due to its basic design or its irregular use is undetermined.

We considered the possibility that a restored Civic Arena, in competition with other regional spectator event venues would drive down ticket fees. In fact, it is more likely that the competition would drive down the rental fees paid by event promoters, making the operation of the facility less economically sustainable.

Without a major tenant, it is unlikely to be profitable and would require subsidies for both the capital improvements and maintenance and operating costs.

### VIII. SUMMARY FINDING

#### Options Advanced for Further Consideration

Options 1, 3, 5 and 6 were advanced for further consideration.

- **Option 1 – “Do Nothing” (Mothball Arena)** is advanced as a baseline condition to which other options may be compared. This Option avoids adverse effects to the Civic Arena.
- **Option 3 – Arena Reuse and Site Development** is advanced for further consideration as an alternate option that minimizes the adverse effect to the Civic Arena.
- **Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development** would adversely affect the Civic Arena by removal. This option is advanced for further consideration.
- **Option 6 – Restore Arena to Original Condition** is advanced for further consideration as an alternative that is assumed to avoid an adverse effect to the Civic Arena.

With the Interested Parties, the effectiveness of each option in addressing key need issues was considered and the results are included in Development Options Comparison Matrix (See Figure 7). Option 1 - “Do Nothing” does not effectively address the identified issues needed to be considered by each option. Option 6 – Restore Arena to Original Condition is also not effective in addressing the identified needs. This option maintains the existing parking lots in support of the restored arena and the Consol Energy Center but could be refined to consider development similar to Option 3. The restored arena would be in competition with other spectator venues including the Consol Energy Center. The restoration of the arena is estimated to cost $95,700,000 for improvements and an annual operating cost of $3,000,000 that would be offset in part by revenue. Option 6 requires continued investment in the Civic Arena as a
redundant spectator facility that would be in competition with the Consol Energy Center and other spectator facilities venues of the City and, based on the above information, therefore is not a financially prudent option.

Both Options 3 and 5, to some degree, address the following need issues:

- The perimeters or edges of the proposed mixed-use development are compatible with adjacent community assets.
- The proposed mixed-use development is harmonious with the surrounding community in that it transitions from mainly residential uses near Crawford Avenue to office and commercial uses towards the downtown.
- The proposed mixed-use development is harmonious with the surrounding community in that it transitions in scale with lower buildings near Crawford Avenue and larger building towards the downtown.
- Accessibility and opportunities for transit connections are enhanced.
- Visual connectivity is enhanced between the Hill District and the downtown.
- Site developments provide housing and employment opportunities.
- Site redevelopment would be LEED-based for long-term energy efficiency.
- Provides for connectivity between the Hill District and Washington Place.

**Option 3 – Arena Reuse and Site Development: Advantages and Disadvantages**

Advantages of Option 3 – Arena Reuse and Site Development include:

- A minimized adverse effect to the Civic Arena due to the retention of character defining features as part of the repurposed building.
- Takes advantage of the embodied energy contained in the portion of the existing Arena structure to be reused.
- Incorporates the Arena as an urban focal element.
- Provides the opportunity to have 2.1 acres of contiguous public open space within the Arena for major events.
- Reduces infrastructure-related costs by building fewer streets.
- Opportunity exists for the application of historic preservation tax credit for restructuring the Arena, providing the Arena can be operated as a “for profit” enterprise.

Disadvantages of Option 3 – Arena Reuse and Site Development include:

- Proposed 150-unit hotel is of a non-standard design including the single-loading of rooms (i.e. rooms located on one side of the service hallway) as a result of being located inside and back against the leaves of the dome roof and support arm, restricting available room viewsheds to a single direction. Construction within the dome including access by equipment and materials present a challenge. Non-standard hotel design with single-loaded rooms result in increased construction and operational costs.
- Pedestrian-only Wylie Avenue extension between the Hill District and Lemieux Place is estimated to be a 12% slope, requiring the use of tiered steps and, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, is therefore not ADA compliant. Vertical access between Crawford Avenue and Lemieux Place is to be provided by elevators.
- Establishes a partial, discontinuous street grid system that does not provide a direct connection between Crawford Avenue and Lemieux Place and that may not be adequate to meet vehicular demands.
• Annual operational and maintenance costs of the Arena would need to be paid for by Arena users, absorbed by the private investors affecting their overall profitability, paid through public subsidies, or through a combination of all three.
• Arena’s exterior footprint of four acres in the central portion of the site and the elevation differential between the Arena and Crawford Avenue presents constraints to construction in terms of available development space, construction approach and staging, grading, marketability and contracting.
• Green space and open space is mainly planned to occur as an organic cover over man-made structures (i.e., the Crawford Overlook located on the parking garage structure and open space within the restructured Arena) presenting potential challenges to landscaping and sustainable tree growth.

Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development: Advantages and Disadvantages

Advantages of Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development include:

• Establishes a street grid system, reminiscent of the grid that pre-dated the Arena, consisting of four through-streets for vehicular and pedestrian traffic connecting with the perimeter roads (Bedford Avenue, Crawford Avenue, Centre Avenue, and Washington Place).
• All street/pedestrian corridors are at a grade of 8% or less and, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, are more likely to be ADA compliant.
• Physical connectivity is enhanced with the establishment of a through-street grid system connecting with the perimeter roads (Bedford Avenue, Crawford Avenue, Centre Avenue, and Washington Place) and providing access flexibility.
• Provides for a conventional urban street and block pattern.
• Parking garages and surface parking is provided throughout in support of the proposed development amenities.
• Parks and open space are dispersed and associated with the street/pedestrian corridors where landscape and tree sustainability is less problematic.
• The removal of the Arena frees up the total footprint of four acres and allows for a minimally constrained construction site eliminating major challenges to construction.
• Nine separate urban blocks enhance marketability, contracting and construction sequencing.
• Proposed 150-unit hotel is of a conventional design including the double-loading of rooms (i.e. rooms located on either side of the service hallway) that minimize construction costs and maximize operational efficiency.
• With the removal of the Arena, more design flexibility exists relative to development densities and desirable transition in building massing and scale.
• Provides a total public economic benefit over a 10-year period of approximately $126,500,000; approximately $49,000,000 more than Option 3 and $90,000,000 more than Option 6.

Disadvantages of Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development include:

• The Civic Arena would be removed resulting in an adverse effect to this historic resource.
- Additional costs (currently undetermined) associated with the design and implementation of suitable measures to mitigate the loss of the Arena and memorialize its historical significance would need to be considered.
- Removal of the Arena foregoes the opportunity to capitalize on the embodied energy contained in the existing Arena building.
- Greater infrastructure-related costs due to more streets.

**Recommended Preferred Option for SEA Action**

Based on our analysis as presented in this report, including Addendums, Figures and Appendices, and taking into account all of the input received from the Interested Parties and public, Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development is recommended as the preferred option. The advantages of Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development for a comprehensive redevelopment plan for the site and the reasons for it having been identified as the preferred option are as follows:

- Removal of the Arena allows for the establishment of a street grid system that is reminiscent of the grid that pre-dated the Arena, consists of four through-streets for vehicular and pedestrian traffic, connects with the perimeter roads (Bedford Avenue, Crawford Avenue, Centre Avenue, and Washington Place), and effectively removes physical barriers and provides flexibility in access.
- Conventional urban blocks enhance the opportunity for the orderly grouping and segmentation of specific uses into an efficient and memorable land use pattern, effectively accommodate a high-density, mixed-use development, and allow for the location of parking garages and surface parking lots throughout the development.
- Removal of the Arena allows for the adjustment of site gradients and the establishment of linear pedestrian corridors that, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, are more likely to be ADA compliant.
- Results in a higher public economic benefit.
- Removal of the Arena frees up the total footprint of four acres and allows for the establishment of conventional urban blocks that enhance the marketability of the site.
- Removal of the Arena provides for an unencumbered development site with flexibility in grading.
- Removal of the Arena does not require continued investment in the Civic Arena as a redundant spectator facility that would be in competition with other spectator venues of the city.
- Removal of the Arena does not require continued investment anticipated with reuse of the Civic Arena.

Furthermore, we have taken into account input from the BHP advising the "SEA to consider delaying demolition of the Arena to allow for and in fact to assist in a more fully articulated economic and development opportunities for the Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment based in a context of adaptive reuse" as stated in its August 12 letter. In that regard and based on information contained in this report, any adaptive reuse that retains the operating dome will by definition resemble Option 3 in many respects and thus is anticipated to address the need categories to much the same degree as Option 3.

Therefore, it is our considered opinion that taking an additional year to more fully articulate economic and development opportunities for reuse of the Arena will be unlikely to improve the effectiveness of this option in addressing the need categories, overcoming the disadvantages of Option 3 compared to Option 5, or resulting in a finding different than presented in this report.
IX. Addendum 1

Introduction

This Addendum sets forth supplemental considerations and information in regard to Option 3, Arena Reuse and Site Development and was prepared to supplement the information contained in the draft Development Options Comparison Reports. This Addendum is part of the final report and as such is a basis for the recommendation made in the report.

In conjunction with the consultation and public involvement processes, the SEA has broadened its identification, development and evaluation of alternatives that avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse effect to the Civic Arena. These efforts continue the process of developing and evaluating alternatives by conducting additional analysis (Option 6, Restore Arena to Original Design) and by identifying and considering additional reuse options, or refinements to Option 3 for the Civic Arena site. This final Options Report includes the addition of the following evaluations.

A. Additional Report by 4Ward Planning

Through media reports the SEA was informed that certain Interested Parties had retained the services of 4Ward Planning, a consultant, for the purpose of preparing an economic analysis of additional options or refinements of existing options. The SEA shared information with the consultant and considered information presented by the consultant at a meeting of the Interested Parties on July 13, 2010.

The presentation is included in Appendix H along with comments by the SEA’s consultant, OREA included in Appendix I. OREA’s analysis (Appendix D) includes modifications made as a result of 4Ward Planning’s comments. 4Ward Planning’s presentation does not include any new economic analysis and does not identify any new options that were not previously considered.

B. Further Development and Evaluation of Reuse Options

Consideration has been given to reuse of stadiums by other cities as listed below. Consideration of other reuse ideas for the Civic Arena has been undertaken and is also listed below.

Other Stadiums
1. Montreal’s Forum (entertainment complex and theater)
2. Portland’s Memorial Coliseum (athletic complex)
3. Austin’s Long Center for the Performing Arts
4. Bojangles Coliseum in Charlotte (uncertain future)
5. Seattle Center Key Arena (college basketball and WNBA)
6. Philadelphia Spectrum (vacant)
7. Pyramid Arena in Memphis (Bass-Pro Shop)
8. Houston’s Astrodome (vacant, proposed science center, conference center, planetarium and county and city museum)
9. Pontiac Silverdome (major league soccer)
10. San Antonio Alamodome (college football)
11. The LA Forum (multipurpose)
12. Milwaukee US Cellular Arena (multipurpose)
Other Arena Reuse Concepts
13. Relocate Three Rivers Arts Festival from Point State Park
14. Parking Garage
15. Urban Greenhouse in partnership with Plantagon
16. Transit hub
17. Indoor waterpark
18. Small business incubator or artist incubator
19. Indoor / outdoor market

Evaluation of Other Stadiums

A wide number of similar facilities in other cities where a reuse was contemplated were studied to determine their success in identifying feasible reuse opportunities. Evidence was sought that a reuse idea would emerge that could address the project needs effectively.

The information is summarized below. In general, most of the facilities are owned by a public entity and are identified here because their primary tenant relocated to a new facility. Except for instances where the public relinquished ownership for a very small consideration, most of the facilities listed below are maintained, renovated or subsidized by significant amounts of public money, and offer a poor public return on investment.

1. Montreal's Forum: The Montreal Forum is currently owned by a private company but was originally owned by the City of Montreal as an indoor arena. The building was historically significant as it was home to 24 Stanley Cup championships. The Forum opened in 1924 and closed in 1996 after the Montreal Canadiens moved to the Molson Centre. In 1999, Canderel Development spent $75 million to gut it and convert it into a 310,000 sf downtown entertainment centre called the Pepsi Forum, consisting of an AMC multiplex theater, shops and restaurants. It was sold in 2006 for $45 million to Ashkenazy Acquisitions and was 36% vacant at that time. This is an example of private investment in a formerly public facility.

2. Portland's Memorial Coliseum: In 1995, the Portland Trailblazers NBA team moved to the new privately-owned Rose Garden Arena from the City-owned Memorial Coliseum. According to a Baseline Conditions Summary Report prepared by ECONorthwest dated December 2, 2009, the Coliseum continued to operate as a spectator arena and has lost money in eight of the last ten years. In 2009, the Memorial Coliseum was listed by the US Department of the Interior’s National Park Service on the National Register of Historic Places, in part, for its unique application of International Style to an unexpected building type.

In 2003, Portland Development Commission studied three Reuse Options: Updating the coliseum; updating it and combining it with a community recreation center; and altering it to be an athletic and recreation complex. All three options noted that significant capital costs ($7 million basic upgrades to $104 million for alterations) would be required and that annual operating losses would approach $2 million. (Reference: Memorial Coliseum Reuse Study – Phase II dated Jun 18, 2003.) All three options assume a significant public investment as well as continued ownership of the facility by the City of Portland.
The Coliseum currently houses the Portland Winterhawks hockey team and is operated as a spectator facility by Portland Arena Management who pays rent to the City. The City is responsible for capital improvements. According to the Portland Development Commission Status Quo Analysis of the Memorial Coliseum, the capital improvement costs needed to maintain the building as a safe and accessible spectator facility and keep the Winterhawks as the primary tenant ranges from $10 million to $25 million.

Most recently (June 2010) the city of Portland and the PDC have announced its plans to study the entire Rose Quarter Development Area for a feasible development plan.

3. Austin’s Long Center for the Performing Arts: The City-owned Palmer Auditorium opened in 1959. In 2002, a majority of events moved to the new Palmer Events Center. The City leased the old auditorium to a nonprofit group for renovation into a community performing arts venue, which opened in 2008. Designed to provide a venue for a broad array of regional art groups, it includes three small theaters. Pittsburgh already has several community performing arts venues throughout the city and county that receive funding through the Regional Asset District, so reuse as a performing arts venue is not financially prudent.

4. Bojangles Coliseum (formerly Independence Arena and Memorial Coliseum and owned by the City of Charlotte, NC), opened in 1955 as the largest unsupported steel dome in the world. The 9,600 seat arena was renovated and expanded to 11,000 seats in 1993 for $3.7 million to accommodate a minor league hockey team and indoor soccer team. In 2005, the hockey team moved to a new facility. With no major tenants, its future is uncertain and it currently operates at a $1.7 million annual deficit.

5. Seattle Center includes the Key Arena, built in 1962 that is part of an Arena District that attracts 12 million visitors per year. Formerly the home of the NBA Seattle Supersonics until they left for Oklahoma City in 2008, the Key Arena now hosts college basketball and WNBA games. It is owned by the City, currently operates at a deficit and it is estimated to take $200 million in capital improvements to make it competitive. Before the Supersonics left Seattle for Oklahoma City, the City lost $3 million in 4 years at the Center and the team lost about $10 million per year.

6. Philadelphia Spectrum is privately owned by Comcast Spectator. Built in 1967 and home of the NHL Flyers and NBA 76ers until 1996, it continued to house a variety of sporting events and concerts until 2010. The owners intend to demolish it to make way for Philly Live!, a dining, retail, and entertainment complex.

7. The Pyramid Arena (owned by the City of Memphis and Shelby County) was built in 1991 as a 321 foot tall stainless steel pyramid with a capacity for 21,000 seats. It has an interesting comparison to the Civic Arena in that the unique shape of the structure presents opportunities for an unusual destination as well as challenges to renovation. It is currently being considered as a Bass Pro megastore. Bass Pro and city officials announced an initial 20-year lease agreement on The Pyramid. Bass Pro would pay Memphis a base amount of $1 million a year, and potentially more depending on sales. City officials will provide $30 million to the project and will be responsible for repairs and maintenance of the facility.
8. Houston’s Astrodome (owned by Harris County) was one of the world’s first domed sports stadium when it was completed in 1965. It lost its last major tenant in 2003 to the new Reliant Stadium and has stood vacant since 2008.

As of summer 2010, officials’ are evaluating three options: level the building and replace it with a plaza ($873 million); renovate the building (Astrodome Renaissance Plan) and build a science center, conference center, planetarium and county and city museum ($1.35 billion); or repurpose the dome by building a science and technology center and a place for storage ($1.13 billion). All options would require $324 million in public subsidy.

Currently, the Astrodome costs Harris County about $2 million a year in insurance and minimal maintenance and millions more in debt and interest payments.

9. Pontiac’s Silverdome was built for $56 million 35 years ago and was bought at auction by developer Andreas Apostolopolous in 2009 for $583,000. Per a March 12, 2010 article in the Christian Science Monitor by Mark Guarino, “To bring the venue up to current standards, the new owners plan to upgrade the VIP suites, renovate concession areas, paint all public spaces, and perform cosmetic upgrades to all Silverdome restrooms. Partnerships with the Marriott Centerpoint Hotel Group, Comcast, and Pepsi are expected to contribute to the venue’s upgraded amenities.” It has since been re-opened and continues to operate.

10. The San Antonio Alamodome was built in 1993 with 65,000 seats for football/basketball. The San Antonio Spurs moved to the new AT&T Center and the facility is now owned by the City and University of Texas-San Antonio. The facility would have to undergo renovations and add a considerable number of luxury suites in order to make it a profitable venue for an NFL team. Preliminary estimates for the cost of capital improvements range from $100 to $150 million.

11. The LA Forum was built in 1967 and formerly housed the LA Lakers and NHL Kings until they moved to the new Staples Center in 1999. It was bought in 2000 for $23 million by the Faithful Central Bible Church and is operated by SMG. With a capacity of 17,800, its website, www.thelaforum.com claimed 400,000 guests in 2007. It advertises itself as a location for film shoots, rehearsal space, and church services.

12. Milwaukee’s Arena opened in 1950. It was home to a variety of basketball and hockey teams until these teams moved to the new Bradley Center in 1988. It is currently owned by the Wisconsin Center District (state-run authority) and serves as a multipurpose facility. The WCD operates at a $12 million annual operating loss (which includes the arena, convention center and a small theater.)

Evaluation of Other Arena Reuse Concepts

In consultation with the Interested Parties and the public, the SEA identified numerous suggestions for reuse opportunities for the Civic Arena. These reuse ideas were studied to determine their ability to address the project needs effectively.

The findings are summarized below. In general, most of the suggestions require continued use of the Civic Arena as a ‘publicly owned facility’ or would require that the Civic Arena be
otherwise maintained, renovated or subsidized by significant amounts of money. Thus, these ideas do not effectively address the project needs.

13. Relocate Three Rivers Arts Festival from Point State Park to a park-like or open space area within the Civic Arena. This plan or a related plan for creation of a park would need to be coordinated with the City’s Open Space, Parks and Recreation (OSPR) Plan.

A key component of the OSPR Plan includes Right-sizing Pittsburgh. According to OSPR website, “Pittsburgh covers a compact land area, and at its population peak, was a very dense city despite the challenges of topography. During the twentieth century, a system of services, facilities and infrastructure was constructed, often with the sponsorship of foundations or through philanthropy, that was designed to serve a population much larger than today’s. With the downsized population, the city has been left with “legacy” public facilities, parks, and civic infrastructure, a system that is unsustainable given the current sources of revenue and the anticipated population. A critical task of the Open Space, Parks and Recreation Plan is to determine the right size of the city’s system of open space and parks, given the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, community priorities and needs, and the financial resources available now and in the future. In addition to providing a framework for advancing citywide priorities, the OSPR Plan will need to respect and celebrate neighborhood identities.”

In its 50th anniversary year, Three Rivers Arts Festival is now a division of The Pittsburgh Cultural Trust, further advancing the shared mission of each organization to foster economic development through the arts and to enhance the quality of life in the region. The Festival has returned to the newly revitalized ($25 million in 2008) 36 acre Point State Park, where the Main Stage, an expanded Artists Market footprint and the Children’s Area are located. Through the continued use of Gateway Center and the addition of the gallery-and-theater network found in the Cultural District, the attendees are able to explore exhibition spaces and nearby restaurants, theaters, live stages and gathering places in the existing Cultural District. Relocating the Arts Festival to the Civic Arena would be counterproductive to fostering pedestrian traffic throughout the Cultural District as the distance is over ½ mile away.

14. Parking Garage. The initial concerns of constructing a parking garage inside of the Civic Arena can be listed as (1) centralized parking (versus decentralized), (2) maintenance requirements of two structures (garage and arena).

Centralized Parking: This design option would accommodate approximately 490 spaces (7 floors at 70 spaces per floor) in a main central parking area. At a construction cost of $22,000 per parking space, and with a possible additional 15% premium increase due to possible conflicts of constructing a building within an existing building, the subtotal of $12,397,000 for the garage building alone would be needed. This does not consider demolition/modification, mechanical ventilation, abatement, site preparation and access costs. Nor does this consider whether this is offers optimal or efficient deck capacity, or whether the revenue stream would be enough to make the option profitable.

Maintenance of both structures: In order for a garage structure to be located within the existing Arena building, sufficient space must be allowed to accommodate future building maintenance and repairs to both structures, building systems, and utilities that may feed both buildings.
15. Urban greenhouse in partnership with Plantagon. The Plantagon concept is a glass geodesic dome that functions as a vertical greenhouse, permitting a large quantity of food to be grown in a small footprint. Thus, it is suitable for urban environments. While this is an interesting concept that would likely draw visitors from around the world, it appears that a significant portion of the Civic Arena roof dome would need to be removed in order to create the glass, geodesic dome. This would result in an adverse effect to the Civic Arena.

16. Transit hub. The Civic Arena is situated between Downtown and Oakland on Centre Avenue. The Allegheny County Transportation Action Partnership indicates a future alignment between Downtown and Oakland for rail transit along Fifth Avenue, rather than Centre with the Lower Hill station location on Fifth Avenue. The document states that the rationale for this location is that this stop will serve the Consol Energy Center and will also be pivotal for the employees and students that commute to Duquesne University and Mercy Hospital. Further consideration of this option would require a reconsideration of the placement of the Lower Hill station and the rail line along Fifth Avenue. This idea would require significant investment to the Civic Arena to modernize the HVAC, plumbing and electrical systems; construct necessary structural elements; and to address accessibility both within and surrounding the arena. This plan also assumes that the public or public/private entities developing the transportation system would find the scale of the arena compatible with its requirements.

17. Indoor waterpark. Great Wolf Resorts Inc. announced this year its plans to bring an indoor waterpark resort to the Galleria at Pittsburgh Mills. According to the Pittsburgh Business Times, the company plans to commence construction in 2010, and have the opening at the end of 2011 or beginning of 2012. Great Wolf resorts are typically indoor "destinations" in the neighborhood of 500,000 square feet, which include a hotel, a 60,000- to 80,000-square-foot water park, children's activities, restaurants, an arcade and spas for kids and adults. The Pittsburgh market is unlikely to attract two indoor waterpark developers.

18. Small business, technology or arts incubators. This idea would require significant investment to the Civic Arena to modernize the HVAC, plumbing and electrical systems; construct the necessary structural elements; and to address accessibility both within and surrounding the arena. The challenges outlined in Option 3 would remain. In National Business Incubators Association 2006 State of the Business Incubation survey, only 6% of responding incubators were for-profit programs. Furthermore, a green industry incubator is currently planned for the 80-year old former Connelly Technical Institute building adjacent to the Civic Arena.

19. Indoor / outdoor market. It appears that this competes directly with the neighboring Strip District’s Terminal Market Plan which will develop the Terminal Building into a produce market. The program has evolved over the last 5 years into a 10,000 sf market. The interior footprint of the Civic Arena is approximately 170,000 sf; so the scale of a market at the Civic Arena is significantly larger than the Strip District’s Terminal Market Plan. The distance between the two areas is less than 1 mile.

Findings

This Options Report makes a finding in favor of Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development, over Option 3 – Arena Reuse and Site Development (including refinements) and
over Option 6 – Restore Arena to Original Condition. This report is intended to aid the SEA in its decision regarding options of the arena site.

In conjunction with the consultation and public involvement processes, the SEA has broadened its identification, development and evaluation of alternatives that avoids or minimizes the adverse effect to the Civic Arena. These efforts continued the process of developing and evaluating alternatives by conducting additional analysis (Option 6 – Restore Arena to Original Condition) and by identifying and considering additional reuse options, or refinements to Option 3 for the Civic Arena site. The results of this evaluation concluded that the arena reuse options considered are not as effective in the extent to which they address the evaluation criteria or needs. As a result, the justification cited for the preliminary finding of Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development as the preferred option remains unchanged, including:

- Removal of the Arena allows for the establishment of a street grid system that is reminiscent of the grid that pre-dated the Arena, consists of four through-streets for vehicular and pedestrian traffic, connects with the perimeter roads (Bedford Avenue, Crawford Avenue, Centre Avenue, and Washington Place), and effectively removes physical barriers and provides flexibility in access.
- Conventional urban blocks enhance the opportunity for the orderly grouping and segmentation of specific uses into an efficient and memorable land use pattern, effectively accommodate a high-density, mixed-use development, and allow for the location of parking garages and surface parking lots throughout the development.
- Removal of the Arena allows for the adjustment of site gradients and the establishment of linear pedestrian corridors that, based on a broad brush level of analysis and available information, are more likely to be ADA compliant.
- Results in a higher public economic benefit.
- Removal of the Arena frees up the total footprint of four acres and allows for the establishment of conventional urban blocks that enhance the marketability of the site.
- Removal of the Arena provides for an unencumbered development site with flexibility in grading.
- Removal of the Arena does not require continued investment in the Civic Arena as a redundant spectator facility that would be in competition with other spectator venues of the city.
- Removal of the Arena does not require continued investment anticipated with reuse of the Civic Arena.

Additionally, Option 5 does not require continued investment in the Civic Arena as a redundant spectator facility that would be in competition with the Consol Energy Center and other spectator facilities of the City.

Removal of the Arena, having an exterior footprint that occupies approximately 4 acres squarely in the center of the development site, allows for rational development and promotes investment by developers for the entire 28-acre site. We find that a reuse concept must be powerful enough to overcome the advantages of Option 5 by serving as a centerpiece for development of the site. Reuse considerations which keep the historic characteristic (the operational dome) require significant initial and ongoing public support and also fail to generate economic activity sufficient to justify forgoing redevelopment opportunities available with Option 5.
X. ADDENDUM 2, DETERMINATION OF EFFECTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Addendum assesses the potential effects of the Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment Project in the City of Pittsburgh, upon historic resources identified within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) of the proposed undertaking. The APE contains one (1) historic resource, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible Civic Arena. Previous Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey forms for the Civic Arena did not define a NRHP boundary for the property (English 2001; Kibert 1980). Therefore, it is recommended that the NRHP boundary for the Civic Arena include the pentagonal area bound by Bedford Avenue and the northwest, Mario Lemieux Place on the northeast and east, Centre Avenue on the south, and Washington Place on the southwest. This area includes the footprint of the Arena itself as well as adjacent paved and landscaped entry and services areas and two immediately adjacent parking areas that flank the Arena. The area contained within this boundary forms a recognizable visual unit that was planned as a whole that maintains physical integrity from the time of its original construction; this boundary was used in assessing project effects on the Civic Arena and is included on the next page.

This report was prepared as part of a consultation process that the SEA has undertaken in accordance with Chapter 5 of the Pennsylvania State History Code. To provide a framework for the consultation, the SEA adopted a process that is modeled on Section 106 consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. § 470f. As part of that process, this report was prepared to determine whether an alternative would have an “adverse effect” on a historic property. While this report applies the adverse effect criteria as defined in the Section 106 regulations, the SEA has not been engaged in Section 106 consultation because the redevelopment project is not a federal undertaking. As noted above, the Section 106 process has been used as a template for compliance with the State History Code. In a letter dated August 12, 2010, the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission has concurred that the SEA has complied with the consultation requirements of the State History Code.
Area of Potential Effect, showing the three tax parcels it encompasses (2-B-400, 2-C-400, and 2-C-300). Civic Arena is located on parcel 2-C-400, and its proposed NRHP boundary is depicted in green above.
2.0 EFFECTS ASSESSMENT

Option 1: Relationship of Proposed Action to Historic Resource and Assessment of Project Effect

This option involves closing or “mothballing” the Civic Arena. Because Option 1 does not involve any physical alteration to the Civic Arena or its surrounding land, this alternative has no potential to alter, directly or indirectly, characteristics of the historic resource such as design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association that qualify it for the NRHP (Table 1).

TABLE 1: RESULTS OF EFFECT EVALUATION FOR CIVIC ARENA, OPTION 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF EFFECT</th>
<th>EVALUATION OF OPTION 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effect may occur when there is alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligible for the National Register as defined in Section 800.16(l).</td>
<td>Civic Arena is eligible for the NRHP for its significance in community planning and development and for its architecture and engineering merit as an important example of a Modern-style, large multi-purpose sports / entertainment facility from the mid-twentieth century. The undertaking will not have any direct or indirect effects on the Arena or its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINDING</td>
<td>Historic Property Not Affected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 3: Relationship of Proposed Action to Historic Resource and Assessment of Project Effect

This option envisions the preservation of the functioning Arena dome through restructuring as a center piece to a moderate density mixed-use development of the remainder of the 28-acre site. Because Option 3 involves the partial demolition and substantial reconfiguration of Civic Arena, the proposed project has the potential to alter, directly or indirectly, characteristics of the historic resource such as design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association that qualify it for the NRHP (Table 2).

**TABLE 2: RESULTS OF EFFECT EVALUATION FOR CIVIC ARENA, OPTION 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF EFFECT</th>
<th>EVALUATION OF OPTION 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effect may occur when there is alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligible for the National Register as defined in Section 800.16(I).</td>
<td>Civic Arena is eligible for the NRHP for its significance in community planning and development and for its architecture and engineering merit as an important example of a Modern-style, large multi-purpose sports/entertainment facility from the mid-twentieth century. The undertaking will directly alter the design and integrity of Civic Area and proposed redevelopment will cause a substantial change in the character and use of adjacent land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINDING** | **Historic Property Affected**

**Application of the Criteria of Adverse Effect, Option 3**

The following discussion applies the Criteria of Adverse Effect on the historic resource as defined in the regulations of 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1).

Under Option 3, the proposed undertaking will result in the demolition of the seating bowl. The building’s signature metal retractable dome would remain operable, and the building shell would shelter flexible open space and a new hotel. This option would preserve the dome (albeit in a typically open-roof position), from which the building’s engineering significance is primarily derived. The building’s interior would be substantially altered by the removal of the seating bowl. The building would no longer be capable of performing its historic function as an arena. Therefore, Option 3 constitutes an adverse effect to Civic Arena, although that effect would be minimized by the retention of the building’s dome and support structure. To further clarify this finding of HISTORIC PROPERTIES ADVERSELY AFFECTED, Table 3 evaluates the potential for examples of adverse effects specified in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2).
### TABLE 3: APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA OF ADVERSE EFFECT FOR OPTION 3

**CRITERIA OF ADVERSE EFFECT**

An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property’s eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Adverse Effects, pursuant to Section 800.5(a)(2)</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;</td>
<td>Physical destruction of part of the resource will occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR§68);</td>
<td>The proposed project will alter the historic property in ways that do not comply with the Secretary’s Standards. The seating bowl and all interior features will be removed. The interior will be reconstructed as flexible open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;</td>
<td>The property will remain at its historic location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Change of the character of the property’s use or of physical features within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance;</td>
<td>The property will no longer be able to perform its historic function as an arena. The seating area, which is a character-defining feature of an arena, will be demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features;</td>
<td>The proposed construction of a modern hotel under the arena dome will introduce a modern visual element that is out of character with the historic function of the property. In addition, the mixed-use redevelopment of the land surrounding the Arena will cause substantial visual and atmospheric changes in the setting of the Arena, which was historically surrounded by large surface parking lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and</td>
<td>The proposed project will not cause neglect of the property resulting in its deterioration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.</td>
<td>The property is not under Federal ownership or control.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER:**

**FINDING:** The Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment Project results in a finding of **Historic Property Adversely Affected** for Civic Arena under Option 3.
Option 5: Relationship of Proposed Action to Historic Resource and Assessment of Project Effect

This option envisions the removal of the Civic Arena and the construction of the mixed-use development for the entire 28-acre site. Because Option 5 involves the demolition and removal of Civic Arena, the proposed project has the potential to alter, directly or indirectly, characteristics of the historic resource such as design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association that qualify it for the NRHP (Table 4).

TABLE 4: RESULTS OF EFFECT EVALUATION FOR CIVIC ARENA, OPTION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF EFFECT</th>
<th>EVALUATION OF OPTION 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effect may occur when there is alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligible for the National Register as defined in Section 800.16(i).</td>
<td>Civic Arena is eligible for the NRHP for its significance in community planning and development and for its architecture and engineering merit as an important example of a Modern-style, large multi-purpose sports/entertainment facility from the mid-twentieth century. The undertaking will result in the destruction and removal of Civic Arena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application of the Criteria of Adverse Effect, Option 5

The following discussion applies the Criteria of Adverse Effect on the historic resource as defined in the regulations of 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1).

Under this option, the proposed project involves the demolition and removal of Civic Arena and the redevelopment of the former arena site and adjacent parking areas with a mix of modern commercial and residential buildings. The undertaking will also remove the resource from its historic location. Therefore, Option 5 constitutes an adverse effect to Civic Arena. To further clarify this finding of HISTORIC PROPERTIES ADVERSELY AFFECTED, Table 5 evaluates the potential for examples of adverse effects specified in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2).
### TABLE 5: APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA OF ADVERSE EFFECT FOR OPTION 5

**CRITERIA OF ADVERSE EFFECT**

An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property’s eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Adverse Effects, pursuant to Section 800.5(a)(2)</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;</td>
<td>The proposed project will result in the physical destruction of all of the resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR§68);</td>
<td>The proposed project will not alter the historic property in any of the indicated methods—it will be demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;</td>
<td>The proposed project will remove the property from its historic location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Change of the character of the property’s use or of physical features within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance;</td>
<td>The proposed project will change the character of the property’s use and physical features within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance through the demolition of the historic resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features;</td>
<td>The proposed project will not introduce visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the resource’s integrity—the resource will be demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and</td>
<td>The proposed project will not cause neglect of the property resulting in its deterioration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.</td>
<td>The property is not under Federal ownership or control.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER:**

**FINDING:** The Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment Project results in a finding of **Historic Property Adversely Affected** for Civic Arena under **Option 5**.
Option 6: Relationship of Proposed Action to Historic Resource and Assessment of Project Effect

This option envisions the restoration of the entire facility to its original 1961 design as a 10,500 seat spectator facility. Because Option 6 involves the removal of several interior features, the proposed project has the potential to alter, directly or indirectly, characteristics of the historic resource such as design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association that qualify it for the NRHP (Table 6).

TABLE 6: RESULTS OF EFFECT EVALUATION FOR CIVIC ARENA, OPTION 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF EFFECT</th>
<th>EVALUATION OF OPTION 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effect may occur when there is alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligible for the National Register as defined in Section 800.16(l).</td>
<td>Civic Arena is eligible for the NRHP for its significance in community planning and development and for its architecture and engineering merit as an important example of a Modern-style, large multi-purpose sports/entertainment facility from the mid-twentieth century. The undertaking will alter several existing interior features of Civic Arena.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application of the Criteria of Adverse Effect, Option 6

The following discussion applies the Criteria of Adverse Effect on the historic resource as defined in the regulations of 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1).

Under Option 6, the proposed undertaking will result in the removal of the balconies, press box, super boxes, and A-level seats. These features were constructed as part of arena expansion projects that occurred in 1972-1975 and 1988-1991, and they are not considered important character-defining features that convey important aspects of the building’s engineering significance. On the contrary the building’s historic integrity would increase as a result of the removal of these modern intrusions. In addition, the decrease in seating capacity would mitigate some of the building’s present shortcomings in light of current building code standards and thus enhance the property’s ability to continue to perform its historic function as a multi-purpose spectator facility. Therefore, Option 6 will not have the potential to adversely affect aspects of Civic Arena that qualify it for the NRHP. To further clarify this finding of HISTORIC PROPERTIES NOT ADVERSELY AFFECTED, Table 7 evaluates the potential for examples of adverse effects specified in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2).
### TABLE 7: APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA OF ADVERSE EFFECT FOR OPTION 6

**CRITERIA OF ADVERSE EFFECT**

An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property’s eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.

#### Examples of Adverse Effects, pursuant to Section 800.5(a)(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;</td>
<td>Physical destruction of non-contributing, modern parts of the resource will occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR §68);</td>
<td>Interior alterations associated with the proposed restoration project will comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;</td>
<td>The property will remain at its historic location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Change of the character of the property’s use or of physical features within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance;</td>
<td>The property will continue to perform its historic function as a multipurpose entertainment facility. No changes to the property’s setting are anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features;</td>
<td>The proposed project will restore the property to its 1961 configuration, thus increasing the integrity of its significant historic features. No new elements will be introduced that are out of character with the property or its historic setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and</td>
<td>The proposed project will not cause neglect of the property resulting in its deterioration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.</td>
<td>The property is not under Federal ownership or control.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER:**

**FINDING:** The Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment Project results in a finding of *Historic Property Not Adversely Affected* for the Civic Arena under Option 6.
3.0 SUMMARY

The assessment of project effects on the historic resource identified within the undertaking’s APE indicates that the project may or may not have an adverse effect on the historic resource depending on the option chosen. Option 1 will have no effect on the identified historic resource. Options 3 and 5 will result in a project finding of Historic Property Adversely Affected. The adverse effect under Option 3 would be minimized by the retention of the fully-operational dome, a character-defining feature of the building and for which the building’s engineering significance is primarily derived. Option 6 will have No Adverse Effect on the historic resource; in contrast Option 6 will actually increase the building’s integrity of design by restoring its original interior configuration.
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Option 1: Do Nothing

(Mothball Arena)

- Arena to remain Vacant
- Parking supports Consol Energy Center
- Barriers between Hill & City remain
- Life Support Costs
- Loss of Revenue
- Opportunity Costs
- No Adverse Effect
Option 2: Preserve Arena

(Continued Multi-Purpose Use Arena)

- Dome as a Constraint to Expansion
- Restricted Truck Loading Area
- Uncompetitive for larger venue events
- Inadequate Concourse / Ticket Sales areas
- Inadequate ADA / Egress Code Compliance
- Inadequate Toilet Distribution

No Feasible Use as Multi-Purpose Arena & is not advanced for further considerations.
Option 3:

Arena Re-Use & Site Development

- Re-Use Arena (hotel & / or flexible Open Space)
- Extend Wylie Ave as a Pedestrian corridor
- Parking Garages between Crawford Ave & Lemieux St.
- Fulton & Webster Aves on top of Parking garages
- Overlook & Housing on Garage top
- Retain Lemieux Place
- Mixed Use Development
- Minimized Adverse Effect to Arena
Option 4: Restructure Arena
(Continued Multi-Purpose Use Arena)

- 1/3 Dome Reconfigured at Higher Level
- Electrical & Mechanical Upgrades
- Replace seating (16,600)
- Renovate Bowl
- 59 new suites (80)
- Minimized Adverse Effect

No Feasible Use as Multi-Purpose Arena & is not advanced for further considerations.
Option 5:
Arena Demo & Site Development

- Remove Arena
- Establish Street Grid
- Extend Wylie Ave for Vehicles & Pedestrians
- Housing (transition from Crawford Ave towards City)
- Garage Parking throughout
- Mixed Use Development & Small Parks
- Adverse Effect to Arena
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is a NEED to Consider:</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS in addressing the NEEDS &amp; WHY?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. DESIGN, PLANNING &amp; SUSTAINABILITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>OPTION 1 Do Nothing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Compatibility with Community Assets</td>
<td>LOW EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only parking lots would be compatible.</td>
<td>- Edges of mixed-use development compatible with adjacent community assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Harmony w/ Surrounding Community</td>
<td>LOW EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land Use</td>
<td>- Transition in residential use from Hill to commercial/office towards City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scale Transition between Hill &amp; City</td>
<td>- No change from existing condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Historic Community Fabric</td>
<td>LOW EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Street Network</td>
<td>- Only parking lots would be compatible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Urbanism</td>
<td>- Wylie Ave extended, but does not connect with Lemieux Place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Urban Design</td>
<td>LOW EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Constructability</td>
<td>- Constrained construction site due to Arena. Benching required to adjust the grade between Crawford Ave &amp; Arena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Density/Massing/Access/Scale (DMAS)</td>
<td>- Benching required to adjust the grade between Crawford Ave &amp; Arena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Green (Environmental &amp; Economic)</td>
<td>LOW EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Short-term / Long-term</td>
<td>- Embodied energy short-term advantage of Arena reuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public Green / Open Space</td>
<td>- Purposed &amp; passive public green &amp; open space along edges and pedestrian corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Historic Resource</td>
<td>No Adverse Effect to Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effect on Resource (anticipated)</td>
<td>- No change from existing condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. COMMUNITY COHESION &amp; CONNECTIVITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>OPTION 1 Do Nothing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Physical Barriers</td>
<td>LOW EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hill to Downtown</td>
<td>- Arena site remains a barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Downtown to Hill</td>
<td>- Pedestrian Wylie Steps link Crawford Ave with Lemieux Place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Within Redevelopment</td>
<td>- Fulton/Webster Aves on top of garage do not connect with Lemieux Place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Visual Barriers</td>
<td>LOW EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Between Hill &amp; Downtown</td>
<td>- Views from Crawford Overlook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Within Development</td>
<td>- Arena as a focal urban design element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Pedestrian &amp; Transit Connections</td>
<td>LOW EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance</td>
<td>- Pedestrian Wylie Ave not ADA compliant. Elevators required at Crawford Overlook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhanced Connection Opportunities</td>
<td>- Transit &amp; pedestrian opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

Website Posting Record
### Log of Items Posted on Website

#### Lower Hill Redevelopment Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Posted on Website</th>
<th>Date Posted on Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHP to PHMC letter (2010-08-10)</td>
<td>August 16, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Comments Week Ending (2010-08-06)</td>
<td>August 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hill - Civic Arena Press Release (20100-08-13)</td>
<td>August 16, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHMC to SEA letter (2010-08-12)</td>
<td>August 16, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHMC to SEA letter (2010-08-12) - Revised</td>
<td>August 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interested Party Meeting #6**

July 13, 2010; at 6pm

Location: David L. Lawrence Convention Center, Room 336

- Meeting #6 - Agenda
- Meeting #6 - Arena Holding Costs 2010-06-16
- Meeting #6 - FHWA to PHMC Response 2010-07-07
- Meeting #6 - 4Ward Planning Presentation
- Meeting #6 - 4Ward Planning Presentation - Final
- Meeting #6 - ODCCE and Baker to PHMC response to 20100616 letter FINAL 2010-06-28
- Meeting #6 - Minutes
- Meeting #6 - PHMC to ACHP 2010-06-16
- Meeting #6 - PHMC to FHWA 2010-06-14
- Meeting #6 - PHMC to SEA letter 2010-06-16
- Meeting #6 - Options Comparison Report - Second Draft
- Meeting #6 - Restore Arena Cost Estimate
- Meeting #6 - Handouts for IP Meeting#8
- Meeting #6 - Ammann Whitney Structural Engineering Considerations (2010-07-02)
- Meeting #6 - ODC-CE to PHMC request for comments 2010-07-30-FINAL
- Meeting #6 - Baker IP Memorandum 2010-08-02
- Meeting #6 - Gary English Handout

**Interested Party Meeting #7**

June 9, 2010; at 6pm

Location: David L. Lawrence Convention Center

- Meeting #7 - Agenda
- Meeting #7 - Interested Parties
- Meeting #7 - Catalog of Articles Opinions Editorials
- Meeting #7 - Catalog of Correspondence and Other Info
- Meeting #7 - Comment Form Summary
- Meeting #7 - DRAFT Mitigation Proposals
- Meeting #7 - DRAFT Options Report - Findings Excerpt
- Meeting #7 - MA Effects Summary
- Meeting #7 - Powerpoint 06-09-10
- Meeting #7 - Five Mile Development Presentation - Arena Relocation
- Meeting #7 - Tentative Process Schedule 06-10-10
- Meeting #7 - Preservation Pittsburgh to SEA 2010-06-09
- Meeting #7 - RTI to SEA 2010-06-08 Section 106
- Meeting #7 - DRAFT Lower Hill Determination of Effect Report
- Meeting #7 - Meeting Minutes
- Meeting #7 - Historic Hill Institute Presentation Design Success Arena

**Public Informational Meeting #1**

May 13, 2010; time

Location: TBD

- Public Meeting #1 - Community Flyer
- Public Meeting #1 - Development Options
- Public Meeting #1 - Display What are Your Thoughts
- Public Meeting #1 - Mellon Arena Comment Form
- Public Meeting #1 - PA History Code Flowchart
- Public Meeting #1 - Purpose Needs
- Public Meeting #1 - Workshop Survey IP Summary May 5, 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Posted on Website (<a href="http://www.pgh-sea.com/LowerHillRedevelopment.htm">http://www.pgh-sea.com/LowerHillRedevelopment.htm</a>)</th>
<th>Date Posted on Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #1 -Presentation</td>
<td>May 23, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #1 -Attendance</td>
<td>June 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interested Party Meeting #6**
May 5, 2010; at 6pm
Location: David L. Lawrence Convention Center
- Meeting #6 -Agenda | May 2, 2010 |
- Meeting #6 -Interested Parties | May 2, 2010 |
- Meeting #6 -Minutes | May 21, 2010 |
- Meeting #6 -Workshop Survey PI Summary | May 5, 2010 |
- Meeting #6 -Attendance | June 11, 2010 |

**Interested Party Meeting #5**
April 21, 2010; at 6pm
Location: David L. Lawrence Convention Center
- Meeting #5 -Agenda | April 23, 2010 |
- Meeting #5 -Power Point 4/21/10 | April 23, 2010 |
- Meeting #5 -ROMA Financial Analysis 4-20-10 | April 23, 2010 |
- Meeting #5 -Minutes | May 2, 2010 |
- Meeting #5 -Attendance | June 11, 2010 |

**Interested Party Meeting #4**
March 30, 2010;
- Meeting #4 -Agenda | April 7, 2010 |
- Meeting #4 -Poster | April 7, 2010 |
- Meeting #4 -Presentation | April 7, 2010 |
- Meeting #4 -Workshop Survey (Word format) (PDF format) | April 8, 2010 |
- Meeting #4 -HOK 2001 Mellon Arena Renovation & Expansion Study | April 7, 2010 |
- Meeting #4 -Minutes | April 7, 2010 |
- Meeting #4 -Attendance | June 11, 2010 |

**Interested Party Meeting #3**
March 17, 2010;
Location: David L. Lawrence Convention Center
- Meeting #3 -Interest Parties List as of 3/17/2010 | March 28, 2010 |
- Meeting #3 -Penguins UDA Master Plan Presentation | March 28, 2010 |
- Meeting #3 -Preservation Pittsburgh Presentation | March 28, 2010 |
- Meeting #3 -ReusetheIgloo Presentation | March 28, 2010 |
- Meeting #3 -Minutes | April 7, 2010 |
- Meeting #3 -Attendance | June 9, 2010 |

**Interested Party Meeting #2**
February 16, 2010;
Location: David L. Lawrence Convention Center
- Meeting #2 -Agenda | February 5, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -Draft PN Statement | February 17, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -PN process chart | February 17, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -Presentation 2010feb16 | February 17, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -Workshop Aerial Maps | February 17, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -Workshop Flip Chart form | February 17, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -Mellon Arena Interested Parties 2010feb15 | February 17, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -ODC-CE to PHMC record of telephone conversation 2010feb10 | February 17, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -PHMC to SEA letter 2010jan25 | February 5, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -PN Satatement -revised | February 25, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -Minutes | February 25, 2010 |
- Meeting #2 -Attendance | June 11, 2010 |

**Interested Party Meeting #1**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Posted on Website</th>
<th>Date Posted on Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 19, 2010;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Mellon Arena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1 -Community Benefits Agreement</td>
<td>February 2, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1 -Presentation for Meeting #1</td>
<td>January 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1 -Interested Party Invitee List</td>
<td>January 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1 -Interested Party Response Form</td>
<td>January 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1 -Project Purpose and Need Statement Exercise</td>
<td>January 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1 -Minutes</td>
<td>January 26, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1 -Attendance</td>
<td>June 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Letter for National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>February 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Arena District Parking Study 12-05-2007</td>
<td>July 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill District Community Benefits Agreement</td>
<td>February 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-4 Auditorium Site Plan</td>
<td>February 26, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-5 Auditorium Site Plan</td>
<td>February 26, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Acronyms</td>
<td>February 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Arena Economic Analysis_DRAFT AECOM Penguins FEB 2010</td>
<td>July 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Arena Electronic Project Request Form and Drawing List</td>
<td>February 24, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Arena Estimate - Site Infrastructure Detail</td>
<td>May 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Arena Estimate - Operating Costs</td>
<td>May 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Arena Estimate - Civic Renewal Plan</td>
<td>May 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Arena Market Analysis DRAFT AECOM Penguins FEB 2010</td>
<td>July 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh Penguins Arena FINAL Traffic Study 12-05-07 (without appendices)</td>
<td>July 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to Initiate Consultation in Compliance with the State History Code and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td>February 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design Guidelines</td>
<td>July 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose and Need Statement
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Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment  
Sports & Exhibition Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County  

- Interested Party Process /Purpose & Need Statement -

**Mellon Arena History**
The Civic Arena was constructed in 1961, displacing the existing community fabric including buildings, local streets and many Lower Hill District residents. Major roadway improvements were constructed to better serve the Arena and City communities including the Crosstown Expressway (Interstate 579); HOV lanes; the extensions of Bedford Avenue, Center Avenue and Washington Place; and improvements to other elements of the local roadway network.

The Civic Arena is famous for its revolutionary architectural design which features a large retractable roof and has been determined eligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places. The Arena housed the Civic Light Opera, hosted many concerts and exhibitions, and became the home of the Pittsburgh Penguins, a National Hockey League franchise. In 1999, the name of the arena was changed to the Mellon Arena.

As a result of the Arena’s unique dome-design which limited facility expansion options, the construction of a new Consol Energy Center & arena facility began in 2008. The Consol Energy Center site is located on the opposite side of Centre Avenue and immediately south of the Mellon Arena. The existing Mellon Arena Area of Potential Effect (APE) is the focus of a preliminary plan to redevelop the site.

**Interested Party Process**
Because the PA History Code does not establish a process for public consultation, the Interested Parties (IP) process for the Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment Project will follow the consultation procedures outlined in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (36 CFR 800). Section 106 establishes a process that seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns through consultation among agencies and other parties with a demonstrated direct legal or economic relation to the project or affected properties, or their concern with the project’s effects on historic properties. Through this process, an informed consensus on the recommendation of an alternative redevelopment option that avoids, minimizes, or mitigates potential adverse effects to historic properties will be sought.

**Purpose Statement**
To assist the Interested Parties in the development, evaluation and comparison of an alternative redevelopment, the following Purpose & Need Statement has been developed based on a survey of Interested Parties’ values.

“The purpose is to consider feasible preservation possibilities for the continued use of the Mellon Arena site given its cultural value as a historic resource eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.”

**Need Statement:**
In developing the alternative redevelopment options that avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects to the Arena site, there is a need to consider the following:

**Design, Planning & Sustainability**
- Compatible with community assets (including Consol Energy Center)
- Harmony with the surrounding community
- Community fabric that pre-dated the Arena
- Urban design
- Green (environmental & economic sustainability)
- Effect on Historic Resources

**Community Cohesion & Connectivity**
- Physical and visual barriers between the HD from the CBD
- Pedestrian and transit connections

**Economic Development**
- Economic benefit
- Employment & housing opportunities
- Tax revenue
- Asset to the community and City

**Affordability**
- Feasible & reasonable
- Financially prudent
APPENDIX C

Public Meeting Comments Summary
Comment Summary

Purpose of this Comment Form - This form is to supplement the Public Open House Plans Display format by providing an opportunity for additional informal input into the project development process. Additional available space is provided at the end of the form for comment on areas of interest other than those identified. Due to the complexity of the project development process where the Sports & Exhibition Authority must weigh many factors in making its decisions, it must be understood that the comments provided are for consideration purpose and do not constitute a vote or referendum on the process.

The Plans Display was attended by 55 people. A total of 18 Comment Forms were completed and returned during the meeting. One comment was received via mail after the meeting, for a total of 19 Comment Forms. The Comment Forms are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. With which group(s) do you most align yourself on this project?
   General Community / Individual - 6
   Organization - 1
   Hill District Community - 9
   Mellon Arena Preservation Community – 8*
   Development Community - 0
   Other (Please explain) - 6

*Note: Two (2) of the 8 respondents who selected “Mellon Arena Preservation Community” crossed out “Preservation” and wrote “Reuse.”

Explain:
1. Keeping the Arena intact and using it for public use.
2. Organization – Hill Consensus Group, Resident - Middle Hill
3. I believe if everyone put emotion aside, the right choice would be clear… to transform the Mellon into a positive development.
5. Reuse the Igloo!
6. Reuse the Igloo

5. Each Mellon Arena Development Option needs to considered the following items. Please select 4 of the following “need to consider items” that you feel are most important?*

   Compatibility with Community Assets - 3
   Harmony with Surrounding Community - 11
   Restore Community Fabric that Pre-dated Arena - 5
   Urban Design - 6
   Green (Environmental & Economic Sustainability) - 7
   Pedestrian & Transit Connections - 4
   Economic Benefit - 4
   Employment & Housing Opportunities - 4
   Tax Revenue - 4
   Asset to Community & City - 10
*Note: Two (2) of the respondents selected fewer than four items, 3 selected more than four items, and 1 did not answer the question.

**Comment:**

1. Ideas for how to bring business and people to the area with retail and destinations was not addressed at the meeting even when directly asked.
2. Make the Mellon Arena and its site into an asset to Pittsburgh and its community. It should continue to be used and enjoyed.
3. The Arena could be used as a way to inform and teach people about what the redevelopment of the '60's did and how it affected the community much like leaving part of the Berlin Wall was left to make sure people never forget.
4. Keeping everything in balance is the important.
5. Unique asset for the community.

6. Including “Do Nothing” Option, five development options or alternatives are presented (listed below). Are there other options or alternatives that do not impact the Arena that you think should be considered?

- Option 1 - Do Nothing
- Option 2 – Preserve Arena (for Continued Use as Multi-Purpose Arena)
- Option 3 – Arena ReUse & Site Development
- Option 4 – Reconstruct Arena (for Continued Use as Multi-Purpose Arena)
- Option 5 – Arena Demolition & Site Development

**Other Options to Consider:**

1. A destination Center with parking – Canada theme – restaurants, specialty, retail.
2. Not really sure what that question asks.
3. Option 3 (Where is option 2 and 4?)
4. Option 2- Make it more useful for the other types of uses, continue to use for children’s activities, schools.

Note: More than half of the respondents selected an existing option for this question, rather than suggesting other options. The options that were circled are as follows:

- Option 1 – 1
- Option 2 – 1
- Option 3 – 6
- Option 4 – 1
- Option 5 – 2

7. Of the three options still under consideration (including “Do Nothing”), which do you prefer and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 – Do Nothing</th>
<th>Option 3 – Arena ReUse &amp; Site Development</th>
<th>Option 5 – Arena Demolition &amp; Site Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

1. [Option 5] - Too costly for upkeep and renovations, has been neglected without proper maintenance for the past 20 years that I have worked there.
2. [Option 3] - Arena is a shrinking mid-20th Century building that reflects Pittsburgh’s industrial past. Careful redevelopment as a community resource benefits neighbors and visitors.
3. [Option 3] - Saves taxpayer dollars, keeps Pittsburgh unique, and most importantly, creates added value, which in the end will bring greater economic benefit to the Hill Community.
4. [Option 3]- Preserving and reusing an architectural icon in ways that ‘enhance’ the Hill District and Downtown benefits all concerned parties and develops a new, more positive history.
5. [Option 3] – The Mellon Arena is a significant and important piece of architecture and local history. It needs to be reused as a place that serves the community, the Hill District, and all of Pittsburgh.
6. [Option 3] – We can come to a compromise so people in the Hill and the rest of the city can gain from redevelopment of the area.
7. [Option 3] – Option 3 is the only efficient way to use the area.
8. [Option 3] – Arena is a public asset and should be “preserved” in its basic form if not specific function as a continuing destination for the Hill and others. A plan without the Arena is NOT an asset and the location just becomes another street.
8. **If the Mellon Arena were to remain, what uses do you feel would be most appropriate?**

- Active recreation (ice skating, soccer, exercise, etc) - 9
- Hotel development within a portion of the Arena - 5
- General and flexible public open space - 10
- Parking garage - 0
- Other (Please explain) - 4

Note: Six (6) respondents did not answer this question.

**Explain:**
1. I cannot envision reuse.
2. Mixed commercial development including parking, shops, open market space to draw people from all neighborhoods including the Hill District and downtown.
3. All uses that are compatible with the community and the Arena!
4. There is potential for an Indoor/Outdoor park where the shell can close in winter and open in summer. This takes full advantage of the structure and creates a destination.
5. Needs to go.
6. Community center for youth, after school programs, summer programs, classes, tutoring, recreation/athletic activities and gatherings (like Chicago’s Gary Comer Youth Center).
7. Implement community input process with highest and best re-uses.
8. Public park space.
9. Used for Special Events (church functions); open for other out of town conferences, for community events [illegible]
10. Open flexible space will accommodate all possible uses versus being dependent on some commercial venture.

9. **If the Mellon Arena were to be removed, what do you think should be done to memorialize its historical significance?**

- Photographic Recordation - 3
- Public display of important Arena remnants - 4
- Informational signs & plaques - 5
- Recycling of building materials - 4
- Private reuse of Arena remnants - 5
- Other (Please explain) - 2

Note: Nine (9) respondents did not answer this question.

**Explain:**
1. I don’t think it should be removed. It can develop more jobs.
2. An economically self-sustaining building on one of the green spaces or close to the amphitheater that has a green exterior (materials) and a reused steel interior. The visitor’s/museum center would contain documents and photos of all areas affected by urban renewal (Hill, Northside and Homewood).
3. Auction contents of hockey Arena to general public.
4. None- keep it!
5. As far as I am concerned, this is not a valid option.
6. It should never be removed. If you do then there is nothing that can make it right. Nothing.
7. Do not remove, make it a historical site.
8. Not an option. Nothing that can be built there will ever be as important as what is already there.

10. **Please use the remaining space to expand on comments provided above or to provide input on other issues.**

1. I don’t think it should be removed. It can develop more jobs.
2. A childcare center could be opened in the place of the igloo club in the area of B21, 22 and 23.
3. A roller-skating and ice skating rink for our children to have a place to go because all you have to do is put down the basketball floor.
4. A parents’ resource center.
5. Keep the truck pulls, motocross and the Circus in the building.
6. Also you may bring back the Sportsman Show.
7. Build affordable homes from Crawford Street down to Mario Lemieux Place.
8. I am against the parking garages from Crawford to Lemieux.
9. These are things I want to benefit the Hill residents as they can also have stores inside of the Arena. We also would like the residents to be involved in the redevelopment as workers.
10. Create a new visitor's center in the area of the Arena/other retail area – restaurants, hotel, other themed businesses to promote hockey as a sport and its origins in Canada. Concerts in the new Arena – Shania Twain, comedy performances – can provide monetary funds to assist nonprofits in uptown and the Hill.

11. In redevelopment, the “clear slate” urban renewal history should be exposed and honored – building the Arena the way it was done was a mistake, but now the Arena means many things to many people. Getting rid of the massive parking lot surrounding the Arena should help to re-establish the lower Hill as a viable community. Not crazy about the “Crawford Cliff” concept though – do we really need all those garages?

12. The “process” for approval has not been addressed. I would like to know if there is potential for other architectural firms and organizations to develop/submit schemes for Reuse and Redevelopment of the Arena. I work for MacLachlan, Cornelius and Feloni Architects (local Pittsburgh firm). There is interest in the firm to get involved, yet we are not sure how, or who to talk to. There is a unique structure the development of which is only limited by the creativity of the individuals making the decisions.

13. I am a lifelong resident of the Hill District over 60 years. As a young girl I witnessed my classmates at Letsche School disappear as a direct result of Urban Renewal. The Civic Arena leaves a bad taste in my mouth. The community needs to be made whole. Restore the street grid and construct mixed income housing and businesses.

14. Pittsburgh is a layered city with rich history and always looks forward to make a better city. Mistakes were made in Mellon Arena project but they were urban planning, government mistakes, not architectural. The same building can be reused as a center piece for a better development, better than it ever was before. It can turn around the pains of the Hill District and transform them, correct them into something to be proud of. Pittsburgh should build on its history, not erase it. This has been done in Portland, Memphis and Austin to convert an area into a community asset. It can be, it has been done. We can do it in Pittsburgh too. It’s a good story we Pittsburghers would be proud to tell.

15. Errors in presentation content. Arena reuse plan for Wylie Avenue IS ADA-compliant. Your info is incorrect! No elevation required. Explanation of connectivity glosses over the fact that NONE of these plans improve or affect in any way vehicular or pedestrian access to downtown.

16. Why hasn’t the Mellon been registered as a historical site yet?

17. Definitely must eliminate the sea of parking around the Arena!

18. Should remove solid panels to create large skylight areas. Could become a huge atrium that could be in filled with all sorts of uses. Residential, stores, hotel, playground, etc.

19. Transportation hub for light rail between Oakland, Hill, Downtown, Airport, and even the North Hills and South Side.

Thank you for your time and cooperation in providing input on the Mellon Arena Redevelopment Project. For additional information on the Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment project, visit www.pgh-sea.com. If you need additional time to complete the form, you can complete it at your convenience and send it to the address below by May 20th, 2010.

Lisa Olszak
Olszak Management Consulting, Inc.
Fax: (412) 281-9261
Email: lolszak@olszak.com
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Development of Arena Site
Comparative Economic Benefit Analysis
Methodology & Assumptions

METHODOLOGY
For purposes of eliminating as many subjective criteria as possible, the analysis utilized the real estate use programs specified in each plan, and applied equal cost and revenue metrics to each plan. By way of example, the cost to construct office space per square foot is the same in all analyses and the revenue generated per square foot is the same. Likewise, the employment generation, tax revenues, etc. utilize the same criteria for each plan, and the costs for providing the necessary road infrastructure were allocated proportionately.

TASK
Prepare a general comparative economic benefit analysis of development plans contemplated for the Arena Site.

PLANS
Option 1 is a plan to mothball the Arena and continue to use the site for parking. Option 3 works with data provided by plans which contemplate keeping the Arena in an altered state, reutilizing the facility for to-be determined public uses, constructing a hotel within the footprint, and redeveloping the remaining site acreage. Option 5 contemplates plans to remove the Arena, construct new street grid, and develop the entire site according to a new master plan. Option 6 contemplates a plan to restore the Arena to its 1961 condition.

ASSUMPTIONS

Infrastructure Costs
Estimates provided by the various plans and their consultants were used in this analysis. In cases where unit costs differed between plans, a new unit cost was used and applied to each plan equally. In cases where costs were incomplete or omitted the equalized unit costs were applied to complete the data.

Development Program Components
The residential, retail, office, hospitality, parking and other development components for Options 3 and 5 are substantially consistent with those proposed by the proponents.

Development Costs
Identical per unit costs were used for each plan’s program components. Option 3 data for the Arena reuse and Option 5 data for its removal were provided by each plan proponent.

Oxford Real Estate Advisors
Development of Arena Site
Comparative Economic Benefit Analysis
Methodology & Assumptions – Continued

Income Projections
Identical per unit residential sales prices and rental rates, as well as, the same rental rates for office and retail space were used.
Each plan’s parking component was assumed to generate the same net profit and pay for the cost of construction.

Construction Job Creation and Permanent Employment
Identical assumptions based upon the construction costs and the amount of completed office and retail space were used to calculate the construction and on-going employment figures.

Employment and Real Estate Tax Revenue
Equal metrics were applied to each plan to calculate the results.

PUBLIC SUBSIDIES
It is likely that infrastructure costs and certain costs for public amenities pursuant to the reuse or restoration of the Arena (should that alternative be chosen) will create the need for City, County, State and/or Federal assistance. No federal funding is assumed.

DEVELOPMENT TIME FRAME
Because of the size and scope of the alternative development plans, a timeframe of three (3) years for infrastructure was assumed; 50% of infrastructure costs the first year, 30% the second year, and 20%, or the balance in the third year. The overall real estate development programs were implemented over a ten (10) year basis; Development Period– 30%, Year 1 – 20%, Years 2-4 – 10% each, Years 5-6 - 5% each, and Years 7-10 – 2.5% each.

PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS
Private developers and their capital providers seek projects on the basis of the highest projected return with the least financial and other associated risks. Due to the size of this project and its diverse components it is likely that more than one developer will be needed for the successful completion of this project. Private developers will look for overall leveraged investment returns in the 20% range which is deemed suitable to assume the risk associated with development projects. The financial risks fall broadly into four categories: Development Costs, Income Projections, Debt Assumptions, and overall Development Schedules.

Other associated risks’ are interrelated; the likelihood of public subsidy monies; the projected demand for potential development uses, in this case, office, retail, and residential; the flexibility of the project development site and/or constraints, whichever the case may be; and the local community support for the project. It is unlikely that private developers will assume any risk associated with the reuse of the Arena and this alternative will require initial and on-going public subsidy.

September 2010    Oxford Real Estate Advisors
## Development of Arena Site

### Program Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of Arena Site</th>
<th>Option 1 Plan – Program Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena Annual Operating Costs</td>
<td>$2,229,800 In Year-One*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event Parking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Parking Spaces</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Available Spaces Occupied Per Event</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Vehicle Collected by Parking Concessionaire [Taxes Included]</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Vehicle Distributed to Owner</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commuter Parking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Parking Spaces</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Commuter Spaces Occupied During Workweek</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Vehicle/Day Collected by Parking Concessionaire</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Vehicle/Day Distributed to Owner</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Returns:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap Rate</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Sale</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pittsburgh Parking Tax</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From ODC-CE draft memo dated February 16, 2010 estimating the cost of maintaining the arena in a mothballed state. Posted on SEA website under references.
### Development of Arena Site
#### Program Components (Continued)

#### Option 3 Plan (Arena Reuse)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Estate Segment</th>
<th>Units/SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing For Sale</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing For Rent</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wylie &amp; Quad Retail</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A Office Space</td>
<td>510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Service (Keys)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Level Garage &amp; Structured</td>
<td>2,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Park Area - Arena Interior</td>
<td>94,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Option 5 Plan (Arena Demo)

1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Estate Segment</th>
<th>Units/SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing For Sale</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing For Rent</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood, Theatre, Entertainment</td>
<td>208,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A Office Space</td>
<td>608,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Service (Keys)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Parking</td>
<td>2,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Park Area</td>
<td>57,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development of Arena Site
### Program Components
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses:</th>
<th>Development of Arena Site Option 6 Plan - Program Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost:</td>
<td>$95,698,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena Annual Operating Costs</td>
<td>$3,000,000 Year-One*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facility Rental and Ticket Revenue:

| Arena Seats | 10,500 |
| Avg MA Events/Yr 2000-2009 | 108 |
| Avg Penguins Games/Yr 2000-2009 | 42 |
| Avg Other MA Events/Yr 2000-2009 | 65 |
| Est % Lost to Consol Energy Center | 30.00% |
| Projected Events Per Year | 46 |
| % of Seats Sold Per Event | 60% |
| Average Ticket Price Per Event | $50.00 Per Ticket |
| % Ticket Surcharge | 5% |
| Facility Rental Rate Per Event | $25,000 Per Event |
| Food & Beverage Per Event Attendee | $10 |
| % Food & Beverage Surcharge | 10% |
| Inflation | 3.00% |

### Event Parking:

| Available Parking Spaces | 2,470 |
| % Available Spaces Occupied Per Event | 100.00% |
| Cost/Vehicle Collected by Parking | $10.00 |
| Concessionaire [Taxes Included] | |
| Cost/Vehicle Distributed to Owner | $1.00 |
| Consol Energy Center Events Per Year [20% over MA avg events/yr 2000-2009] | 129 |

### Commuter Parking:

- Available Parking Spaces: 2,470
- % Occupied: 85.00%
- Cost/Vehicle/Day Paid to Concessionaire: $6.50
- Cost/Vehicle/Day Distributed to Owner: $0.50

### Investment Returns:

- Cap Rate: 10%
- Cost of Sale: 4%

### Public Benefits:

- Construction Salary: $38,000 Per Worker
- Labor Percentage of Construction Costs: 40.00%
- Percent of Local Labor: 90.00%
- Arena/Event Employee Salary: $25,000 Per Worker
- Local Payroll Tax Rate: 0.55%
- Local Service Tax: $52.00 Per Worker
- Commonwealth of PA Earned Income Tax: 3.07%
- Milage Rate: $29.41 Per $1,000 of Assessed Value
- City of Pittsburgh Amusement Tax: 5.00%
- City of Pittsburgh Parking Tax: 37.50%

* From ODC-CE draft memo dated February 16, 2010 estimating the cost of maintaining the arena in a mothballed state; costs were increased to $3,000,000 to reflect the usage of the arena.
## Development of Arena Site
### Site Infrastructure Comparative Analysis

Composite Estimates from Review of Alternative Development Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Option 1 Plan</th>
<th>Option 3 Plan</th>
<th>Option 5 Plan</th>
<th>Option 6 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Arena (1-Mothball cost 3-partial demolition and restoration for reuse 5-Removal cost)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,885,000</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Arena Site Grading/Preparation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena Interior/Public Open Space - Recreation, Concerts, Festivals</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$9,410,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Existing Mario Lemieux Place</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$268,579</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Existing Parking Lots</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$444,891</td>
<td>$444,891</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Wylie Avenue (Option 5-Washington to Crawford/Option 3 Arena to Crawford)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,142,499</td>
<td>$5,356,247</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mario Lemieux Place (Option 5 from Centre to Bedford/Option 3 Upgrade for new Development)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,162,164</td>
<td>$2,905,409</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Logan Street (from Centre to Bedford)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,784,195</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Fulton Street (from Center to Bedford)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,784,195</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Development Road (from Crawford West)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$722,038</td>
<td>$722,038</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Development Quads (site work for 9 quads)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$22,950,786</td>
<td>$24,658,014</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Soft Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>% of Cost</th>
<th>Option 3 Plan</th>
<th>Option 5 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Cultural Assessments</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$344,262</td>
<td>$369,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Costs</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$688,524</td>
<td>$739,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contingency 5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>$860,654</td>
<td>$924,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Oversight and Inspection</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$516,393</td>
<td>$554,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Fee</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>$172,131</td>
<td>$184,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency 4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$688,524</td>
<td>$739,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Power Allowance</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$86,065</td>
<td>$92,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Engineering Costs</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$86,065</td>
<td>$92,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs Totals</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>$3,442,618</td>
<td>$3,698,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Infrastructure Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>% of Cost</th>
<th>Option 3 Plan</th>
<th>Option 5 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Infrastructure Cost</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$26,393,404</td>
<td>$28,356,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development of Arena Site

### Comparative Economic Benefit Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1 (Mothball)</th>
<th>Option 3 (Reuse)</th>
<th>Option 5 (Demo)</th>
<th>Option 6 (1961 Condition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Entity Return on Investment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Public Economic Benefit</td>
<td>$2,300,159</td>
<td>$77,650,135</td>
<td>$126,443,622</td>
<td>$36,539,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential State/Local Infrastructure-Arena ReUse Subsidy</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$26,393,404</td>
<td>$28,356,716</td>
<td>$95,698,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Public Benefit after Subsidies</td>
<td>$2,300,159</td>
<td>$51,256,730</td>
<td>$98,086,906</td>
<td>$(59,159,193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Creation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Costs / Construction and Permanent Jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Construction Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs &amp; Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs by Year-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Wages by Year-10</td>
<td>$2,795</td>
<td>$106,204,286</td>
<td>$147,718,309</td>
<td>$34,451,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Economic Benefits Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Construction Employment Wage Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and State Wage Taxes</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$3,989,927</td>
<td>$5,549,544</td>
<td>$1,294,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Permanent Wage Taxes and Real Estate Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/State Wage Taxes (10-year totals)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$34,881,416</td>
<td>$41,315,469</td>
<td>$3,828,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Taxes (10-year totals)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$45,571,886</td>
<td>$73,275,965</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Amusement Taxes</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,305,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Parking Taxes</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$21,073,892</td>
<td>$6,220,371</td>
<td>$24,607,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Public Economic Benefits</td>
<td>$21,073,892</td>
<td>$90,663,601</td>
<td>$126,443,622</td>
<td>$38,035,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena Operating Costs (10-year totals)</td>
<td>$(18,773,733)</td>
<td>$(13,013,466)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,496,208)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Public Economic Benefits</td>
<td>$2,300,159</td>
<td>$77,650,135</td>
<td>$126,443,622</td>
<td>$36,539,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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DEVELOPMENT OF ARENA SITE
Comparative Investment Return Analysis
Revised September 2010

Notes
1. A cleared unconstrained site presents the best opportunity for private developers to design and construct cost effective and economically viable real estate investments for projected residential, retail, office, and hospitality and public space components. It is likely that multiple private parties with expertise in each of these areas will be interested in pursuing the potential of this 28 acre site.

2. The amount and configuration of office space as conceived for Option 3 rely on very high density with minimal setbacks. The views from a large portion of the office space will be the exterior wall of the Arena. As currently configured the cost to design and construct curved walls to fit the site adjacent to the Arena for Class A multi-tenant office space will be in excess of the projections contained in this report. Changing to a more conventional design will likely result in less space than programmed.

3. The hotel included in the reuse plan as configured ‘inside’ the dome presents numerous issues (i.e. opening/closing dome, snow, load/noise issues, fire safety access, daylight concerns, etc. that have not been studied). A single-loaded corridor with rooms on only one side is contemplated because only one-side of the hotel would have views. Single-loaded corridor hotels are more expensive to build and are operationally inefficient.

4. The site infrastructure estimates are preliminary in nature but reflect a composite of estimates prepared for a number of plans.

5. This report considers the Arena public space as part of the public infrastructure costs for the reuse plan.

6. The ‘equalized’ unit cost methodology provides a broad-brush and objective approach to the economic analysis.

7. Public economic benefits reflect potential employment and tax generation over a 10-year development period for the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.
Development of Mellon Arena Site
Addendum- May 5, 2010

This addendum is prepared to clarify statements made in various news media outlets regarding the economic analysis prepared and distributed on April 21, 2010.

1) Comments were made that the analysis did not take into account the value of historic tax credits or the economic value (or lack thereof) of public uses that would accompany a reuse. In fact, as described below, these potential items were taken into consideration.

Historic Tax Credits: It is unclear whether Option #3 Arena Reuse will qualify for historic tax credits. The application to receive historic tax credits is a lengthy process that begins when a detailed description of ‘Qualified Rehabilitation Expenses’ are quantified. Up to 20% of Qualified Rehabilitation Expenses can be issued as ‘tax credits’. However, we assumed that a $5,000,000 tax credit could be achieved for Options #3 and #6 in our economic analysis. It should be noted that the tax credit, if achieved, would be owned by the ‘public’ and would need to be sold at a discount (typically 10-25%) to its face value to a private developer.

Additionally, even if a private developer were to gain the historic tax credit, it is a tax credit that can only be applied to tax liability, it is not a grant of money nor is it a deduction to project costs as has been depicted by some reuse plans.

Potential Development that would accompany a Reuse: Our assessment concluded that a community ice rink and an amphitheater, as well as any ancillary uses would most likely be run at a loss with the public, either the City of Pittsburgh, or Allegheny County absorbing the ongoing costs.

Our analysis did not include specific uses or attempt to make assumptions as to the revenue/expense metrics for a particular use. This evaluation, which foots to our original economic evaluation line item entitled ‘Arena Operating Costs’ is as follows:
### Arena Operating Costs

*(Annually, inflation of 2.5% assumed in economic analysis, as well as, initial "reuse preparation costs" of $530,000 provided by Option #3 Proponents, 2010 $*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Arena Operating Costs&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs</td>
<td>$185,817</td>
<td>$2,229,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Net Revenue From Public Uses plus Historic Tax Credit Benefit&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$102,483</td>
<td>$1,229,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Public Profit/(Loss)

$(1,000,000)$

**Notes:**

A- Assumes a facility maintained in a state of usability by the public, excluding costs of a concession or event operator. Does not include exterior maintenance of the Dome which would have to be carried in a Reserves and Maintenance Line Item. Estimate was prepared by Mellon Arena Operations personnel. Includes Engineers, Electricians, Janitorial, Elevator/Escalator Maintenance Contracts, Security, Repairs and Maintenance, Supplies, Utilities, Permits/Licenses, HVAC Maintenance Contract, Trash removal (No Events, Snow Removal (Arena Plaza Only), Landscaping, Property and General Liability Insurance. (ODC-CE 2/16/20 memo on SEA website.)

B- Net Revenue is Gross Revenue generated by the operator of any event and/or the public entity operating the facility less any and all event/facility expenses, including, but not limited to, any and all increased facility operating and maintenance costs, as well as added insurance, security, utilities, clean-up, ice and/or park maintenance, etc. Historic Tax Credit value assumes: for the Public, a sale of the $5m tax credit at a discount and pro-rated over 10-year development term or for a Private developer, a credit against taxes owed providing a benefit that enables their participation.
2) Several additional comments were made in the media that are clarified below:

a) All data for Option #3 and Option #5, were provided by the proponents of each plan; each was reviewed and confirmed in face-to-face meetings. Any requested changes to the base plan in one plan would simply result in the request for an equal change in the competing base plan.

b) All assumptions for the calculation of tax revenue generation, employment, etc. were the same for each plan. A change in those assumptions would not materially change the net effect of the economic analysis.

c) We stand by our assessment that a reuse of the Arena would be remain a public venue and cost both the City of Pittsburgh and the County of Allegheny substantial public revenue to support on an annual basis.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Source Title and/or Subject</th>
<th>Source Date</th>
<th>Source Author / Contributor</th>
<th>Excerpt and/or Summary</th>
<th>Point of View</th>
<th>Response and/or Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena) and federal historic preservation review requirements</td>
<td>3-Sep-10</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation Elizabeth Merrill and Walter Gallas</td>
<td>“...the demolition of the historic Mellon Arena, prior to the application for federal funding or permits, and prior to the initiation of Section 106 review, would severely jeopardize future federal funding for any element of the proposed replacement plan, because of the penalty for anticipatory demolition under Section 110(b) of the NEPA. The National Trust strongly urges the SEA not to take any action leading to the demolition of the Mellon Arena, in order to avoid the risk of this future penalty.”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>2-Sep-10</td>
<td>Citizen Ethan Keeler</td>
<td>“…I was curious as to what was going to happen with Mellon and if anyone thought of making the structure into a parking garage?”</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena)</td>
<td>2-Sep-10</td>
<td>Preservation Pennsylvania F P Melinda Crawford</td>
<td>“...we strongly urge you not to rush to a decision that might result in the loss of the important historic resource. It has been made very clear, in our opinion, that you will be seeking federal funds for future phases of this project. To ignore the Section 106 process now is clearly segmenting the process to avoid this compliance...” We respectfully ask you to take the following action. Table the decision to demolish this structure. Continue with a careful review of this project, identify the sources of federal funds to be used and initiate the Section 106 process...”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>31-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Jeff Neubauer</td>
<td>Mellon Arena should meet the same fate as the Three Rivers Stadium and allow for the opportunity of economic development of the lower hill. Mellon Arena is obsolete and should be torn down to allow the site to be reused and developed.”</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>30-Aug-10</td>
<td>Carlson Consulting Thomas Carlins</td>
<td>“...Please reconsider your decision to demolish the Civic Arena. It is a unique historic structure that has been part of Pittsburgh for 50 years. As a GREEN city it would be another feature in our cup. Pleasebmp demolish and rebuild in the world of sustainability. Support the reuse the igloo movement.”</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena Options</td>
<td>30-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Kitty Vagley</td>
<td>“…I think removal of the arena will bode well for the extension of Crawford Village and further development. I believe time is of the essence and speedy demolition is necessary to keep the energy level positive...Let’s take advantage of the momentum of the opening of the Consol Energy Center to move forward on a workable street grid, a new relationship between downtown and the Lower Hill, and a fresh new portion of the city.”</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Public Comment on Civic Arena</td>
<td>27-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Rebekah Johnston</td>
<td>“As a fan of the Pittsburgh Penguins, a Graduate Student of Landscape Architecture, and a devoted historian, I have mixed feelings regarding the fate of the Civic Arena...leaving down the Civic Arena to correct the past is only covering up what truly happened on the site...I believe that working with the community and the Penguins and the SEA is the best solution to the problem. But my ideas or some other architect or engineer’s ideas need the community’s approval.”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>27-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Robert J. Carroll, MD</td>
<td>“Please get the Civic Arena torn down and return this valuable site to something productive. The 28 acres of prime real estate should be returned to the private sector and developed with the aim of future economic growth.”</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>27-Aug-10</td>
<td>Mccormack Baron Seckar Mary Kellers</td>
<td>“We feel that the [UDA] plan as currently put forth appropriately recognizes the importance of creating a sense of place that is sensitive to the character of the site...We trust that with the completion of the Hill District Master Plan that the current site plan will be further refined to embrace the development principles that will be spelled out in the Master Plan and employ other design elements...”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Read at Aug 23, 2010 Public meeting, submitted hard copy, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Arena</td>
<td>26-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Bill Rizzo</td>
<td>“The arena has faded in all of its incarnations as a venue and its retractable roof was a dud as a design component...” “This is a time when we must consider a movement forward and forget the mistakes of the past.”</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>September 18, 2007 Option Agreement by the Sports &amp; Exhibition Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, URA, and Lemieux Group, LP</td>
<td>26-Aug-10</td>
<td>Eaddy Smith Zudy Elas Kirk</td>
<td>To additon to my public comments and the comments of Penguins representatives, we write to remind the Authority that the execution of the September 18, 2007 Option Agreement signed by the Authority, the URA, and the Lemieux Group, LP was a &quot;material inducement&quot; in the Penguins entering into the lease to occupy the CONSOL Energy Center and to remain in Pittsburgh.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>24-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Mike Barcus</td>
<td>&quot;I, for one, would like to see the arena torn down to make room for something new, whether it be parking or business. Three Rivers Stadium is a wonderful example of why not to save old structures just because many feel they have &quot;sentimental value.&quot; Look at what the demolition of the old stadium has done for the North Shore area; there is more business there than ever before.&quot; &quot;The cost of maintaining an old, outdated building such as the Mellon Arena would far exceed any possible benefit of reuse.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>24-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Dave Muders</td>
<td>&quot;There is no other building like it… The Pittsburgh area and Allegheny County made a terrible mistake in tearing down the old great Pittsburgh airport.&quot; &quot;I normally would not speak out on something like this but I am tied watching our history do down the tubes because someone stands to make some kind of profit from it.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Save the Arena</td>
<td>24-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Mary Lou Buriak</td>
<td>&quot;I like the idea of a public skating rink - just think of all the school and independent leagues of children who could benefit by having a local arena to use for practice and games. …Bring in some restaurant, do some housing. Who knows maybe, some sport stores.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena Plan</td>
<td>24-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Herbert Adelman</td>
<td>&quot;My idea what to do with Civic Arena… Well, if Pittsburgh Hall of Fame and retail shopping mall. There are so many well known names from our area that would constitute a tourist attraction.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>SEA Censorship and ignoring IP Recommendations</td>
<td>24-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP Gary English</td>
<td>&quot;As the person who filed for historic preservation of the Civic Arena and now a member of the SEA &quot;Interested Party&quot; Committee, I am appalled by your continuing actions of censorship. It started with not contacting me in the beginning of the IP Process. Furthermore, you have censored my presentation… I feel this would be a win-win for our entire area.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Phone Message</td>
<td>Opinion on Civic Arena</td>
<td>24-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen John Adams</td>
<td>&quot;In '35, his family’s home was relocated to build the arena, against their wishes. His house used to be where the entrance to the arena is now. He thinks we should keep the arena as a concert venue. Use it for the middle class working people and have more affordable concerts there. Why should the city spend money they don’t have to tear 1 down when they could use it to make more money?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>The Case for Communication</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Ken Droyo</td>
<td>&quot;The closing of Lower Hill… left a legacy of mistrust between classes and races which continues to hinder our region’s social cohesion.&quot; &quot;The most important than the physical plan will be the social and economic reconciliation that come about through exchange and partnership. Regardless of how beautiful a plan may be, no one wants to invest in a social mismatch.&quot; &quot;Personally, it does not matter to me if the future includes all, part or none of the silver dome... so long as the outcome belongs to all of the people that call this great city home.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Distributed at Aug 23, 2010 Pub ic meeting, catalogued items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Alan Kemper</td>
<td>&quot;This structure has served the community for 49 years and it is time to remove it from the Pittsburgh skyline. Bring it down and build some type of a small effective facility of a smaller scale if anything at all must be built.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Submitted for Aug 23, 2010 Pub ic meeting, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Please Read.</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Adam Balla</td>
<td>&quot;This is not a row house, a gas station or some other perceived anonymous box structure. This is a domed, movable or not, structure. Please reconsider the reuse of the building as a casino, an urban garden with museum, a hotel, a concert venue, or condominiums. Please do not tear it down.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Submitted for Aug 23, 2010 Pub ic meeting, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>civic arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Scott Shaw</td>
<td>&quot;This is absolutely no reason the arena needs to be torn down. The penguins should have no say in the matter, they got the taxpayers to pay for their new arena and now they want to dictate more terms. I say shut up, you get your new place, no let the public decide what to do.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Submitted for Aug 23, 2010 Pub ic meeting, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena Idea</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen John Burletti</td>
<td>&quot;I... my idea for the Mellon Arena is to make it the Largest indoor water park all year round with roof open in the summer and give it a theme lie Disney’s Blizzard Beach. its already called the Igloo.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Submitted for Aug 23, 2010 Pub ic meeting, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Darryl Feth</td>
<td>&quot;There is absolutely no reason the arena needs to be torn down. The penguins should have no say in the matter, they got the taxpayers to pay for their new arena and now they want to dictate more terms. I say shut up, you get your new place, no let the public decide what to do.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Submitted for Aug 23, 2010 Pub ic meeting, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Gary Buck</td>
<td>&quot;I hear so much from residents from the hill who say development must benefit them, but I feel that the region as a whole takes precedent. If there is no solid plan for the Civic Arena structure then tear it down, if there is then let's get it started.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Igloo aka Civic Arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Bernadette Farah</td>
<td>&quot;If there is any way to restore the Igloo, please attempt to do so…maybe a planetarium or casino license with an offer for a buyer?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Arena Reuse</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Michael Baker</td>
<td>Two suggestions regarding the reuse: 1) the people who live in the Hill District should have the greatest voice in whether the arena is reused or torn down; 2) consider reviving the arena to create a National Jazz Museum…also include a park for use by area residents/visitors and people coming to the museum.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>NEED a Volunteer to Introduce or Read letter</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Re-Use the Igloo!</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>Submission by Larry Glaeser, Associate Professor at Pitt. &quot;Lessons we have learned from mistakes made in redeveloping Lower Hill in the 1950s are: 1) the importance of proceeding slowly, and with full transparency at all levels of decision making; but things went very quickly and citizens didn't fully understand…2) the importance of having a clearly defined plan before demolition; promises were made to provide housing…but they remained just that, promises…3) the irreversibility of destruction…mistakes cannot be undone.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lower Hill Redevelopment</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Builders Guild of Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Jason Finkle</td>
<td>&quot;I am here today on behalf of my members and my board of directors…all together the Builders Guild represents about 40,000 workers and hundreds of professional contractors. We believe the demolition of the Civic Arena and the transition of the area into a commercial and residential mixed use development would allow that transformation to continue...into a potentially vibrant residential and commercial community center. In replacing the Arena, we are not destroying memories, but building dreams.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Thomas O. Gray</td>
<td>&quot;I urge you to carefully consider the option of saving the Civic Arena from demolition. I believe it is irresponsible to demolish such a much taxpayer-funded institution in the simplified interest of &quot;wanting fresh&quot; or because nobody can imagine any development there unless the site is cleared right away. Please look at the attached drawings for specifics. ...in the real right thing to do to destroy all of this?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Testimony of Tom Armstrong, Former Chairman of the Pittsburgh City Planning Commission</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Tom Armstrong</td>
<td>&quot;I have three key points to communicate to you, regarding the purpose and intent of both local and federal law: 1. Federal Section 106 Process - the actions you have taken…may place future funding in jeopardy…2. New Parking Lot Approvals - the city code explicitly does not allow buildings to be demolished for surface parking lots…3. Demolition Approval - a request for demolition permit...I would probably insert someone to nominate the structure, resulting in a complete process...I encourage you to table the vote to demolish and engage…in a true public engagement process.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Comments to the Board of Directors of the Stadium &amp; Exhibition Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>John Stephen</td>
<td>&quot;I strongly recommend that the Board defer a demolition decision long enough to complete a planning process that accomplishes four things: (1) satisfies the federal historic review process; (2) allows for a credible test of the irreplaceable cost; (3) solicits long-range development proposals and concepts for the Lower Hill Development site; and (4) integrates the unfinished work of the Hill District Master Plan and the Green Print.”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Peter Floyd</td>
<td>&quot;I am a very interested Party in seeing the appropriate reuse of the Civic Arena; a national historic landmark at regional asset supported by our taxes...Comments included “Option 5. Ready!.. Past Urban Planning Procedures...Return of the Street Grid; A Green Seat; Missing Analysis...Green Pittsburgh; American Historic Preservation Lessons Learned...Pittsburgh’s Own Central Park or Millennium Park.”</td>
<td>Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Mark Rivell</td>
<td>&quot;The historical significance of the Mellon Arena is important, but more importantly is the fiscal solvency of the property and ensuring it does not become a burden on the community... In the interest of such a goal I suggest Women’s Roller Derby.”</td>
<td>Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Audrey Reichbloom</td>
<td>Submitted her comments, as well as others. &quot;I stand here to read the following letters from two people who could not attend today's meeting... I read them with the understanding that you all understand then we all want the arena as an economic, social, and cultural benefit to the entire region...it is unique and this is your unique opportunity to save a building like no other in the world.”</td>
<td>Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen (resident of Washington Works)</td>
<td>Earl Douglas Childs</td>
<td>&quot;My interest is to see the area served by a project that can benefit the people of the Hill District the c/p and the county immediately...&quot;Preseerving and repurposing the civic Arena has the most potential to serve multiple age groups in the hill from all areas of the hill; to serve as a unique venue that will complement the new Energy center...&quot; A hastily redevelopment starting from scratch only repeats the urban renewal mistakes of the past.”</td>
<td>Submission</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP</td>
<td>David Bear</td>
<td>I would like to use this three minutes...about alternative visions might be: &quot;Obviously the three-minute time limit for each speaker and the tightly controlled structure, with no opportunities for question or open discussion makes this an inappropriate forum in which to present a comprehensive report.&quot; &quot;Todd Poole will be back next week to present our Prospects for a Civic Renewal before a party of all interested parties, adjacent communities, the city, the region and even the Penguins, because it proposes tangible benefits for all these groups.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Statement of State Senator Jim Perla</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Sen. Jim Perla</td>
<td>Certainly, we cannot lose sight of, or understate, the social and political destruction of a significant part of the Hill District community decades ago in the days of urban renewal, elitist planning, and myopic decision-making. As comments today are strategically focused on the significant lack of transparency in the deliberations of the Authority and its paid consultants as it relates to an aborted process of community participation. Please report any demolition at this time...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Greater Hill District Development Principles</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Hill District Consensus Group / IP</td>
<td>Carl Redwood</td>
<td>&quot;We expect that Hill residents will benefit from all future Lower Hill development. We will not support either plan if there are not clear benefits for Hill residents and businesses. These public benefits must be spelled out in advance and must be measurable [for example, if the Hill District apprentice on construction for every $1m in public subsidy, $1 car donation to the Hill District Community Improvement Fund from all surface and structured parking revenue receiving public subsidy...]&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>From Wacky to Brilliant</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Preservation Pittsburgh / IP</td>
<td>Scott Leib</td>
<td>&quot;The idea that a repurposed Civic Arena can be an economic magnet. Many leaders in the Hill District have also said that they could support reuse of the Arena if it shows economic benefit to the Hill. In contrast, the Penguins are following an old urban renewal pattern that we must have a clear state to effectively develop land. We believe that a repurposed Civic Arena [like High Line Park] has similar potential. An effective process that includes all stakeholders should explore this incredible economic potential to benefit the Hill District, Pittsburgh Allegheny Court, and the Penguins.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>23-Aug-10</td>
<td>Regional Housing Legal Services</td>
<td>Robert Dannerwood</td>
<td>&quot;Please accept the following comments on behalf of the Hill House Association. The Lower Hill can and should be redeveloped in a way that rearticulates the area into the cultural fabric of the neighborhood, provides housing and job opportunities for Hill District residents, and serves as a catalyst for market-driven investment throughout the Hill. The preliminary development plan offered by the Penguins – to remove much of the pre-urban renewal street grid and redevelop the area for commercial, residential and mixed uses - are largely consistent with this objective.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>22-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Sophie Masloff</td>
<td>&quot;It is not surprising to me that no realistic reuse suggestion have come forward considering that is a very large domed shaped building all windows.&quot; &quot;What the City does need at that location is development, including housing, that will create jobs and opportunities and the potential for future growth.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>22-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Renita Zumbro (Washington Plaza resident)</td>
<td>&quot;Please be aware that a repurposed Civic Arena can be an economic magnet. Many leaders in the Hill District have also said that they could support reuse of the Arena if it shows economic benefit to the Hill. In contrast, the Penguins are following an old urban renewal pattern that we must have a clear state to effectively develop land. We believe that a repurposed Civic Arena [like High Line Park] has similar potential. An effective process that includes all stakeholders should explore this incredible economic potential to benefit the Hill District, Pittsburgh Allegheny Court, and the Penguins.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>20-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Larry Glace</td>
<td>&quot;Lessons we have learned from mistakes made in redeveloping the Lower Hill in 1950s...1) the importance of proceeding slowly, thoughtfully, and with full transparency...2) the importance of having a clearly defined plan before proceeding with demolition...3) the irreversibility of destruction...&quot; &quot;That is why it is crucial to proceed slowly and carefully, fully airing of alternatives and complete understanding of what is coming.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>20-Aug-10</td>
<td>Continental Real Estate Companies</td>
<td>Barry Ford</td>
<td>&quot;We have not studied potential reuse options for the Arena, we believe from experience that the reuse of large single-purpose facilities is generally very difficult and very expensive. We would envision taking years to develop a reuse concept and possibly longer to identify viable users for the facility. We believe a more sound development approach is the demolition of the Arena and the creation of a flexible development site adjacent to the Consol Energy Center...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment Options</td>
<td>20-Aug-10</td>
<td>Loftsus Engineers</td>
<td>Patrick Branch</td>
<td>&quot;As evidenced by the lack of viable private developer proposals, the building will not be utilized. At the same time there is no significant interest in developing the land into a viable part of the city. The building should be demolished and allow the private sector to develop the land for the benefit of the city rather than having it become an unusable eyesore and a liability.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Lower Hill Redevelopment Letter in Support of Option 5</td>
<td>19-Aug-10</td>
<td>CB Richard Ellis</td>
<td>Jack R. Norris</td>
<td>&quot;The conventional urban street and block pattern permits nine discrete development parcels with self-contained parking capacity that will facilitate a succession of new uses development at an appropriate urban scale. The bottom line of Option 5 is that it has by far the most significant effect on the creation of economic benefits for the City and County, the economics are overwhelming.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>2nd request for information, register to speak on 8/23</td>
<td>19-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Cindi Freeman</td>
<td>This is the second e-mail that has gone unanswered. I have requested information on the lack of an RFP for dome repair and interested Party presentations that are being considered from public view. Additionally, I have requested copies of all responses made to the &quot;Effect Report.&quot; I cannot prepare my commentary for next Tuesday's meeting unless I have this information available in a timely manner.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lower Hill Redevelopment</td>
<td>19-Aug-10</td>
<td>Burns &amp; Scal</td>
<td>James D. Scal</td>
<td>&quot;Understanding the national and regional marketplace, Pittsburgh's commercial real estate is performing in the top 10 markets. It is our belief that the Civic Arena, in its current form, is an inefficient use of the site. Keeping the arena will greatly discourage and prohibit development in and around the arena.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>19-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Rob Cranmer</td>
<td>&quot;...one mistake should not be exacerbated further. We all must bring ourselves to accept the fact that the Civic Arena across the street no longer has any viable purpose, and unlike Rome and its Coliseum, Pittsburgh cannot afford to let it stand. As it stands, as I see it, the Civic Arena needs to come down.&quot; &quot;...it is not time to bid farewell to the Civic Arena, say thanks for the memories, and permit the planned progress and development to move forward.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment</td>
<td>19-Aug-10</td>
<td>DLA Architecture</td>
<td>Dennis Astorino</td>
<td>&quot;I truly believe that one of our energies to save the Arena should have been exerted long before this point. Once I decided was made to build a new facility, the opportunity to save the Arena, in my opinion, was lost. I have never been one realistic, logical idea for operating this type of facility that is directly adjacent to the Consol Energy Arena.&quot; &quot;...I have set aside my emotions and look at the issues pragmatically. It is with a heavy heart that I must conclude that our community cannot support two facilities of this size that would serve the same function. It is not financially responsible.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Supporting Demolition of Hockey Arena</td>
<td>19-Aug-10</td>
<td>MDB &amp; Associates, LLC</td>
<td>Mikelotte Bluu</td>
<td>&quot;The Arena played a historic and important role in the redevelopment of Pittsburgh. While there should be different avenues to celebrate the contribution of the Arena to the Pittsburgh region, the redevelopment of the site...for sublease the readaptive reuse of the building. During my entire tenure as Executive Director of the RHA, I have always been reminded by the residents and leaders in the Hill District about the forced relocation residents and businesses to pay way for redevelopment of the Arena. I believe...we should reconnect the Hill District and downtown.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>19-Aug-10</td>
<td>NAI Pittsburgh Commercial</td>
<td>William J. Leone</td>
<td>&quot;Overall, it is our belief that the Mellon Arena is an inefficient use of the site that does not enhance the viability of development in and around the building. Instead, its presence becomes an impediment to logical development in that area.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 158    | Letter      | Pennsylvania History Code process, Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena) and Lower Hill Redevelopment project | 19-Aug-10 | PHMC - SHP | Jean Cutler               | "Due to a mix-up in our office, the letter you received was actually part of a draft which transposed two paragraphs and did not include what we believe to be important information regarding our comments to you."
<p>| 157    | Letter      | Civic Arena                | 19-Aug-10   | Ryon Construction, Inc. | Todd A. Dornreci    | &quot;Adaptive reuses is a legitimate goal for all buildings and it may be appropriate and feasible for many historic buildings. However, the age, size, scale and location of the Civic Arena seems to make adaptive reuse impractical. I believe that it is time to move forward with the demolition of the Civic Arena so that the Hill can be reconnected to the City and the site can be utilized for a variety of traditional and privately-owned urban uses.&quot; | Demolition      | Submitted for Aug 23, 2010 Pub ic meeting, catalogued item. |
| 156    | E-mail      | Save the Civic Arena!      | 18-Aug-10   | Citizen     | Mark Tomlinson             | &quot;The civic arena is the most iconic, interesting, and irreplaceable building in Pittsburgh, and it would be a shame to lose this gem of our history. I am in full support of Rob Phipps's vision to keep and reuse the Civic Arena shell and pursue alternate redevelopent plans for the site.&quot; | Preservation    | Added revised letter to catalog, see previous revision. |
| 155    | Letter      | Civic Arena                | 18-Aug-10   | Citizen     | Pierce Richardson         | &quot;I had the opportunity to work with private developers, governmental agencies, non-profits, and lenders in projects relating to older historic structures...&quot; &quot;It seems to me that the plan which calls for the demolition of the arena, the realisation of a traditional street grid and the construction of a mixed-use development on the site makes the most sense and should be pursued as quickly as possible.&quot; | Demolition      | Submitted for Aug 23, 2010 Pub ic meeting, catalogued item. |
| 154    | E-mail      | Please do not ignore the letter Andrea Fieser sent about the Igloo | 16-Aug-10   | Citizen     | JT Kaufmann               | &quot;There is compelling reason outside historical allegiance to seeing this structure. You are relying once again on the taxpayers to undermine the demolition... that along with the evidence in [the Fieser letter] renders any decision other than to save the Igloo as facely baseless, unsound and irresponsible.&quot; | Preservation    | Noted comments, catalogued item. |</p>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment Press Release</td>
<td>16-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen/IP Gary English</td>
<td>Request to be placed on SEA Board Meeting Agenda for public comment on Aug 23.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Placed on list for public comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment Press Release</td>
<td>16-Aug-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP Jason Harris</td>
<td>Request to be placed on SEA Board Meeting Agenda for public comment on Aug 23. &quot;I also feel it is in the best interest of the public to release ALL presentations given at the interested Perks meetings which would include presentations given by Gary English. Every perspective and opinion needs to be weighed by the public and withholding any information is detrimental to the process.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Placed on list for public comment. Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>16-Aug-10</td>
<td>Historic Hill Institute Kimberly Ellis</td>
<td>I'm outraged that anyone thinks the best solution to this issue is demolition. Some part of it should remain and be utilized in a way that ties our past to the &quot;second future&quot; of the Hill. Sen. Fontana's &quot;locally responsible&quot; answer is half-fail, half-empty glass argument at best. &quot;I implore the SEA to deliberate carefully and to reconsider the apparent foregone conclusion that only flattening this icon is acceptable.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Submitted and read at Aug 23, 2010 Public meeting, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Saving the Arena</td>
<td>14-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Bill West</td>
<td>I'm outraged that anyone thinks the best solution to this issue is demolition. Some part of it should remain and be utilized in a way that ties our past to the &quot;second future&quot; of the Hill. Sen. Fontana's &quot;locally responsible&quot; answer is half-fail, half-empty glass argument at best. &quot;I implore the SEA to deliberate carefully and to reconsider the apparent foregone conclusion that only flattening this icon is acceptable.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Forwarded from Sen. Fontana's office, noted comments and catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Please save the arena</td>
<td>14-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Lawrence G. Pearson</td>
<td>&quot;Please save that gorgeous addition to Pittsburgh's skyline – the Civic Arena. We will all regret it later on if it is razed. Guaranteed.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Note comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Save the Igloo!</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Al Zangrilli</td>
<td>&quot;Please save the Igloo!&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Nicholas Kynast</td>
<td>I've read the arguments for and against. I understand it's mostly about dollars on the one hand and nostalgia on the other. It may look like something quirky and arctic now, but it will look like the first home of the Penguins in years. And we will be able to see the Penguins and enjoy a strong message that Pittsburgh is a place that respects our past accomplishments as we reach into the future.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Gail Jarvis</td>
<td>&quot;Please save the Igloo!&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Demolition of Civic Arena</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen Audrey Reichblum</td>
<td>&quot;Please save the Igloo!&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Press Release</td>
<td>PHMC SAYS DELAY CIVIC ARENA DEMOLITION</td>
<td>12-Aug-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>&quot;Today PHMC commented on the SEA's Draft Options Report for the Civic Arena, indicating the following key points: 1) Any consideration of demolition should be delayed; and 2) Further study is needed to develop alternatives to demolition, assist preservation advocates, conduct a nationwide request for purposes for reuse, and 3) Pay for a more thorough review of economic viability.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Press Release</td>
<td>Lower Hill (Civic Arena) Redevelopment</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>SEA SEA</td>
<td>&quot;The SEA will have an abbreviated agenda at its meeting scheduled for Monday, August 23, 2010, and will devote most of the meeting time to taking public comment on the Lower Hill Redevelopment project and the future of the Civic Arena.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Pennsylvania History Code process, Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena) and Lower Hill Redevelopment project</td>
<td>12-Aug-10</td>
<td>PHMC - BHP Joan Cutler</td>
<td>&quot;We have received and reviewed all materials relevant to the SEA Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment project. As we have stated in the past, we are aware of no federal undertaking which would involve Section 10 of the NHPA for this project.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>12-Aug-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>&quot;We are writing this letter to clarify the content and implications for Lower Hill redevelopment based on the recent legal opinion obtained by Reuse the Igloo and Preservation Pittsburgh. Our attorney, Andrea Fester, a national expert on federal preservation law sent to the SEA a letter which summarizes our understanding of the Federal historic preservation laws affecting the Civic Arena.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Proposed Demolition of the Mellon Arena</td>
<td>10-Aug-10</td>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Colleen Duvan-Vaughn</td>
<td>&quot;With regard to anticipatory demolition, the information provided about this undertaking does not establish that Section 110(5) of NHPA is applicable since there does not appear to be an applicant that has carried out an activity that would require Section 110 review. Further, all discussions regarding the Mellon Arena and its future prospects are more speculative than definitive with no firm assurances, to date, of future Federal funding.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>9-Aug-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP</td>
<td>David Bear</td>
<td>&quot;As we discussed, we want members of the board to be fully informed regarding the many and complex issues about the repositioning of the Civic Arena. Because we have no confidence in the Interested Parties Process (which we have fully participated in), the summary report it will produce, will not the ACHP's/OBD's financial assessments upon which it has been predicated. Reuse the Igloo and Preservation Pittsburgh have hired an expert to conduct a separate analysis. This report is now complete. We request time for this presentation to be included on Aug 23rd board agenda.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Response to Draft Report on Civic Arena</td>
<td>7-Aug-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>&quot;To elected Officials of the Hill: Whether we agree on the Arena or not, we should agree on the poor public engagement process and huge losses of legal and economic consequence (see two attachments) to the Hill and the Region at large. Please take the time to read the SEA's report and our response. There is a lot here to consider and it takes time to absorb. We believe and can now demonstrate the economic viability of the arena&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>8-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Cindi Freeman</td>
<td>&quot;I am responding because I have found that today is the last opportunity to comment on Arena issue.&quot; Comments include culture review process, public meetings, Graylish presentation/posting, conflicts of interest with respect to consultants of SEA, condition of Mellon Arena, Penguins development rights, auction of arena assets, federal funding, preservation alternatives, and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Mellon (Civic) Arena</td>
<td>6-Aug-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Penguins / IP</td>
<td>Travis Williams</td>
<td>Comments on the Determination of Effects Report dated June 2010. &quot;It is the Penguin's strong belief that, of the various development options for Mellon Arena (now Civic Arena), Option 5 - Demolition and Site Development is the only financially viable and prudent option for the Authority, the Lower Hill District and the broader Hill District and Uptown community. &quot;It is the single, most significant facts in Mr. Poole's data presentation at IP #8 meeting, analysis and conclusions are described in detail [copy attached].&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>SEA Report</td>
<td>6-Aug-10</td>
<td>Preservation Pittsburgh / IP</td>
<td>Scott Leb</td>
<td>Responded that comments on the Options Report are &quot;being submitted with those of Reuse the Igloo.&quot; &quot;The purpose of this letter is to notify you of my disappointment regarding the SEA &quot;interested Parties&quot; process.&quot; Also commented on reviews processes held by other projects (Portland, Houston), economic analysis done, taxpayer impacts on demolition/infrastructure, Penguins agreement, preservation as economic benefits, and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 134   | Letter      | Response Report RI 8-6-10.pdf | 8-Aug-10   | Reuse the Igloo / IP        | Rob Pfaffmann          | Submitted a 42-page response on the Development Options Comparison Report (July 2010) report and states "we are submitting enclosed critique under protest...we strongly object to the methodology employed by the SEA, and its consultants." In accompanying e-mail cover letter, RTI requests "to allow our economic and legal representatives 10 minutes each" at next Board meeting, and "that each board member publicly testify that they have READ all the documents, addenda and responses, for the record."
<p>| 133   | Letter      | Notice Regarding Anticipatory Demolition of Civic Arena | 5-Aug-10   | Andrea C. Fentner Law Office | Andrea C. Fentner | The letter is written on behalf of Preservation Pittsburgh and Reuse the Igloo concerning the plans under consideration by SEA to demolish Civic Arena. &quot;Your agency has provided no sound reason for why it is necessary to proceed with the demolition of the arena at this point. Indeed, public statements that the arena must be demolished in order to undertake the street grid modifications for which federal funding is sought confirm the wisdom of reposition, re-purposing of the arena.&quot; | Planning    | Noted comments, see letter, catalogued item. |
| 132   | Letter      | Section 106                 | 5-Aug-10   | Pittsburgh History &amp; Landmarks Foundation | Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr. | PHLP provided primer on Section 106 in California discussing segmentation, as well as various preservation cases. | Planning    | Noted comments, catalogued item. |
| 131   | Letter      | Response to Memorandum and Comments on the Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment Draft Reports | 5-Aug-10   | Pittsburgh History &amp; Landmarks Foundation | Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr. and Anne E. Nelson, Esq. | PHLP provided some clarification to the Memorandum sent by Oxford to PHMC/IP on July 30, 2010, and provided comments on the Draft Reports that were distributed to IP. Comments focus on Section 106 process potential federal funding and applicability of Section 106 process; compliance of Draft Reports with State History Code, and other matters. | Planning    | PHLP provided response to July 30 memo sent by Oxford to PHMC/IP (see catalogued item). |
| 130   | Letter      | Request for SEA informational session | 5-Aug-10   | Reuse the Igloo / IP        | David Bear           | &quot;we want members of the board to be fully informed regarding the many and complex issues about the repurposing of the Civic Arena...we have no faith in the integrity of the Interested Parties Process in which we have fully participated, the summary report it will produce, one of the OBD/OBD financial numbers upon which it has predicated...&quot;...we urge you again, as board chair, to schedule that session...to give our experts present findings directly to board members.&quot; | Planning    | Letter to Senator Fontana, noted comments and catalogued items. |</p>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>UPDATE Response to Effects Report</td>
<td>4-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP</td>
<td>Gary English</td>
<td>This is an update to his previous response to Effects Report. Comment on various items including the cultural review process, IP meetings and minutes, Effects Reports, and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, forwarded to PHMC-BHP, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Quarterly Community Update, Civic Arena and PA State History Code</td>
<td>4-Aug-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Notes by Oxford of the Quarterly Community Update meeting held at Consol Energy Center on Aug 3, hosted by Pens and attended by Pens staff, SEA staff, Oxford (Chris C.), arena construction team; First Source, Hill residents, IP members, media, business owners and others.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>3-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Tee Cee Furiga</td>
<td>I am opposed to the demolition of the Civic Arena.*</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Future of Civic Arena site</td>
<td>3-Aug-10</td>
<td>Uptown Business Owners</td>
<td>Anthony Williams</td>
<td>I believe the current Arena is a barrier to connecting our communities. It is a wall, not a bridge. If not demolished, it would run the potential benefits of a very beautiful and developable tract of land.*</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, forwarded to PHMC-BHP, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>the Igloo</td>
<td>2-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Syl Damianco</td>
<td>“As an architect and planner in the region for over 50 years, I would like to add my name in support of the effort to save the arena. It is a unique landmark for the City of Pittsburgh and the proposals I have seen to adaptive reuse and reconnection to the Hill District have credit to. I am not convinced that the concept for demolition or redevelopment are appropriate and will ever be realized.”</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, forwarded to PHMC-BHP, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Public Comment to the SEA &quot;Effects Report&quot;</td>
<td>2-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Lisa Morrow</td>
<td>“...I feel compelled to respond to the Mellon Arena &quot;effects report&quot;. &quot;Since the minutes were abstract not verbatim, I must question the accuracy. I have to question the objectivity of these consultants...&quot; The report does not subside the monthly [hourly?] costs and li is to indirectly the revenue streams from daily parking at the arena. &quot;[Mr. English] presentations must be included.&quot; Writer also commented on other various matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, forwarded to PHMC-BHP, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>2-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Geoff Santilliquido</td>
<td>“I am writing you to encourage preservation of the Civic Arena. Once it is gone, it is forever. Take the opportunity you have to turn it into a jewel, not a darned parking lot.”</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, forwarded to PHMC-BHP, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena Future</td>
<td>2-Aug-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Barbie Suhr</td>
<td>“Please help to save our Civic Arena...To me building for the future doesn’t mean to wipe out the past.”</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, forwarded to PHMC-BHP, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena Future</td>
<td>2-Aug-10</td>
<td>Hill District Consensus Group / IP</td>
<td>Carl Redwood</td>
<td>The Hill District Consensus Group strongly requests that no decision regarding the future of the Civic Arena should be made without a full review of the benefits that either plan will provide for Hill residents and businesses.”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Options Report - Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>2-Aug-10</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Tim Zinn</td>
<td>The purpose...is to clarify issues raised during IP meeting #7 and #8 regarding the selection of a &quot;Preferred Alternative&quot; in the [Options Comparison Report]. &quot;If Process. Although the proposed project does not involve a federal action, the SEA chose to use decision-making procedures that are modeled on two federal laws (NEPA and Section 106 of NHPA) 2. Preferred Alternative. The IPs did not—nor were they asked—to determine the Purpose and Need or select Option 5 as their preferred alternative...the final selection...is the prerogative of the SEA’s boards.”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Response to IP members comments in meetings #7 and #8, distributed to IPs, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>31-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP</td>
<td>Gary English</td>
<td>Response to July 30, 2010 e-mail by Lisa Olslak re: forwarding “PHMC request for comment” letter. Gary English comments: “Extending the deadline for a third time will unlikely change the results.” Since the aforementioned [point raised] has completed the Section 106 process, no other method can fairly take place other than to put the decision of this publicly owned “historic” facility...to a Nov 2, 2010 referendum and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Right-To-Know Law Request Regarding highway signage</td>
<td>30-Jul-10</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Mary K. Conturo</td>
<td>Response to July 22 e-mail requesting &quot;under the &quot;PA Right to Know&quot; who authorized this sign change form the Sports &amp; Exhibition Authority.&quot; SEA responds: &quot;Although your message does not constitute a Right To Know law request, please be advised the purchase of traffic control signs...was approved as project expenditure at the SEA’s May 20 meeting.”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Response to July 22 e-mail (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>PA History Code Process, Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>30-Jul-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>The SEA responds to the PHLF letter dated July 15, and comments to 4Ward Planning’s critique/presentation of CRE and ACCORD economic analysis, and request to extend process 1 year. And other matters. SEA extends the comment period for 10 days for the Option Report and/or Effects Report in August 10. After this date, the consultant will finalize the reports. The SEA will then review reports et al and make a decision regarding the redevelopment of the site.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Responses to letter from PHLF dated July 15, 2010, and comments/response to IP’s consultant 4Ward Planning presentation at IP meeting #9 (see catalogued items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Please reconsider your support for the seriously flawed Civic Arena historic review process</td>
<td>26-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP</td>
<td>Jeff Slack</td>
<td>Cited correspondence from PHMC and PHLF regarding critical feedback on process. &quot;I ask again how can you continue to respect this historic review process and the result it will produce?&quot; &quot;Please…consider endorsing a valid historic review process.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>E-mail to Chief Executive, forwarded to SEA, noted comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Roof Opening History</td>
<td>28-Jul-10</td>
<td>SMG</td>
<td>Jay Roberts</td>
<td>A summary compiled by SMG general manager, Jay Roberts, manager of then Mellon Arena, as it relates to the history of opening the roof, interviews with various trades people, complications if trying to open the roof today, and recommendations.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>An Example</td>
<td>24-Jul-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP</td>
<td>Rob Pfeffermann</td>
<td>Mr. Pfeffermann sent the agenda of the Rose Quarter Development (Portland) to show their process.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>reuse of igloo</td>
<td>23-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Michael Keenan</td>
<td>&quot;...especially given the projected additional service cuts of the port authority… / feel you should turn the entire arena into a parking garage.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail on Aug 6, noted comments, see catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Reuse the Arena! Conversation</td>
<td>22-Jul-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP</td>
<td>David Bear</td>
<td>E-mail to Senator Fontana “This is a follow-up to our conversation at the end of last week’s Sea board meeting… / we urge you again, as board chair, to schedule that [informational] session we discussed to give our experts to present findings directly to board members.” Attached media press release “Penguins Economic Analysis of Lower Hill Deeply Flawed.”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Senator forwarded to SEA, noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>SEA Censorship and ignoring IP Recommendations</td>
<td>21-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP</td>
<td>Gary English</td>
<td>Various comments in thread, including &quot;Missing from the website is my presentation.&quot; &quot;I advocated the reuse of the Arena that is not detailed. I identified 15 revenue streams available to Arena...&quot; SEA’s failing their fiduciary responsibilities to taxpayers... the abysmal failure of the IP Committee Process.&quot; &quot;I’m requesting that the comment period for the &quot;Effect Report&quot; be suspended until these issues are resolved... and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Responded to PHMC, BHP, Sen. Fants, Jacki Freeman, Mary Conturo that his correspondence is catalogued and in files for consideration by Board during process, noted comments, see catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Arena</td>
<td>21-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP</td>
<td>Gary English</td>
<td>E-mail thread w/ San Fontana’s chief of staff requesting an appointment with Senator. Mr. English asked if Senator had attended IP meeting #8 or reviewed his presentation on SEA website, and stated that Civic Arena is Senate business. Chief of staff indicated that Senator “is receiving all information that you have sent him.” Has, and will continue to, share all information that he receives with his fellow SEA Board members and staff.”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>IP Meeting #8 Minutes</td>
<td>20-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>RL Mitchell</td>
<td>It seems to me that you are censoring the other presentation given by Mr. English that included arena re-use proposal, identified arena funding streams and was critical of the SEA’s “interested parties” process. Me and my wife would have liked to have made public comments but these meetings were closed to the media and public.”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>SEA-Arena E-mails</td>
<td>20-Jul-10</td>
<td>Senator Fontana</td>
<td>Annie M. Owens, Esq</td>
<td>Senator Fontana directed his chief of staff to forward various letters and e-mails to SEA re. Mellon (Civic) Arena that had been sent to his office.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>SEA has received various letters and e-mails, noted comments and catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Contact Form Submitted [re Civic Arena]</td>
<td>17-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Melissa McSweeney</td>
<td>Sent through Sen. Fontana’s website submission form. “There have been too may examples of viable or interesting buildings being torn down using taxpayer money only to result in a failed outcome. What assurances do we have that the Penguins development is needed, sustainable, aesthetically pleasing, and will not detract from the other development?” &quot;I respectfully urge you to ask the SEA Board to defer Civic Arena demolition until all reasonable and viable options are explored in an open and inclusive manner.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Conference Call &amp; Webinar</td>
<td>RE: Gary English</td>
<td>16-Jul-10</td>
<td>Senator Fontana</td>
<td>Annie M. Owens, Esq</td>
<td>Chief of staff forwarded notes re. Mr. Eng’s phone call. Comments include historic review process, public meetings should be held in all county districts, economic impacts, public subsidies, conflict of interest with respect to consultants, Interests of Hill District, demolition contrary to RAD tax, believes public is against demolition, there should be public referendum question, federal funding issues, and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Hill District traffic study</td>
<td>16-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen Mary Straughn Robson</td>
<td>Requested arena traffic study. &quot;My father is interested in taking a critical look at the existing traffic patterns in the Hill. At the very least he needs the vehicle counts on streets in and around the Hill. Can you help me with this?&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Forwarded Arena Traffic Study to Ms. Robson on July 17, 2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>SEA &quot;Interested Party&quot; Process is fraught with corruption</td>
<td>16-Jul-10</td>
<td>Senator Fontana Gary English</td>
<td>Mr. English sent his 3rd meeting presentation to Senator. &quot;I am sending you a copy of my presentation...and hope to speak with you soon after.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Sen. Fontana's chief of staff forwarded e-mails/letters to SEA, noted comments, catalogued items.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>SEA/Fontana Meeting Request</td>
<td>16-Jul-10</td>
<td>Senator Fontana Gary English</td>
<td>Senator Fontana forwarded e-mail from Gary English who requested a meeting with Senator regarding various issues including financing, cultural review process, his presentation and other matters to an e-mail thread with Chief of Staff Amy Doane. Ms. Doane indicated to Mr. English that communications should be with SEA re Mellon Arena, as the project relates to senator's service as an SEA Board member.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>F/u with SEA, noted comments and catalogued items.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>16-Jul-10</td>
<td>Macalaster Cornelius &amp; Filoni et al</td>
<td>&quot;I am writing to you...asking you not to support demolition of the Civic Arena. The Civic Arena deserves to be designated a historic landmark. All changes and additions should be removed so that it is returned to its original condition, and it should be made an integral part of a &quot;new&quot; Hill Community.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Sen forwarded letter to SEA, noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>Senator Fontana Gary English</td>
<td>&quot;I am in favor of exploring all reasonable and viable options regarding reuse of the arena and want to see the SEA Board vote to defer demolition until all options have been carefully considered.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Forwarded by Kate Molnar (Historic Preservation Planner for City), noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen Barbara J. Latas</td>
<td>&quot;I wish to be on record as opposing the demolition of the Mellon Arena until all reasonable and tenable options for its preservation and continued operation are being considered.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Forwarded by Kate Molnar (Historic Preservation Planner for City), noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo (Mellon Arena)</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen Alicia Micsic</td>
<td>&quot;Please, please, save this wonderful and historic structure. There MUST be more to the world besides tearing out things we feel are useless. Shouldn't we, at the very least, salvage our history as well?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail on Aug 6, noted comments, see catalogued item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo...</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen Rob Mclnster</td>
<td>&quot;I am seeing far too many uninterested in preserving our past from this time period. Just because it is not from what some consider an &quot;historical&quot; era, does not mean it is not historic or full of historic meaning to the community. We need to stop throwing away buildings and rethink how we are as a consumer based culture...thinking of a better future.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Forwarded by Kate Molnar (Historic Preservation Planner for City), noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>URGENT EMAILS TO RAVENSTHAL &amp; PORORATO NEEDED ASAP!</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen Lee Calati, AIA</td>
<td>&quot;I am seeing far too many uninterested in preserving our past from this time period. Just because it is not from what some consider an &quot;historical&quot; era, does not mean it is not historic or full of historic meaning to the community. We need to stop throwing away buildings and rethink how we are as a consumer based culture...thinking of a better future.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail on Aug 6, noted comments, see catalogued item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Example of a process right here - Garden Theater Block</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>Sent his plan for redevelopment of Garden Theater Block on North Side. &quot;This is an example of what should have been and could be done with an arena process. It took about 8 months. If we avoid a protracted legal and delay fight and use our resources to develop a real process would that be better for all of us.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Sent letter to PHMC on July 30, responding to comments from this PHLF letter, see catalogued item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh History &amp; Landmarks Foundation / IP Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr.</td>
<td>&quot;We appreciate the SEA's efforts to comply with the PA State History Code in reviewing and analyzing alternative for the redevelopment of the Mellon Arena site. While the SEA is attempting to mirror the State History Code review process with Section 106, this does not put the SEA in compliance with Section 106 as advised numerous times.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Sent letter to PHMC on July 15, 2010, requesting comments from this PHLF letter, see catalogued item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Minutes of SEA Board Meeting - July 15, 2010.</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Public comments at July 15, 2010 at SEA Board meeting. 5 speakers spoke primarily on cultural review process, economic analysis, historic designation, aggressive timelines, review of materials, public perception of demolition vs preservation and process, preservation benefits, board decision making, analysis of opening the dome and costs, request for technical documents, Baker consultants qualifications, prudence in making decisions, and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Defer demolition</td>
<td>14-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Jenni Easton</td>
<td>&quot;To tear an iconic piece of Pittsburgh's skyline would be a tragedy. To do so without a fair, deliberative and truly collaborative decision-making process would be an absolute crime.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail on Aug 6, noted comments, see catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Re-use the Igloo (Mellon/Civic Arena)</td>
<td>14-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Barb Toland-Wood</td>
<td>&quot;I am 100% behind the effort to keep the Mellon/Civic Arena standing &amp; re-purposed into something else. Would also like for the SEA group to defer demolition until an in-depth study can be done to determine its future.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail on Aug 6, noted comments, see catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Press Release</td>
<td>Penguins Plan Based on Faulty Numbers</td>
<td>13-Jul-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP</td>
<td>David Bear</td>
<td>According to Todd J. Prose, the figures and assumptions being used to justify the demolition of... Civic Arena are flawed, and any decision regarding the building should be postponed until proper assessments can be made.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>ERA/UCOM submitted response, see Aug 6 letter by Penguins, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo</td>
<td>10-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Bianca Palmerso</td>
<td>&quot;Mellon Arena's space is vast and could be broken into smaller sections for retail sales, performance spaces and even community spaces like an ice rink. Please consider these options before Mellon Arena is destroyed and claimed by urban decay.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail Aug 6, noted comments, see catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Development Options Comparison Report - Second Draft?</td>
<td>9-Jul-10</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo / IP</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>Mr. Pfaffmann sent e-mail to Oxford related to release of second draft of Option Report including timing of release, report name change, coordination with Hill group, request for back-up reports/data, process and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Mellon Arena / FHWA response</td>
<td>7-Jul-10</td>
<td>Mellon Arena / IP</td>
<td>Renee Sigel</td>
<td>&quot;...the FHWA has no discretion or influence and cannot participate in Section 106 consultation on this activity.&quot;</td>
<td>FHWA response</td>
<td>FHWA response to Jean Cutler June 16 letter, noted comments, see catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Ped - Two unanswered e-mails</td>
<td>6-Jul-10</td>
<td>Senator Logan's office</td>
<td>Senator Logan</td>
<td>As a continuing e-mail thread between Sen. Pitts and Sen. Logan re: following up on Gary English's request to present at IP meeting #4 July 13, and Sen. Ferris' question on process of allowing speakers at Board meetings. Sen. Logan responds &quot;in my 5 years on the SEA Board, I can never remember an instance where an individual in group not allowed to speak. As it relates to Mr. English, I have spoken to him about the arena...he has no suggestion on how the SEA can appropriately maintain this very expensive structure in addition to other facilities...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Civic Arena Preservation</td>
<td>5-Jul-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Caesak</td>
<td>Response to Gary English's June 5, 2010 e-mail, &quot;two unanswered e-mails&quot; - his questions about Section 106 process, inclusiveness of process, RAO bill and other matters. Oxford invited Mr. English to present his redevelopment alternative at IP meeting #4, July 13th.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail to Mr. English (see catalogued item), copied Sen. Pitts, BHP and PHMC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Letter re: future of Mellon Arena</td>
<td>2-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Russell Guest</td>
<td>&quot;The plan to demolish the Mellon is &quot;to reestablish a street grid&quot; is misleading. Think about the opportunity to correct our mistake...not coudly under the failed urban revitalization efforts of the Mid-Century Era. I also suggest a...design competition from around the world to redevelop and reuse the Mellon Arena site...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, responded to Mr. Guest via letter on July 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>PA: SEA Executive Director needs to step down</td>
<td>1-Jul-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>RJ Mitchell</td>
<td>Continuation of e-mail thread (Open the Dome on Saturday, June 25 e-mail), includes dome not opening for James Taylor concert, development rights, naming rights, asset sale, demolition costs, RAO funding, SCAIR funding, and other matters.</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Historic Hill Institute - Community Meeting</td>
<td>30-Jun-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Caesak</td>
<td>Notes taken during a public meeting hosted by HHI at Ebenezer Baptist Church. Clarence Curry attending with Chris. Presentations give by Kim Elks, Brenda Tate, Sala Udin, Larry Glasso, Emma Lucas Girty, Carl Rockwood, Jason Matthews and Scott Leib.</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Materials collected, points of view noted and catalogued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>PA History Code Process, Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>26-Jun-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Caesak</td>
<td>E-mail to Jean Cutler in response to her June 16, 2010 letter to SEA, regarding to BHP's concerns of Section 106 consultation process, timeline and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail to PHMC-BHP letter (see catalogued item).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Source Title and/or Subject</td>
<td>Source Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Source Author / Contributor</td>
<td>Excerpt and/or Summary</td>
<td>Point of View</td>
<td>Response and/or Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Open The Dome</td>
<td>25-Jun-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Cindi Freeman</td>
<td>E-mail thread that included request to open the dome for James Taylor concert, as well as cost of demolition, repair of roof, outstanding debt of Mellon Arena, and other matters.</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Comments noted, catalogued, and staff responded several times via e-mail thread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Open The Dome On Saturday</td>
<td>25-Jun-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>RJ Mitchell</td>
<td>E-mail thread that included request to open the dome for James Taylor concert, comments on RAD funding, preservation, and other matters.</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Comments noted, catalogued, and Executive Director responded via e-mail thread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>The Last Concert</td>
<td>25-Jun-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Lisa Morrow</td>
<td>E-mail thread that included request to open the dome for James Taylor concert, Interested Party process and timeline, public participation, Section 106 process, preservation, and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Comments noted, catalogued, and staff responded several times via e-mail thread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Preservation Questions Call with PHMC-BHP</td>
<td>17-Jun-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Purpose of call to discuss with Bill Callahan the letter sent by Jean Cutler, dated June 16, 2010 re SEA's following Section 106, and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Held conference call to follow-up on comments (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Preservation Questions Call with PHLF and PHMC - BHP</td>
<td>16-Jun-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Purpose of call to PHLF to follow up on Anna's comments re Section 106 process and engaging Advisory Council, Purpose of call to PHMC-BHP regarding section 106 process, timeframe of process, Advisory Council and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Held conference call to follow-up on comments (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena Relocation</td>
<td>16-Jun-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Follow up to e-mail written by Mr. Wiegarten re relocating Mellon Arena to Vermont. When review process concludes, will follow up him.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Replied to e-mail (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Letter from PHMC-BHP to Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
<td>15-Jun-10</td>
<td>PHMC - BHP</td>
<td>Jean Cutler</td>
<td>Jean Cutter's seeking input from Advisory Council that &quot;if there is a federal undertaking, post demolition of Arena, that the federal agency would consider the demolition practicable, I would also like to know where the ACHP would be willing to enter into consultation now, prior to the determination that there is a federal undertaking...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Followed up with Jean Cutter/BHP via conf call (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Pennsylvania History Code process, Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena) and Lower Hill Redevelopment project</td>
<td>15-Jun-10</td>
<td>PHMC - BHP</td>
<td>Jean Cutler</td>
<td>&quot;Insofar as using Section 106 regulations as a template for complying with the state history code, the SEA has done well. However, it is impossible to anticipate how a federal agency would view the current process and its findings, and whether the Advisory Council would choose to participate and what their views might be.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Responded to letter (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Save Civic Arena</td>
<td>15-Jun-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>William Farley</td>
<td>&quot;Please don't tear down Civic Arena...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Point of view noted, and catalogued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Letter from PHMC-BHP to FHWA</td>
<td>14-Jun-10</td>
<td>PHMC - BHP</td>
<td>Jean Cutler</td>
<td>&quot;Jean Cutter's request of FHWA's involvement in this consultation process. Would FHWA agree to enter into consultation with us and the SEA prior to a federal undertaking being officially determined?&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Jean Cutter also sent letter to Advisory Council (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Lower Hill (Mellon Arena Site) Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>11-Jun-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Jason Harris</td>
<td>&quot;...I am amazed that after getting the comments you did, you were able to conclude that the Arena should be torn down...I feel there is plenty of public support for keeping and reusing the Arena and there needs to be more public input and a process to allow for this.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Point of view noted, and catalogued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Source Title and/or Subject</td>
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<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Preservation Questions Meeting Summary - PHBC-BHP</td>
<td>10-Jun-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Purpose of call - to review IP meeting #7 comments and RFI June 8, 2010 letter regarding Section 106 process</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Discussion of RFI letter (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>SEA IP Committee Meetings</td>
<td>10-Jun-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP</td>
<td>Gary English</td>
<td>“...I have asked numerous questions and have proposed several remedies to faulty process that has taken place during the IP Meeting process, my questions have been ignored...”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Response to e-mail via letter (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>4Ward Planning Analysis</td>
<td>10-Jun-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Sent to Rob P., Jeff Slack, RTI Steering Committee, Todd Poole, 4Ward Planning. F/u to media reports that RTI intends to engage 4Ward Planning. Requesting scope of work, expected deliverables, and offering any assistance to help complete their efforts.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Inquiry to RTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Section 106 and Agenda for Interested Parties Meeting #7</td>
<td>9-Jun-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Response to June 8 letter to SEA re: RTI's comments on Section 106 process, mitigation discussions, refinements, timeline and other matters.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Responded to June 8 letter (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Civic Arena</td>
<td>9-Jun-10</td>
<td>McLachlan Cornelius &amp; Filoni / IP</td>
<td>Albert L. Filoni</td>
<td>Wrote to SEA that they &quot;believe that the Civic Arena is a significant architectural accomplishment that deserves the status of being designated a historic landmark structure. It should be saved.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Point of view noted, and catalogued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Arena Interested Parties Process</td>
<td>9-Jun-10</td>
<td>Preservation Pittsburgh / IP</td>
<td>Scott Leib</td>
<td>An extensive letter that outlines preservation Pittsburgh's ideas and concerns including the IP process, MDU, land use plan, sustainability, Oxford analysis, burdened sites and other matters.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Letter received and comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Section 106 and Agenda for Interested Parties Meeting #7</td>
<td>8-Jun-10</td>
<td>Re-Use the Igloo / IP</td>
<td>Jeff Slack</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo outline concerns re: Section 106 process has not been followed, and offered suggestions moving forward.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded to letter (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>IP Member asks for County Ballot Initiative on Civic Arena presentation</td>
<td>5-Jun-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP</td>
<td>Gary English</td>
<td>Requested under Right to Know various documents including contracts for Oxford, subs and other consulting firms. Also commented on meeting minutes, proposed funding streams for re-use of Mellon Arena and remedies to his points.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded to e-mail via letter (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Preservation Questions - Meeting with Reuse the Igloo and 4Ward Planning</td>
<td>1-Jun-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Todd Poole (4Ward Planning) did not prefer either plan (hotel in arena vs. no arena); economic analysis should not count migration of jobs as &quot;new&quot; jobs or taxes. RTI requested equalizing programmatic assumptions; Todd agreed that unconstrained site best for private developers.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Meeting further to RTI's May 5th letter for economic analysts to meet and further evaluate economic benefits (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Preservation Questions Meeting Summary - PHBC-BHP</td>
<td>27-May-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Purpose of call - to discuss with Bill Callahan schedule for submitting Options Report and obtain feedback from BHP on approach. This is follow-up to May 26 e-mail to Bill.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Follow-up to e-mail to BHP re: release of Draft Options Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Young Preservationists Association of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>27-May-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>CC; Dan Holland discussed YPA's Top Ten Best Historic Opportunities - Mellon Arena is not included. YPA shared mixed feelings about preserving arena, general sense wasn't feasible. YPA has not taken formal position, but tie to discuss what goes there after decision made.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Held conference call for background (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>SEA - Lower Hill Redevelopment Project - IP Meetings</td>
<td>27-May-10</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Website summarizes historic review process, schedule, and has the various materials related to the Interested Party and public meetings in relation to the historic review process. Materials can be downloaded from website</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Items in pdf form on website, as well as cataloged items in SEA office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
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<td>Source Title and/or Subject</td>
<td>Source Date</td>
<td>Source Author / Contributor</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Find the Rivers! and Hill District Greenprint</td>
<td>26-May-10</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Text Baltimore said there were a lot of unknowns related to future Mellon Arena development but Greenprint efforts are to re-integrate neighborhood with downtown through linear connective green spaces.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Held conference call for background (see catalogued item)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>District Greenprint</td>
<td>26-May-10</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pittsburghparks.org/greenprint">www.pittsburghparks.org/greenprint</a></td>
<td>Find the Rivers! The Greenprint project is led by Walter Hood, w+g Arup, Studio for Spatial Practice. They’re working with community to determine the best locations for parks, gardens and trails...to establish visual and physical relationships between Hill and neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Bookmarked site, catalogued item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Facebook - Re-Use the Igloo ( Mellon Arena)</td>
<td>26-May-10</td>
<td><a href="http://www.facebook.com">www.facebook.com</a></td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>Social network site for Re-use the Igloo! As of Aug 9, 2010 - 4,787 members.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Oxford reviews site regularly, comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Find the Rivers!</td>
<td>26-May-10</td>
<td>findtherivers.net</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>A community partnership for enhancing the Hill District and its green spaces. Greenprint, a foundation for Hill District Master Plan.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Reviewed website, Greenprint, community planning process, bookmarked site, catalogued item (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Hill District Consensus Group</td>
<td>26-May-10</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hdcg.org">www.hdcg.org</a></td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Website of the planning efforts of the Hill District Consensus Group, including blog and other various resources.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Bookmarked site, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>FW - UDA’s failed master plan for Portland</td>
<td>21-May-10</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>Rob forwarded UDA’s presentation for the Portland redevelopment project - was not accepted by Portland.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo! /IP</td>
<td>21-May-10</td>
<td>Mary Conturo</td>
<td>Response to May 5, 2010 letter from Re-use the Igloo regarding scheduling adjustments and 1) shared financ- info and conducted additional analysis, 2) no Federal funding, lead agency has been identified.</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item (see catalogued item)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>The Long Center - Austin TX</td>
<td>20-May-10</td>
<td>Joe Saccomanno</td>
<td>Summary to convert old Palmer Auditorium to a new performing arts center. Development took 10 yrs, $77m cost, underwritten by foundation. Revenues cover 70%, 30% gap covered by donations.</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Referenced in Option Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Preservation Questions</td>
<td>19-May-10</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>CC spoke with Portland Development Commission to learn more about Memorial Coliseum and Rose Quarter Development.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Follow up Rob’s reference to Portland's re-use efforts (see catalogued item)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Preservation Questions - Neighbors in the Strip</td>
<td>19-May-10</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>CC spoke with Neighbors in the Strip to follow up on meeting May 13 with Scott Lab - his proposal for indooroutdoor market at Mellon Arena, Strip D, market is 10,000 sq ft, at $1.5m cost - size of Mellon Arena is 100,000 sq ft, and is 1 mile away from Terminal Bldg in Strip.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Follow up to meeting with SEA, Scott Lab, Oxford (see catalogued item)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rosequarterdevelopment.org">www.rosequarterdevelopment.org</a></td>
<td>19-May-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>CC spoke with Portland Development Commission to learn more about Memorial Coliseum and Rose Quarter Development. This is reference website which includes various documents during their cultural/resources review process.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Follow up Rob’s reference to Portland’s re-use efforts (see catalogued item)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>What’s Next For The Igloo?</td>
<td>17-May-10</td>
<td>Eve Pickar</td>
<td>A meeting, seminar that asked the question &quot;what are the very good reasons to either keep or get rid of Mellon Arena. Over 100 attended, with Kimberly Ellis, Christine French, Larry Glasco and Rob Pfaffmann as panelists and moderated by Evan Stoddard.</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>SEA staff attended, circulated meeting notes to consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Source Type</td>
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<td>Excerpt and/or Summary</td>
<td>Point of View</td>
<td>Response and/or Action</td>
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<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Comments on Public Meeting #1</td>
<td>13-May-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development / Baker</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Summary of comments presented at Public Meeting, May 13, at Ebenezer Church. Handouts included Guiding Principles of Hill District development, Reuse the Igloo handout.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Recorded and cataloged, see SEA website for all handouts from this meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting between Preservation Pittsburgh and SEA</td>
<td>13-May-10</td>
<td>Preservation Pittsburgh / IP</td>
<td>Scott Leib</td>
<td>Meeting with Scott Leib and Mary C. Agenda items included importance of Civic/Mellon Arena, preservation, adaptive re-use, SEA planning process and federal funding.</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Consultant discussions with Neighbors in the Strip, referenced in Options Report (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Preservation Questions - Bureau for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>11-May-10</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>The purpose of call to summarize key points from IP Meeting #6, get feedback from PHMC on draft economic analysis, to discuss receipt and response to Reuse the Igloo's letter of May 3, 2010, considering intangible benefits, cataloging correspondence.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Follow-up with PHMC as needed during review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Future of Mellon Arena</td>
<td>5-May-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Kathleen M. Dickinson</td>
<td>Would like us to consider historic, sentimental value. Find a way to continue its existence.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail, catalogued point of view (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lower Hill Redevelopment and Civic Arena - Cultural Resource Consultation Process</td>
<td>5-May-10</td>
<td>Re-Use the Igloo / IP</td>
<td>Re-Use the Igloo Steering Committee</td>
<td>Request delay in public information meeting on May 13, and clarification on funding.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Met with Todd Poor, see May 21, 2010 letter in response (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Mellon Arena Wish List</td>
<td>5-May-10</td>
<td>Heinz History Center</td>
<td>SMG</td>
<td>Heinz History requests several items for donation to museum after doing tour of Mellon Arena. Currently under discussion what will be donated</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Under discussion with transition group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Manager to the Fallen: Top 10 Buildings We Wish We Had Back</td>
<td>1-May-10</td>
<td>Young Preservationists Association of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Anna Binkley, Anna Broverman, Dan Ho</td>
<td>&quot;...we learned that urban renewal is not the way to revitalize cities...&quot; Hill District was chosen as a site. Does not mention Mellon Arena's potential for either re-use or demolition.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Top 10 Best Preservation Opportunities in the Pittsburgh Area</td>
<td>1-May-10</td>
<td>Young Preservationists Association of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>YPA Staff</td>
<td>YPA seeks to discuss various issues affecting Washington Plaza residents, one issue was their role in Mellon Arena redevelopment. Guest speaker included Rep. Wheatley, Councilman Lavelle, Rif Qureshi. Various viewpoints on Lower Hill development in Hill and region.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Washington Plaza Community Meeting</td>
<td>29-Apr-10</td>
<td>Washington Plaza Residents Group</td>
<td>Angela House</td>
<td>Purpose to discuss various issues affecting Washington Plaza residents, one issue was their role in Mellon Arena redevelopment. Guest speaker included Rep. Wheatley, Councilman Lavelle, Rif Qureshi. Various viewpoints on Lower Hill development in Hill and region.</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>SEA staff presented, cataloged meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Civic Arena IP meeting presentation</td>
<td>21-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen / IP</td>
<td>Gary English</td>
<td>Attached presentation he made April 21, 2010 meeting historical concerns, legal interest, economic interests, re-use and politics, Act 77 RAD, preserving regional assets.</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Consultant and staff researched RAD Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>16-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Tse Cee Fungu</td>
<td>&quot;...do not destroy this beautiful, historic building...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail, catalogued point of view (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Transplant the Civic Arena to your proposed amphitheater on the North Side?</td>
<td>16-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Wayna D. Palko</td>
<td>&quot;...that would save part of the arena &amp; the land on the Lower Hill could then be redeveloped...&quot; &quot;...take part of arena for HS amphitheater.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail, catalogued point of view (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Source Title and/or Subject</td>
<td>Source Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Source Author / Contributor</td>
<td>Excerpt and/or Summary</td>
<td>Point of View</td>
<td>Response and/or Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>16-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Erica P. Kreisman</td>
<td>&quot;...why leave us with all box buildings?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded by letter, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Phone Message</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>16-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Rebecca Gilbert</td>
<td>&quot;...Mellon Arena should be preserved and used as a year-round skating rink with a park around it...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Returned call, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Reusing the Igloo</td>
<td>14-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Jason Harris</td>
<td>&quot;...the arena should be left and reused in a way so as to be a lasting reminder of why we shouldn't let it destruction of Lower Hill happen again.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail, cataloged point of view (see cataloged item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Reusing the Igloo</td>
<td>14-Apr-10</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Mary Conturo</td>
<td>Responded to Jason Harris e-mail, to be included in records, invited sender to visit SEA website for information and materials on historic review process.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail, cataloged point of view (see cataloged item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lower Hill Redevelopment and Civic Arena</td>
<td>12-Apr-10</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Mary Conturo</td>
<td>Response to March 18, 2010 letter from Melissa McSwigan. Acknowledged that letter included in records.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via letter cataloged point of view (see cataloged item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Downtown Pittsburgh redevelopment starts to bear fruit</td>
<td>9-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Thanks A lot</td>
<td>Forwarded e-mails to SEA - exchange between Thanks A lot and Neighbors in the Strip about moving Strip to Civic Arena. Forwarded dozens of links on history of region, nostalgia, etc.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Pens Fans Share Mellon Arena Memories</td>
<td>9-Apr-10</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thepittsburghchannel.com">www.thepittsburghchannel.com</a></td>
<td>WTAE</td>
<td>Broadcast TV - video clips and interviews of fans remembering Mellon Arena</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Save our Igloo</td>
<td>8-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Barbie Suhr</td>
<td>&quot;Our family loves the Igloo, it is true Pittsburgh landmark. We all wish to be named to save the Igloo. Sincerely, Barb Suhr, John Suhr, Pete Miko, Rich Druga, Chris Druga, Alt Miko, Melissa Hodgkinson, Vince Czupkauskas, Jozue Czupkauskas, Leona Vining, Carole Felix, Russell Felix, Tina LaFere, Binde Schmidt, Ken Blystone.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Igloo</td>
<td>8-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Barbie Suhr</td>
<td>&quot;We are a Pittsburgh family that wants our Igloo...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail, cataloged point of view (see cataloged item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>8-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Greg Gassett</td>
<td>&quot;...if the Penguins host the NHL Winter Classic this January, why not have it at Mellon Arena with an open roof...&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Responded via e-mail, cataloged point of view (see cataloged item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Hill Planning Forum - Workshop</td>
<td>1-Apr-10</td>
<td>The Hill Planning Forum</td>
<td>Hill Planning Forum</td>
<td>Purpose to introduce guiding principles, explaining master plan process, and holding break-out workshops to identify outcomes for master plan.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>SEA staff attended, cataloged meeting materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>RE Lower Hill Redevelopment and Civic Arena</td>
<td>18-Mar-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Melissa McSwigan</td>
<td>&quot;...express my concern for the process underway to determine fate of 28 acres...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item, responded by letter dated April 12 (see cataloged item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Source Title and/or Subject</td>
<td>Source Date</td>
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<td>Excerpt and/or Summary</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>RE  Mellon Arena</td>
<td>17-Mar-10</td>
<td>House of Representatives, City Council (IP)</td>
<td>Jake Wheatley, Jr. Danielle Lawle, Jr.</td>
<td>&quot;We come together as a unified voice declaring our complete opposition to the idea of keeping Arena standing in its current condition.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>9-Mar-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Ken Dysno</td>
<td>&quot;I believe we should advocate, participate in, and facilitate public exchange that celebrates different opinions...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Could not be replicated today</td>
<td>7-Mar-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Synkrony</td>
<td>&quot;...if they really embrace green why wouldn't they go green all the way and reuse the arena?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Re-using the Igloo, Re-using the Igloo Part II</td>
<td>25-Jan-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Edward Mitchell</td>
<td>2 e-mails to Mayor re: development history of Mellon Arena, architecture, and his personal history related to Mellon Arena.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Mr. Mitchell was invited to be an Interested Party, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>PA History Code process, Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena) and Lower Hill Redevelopment project</td>
<td>25-Jan-10</td>
<td>Bureau for Historic Preservation, PHMC</td>
<td>Jean Cutler</td>
<td>letter commenting on first meeting (Jan 19, 2010) and to summarize PHMC’s understanding of process and timing, SEA has chosen to follow.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Forwarded to Oxford for review, and to adjust process as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>20-Jan-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Eric Frankenberg</td>
<td>&quot;The Hill District has been cut off from the city for far too long, and has suffered immensely as a result. Highway connectors also sever the Hill’s ties with downtown, but there is nothing to be done about that. The demolition of Mellon Arena...would greatly benefit the residents of the Hill...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, and catalogued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Review Process - PennDOT, PHMC, FPHA</td>
<td>14-Jan-10</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Tim Zinn</td>
<td>The purpose of call to clarify the cultural resources review process, federal funding; section 106, 1579 cap - decision reached that review process will continue to follow PHMC’s guidelines.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Follow-up call to clarify ongoing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lower Hill (Mellon Arena Site) Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>7-Jan-10</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Tim Zinn</td>
<td>letter outlining first public meeting on the cultural resources review process, timeline, agenda.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Plan for first cultural resources review meeting on Jan 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Greater Hill District Development Principles</td>
<td>2-Jan-10</td>
<td>The Hill Planning Forum</td>
<td>Carl Redwood</td>
<td>Document that provides framework for the greater Hill District Master Plan, and to serve as interim guidelines.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>SEA Board Meeting</td>
<td>18-Nov-09</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>John Axtell stated he expects SEA to act in the public interest by following laws determining potential historic structures, and looking at ways of mitigating adverse affects. He asked Authority to consider the costs of demolition vs. salvage benefits and make figures public.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comment and request, and SEA stated that no figures were yet available, but there would be a public process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>SEA Board Meeting</td>
<td>18-Nov-09</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Rob Pleifmann sent Authority a letter dated Sept 22, 2009 re: cultural resources review process. He believed &quot;we have a long process, no need to demolish the facility... and that historic tax credits could be used, and all interested parties voices should be considered.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comment, and SEA stated there would be a public process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Public input during Mellon Arena review process</td>
<td>1-Nov-09</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Melissa McSweeney</td>
<td>&quot;...in order for a transparent and collaborative process to occur, it must include those who believe the Arena can be reused... and those who believe it should be demolished...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Catalogued point of view (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Source</td>
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</tr>
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<td>--------</td>
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<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>RE  Mellon Arena Consultation Process</td>
<td>22-Sep-09</td>
<td>Re-Use the Igloo!</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>Asking for clarification on process, and opportunity to present their proposal.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>Mellon Arena and Preservation Questions - Bureau for Historic Preservation, PHMC</td>
<td>21-Sep-09</td>
<td>Oxford Development</td>
<td>Chris Cieslak</td>
<td>Discussion of historic review process and clarification on Section 106, PA History Code, SHPO participation, and federal agency identification, review process timelines, contact info and resources.</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Follow up call to clarify ongoing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Five Mile Development</td>
<td>17-Aug-09</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Donald P. Cella Jr</td>
<td>Subsequent meeting to discuss their relocation plans, including costs, timeline.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>SEA staff attended meeting, cataloged handouts (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Salvage - Restructure - Reuse of Mellon Arena</td>
<td>10-Oct-07</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Donald P. Cella Jr</td>
<td>Presented plan and costs for salvaging, dismantling and moving portions of Mellon Arena to be part of an office park located near Pittsburgh. Subsequently invited to be an interested party.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Meeting with SEA staff, discussed plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Five Mile Development</td>
<td>10-Oct-07</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Donald P. Cella Jr</td>
<td>Meeting with development firm that presented plans for relocating Mellon Arena to SEA staff.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>SEA staff attended meeting, cataloged handouts (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>RE  New Multi-Purpose Arena, Pittsburgh, Allegheny County</td>
<td>4-Apr-07</td>
<td>Bureau for Historic Preservation, PHMC</td>
<td>Jean Cutler</td>
<td>Requested mitigation for adverse efforts of new arena for recordation of Epiphany Church and Fifth Ave buildings “it is imperative that SEA include the interested parties in the planning for the redevelopment of the Civic (Mellon) Arena site...”</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Recordation submitted and accepted by PHMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>A Civic Renewal</td>
<td>1-Mar-07</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>Proposal for the re-use of Civic Arena.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>RE  Civic Auditorium (Arena), Pittsburgh, Allegheny County</td>
<td>2-Aug-01</td>
<td>Bureau for Historic Preservation, PHMC</td>
<td>Jean Cutler</td>
<td>Letter from PHMC to Gary English accepting application to acknowledge Mellon Arena eligible for inclusion on National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Mellon Arena - Renovation &amp; Expansion Study</td>
<td>1-Jun-01</td>
<td>HOK Sport</td>
<td>HOK Sport</td>
<td>HOK study of feasibility of remodeling and expanding Mellon Arena - to make arena competitive with comparable facilities. Two options presented - minimal remodel approach with no lost hockey season; total remodel with one lost hockey season.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Cataloged item in SEA office and website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<th>Source Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source Author / Contributor</th>
<th>Excerpt and/or Summary</th>
<th>Point of View</th>
<th>Response and/or Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Arena's waste</td>
<td>7-Sep-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Glenn Avick</td>
<td>&quot;...keep the Civic Arena as an ineffectively used or &quot;mothballed&quot; facility would waste precious energy resources as well as limited taxpayer money. Further, the unique attributes of the arena were a retractable roof, just that was seldom ever utilized. The building should be demolished to lower the private sector to develop the site for the benefit of the city, rather than having it become an unused landmark and a financial liability.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Construction workers</td>
<td>7-Sep-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Richard Stanisz Jr.</td>
<td>&quot;On behalf of the men and women of the Pittsburgh Regional Building and Construction Trades Council, I want to voice my support for the demolition of Civic Arena...we have an opportunity to revitalize the Hill District with Downtown Pittsburgh by replacing the arena with both residential and commercial development. It is an opportunity that we cannot afford to miss. Development means both permanent and temporary jobs for the construction industry and for many other workers. It means new tax revenues... In short, development means progress.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Hold hearings when working people can attend</td>
<td>4-Sep-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>David Hibbsbrand</td>
<td>&quot;The PG editors admonish the public for not participating in this hearing, but, duh, the hearing was at 10:30am on a Monday. Most residents who may have an interest in this arena do not have to do to afford tickets to events there... They are working. Hold these hearings on evenings or weekends, and if more of the public doesn't participate, then you will know they don't care.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Many attended</td>
<td>4-Sep-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Connie Cantor</td>
<td>&quot;There were not just 49 attendees at the SEA's public meeting. The meeting was, in fact, standing-room only, more than 150 concerned citizens overflowed in the aisles and back entrances. The majority were clearly in favor of saving the arena and showed their loud and clear by clapping and vocal responses to speakers. On the flip side, the pro-demolition side spoke on behalf of their company or organization. Architects, developers and builders seeking contracts blatantly peddled to the SEA board, spoke for three minutes and left the building.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Developing an arena neighborhood is not realistic</td>
<td>2-Sep-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Filomena Conti</td>
<td>&quot;Fifty years ago, the residents of this area moved to Penn Hills and the South Hills and those still living in those areas are not choosing to relocate to a new development in Uptown, nor is anyone else. Pittsburgh is basically able to maintain its current population, so why all this talk... about building a new neighborhood?... If Pittsburgh wants to be a travel destination city...there is no better example than the arena.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>SEA gets an earful on arena fate</td>
<td>27-Aug-10</td>
<td>New Pittsburgh Courier</td>
<td>Christian Monroe</td>
<td>&quot;After three hours of public comment from 50 speakers, no clear consensus on the fate of the now vacant Civic Arena during the SEA's public meeting. But judging by the &quot;boo&quot; given to several attorneys and developers, and applause given supporters of reusing the facility, there appeared to be more supporters of the latter option...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Arena football</td>
<td>27-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette staff</td>
<td>&quot;Media interest may have been high, but turnout was not. In a county with a population of 1.2 million, the meeting to offer input on the fate of this so-called historic jewel...was attended by all of 49 people, 39 of whom came to say knock it down.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>All about the dome</td>
<td>27-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Andrew Ellsworth</td>
<td>&quot;Move the dome to some other location in the county/region where it can be re-erected with a better use in a better-planned development, and a low the land to be redeveloped in a sensitive manner both socially and environmentally. Win-Win? I think so.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>PG's negativity</td>
<td>27-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Steven Paul</td>
<td>&quot;Shame on [the PG] for advancing a most ignorant and uninformed position on an issue critical to the Hill District, city and region -- and perhaps more so to planners and developers in a city where most of its structure are over 50 years old (not to mention the image of the city as a leader in sustainable development.) Why don't you try to paying attention?&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Ideas for reusing the arena aren't realistic</td>
<td>26-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Sophie Mastoff</td>
<td>&quot;I agree that the building is a very interesting engineering marvel... However, it was designed as a public auditorium and is no longer needed for that purpose.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Haste could be a waster of retired Mellon Arena</td>
<td>25-Aug-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Eric Heyl</td>
<td>&quot;Them perspective can be summarized thusly. Preservationists: &quot;You can't tear down that architectural marvel right now! Someone eventually is bound to step forward and pay for its renovation and upkeep as a public recreation and entertainment venue.&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Igloo's future no clearer after three-hour SEA hearing</td>
<td>24-Aug-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Jeremy Bonen</td>
<td>&quot;Architects, labor union heads, CEOs, lawyers and learn officials peppered SEA board members for nearly three hours with arguments, but afterward, no one seemed any closer to saying what will happen to the Civic Arena, or what to do with it. &quot;This was the last meeting put on the question of demolishing the arena to allow the team to develop its 28-acre footprint over 10 years. Nine people urged the SEA to postpone the vote that has been scheduled to decide the arena's fate.&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tbody>
</table>
| 201    | Article     | Spirited debate on Igloo’s future: A civic treasure or a useless behemoth, and who gets to say? | 24-Aug-10   | Post-Gazette | Mark Belko | To all, the 49 people who testified before [SEA] seemed to be evenly divided over whether the silver domed landmark should get a makeover or a death sentence. "Some accused the SEA of rushing through a state process designed to consider alternatives to demolition, even though the PHMC has stated that the agency has met the consultation requirements of the state History Code."
 |             |                        |             |         |                           |                      | Balanced     | Noted comments, cataloged item |
| 200    | Letters to Editor | A new arena was unnecessary, but we must say farewell to the old | 24-Aug-10   | Post-Gazette | Bob Cramer | To fact, the public debate is reminiscent of a similar one that involved the demolition of the 1952 Pittsburgh International Airport terminal, just like the airport terminal, it is now time to bid a fond farewell to the Civic Arena | Demolition | Noted comments, cataloged item |
| 199    | Article     | Both sides air views on Mellon Arena’s future | 23-Aug-10   | Tribune-Review | Jeremy Born | The SEA, which owns the arena, devoted nearly three hours of its monthly meeting today to absorbing public comments in response to criticism that the authority has been secretive about its plans. Most made clear their opinions in favor or against, but none simply urged the authority to delay its decision. | Balanced | Noted comments, cataloged item |
| 198    | Article     | Fate of Arena no More Clear After Hearing | 23-Aug-10   | WQJO News | Mark Northbar | "The...SEA heard from roughly equal numbers of speakers for and against the razing of the civic arena to make way for new development..." | Balanced | Noted comments, cataloged item |
| 197    | Article     | Penguins President Weighs in On Civic Arena Fate Debate | 23-Aug-10   | The Pittsburgh Channel | The Pittsburgh Channel staff | Morehouse said he feels the community would be best served by redevelopment of the site, which he said would reconnect the Hill with downtown. He was a sentiment shared by some who spoke at the hearing. "Is keeping the structure intact...it is not an economically or culturally sustainable approach," said Hill House attorney Bob Darow. "But others would like to see the building be repurposed. "Please do not let the needs of the few take precedence over the needs of the many. Do the right thing, if you save it, they will come."
 |             |                        |             |         |                           |                      | Balanced     | Noted comments, cataloged item |
| 196    | Article     | Public comments on future of Mellon Arena | 23-Aug-10   | Pittsburgh Business Times | Tim Schooley | "Leaders of the region's construction and union trades spoke out in favor of tearing down the arena in the name of progress as well as the potential jobs it would bring...a vocal contingent in favor of employing an adaptive reuse strategy for the property claims the arena is a distinctive cultural asset with plenty of creative opportunities to reuse that the SEA and Penguins are not considering."
 |             |                        |             |         |                           |                      | Balanced     | Noted comments, cataloged item |
| 195    | Article     | Public gets chance to opine on future of Mellon Arena | 23-Aug-10   | Post-Gazette | Vivian Nerem | The meeting is the SEA's latest attempt to gather enough information to decide the 49-year-old hockey and concert venue's future. "The board has to be confident in making a vote," said Chairman Wayne Fontana. "Bob Plummer said, "My vision is, that if we did this right, it would become our Millennium Park."
 |             |                        |             |         |                           |                      | Balanced     | Noted comments, cataloged item |
| 194    | Article     | Public Meeting Held About Civic Arena’s Future | 23-Aug-10   | KDKA.com | KDKA staff | "People want to tear it down to develop the land for retail purposes and to reconnect the Lower Hill District to downtown."
<p>|             |                        |             |         |                           |                      | Balanced     | Noted comments, cataloged item |
| 193    | Article     | Speakers debate future of Civic Arena | 23-Aug-10   | Post-Gazette | Mark Belko | &quot;People want to tear it down to develop the land for retail purposes and to reconnect the Lower Hill District to downtown.&quot; | Balanced | Noted comments, cataloged item |
| 191    | Broadcast   | Civic Arena - meeting to be held | 23-Aug-10 | KRONA-TV | Ross Goldsht | News broadcast of a preview of August 23, 2010 Public hearing | Balanced | Noted comments, cataloged item, video on file in office. |
| 190    | Letters to Editor | The Penguins have no developer either | 22-Aug-10 | Post-Gazette | Scott Leib | &quot;So far, the Penguins have not found an interested developer for their plan. And the PG isashing the preservationists?&quot; | Preservation | Noted comments, cataloged item |</p>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>We're the investors</td>
<td>22-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>&quot;Here are the key points to remember: 1. Nobody has a developer/investor…2. Investment is complex…3. Development is a process…4. Holding costs are accounted for…5. We, the citizens of Pittsburgh, are the real investors both in the past (the civic Arena) and the future (at least $75 million for roads, garages and tax incentives).&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>What others see</td>
<td>22-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Paul Potter</td>
<td>&quot;I drove a taxi for seven years. It was a &quot;wow&quot; factor was sometimes taking people up Centre Avenue close to the arena. Other people would ask what that beautiful building was. &quot;Watching in the mirror, you could see the eye-opener effect.&quot; &quot;Why the rush? There are so many things that can be done with the arena.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Pacing for dreams: Any viable save-the-arena plan needs an investor</td>
<td>19-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Post-Gazette staff</td>
<td>&quot;There has been no shortage of ideas—some bordering on plausible but many far from it. [robotics research center, water park, indoor amusement park, a product market, an urban greenhouse, a national tennis center, an enclosed mall with shopping and housing, a museum]. The common problem is that they have not attracted a developer interested in putting forward money to make the dreams a reality. And leaving the abandoned arena in place while waiting and hoping would be expensive. The SEA should proceed with caution, but shouldn't delay its decision for too long.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, see catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Future preservation</td>
<td>16-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Dan Holland, Young Preservationists Association of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>The aim of the Young Preservationists Association of Pittsburgh is to approach each instance with an appropriate objectivity. There are moments when casting a vision is necessary, and others when supporting the vision of others is paramount. We do not seek to define what is right or what is wrong. On the contrary, we hope to provide an atmosphere for dialogue and an exchange that leads to a heightened and inclusive discussion.</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Hill District hopes to restore vitality</td>
<td>15-Aug-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Bill Vitroic</td>
<td>Community leaders are trying to decide what to do with the $1m for redevelopment donated by Rivers Casino. &quot;I think it's been positive,&quot; said Carl Redwood, head of the Hill District Commerz Group. &quot;Some development plans are up in the air until the fate of the Civic Arena is decided. A master planning committee consisting of Hill District leaders and representatives of government agencies was to have drawn up guidelines for development by February. Consultants delays have pushed that back; officials expect to have the plan done within the next six months.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Save-the-arena proponents get hint of help from state</td>
<td>14-Aug-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Jeremy Boren</td>
<td>&quot;Reuse the Igloo&quot; wrote, &quot;The SEA and its consultants have offered no legal reason as to why the Civic Arena project should not be fully subject to the provisions of the NHPA. We therefore urged the SEA to submit its applications for federal funding and complete the required review under the provisions of the NHPA prior to taking any course of destruction...&quot; &quot;What [PHMC] are saying, probably is, &quot;We agree with Reuse the Igloo folks that you have missed too fast, that you haven't conducted a public process, and slow down and develop further studies...&quot; said Pfaffmann.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, see catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>State preservation group urges delay in razing Civic Arena</td>
<td>14-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>Th a letter...[PHMC] said a delay would allow the SEA to &quot;more fully engage in assisting those advocating a reuse and help to cement Pittsburgh's reputation as a sustainable city.&quot; &quot;Rob Pfaffmann...said the recommendation to delay gives the group &quot;important influence&quot; with leadership in the Pittsburgh community.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, see later cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>&quot;Reuse the Igloo&quot; Tries To Stave Off Civic Arena Demolition</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>The Pittsburgh Channel The Pittsburgh Channel staff</td>
<td>&quot;The Igloo wrote, &quot;The SEA and its consultants have offered no legal reason as to why the Civic Arena project should not be fully subject to the provisions of the NHPA. We therefore urged the SEA to submit its applications for federal funding and complete the required review under the provisions of the NHPA prior to taking any course of destruction...&quot; &quot;What [PHMC] are saying, probably is, &quot;We agree with Reuse the Igloo folks that you have missed too fast, that you haven't conducted a public process, and slow down and develop further studies...&quot; said Pfaffmann.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, see catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Arena might qualify for Historic Places registry</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>The PHMC is recommending a delay in the 40-year-old arena's demolition to give Reuse the Igloo and others interested in saving it more time to develop alternative plans. &quot;If the arena reamins, Pittsburgh has a better argument for federal redevelopment dollars &quot;critical to a revitalized Hill District,&quot; said Rob Pfaffmann.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, see catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Group Recommends Delay in Civic Arena Demolition</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>KDKA.com KDKA staff</td>
<td>&quot;We believe this is a good first step...[PHMC] believe that what we've done is the right thing in advocating for an adaptive reuse strategy,&quot; said Rob Pfaffmann. &quot;The recommendation is only an advisory, but it is one of the factors the SEA will take into account when considering the future of the Civic Arena.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, see catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>SEA to hold Mellon Arena meeting</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Business Times Pittsburgh Business Times staff</td>
<td>&quot;[PHMC] told SEA that soliciting developers and designers nationwide could provide a broader perspective on the long-term viability of reuse for the arena...&quot; &quot;At an April meeting in the Hill District, a group of elected officialもらった...[PHMC] agreed the best plan would be to tear down the arena.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, see catalogued item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>State office asks for delay in Mellon Arena demolition decision</td>
<td>13-Aug-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Jeremy Boren</td>
<td>Officials have not yet decided to demolish the shuttered Civic Arena, but the state's Bureau of Historic Preservation is urging them to delay its demise anyway. Cullen said pulling off a final decision to demolish the arena would allow the SEA to conduct a national search for &quot;developers and designers&quot; who could offer ideas to reuse the arena. The state has no power to order the SEA to delay tearing...&quot; Continos said SEA board members will review the bureau's recommendations.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, catalogued item</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Although it's time for a change, it's sad to leave the Igloo</td>
<td>12-Aug-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Jerry Clark</td>
<td>&quot;Mellon Arena, formally known as the Civic Arena, is winding down its existence...as nice as the new arena will be, we will never forget the old half-spheres, and all the memories that come in that now rundown facility.&quot; &quot;But alas, all good things must come to an end...Farewell Mellon Arena, thanks for the memories...&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Bruce lead voice to save Mellon Arena</td>
<td>4-Aug-10</td>
<td>The New Pittsburgh Courier</td>
<td>Christian Morrow</td>
<td>That group of preservationists now has another voice. New Pittsburgh Courier sports columnist, Aubrey Bruce, who said the arena could serve as the home for VBNR, ABA and Arena Football teams. He said he has had preliminary discussions with officials from all three leagues and they have expressed an interest in the idea.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Bright to Bright</td>
<td>1-Aug-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Andrew Conte</td>
<td>&quot;When I opened Sept. 17, 1961, the Civic Arena generated new revenues for its retractable roof...&quot;&quot;If one of the brightest and slickest cities has been able to remake itself in shining pride, any city in the U.S. should be able to do it's example,&quot; Fornate magazine reported at the time.&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Can-do Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1-Aug-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Joseph Mastik</td>
<td>&quot;If you could dream it, you could build it in Pittsburgh. That was the attitude during Pittsburgh's first Renaissance and the best example of it was the conception and construction of Civic Arena.&quot; &quot;In the end, the right decision might be to tear it down. But what's the rush? Once it's gone, there are no options. There is no compelling development waiting in wings. And if it is saved, future generations will say &quot;Look at that. We can do anything in Pittsburgh.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Razing the Roof</td>
<td>29-Jul-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City Paper</td>
<td>Chris Potter</td>
<td>&quot;Pfaffmann lauds the arena as an example of &quot;googie architecture&quot; a Space Age design...that George Jetson would have felt comfortable in.&quot; &quot;Outside though, the yelping never really stopped. The arena has always been a symbol of the harm done to the Hill District community,&quot; says Sala Udin. &quot;Ultimately, the arena's fate may be decided in the courthouse.&quot; &quot;One proposal involves leveling everything except the massive trusswork...There it could stand like a post-industrial sundial.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>The Sky Was the Limit: Highlights from Arena History</td>
<td>29-Jul-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City Paper</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City Paper staff</td>
<td>List of key dates and acts in arena history.</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Report is fodder in Mellon Arena debate</td>
<td>27-Jul-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Adam Brandolph</td>
<td>&quot;Other cities [Portland/Memorial; Houston/Astrodome; Philadelphia/Spectrum; Dallas/Reunion Arena] grapple with retired venues Pittsburgh's dilemma to raise or reuse Civic Arena is not unique.&quot; &quot;Residents may not have wanted it 50 years ago, but it's since come to be part of the community,&quot; said Sarah Hollerand of Hill District.&quot; &quot;We always thought the best use of the 28 acres is to bring down the obsolete arena, restore the street grid,&quot; said Tom McMillan.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Arena inaction</td>
<td>27-Jul-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Cassey Schaefer</td>
<td>&quot;I am a 23-year-old recent graduate of the University of Pittsburgh's History Art and Architecture program and am working for reasons not to be determined by local politicians and some of our local preservation groups whose actions (or inactions) may lead to demolition of Mellon Arena within a fully engaged community process occurring. &quot;To the Young Preservationists Association and the mayor's plan (or no longer relevant)&quot; Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation. Where is your support for creative reuse ideas that could benefit the Hill District?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Civic Light Opera: Big and blustering beginning at Civic Arena; but curtailed there before anyone knew it</td>
<td>25-Jul-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Sharon Elsner</td>
<td>&quot;A Pittsburgh Press story in August of 1964 warned that the end was in sight. The CLO was losing more than $100,000 a year by its third year there. In its first year, 1962, a record-breaker at the box office, the company showed a $7,000 profit. Rent was the biggest culprit...18% - 32% of the annual budget. The 10% city entertainment tax took tens of thousands of dollars more.&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Group asks 1-year delay in Mellon Arena demolition</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;Mr. Pfafmann said the group also would develop a plan to help the SEA cover the operating costs of the building while a move through planning process is undertaken. Alternatives are studied.&quot; &quot;The SEA is still the process of reviewing options through an ongoing historic review process...&quot; Board chairman Fontana said the request would be taken under advisement.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Could new teams save old Mellon Arena</td>
<td>14-Jul-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;Mr. Bruce...has formed Famous Sports Management Group with hopes of salvaging Mellon Arena by recruiting teams to play under its iconic silver dome. &quot;We is hoping the SEA, which owns the building, will issue a memorandum that would prevent any demolition for at least a year. Mr. Minnichius questioned the viability of plans. There are all kinds of cockamamy ideas out there. The question is: Does anyone have anything that's financially viable?&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon arena plan called faulty</td>
<td>14-Jul-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Dan Majors</td>
<td>&quot;An economic development firm working for a group trying to preserve Mellon Arena said the Penguins' current development plan is based on faulty numbers and should be re-evaluated.&quot; They pulled excerpts from their own consultant's study and identified a variety of data errors, said Mr. Poole.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Penguins Arena Plan Questioned</td>
<td>14-Jul-10</td>
<td>WDUQ News</td>
<td>WDUQ News Staff</td>
<td>&quot;Poole says the figures and assumptions being used to justify the demolition of Pittsburgh's Mellon Arena are flawed. He recommends any decision by the SEA Board members regarding the building should be postponed until proper assessments are made.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>14-Jul-10</td>
<td>93.7 The Fan</td>
<td>Grant Bushardt</td>
<td>Interview with Rob Pfaffmann re Mellon Arena preservation, planning process and other matters.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>14-Jul-10</td>
<td>DUQ 90.5</td>
<td>Alexandria Chaklos</td>
<td>Previewing IP meeting on July 13, 2010, Interviews with Senator Specter, Mayor Ravenstahl, Councilman Pawlak, Rob Pfaffmann, regarding the redevelopment of Mellon Arena, historic review process, economic development, preservation, re-use ideas, economic analysis commentary, and other issues.</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>SEA Considers Options for Arena</td>
<td>13-Jul-10</td>
<td>WDUQ News</td>
<td>WDUQ News Staff</td>
<td>&quot;Tonight, the economic impact study of the Penguins' plan commissioned by architect Rob Pfaffmann...will be presented at the SEA meeting, it was done by Award Planning. Pfaffmann has submitted his plan to save the arena from the wrecking ball...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Arena's worth a look, but not these murals</td>
<td>12-Jul-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Ruth Ann Olney</td>
<td>&quot;Until now…the SEA funded study that purports to show the SEA/Penguins plan would bring in $103.5m in economic benefit, compared to Mr. Pfaffmann's plan at $53.8m. But Mr. Pfaffmann notes that the SEA study failed to include the value of federal tax credits awarded for preservation, and he expects an accomplished national expert like Mr. Poole to bring more insight to the site's possibilities...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Pittsburgh's&quot;Igloo&quot; Arena on Thin Ice</td>
<td>8-Jul-10</td>
<td>The Architect's Newspaper</td>
<td>Julia Gelaf</td>
<td>&quot;The debate over the Igloo's future is also complicated politically by its checkered past. Its construction was part of one of the city's major urban renewal schemes that severed the street grid, isolating the predominantly African American Hill District from the city's downtown. &quot;Hill District residents are split,&quot; Pfaffmann said. &quot;Some think it should be symbolically erased...&quot;...with adaptive reuse, the arena can transcend its past as a barrier...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>The next Page: That arena on the Hill! - the complex legacy of black Pittsburghers</td>
<td>4-Jul-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Laurence Glassco</td>
<td>&quot;Those interested in the future of the Arena can draw at least four lessons from this history. First, be careful what you wish for...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Igloo</td>
<td>3-Jul-10</td>
<td>KDKA Radio</td>
<td>Kelly Pulpmann</td>
<td>Interview with actor David Conrad re preservation of Mellon Arena, planning process, redevelopment, historical context, re-use ideas, and other matters.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Arena for Debate</td>
<td>1-Jul-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City Paper</td>
<td>Chris Young</td>
<td>&quot;Article about mixed feelings about fate of Mellon Arena. Interviews with various residents. &quot;Henderson Hill say the Mellon Arena destroyed the Hill District, but is still against its demolition.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Home Sweet Dome</td>
<td>1-Jul-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Magazine</td>
<td>Craig McConnell</td>
<td>&quot;The Igloo is a century-old, Pittsburgh's iconic Civic Arena, an engineering marvel and shining symbol of the city's post-war renaissance, has hosted championship teams, all-stars, icons and legends...the arena will face an uncertain future after the completion of Consol Energy Center...a last look back at the dome...&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Preservation Pittsburgh announces design competition for reuse of the Mellon Arena</td>
<td>30-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-City Media</td>
<td>John Farley</td>
<td>&quot;Fifty years ago, we made the mistake of tearing down our heritage when the arena was built and we demolished the Lower Hill District, and I'm afraid that today we're doing the same exact thing,&quot; says Scott Judy. &quot;We're tearing down our heritage, instead of...finding a way to incorporate it into our future.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Arena process flawed</td>
<td>29-Jun-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Jeff Slack</td>
<td>“Recent SEA statements about Mellon arena could be entertaining summer reading for their unabashed misrepresentations.&quot; &quot;It is so important to the economic future of the Hill District and region that we must demand better accountability.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Keep the arena intact - here or elsewhere</td>
<td>24-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Tom Galoiania</td>
<td>“...the Igloo doesn't belong just to the Hill residents - it belongs to all of Western Pennsylvania.&quot; &quot;So what I suggest is just move it to another location.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted points of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Your ideas for repurposing Mellon Arena</td>
<td>22-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Reader responses to Patricia Lowry's article</td>
<td>Ideas: public ownership, the Save Mellon, commerce space for green products, giant roller coaster, golf course, shopping center, steel museum, indoor market, public dance hall, regional travel center, another casino, cultural center, boating arena, aquarium, electrical plant, job training center, indoor water park, white water training course, art museum, jazz concert hall, hall of fame museum, Pittsburgh history museum, planetarium, labor history museum, restore it for CLO, lecture hall, convention center...</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Reviewed readers ideas and considered some, evaluated other ideas, to be included as an addendum to Options Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Broadcast</td>
<td>KDKA Sunday Business Page</td>
<td>20-Jun-10</td>
<td>KDKA Radio Mike Potegal</td>
<td>“...The Ravenstahl administration...has loudly publicized its calculation of prospective carrying costs associated with the soon-to-be-abandoned Civic Arena...&quot; &quot;...that anyone proposing illustration or examination of their plans to demolish Civic Arena...is a history hugging, progress-hating communist.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, video filed in office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Arena agonistes</td>
<td>20-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Infinonymous Blog</td>
<td>“...The Ravenstahl administration...has loudly publicized its calculation of prospective carrying costs associated with the soon-to-be-abandoned Civic Arena...&quot; &quot;...that anyone proposing illustration or examination of their plans to demolish Civic Arena...is a history hugging, progress-hating communist.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Ferlo sets sights on saving arena</td>
<td>19-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Bello</td>
<td>“...In the end, it may be an issue of demolition, but I don't feel that we have legitimately and seriously exhausted opportunities for investors to look at adaptive re-use.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Group asks SEA to slow process on Igloo Arena chief says all's “very thorough” as demolition looms</td>
<td>18-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Katie Falloon</td>
<td>“We are sympathetic with the need to move quickly, however we also want to ensure that we have received all crucial information in a fashion that allows us to fully understand both the process and the project's effects on historic resources,&quot; Ms. Cutler said in a letter.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Historical Commission Wants More Info on Arena Plans</td>
<td>18-Jun-10</td>
<td>WDUQ News WDUQ News Staff</td>
<td>“The PHMC has sent a letter to the SEA questioning the speed of razing the Mellon Arena.&quot; &quot;In her letter to the SEA, Historical Commission Director Jean Cutler said they want to make sure they've received all crucial information to fully understand the process and the effects on historic resources (the arena).&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted comments, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>SEA will pay upkeep on Mellon Arena</td>
<td>18-Jun-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Jeremy Bornen</td>
<td>“The city-county Sports &amp; Exhibition Authority will spend from $75,000 to $100,000 a month on the shuttered arena, depending on whether it's mothballed with minimal upkeep or it is maintained with an eye toward eventually reusing it.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Provided costs to Interested Parties, noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena upkeep could hit $100K a month</td>
<td>17-Jun-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Jeremy Bornen</td>
<td>&quot;Every month like Ion Arena remains dark will cost taxpayers. The monthly cost would cover insurance, security, utilities, and maintaining the building's environmental and electrical systems. &quot;The Penguins currently pay those costs.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Provided costs to Interested Parties, noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Pa. historic panel raises concerns about Mellon Arena</td>
<td>17-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Katie Falloon</td>
<td>“The PHMC has expressed concerns about the speed of the planned demolition of the Mellon Arena, prompting a response from the SEA. In the commission's letter -...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Proposals may “mitigate” pain of arena demolition</td>
<td>17-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Bello</td>
<td>“If Mellon Arena goes, a fountain could be left in its wake...as on of 14 measures being considered to &quot;mitigate&quot; the effect of the arena's potential demolition...are contained in a 107 page draft Determination of Effect report...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
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</table>
| 142   | Article     | Stalled on the Hill: Master plan on hold while issues addressed | 17-Jun-10   | Pittsburgh City Paper | Chris Young | "We ran into a snag, announced Carl Redwood at a June 11 Hill District Consensus Group meeting. "Right now the master-plan process with the consultant is on hold."
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Planning     | Noted point of view, cataloged item |
| 141   | Article     | Study offers 6 options for Mellon Arena | 17-Jun-10   | Tribune-Review | Jeremy Bonen | The 107 page report provides the first detailed look at six scenarios, which include restoring the arena to its original 1961 design, mothballing it indefinitely, preserving its unique silver dome, and razing it to build 1,191 residential units and 938,000 sq ft of offices.
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Balanced     | Noted point of view, cataloged item |
| 140   | Campaign    | Save the Igloo Campaign | 16-Jun-10   | Savetheigloo.web.com | Save the Igloo staff | As of June 16, 2010 - 73 signatures were recorded.
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Noted point of view, cataloged item |
| 139   | Campaign    | The Future of America's Oldest Arena is Uncertain! | 16-Jun-10   | PittsburghHeritage.com | Preservation Pittsburgh | Donation page and links to Reuse the Igloo.
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Noted point of view, cataloged item |
| 138   | Article     | Renovation plans for Astrodome revealed | 15-Jun-10   | MLB News | Bailey Stephens | "Local officials unveiled a $1.35 billion plan on Monday to renovate the famed structure and convert it into a convention and science center if area taxpayers are willing to contribute to the cost."...to be named the Astrodome Renaissance. The property would feature a science center, a planetarium, several museums and a conference center."
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Noted point of view, cataloged item, and included in addendum of Options Report |
| 137   | Letters to Editor | What's the rush? | 15-Jun-10   | Tribune-Review | Melissa McSwigen | "...the SEA's timeline, which seems intentionally designed to move forward with the Penguins' plan for Mellon Arena and its site without giving serious attention and time to alternatives." "One only needs to look at...the High Line...to understand that sometimes things take a while."
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Noted point of view, cataloged item |
| 136   | Radio       | Mellon Arena | 15-Jun-10   | Talkshow.com - American Entrepreneur | Ron Morris | Interview with Rob Pfaffmann re: Mellon Arena preservation, preservation groups in City, history, urban renewal, in other cities, planning process, other preservation efforts in City, and other matters.
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Noted comments, mp3 filed in office |
| 135   | Opinion     | Bad of days: mayoral nepotism, SEA strongman | 14-Jun-10   | Post-Gazette | Ruth Ann O'Keefe | "Now we have architects and urban planners and real estate developers to ask why the Penguins and SEA are ignoring the Hill District. The final decision on the fate of the arena is up to the SEA."  "Yet another occasion to question whether demolition costs have been wildly underestimated and street-grid restoration claims wildly inflated..."
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Noted comment, cataloged item |
| 134   | Article     | A request for creative ideas to save, reuse the Igloo | 13-Jun-10   | Post-Gazette | Patricia Lowery | "It's astonishing that official Pittsburgh, which demolished the Lower Hill, good chunks of the North Side and East Liberty and Downtown's Mellon Bank interior, once again doesn't see the value in what it has -- a unique, quirky, theater-in-the-round building straight out of the Jetsons. So I'm putting out my own RFP."
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Reader's responses to original article (see catalogued item) |
| 133   | Letters to Editor | RE: street-grid restoration and the arena being "finished" | 13-Jun-10   | Post-Gazette | Jeff Slack | "...it appears that the editors of the Post-Gazette continue to be uninformed about the flexibility inherent in historic preservation."
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Noted comment, cataloged item |
| 132   | Article     | Consultants: No Future for Mellon Arena | 12-Jun-10   | ArenaDigest.com | Editor | "The economic reality is that it will be hard to justify two major arenas in Uptown...and the track recorded for renovating older arenas is pretty bad. "Given that Mellon Arena is one of the most unique arenas ever built...coming up with an imaginative reuse shouldn't be that difficult."
 |                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Noted point of view, cataloged item |
| 131   | Blog        | Preservationists Conduct Own Study On Fate Of Arena | 11-Jun-10   | WDQU News | WDQU News Staff | "Pfaffmann says he will take their study...not to the SEA...but to the residents of the Hill District. The final decision on the fate of the arena is up to the SEA."
<p>|                  |                             |             |        |                             |                        | Preservation  | Noted comment, cataloged item |</p>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>SEA consultants advise razing Mellon Arena</td>
<td>10-Jun-10</td>
<td>Adam Brandolph</td>
<td>&quot;The report...evaluated several alternatives, but concludes that the Penguins' plan to demolish the arena...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted points of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Mellon Arena</td>
<td>10-Jun-10</td>
<td>Robert Mangino</td>
<td>Robert Mangino talks with Todd Poole, President and Principal Manager of WEED Planning, about saving Mellon Arena.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted comments, mp3 filed in office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Reality trumps fantasy: Lack of developer says it all on keeping the arena</td>
<td>9-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Editorial Board</td>
<td>&quot;...Pittsburgh will be well served by a development plan that restores the street grid of the Lower Hill District through the arena site...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Pittsburgh History &amp; Landmarks Foundation weighs saving Mellon Arena</td>
<td>8-Jun-10</td>
<td>Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;...the [PHLF] won't rush to judgment on the future of Mellon Arena. &quot;...the organization would await the outcome of a required review to determine possible alternatives to demolishing...before deciding whether to join the battle to save it.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Let arena exist in memories only</td>
<td>8-Jun-10</td>
<td>Washington Greens Observer-Reporter</td>
<td>&quot;...It would seem likely that keeping Mellon Arena intact and building around it would be more costly and less flexible than knocking it down and starting anew. And it's not like Pittsburgh...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Poll</td>
<td>Do you think the Mellon Arena's demolition should be delayed until a study of possible Arena reuses is completed?</td>
<td>7-Jun-10</td>
<td>KQV.com</td>
<td>Results: Phone respondents say 83% -yes, 17%- no. Internet respondents said 60% -yes, 40% -no. There were 1,170 votes.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>It's an issue to raise: Shall we save arena?</td>
<td>6-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Brian O'Neill</td>
<td>&quot;...The strong demand for Downtown rentals, and demographic trends...only makes these plans a sure bet...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Reuse the Mellon Arena</td>
<td>6-Jun-10</td>
<td>YouTube Student documentary on reuse of Mellon Arena.</td>
<td>&quot;...It's an issue to raise: Shall we save arena?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Campaign to save Igloo tries to beat final buzzer</td>
<td>5-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;...It's an issue to raise: Shall we save arena?&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Preservationists want slow decision on Mellon Arena</td>
<td>5-Jun-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Ashley Gold</td>
<td>&quot;...It's an issue to raise: Shall we save arena?&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Igloo reuse study under way</td>
<td>4-Jun-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Ashley Gold</td>
<td>&quot;...It's an issue to raise: Shall we save arena?&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Preservationists want more time to study reuse of Mellon Arena</td>
<td>4-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;...It's an issue to raise: Shall we save arena?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Looking back, moving forward</td>
<td>1-Jun-10</td>
<td>AIA-PGH Column Magazine</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann and Kenneth Doyno</td>
<td>&quot;...two local architects' opinions concerning this historical issue...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted points of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Don't blame Mellon Arena for Hill problems</td>
<td>1-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Joel C. Borch</td>
<td>&quot;...I don't have a dog in the race for what should be done with Mellon Arena...&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Igno Memories for 6/1/2010</td>
<td>1-Jun-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>A reader submission on their memories and thoughts on Mellon Arena.</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted points of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Cool built places we like</td>
<td>31-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>The Feed</td>
<td>&quot;...The Feed is...of the opinion that is should not be razed, being a landmark of Pittsburgh skyline and a symbol of architecture and design that was forward-thinking...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Arena timeline – Highlights of 50 years of entertainment</td>
<td>30-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Sharon Ettersen</td>
<td>A decade-by-decade breakdown of notable acts/concerts held at Civic (Mellon) Arena.</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>At the Arena the future : The nice, the rude, the outrageous</td>
<td>30-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Pat DiCesare</td>
<td>Anecdotes and personal stories of the various acts that DiCesare managed during his career as promoter for concerts at Arena.</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Civic Arena played big part in birth of &quot;megaconcert&quot; industry</td>
<td>30-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Pat DiCesare</td>
<td>Memories, anecdotes and history of early days of concert promotion, and concerts at Civic Arena, by pioneer concert promoter Pat DiCesare.</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Test Your Arena IQ</td>
<td>30-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Dave Goodrich</td>
<td>20 question quiz on the various acts, events, etc held at Mellon Arena (answers provided).</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena may open for final show</td>
<td>25-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Mark Bellu</td>
<td>&quot;...officials are exploring the idea as part of a grand finale for the iconic arena-dome building...&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Gutting the arena is not &quot;saving&quot; it</td>
<td>25-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Paul Ostergaard</td>
<td>&quot;...arenas are very difficult to re-purpose as other uses. No examples exists of an arena that was used as something other than a public assembly building...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted points of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Poll</td>
<td>Should you come Downtown to see roof of Mellon Arena open one final time before its sandwhiched?</td>
<td>25-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Post-Gazette staff</td>
<td>Results of May 25. Yes (85%); maybe, depending on day (24%); no (11%)</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>Save Mellon Arena</td>
<td>24-May-10</td>
<td>Petition Online</td>
<td>Stanley Hetz</td>
<td>As of May 24, 2010 - 743 signatures in support of re-use.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Igloo Memories: Dancers, singers and folk festival captivated at arena</td>
<td>21-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Sherry Atri</td>
<td>&quot;...I keep the memories of music and dancing and magic at the Civic Arena. Too bad that will be lost to future generations.&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena basketball floor to bring in $15,001</td>
<td>21-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Mark Bello</td>
<td>&quot;...the hiring of the company to conduct an inventory and perhaps sell off parts of the Igloo is not an indication that officials have decided to demolish the structure.&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Historic preservation has $475 million impact; Pittsburgh sees more benefits, study says</td>
<td>20-May-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Business Times</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>&quot;...Historic preservation impacts the...region...with $475 million in regional investment...$65.6m in tax revenues...5.2 million sq ft of renovated space...more than 3,000 permanent jobs.&quot;</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted comment, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Historic preservation has $475 million impact; Pittsburgh sees more benefits, study says</td>
<td>20-May-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Business Times</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>&quot;...Historic preservation impacts the...region...with $475 million in regional investment...$65.6m in tax revenues...5.2 million sq ft of renovated space...more than 3,000 permanent jobs.&quot;</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted comment, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Arena's demise could be Hill's rebirth</td>
<td>20-May-10</td>
<td>The Herald (Tribune-Review)</td>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
<td>&quot;...the building, for all its history, charm and architectural cache, is old, outdated and in need of extensive and costly repairs if it were to be maintained for even the simple of purposes...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Bland replacement</td>
<td>20-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Harry and Larisa Waters</td>
<td>&quot;...the new Consol Energy Center is a cookie-cutter designed warehouse...&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Storytelling: Vibrant collection of backgrounds preceded the arena</td>
<td>19-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Gene Kail</td>
<td>&quot;...while I revel in rooting on the Penguins during their last playoffs ever at the arena, I can't fully embrace the Igloo as all things good.&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>19-May-10</td>
<td>utterlyopinionated.com</td>
<td>Eve Picker</td>
<td>&quot;...We want an opportunity to be educated, to help decide.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Hold on to the best of Mellon Arena</td>
<td>17-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Chris Travers</td>
<td>&quot;...this fiscally sound idea [of re-use] will add enormous value to all other proposals for the arena district, and will generate national buzz about Pittsburgh's creative asset reuse plan.&quot;</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Keep the cantilever</td>
<td>17-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Matt Zoller</td>
<td>&quot;...leave the cantilever and demolish the rest...it will be an appropriate and historical remembrance...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Poll</td>
<td>Do you think the proceeds from Mellon Arena auction should go to paying down the Arena's debt?</td>
<td>17-May-10</td>
<td>KGV.com</td>
<td>KGV.com</td>
<td>&quot;...leave the cantilever and demolish the rest...it will be an appropriate and historical remembrance...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Poll</td>
<td>What, if anything, would you miss most about Mellon Arena?</td>
<td>17-May-10</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thepittsburghchannel.com">www.thepittsburghchannel.com</a></td>
<td>WTAE</td>
<td>&quot;...leave the cantilever and demolish the rest...it will be an appropriate and historical remembrance...&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Sunday pops</td>
<td>16-May-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>&quot;...$9.3m debt on the soon-to-be-demolished arena that...taxpayers will have to retire.&quot;</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item. Incorporated into addendum of Options Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mayor Sam Adams wants a compromise proposal for Memorial Coliseum</td>
<td>15-May-10</td>
<td>OregonLive.com</td>
<td>D.K. Row</td>
<td>Development challenges of old Memorial Coliseum and surrounding Rose Quarter. $100m development cost from proposal - already nine-months into process. Mayor wants it speeded up.</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item. Studied in addendum of Options Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Meeting held to discuss 49-year-old Arena's future</td>
<td>14-May-10</td>
<td>The Pittsburgh Channel</td>
<td>WITAE</td>
<td>&quot;...the three options weighed at the meeting included the arena vacant, using it as some sort of convention center or demolishing it for new development...[a] timetable for a decision on the arena's future has not been set.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Pens gone, but Igloo $9.3 million in debt</td>
<td>14-May-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Jeremy Boxen</td>
<td>&quot;...there would be significant capital improvements required to stay in building...&quot; &quot;...making more repairs wouldn't be worth it, said David Donahue, director of RAG...&quot;</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Views differ on whether Mellon Arena should survive</td>
<td>14-May-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Adam Brandolph</td>
<td>&quot;...residents voiced their concerns over both options. While some want to rid their neighborhood of the memory that the arena...there are lot of things that can be done in that beautiful dome...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>The End is Near for Mellon Arena</td>
<td>13-May-10</td>
<td>KDKA Radio</td>
<td>Mike Pintek</td>
<td>Sala Udin interviewed on his thoughts on why Mellon Arena should be demolished. Cites economic development, progress, historical context, highest and best use, community/resident benefits, jobs participation and other matters.</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted comments, mp3 filed in office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Move the arena</td>
<td>12-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Thomas A. Josephi</td>
<td>&quot;...whatever individual or group who buys it...will pay to disassemble the building an re-erect it at another location exactly as it was...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Don't new it</td>
<td>11-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Joseph Pugatsi</td>
<td>&quot;...leaving Mellon Arena is a horrible idea...reconstruct into a shopping mall...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Researched Montreal Forum as indoor mall. (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Oppressive barrier</td>
<td>8-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Eva-Maria Simms</td>
<td>&quot;...has been an eyesore squattting at the bottom of the Hill District...a symbol of oppression and destruction for the residents...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Part of our history</td>
<td>8-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Scott Schlesicher</td>
<td>&quot;...keep Mellon Arena standing and functional while incorporating a park-like atmosphere...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Fit's with First the Rivers re: their Greenprint for the Hill (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Unique building</td>
<td>8-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>J. Little</td>
<td>&quot;...Please save our great landmarks and stop tearing them down...[it's a stunning piece of architecture and should be saved...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>More retail isn't unique, the arena is</td>
<td>7-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Jason Harris</td>
<td>&quot;...any study can show a certain plan more economically feasible, but ultimately comes down to which one has more character and passion behind it...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item.</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena preservation group hires economic consultant</td>
<td>5-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>Pfaffmann said one goal of [new] study is to refute an economic analysis released last week that found that plan by the Penguins...which had nearly double the economic benefit to Pfaffmann's plan...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>Reason they don't make a number that goes that high...</td>
<td>5-May-10</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thatstchurch.com">www.thatstchurch.com</a> Blog</td>
<td>&quot;...but Chad's really pushed me over the fence onto the &quot;keep it&quot; side.&quot; (19 comments with various points of view)</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Arena practicality</td>
<td>4-May-10</td>
<td>Citizen Greg Fuhrman</td>
<td>&quot;...was one of the early great marvels of engineering...the arena is not worth saving at the expense of connecting the Lower Hill with Downtown...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Issue One Mellon Arena</td>
<td>2-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Various</td>
<td>&quot;...was one of the early great marvels of engineering...the arena is not worth saving at the expense of connecting the Lower Hill with Downtown...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Sensible arena plan</td>
<td>1-May-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette George Villani</td>
<td>&quot;...Pfaffmann's plan to turn an existing venue into a unique entertainment, shopping and hospitality center...makes so much more sense.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>The arena deserves better than a wrecking ball</td>
<td>1-May-10</td>
<td>Citizen Carol Schmidt</td>
<td>&quot;...This city has a history of tearing things down, not saving anything for history...&quot;</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Study says razing Mellon Arena makes economic sense</td>
<td>28-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;...conclusion of [report] found that Pfenn plan to demolish had nearly double the benefit of proposed...re-use [option]...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Let's embrace our architectural past</td>
<td>27-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Scott Kerr</td>
<td>&quot;...what will be gained by reconnecting...will pale to what will be historically lost by demolishing this structure.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Meltdown - The Fight to Reuse the Igloo</td>
<td>27-Apr-10</td>
<td>YouTube Egg72485</td>
<td>&quot;Story of a group who is attempting to save Mellon Arena from destruction.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>A clash of visions</td>
<td>20-Apr-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Editorial Board</td>
<td>&quot;...if you put the grid back, you'll connect...as you go up the Lower Hill...all of which was once connected, there are things to keep in mind...what to do w th old arena...[writes] Roberta Brandes Gratz...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>Arena decisions should rest with Hill residents</td>
<td>24-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Jason Vrablic</td>
<td>&quot;...the community deserves to weigh the economic and social benefits to various development scenarios...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>The arena would make for a great museum</td>
<td>23-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Sean Daly Ferris</td>
<td>&quot;...the City needs an attract other than sports teams and ballparks...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>The Igloo could showcase our brain trust</td>
<td>23-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Locke Roberts</td>
<td>&quot;...I can think of no other space anywhere that could accommodate research and development along with product show space in presenting...Pittsburgh's goods and advanced technology...&quot; (11 comments, various)</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>URA Chief at chamber breakfast</td>
<td>21-Apr-10</td>
<td>New Pittsburgh Courier</td>
<td>Christian Moro</td>
<td>&quot;...thought authority is known for its successes in reviving former industrial sites...It is also known for while elephants like Larcen and Lord &amp; Taylor...Authority is toiling at smaller scale to stabilize neighborhoods...&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Letters to Editor</td>
<td>A final opening?</td>
<td>20-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Rose Bightwell</td>
<td>&quot;...to have a roof opening for closing ceremony...for a younger generation who have never seen roof open...&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>More fatal conceit</td>
<td>18-Apr-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Colin McNickle</td>
<td>&quot;...it's hardly a real free-market deal. Taxpayers are, in effect, paying for another capital cost [infrastructure], that's already had its other capital costs largely offset by taxpayers [arena],...&quot;</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>We can have it both ways with arena</td>
<td>16-Apr-10</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>David Julian Roth</td>
<td>&quot;...an innovative preservation of this special place would reinvent it as a neighborhood asset &quot;the Pittsburgh way&quot; built today, for tomorrow, with respect for the past.&quot; (3 comments, various)</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Coming attraction: New development</td>
<td>15-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
<td>&quot;...leaving the arena in place...would be an obstacle to future development, despite sentimental attachment...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Poll</td>
<td>Should Mellon Arena be saved, or demolished?</td>
<td>14-Apr-10</td>
<td>KQV.com</td>
<td>KQV.com</td>
<td>Phone and Internet results</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Grid of roads proposed to link Lower Hill with Downtown</td>
<td>13-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Adam Brandolph</td>
<td>&quot;...the public sector is what leverages the private sector, said Ravenstahl...&quot;&quot;...there is a &quot;better and higher reuse of that land&quot; than preserving Mellon Arena...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Is Mellon Arena a roadblock?</td>
<td>13-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Mark Bebu</td>
<td>&quot;...their [elected officials] views regarding the fate of the silver-domed landmark come as a blow to efforts by local preservationists who want to save and re-use the building...&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Pittsburgh's riverfronts will continue to attract investment</td>
<td>13-Apr-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Bill Zaleski</td>
<td>&quot;...it...and foundation officials used a top-down approach that did not always work [in 1970-80s]...said program officer for RK Mellon Foundation...&quot;&quot;...About $45 will be invested in riverfront in next decade...&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Mellon Arena Tribute Video</td>
<td>13-Apr-10</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>i01p</td>
<td>&quot;As of 2010, Mellon Arena is the oldest and lowest capacity arena in the NHL by official capacity.&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Pittsburgh officials: Mellon Arena should come down</td>
<td>13-Apr-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Business Times</td>
<td>Jim Lyons</td>
<td>&quot;...Lawless said his constituents have expressed overwhelming support for tearing down Mellon Arena. &quot;Only a handful of preservationists have expressed a desire to keep it...&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
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<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Ravenstahl: Mellon Arena must come down for redevelopment</td>
<td>13-Apr-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Mark Bello</td>
<td>&quot;...Mr. Specter threw his support behind plans to restore the street grid between the Hill and Downtown, saying I would create thousands of construction and permanent jobs.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Old Building Hosts Final Regular-Season Penguins Game</td>
<td>9-Apr-10</td>
<td>The Pittsburgh Channel</td>
<td>The Pittsburgh Channel &amp; Pitt</td>
<td>Pens fans share memories of Mellon Arena.</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted comments, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo? One Group Sure Hopes So</td>
<td>8-Apr-10</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>WTAE-TV</td>
<td>WTAE piece on Mellon Arena.</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>If These Walls Could Talk</td>
<td>1-Apr-10</td>
<td>Western Pennsylvania History Magazine - Heinz History Center</td>
<td>Tom Rooney</td>
<td>Recollections of Tom Rooney, former Mellon Arena director: &quot;If it's clear and sunny, the Civic Arena gleams to me, like an old friend with a great smile. But before long, the iconic arena dome will be no more. And for anyone who has become familiar with seeing it, things won’t be quite the same.&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Memory &amp; Renewal</td>
<td>1-Apr-10</td>
<td>Western Pennsylvania History Magazine - Heinz History Center</td>
<td>Rob Pfieff</td>
<td>Describes urban renewal history of Hill. &quot;The question for buildings like the Civic Arena, is, do we delete it from our memories, or transform it and make it a vital anchor for the rebirth of the Hill?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Save the Building, or Save the People?</td>
<td>1-Apr-10</td>
<td>Western Pennsylvania History Magazine - Heinz History Center</td>
<td>Sala Udin</td>
<td>An extensive history and reflection on the redevelopment of Lower Hill District. &quot;There is simply no way to argue that preserving the Civic Arena, simply out of preservational nostalgia, is an intelligent exchange for a truly once-in-a-lifetime development opportunity.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Hill slight</td>
<td>25-Mar-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City Paper</td>
<td>Chris Young</td>
<td>&quot;...by the end of the two-hour debate, it was clear that the residents wanted [Pens] officials...to include more community involvement...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Buncher set to develop Allegheny waterfront</td>
<td>9-Mar-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Timothy McNulty</td>
<td>Redevelopment of 80 acres of riverfront land from Strip District to Highland Park.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Uptown &amp; the Hill: Putting the pieces together</td>
<td>28-Feb-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Business Times</td>
<td>Maria Spencer</td>
<td>Various articles on redevelopment in the Hill and Uptown.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Downtown Pittsburgh redevelopment starts to bear fruit</td>
<td>21-Jan-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Andrew Conte</td>
<td>Examples of various redevelopment and preservation successes in and around downtown.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Hill District group, firm collaborate on master plan</td>
<td>26-Jan-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Diane Nelson Jones</td>
<td>&quot;...the master plan process has begun with a list of guiding principles that the group posted on web site at <a href="http://www.hilp.org">www.hilp.org</a>...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Hill District residents look to enhance parks, housing, shopping</td>
<td>26-Jan-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Jeremy Born</td>
<td>&quot;...first meeting will be nine-month, $500,000 master planning effort to shape residents’ desires for more housing, park space and shopping into an economically feasible plan...to attract enterprise developers...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Source Title and/or Subject</td>
<td>Source Date</td>
<td>Source Author / Contributor</td>
<td>Excerpt and/or Summary</td>
<td>Point of View</td>
<td>Response and/or Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>SEA to consider alternatives for arena</td>
<td>20-Jan-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;...the arena’s demolition is not a foregone conclusion...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Authority to consider possible reuses for Mellon Arena</td>
<td>19-Jan-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;...the arena's demolition is one alternative...other alternatives would be considered as well, including possible re-use of the distinctive building...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena may not necessarily see wrecking ball</td>
<td>19-Jan-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Jeremy Boren</td>
<td>&quot;...the historic preservationists want to reuse the building...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena nostalgia kept in check</td>
<td>19-Jan-10</td>
<td>American Chronicle Jeremy Boren</td>
<td>&quot;...the first of several meetings about the arena’s development...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Developer wants to use arena roof</td>
<td>16-Jan-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;...developer had yet to discuss with SEA whether he would have to pay...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Parts of Mellon Arena could grace high-concept office site</td>
<td>15-Jan-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Andrew Conte</td>
<td>&quot;...Five Mile Development wants to re-use portions of Mellon Arena in an office building...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena roof could be reused in N. Hill office park</td>
<td>15-Jan-10</td>
<td>Post-Gazette Mark Belko</td>
<td>&quot;...the truss would be used to span a township road...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>PBT readers Mellon Arena has much potential</td>
<td>15-Jan-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Business Times Poll</td>
<td>&quot;...Tear it down (30%); make it a skating rink/park (34%);...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Old arena can be grocer's paradise</td>
<td>3-Jan-10</td>
<td>Tribune-Review Eric Heyl</td>
<td>&quot;...residents of the Hill facing lengthy bus or jitney rides to get basics such as bread and milk might disagree...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Vision Quest</td>
<td>24-Dec-09</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City Paper Chris Young</td>
<td>&quot;...there is a consensus on at least one of those (guiding) principles already. Both the community groups and the Penguins support demolishing Mellon Arena...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Last-Minute Gift Ideas Old Stadiums</td>
<td>23-Dec-09</td>
<td>The Wall Street Journal Hannah Karp</td>
<td>&quot;...look at various stadiums that are vacant...&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Preserving the arena</td>
<td>9-Dec-09</td>
<td>Citizen Jeff Slack</td>
<td>&quot;...The standards present four approaches...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Source Title and/or Subject</td>
<td>Source Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Source Author / Contributor</td>
<td>Excerpt and/or Summary</td>
<td>Point of View</td>
<td>Response and/or Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>The arena has value</td>
<td>6-Dec-09</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Bianca Palmisano</td>
<td>&quot;...be revamped and reused as a secondary all-purpose venue...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item, see analysis in Option Report (see catalogued item 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Worthy of a future</td>
<td>6-Dec-09</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Bob Ziller</td>
<td>&quot;...It's a beautiful structure...a worldwide call for architects and designers to offer their ideas as to what to do with it...&quot; (7 comments, various)</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Important igloo</td>
<td>4-Dec-09</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Christine Belhea</td>
<td>&quot;...I am still crying over the Syrian Mosque...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Open Letters</td>
<td>Make our unique arena part of our future</td>
<td>4-Dec-09</td>
<td>Preservation Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Scott Leib</td>
<td>&quot;...It's easy to demo and start over, but the results will only be ordinary. Why not reuse the arena to make it an extraordinary destination?&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Fantasy on ice: Recycling the Igloo is an outlandish idea</td>
<td>2-Dec-09</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
<td>&quot;...this pie in the sky plan (Pfaffmann's plan) does not rate serious consideration.&quot;</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Architect states case to preserve the Igloo</td>
<td>20-Nov-09</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Mark Bello</td>
<td>&quot;...I can make the argument to the Penguins that the economic advantages to keeping the arena is better than tearing it down...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena study may sketch out vision</td>
<td>20-Nov-09</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Jeremy Boren</td>
<td>&quot;...A key component will be gathering input from the new arena’s neighbors...an effort that began when the SEA hired Michael Baker to study the historical and archeological significance...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Authority looks at 'cultural' impact of hockey arena site</td>
<td>19-Nov-09</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Jeremy Boren</td>
<td>&quot;...The process is beginning, and we have no hard figures on anything right now, said Mary Conturo...It will be public process that you will have the opportunity to participate in...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>The Civic Arena (Mellon Arena) History 1961 - Present</td>
<td>5-Nov-09</td>
<td>PittsburghHockey.net</td>
<td>PittsburghHockey.net Staff</td>
<td>&quot;A timeline and history of the major events and milestones.&quot;</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>Noted background information, and cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Hill group irked over delay in redevelopment timing</td>
<td>9-Oct-09</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Mark Bello</td>
<td>&quot;...Tonya Payne, a URA board member, requested a one-month delay in hiring CH/Planning Ltd., so that she and her board colleagues would have more time to review qualifications of the firm...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>A Civic Renewal</td>
<td>1-Oct-09</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Magazine</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>&quot;...the REUSE of the Civic (Mellon) Arena is my proposal for Pittsburgh's symbol...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>The End of An Igloo</td>
<td>12-Aug-09</td>
<td>Politics and Place</td>
<td>Bing</td>
<td>&quot;...the first thing everyone needs to realize is that the area is still...the development on the North Side will always be more appealing since the land is flatter...as for the building, I'm torn...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Source Title and/or Subject</td>
<td>Source Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Source Author / Contributor</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>What to Do With Mellon Arena?</td>
<td>12-Aug-09</td>
<td>Pop City Media</td>
<td>Abby Mendelson</td>
<td>&quot;This is an emerging story, as the city enters its Master Planning phase of its most expensive piece of available real estate—the 28 acres of the Lower Hill...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Master Plan: City looking for company to help plan Hill District's future</td>
<td>16-Apr-09</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City Paper</td>
<td>Chris Young</td>
<td>&quot;...to find a consultant who can provide a comprehensive plan identifying community needs—affordable housing, economic development, educational facilities...&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Civic Arena Engineering &amp; Innovation in Pittsburgh</td>
<td>31-Jan-09</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>pittywatcher</td>
<td>Thanks to Rich Sebak and WQED Civic Arena Adaptive Reuse Goals: Promote a sustainable reuse strategy...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Pens' arena groundbreaking today</td>
<td>14-Aug-08</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Andrew Conte</td>
<td>&quot;...when the Igloo's demise finally comes, the [SEA] could recoup some of its costs by selling off the building's stainless steel roof and the sports-themed memorabilia inside...&quot;</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Can this landmark be saved?</td>
<td>20-Jan-08</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Joseph Sabino Mistick</td>
<td>&quot;...with godlike decisions in the hands of flawed mortals, however, our heritage will continue to slip away as the light for political dominance flicks on...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Hill District divided by legacy of Mellon Arena</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Salena Zito</td>
<td>&quot;...a second argument has begun -- between people impassioned over whether to preserve or demolish Mellon Arena...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Places On the Hill, preservation and the Penguins can be compatible</td>
<td>20-Feb-07</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Patricia Lowry</td>
<td>&quot;...the arena isn't the culprit, but it will be the scapegoat if a half-century of hard feelings help bring it down...[p]. the arena could be reinvented as a park/the civic center that is the focus of the neighborhood...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>The Next Page: A Conceptual Plan for the Hill</td>
<td>11-Feb-07</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Rob Pfaffmann</td>
<td>&quot;...we're asking the SEA to think more creatively about the design of not just the Lower Hill, but also the whole Hill...&quot;</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena Re-Imagined</td>
<td>11-Jan-07</td>
<td>Pittsburgh City Paper</td>
<td>Violet Law</td>
<td>&quot;...whatever form the [arena] is going to take, it has to be something that the community helps build and form, says [voice]...[Pfaffmann concedes the first priority is to win broad support for saving the arena...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Mellon Arena status debated at hearing</td>
<td>11-Jul-02</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Stephanie Frankien</td>
<td>&quot;City Councilman Sala Udin spoke strongly against the proposal, saying the arena should be removed or demolished.&quot; &quot;...Mellon Arena is a Pittsburgh landmark that ought to be preserved. Along with Fallingwater, it was one of Pittsburgh's claims to fame, and both were the vision of Edgar Kaufman.&quot; &quot;...the SEA said it could not afford to own and operate Mellon Arena along with a new $225 million [arena] that the Penguins want to build near the existing arena...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted comments, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Arena's famous dome falls for the theater</td>
<td>13-May-02</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Patricia Lowry</td>
<td>&quot;Although it never lived up to its advance billing, the stainless steel Civic Arena in the early 1960s not only was the brightest baste in Pittsburgh's Renaissance but also its boldest engineering feat.&quot; &quot;...some movers and shakers of Renaissance I acknowledged that more than buildings was lost when Lower Hill fell...&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted points of view, history and nostalgia, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Preserving, improving Pittsburgh with Art Zeigle</td>
<td>11-May-02</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
<td>Bill Steigerwald</td>
<td>&quot;...What we are asking is time to see if any feasible new use can be found...if none...I don't think it will be standing...but it's an incredible structure. It's unique.&quot;</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Source Title and/or Subject</td>
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<td>Excerpt and/or Summary</td>
<td>Point of View</td>
<td>Response and/or Action</td>
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<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>HOK Sports' dominant role in region's stadium raises questions</td>
<td>17-Mar-02</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Dan Flanagan</td>
<td>&quot;From 1994 to 1998 HOK also received about $200,000 for studies and renovations at Three Rivers Stadium, and more recently, shared responsibility for a $100,000 Penguins study that examined the feasibility of renovating the 41-yr-old Mellon Arena.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item. Refer to original HOK study (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>New arena is Penguins best bet</td>
<td>13-Jun-01</td>
<td>Post-Gazette</td>
<td>Tom Barnes</td>
<td>&quot;Consul'tant's reports finds that fixing Mellon Arena would cost as much as building a new one. The cost of the new arena is estimate at $200 million to $220 million. The most expensive option for renovating Mellon Arena in the same range.&quot;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item. Refer to original HOK study (see catalogued item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Civic Arena Sound Rated Deplorable</td>
<td>23-Sep-64</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>&quot;But I am sure that I express that feelings of thousands of people in Pittsburgh who feel they are being shortchanged when they attend dramatic performances there. I suggest we correct this deplorable condition in the Arena.&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted historical article, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Arena Chiefs Sound Plans for Repairs</td>
<td>23-Jun-64</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>Carl Apone</td>
<td>&quot;The sound systems was installed at a time when civic authorities, alarmed at the mushrooming cost of building the arena, began cutting corners wherever they thought possible. Unfortunately, one of those &quot;savings&quot; was the sound system, reportedly installed at a cost of $22,000.&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted historical article, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Civic Arena Loss $30,492 in 15 Months</td>
<td>28-Nov-63</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>Edward Jensen</td>
<td>&quot;The Civic Arena disclosed yesterday an operating loss of $30,492 for the 15-month period beginning July 1, 1962 and ending Sept 30 of this year.&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Steinberg Urges Shell for Arena</td>
<td>2-Oct-63</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>&quot;Officials have been trying to improve arena sound since Bernstein's criticism last month following a concert here by his NY Philharmonic Orchestra.&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Civic Arena Gives Boost to Business</td>
<td>26-Sep-63</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>Post-Gazette staff</td>
<td>&quot;The new Civic Auditorium has helped increase business in many bars and restaurants Downtown... had a &quot;substantial&quot; increase in business since the Auditorium opened Sept 18.&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>What's wrong with Civic Arena?</td>
<td>20-Sep-63</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>Post-Gazette staff</td>
<td>&quot;The complaints are piling up, and the experience of the past two years has indicated faults in planning, design and operation which may seriously affect the future of the $22 million facility. Something will have to be done to make the best use of the big investment in the Arena...&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Bernstein Raps Arena Sound</td>
<td>16-Sep-63</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>Carl Apone</td>
<td>&quot;The occasion was a historic one, the first symphony orchestra concert ever held in the Arena, with a crowd of 7,500. &quot;It is impossible to play here without a shell on stage. The music is wasted. There is no projection.&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Civic Razz Civic Arena's Roof While Audience, Stars Applaud</td>
<td>4-Sep-63</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Press</td>
<td>Carl Apone</td>
<td>&quot;Some say the Wylie Avenue Roundhouse may be good for sports but not for light opera. There are complaints about the Arena's sound system, parking facilities, ushers, peanut vendors, etc.&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Noted point of view, cataloged item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Oxford Development Company is the largest privately owned real estate services firm in Pennsylvania. We are committed to providing valued solutions in commercial real estate ventures including: Real Estate Development, Asset/Property Management, Brokerage Services, Business Operations, and Investment Advisory Services.

We provide innovative, cutting edge and cost effective solutions that deliver lasting value to real estate projects of all sizes.

Headquartered in heart of downtown Pittsburgh, we have over 44 years of experience in the local, regional, and national marketplace.

Our properties and projects include:
- Mixed Use Developments
- High Performance Green Buildings
- GSA Government Projects
- Urban and Suburban Office Buildings
- Warehouse and Distribution Facilities
- Institutional Developments
- Malls and Retail Centers
- Hotels and Resorts
- Apartments and Luxury Condominiums
- Exhibition Centers
- Airport Retail Facilities
- Health and Fitness Centers

Oxford Development now has a division dedicated to handling Distressed Assets for financial institutions, investors and owners. Click our logo for more information.
Environmental Clearance and Project Development

Qualifications

Baker has extensive experience in providing the relevant services to advance projects efficiently through project development, NEPA environmental clearance, permit acquisition, mitigation commitments and construction. Baker has provided these service to a varied client group including transportation agencies, private developers, state and national parks, Fish & Wildlife Service, conservation and preservation groups, Department of Defense, Department of Energy, etc.

Baker maintains a highly-qualified team of environmental scientists, engineers, planners, geologists, and cultural resource specialists who can successfully work anywhere in the nation to prepare NEPA EIS and EA documents, perform environmental investigations, assess impacts, and document findings, obtain permits, develop and implement mitigation and get the job done. The Baker team is up on the latest techniques, regulatory requirements, and analysis protocol resulting in the highest level of client service.

Baker’s Comprehensive Technical and Permitting Expertise

**Project Development Services**
- Corridor Studies
- Alternatives Analysis
- NEPA
  - Environ. Impact Statement
  - Tiered EIS
  - Environmental Assessment
  - Categorical Exclusions
- Section 4(f) & (6) Evaluations
- Program Management
- Agency & Public Coordination

**Natural Resource Services**
- Wetlands
  - Identification & Delineation
  - Mitigation Design
  - Federal / State Permitting
  - Water Budget Analysis
  - Treatment Wetland Design
- Aquatic Resources
  - Habitat Analysis
  - Benthic Studies
  - Water Quality Studies
  - Rapid BioAssessment
  - Hydraulic/Hydrologic
  - Natural Channel Design
- Threatened & Endangered Species
  - Field Survey
  - Biological Assessments
  - Section 7 Consultation
  - Habitat Evaluation (HEP)
- Environmental Management Systems

**Socio-Economic Resources**
- Community Impact Assessment
- Environmental Justice
- Linguistic Isolated Households
- Economic Analysis
- Context Sensitive Design
- Visual Impact Assessments
- Secondary & Cumulative Impact Analysis
- Farmland Impact Assessments

**Cultural Resource Services**
- Section 106 Compliance
  - Architectural Studies
  - Archaeological Surveys
- Archaeological Evaluations
- Eligibility Determinations
- Determinations of Effects
- Historical / Archival Research
- NEPA Compliance
  - Early Coordination
  - Programmatic Agreements
  - Memorandum of Agreements
- Predictive Models
  - Public Education / Outreach
- Mitigation & Recordation
  - HABS / HAER Recordation
  - Artifact Analysis / Curation
  - Statistical Analysis
  - Archaeological Mitigation (Phase II and III Studies)

**Noise & Air Quality Analysis**
- Barrier Design / Analysis
- Mobile Source Air Toxins
- Particulate Matter 2.5
Streamlined Approach to Project Development

Concurrent study of engineering and environmental issues is the heart of Baker's approach to corridor studies. Using a GIS-generated constraints map, Baker's engineers and environmental scientists work side-by-side to identify the most feasible engineering solutions that avoid or minimize environmental impacts. The consideration of environmental issues at the earliest possible point in the planning process paves the way for expedient preparation and approval of EISs, only the most feasible solutions are developed and studied, and fewer alternatives mean less time and cost spent analyzing alternatives that do not meet the purpose and need or involve high impacts.

Baker's experience includes coordination with a complex array of agencies and the ability to conduct the range of impact analyses, from socioeconomics to the natural and cultural environments. Public involvement, in areas running the gamut from intense urban to sparsely settled rural settings, has been an important aspect of each of these studies. In addition, Baker has conducted environmental studies (EISs, EAs, CE) for numerous smaller projects from the firm's offices in locations ranging from Arizona to Florida to the northeastern US.

Consensus Building Through Public Involvement

Participation by the general public and local officials is an important means of gaining consensus on a preferred alternative, as well as an important means of obtaining information for the project team. It can help to define important local issues and lead to the best alternative alignment. Establishment of a local project office, staffed with a project-dedicated team, with easily access to the public and local review agencies, improves the quality of the public involvement effort.

Individualized Client Focus

Our approach has proven to be an effective method for conducting corridor studies, but we recognize that each project is unique and may require customized procedures. We will identify the most efficient means of obtaining and analyzing data. Baker staff will propose a scope of work that accommodates the needs of the client, satisfies all reporting requirements and environmental regulations, includes an effective, suitable public participation program, and that ultimately produces the environmental clearance as quickly as possible.

Baker is proud of its broad base of qualified environmental scientists, engineers, and GIS specialists. In fact, Baker has experienced staff with expertise in every aspect of NEPA corridor studies. An "All Baker" staff means that project team coordination is simplified. The staff has a well-established working relationship from prior engagements. This facilitates a rapid start-up and smooth operation of each new assignment. Management and coordination costs are minimized, uniform working styles and computer compatibility are assured, and projects can be advanced more quickly than projects in which team members are assembled from a diversity of firms.

Baker

ChallengeUs.

Airside Business Park
100 Airside Drive
Moon Township, PA  15108
412.269.6300
www.mbakercorp.com
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General Qualifications

Mr. Zinn is a historic preservation specialist and architectural historian manager for the Pittsburgh office. He has over 20 years of experience in the Mid-Atlantic region, serving as both principal investigator and project/task manager for numerous historic resource projects in multiple states.

Mr. Zinn has a proven track record in Section 106 documentation, including Historic Resource Surveys, Determination of Eligibility studies, Criteria of Adverse Effect findings, Memoranda of Agreement, National Register of Historic Places nominations, Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) documentation, and State Historic Resource surveys.

Experience


Economic Development, Route 30 Roadway Improvements, Airport Site 10, Route 30, Findlay Township, Pennsylvania. Allegheny County Airport Authority. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting a pedestrian reconnaissance of the area to determine presence or absence of historic resources. Assisted with the preparation of Environmental Evaluation Form C. For the development of Site 10, Baker was responsible for the preparation of two FAA Environmental Evaluation Form C’s, preparation of a Highway Occupancy Permit, preparation of a Traffic Impact Study, and design for widening of Route 30 to accommodate left turn lanes and traffic signals at two new access driveways into the site.

Cultural Resources to Support Section 404 Permit, Akron-Canton Regional Airport (CAK), Akron, Ohio. Akron-Canton Regional Airport Authority. Architectural Historian. Responsible for conducting a pedestrian reconnaissance of the area to determine the presence or absence of historic resources and assisting with the preparation of Environmental Evaluation Form. Baker conducted a Phase I assessment of potential impacts to cultural resources from planned improvements to the Runway 5-23 Safety Area at Akron-Canton Regional Airport. Baker’s thorough investigation of the project site revealed that there would be no impact to archaeological or architectural resources from the proposed construction. The OHPO concurred with Baker’s findings and determined that no further reconnaissance was necessary.

Cultural Resources. City of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Urban Redevelopment Authority. Project Manager. Responsible for initiation consultation between the Urban Redevelopment Authority and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission regarding the redevelopment of a commercial block in the East Liberty

Years with Baker: 16
Years with Other Firms: 7

Education
M.A., 1996, Historic Preservation, Middle Tennessee State University
B.S., 1986, Accounting/Computer Science, Salem College

Licenses/Certifications
Architectural Historian (36 CFR61) Qualified
Railroad Safety Training, Pennsylvania, 2006
business district. The block is contained within the National Register listed East Liberty Commercial Historic District, and includes the individually listed Highland Building. Responsibilities also included the identification of and coordination with consulting parties, the preparation of a Determination of Effect Report, and the execution of a Memorandum of Agreement.

**Bossier Parish East-West Corridor (Winfield Rd. Ext) EA, Bossier Parish, Louisiana.** *Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments (NWLCOG).* Architectural Historian. Assisted with the preparation of Louisiana Historic Resource Inventory Forms and a Determination of Eligibility Report. Baker was responsible for preliminary engineering and NEPA/environmental documentation for a new 8-mile, two-lane urban collector with right-of-way clearance for possible expansion to a 4-lane boulevard. This new facility will alleviate congestion and reduce travel delays along the other roadways that link the rapidly growing residential areas of Bossier Parish with the Shreveport and Bossier City employment centers.

**Archaeological and Historic Resource Survey of the Bizzack Fill Areas, Parkersburg, West Virginia.** *Bizzack, Inc.* Architectural Historian. Responsible for preparing West Virginia Historic Property Inventory Forms and a Determination of Eligibility Report. Baker performed a Phase I archaeological survey and historic resources survey and eligibility assessment of two noncontiguous, upland drainages that were selected for permanent dumping of residual soils resulting from construction of the Appalachian Corridor D highway system. The two proposed areas collectively spanned roughly 24 ha (60 ac). The work was conducted for Bizzack, Inc., Lexington, Kentucky. As part of the Phase I archaeological survey, two historic archaeological sites and a historic isolated find site were identified. The historic resources survey identified two unrecorded historic resources over 50 years of age.

**Phases I, II, and III Cultural Resource Investigations, Appalachian Corridor H Highway (Mainline), Hardy, Grant, Tucker, and Randolph Counties, West Virginia.** *West Virginia Department of Transportation, Division of Highways.* Architectural Historian. Responsible for conducting a historic resources survey. Also responsible for preparing West Virginia Historic Property Inventory Forms, Determination of Eligibility reports, and Criteria of Effects reports. Baker has performed cultural resources investigations on approximately 216 km (134 mi) of highway right-of-way for the Appalachian Corridor H Project, located in east-central West Virginia. The project extends from Elkins, West Virginia, eastward to the West Virginia/Virginia state line, bisecting portions of Randolph, Tucker, Grant, and Hardy counties, and traversing portions of both the Appalachian Plateaus and the Ridge and Valley physiographic provinces.

**Market Street Bridge Replacement - Phases I and II Archaeological Field Investigations, City of Williamsport & Borough of S. Williamsport, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania.** *Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 3-0.* Architectural Historian. Responsible for identifying and recording historic resources. Also responsible for preparing Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey Forms for selected resources. The Market Street Bridge Replacement project consisted of Phase I and Phase II archaeological investigations. The urban setting of the project presented several challenges to the cultural resource effort which, spanning the Susquehanna River, required the definition of two, non-contiguous Areas of Potential Effect (APE), as well as separate APEs for archaeological resources and historic structures.

**Historic Structures and Terrestrial Archaeological Site Identification and Analysis Services Agreement 98-100B, Statewide, Maryland.** *Maryland State Highway Administration.* Architectural Historian. Responsible for conducting historic resources surveys and preparing Determination of Eligibility Reports. Baker provided consulting services on various task orders to the Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering. The results of these task orders were then incorporated in environmental evaluations prepared by the State Highway Administration or by other consultants. Baker's architectural historians were especially conscious of the importance of sound historic resource evaluations in larger environmental evaluations.
Southern Beltway, PA 60 to U.S. 22, Design Management Services, Allegheny and Washington Counties, Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission. Architectural Historian. Responsible for review of Cultural Resources Studies. Baker was Pennsylvania Turnpike's Design Manager for the Southern Beltway project, a 35-mile limited access toll road from Pittsburgh International Airport at PA 60 to the Mon/Fayette Expressway. Six miles of this beltway is complete and open to traffic, from PA 60 to U.S. 22. The project traversed abandoned surface and underground coal mines, requiring a variety of associated treatments, including dewatering of flooded underground mines and extinguishing an underground mine fire.

The Mall at Robinson Peripheral Development, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. Metro Property Developers. Architectural Historian. Responsible for assisting with the preparation of a Phase I Cultural Resources Report. Baker has been actively involved with a wide variety of engineering and site design tasks on this ever-expanding, large commercial development (approximately 700 acres) surrounding Robinson Towne Center.

Pittsburgh Stage II Light Rail Transit Corridor Study, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Port Authority of Allegheny County. Architectural Historian. Responsible for preparing a historic context of former commuter railroad and interurban line. Providing innovative transportation services to meet citizens' changing mobility needs continues to be one of Baker's priorities. Baker provided subconsultant services to LS Transit Systems, Inc. for the Port Authority of Allegheny County's Light Rail Transit (LRT) Corridor Study, an alternatives analysis for upgrading an existing 12-mile trolley system through Pittsburgh's South Hills area. Baker's services included development of preliminary alternative physical designs, structural and geotechnical analysis, capital cost estimates, environmental impact analysis and completion of an Environmental Assessment Report.

Lawrenceville Access Road, Pittsburgh. Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 11-0. Task Manager. Responsible for performing cultural resource investigations for a five-mile corridor traversing five Pittsburgh urban neighborhoods. Baker conducted a Needs Analysis, Congestion Management System Analysis, and Design Alternative Studies and prepared the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a proposed five-mile industrial access facility. Alternatives developed improved truck access to industrial sites without providing single occupancy vehicle commuters the same access. Significant project issues included alleviation of traffic congestion, connection to four major crossings of the Allegheny River, geotechnical concerns (unstable soils and landslide-prone areas), and relocation of an active rail line.

HABS/HAER Documentation for Overbrook Trolley Line, Stage II LRT Corridor, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Port Authority of Allegheny County. Project Manager. Responsible for recording the National Register eligible Overbrook Trolley Line and four associated historic bridges according to Historic American Engineering Record standards. Baker's Cultural Resources Section assembled Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) information on the Port Authority of Allegheny County's Overbrook streetcar line, which included four historic bridges. Engineering changes and technological improvements to the line were documented and HABS/HAER-level photo-documentation of the resources was performed. These efforts were performed as mitigation of impacts to historic bridges identified in the Environmental Assessment for the Stage II LRT project.

S.R. 0018 Relocation Project (Geneva College) - Preliminary Engineering, Beaver County, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 11-0. Architectural Historian. Responsible for conducting a historic resources survey, preparing a Pennsylvania Historic Resources Survey Forms for selected resources, and preparing National Register eligibility assessments, including the Geneva College Historic District. The proposed project will realign S.R. 0018 to eliminate the two 90-degree turns on 32nd Street by providing a sweeping diagonal curvilinear alignment with two travel lanes, sidewalks and standard width parallel parking lanes on both sides of the roadway between 4th and College Avenues. In
addition, the intersection of S.R. 0018 and 31st Street will have curb bulbouts to enhance pedestrian safety at the street crossing.

**31st Street Bridge Rehabilitation, S.R. 2122, Section A03, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.** Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 11-0. Task Manager. Responsible for managing cultural resources investigations and determinations of eligibility for the proposed rehabilitation of this 28-span, metal arch bridge, constructed in 1927-1928 over the Allegheny River. Co-author of Determination of Eligibility and Criteria of Effects Reports. Baker provided preliminary and final design services for the rehabilitation of the historic 31st Street Bridge in the City of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In addition to structural rehabilitation, the objective of this project is to widen the bridge deck as much as possible. Investigations included consideration for replacement of approach spans versus rehabilitation.

**S.R. 28, Sections A09 and A10 - DEIS/FEIS, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.** Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 11-0. Architectural Historian. Responsible for reviewing cultural resources compliance studies conducted by subconsultants. Also responsible for assisting with the preparation of Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. Baker performed a study of improvements for a section of S.R. 0028 between Troy Hill Road in the City of Pittsburgh and the Millvale Interchange in the Borough of Millvale. The roadway segment, a four-lane undivided principal arterial with four signalized intersections, had a high daily traffic volume. Adjacent sections of S.R. 0028 were previously upgraded to limited access facilities. Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements were prepared. Detailed engineering and environmental analyses are currently being performed.

**Previous Work History**

Mount Washington Community Development Corp., Development Consultant, 1992-1994
South Side Local Development Co, Director, Economic Development, 1991-1992
NewMartinsville Main Street, Inc., Director, 1989-1991

**Professional Affiliations**

Allegheny City Society
National Trust for Historic Preservation
Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation (PHLF)
Raymond Maginness
Project Manager

General Qualifications
As a Project Manager in the NEPA & Natural Resource Section, Mr. Maginness is called upon to participate and direct environmental planning projects due to his exceptional knowledge of such processes especially during transportation development. His responsibilities include supervising project teams; coordinating with and contributing to Baker's highway, structural, planning, traffic divisions; coordinating subconsultants' activities; and conducting/preparing public meetings. As part of the Transportation Planning Department, he ensures compliance with policy, guidelines, and regulations in the preparation of comprehensive environmental documentation. This includes, but is not limited to: planning studies and Land Use Plans; NEPA documents (Environmental Impact Statements, Categorical Exclusion Evaluations, and Environmental Assessments); and Public Involvement programs and implementation strategies, technical, environmental, and engineering studies such as feasibility studies, socioeconomic studies, cultural resource Consulting Party process, wetland delineations, farmland assessments, waste site evaluations, and threatened and endangered species studies and documentation. Mr. Maginness assists other regions including Ohio, New Jersey, Arizona, Texas, and West Virginia. With 22 years of experience prior to Baker, Mr. Maginness has served as Section Chief with the New Jersey Department of Transportation and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection for wetland and waterway encroachment-permitting.

Experience
Airfield Maintenance Center Environmental, Pittsburgh International Airport (PIT), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Allegheny County Airport Authority. Environmental Manager. Conducted the Environmental Assessment Re-evaluation impact assessment and prepared the EA Re-evaluation document for the project. Baker prepared a draft Environmental Reevaluation for a Proposed Airfield Maintenance Facility at Pittsburgh International Airport. Midway through the project, the location of the proposed facility changed and the project was re-scoped as an FAA Environmental Evaluation Form A with documented Cultural Resources coordination. This work was submitted under a separate contract.

S.R. 0090, Section B08 over Six Mile Creek, Erie, Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 1-0. Environmental Manager. Directed the environmental related tasks related to the Value Engineering Accelerated Construction Technology Transfer (VE_ACTT) 3-day meeting. Baker performed preliminary engineering, conducted a Value Engineering/Accelerated Construction Technology Transfer (VE/ACTT) workshop, and prepared a Level 2 Categorical Exclusion Evaluation environmental document for the replacement of the dual steel deck truss structures carrying I-90 Eastbound and Westbound over Six Mile Creek in Erie County, Pennsylvania.

New Fallston Bridge, Bridgewater, Pennsylvania. Beaver, County of. Environmental Manager. Conducted public involvement activities during the final design process to keep the public and elected officials informed of project developments. Also, directed coordination and process through a late discovery potential Section 4(f) issue related to utility relocation and easements. Baker performed final design for a
new three-span highway bridge over the Beaver River connecting S.R. 0018/0065 and S.R. 0051. The project also included replacement of a single-span Norfolk Southern Railroad Bridge carrying four active mainline tracks.

S.R. 28, Sections A09/10 Phase II, Environmental, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 11-0. Environmental Manager. Responsible for technical management of all environmental studies, responsible for preparing the environmental document, organizing and conducting public meetings and special purpose meetings, and maintained environmental mitigation tracking system to ensure that commitments made during the environmental process are implemented. Baker performed the rehabilitation design of a two-mile section of S.R. 28 in the City of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to improve traffic flow and enhance roadway safety. The project included the design of a grade-separated interchange at 31st Street and new on-ramps and off-ramps for continuous main line flow, as well as the addition of median barrier. Traffic flow is further expedited by the elimination of the main line traffic signals.

Environmental Compliance Oversight, Mitigation, and Permitting, Erie International Airport/Tom Ridge Field (ERI), Erie, Pennsylvania. Erie Municipal Airport Authority. Environmental Manager. Responsible for maintaining project involvement during final design to ensure that environmental commitments made in the FONSI/ROD are implemented. Review technical documents and maintain coordination with project manager and Program Director on an "as needed" basis to provide technical advice and options. Prepare a final Environmental Commitment Compliance Report verifying the implementation of commitments. Baker is providing environmental permitting and engineering services in support of the extension of Runway 6-24 at Erie International Airport. Project tasks include environmental compliance monitoring, wetland mitigation site identification and screening, stream and wetland permit application preparation, and stream and wetland mitigation design.

Hickory Street Bridge, S.R. 3005, Section B00, (over the Allegheny River), Warren, Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 1-0. Environmental Manager. Responsible for directing the preliminary design phase of project development including conceptual design, needs study, NEPA documentation (EA/4(f), 6(f)), Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act Consultation, and preparation of a Biological Assessment for impacts to federally listed mussel species. Planned, directed, and participated in a robust Public Coordination plan (involving public meetings, special purpose meetings, and focus group meetings) on this highly successful and award winning bridge project. Baker designed a replacement for the Hickory Street Bridge in Warren, Pennsylvania. The original bridge, which carried S.R. 3005 over the Allegheny River, was a four-span, concrete arch bridge approximately 500 feet long. It served as a major community connector, linking businesses on the north side with neighborhoods on the south side of the Allegheny River. Built in 1917, the bridge was structurally deficient and functionally obsolete, and was closed to pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The goal of this project for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) was to design a bridge replacement that not only satisfies community expectations by replicating the aesthetics of the original structure, but also meets PennDOT's funding and maintenance criteria.

Pond Eddy Bridge Replacement, S.R. 1011, Section 470, Pond Eddy (Shohola Township), Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 4-0. Technical Manager. Organized and participated in the Design Advisory Committee (DAC) to address the appropriate aesthetic treatments for the replacement bridge over the Delaware River, a federal Wild & Scenic River. The existing Pond Eddy Bridge across the Delaware River served as the only public access via paved, state-maintained roads to the community of Pond Eddy, Pennsylvania. The existing structure was a two-span steel thru truss bridge with two equal spans, 252 feet long. The Bridge Replacement Alternative involved the construction of a new bridge immediately upstream of the existing bridge, such that the existing bridge could be used to maintain traffic during project construction. Implementation of aesthetic bridge treatments (as identified and selected through the Design
Advisory Committee) served, in part, as mitigation for the impact to the Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River.

**Environmental Baseline Study Data Refresh, 40 Land Ports of Entry Within the Continental U.S.**

*General Services Administration.* Technical Manager. Responsible for the update of all environmental data and report editing for 40 Land Ports of Entry included in the 2003 initial Environmental Baseline Reports. Updates were included in the categories of Environmental Justice, federally Threatened & Endangered Species and associated habitats, aquatic resources including wetlands, demographics, land use and zoning, labor and industry, traffic and border crossing data, and site improvements. Baker was tasked by the Department of Homeland Security, United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) Program, to perform an update (‘refresh’) of the Environmental Baseline Studies for 40 select Land Ports of Entry (LPOEs) previously performed in 2003. To complete this project, Baker mobilized several teams to the border crossings throughout the country to collect and update the EBS data at the LPOEs. After collecting the data, it was incorporated into a GIS database and used to develop a comprehensive EBS Data Refresh report.

**I-69 SIU 15 - Louisiana (HPC 18 U.S. 171 to I-20), Louisiana.** *Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD).* Environmental Manager. Responsible for conducting field investigations and file research in the preparation of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for approximately 12 miles of new alignment. The completed document was accepted without comment. Also conducted field investigations on proposed stream crossing including stream cross-section data. Baker conducted a preliminary engineering and environmental study for I-69 Section of Independent Utility (SIU) 15 for the client. The proposed highway will be an interstate facility on new location between U.S. Highway 171 (U.S. 171) near the Town of Stonewall in DeSoto Parish, and I-20 near the Town of Haughton in Bossier Parish.

**West Ohio St. Bridge- Part 1.** *City of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.* Technical Manager. Developed, coordinated and implemented a Public Involvement and Consulting Party process to engage the active, informed and unified community that was opposed to the project.

**Charleroi-Monessen Bridge.** *Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 12-0.* Technical Manager. Developed, coordinated and implemented the Consulting Party process for the replacement of the 3-span steel Parker truss, 1000-ft major river crossing, National Register of Historic Places listed bridge.

**Previous Work History**

MS Consultants, Inc., Environmental Division Manager, 1992-2002
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Section Chief, Bureau of Freshwater Wetlands, 1988-1992
New Jersey Department of Transportation, Section Chief, Bureau of Environmental Analysis, 1980-1988
Soil Conservation Services (NJ), Site Inspector, 1980

**Professional Affiliations**

American Society of Highway Engineers (ASHE)
Duncan M. Penney, R.A., LEED AP

Architect

General Qualifications

Mr. Penney's exceptional technical, analytical, and architectural skills reflect more than 24 years of experience in architectural design and project management. His achievements include delivering multi-million dollar projects on time and within construction budget. Mr. Penney has performed project design, project management, design charrettes, feasibility studies, construction administration, and specification writing. A Certified Construction Specifier (CCS), he is skilled in producing construction documents. Mr. Penney is also a U.S. Green Building Council, LEED® accredited professional, with recent experience on over a dozen Pennsylvania Army National Guard Readiness Centers, statewide, for the Stryker Brigade Combat Teams, and Silver LEED®-certified U.S. Army Reserve Center projects for the Louisville District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He is a skilled team facilitator and is adept in providing cross-functional team leadership. He maintains close liaison with clients.

Mr. Penney's computer software experience includes MicroStation SE; Microsoft Word, and other spreadsheet, database, and word-processing applications; AutoCAD 12 and 14; Microsoft Project; Microsoft Excel; Micro-Station version 8; and Adobe Photo Editor.

Experience

Armed Forces Reserve Center, Grand Prairie, Texas. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District. Architect. Responsibilities included serving as a technical advisor for the construction documents. Baker and another contractor design/build team are constructing a new facility to serve as an Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) for units of the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) and Texas Army National Guard. The USAR uses the AFRC for administrative activities, to plan and support operations, and to train unit personnel in their engineering specialties. Four separate buildings are being constructed on various sites on the Grand Prairie Reserve Complex, including a new 78,600-square-foot Administration building, 30,070-square-foot Storage building, 30,450-square-foot Facility Maintenance Storage (FMS) building, and a 4,900-square-foot Unheated Storage building.

Renovations to ADP Pittsburgh Office, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. ADP (Automatic Data Processing). Architect. Responsible as a technical advisor to the architectural team for building codes, architectural design, and architectural specifications. Baker provided design services for renovations to ADP's Pittsburgh office building. Tasks included replacement of the existing skylight above the central atrium, and alterations to the existing building to improve security.

Short Term Parking Garage Stair Tower Replacement, Pittsburgh International Airport (PIT), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Allegheny County Airport Authority. Architect. Responsibilities included serving as a technical advisor for the construction documents. Baker was tasked to design replacement stair

Years with Baker: 7
Years with Other Firms: 21

Education
B.Arch., 1979, Architecture, Carnegie Mellon University
A.D., 1975, Fine Arts, Cape Cod Community College

Licenses/Certifications
Registered Architect, Pennsylvania, 1986
LEED Accredited Professional, 2003
Certified Construction Specifier, 2001
Certified Construction Contract Administrator, 2004
NCI Charrette System Certificate, 2006
towers for Pittsburgh International Airport’s parking garage in two phases. Stairs 5-8 were constructed during Phase 1 with Stair Towers 1-4 constructed in the second phase. This $3 million dollar project included demolition and replacement of the stair towers in their existing locations. Baker provided existing condition verification and documentation, design development, construction documents, and construction administration.

**Readiness Center for PAARNG Stryker Brigade Combat Team, Hanover, Pennsylvania.** *US Property and Fiscal Office for Pennsylvania.* Architect. Served as Lead Facilitator and Senior Architect for Baker Team Design Charrette. Responsibilities included architectural specifications and building code review. Also served as Technical Advisor and contributor for coordination of disciplines for technical documentation and Task Manager for architectural RFP documents. Baker developed the conceptual design and Design/Build RFP documents for the conversion of the PAARNG’s 56th Brigade to a Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT). Key program components include two building types: Readiness Centers (RC) for the training of SBCT Soldiers and Field Maintenance Shops (FMS) for the maintenance and storage of a variety of military vehicles, including the Stryker military vehicle. The existing 18,000-square-foot Hanover RC will be renovated in order to meet current building codes and to add 7,000 square feet of space, providing adequate administrative, training, and storage areas to accommodate a unit strength of 85. The new facility was designed to meet a LEED®-Certified sustainability rating.

**Renovations to Cask Shipping and Receiving Building, Confidential Location.** *Confidential Client.* Architect. Conducted a technical forensic review for the client. Baker provided complete design and cost estimating services for a major reconfiguration and renovation of this 22,000-square-foot heavy-industrial production facility with a 90-foot tall high-bay. The design includes demolition of multiple existing platforms and overhead crane, and addition of a new railroad spur, gates, fences, utility relocations, structural platforms, massive (W33) floor inserts, articulating catwalks/platforms, installation of a new 310-ton overhead crane, seismic restraints, process and material flow, HEPA exhaust, recirculating (radioactive) water systems, hydraulic systems, and associated electrical modifications. Baker’s team prepared a LEED® scorecard and sustainable design report. The Department of Energy requires projects of this size to meet the Gold rating.

**Readiness Center for PAARNG Stryker Brigade Combat Team, Bradford, Pennsylvania.** *US Property and Fiscal Office for Pennsylvania.* Architect. Served as Lead Facilitator and Senior Architect for Baker Team Design Charrette. Responsibilities included architectural specifications and building code review. Also served as Technical Advisor and contributor for coordination of disciplines for technical documentation and Task Manager for architectural RFP documents. Baker developed the conceptual design and Design/Build RFP documents for the conversion of the PAARNG’s 56th Brigade to a Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT). Key program components included two building types: Readiness Centers (RC) for the training of SBCT Soldiers and Field Maintenance Shops (FMS) for the maintenance and storage of a variety of military vehicles, including the Stryker military vehicle. A 32,497-square-foot Readiness Center (RC) will be constructed to house a unit strength of 175 personnel. The new RC will provide the necessary vehicle maintenance training work bays, administrative, training, and storage areas required to achieve proficiency in required training tasks. The new facility will meet a Gold SPiRiT sustainability rating.

**NOT REFERABLE* Design/Build Armed Forces Reserve Center, Bell, California.** *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District.* Architect. Served as technical advisor to the core design team that was responsible for review of building codes. Baker was the designer-of-record, working with a contractor and the client, for the design/build delivery of a $62 million, 238,500-square-foot Armed Forces Reserve Center complex, comprised of a 179,000-square-foot Administrative/Training facility, 44,000-square-foot Organizational Maintenance Shop, and a 15,500-square-foot Unheated Storage facility (AFRC/OMS/UHS) with all site features. The facility was designed to achieve a Silver LEED® sustainable rating. Services provided include architecture, Structural Interior Design (SID) and Comprehensive Interior Design (CID), site/civil, all building engineering, and value engineering.
NRF Master Plan for Facility Upgrade, Confidential Site. Confidential Client. Architect. Responsibilities included performing a quality review of a Baker presentation of planning documentation to the client. Site growth and construction have continued at the over 50-year old campus, providing a mixture of older buildings and relatively new facilities. Using GIS technology, Baker developed an ongoing web-based strategic master planning module to focus site facility and infrastructure decisions on the long-range goals of flexibility, program responsiveness, and cost efficiencies. This planning module includes strategies for the development of the site and facilities with the ability to produce periodic reports (master plans) for funding requests and updates; it also includes both long-range and short-range functional siting and layout, architectural considerations for flexibility, utility system availability, location and design, and security and selected process reviews. Short-range reporting includes phased individual project recommendations within the 10- and 30-year plans with five-year incremental milestones.

Rehabilitation of U.S. Coast Guard Station Oswego, Oswego, New York. U.S. Coast Guard. Architect. Responsible as LEED® AP and technical advisor for sustainable design and construction issues, and for technical writing and analysis for the project to become LEED® 2.2 accredited. Baker prepared design and construction documents for the renovation of the Coast Guard Station. The renovation involved interior upgrades, new HVAC system, and upgrades to meet ADA criteria and LEED® Silver requirements.

Unit Operations Facilities, SATOC TO #4, Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa District. Architect. Responsibilities included serving as LEED Project Administrator, along with being an advisor to the review team for sustainability and LEED design and construction issues. Projects constructed under this task order include Brigade Combat Team (BCT) Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facilities (TEMF). TEMFs provide facilities for the purpose of maintaining and repairing vehicles, complete with equipment and parts storage, and administrative offices. Task Order No. 0004 was for the design/build delivery of a medium-sized, 32,290-square-foot TEMF, a 6,300-square-foot Organizational (Deployment) Storage facility, a 540-square-foot oil storage facility, and a 540-square-foot building for hazardous materials storage. Facility designs are required to meet or exceed a Silver LEED® certification.

U.S. Armed Forces Reserve Center, Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District. Project Manager. Responsibilities included serving as Project Manager, advisor to the A/E design team for planning and implementing a design charrette for a design bid build project for the client, and technical advisor to the architectural / engineering team for the construction documentation. Additional responsibilities included serving as LEED Project Administrator (using LEED version 2.2), along with being an advisor to the design team for sustainability and LEED design and construction issues. Baker was tasked to provide design-bid-build documents for a 400-member, 64,828-square-foot U.S. Army Reserve project. The new 7.5-acre site was developed to include three structures including a USARC Readiness Training Center, Organizational Maintenance Shop, and an Unheated Storage facility. Sustainable Design and Development and Energy Policy Act of 2005 features were provided to meet the Silver level of LEED® certification.

U.S. Armed Forces Reserve Center, Jonesboro, Arkansas. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District. Program Manager. Responsibilities included serving as Project Manager, advisor to the A/E design team for planning and implementing a design charrette for a design build RFP project for the client. Additional responsibilities included serving as LEED Project Administrator (using LEED version 2.2), along with being an advisor to the design team for sustainability and LEED design and construction issues.

Fires Brigade, SATOC TO #3, Fort Bliss, Texas. Walbridge Aldinger Company. Architect. Responsibilities included serving as LEED Project Administrator, along with being an advisor to the review team for sustainability and LEED design and construction issues.
Previous Work History
- Burt Hill Kosar Rittelmann, Associate/Project Manager, 1997-2002

Professional Affiliations
- American Institute of Architects (AIA), Pittsburgh and National Chapters, 30019192
- Construction Specifications Institute (CSI), 394116
- Design-Build Institute of America (DBIA)
- International Code Council (ICC), Western Pennsylvania, Past Board Member, Past President
- National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB), 47947
- U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC)
General Qualifications

Mr. Kretz is a registered architect with over 20 years of experience as project manager, designer, and principal. As Operations Manager of Baker's North Region Facilities Group, he has direct management responsibility over all architectural and building engineering personnel, project designs, and office functions, as well as serving as project manager for design projects. Mr. Kretz's project experiences includes various building types for military, educational, institutional, commercial, health care, aviation, transit, and housing clients in public and private sector facilities. Building types include readiness training centers and classrooms with sophisticated telecommunication systems, fitness centers, airport facilities, vehicle maintenance and intermodal transit facilities, warehouses, parking garages, and rail stations. Mr. Kretz is well versed in a variety of project delivery systems including fast-tracked designs, traditional design/bid/build, design/build RFP documents, design/build delivery as a member of the contractor's team, bridging documents, and site adapt designs.

Experience

Comprehensive Design Services - Contract VI, MAA-AE-03-005, Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood, Marshall (BWI) & Martin State (MTN) Airports, Baltimore, Maryland. Maryland Aviation Administration. Department Manager. Responsible as facility design manager, overseeing all facility related designs. Baker served as an extension of the MAA staff, providing civil, mechanical, electrical, structural and architectural design and support services required for a variety of terminal, landside and airside projects. In total, Baker has served MAA in this role since 1993.

Armed Forces Reserve Center, Fort Allen, Puerto Rico. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District. QA/QC. Provided QA/QC oversight on the project. The Korte-Baker design/build team is constructing a new 126-member Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) for the United States Army Reserve (USAR) on approximately 8.5-acres of Army National Guard property within Fort Allen, near Ponce, Puerto Rico. The project will provide a critical training center, administration offices, education facilities, assembly area, library, learning center, arms vault, physical fitness areas, and storage facility for USAR units, and a PRARNG unit, in the Ponce area. Primary facilities will include a 49,320-square-foot AFRC and a 150-square-foot unheated storage building, designed for Silver LEED® certification. Baker is providing architectural and interior design; structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and communications design; permitting; site survey; and geotechnical engineering.

Tenant Improvements to Flex Building 400, Airside Business Park, Moon Township, Pennsylvania. Airside Business Park, L.P. Architect. Responsibilities included architectural design assistance and oversight of design staff. Baker provided planning, architecture, and engineering design services for the shell and core structure of Building 400, as well as tenant improvement/interior design services for the project. NDC Health occupies two-thirds of the structure. The original facility design was customized for NDC, providing fewer loading docks than the six originally specified. Approximately 90% of the high-bay area is being used as
office space and includes a boardroom, executive offices, and training room. The remaining tenant space was converted to at-grade storefronts and is available for lease.


**A/E Services Contract for the Pennsylvania National Guard, 171st Air Refueling Wing, Pittsburgh International Airport (PIT), Coraopolis, Pennsylvania.** *Pennsylvania Department of Military and Veterans (formerly Departments of the Army and the Air Force).* Architect. Responsibilities included providing architectural design and construction assistance on facility projects. The United States Property and Fiscal Office (USPFO) and the 171st Air Refueling Wing (ARW) selected Baker for an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract for architectural and engineering services. Task orders contracted under this Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract include: a 129,634-square-foot Combined Support Maintenance Shop; a 3,000-gross-square-foot, $920,000 Crew Readiness Center; a $200,000 Base Marquee; a $405,000 upgrade to the West Apron Lighting for the Pennsylvania Air National Guard; a Deicing Collection Study for the 171st ARW; and Phase One services in support of the conversion of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard's 56th Brigade to a Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT) at various locations throughout the state.

**Louisville District IDIQ for Various Civil and Military Projects, Great Lakes and Ohio River Division, Louisville, Kentucky.** *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District.* Architect. Responsibilities include project management duties on various task orders, as well as architectural design. A variety of planning and design services were provided to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District under an Indefinite Delivery Contract. Delivery Orders including master plan updates, capital investment strategies, installation design guides, and facility designs for an Army Reserve Center, Battalion Operations Facility, and an Army Base High School.

**FBO AvCenter, Pittsburgh International Airport (PIT), Moon Township, Pennsylvania.** *American Port Services, Inc. (AMPORT).* Architect. Responsibilities included providing architectural design and detail assistance during the construction documents phase. Full architectural and engineering services were provided for a FBO AvCenter located on the former site of the Pittsburgh International Airport. The 39,022-square-foot, $9,043,000 project includes: an executive terminal building with offices and support space; corporate aircraft hangar; an auxiliary structure adjoining the hangar with additional office and support space; vehicle maintenance building; above-ground fuel farm; apron; aircraft parking; 160-space parking lot for ground transportation; and all site preparation work.

**Flex Office/Warehouse Building 400, Airside Business Park, Moon Township, Pennsylvania.** *Airside Business Park, L.P.* Architect. Responsible for providing design assistance to the project architect. Flex Building 400 was designed to provide flexibility for tenants that need both office and warehouse space. The one-story office space surrounds the 1.5-story high-bay warehouse space on three sides. The loading dock for the warehouse was originally designed to have six depressed dock parking locations. Due to predetermined tenant needs, this building was modified to provide only two dock locations. The building was constructed using tilt-up concrete with metal accents at entrance canopies, compatible with the nearby airport's terminal.
*NOT REFERABLE* Design/Build Armed Forces Reserve Center, Bell, California. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District. QA/QC. Provided design oversight and supervision to the architectural team. Baker was the designer-of-record, working with a contractor and the client, for the design/build delivery of a $62 million, 238,500-square-foot Armed Forces Reserve Center complex, comprised of a 179,000-square-foot Administrative/Training facility, 44,000-square-foot Organizational Maintenance Shop, and a 15,500-square-foot Unheated Storage facility (AFRC/OMS/UHS) with all site features. The facility was designed to achieve a Silver LEED® sustainable rating. Services provided include architecture, Structural Interior Design (SID) and Comprehensive Interior Design (CID), site/civil, all building engineering, and value engineering.

Clinton Community Park Amphitheater, Findlay Township, Pennsylvania. Findlay, Township of. Architect. Responsibilities included design assistance and architectural detailing. Baker provided full architectural and engineering design for the Clinton Community Park Amphitheater, a freestanding open-air structure which serves numerous performance functions for Findlay Township. The facility includes a stage with concrete floor and wood roof framing including a truss spanning the stage width, decorative concrete masonry walls, asphalt shingle roof, general and stage lighting, and handicapped accessible concrete ramps.

Historical Display, Pittsburgh International Airport (PIT), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Allegheny County Airport Authority. Architect. Responsibilities included assisting with design details and construction phase services. Baker designed the Historical Display area as the centerpiece of the terminal-wide historical display program at Pittsburgh International Airport, for the Allegheny County Airport Authority (ACAA). This display area features the theme “Yesterday’s Airport of Tomorrow” and combines materials salvaged from the original Airport with new design elements, to celebrate the history of the airport and its journey into the future.

Program Definition/Master Planning, Port Columbus International Airport (CMH), Columbus, Ohio. Concourse A Build-Out, Port Columbus International Airport (CMH), Columbus, Ohio. Columbus Regional Airport Authority (CRAA). QA/QC. Provided design oversight and supervision to the architectural team. Baker provided full architectural and engineering design services for the construction of a new two-story addition to Concourse A at Port Columbus International Airport. This 4,200-square-foot addition will provide concessionaire space on the upper level for retail food, beverage, and gift vendors, with Airport Authority storage on the apron level.

New Haven Line Railroad Stations, Darien and Milford, Connecticut. Connecticut Department of Transportation. Architect. Responsibilities included assisting with construction phase services. Baker was responsible for renovation of two historic rail stations. For Milford Station, Baker designed structural and architectural repairs that limited negative impacts yet adhered to the State Historic Preservation Office’s “Determination of No Effect.” For Darien Station, Baker renovated the station while restoring the look of the station’s past.

New Haven Bus Maintenance Facility, Hamden, Connecticut. Connecticut Department of Transportation. Project Manager. Responsibilities included serving as project manager, serving as lead architect for the facility design, and producing construction documents. Baker designed a 290,000-square-foot bus maintenance, storage, and administrative facility, which will incorporate state-of-the-art equipment for the repair and maintenance of a 150-bus fleet and 20 support vehicles. The new facility includes money-handling security; controlled room access; an energy-efficient exhaust system for a high level of diesel operation; vehicle wash bays; detail and fueling bays; vehicle maintenance and body repair bays; and parts storage. Baker's services included architectural design and structural; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; electrical; plumbing; fire protection; and industrial equipment engineering. Baker also performed preliminary engineering studies, prepared environmental documents, and provided remediation design for contaminants from the abandoned steel mill that had previously occupied the site.
Renovations to Building 4305, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District. Project Manager. Responsibilities included performing project management duties, and design and preparation of construction documents. Building 4305 at Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) was an existing three-story concrete framed structure with concrete slab floors. Baker designed the interior office renovations to the 25,000-square-foot second floor, including new offices, conference rooms, and training facilities. An addition to the building provided space for a new elevator and stairs, providing for emergency and ADA egress to the upper two floors. The new roof-mounted HVAC system and second floor build-out, which included extending the new exterior wall treatment to match what had previously been finished, were completed while the building remained partially occupied. The first floor had been renovated prior to Baker's contract, including the exterior.


Special Operations Recruiting Brigade Office Building, Ft. Sam Houston, San Antonio, Texas. U.S. Army Recruiting Command. Architect. Responsibilities included serving as the project architect and taking an active role in the design charrette. Through the functionality of an on-site design charrette with all project stakeholders, the design and project definition documents were prepared for a new 35,000-square-foot Brigade HQ building located adjacent to an historic area at Fort Sam Houston, Texas. Designed to achieve a SPIRIT Level Silver rating, the HQ project included: a direct digital control system, intrusion detection system, anti-terrorism and force protection measures, lawn and fire sprinkler system, and parking lot.

South Side Facility Renovation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. PNC Bank. Project Architect. Responsible for construction supervision of a full interior reconstruction and exterior restoration of a "turn-of-the-century" branch bank in Pittsburgh's Historic South Side District. All construction was phased to allow the bank to stay in operation. (Project was completed in 1993 for a total construction cost of $550,000.)

ADA Campus Survey, California, Pennsylvania. California University of Pennsylvania. Project Architect. Complete study of the entire main campus, which included 38 buildings totaling 1,300,000 square feet, and all outdoor public areas for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Guidelines. The survey and report was completed jointly by Mr. Kretz and the firm's partner in March 1992.

Previous Work History
- CH2M Hill, Project Architect, 2005-2006
- Baker and Associates, Director of Architecture - Aviation and Transit Studio, 2004-2005
- Celli-Flynn Brennan, Architects and Planners, Project Architect and Manager

Professional Affiliations
American Institute of Architects (AIA), 38046035
National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB), 45973
General Qualifications

Mr. Belfast is a cultural resources specialist with experience in historic structure surveys, state inventory form preparation, criteria of effects evaluations, programmatic agreement preparation, archival records research, deed research, and HABS/HAER documentation. His project involvement at Baker includes preparing historic context reports and evaluating historic structures for National Register eligibility for projects in fifteen states as part of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's US-VISIT initiative, as well as Section 106 related work for state departments of transportation in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Indiana, Ohio, New Jersey, and Louisiana.

Experience

Bossier Parish East-West Corridor (Winfield Rd. Ext) EA, Bossier Parish, Louisiana. Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments (NWLCOG). Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting a historic structure survey, preparing a historic context statement, completing state inventory forms, and making recommendations of national register eligibility. Baker was responsible for preliminary engineering and NEPA/environmental documentation for a new 8-mile, two-lane urban collector with right-of-way clearance for possible expansion to a 4-lane boulevard. This new facility will alleviate congestion and reduce travel delays along the other roadways that link the rapidly growing residential areas of Bossier Parish with the Shreveport and Bossier City employment centers.

Valley View Downs Race Track and Casino, Mahoning Township, Lawrence County, Pennsylvania. Centaur, Inc. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included developing an architectural Area of Potential Effects, conducting an architectural field survey, and completing Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey forms for resources within the project area. Baker was retained by Centaur, Inc. to provide general civil and environmental engineering services associated with the proposed Race Track and Casino complex. The 250-acre site will contain a 270,000-square-foot Grandstand/Clubhouse/Casino building, a one-mile harness racing track, eight horse barns, an administration building, dormitory, paddock and various support buildings, a 4,000-vehicle customer parking lot and 100-horse-trailer parking spaces.

US-VISIT Program Management, GIS, and Environmental Support Services - Nationwide, Nationwide. Department of Homeland Security, US-VISIT. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting archival research and files search, preparing historic context reports, and evaluating architectural resources for National Register eligibility at various border crossing sites. Also served as Author and Researcher on this project. Baker provided program management and related planning, environmental, engineering design, and geospatial services that supported the mission of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in modernizing and improving the nation's immigration and border management system and thereby strengthening national security.

Opportunity Corridor Preliminary Environmental and Engineering Services, Cleveland, Ohio. Ohio Department of Transportation, District 12. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting a field survey, conducting historical research, preparing a historical context of the project area, and assisting with the preparation of photo key figures. Baker provided preliminary environmental and engineering
services for the completion of Step 2 of Ohio Department of Transportation’s Major Project Development Process (PDP) for the Opportunity Corridor Project.

**Cultural Resources.** City of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Urban Redevelopment Authority. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting a field survey and historical research, for the preparation of a Section 106 Initiation of Consultation form addendum.

**S.R. 0028, Sections A09 and A10, Final Design (East Ohio Street Improvement Project), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.** Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 11-0. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included preparing a land use history for the project area, conducting archival research, general report editing, and the preparation of Pennsylvania Historic Resource Inventory forms. Baker provided environmental and engineering services to rehabilitate a two-mile, four-lane section of S.R. 0028 within the City of Pittsburgh characterized by narrow lanes, proximity of fixed objects, lack of a median barrier, heavy traffic congestion, and insufficient sight distances. The project challenges included minimizing hillside impacts, maintaining current railroad capacity, constructing within a tight corridor, and accommodating historic structures, while enhancing safety, improving traffic flow, and providing pleasing aesthetics. The project includes the addition of a median barrier on S.R. 0028, a grade-separated interchange at 31st Street, and new southbound on and off ramps at 40th Street to allow continuous mainline flow. The elimination of mainline traffic signals contributes to the goal of promoting uninterrupted flow along the corridor. The design team worked closely with the project stakeholders and the public to develop a design alternative that meets the project’s purpose and needs, addresses challenges, meets stakeholder and public desires, is constructible, and is affordable.

**Design/Build AFQ/RFP Development for Statewide Construction Program, PAARNG Stryker Brigade Combat Team, Statewide, Pennsylvania.** US Property and Fiscal Office for Pennsylvania. Cultural Resources Specialist. Responsibilities included preparing a historical context report for the Hollidaysburg Veterans Home, conducting archival research, and taking field photographs of the project area. Baker provided services under numerous National Guard Bureau IDIQ contracts to support the Pennsylvania Army National Guard (PAARNG) in implementing a $167,000,000 statewide construction program for the Stryker Brigade Combat Team conversion of numerous PAARNG facilities. The program included the design of new soldier Readiness Centers (RC) and vehicle Field Maintenance Shops (FMS), as well as facility additions. Baker performed all aspects of design/build RFP implementation, from providing significant architectural, structural, geotechnical, civil engineering, and other technical input for RFP Project Definition Documents, to developing the application form used to evaluate potential design/build contractor teams, to providing client support during the actual design/build team selection process. The sustainable design goal is for each finished facility to qualify for either a Gold SpiRiT or Silver LEED®-Certified rating. Baker’s task orders include the following sites: Erie – a new Readiness Center and a new Field Maintenance Shop; Philadelphia – a new Readiness Center and Field Maintenance Shop; Elizabethtown – a new Readiness Center and a new Field Maintenance Shop; and Bradford and Huntingdon – new Readiness Centers. Additionally, Baker has developed Design/Build RFP documents for the additions and alterations to Readiness Centers in Lewistown, Punxsutawney, Butler, Hanover, Lebanon, Huntingdon, and Hollidaysburg.

**Land Ports of Entry, Section 106 Compliance, Various Border Locations.** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting archival research and files search, preparing historic context reports, and evaluating architectural resources for National Register eligibility at various border crossing sites. Also served as Author and Researcher on this project. Baker assisted the US-VISIT Program with its cultural resource compliance program. The project oversees all requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Baker assisted US-VISIT in developing a strategy for introducing this new agency to State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO), General Services Administration regional historic preservation officers, and Native American Tribes. In addition to strategy and agency coordination, Baker managed the completion of cultural resources surveys at...
165 land ports of entry (LPOE) on the northern and southern international borders. Baker also supported US- 
VISIT in developing relationships and communicating with the State Historic Preservation Officers in all 
border states, and thereby began the collection of one of the most comprehensive databases for historic and 
cultural resources at US LPOEs.

**Cultural Resources Statewide Agreement, Various Locations.** *West Virginia Department of 
Transportation, Division of Highways.* Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included revising 
Determination of Eligibility Report in response to comments from the State Historic Preservation Office and 
Department of Transportation. Baker provided statewide cultural resources consulting services pertaining to 
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

**I-69 Tier 2 Section 5 - EIS and Engineering Services, Bloomington, Indiana.** *Indiana Department of 
Transportation.* Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included revising 
Determination of Eligibility Report in response to comments from the State Historic Preservation Office and 
Department of Transportation. Baker is providing statewide cultural resources consulting services pertaining to 
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

**Phase I Environmental Assessment.** *Beaver County Transit Authority.* Architectural Historian. 
Responsibilities included conducting background research and oral 
history interviews, preparing historic contexts for the Historic Property Report. Prepared a draft Identification 
of Effects Report. Also served as Researcher and Editor on this project. Baker is providing Tier 2 
environmental and engineering services for one of six sections of the planned I-69 corridor. Baker's section, 
Section 5, is located in Monroe and Morgan Counties, Indiana. Services included NEPA Environmental 
Impact Statement studies and documentation, Engineer's Report, and Public Involvement.

**Section 4(f) Evaluation, Allegheny County Airport (AGC), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.** *Allegheny County 
Airport Authority.* Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting archival research and 
preparing Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey forms for National Register-eligible hangars prior to 
demolition. Baker conducted a Section 4(f) evaluation to fulfill Memorandum of Agreement stipulations for 
the Lower T-Hangar Redevelopment Project at Allegheny County Airport. The airport's lower T-hangar area 
contains buildings that are contributing elements of the Allegheny County Airport Historic District, which is 
eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Baker conducted a field survey and prepared 
the forms necessary to comply with state historic recordation standards. The Section 4(f) evaluation included 
identification of project purpose and need, and discussion of alternatives, impacts, and mitigation measures. 
The project required close coordination with the client and the FAA.

**Cultural Resources Programmatic Agreement, Allegheny County Airport (AGC), Pittsburgh, 
Pennsylvania.** *Allegheny County Airport Authority.* Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting archival research and a field survey, updating a previous Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey form for the Allegheny County Airport Historic District, and assisting with the preparation of a Programmatic 
Agreement for the implementation of a twenty-year master plan for development and maintenance at the 
Allegheny County Airport. Baker prepared a Programmatic Agreement to streamline the cultural resource 
environmental review process for the Allegheny County Airport Authority's (ACAA) implementation of its 
20-year master plan at Allegheny County Airport.

**Route 52 Bridge and Causeway Replacement, Somers Point and Ocean City, New Jersey.** *New Jersey 
Department of Transportation (NJDOT).* Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included preparing 
Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) documentation for the World War Memorial Bridge and 
conducting a comparative bridge study to guide context sensitive design of the replacement bridge. Also 
served as Researcher and Author on this project. Baker is currently managing the right-of-way pilot project. 
This project includes conducting deed and title searches early in the Preliminary Engineering Process. Early 
identification of property rights will improve plan quality.
BAKER I/S PLUS 1 PROJECT. West Virginia Department of Transportation, Division of Highways. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting a historic structures survey, delineating an architectural Area of Potential Effect, preparing West Virginia Historic Property Inventory forms, preparing a historic context and determination of eligibility report.

Shepherdstown Bridge, Jefferson County, West Virginia, and Washington County, Maryland. West Virginia Department of Transportation, Division of Highways. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included preparing Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) documentation for the James Rumsey Bridge. Also served as Author on this project. Baker was selected by the West Virginia Division of Highways (WVDOH) to provide all environmental and engineering services for the replacement of the James Rumsey Bridge. The bridge is a historic structure of Wichert Truss design originally constructed in 1937. It is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The James Rumsey Bridge carries WV Route 480 and MD Route 34 vehicular traffic over the Potomac River. The bridge currently has sidewalks on both sides that carry pedestrians and bicyclists. The bridge also crosses over the C&O Canal National Park and National Register listed C&O Canal on the Maryland side. The town of Shepherdstown, West Virginia lies on the west side of the bridge. The replacement of the bridge is necessitated by its rapidly deteriorating condition. The AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications were used for this bridge design.

Charleroi-Monessen Bridge. Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 12-0. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting a field survey and historical research and preparing Determination of Eligibility and Determination of Effect reports.

Cultural Resources - District 9 Headquarters, West Virginia. West Virginia Department of Transportation, Division of Highways. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting a field survey, historical research, and preparing West Virginia Historic Property Inventory forms. This project consisted of a Phase I cultural resources survey of the proposed West Virginia Department of Transportation (WVDOT) District 9 Headquarters property, north of the Town of Lewisburg, West Virginia. The Phase I archaeological survey of the parcel resulted in the identification of the Stonehouse Road site (46GB451), a small prehistoric site of unknown age. The architectural survey documented the ca. 1956 Coffman House. These cultural resources were not significant, and further cultural resources work was recommended in the project area.

AGC BUILDING RECORDATION. Allegheny County Airport Authority. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included conducting archival research and completing Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey forms for National Register-eligible hangars prior to demolition.

Aberdeen Proving Ground Maryland - Facility Inspection, Aberdeen, Maryland. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District. Architectural Historian. Responsibilities included preparing building history documentation. Also served as Researcher on this project.
Laurence R. Castonguay
Executive Vice President/Chief Operating Officer, Oxford Real Estate Advisors, Inc. (OREA)

Mr. Castonguay joined Oxford Development Company in 1983 and has overall responsibility for its affiliate Oxford Real Estate Advisors, Inc., (‘OREA’). He directs the sourcing, evaluation, acquisition, due diligence, entitlement process, on-going property management and leasing, and disposition of assets under the investment management of Oxford Real Estate Advisors, Inc. OREA has successfully acquired, managed, and divested an $80m industrial real estate investment portfolio. One of its current business platforms focuses on the development and lease of property to the Federal Government through the General Services Administration. Properties are held in Florida and New York. Additionally, OREA is investing in the development of select service hotels and has completed projects in Michigan and Colorado. Several other projects are in process with land entitled in North Carolina, Tennessee, Colorado, and Pennsylvania. In 2007-2008, OREA and Oxford Development Company were awarded the Hyatt Select Service Development Partner of the year award under his direction.

Mr. Castonguay is also an integral part of the evaluation and underwriting of company owned and third-party assets. He has had direct responsibility for approximately $250m in transactions, overseen $200m in third-party real estate evaluations, and participated in the placement of over $125m in mortgage debt.

He has served as Assistant Vice President of Leasing and Director of Real Estate Services prior to assuming his current position with the formation of Oxford Real Estate Advisors, Inc. in 1997.

He is a past member of the Pennsylvania Bar Association and a Registered Investment Advisor with Securities and Exchange Commission. In 2003, Mr. Castonguay was a recipient of the Jefferson Award for Public Service and in 2008, received the John Heinz Award issued by the United Way Alexis de Tocqueville Society.

Mr. Castonguay received his undergraduate degree in Economics from Gettysburg College and his Juris Doctor degree from Duquesne University School of Law.
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Joseph M. Saccomano  
Real Estate Financial Analyst  
Oxford Real Estate Advisors, Inc. (‘OREA’)

**Professional Experience**

Mr. Saccomano joined Oxford Development Company in April 2008 as a Real Estate Financial Analyst for its investment advisory affiliate, Oxford Real Estate Advisors, Inc (OREA). OREA is the advisor to the Oxford Fund, LP, an institutional real estate fund that invests in the development of hotels and government leased office properties. Mr. Saccomano plays an integral role in the evaluation of the fund’s asset acquisitions by preparing market studies, tax analyses, income projections, and investment return analyses and by developing complex financial models designed to perform an array of ad hoc investment analyses. He also is responsible for monitoring and reporting the performance of managed assets to the fund’s ownership. In addition, Mr. Saccomano provides ongoing financial analysis and support to Oxford’s executive level staff on various projects, including performing property valuations of company owned assets.

Prior to joining Oxford, Mr. Saccomano was employed as a commercial mortgage underwriter at CreditVest, Inc. During his tenure at CreditVest, Mr. Saccomano provided financial analysis and due diligence for the underwriting of over $1 billion of commercial real estate debt on behalf of some of the largest banks in the country.

**Education**

Mr. Saccomano received his Bachelor of Science degree in Finance at the University of Pittsburgh’s College of Business Administration, graduating Summa Cum Laude. As a student at the University of Pittsburgh, he earned the highly regarded University Scholar Award twice and received a membership and scholarship from the Beta Gamma Sigma Honor Society.
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I. Review of the Penguins Plan

• Review of Methodology
• Current Market Conditions
• Market Viability
• Fiscal and Economic Implications
I. Review of the Penguins Plan
We reviewed:

- AECOM Market Analysis, February 2010
- AECOM Economic & Fiscal Impact Analysis, February 2010
- UDA Pittsburgh Penguins Presentation, March 17, 2010
- Oxford Development Analysis, April 21, 2010
- Oxford Development Analysis Assumptions, April and June, 2010
Review of the Penguins Plan

Findings of Inconsistency and Mathematical Errors

1. AECOM and Oxford studies use differing assumptions for office space per worker
AECOM Economic & Fiscal Impact Analysis utilizes 225 SF per worker, AECOM Market Analysis utilizes 200 SF per worker, and Oxford Development Analysis utilizes 250 SF per worker.

2. AECOM studies show differing amounts for supported office space
AECOM Market Analysis suggests site can support 600,000 SF office space; AECOM Economic & Fiscal Impact Analysis uses 605,550 SF to determine impact – unspecified difference of 5,550 s.f. of office space.

3. AECOM Market Study suggests differing amounts of supportable office space
AECOM Market Analysis suggests 400,000-600,000 s.f. of office space can be captured by downtown and fringe submarkets over next 7-10 years. Later in the document, AECOM recommends 600,000 s.f. on the Mellon Arena site alone. UDA plan shows 608,550 s.f. of office space – unspecified difference of 8,550 s.f. of office space.
Review of the Penguins Plan

Findings of Inconsistency and Mathematical Errors - Continued

4. AECOM and Oxford use differing assumptions for lease rates for retail and office space
   For office space, the Oxford Development Analysis uses $23.50 per SF (Class A), $24.50 per SF (Neighborhood), and $25.00 per SF (Institutional). AECOM Economic & Fiscal Impact Analysis uses $24.00 per SF (Class A) and $22.00 per SF (Other). For retail space, Oxford Development Analysis uses $13.00 per SF (Neighborhood), $14.00 per SF (Theater), and $16.00 per SF (Entertainment). AECOM Economic & Fiscal Impact Analysis uses $35.00 per SF (Neighborhood and Entertainment)

5. Oxford Development Analysis transposes retail and office worker salaries
   The current document shows an average annual office worker salary of $23,000 and average annual retail worker salary of $55,000. These figures should be reversed. This error significantly underestimates total payroll and associated taxes for both Option 3 and Option 5.
### 6. AECOM Market Study Substantially Overestimates Projected Office Employment

Due to the error in a single calculation, identified below, projected office employment within the AECOM market study overestimates office employment by 1,255 and total payroll by $52.3 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Total Square Feet</th>
<th>Occupied Square Feet</th>
<th>Square Feet per Employee</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average Annual Salary / Wages</th>
<th>Total Payroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A Office</td>
<td>566,800</td>
<td>510,120</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>$56,275</td>
<td>$127,587,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Office</td>
<td>38,750</td>
<td>348,750</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>$41,644</td>
<td>$58,093,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>105,450</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>$21,385</td>
<td>$5,637,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>97,750</td>
<td>87,975</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$24,761</td>
<td>$5,445,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>see detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,444,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>814,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,204</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 198,208,637</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Wages based on Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry occupational wages data. Class A office based on a weighted average of numerous office-using occupations. Entertainment Retail based on a weighted average of several restaurant-related occupations. Neighborhood Serving Retail based on retail sales persons.

**Source:** Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, AECOM
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Program Components:

• Housing Units: 1,191 Units
• Neighborhood, Theatre and Entertainment Retail: 208,750 SF
• Class A Office Space: 608,550 SF
• Lodging Facility: 150 Rooms
• Structured Parking: 2,145 Spaces
• Public Park Area: 1.3 Acres

SOURCE: UDA Pittsburgh Penguins Presentation, March 17, 2010
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AECOM Market Study, February 2010

“It is not likely that new employment growth within the region will drive demand for substantial new office space within the downtown area.”

“...vacancy within the CBD recently increased after moves by several companies to new locations (adding a total of 370,000 square feet of vacant space plus 363,000 square feet of sublease space).”

Study uses 200 square feet per employee to estimate future office space demand. Space per employee in the U.S. has been declining from this figure.

“It is also important that new retail at the project site not compete with ongoing retail efforts within the CBD and strip district. We estimate that the immediate market would generate demand for about 46,000 to 71,000+ square feet of neighborhood retail...”
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**Program Components:** Residential

Housing Units: 1,191 Units

2.2 Residents Per Unit = 2,620 Persons

GOOD IDEA
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Program Components:

Theatre and Entertainment

Good Idea

Not So
Review of the Penguins Plan

Program Components: Theater

65,000 s.f. Multi-Screen Cinema Proposed (16 Screens)

Motion Picture Industry Rule of Thumb:
One Movie Screen per 8,000 to 9,000 persons in a given geography.

SOURCE: National Association of Theater Owners; 4ward Planning LLC, 2010
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Market Area Stats

- 14 Movie Houses
- 130 Screens
- 770,000 Residents
- 335,000 Too Few

SOURCE: DirectoriesUSA.com; ScanUS; 4ward Planning LLC, 2010
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“A state-of-the-art cineplex could be on the way for the North Hills communities of McCandless and Cranberry, as developers of new projects in both communities report interest by movie exhibitors.”

“Cinemark … is scouting for theater sites in the northern suburbs and Monroeville.”
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**Program Components:** Restaurants

Eight to Nine Restaurants Averaging 8,000 S.F. Each

**Restaurant Industry Benchmarks:**

$400 to $800 in sales per square foot for the above Casual Dining Chains

SOURCE: ULI; RetailTraffic.com; 4ward Planning LLC, 2010
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Current Retail Real Estate Market

46% of CBD Restaurant Sales

66% of Fringe CBD Restaurant Sales

$38.4MM Estimated Annual Gross Restaurant Sales at Stabilization for Proposed Restaurants

SOURCES: DirectoriesUSA.com, ScanUS, 4ward Planning LLC, 2010
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Current Retail Real Estate Market

976
Approximate Number of Restaurants within 30-minute Drive of Mellon Arena

2010 Market Area Quick Stats:
• Estimated $1.1 to $2.5 Billion in Sales
• 76 restaurants within and immediately adjacent to CBD
• Overwhelming number are small establishments
• Households spent more than $1.8 Billion dining out
• Average HH Expenditure on Dining out is $3,000

546,000 Square Feet

The Estimated Supply of Restaurant Space Exceeding Market Demand

SOURCES: DirectoriesUSA.com, ScanUS, 4ward Planning LLC
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Recent Retail Developments

**Settlers Ridge, 2009**
Located in Robinson Township, 8 miles west of Downtown Pittsburgh; 600,000 SF

**Tenants:**
Cinemark Theater, Giant Eagle Market District, Barnes & Noble, REI, LA Fitness

**Bakery Square, 2010**
Located in Shadyside, 5 miles east of Downtown Pittsburgh; 178k SF Retail, 216k Office, 110 room Hotel

**Tenants:**
Anthropologie, Urban Active Fitness, Verizon, Coffee Tree Roasters
Review of the Penguins Plan

Program Components: Office

608,550 S.F. of Class A Space

Not So
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Current Office Real Estate Market

5,257,420

Available Square Feet of Office Space in the Downtown Area

...this equals over 1.8 empty U.S. Steel Tower Buildings

Pittsburgh Metropolitan Office Market Vacancy

Downtown Vacancy Share
49.9%

SOURCE: CBRE, Cushman & Wakefield
Office Real Estate Trends

According to the Penguins’ updated market study, only 400,000 to 600,000 s.f. of office space is likely to be captured in the downtown and fringe submarkets over the next seven to ten years.

“...It is not likely that new employment growth within the region will drive demand for substantial new office space within the downtown area...Some demand may be driven by industrial shift within the greater Pittsburgh region.”

SOURCES: AECOM February 2010 Market Study
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Demolition and Infrastructure Costs

It is estimated that, annually, the SEA will spend $2.2 million dollars to fund debt service on the demolition of Mellon Arena and infrastructure costs for the site. These costs are incurred before any significant revenue generating activities occur on the site.

SOURCE: Oxford Infrastructure Analysis, April 21, 2010

NOTE: $28,356,716 amount, 5% interest rate, 20 year amortization
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Economic & Fiscal Impacts

AECOM and Oxford’s assumptions used for commercial lease rates (office, retail and entertainment) differ markedly (e.g., $24/sf versus $13/sf);

Oxford’s transposition error ($23K annual salaries for office workers and $55K annual salaries for retail workers) **significantly underestimates total payroll and associated taxes for both Option 3 and Option 5.**
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Economic & Fiscal Impacts

Transposed Salary Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Salary

Option 3: $72MM
Option 3 (Revised): $124MM
Option 5: $84MM
Option 5: (Revised): $145MM
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Economic & Fiscal Impacts

AECOM’s market study and Oxford’s benefits analysis utilize varying metrics for office employment (e.g., 200 s.f. per worker, 225 s.f. per worker and 250 s.f. per worker), which raises issues regarding the accuracy of needed office space and/or projected office employment.

Neither the economic or fiscal impact analysis address the likely long-term negative impacts associated with over supplying the market with office and entertainment retail space (e.g., increased vacancy, lost employment, lower property values and reduced property and wage tax collections).
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AECOM Economic & Fiscal Impact Analysis Report, February 2010

Page 5 – Ongoing Permanent Impacts: “Total employment benefits attributable to the ongoing operations at the proposed development are based on commonly accepted employment ratios by land use type (e.g., 225 square feet of required space per Class A Office employee).”

Page 11 – Ongoing Operational Impacts: Mixed Use Development Options: “Permanent benefits are those that will be achieved once the mixed-use development has been built, the space fully occupied, and stabilized sales and occupancy levels have been achieved. It is assumed that a transition time will be required to achieve stabilization.”

Page 11 – Employment and Earnings: “Total on-site employment is estimated at 4,204 jobs for the proposed master plan, with the largest number of jobs attributable to office employment. Total wages for on-site employment are estimated at approximately $198.2 million. Wages are based on a wage and salary survey for the Pittsburgh area by the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry.”

Page 11 – Employment and Earnings: “Total on-site employment is estimated at 4,204 jobs for the proposed master plan, with the largest number of jobs attributable to office employment. Total wages for on-site employment are estimated at approximately $198.2 million. Wages are based on a wage and salary survey for the Pittsburgh area by the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry.”
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**AECOM Economic & Fiscal Impact Analysis Report, February 2010**

This erroneous value…

...resulted in the overestimation of these values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class A Office</th>
<th>Total Square Feet</th>
<th>Occupied Square Feet</th>
<th>Average Annual Salary / Wages</th>
<th>Total Payroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>566,800</td>
<td>510,120</td>
<td>$56,275</td>
<td>$127,589,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Office</td>
<td>38,750</td>
<td>348,750</td>
<td>$41,644</td>
<td>$58,093,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Retail</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>105,450</td>
<td>$21,385</td>
<td>$5,637,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Serving Retail</td>
<td>97,750</td>
<td>87,975</td>
<td>$24,761</td>
<td>$5,445,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>see detail</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,444,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>814,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$198,208,637</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Wages based on Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry occupational wages data. Class A office based on a weighted average of numerous office-using occupations. Entertainment Retail based on a weighted average of several restaurant-related occupations. Neighborhood Serving Retail based on retail sales persons.

**Source:** Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, AECOM
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**AECON Economic & Fiscal Impact Analysis Report, February 2010**

This is the value that should have appeared...  

...resulting in these lower values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Total Square Feet</th>
<th>Occupied Square Feet</th>
<th>Square Feet per Employee</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average Annual Salary / Wages</th>
<th>Total Payroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A Office</td>
<td>566,800</td>
<td>510,120</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>$56,275</td>
<td>$127,589,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Office</td>
<td>38,750</td>
<td>34,875</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$41,644</td>
<td>$5,830,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>105,450</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>$21,385</td>
<td>$5,637,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>97,750</td>
<td>87,975</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$24,761</td>
<td>$5,445,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving Retail</td>
<td>see detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,444,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>814,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,204</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>145,945,660</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Wages based on Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry occupational wages data. Class A office based on a weighted average of numerous office-using occupations. Entertainment Retail based on a weighted average of several restaurant-related occupations. Neighborhood Serving Retail based on retail sales persons.  

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, AECOM
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AECOM Market Analysis Report, February 2010

Page 5 – Key Findings - Office Market: “Nevertheless, according to data provided by Grubb & Ellis, vacancy in the downtown/fringe area remains a relatively high 16% (compared to about 14% in the suburbs) and vacancy within the CBD recently increased after moves by several companies to new locations (adding a total of 370,000 square feet of vacant space plus 363,000 square feet of sublease space).”

Page 6 – Key Findings - Office Market: “...Based on assumptions for the percent of employees using office space by sector, we have derived net new office space demand of about 2.1 million square feet for the entire region. A capture rate of between 20 and 30 percent of new office space demand would generate the need for approximately 400,000 to 600,000 square feet of office space over the next ten years within the downtown/fringe submarket.”

Page 6 – Key Findings - Office Market: “It is not likely that new employment growth within the region will drive demand for substantial new office space within the downtown area.”

Page 26 – Anticipated Demand by Land Use – Retail – Demand Based on Nearby Market Support: “It is also important that new retail at the project site not compete with ongoing retail efforts within the CBD and strip district. ...we estimate that the immediate market would generate demand for about 46,000 to 71,000+ square feet of neighborhood retail (e.g. local market, services).”
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AECOM Market Analysis Report, February 2010

Page 7 – Key Findings – Retail Entertainment Market: “There is significant competition for ‘entertainment’ retail in the area. While entertainment retail makes sense near a large event venue, it is important not to over supply retail targeted at arena users (new retail is also planned for the arena site).”

Page 27 – Entertainment – Current and Proposed Development: As indicated in the first market report for the Mellon Arena site, there are currently several competitive destinations for entertainment-oriented development within close proximity to the site.”
### Derivation of Employment and Wage Taxes

**From Construction**
- Construction Wages: 40% of Hard Costs
- Local Share of Construction Wages: 90% of Construction Wages
- Average Construction Salary: $38,000

**Ongoing (Permanent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>1 Per 250 SF</th>
<th>23,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1 Per 400 SF</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tax Rate**
- City Payroll: 0.55%
- Service: $52 Per Employee
- State: 3.07%

Transposed wage figures here...
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Oxford Development Analysis, April 21, 2010

...leads to understated wage figures here.
II. A New Plan Coming Soon!
General & Limiting Conditions

4ward Planning LLC has endeavored to ensure that the reported data and information contained in this report are complete, accurate and relevant. All estimates, assumptions and extrapolations are based on methodological techniques employed by 4ward Planning LLC and believed to be reliable. 4ward Planning LLC assumes no responsibility for inaccuracies in reporting by the client, its agents, representatives or any other third party data source used in the preparation of this report.

Further, 4ward Planning LLC makes no warranty or representation concerning the manifestation of the estimated or projected values or results contained in this study. This study may not be used for purposes other than that for which it is prepared or for which prior written consent has first been obtained from 4ward Planning LLC. This study is qualified in its entirety by, and should be considered in light of, the above limitations, conditions and considerations.
### Basis of “Preferred” Option??

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Option 3 Reuse</th>
<th>Option 5 Demolition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony (Land Use)</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Community Fabric</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>MODERATE/HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>MODERATE/HIGH</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW (ADVERSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MINIMIZED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Barriers</td>
<td>LOW-MODERATE</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Barrier</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Transport</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>MODERATE/HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 13 Public Meeting Support:</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arena Reuse

Rental Capacities

Rental A: 7,500 SF
Rental B: 7,500 SF

Old Exhibit Hall 1

Stage/Studio (former ice rink club)

Rink/Field

Gate 3
Arena Reuse

Rental Capacities
Conceptual Schedule for UNIFIED Process

- Technical & Financial Feasibility Confirmation Process
- Ideas Competition
- Development RFPs
- URA/SEA/Planning Commission

2010
- July
- Aug
- Sept
- Oct
- Nov
- Dec

2011
- Jan
- Feb
- Mar
- April
- May
- June
- July

SEA BOARD VOTE ?

Input

Unified Hill Planning Process

URA/SEA/Planning Commission

Development RFPs

Reuse the Island
For more information, please contact:
Todd Poole
4ward Planning LLC
301 Grant Street, Suite 4300
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 428-9644
tpoole@4wardplanning.com
July 29, 2010

The following is a summary of our comments with regard to the report prepared by 4Ward Planning entitled Mellon Arena Reuse Analysis, and dated July 13, 2010, for Preservation Pittsburgh (“Option 3”). We have divided our commentary into two components, 1) an Executive Summary and 2) Specific Slide Commentary.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The referenced ‘analysis’ refers to the AECOM report which was done independently (and prior to all other reports) and provided the broad-spectrum basis for the Option 5 data. It also refers to Oxford’s Comparative Economic Benefit Analysis which is an evaluation of Option 3 data (provided by affiliates of Preservation Pittsburgh) and Option 5 data, utilizing a number of new assumptions which were ‘equalized’ and which had been agreed to by the various parties in an effort to avoid providing either Option with an advantage.

A substantial number of the slides in the 4Ward Planning, LLC presentation contain misleading information, omissions, and incorrect source citations and quotes.

The presentation takes statements and data out of context and includes conflicting, misleading and incorrect data to cast doubt on the validity of various market conclusions. The presentation also ignores the agreement to equalize assumptions for Option 3 and Option 5.

Overall, the 4Ward Planning analysis uses a generic approach to evaluation which in many cases is not specific or applicable to the Pittsburgh market.

In conclusion, the amount of misleading information, incorrect data, and inconsistencies throughout 4Ward Planning’s presentation is a concern and needs to be accounted for by those relying on the representations made and the conclusions drawn.

SPECIFIC SLIDE COMMENTARY

Slides 9 & 21

The first sentence is taken from AECOM’s draft February 19, 2010 report, but fails to include the follow up sentence which qualifies it by stating: “However, given the lack of developable land within the golden triangle and the desire of many office tenants to be near the CBD, the project site will offer desired proximity to downtown resources (although there is also competition from the North Shore). Utilizing a quote of one sentence and ignoring a succeeding sentence that qualifies it, is misleading.

The second quote on this slide is also misleading. In the AECOM report, the quote is actually referring to the effect that the “movement among several firms” had on the CBD at a specific point in time and does not accurately address the overall CBD office market. A more thorough evaluation of the Pittsburgh office market would
conclude that the market is performing very well. For example, the Pittsburgh office of Cushman and Wakefield stated in its 2010 1Q Pittsburgh Office Report ‘MarketBeat’: “Leasing activity increased significantly over first quarter 2009 and is expected to climb throughout 2010.” “Direct absorption should increase in 2010 in response to new energy companies entering the market.” The report states that overall absorption in the CBD for the quarter finished at 318,227 sf.

Slides 11-14

The Slide 13 map illustrates 18 movie theaters however the data box indicates 14 “movie houses.” The map also appears to show two ‘movie houses’ in the CBD, and one on the Northshore. None of these three ‘movie houses’ show mainstream movies that would compete with a movie house on the subject site. In addition, nine (9) of the theatres are outside, or close to, the ‘15 minute’ contour and it is unlikely that they would be considered competitive theatres.

Slide 14 quotes Cinemark as searching for theatre locations in Monroeville and the North Hills communities of McCandless and Cranberry; three locations not likely to compete with a theatre complex on the subject site.

Slides 15-18

These slides provide information related to restaurants and the retail market in general. The information is credited to DirectoriesUSA.com and ScanUS, internet research sources, as well as the author of the report.

The Pittsburgh office of CB Richard Ellis paints a different picture with regard to retail viability in this market.

According to the CB Richard Ellis Real Estate Symposium Report of May 18, 2010 “Pittsburgh has benefitted from slow, consistent growth and stable housing and job growth. Retailers are looking for markets with limited exposure to housing busts and job creation.” In their “Predictions-Pittsburgh” CBRE states the following: “2010 will surprise many as the market is as hot as it has ever been;” “Downtown will continue to prosper and grow;” “Meds, Eds and High Tech will continue to lead us to new heights;” “Retailers will continue to enter our market given our notoriety and new found success/stability;” “Development will continue bucking National Trends.”

Slides 19 and 20

Slide 19 states that the Class A office component of Option 5 is not such a good idea. However, the Pittsburgh office of CB Richard Ellis sees opportunity for Class A office in Pittsburgh and its CBD.

In its May 18, 2010 Real Estate Symposium, Pittsburgh, 2010, CBRE stated that Pittsburgh is a “Diamond in the Rough” with stability, job creation (second best City for graduating seniors), led by lower recession industries; medical, education, hi-tech, and engineering. Pittsburgh’s downtown area is “booming with development, new residences, new Class A office, new exclusive retail, new restaurants, new green spaces, new parking, new entertainment/sports, new hotels.”

Slide 20 uses data that includes Class B and Class C space, as well as suburban office data, which is data not pertinent to a discussion regarding new Class A office development in the CBD.
According to CBRE’s May 18, 2010 report, the Class A office market in the CBD is comprised of 13,645,792 square feet and has one of the lowest vacancy rates nationwide at 9.6%, or 1,313,215 square feet. If the total office space currently planned for either Option 3 or Option 5, +/- 600,000 square feet, were added to the market today, the vacancy rate would be 14%. Moreover, if fringe downtown Class A space is added to the mix, the vacancy rate would be only 8.56%, and even with the Option 3 or Option 5 space included, the rate would only increase to 11.9%.

CBRE concludes that 1st quarter statistics indicate five consecutive quarters of positive absorption and population influx in Pittsburgh for the first time in 20 years.

Slide 21

The first sentence beginning with, “According to the Penguins’ updated market study” is reworded resulting in a misinterpretation of this statement. The sentence in the AECOM report actually states that “a capture of between 20 and 30 percent of new office space demand would generate the need for approximately 400,000 to 600,000 square feet of office space over the next ten years within the downtown/fringe submarket.” The AECOM report does not use the words ‘only’ or ‘likely’ and states affirmatively a capture rate that would substantiate the office space programmed by Options 3 and 5.

The second sentence repeats the same misquote as Slide 9, deleting a second sentence which modifies the first sentence. The complete statement supports the subject sites close proximity to the Pittsburgh CBD as a positive attribute for Class A Office development.

Slide 22

The ‘source’ citation identifies the April 21, 2010 Oxford Infrastructure Analysis, however only a portion of the information is from that source. The remaining information comes from an unidentified source. The results are misleading because the annual carrying costs for Option 5 are not greater than Option 3.

Slides 5,6, 23 and 25

Each of these slides ignores the agreement reached by all concerned parties to equalize assumptions for economic benefit analysis purposes. In meetings with Option 3 and Option 5 proponents, assumptions (including but not limited to) commercial lease rates, square footage for office workers, and construction costs per square foot, were different and it was agreed to use the same set of assumptions for each option so that neither Option would gain an advantage. This agreement to equalize the assumptions was confirmed in a meeting held May 18, 2010 and was attended by Scott Pollock, Larry Castonguay, Chris Cieslak, Rob Pfaffmann, Steve George, Rebecca Moller, Todd Poole, and Adam Nelson.

The transposition error was a mistake and was discovered by Oxford, however not corrected. The revision will be included in the next published report. Total payroll and associated taxes for Option 3 and Option 5 will increase.

Slide 24

Slide 24 affirms the fact that, once corrected, the transposition error increases the difference between the two options’ economic benefits to the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County by an estimated $10 million in favor of Option 5.
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APPENDIX I

Agency and Interested Party Correspondence
## APPENDIX I:
AGENCY & INTERESTED PARTY CORRESPONDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 25, 2010</td>
<td>PHMC – Jean Cutler</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>PA Code process, Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16, 2010</td>
<td>PHMC – Jean Cutler</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>PA Code process, Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL COMMENTS ON SECOND OPTIONS REPORT, AND EFFECTS REPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 4, 2010</td>
<td>Gary J. English</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Response to Effects Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 5, 2010</td>
<td>Pittsburgh History &amp; Landmarks Foundation</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Response to Memorandum and Comments on the Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment Draft Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6, 2010</td>
<td>Reuse the Igloo</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Comments on the SEA’s Development Options Comparison Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6, 2010</td>
<td>Preservation Pittsburgh</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Comments on SEA’s Development Options Comparison Report and Interested Parties process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6, 2010</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Penguins</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Review of Determination of Effects Report and response to 4Ward Planning presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVISORY COUNCIL LETTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL PHMC ADVICE LETTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12, 2010 (as revised and restated August 19, 2010)</td>
<td>PHMC</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Comments and advice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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January 25, 2010

Ms. Mary Conturo, Executive Director
Sports and Exhibition Authority of
Pittsburgh and Allegheny County
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2750
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: Pennsylvania History Code process, Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena) and Lower Hill Redevelopment project

Dear Ms. Conturo:

Thank you for inviting our staff to the first interested parties meeting for the Mellon Arena project on January 19th. Bill Callahan represented the Bureau for Historic Preservation/State Historic Preservation Office on behalf of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. This letter is intended to comment on the meeting itself and to summarize our understanding of the process and timing SEA has chosen to follow for this project.

We understand the Arena project is currently required to follow the Pennsylvania History Code process for state undertakings, as there is no known federal involvement which would invoke Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. We understand further, however, that the SEA has chosen to follow the procedures as defined for Section 106 undertakings excluding, of course, participation by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation or a Federal agency that would be responsible for oversight of the process.

In our opinion, this is a prudent and laudable step. By following the Section 106 template, SEA could reduce or avoid potentially significant project delays should federal assistance become available thereby necessitating the Section 106 process be “caught up.” Additionally, Section 106 procedures are much more defined than those in the state History Code, which should help maintain additional clarity in the process. We encourage the SEA to continue in this manner as much as possible.

The SEA will be selecting “interested parties” to participate in the project consultation process. As stated in the public meeting, we encourage SEA to maintain broad selection criteria for interested parties, and to allow for a broad definition of “demonstrated interest” in the project. We also respectfully request the SEA allow us to review and comment on a preliminary list to ensure all parties known to the PHMC who may be interested in the process are included.

We also suggest that in future meetings, the term “interested parties” not be made interchangeable with the term “consulting party.” These terms have different meanings in Section 106 review and, since SEA is following the Section 106 template, should not be made interchangeable in the context of this project. In addition, it would be a good idea to be certain that any individual, business or organization that would be granted legal consulting party status under Section 106 is included in those who participate as “interested parties.”
Additionally, it appeared as though future meetings will be held primarily during the work day. To maximize public input at least some future meetings should be planned understanding that many interested parties are unable to consistently attend meetings held during regular working hours. In our opinion, meetings of this nature are more inclusive and useful if held in the evening or on weekends. It was mentioned during the presentation that much information will be posted on your website. In our view, posting plans, meetings minutes, and comments on your website as you move through the process for all to access is also a good idea.

During the January 19 meeting, a target goal of six months was stated for completion of the consultation process. It is our hope the process will be completed in that time; however in our view it would be prudent to be aware that six months is quite an aggressive time frame for a project of this nature and scope.

Also during the meeting a “project purpose and need exercise” was handed out to all attendees. Attendees were then requested to rank and interpret each of eleven criteria as to their importance to the consultation process and to the community. In our opinion, this exercise presents significant problems on two fronts.

First, the History Code and certainly Section 106 do indeed provide for and encourage a variety of perspectives as they pertain to the effects of an undertaking on historic resources. The ranking mechanism provided at the meeting treats a large variety of commendable community themes as competing interests. “Preservation” competes for ranking with “community cohesion,” “sustainability,” and “compatible planning” as separate issues when, indeed, these issues are highly compatible. Please keep in mind that the purpose of Section 106 and the History Code is, essentially, to find ways to avoid adverse effects to historic resources while investing in new community development opportunities.

Second, without a great deal of subsequent outreach and education, this type of ranking mechanism will create factions amongst interested parties. One outcome of the public participation process should be to assist the public in understanding how seemingly disparate components of community development are not just compatible, but dependant upon each other for success. “Ranking” exercises such as the one distributed on the 19th result in just the opposite: a compartmentalization of competing interests. Our suggestion is to simply scrap this well-meaning but potentially destructive “ranking” mechanism, and focus on soliciting public input in a manner that allows for a meaningful understanding of the community development needs of the Hill community and the public at large.

Given the information we have received to date in our opinion the SEA’s investigation of potential significant archeological resources coupled with the system of monitoring suggested at the meeting is adequate.

Finally, we were very pleased to learn that the demolition of the former Civic Auditorium, now known as Mellon Arena, is not considered inevitable by the SEA. In order for the process to not be construed a sham by the public, that is an extremely important concession. In our opinion Mellon Arena is, literally, an exceptionally significant historic resource. Generally speaking, if they are less than fifty years old, only properties with exceptional significance are considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

In our view, Mellon Arena typifies a classic era of American civic architecture, on the order of Seattle’s Space Needle, the St. Louis Gateway Arch and Houston’s Astrodome. Certainly, in terms of Pittsburgh’s architectural and engineering history, the former Civic Auditorium stands out as
exceptionally significant. We are, however, also quite cognizant of the Arena's less palatable history; as a physical reminder of the tremendous damage mid-20th century urban renewal projects did to existing neighborhoods. The story of the destruction of the Lower Hill neighborhood for urban renewal is an important story that should not be forgotten.

If a satisfactory adaptive re-use for the Arena can be found, part of that re-use should be a renewed, ongoing emphasis on interpreting that history in order that we avoid similar mistakes in the future. A development project that includes adaptive re-use of the Arena could be a true monument to the people of the Hill district, to Pittsburgh's history as an industrial giant and to the future development of both the Lower Hill and the city at large as we move into a more sustainable and thoughtful era of development.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call Ann Safley at 717-787-9121 or Bill Callahan at 412-565-3575.

Yours Truly,

Jean Cutler, Director
Bureau for Historic Preservation
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

cc: Scott Leib, Preservation Pittsburgh, c/o Applied Systems Associates, 5270 Logan Ferry Rd., Murrysville, PA 15668
Arthur Ziegler, Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation, 100 W. Station Sq. Dr., Suite 450, Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Katherine Molnar, City of Pittsburgh, Dept. of City Planning, 200 Ross St., Pittsburgh, PA 15219
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June 16, 2010

Ms. Mary Conturo, Executive Director
Sports and Exhibition Authority of
Pittsburgh and Allegheny County
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2750
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: Pennsylvania History Code process, Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena) and Lower Hill Redevelopment project

Dear Ms. Conturo:

We have received both the economic analysis and the draft alternatives report completed as part of SEA’s Mellon Arena project. We received documentation of the economic analysis via email on May 20 and received the draft alternatives report June 4th. Thank you for providing us an opportunity to review these documents. We are also aware that Save the Igloo and Preservation Pittsburgh are undertaking a separate economic analysis of the project. In order to adequately understand the issues at hand and to assist the SEA in their efforts to assess the project’s effects and assess alternatives to any adverse effects we will withhold formal comment until the SEA issues a preliminary finding on the project with supporting documentation, including the economic analysis, alternatives report, the Save the Igloo/Preservation Pittsburgh analysis, any additional supporting documentation and all public comment on the project to date. This package should be assembled with a cover letter that provides a summary of the process and SEA’s documented finding.

Over the past few months we have received a great deal of information from SEA and SEA’s consultants via email, in telephone conversations and through public meetings. We appreciate the level of communication SEA has provided; however our immediate concern is that much of this information has come to us piecemeal and in what appears to be a somewhat haphazard fashion in an attempt to move the project forward as quickly as possible. We are sympathetic with the need to move quickly, however we also want to ensure that we have received all crucial information in a fashion that allows us to fully understand both the process and the project’s effects on historic resources.

As you know, the Arena project is currently required to follow the Pennsylvania History Code for state undertakings, as there is no known federal involvement which would invoke Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act at this time. The State History Code is often referred to as an analogue to Section 106. Although perhaps true in principle, the major difference is in implementation. Section 106 has clearly defined procedures for the consultation process, which are found at 36 CFR Part 800. The State History Code requires consultation with the PHMC, but has no clearly defined procedures.

While we commend the SEA for attempting to follow the Section 106 process as may be possible without a formal declaration of a federal undertaking, make no mistake: the process to date should not be construed as a substitute for an actual Section 106 consultation. As we stated in our January 25 letter, “By following the Section 106 template, SEA could reduce or avoid potentially significant project delays should federal assistance become available...” But we also stated that the Section 106 process would require “...participation by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation or a Federal agency that
would be responsible for oversight of the process.” Insofar as using the Section 106 regulations as a template for complying with the state history code, the SEA has done well. However it is impossible to anticipate how a federal agency would view the current process and its findings, and whether the Advisory Council would choose to participate and what their views might be.

As we have stated several times, both in writing and verbally, the SEA has undertaken an extremely aggressive schedule to attempt to complete a cultural resources review process for the Arena. In so doing, the SEA has overlapped a number of elements the Section 106 process would require. For instance, as we have stated previously, the public participation process and alternatives analysis process have been conflated into one parallel, overlapping process. In skimming the draft alternatives report, we note the report includes preliminary suggestions of mitigation strategies for adverse effects before consultation about effects has been completed. Additionally, as we have mentioned both in writing and verbally, the “purpose and need” exercise and its accompanying arbitrary evaluation system as it was developed and has been instituted in this process is not something we would recommend as an appropriate method of evaluating alternatives.

These issues and the “overlapping” of processes are not, in our opinion, necessarily “wrong.” However, they are also not what we would consider a “best practice” in terms of Section 106 review. Given the PHMC’s role in both the History Code and Section 106, we feel it is important for us to remind SEA about the significant differences between the two processes. On the one hand SEA has fulfilled the consultation requirements of the History Code. On the other hand, at this time there is no way to anticipate what the outcome of a possible Section 106 consultation may be. The process has to be conducted appropriately to be valid.

Among the issues that we initially discussed about the Mellon Arena project was the MOU among the Commonwealth of PA, the County of Allegheny, the City of Pittsburgh, Lemieux Group LP, and SEA which, in Section 2.iii., calls for the demolition of the Arena by the SEA once the new Sports Exhibition Center is open for business. As stated in the MOU, the purpose of the demolition is to create a parking lot. At some point in our consultation, you informed me that the SEA did not have funding to demolish the Arena. If this condition has changed, I need to know about it; otherwise, I am of the opinion that there should be no rush to make a decision about the future of the Arena, and a final decision about its future should wait until it is clear whether the SEA is going to receive federal funding or not. To proceed with demolition of the Arena prior to notification of federal funding and a completion of the Section 106 process, could create a problem. Our purpose in conveying these concerns is to ensure that if a federal undertaking is identified, project consultation will proceed as efficiently as possible.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call Ann Safley at 717-787-9121 or Bill Callahan at 412-565-3575.

Yours Truly,

Jean Cutler, Director
Bureau for Historic Preservation
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

Cc:  Anne Nelson, PHLF, 100 W. Station Square Dr., Suite 450, Pittsburgh, PA 15219
     Rob Pfaffmann, Save The Igloo, 223 4th Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15222
     Scott Leib, Preservation Pittsburgh, 223 4th Ave., Suite 800, Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Chris Cieslak, Oxford Development, 425 6th Ave., Suite 2750, Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Tim Zinn, Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., 100 Airside Dr., Moon Twp., PA 15108
Barbara Franco, PHMC
Gary English, the vigilantone@verizon.net
Bill Callahan, PHMC
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TO: Jean Cutler  
FROM: Chris Cieslak  
CC: Mary Conturo, Doug Straley, Rosemary Carroll, Scott Pollock, Tim Zinn, Ray Maginness  
DATE: June 28, 2010  
SUBJECT: PA History Code Process, Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project

We have received your letter to Mary Conturo dated June 16, 2010 regarding the above subject. We have requested that our subconsultant, Baker, provide some clarification (under separate cover) regarding the steps our team has taken to comply with the State History Code and to mirror the Section 106 process.

We thank you for your comments and wanted to provide you with additional information concerning the Sports & Exhibition Authority’s (SEA) schedule and redevelopment obligations. In paragraph 7 of your letter, you state that the purpose of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Commonwealth, City, County, Lemieux Group and the SEA is to demolish Mellon Arena to create a parking lot. This is not accurate. As described in the SEA’s Request to Initiate Consultation package submitted to you in January 2010, our Project is to develop a comprehensive redevelopment plan for the Mellon Arena Site. The Memorandum of Understanding calls for the timely demolition of Mellon Arena in order to permit parking UNTIL the timely and desirable redevelopment can begin (emphasis added).

We have strived to explore alternatives to demolition that permit a desirable redevelopment plan in an evenhanded and expeditious manner. It is important to us to make a timely decision about the future of Mellon Arena for the following reasons:

- As of August 1, 2010, the holding costs (utilities, insurance, operations, maintenance, security, etc.) become the responsibility of the SEA and are estimated to range from $78,000 to $124,000 per month depending on the decision about Mellon Arena’s future.
- As of August 1, Mellon Arena will ‘go dark’ and be fenced in and secured from the public. This will further isolate the Hill District from the Central Business District. It would be our desire that this area not be in limbo any longer than necessary for the SEA to make an informed decision about the future redevelopment.
- There is a significant amount of planning that needs to occur to prepare the site for redevelopment (hazardous material abatement, asset liquidation, bid package preparation, contractor procurement). Even under the best case scenario, it will take at least 1 year after the arena site is prepared for redevelopment efforts to begin.
  o Design & approvals for arena building footprint  8/15/10 through 3/1/11
  o Furnishings & equipment sale & removal  9/1/10 through 12/31/10
  o Interior hazardous materials remediation  11/1/10 through 12/31/10
  o Roof remediation/demolition/grading  4/1/11 through 12/31/11
  o Confirm program concept  9/1/10 through 3/1/11
  o Design and approvals for infrastructure  3/1/11 through 4/1/12
  o Prepare site infrastructure (roads, utilities, signals)  4/1/12 through 11/1/12
- We feel that an extended period of uncertainty regarding the future redevelopment discourages development interest and the hopes of nearby residents.

As far as funding sources, we are currently in a much better position regarding identification of funding sources for the preliminary preparation of the Mellon Arena site than we were in January 2010. We are 6 weeks from completing the Consol Energy Center and Garage projects and are optimistic that there will be
remaining contingency to be returned to the SEA. We have selected a firm to conduct an inventory and appraisal of the furnishings and equipment at Mellon Arena and are hopeful to realize sizeable proceeds from that sale. And finally, we intend to recycle a significant portion of the Mellon Arena structure (steel, concrete, copper, etc.) to offset the cost of demolition. Cost certainty on these items is expected to fall into place in the coming months, but we can do our best to minimize the overall cost to the SEA by bringing the evaluation of alternatives to a rapid conclusion and by initiating the design and planning.

To be responsive to the suggestions in your June 16, 2010 letter, we have taken the following additional steps: we have advanced another Option for study (Option 6, Restore Arena to Original Design), we have requested that Reuse the Igloo confirm their statement to the media that they would conclude an independent economic analysis by early July, we have delayed our next Interested Parties Meeting until the second week of July, and we have postponed finalizing the Options Report for the time being.

We have also continued to explore a multitude of Reuse Options that have been proposed by the public and other Interested Parties and will issue them as an addendum to the Options Report; we have met with and shared information with Reuse the Igloo such as Arena operating costs, traffic and parking studies and economic assumptions.

With all of that in mind, we intend to take the following steps to conclude this process:
- Complete our analysis of Option 6, Restore Arena to Original Design
- Receive and review Save the Igloo/Preservation Pittsburgh analysis
- Issue an addendum to the Options report that includes the above analyses as well as various refinements to the previously considered options (early July)
- Receive and review any additional comments by Interested Parties, the Bureau of Historic Preservation and the public (through July 13)
- Finalize the Options Report and Effects Report
- Submit a recommendation to the Sports & Exhibition Authority for the selection of a preferred option
- Prepare Memorandum of Agreement

It is our intent to conduct the State History Code process appropriately, and to mirror the Section 106 process as closely as we can without incurring unnecessary delays and costs. We began this process in January 2010 and are hoping to conclude it by August 2010. Please confirm for us that our proposed schedule and sequence of steps will not invalidate the process.
June 28, 2010

Jean Cutler, Director
Bureau for Historic Preservation
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building, Second Floor
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Subject: Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project

Dear Ms. Cutler:

I am in receipt of your letter (June 16, 2010) addressed to Ms. Conturo, Executive Director of the Sports and Exhibition Authority (SEA) of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County. In addition to informing the SEA that formal comment from the Bureau for Historic Preservation (BHP) will be withheld until receipt of SEA’s issuance of a preliminary finding on the project and supportive documentation, the letter goes on to point out areas of BHP’s concern related to the consultation process. As moderator of the Interested Party process, the SEA has directed the letter to Michael Baker Jr., Inc. for follow-up and clarification with the BHP.

Expressed in the letter is an appreciation of “the level of communication the SEA has provided”. However, the letter goes on to characterize that communication as “piecemeal and what appears to be a somewhat haphazard fashion”. We recognize that this process has been fluid in order to ensure that relevant comments have been taken into consideration. We have coordinated with the BHP on the study approaches, proposed Interested Party workshop activities, and the evaluation of development options and refinements, as necessary. A project website has been established and regularly updated as a project information conduit. Additionally, as an Interested Party, the BHP has been involved in meetings and been provided with agendas and meeting minutes on a timely and regular basis.

I am encouraged by your statement that “insofar as using the Section 106 regulations as a template for complying with the State History Code, the SEA has done well”. However, we would like to respond to your concern over the “conflicted into one parallel, overlapping process” that, although “not...necessarily wrong”, is “not...best practices in terms of Section 106 review”. Due to the importance of this discussion, we have advanced drafts of reports and sought input so that the SEA, the Interested Parties, BHP could have a more complete picture in which to form the basis for an informed decision. In other words, we hope that an awareness of effects and potential mitigation will drive a more informed decision.

A reference is made in the letter to the purpose and need exercise as an “arbitrary evaluation system”, “not something...recommended as an appropriate method of evaluating alternative” and as “previously mentioned both in writing and verbally”. However, we revised the purpose and needs statement satisfactorily during Interested Party meeting #2 after discussions with BHP and as summarized in the February 10, 2010 record of telephone conversation.

Finally, BHP’s concern over the Development Options Comparison Report (Draft, May 2010) containing “preliminary suggestions of mitigation strategies for adverse effects before consultation about effects has been completed” is not accurate. The report describes, evaluates, and compares the various development options based on a set of project needs prepared by the Interested Parties. The report does not contain a discussion of specific “preliminary suggested mitigation strategies”. We do however start to outline them in the draft Effects Report, for all Options to aid the SEA in its decision making, as stated above.
We appreciate the advice of Bill Callahan to ensure that we are appropriately following the PA State History Code while also mirroring the federal Section 106 process. We would like to continue to work together to ensure we are in compliance with the law. Going forward, our intent is to issue an addendum of further alternatives analysis for review and comment, consider the results of ReUse the Igloo! / Reservation Pittsburgh's independent study, and finalize the reports. Subsequent to the SEA's decision, we will begin preparation of the Memorandum of Agreement.

We appreciate the continued feedback and oversight of the BHP has provided in this process. We hope this letter helps to clarify our previous and continued response to the guidance.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BAKER JR., INC.

[Signature]

Raymond Maginness
Technical Manager
Ms. Jean Cutler  
PA Historical & Museum Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, 2ND Floor  
Harrisburg, PA  17120-0093

Dear Ms. Cutler:

Thank you for your inquiry dated June 14, 2010 regarding the future of the Mellon Arena in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Your letter both solicits our advice and requests the participation of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. I have reviewed your letter and attachment as well as the June 16 letters to the Sports Exhibition Authority (SEA) and to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council).

Presently, neither the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) nor the Statewide Long Range Program (LRP) includes an activity that might feature the demolition of the structure. Neither the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation nor the Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region, is aware of any intent for a Federal-aid project on or near the site of the area. The action of demolishing sporting areas is not an activity that the FHWA could reasonably foresee having a transportation link or tie where Federal-aid funding might be provided through our programs. Therefore, the FHWA has no discretion or influence and cannot participate in Section 106 consultation on this activity.
Should conditions change or relevant new information be made available, we could reconsider this position.

Sincerely,

Renee Sigel
Division Administrator

cc: Dan Cessna, P.E., District Executive, PennDOT District 11-0
Barbara Franco, Executive Director, PHMC
Reid Nelson, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Chuck DiPietro, SPC
Mark Young, PennDOT District 11-0
June 14, 2010

Ms. Renee Sigel, Director
FHWA, PA Division
228 Walnut Street, Room 508
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1720

Dear Renee:

I am writing to request your advice concerning the future of the Mellon Arena (Arena) located in Pittsburgh.

The Arena, built in the early 1960’s, is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Last year, a new Sports Exhibition Center was built adjacent to the Arena, making the Arena, in the eyes of the Sports Exhibition Authority (SEA), which owns it, as well as the new Sports Exhibition Center, redundant.

The SEA would like to demolish the Arena. The last event is scheduled for June 30, 2010, so this could happen anytime after that date.

The SHPO has been consulting with the SEA under the State History Code. As you may know, the History Code has no clearly defined procedures for consulting about project effects: it merely states the Agency “will consult.” A while ago, the SEA informed our office that they were “anticipating federal funding” for the redevelopment of the acreage under and around the Arena, specifically to re-establish some semblance of the pre-Arena street grid. For this reason, it was agreed that the SEA could use Part 800, the regulations that govern Section 106, as a procedural template in order to impose some structure on the process for a project that was known to be controversial, and we concurred with that course of action. While the SEA, to my knowledge, has not received official notice that the federal funding is available, the SEA may want to proceed with demolition of the Arena.

Advocates for preserving the Arena have inquired as to whether it would be considered anticipatory demolition if the SEA demolished the Arena when it is commonly known that it is anticipating federal dollars for the redevelopment of the site (street grid). From their perspective, the existence of a MOU (enclosed) calling for the SEA to demolish the Arena which, if not for the demolition, federal funds for re-establishing some semblance of the street grid would not be used. On the other hand, the Executive Director of the SEA has informed me verbally that the SEA has no money at this time for demolition.
Our purpose in conveying the concerns of preservation advocates regarding anticipatory demolition is to ensure that if a federal undertaking is identified, project consultation will proceed as efficiently as possible.

In light of the anticipated FHWA funding, I am writing to request FHWA’s involvement in this consultation. Would FHWA agree to enter into consultation with us and the SEA prior to a federal undertaking being officially determined?

I know you and your staff are very busy; however, this issue is quite pressing. I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely,

Jean H. Cutler

CC:

Barbara Franco, Executive Director, PHMC
Bill Callahan, PHMC
Mary Conturo, Executive Director, SEA
Anne Nelson, PHLF
Rob Pfaffmann, Save the Igloo
Scott Leib, Preservation Pittsburgh
Chris Cieslak, Oxford Development
Tim Zinn, Michael Baker
Gary English, avigilantone@verizon.net
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
March 13, 2007

GOVERNOR RENDELL HAILS MAJOR AGREEMENT KEEPING THE PENGUINS IN PITTSBURGH

PITTSBURGH — Governor Edward G. Rendell today joined county, city and Pittsburgh Penguins team
officials to announce an agreement calling for the construction of a new hockey arena to allow the NHL
franchise to remain in the city.

"I am delighted that as a result of this historic agreement, the Penguins will stay and play in Pittsburgh
for the foreseeable future," said Governor Rendell. "The Penguins will get the arena they so desperately
need without imposing any additional burden on taxpayers. This, to me and the other public officials
involved, was the key to securing this deal.

"We are able to build this arena only because Pennsylvania approved gaming. The majority of the
funding going to this plan will come from gaming in one way or another," Governor Rendell said. "I
proposed that Pennsylvania adopt gaming for one reason: to give Pennsylvanians property tax relief. But
our ability to build a new arena for Pittsburgh is a major side benefit of gaming."

Governor Rendell said that the commonwealth, Allegheny County, the City of Pittsburgh, and the Sports
and Exhibition Authority (SEA) have reached a basic understanding with the Lemieux Group LP (the
Penguins) to build, operate and maintain a new arena in Pittsburgh. The new facility will be built adjacent
to the Mellon Arena where the Penguins now play. Opened as the Civic Arena in 1961, the facility has
been the Penguins' home since the team was formed in 1967.

The budget for design and construction of the new arena is set at $290 million. The budget will include
soft costs, eligible pre-development expenses previously incurred by the Penguins, acceptable design
and construction contingencies and oversight expenses of the SEA.

The facility will be designed with the goal of assuring that anticipated costs do not exceed $290 million.
The Penguins will have ultimate control over the design and construction, provided that the
commonwealth and the SEA each approve the design. The Sports and Exhibition Authority will be
responsible for preparing the site for construction of the new facility.

The Penguins will enter into a 29.5-year lease for the new arena, commencing upon the facility's
opening. The lease will obligate the Penguins to play hockey in the arena for the term of the lease and
contain a non-relocation clause. They will also be required to make 30 payments of $4.2 million per year
through the term of the lease. The Penguins will manage, operate and maintain the new arena, subject
to the terms of its current agreement with SMG.

Governor Rendell thanked all parties involved in the negotiation process, including Penguins owner
Mario Lemieux, Pittsburgh Mayor Luke Ravenstahl, Allegheny County Executive Dan Onorato, and NHL
Commissioner Gary Bettman. He also praised the Penguins for turning down offers from other cities.

"The team was willing to work with us to find a way to secure this agreement, even as the folks in Kansas
City were repeatedly sweetening their offer. The Penguins did this because they believe in Pittsburgh
and they believe in their fans. The team will pay more to stay in Pittsburgh than they would in Kansas
City, but I believe -- and they agree -- that they will get infinitely more, too."

EDITOR'S NOTE: Copies of the term sheet and memorandum of understanding are attached.

Pittsburgh Arena Term Sheet

1. The Penguins will enter into a 29.5 year lease for the new arena, commencing upon its opening.
The lease will obligate the Penguins to play hockey in the arena for the term of the lease and
contain a non-relocation clause.

2. i. The Penguins will make thirty (30) payments of $3.6M/year throughout the term of the new
arena lease.

   ii. Upon the opening of the new arena, the SEA will impose a new surcharge on parking. The
first $400,000/year of revenue generated from the new parking surcharge will be deposited
annually into a capital reserve fund established to maintain and improve the new arena.
The balance of the proceeds from the new parking surcharge in excess of $400,000/year
shall go to the Penguins.

   iii. Upon the opening of the new arena, the SEA, at its expense, shall promptly demolish
Mellon Arena and pave, stripe and in all respects prepare the land under Mellon Arena for
use as a parking lot. Upon completion of this work, the Penguins shall pay an additional
$200,000/year over the life of the lease. This use shall continue until the land under Mellon
3. The Penguins will manage, operate and maintain the new arena, subject to the terms of its current agreement with SMG, and shall retain all revenues generated from all events at the new arena.
4. Except for the new parking surcharge, all revenue generated from existing surcharges shall go to the Penguins and no new surcharges of any kind shall be imposed without the approval of the Penguins.
5. Prior to redevelopment, the Penguins shall manage, operate, maintain and retain all revenues from all current and future parking lots on the current Mellon arena site.
6. The SEA will provide a 500 space surface lot adjacent to the new arena; the Penguins will manage, operate, maintain and retain all revenues from said lot. Alternatively, the Penguins may elect for the SEA to construct a 500 space structured parking garage adjacent and connected to the new arena in exchange for the Penguins paying an additional $500,000 per year throughout the term of the new arena lease. The parties will agree on a deadline for the Penguins to make such election. If the Penguins inform the SEA of their election to build the garage by May 1, 2007, the SEA will be obligated to complete the garage in time for it to open in conjunction with the opening of the new arena. The Penguins will manage, operate, maintain and retain all revenues from the garage.
7. The arena construction budget will be set at $290M. The budget will cover the following matters:
   - Construction
   - Design
   - Soft Costs
   - Eligible pre-development expenses previously incurred by the Penguins in an amount of approximately $8M (Commonwealth and SEA to review and approve the itemized expenses)
   - Acceptable design and construction contingencies, including a 5% owner contingency
   - Oversight expenses of the SEA, estimated at approximately $2.5M
8. The new arena will be designed with the goal of assuring that all matters listed in Paragraph 7 do not exceed $290M. The Penguins will exercise ultimate control over the design and construction, provided that the Commonwealth and the SEA each shall approve the design.
9. A GMP for the mutually approved arena design will be contracted for at the earliest appropriate time, taking into account the relationship between design certainty and achieving a cost efficient GMP. If the GMP plus the other matters listed in Paragraph 7 ("GMP+") exceed $290M, the Penguins and the Commonwealth agree to split any excess 50/50 up to a GMP+ of $310M. The Penguins will have the right to pay their share of the increase in the GMP+ from $290M to up to $310M in the form of increased annual payments, rather than a lump sum. In the event the GMP+ exceeds $310M, the Penguins shall have the right to terminate their participation in the project without further financial obligation, provided that the parties shall first work together in good faith to redesign and value engineer the arena to lower the GMP+ to a level not exceeding $310M.
10. Once the GMP+ is established, the Penguins shall be responsible for any cost overruns, provided that the Penguins shall have the right to modify the design of the new arena to mitigate such overruns, subject to the reasonable oversight of the Commonwealth and the SEA.
11. The SEA will pay the Penguins $8.5M for the hospital site. The parties recognize that it is essential for the SEA to gain access to the property as soon as possible to begin abatement, demolition and other site work. It is anticipated that the source of the $8.5M will be from bond proceeds over and above the $290M referenced in Paragraph 7. In the event the SEA must access the property to commence its work before the $8.5M is available, the parties will work together to devise an arrangement acceptable to the current mortgage holders of the hospital site to enable conveyance of the hospital site to the SEA as soon as possible.
12. The Penguins shall be reimbursed for legitimate pre-development costs of approximately $6M out of the $290M referenced in Paragraph 7. To the extent any such costs are not reimbursable from the bond proceeds contemplated to fund the $290M, the Commonwealth will develop an alternative means of delivering this reimbursement to the Penguins.
13. To fund marketing expenses incurred by the Penguins in promoting the Team and/or the current or new arena, the Commonwealth will provide funds for the direct economic benefit of the Penguins in an amount equal to $2M, which the parties contemplate will be paid in a lump sum.
14. $3M from the bond proceeds (over and above the $290M construction budget referenced in Paragraph 7) shall be deposited into a capital reserve fund for the new arena.
15. In the event the City of Pittsburgh amusement tax rate is increased or a comparable tax on tickets
or admissions is created or increased at any time during the term of the new arena lease, the
Penguins shall receive a credit against their financial obligations under the new arena lease or be
paid an amount equal to the proceeds from any such new or increased tax on tickets or
admissions for arena events.

16. The SEA shall be responsible for all site conditions on the new arena site and shall be responsible
for making the site available for construction of the new arena in a clean, buildable condition.
Utilities and other infrastructure shall be made available in a manner and in locations consistent
with the design of the arena.

17. Development Rights:
- For the value and on the terms set forth in this Paragraph 17, the Penguins shall have
development rights to the entire Mellon Arena site, as well as any portion of the hospital
site which is available for development following construction of the new arena and the
agreed upon surface or structured parking facilities built in connection therewith.
- The development rights may be assigned in whole or in part by the Penguins at any time
with SEA approval, which shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.
- Following execution of the new arena lease, the Penguins shall negotiate, in good faith,
terms for PITG Gaming to potentially participate in development rights.
- The Penguins and the SEA shall work together to develop a comprehensive redevelopment
plan for the development site. The parties shall work together in a good faith, collaborative
manner to promote a timely and desirable redevelopment process. The final
redevelopment plan(s) shall be subject to SEA approval, which shall not be unreasonably
withheld or delayed.
- The development site shall have a drawdown period of 10 years, commencing on the first
anniversary of the later of: (1) the opening of the new arena and (2) the demolition of
Mellon Arena and preparation of the land thereunder for use as a parking lot. Upon the
commencement of the drawdown period, the Penguins shall be obligated to develop a pro
rata portion of the development site during each succeeding twelve month period. For
example, if the overall development site is 28 acres, the drawdown schedule would call for
development of 2.8 acres per year.
- Upon the Penguins identifying a parcel they wish to redevelop, the parties shall have
the value of the parcel appraised, taking into account its approved use, on a traditional
“1/1/1” appraisal method.
- The Penguins are entitled to $15M of credits from redevelopment. Until the entire $15M
credit has been received, these credits may be earned in any combination of three ways:
first, in the event the Penguins are developing a parcel, the parcel shall be appraised as
described above, and the Penguins shall receive a credit against the purchase price in an
amount equal to the appraised value; second, the Penguins shall receive the proceeds
from the sale or lease of any parcel to a third party, whether by the Penguins or by the
SEA; third, at the conclusion of the ten year drawdown period, to the extent the Penguins
have not earned credits totaling $15M, the SEA shall pay the shortfall in cash.
- If, on a cumulative basis, the Penguins fail to perform in a timely fashion on the drawdown
schedule, the Penguins shall forfeit their development rights with respect to the
corresponding amount of land. For example, if the drawdown schedule calls for
development of 2.8 acres per year and, at the end of any drawdown year, the Penguins
have failed to develop land at a rate of 2.8 acres per year, the Penguins would forfeit their
development rights with respect to the number of acres representing the short fall. In every
case, the Penguins shall have the right to designate the location of the land on the
development site to which its development rights are forfeited.
- Failure to meet the drawdown schedule and/or forfeiture of development rights with respect
to any portion of the development site shall not affect the Penguins’ right to operate and
retain revenue from the present or future parking lots on the Mellon Arena site prior to any
such lot being redeveloped; provided, however, that the Penguins shall forfeit their rights
with respect to parking upon the 10th anniversary of the beginning of the drawdown period.

18. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Allegheny County and the City of Pittsburgh shall be
responsible for the full and timely performance of all public sector obligations.
PITTSBURGH ARENA
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into on March __, 2007 among the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (the “Commonwealth”), Allegheny County (the “County”), the City of Pittsburgh (the “City”), the Sports and Exhibition Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County (“SEA”) and Lemieux Group LP (the “Penguins”).

The Commonwealth, the County, the City, and the SEA have reached a basic understanding as to a venture with the Penguins to build, operate and maintain a new arena in Pittsburgh adjacent to the current Mellon Arena. The parties are determined to proceed with this venture upon the mutual understandings contained in the attached Term Sheet setting forth the anticipated respective obligations and expectations of the Commonwealth, the County, the City, the SEA and the Penguins. The parties mutually acknowledge that they will work diligently to negotiate and execute a lease and other definitive agreements reflecting the understandings in the Term Sheet within thirty (30) days hereof. The parties intend that the lease and other definitive agreements will use a format and other general relationships utilized for the development, construction and occupancy of PNC Park and Heinz Field, subject to the provisions of the Term Sheet.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

By: ____________________________________________

SPORTS & EXHIBITION AUTHORITY OF PITTSBURGH AND ALLEGHENY COUNTY

By: ____________________________________________

ALLEGHENY COUNTY

By: ____________________________________________

LEMIEUX GROUP LP

By: ____________________________________________

CITY OF PITTSBURGH

By: ____________________________________________
In December 2009, the SEA initiated consultation with the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission ("PHMC") in compliance with the Pennsylvania State History Code regarding the Lower Hill Redevelopment Project ("Project"). Since then, SEA has conducted eight Interested Parties meetings and has solicited comments on two DRAFT Development Options Comparison Reports ("Options Report"), dated May and July 2010, respectively, and one DRAFT Determination of Effect Report ("Effects Report"), dated June 2010. The SEA also has received materials submitted by Interested Parties, including an analysis submitted by 4Ward Planning LLC at Interested Party Meeting #8, held on July 13, 2010.

As you know, the draft Options Report identifies Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development as the preferred alternative. In Interested Party Meeting #8, the SEA requested that any comments on these draft reports be submitted by July 23, 2010. To date, SEA has received comments from only one Interested Party. The SEA has decided to extend the comment period and is now requesting that any further comments on the Options Report and/or Effects Report be submitted on or before August 6, 2010.

After that date, the consultant will finalize the reports. The SEA will review the reports, correspondence, and other documentation and make a decision regarding the redevelopment of the site. The SEA and its consultants will then work with the PHMC and Interested Parties to determine future steps to mitigate adverse effects, if any of the project. The SEA intends to document any mitigation commitments future agreements.

The reason that we are extending the comment period is to give PHMC and all Interested Parties an opportunity to consider the SEA’s responses to several recent comments, including:

1. the comments submitted by the Pennsylvania History and Landmarks Foundation ("PHLF") to the SEA, in a letter dated July 15, 2010 (enclosed);

2. a request made by an Interested Party and its consultant (4Ward Planning LLC) at an Interested Party meeting on July 13, 2010 (available on SEA website) and at an SEA Board Meeting on July 15, 2010, seeking a one-year extension of the decision-making process.

Responses to the above comments are attached. See Attachment A.

In addition, a response to the presentation given by 4Ward Planning LLC at Interested Party Meeting #8 is enclosed. See Attachment B. The 4Ward Planning presentation criticized the economic analysis that had been conducted by Oxford Real Estate Advisors ("OREA") and by AECOM for the Lower Hill site. In the enclosed document, OREA provides its response to 4Ward’s critique. Additionally, we note that 4Ward’s presentation does not include any new economic analysis and does not identify any new redevelopment options that were not previously considered.

We appreciate your participation in this process and look forward to receiving any further comments.
ATTACHMENT A

I. SEA Responses to PHLF Letter of July 15, 2010

1. Compliance with the NHPA

The PHLF letter contends that SEA is not in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and states that “failure to comply with Section 106 may result in foreclosure of the ACHP’s opportunity to comment and/or in anticipatory demolition as defined in Section 110(k) of the NHPA.” The letter also states that “While it is fine to reach out to federal agencies, requesting their participation without federal funds allocated, does not satisfy the requirements of Section 106.”

We disagree with PHLF’s interpretation of the NPHA’s requirements. The NHPA is a federal law. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. The Section 106 consultation process can be carried out only by a federal agency. The SEA is not a federal agency and therefore is not subject to Section 106, nor can it carry out a Section 106 consultation process. Moreover, the SEA has neither the obligation nor the ability to force a federal agency to carry out a Section 106 consultation process on the SEA’s behalf.

The only reason that Section 106 procedures are being discussed, in the context of this non-federal project, is that the SEA has voluntarily chosen to follow a process modeled on Section 106 consultation as a method for satisfying the consultation requirements that apply to SEA under the State History Code. The SEA decided to adopt Section 106-like procedures because the State History Code itself does not define a consultation process. The SEA adopted these Section 106-like procedures because they provide a structure within which the stakeholders can participate in a thorough, thoughtful and methodical decision-making process. While Section 106 terminology has been used, the SEA and its consultants have stated consistently that their intent is to “mirror” Section 106 as a way of satisfying the State History Code. The SEA is in full compliance with its obligations under state law, and has gone above and beyond those requirements in an effort to provide a thorough, thoughtful and inclusive process.

The PHMC’s statements are fully consistent with the SEA’s application of the State History Code and with SEA’s determination that Section 106 does not apply to the SEA’s actions. Both the PHMC and the PHLF have acknowledged that the State History Code does not define a specific consultation process, and have acknowledged that SEA’s actions to date are sufficient to satisfy SEA’s obligation to consult with the PHMC under the State History Code. The PHMC also has recognized that, because the SEA is not a federal agency, the SEA does not have the obligation or the ability to engage in Section 106 consultation.

The potential for future federal funding to be used in the redevelopment of the Lower Hill site does not change this analysis. The SEA would like to receive federal funding for certain road improvements that will be needed on this site, when the site is redeveloped. However, federal funding is at this point a possibility at some indefinite point in the future. There is currently no federal funding designated for any aspect of the redevelopment of this site. The State and metropolitan transportation plans, which identify projects for which federal funding is anticipated over the next 20+ years, do not identify any federally funded projects at the Lower Hill site. Accordingly, in a letter to PHMC dated July 7, 2010, the Federal Highway Administration concluded that “the FHWA has no discretion or influence and cannot participate in Section 106 consultation on this activity.”
In these circumstances, an assertion that demolition of the Mellon Arena could be considered “anticipatory demolition” in violation of Section 110(k) of the NHPA is inaccurate. Section 110(k) defines anticipatory demolition as destroying or irreparably harming an historic property “with the express purpose of circumventing or preordaining the outcome of Section 106 review.” The SEA’s actions throughout this process demonstrate great care for historic resources, and a desire to ensure that it thoroughly considers an array of options other than demolition before any final decisions are made. The reason that Section 106 consultation has not occurred is not because of any intent to avoid consultation. Rather, it has not occurred because there is no federal action.

Moreover, it is important to recognize that Section 110(k) does not directly regulate the actions of non-federal entities such as the SEA. Rather, Section 110(k) places a responsibility on federal agencies to develop procedures for discouraging “applicants and potential applicants” from carrying out “anticipatory demolition” as that term is defined in the statute. Recognizing that Section 110(k) places this responsibility on federal agencies, the PHMC specifically asked FHWA (in a letter dated June 14, 2010) to consider whether SEA’s actions would constitute anticipatory demolition. In its July 7, 2010 response to PHMC, FHWA stated that it has no basis for becoming involved in actions related to the potential demolition of the Mellon Arena. If FHWA considered the SEA a potential applicant and had concerns about anticipatory demolition, FHWA would have been legally obligated under Section 110(k) to provide an “early warning” to the SEA. FHWA’s letter raised no such concerns. FHWA’s response to the PHMC’s letter confirms that FHWA does not view SEA’s actions as creating the potential for “anticipatory demolition” under Section 110(k).

In sum, the SEA has complied with its obligations under the State History Code, and has substantially exceeded those obligations by carrying out a consultation process modeled on the procedures that federal agencies follow under Section 106 of the NHPA. The SEA has no obligations under the NHPA itself and can proceed with the redevelopment of the Lower Hill site, including the demolition of the Mellon Arena if that option is selected. Based on FHWA’s response to the PHMC letter, the demolition of the Mellon Arena would not be considered “anticipatory demolition” and therefore would not affect the SEA’s ability to use federal funding in the future for projects on that site.

2. Purpose and Needs Exercise

The PHLF letter also discusses the “purpose and needs” exercise, asserting that it “added confusion to the review process.” The PHLF letter cites an earlier letter from PHMC to the SEA, dated June 16, 2010, in which the PHMC commented on the purpose and needs exercise and the way it was used for evaluating alternatives.

We are aware that there is a reasoned difference of opinion between SEA and the PHMC regarding the way that the purpose and need statement was developed and the way it was used in evaluating alternatives. The SEA’s consultants developed the purpose and need statement through a collaborative process that included a survey in which Interested Parties articulated various goals. The SEA’s consultants then developed a method for assessing alternatives based on the various alternative’s ability to satisfy various aspects of the purpose and need. The PHMC expressed concerns about this approach early in the process, and the SEA’s consultants discussed these concerns with the PHMC and modified its methodology to address these concerns. While these changes did not fully resolve the difference of opinion, they demonstrate that SEA has carefully considered PHMC’s concerns.
This difference of opinion does not call into question the adequacy of the SEA’s decision-making process with regard to the Lower Hill site. As noted above, the SEA is required to follow the State History Code, and both PHMC and PHLF have agreed that the SEA’s process complies with the State History Code. The SEA is not required to comply with Section 106. The SEA decided on its own to create a process where no formal process existed. The process created by the SEA included elements of Section 106 consultation and also included elements of the type of analysis that is performed under the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”). NEPA is a federal law that requires federal agencies to engage in an environmental review process for major federal actions, and that process includes development of a “purpose and need” and an analysis of alternatives based on that purpose and need. In this case, the SEA’s consultants chose to incorporate those elements from a NEPA study into its decision-making process. While some participants would have designed the process differently, the process was thoughtful, thorough, and inclusive, and went beyond SEA’s obligations under the State History Code.

Therefore, while some differences of opinion remain, those differences relate solely to judgment calls made by the SEA and its consultants with regard to the design of an optional process. Such differences of opinion can be an expected part of a process such as this one, and they do not impair the SEA’s compliance with the State History Code.

3. Decision-Making Responsibility

The PHLF letter states that “the SEA is the entity responsible for the process and the evaluation of alternatives, not the Interested Parties.” It also states that “the SEA is ultimately responsible for making its own decisions regarding the redevelopment of the Mellon Arena site, and any preferred recommendations that stem from the Interested Party process should be labeled as those of SEA and its consultants.”

The SEA agrees with these statements in the PHLF letter. The SEA is the public agency that owns the site and is responsible for making the decision about the future of Mellon Arena. The SEA’s consultants have assisted the SEA by developing and overseeing the Interested Party process; by defining a range of options to be considered and evaluating those options; and by recommending an alternative (referred to as the ‘preferred alternative’) for adoption by the SEA. The SEA’s consultants have facilitated a dialogue among the Interested Parties, and have carefully considered the views expressed by the Interested Parties. However, it is recognized that the Interested Parties do not have a decision-making role and may not necessarily agree with one another or with the SEA consultants’ recommendations. Ultimately, the SEA will consider the recommendations of its consultants, along with the views expressed by all of the Interested Parties, in reaching a final decision regarding the redevelopment of its Lower Hill site.

For these reasons, the SEA concludes that the information in the PHLF letter does not provide a basis for requiring an extension of the existing process. Therefore, once any remaining comments have been submitted on the Options Report, the SEA will consider the comments and proceed forward in its decision-making process.

II. SEA Response to Request for Extension of Process

During the SEA Board Meeting and Interested Party Meeting in July, an Interested Party and its consultant called for a “unified planning process” for the Lower Hill site. As described by the Interested Party and consultant, this process would allow 12 months (through July 2011) for redevelopment requests for proposals to be developed, and no decision regarding the site would be made until after Fall 2011 or later. In effect, this consultant is asking for a substantial delay in the SEA’s decision-making regarding the site.
Delaying the decision-making process would result in significant additional holding costs to the SEA and would result in the area not being ‘development ready’ until 1st Quarter 2014. The holding costs are expected to range from $76,000 to $122,000 per month depending on the future use of the Mellon Arena.

In addition to the financial impacts on the SEA, this delay would be problematic because it would impede efforts to plan for the redevelopment of the site by prolonging uncertainty about what development will be possible.

It is the goal of the SEA to provide for a desirable development-ready site in a timely manner, both in order to minimize holding costs of Mellon Arena and to avoid a situation where the future development of the property is in limbo for an extended period of time. It is the SEA’s desire to build on the momentum that comes with the completion of the Consol Energy Center and Cambria Suites Hotel and the recent announcements of new development efforts underway in the Hill District, including the new YMCA, the new grocery store and the renovated Connelley Technical Institute.

To achieve that goal, the SEA has developed a preliminary schedule (if Option 5 is selected) for site preparation that would permit the first phase of development to commence by Spring 2012. Making a timely decision will enable the design for the site’s infrastructure to proceed.
July 15, 2010

Ms. Mary Conturo
Sports & Exhibition Authority of
Pittsburgh and Allegheny County
425 Sixth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Dear Mary:

We appreciate the Sports & Exhibition Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County’s (SEA) efforts to comply with the Pennsylvania State History Code in reviewing and analyzing alternatives for the redevelopment of the Mellon Arena site. While the SEA is attempting to mirror the State History Code review process with the procedures set forth in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), this does not put the SEA in compliance with Section 106 as the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) and Landmarks have advised numerous times.

Section 106 is invoked when federal funds are designated for a project that may have an adverse impact on historic properties. It is a federal agency’s “statutory obligation” to comply with Section 106. The process is clearly laid out in the Section 106 regulations—36 C.F.R. Part 800—and includes, among other things, that a federal agency be designated, the alternatives analysis be reviewed by the public, and that the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation (ACHP) be given an opportunity to participate and comment.

Failing to comply with Section 106 may result in foreclosure on the ACHP’s opportunity to comment and/or in anticipatory demolition as defined in Section 110(k) of the NHPA. This is applicable to the entire redevelopment of the site. Section 110(k) prohibits “anticipatory demolitions” by placing a penalty on recipients of federal funds that intentionally destroy or harm historic properties prior to the completion of the Section 106 review process.

While it is fine to reach out to federal agencies, requesting their participation without federal funds allocated, does not satisfy the requirements of Section 106.

Furthermore, we concur with PHMC’s comments in their letter dated June 16, 2010, and as were reiterated by Mr. Bill Callahan at the July 13th Interested Parties meeting. As we expressed to you verbally, the “purpose and needs” exercise and statement added confusion to the review process. If mirroring Section 106, then the purpose is clearly defined in 36 C.F.R. § 800.1(b)—“to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects and seek ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties.”
Ms. Mary Conturo  
July 15, 2010  
Page 2 of 2

In continuing the State History Code review process, please note that the SEA is the entity responsible for the process and the evaluation of alternatives, not the Interested Parties. The SEA is ultimately responsible for making its own decisions regarding the redevelopment of the Mellon Arena site, and any preferred recommendations that stem from the Interested Parties process should be labeled as those of the SEA and its consultants.

We agree with PHMC that the SEA has complied with the State History Code, but that it has not complied with, and it is premature to conduct, the Section 106 review process, or to enter into a memorandum of agreement to that effect. The formal Section 106 review process should be initiated when federal funding for an adverse impact is identified.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr.  
President

cc: Bill Callahan  
    Chris Cieslak  
    Jean Cutler  
    Barbara Franco  
    Scott Lieb  
    Anne Nelson  
    Rob Pfaffman  
    Timothy Zinn  
    Yarone Zober
ATTACHMENT B
July 29, 2010

The following is a summary of our comments with regard to the report prepared by 4Ward Planning entitled Mellon Arena Reuse Analysis, and dated July 13, 2010, for Preservation Pittsburgh (“Option 3”). We have divided our commentary into two components, 1) an Executive Summary and 2) Specific Slide Commentary.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The referenced ‘analysis’ refers to the AECOM report which was done independently (and prior to all other reports) and provided the broad-spectrum basis for the Option 5 data. It also refers to Oxford’s Comparative Economic Benefit Analysis which is an evaluation of Option 3 data (provided by affiliates of Preservation Pittsburgh) and Option 5 data, utilizing a number of new assumptions which were ‘equalized’ and which had been agreed to by the various parties in an effort to avoid providing either Option with an advantage.

A substantial number of the slides in the 4Ward Planning, LLC presentation contain misleading information, omissions, and incorrect source citations and quotes.

The presentation takes statements and data out of context and includes conflicting, misleading and incorrect data to cast doubt on the validity of various market conclusions. The presentation also ignores the agreement to equalize assumptions for Option 3 and Option 5.

Overall, the 4Ward Planning analysis uses a generic approach to evaluation which in many cases is not specific or applicable to the Pittsburgh market.

In conclusion, the amount of misleading information, incorrect data, and inconsistencies throughout 4Ward Planning’s presentation is a concern and needs to be accounted for by those relying on the representations made and the conclusions drawn.

SPECIFIC SLIDE COMMENTARY

Slides 9 & 21 The first sentence is taken from AECOM’s draft February 19, 2010 report, but fails to include the follow up sentence which qualifies it by stating: “However, given the lack of developable land within the golden triangle and the desire of many office tenants to be near the CBD, the project site will offer desired proximity to downtown resources (although there is also competition from the North Shore). Utilizing a quote of one sentence and ignoring a succeeding sentence that qualifies it, is misleading.

The second quote on this slide is also misleading. In the AECOM report, the quote is actually referring to the effect that the “movement among several firms” had on the CBD at a specific point in time and does not accurately address the overall CBD office market. A more thorough evaluation of the Pittsburgh office market would
conclude that the market is performing very well. For example, the Pittsburgh office of Cushman and Wakefield stated in its 2010 1Q Pittsburgh Office Report ‘MarketBeat’: “Leasing activity increased significantly over first quarter 2009 and is expected to climb throughout 2010.” “Direct absorption should increase in 2010 in response to new energy companies entering the market.” The report states that overall absorption in the CBD for the quarter finished at 318,227 sf.

The Slide 13 map illustrates 18 movie theaters however the data box indicates 14 “movie houses.” The map also appears to show two ‘movie houses’ in the CBD, and one on the Northshore. None of these three ‘movie houses’ show mainstream movies that would compete with a movie house on the subject site. In addition, nine (9) of the theatres are outside, or close to, the ‘15 minute’ contour and it is unlikely that they would be considered competitive theatres.

Slide 14 quotes Cinemark as searching for theatre locations in Monroeville and the North Hills communities of McCandless and Cranberry; three locations not likely to compete with a theatre complex on the subject site.

These slides provide information related to restaurants and the retail market in general. The information is credited to DirectoriesUSA.com and ScanUS, internet research sources, as well as the author of the report.

The Pittsburgh office of CB Richard Ellis paints a different picture with regard to retail viability in this market.

According to the CB Richard Ellis Real Estate Symposium Report of May 18, 2010 “Pittsburgh has benefitted from slow, consistent growth and stable housing and job growth. Retailers are looking for markets with limited exposure to housing busts and job creation.” In their “Predictions-Pittsburgh” CBRE states the following: “2010 will surprise many as the market is as hot as it has ever been;” “Downtown will continue to prosper and grow;” “Meds, Eds and High Tech will continue to lead us to new heights;” “Retailers will continue to enter our market given our notoriety and new found success/stability;” “Development will continue bucking National Trends.”

Slide 19 states that the Class A office component of Option 5 is not such a good idea. However, the Pittsburgh office of CB Richard Ellis sees opportunity for Class A office in Pittsburgh and its CBD.

In its May 18, 2010 Real Estate Symposium, Pittsburgh, 2010, CBRE stated that Pittsburgh is a “Diamond in the Rough” with stability, job creation (second best City for graduating seniors), led by lower recession industries; medical, education, hitech, and engineering. Pittsburgh’s downtown area is “booming with development, new residences, new Class A office, new exclusive retail, new restaurants, new green spaces, new parking, new entertainment/sports, new hotels.”

Slide 20 uses data that includes Class B and Class C space, as well as suburban office data, which is data not pertinent to a discussion regarding new Class A office development in the CBD.
According to CBRE’s May 18, 2010 report, the Class A office market in the CBD is comprised of 13,645,792 square feet and has one of the lowest vacancy rates nationwide at 9.6%, or 1,313,215 square feet. If the total office space currently planned for either Option 3 or Option 5, +/- 600,000 square feet, were added to the market today, the vacancy rate would be 14%. Moreover, if fringe downtown Class A space is added to the mix, the vacancy rate would be only 8.56%, and even with the Option 3 or Option 5 space included, the rate would only increase to 11.9%.

CBRE concludes that 1st quarter statistics indicate five consecutive quarters of positive absorption and population influx in Pittsburgh for the first time in 20 years.

Slide 21

The first sentence beginning with, “According to the Penguins’ updated market study” is reworded resulting in a misinterpretation of this statement. The sentence in the AECOM report actually states that “a capture of between 20 and 30 percent of new office space demand would generate the need for approximately 400,000 to 600,000 square feet of office space over the next ten years within the downtown/fringe submarket.” The AECOM report does not use the words ‘only’ or ‘likely’ and states affirmatively a capture rate that would substantiate the office space programmed by Options 3 and 5.

The second sentence repeats the same misquote as Slide 9, deleting a second sentence which modifies the first sentence. The complete statement supports the subject sites close proximity to the Pittsburgh CBD as a positive attribute for Class A Office development.

Slide 22

The ‘source’ citation identifies the April 21, 2010 Oxford Infrastructure Analysis, however only a portion of the information is from that source. The remaining information comes from an unidentified source. The results are misleading because the annual carrying costs for Option 5 are not greater than Option 3.

Slides 5, 6, 23 and 25

Each of these slides ignores the agreement reached by all concerned parties to equalize assumptions for economic benefit analysis purposes. In meetings with Option 3 and Option 5 proponents, assumptions (including but not limited to) commercial lease rates, square footage for office workers, and construction costs per square foot, were different and it was agreed to use the same set of assumptions for each option so that neither Option would gain an advantage. This agreement to equalize the assumptions was confirmed in a meeting held May 18, 2010 and was attended by Scott Pollock, Larry Castonguay, Chris Cieslak, Rob Pfaffmann, Steve George, Rebecca Moller, Todd Poole, and Adam Nelson.

The transposition error was a mistake and was discovered by Oxford, however not corrected. The revision will be included in the next published report. Total payroll and associated taxes for Option 3 and Option 5 will increase.

Slide 24

Slide 24 affirms the fact that, once corrected, the transposition error increases the difference between the two options’ economic benefits to the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County by an estimated $10 million in favor of Option 5.
The purpose of this memorandum is to clarify issues raised during Interested Parties Meeting #7 and again in Meeting #8 regarding the selection of a “Preferred Alternative” in the May 2010 Development Options Comparison Draft Report and in the July 2010 revised draft report.

1. **Process.** The Options Report was prepared to summarize the alternatives development and analysis process Baker and the SEA employed. Although the proposed project does not involve a federal action, Baker and the SEA chose to use decision-making procedures that are modeled on two federal laws, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The NEPA process involves the development of a Purpose and Needs Statement for the proposed project, against which alternatives are then evaluated on their ability to meet the identified needs. The Section 106 process involves consultation to identify historic properties, evaluate effects on those properties, and resolve adverse effects. Baker and SEA voluntarily incorporated those elements of NEPA review and Section 106 consultation to provide a structure for the decision-making process. This approach was deemed appropriate because of the site’s history (being one of the city’s most controversial urban redevelopment projects of the 1950 and 1960s), the fact that the building is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, and because of several prior agreements and on-going planning efforts within the Hill District community that involve the arena and its 28-acre site.

2. **Preferred Alternative.** Based on the needs as identified through this process and the economic studies provided by the Pittsburgh Penguins and Oxford-Chester, Baker’s project team identified Option 5 as the recommended preferred alternative, as indicated in the first and second draft versions of the Options Report. The Interested parties participated in the development of the purpose and needs statement used in part by Baker to reach this recommendation to the Authority. The Interested Parties did not - nor were they asked to – determine the Purpose and Need or select Option 5 as their preferred alternative. As both versions of the report were issued in draft, the recommendation of a preferred alternative was not intended to end the Interested Party process and dialog and of course, no matter the recommendation by Baker, the final selection of a preferred alternative is the prerogative of the Authority’s board.
To whom it may concern;

Since the comment period has been extended until Friday, August 6th, I have made some updates to my original submission and want that to replace the original response.

Please advise,

Gary J. English

Comments on the Civic (mellon) Arena “EFFECTS REPORT”

First, I must object to the “Interested Party” process and the findings in this report. I will submit a conclusion and recommendation is at the end of this report.

The SEA failed to advertise for “IP” members that have a historical and/or financial interest in the Civic Arena which did not follow the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as mentioned in Section 1.2 of this report.

Therefore, the IP input was limited and did not have adequate representation. A clear example is the SEA’s failure to contact the PHMC applicant as an “Interested Party” for historic preservation of the Civic Arena and had the documentation and means to do so. That documentation is later identified in Sections 2.2, 6.0 and page 45 of this report. See letter dated, August 2, 2001, addressed to Gary J. English.
The SEA did not address the concerns of the IP Committee and have CENSORED comments in April 21, 2010 Meeting #5 and my July 13\textsuperscript{th} presentation at Meeting #8. Both presentations were not posted on the SEA website. Only 19 words from meeting minutes of my July 13, 2010 presentation inaccurately mentions the content of the 40 minute presentation.

Clearly, my objections were not addressed and proposals for Civic Arena use were not considered in the preparation of this report. Furthermore, repeated calls and emails have not been returned by Chris Cieslak and Mary Conturo.

This report is titled, “LOWER HILL (MELLON ARENA) REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT”. The title assumes demolition and redevelopment, not preservation. This is a failure from the start and flies in the face of your own words;

\textit{The goal of consultation is to identify historic properties affected by the project, assess effects to historic resources, and seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties resulting from project implementation.}

Section 1.1 Project Description further supports the assertion of prejudice of the IP Process with, “The concept of the understanding included a plan to promptly demolish Mellon Arena and provide development rights with respect to the option premises (28 acres) to the Penguins.” The SEA gave away the developement rights before a decision has been made on preservation or redevelopment. The IP process was known well in advance as I filed for preservation in 2001.

Section 1.4 Identification and Evaluation of Alternatives, the report is incomplete, inaccurate and prejudice. Option #2 and Option #6 Preserve Arena (for Continued Use as a Multi-Purpose Arena) relies on a study provided by HOK Sports. The report has a built in conflict of interest, as a negative report would result in a contract to use the designs of HOK Sports for the building of the Consol Energy Center.

The report findings try to embellish any deficiencies to justify spending $321 for the Consol Energy Center. Any upgrades would have cost the taxpayers far less than construction of a new arena.

\textit{Mellon Arena has physical deficiencies that limit its continued competitiveness as a multi-purpose facility}; is categorically untrue. This venue has continued to host concerts, Ice Capades, wrestling, truck and tractor pulls, kids entertainment shows and the Globe Trotters. In a July 2\textsuperscript{nd} report in the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review, see: \url{http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/pittsburgh/s_689065.html} it cited that Pittsburgh is able to support 21 theatre venues and could easily support two Arenas.

\textit{High facility maintenance and operational costs}; The SEA Consultants produced an unobjective report by political consultants to support demolition. The SEA Consultants
would not recuse themselves from future contracts, should demolition and redevelopment take place to avoid conflicts of interest. This concern was repeatedly raised by me and never addressed.

The report had unsubstantiated cost figures that only included expenses and no revenue streams. There were no cost comparisons to the new venue. The SEA consultants were provided 15 different revenue streams in my July 13th presentation, but it was never considered in this report and censored from posting it on the SEA Website presentations and meeting minutes.

The report states, "inability to logistically accommodate the expanding size of events and to compete effectively with alternative regional venue facilities"; Untrue. There were no larger competing venues in the region prior to the Consol Energy construction the Civic Arena was the largest venue in the region.

Inadequate concourse and ticket sales facilities; another excuse to justify the report. TicketMaster/Internet sales are more common than walk up sales to brick and mortar box offices. There were many ticket outlets throughout the region, including record stores, Kaufmann’s Department Stores, et al.

Inadequate compliance with the ADA; contacting SMG Management, I was told that the Civic Arena is in compliance and have seen those with disabilities seated in some of the best views in the arena in the "B" section.

Inadequate acoustics; is a non-issue. Having season tickets for hockey for 10 years in Section E-2, it was more than adequate. I attended the last concert at the Civic (mellon) Arena with James Taylor/Carole King Concert on June 26, 2010 and sat in D-27. A corner section of the arena and the sound was excellent.

Obsolete telecommunications, is absurd and another exaggeration to justify spending $321 million for a new venue.

All the deficiencies listed illustrates that the SEA has not been a good public steward of the public trust. Now the SEA claims the Civic Arena has a “leaky roof” with no substantiation. I am suspect to that claim and/or the degree of a problem. We experienced the worst winter in recent decades and there were no media reports of roof leaks this season.

The SEA received $34 million in RAD sales taxes, intended to “preserve, improve and develop” this regional asset. The SEA also gave away $18 million in naming rights revenue, which also should have been used for upgrades, maintenance and operational costs.
Finally, The SEA knows the cost of demolition, but never acted prudently to obtain a roof repair estimate, as per the SEA’s special counsel, Rosemary Carroll. This illustrates more prejudice in favoring demolition.

Section 1.5 Public Involvement; was very limited. At the time of this report, seven meetings were closed to the media and the public. Only the May 13, 2010 meeting was open for the media and public. This report embellishes the attendance at the May 13, 2010 meeting, reporting 55 people in attendance.

I was present and asked poignant questions about the SEA but was not listed in the head count. I excluded known SEA Consultants (4), SEA Members (3) and the media (5). That would bring their total reporting to 43 from the public. I counted 40 people, consisting of 29 Caucasians, 10 African Americans and one of Asian origin.

The May 13, 2010 meeting was held in the “Hill District” section of the City. This area is known for high crime, drugs and shootings. Caucasians from other parts of the county making up 82.8% of the population would not attend with this meeting with the negative reputation.

The April 2010 census reported that Allegheny County has 1,218,494 citizens and only 40 people attended the meeting. With only one public meeting and disputed attendance, both are grossly inadequate representation and comment for this “regional asset” owned by 1.2 million citizens. The only public meeting took place in just one of 13 County Council Districts.

Section 2.2 Historic Properties Identified within the APE. The report identifies the August 2, 2001 letter from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission addressed to Gary J. English that the Civic (mellon) Arena is eligible the National Registry of Historic Places. No discussions were made on those merits with the “Interested Parties” Committee as evidenced in the minutes of all eight meeting minutes.

Section, 3.0 MELLON ARENA, 3.1 Description of Historic Resource; is inaccurate. The report states the neighborhood was “primarily African-American” and was of modest masonry residences and commercial blocks. In the 2001 application to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, I submitted information that showed the makeup was a melting pot of African-Americans, Jews and Italians.

This SEA reports that 1,600 families, or 8,500 people, were displaced in 1956 as a result of these renewal endeavors. Unsubstantiated but moot. All property owners, both residential and commercial were compensated under imminent domain and no attempt was made to identify these persons for the “Interested Party” Committee, demonstrating a “historic or financial” interest. In a July 2, 1957 report in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the headlines read, “Slums of the Lower Hill disappearing”. So our government chose to improve the city with an urban renewal project that would eliminate urban blight.
Section 3.2 Significance of Historic Resource: The SEA refers to the PHMC August 2, 2001 letter addressed to me on the Civic Arena’s eligibility for a listing of the National Registry of Historic Places. This report does not detail the historic merits in the application nor is any mention in the SEA IP Minutes.

Section 3.9 Development Option 6: Relationship of Proposed Action to Historic, Resource and Assessment of Project Effect; considers the removal of certain inside structures, i.e. super boxes, press boxes, et al that would have “the potential to alter, directly or indirectly, characteristics of the historic resource” that qualify it for the National Registry of Historic Places”. The SEA is narrow-minded and does not consider leaving all components necessary to remain a “historic resource”.

Section 6.0 Refers to the August 2, 2001 letter from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission to Gary J. English, citing availability at the state agency, but not available on the SEA’s website, http://www.pgh-sea.com. There is no mention or discussion of this information in the minutes with SEA IP Committee.

Page 47, is a January 26, 2010 letter from PHMC Director, Jean Cutler directs the SEA to allow for a broad definition for the selection of “IP” candidates that have a “demonstrated interest” in the project and review and comment on the list to ensure all parties known to the PHMC who may be interested in the process are included. Both the PHMC and the SEA failed to identify the applicant for “historic preservation” which has demonstrated an interest in the process. This kept the applicant, Gary J. English from sharing and participating in the process until the “IP” meetings were discovered, missing the first four meetings of this process.

Page 48, continues with concerns about the SEA time table. PHMC Director, Jean Cutler writes, “in our view it would be prudent to be aware that six months is quite an aggressive time frame for a project of this nature and scope”. I agree, this “regional asset” has a replacement value in excess of $321 million, the cost of building Consol Energy Center. The Consol Energy Center lacks the stainless steel retractable dome, pushing the Civic Arena replacement costs to $400-$500 million.

Additionally, we are concerned with the exchange of comments between the SEA and the PHMC. Ms. Cutler states, “we are very pleased to learn that the demolition of the former Civic Auditorium, now known as the Mellon Arena, is not considered inevitable. In order for the process not to be considered a sham by the public...”. The reality is the SEA Board making the final decision are “at will” appointments. This means these appointees must vote the will of their appointers, County Executive Dan Onorato and Mayor Ravenstahl. These two politicians have stated their insistence for demolition and redevelopment, making the SEA Board vote the “very sham” the public knows that it is.
Pages 55 through 90 contains minutes through Meeting #5 and a May 13, 2010 survey. I will point out the survey first then respond to the meeting minutes.

Page 87 is a report that took a survey, key is what this small representation responded to;

**Question #5**, had only three of thirteen categories in double-digit responses, “what you feel are most important?”

Harmony with Surrounding Community – 11  
Mellon Arena as a Historic Resource – 10  
Asset to Community & City – 10

A historic resource and asset to the community and city were on the top of that list, illustrating the historic value and it being a “regional asset”. **The public supports preservation.**

**Question #7**, asks which plan do you prefer, “Mothball, Reuse or Demolition. The majority favored Reuse over demolition 14 to 4. **The public supports preservation.**

Pages 90 through 97 are extrapolated versions of communications, articles, letters, polls. Of emails, letters to the editor and polls, **the overwhelming majority supports preservation.**

**Part II- Pages 55 through 90 contains Meeting Minutes and a survey.**

I will address this issue with the July 13, 2010 presentation that I gave to the SEA IP Committee. Some of my comments are already included in the “Effects Report” above. This presentation was censored and not posted on the SEA Website. Meeting minutes give an inaccurate description with just 19 words.

SEA IP Committee Presentation 7/13/2010

Good evening, the first part of this presentation is based on SEA Meeting Minutes (http://www.pgh-sea.com) and will cover deficiencies in the IP process, then move onto Re-use of the Civic Arena, SEA History and Recommendations.

**Point 1: In Meeting # 1,** Ray Maginness representing the SEA introduced the Interested Parties process “to be as inclusive as possible in ensuring that individuals, organizations, and groups with a demonstrated direct legal, economic or historic preservation interest in the project are represented.
In meeting #2, Comments – B-3 asks; At the time that the Purpose and Needs Survey (meeting #1) was distributed, all Interested Parties were not identified, nor present. As a result, their needs and interests may not be represented.

The response does not address Interested Parties that were NOT identified, it merely states that all IP applications were approved.

The IP process failed to identify the original PHMC applicant for historic preservation and those with an economic interest, African Americans, Italians and Jews, that were displaced during the Civic Arena development. Recruiting the IP Committee through the sole means of posting on the SEA website is insufficient. I believe it also violates the state sunshine law on public meetings. Aside from the law, the SEA needs to advertise the scope of a $321+ million arena’s fate in newspapers, radio and television.

Point 2: Tim Zinn representing the SEA stated that there are no federal funds currently identified for the Lower Hill Redevelopment Project and the cultural resources investigation will be conducted in compliance with Chapter 5 of the State History Code, not Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Only until the June 17th email has the SEA acknowledged Federal Funding with Senator Specter. I have repeatedly pointed out Specter’s funding in addition to Congressman Altmire’s $1 million dollar earmark. The SEA doesn’t listen to IP Members and applying Section 106 from the beginning.

Point 3: Question 6 states an independent consultant should be retained to assess alternatives and thereby avoid “political” influences on the process.

Meeting #2, Question B-7 asks; A truly independent reviewer would come from outside the region and not be paid by SEA. The SEA responded, “we’ll work through the process”.

The SEA did not work through the process and kept politically connected consultants, Michael Baker Engineering and Oxford Development. At IP Meeting #6, I had asked Mr. Zinn if they would recuse themselves from future contracts should redevelopment take place to eliminate political influence. Mr. Zinn’s response, “your comments are noted”. It is a direct question not a comment. This conflict of interest remains.

Point 4: Question 9.

Q: Will the Sports and Exhibition Authority (SEA) Board make the final decision?
A: The interested parties will present a recommended redevelopment option with measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse effects to the arena to the SEA Board for consideration.

The answer was evasive. The SEA Board will make the final decision.

**Question** 10, states the SEA is the owner and will evaluate the feasibility and reasonableness.

**Question** 11. Q: Are you saying that demolition is not a foregone conclusion? The SEA merely serves as steward to the public, not owners as it is the taxpayers that own the Civic Arena.

The answer to questions 10 and 11 is not honest to the IP Committee. SEA Board members can not objectively consider the IP findings since they are “At Will” appointees and must vote their appointer’s wishes, County Executive Dan Onorato and Mayor Luke Ravenstahl who favor demolition and redevelopment. The political appointment of RAD Board member Fred Baker was removed for acting against his appointer’s wishes.

**Meeting #2 Minutes:**

**Point 5:** B-12 - asks, are the Penguins’ existing design plans that have been provided to the Hill District meeting available?

Should the “IP Committee” have input as to who should be picked for redevelopment designs should demolition take place? The Pittsburgh Penguins were given redevelopment rights to keep the Civic Arena from competing with their new venue. That represents a “conflict of interest”.

**Meeting 3 Minutes:**

**Point 6** - The presentation given by President of the Pittsburgh Penguins, David Morehouse was prejudicial. If the Penguins were open to “anything” then an independent report should be made available about the economics of competing venues, Consol Energy Center and the Civic Arena. Pittsburgh can support multiple venues, as per July 6th Tribune-Review report, with 21 theater venues in Pittsburgh.

**Point 7** - 10. C: Did you consider re-using the arena?
R: The Hill neighborhood has clearly said, “tear it down, it has destroyed our neighborhood.”
The comment is prejudicial to the IP Committee and focuses on a limited contingent Hill District residents when it involves all taxpayers of Allegheny County. This refers to point #11.

Meeting 4 Minutes:

III. Purpose & Need Statement (Revised)

Ray Maginness noted the PHMC wanted to consider feasible preservation possibilities for the continued use of the Mellon Arena site given its cultural value as a historic resource eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places:

Point 8 - In reviewing the minutes of all meetings, nothing reflects consideration was given to the Civic Arena’s events, cultural, architectural or engineering value as a historic resource. No, mention was made of the PHMC application for historic preservation and those merits.

Point 9 - Of the five options, #2 & #4 were prejudiced. The Consol Energy Center was built for the main purpose of supplying additional revenue to the Pittsburgh Penguins with more corporate or “superboxes”. The HOK report was designed for building a new arena, not keeping the current venue.

There is no “feasibility” study presented to show what competition would do for generating more revenue to the City. The SEA merely published a cost of operation of a vacant Civic Arena and no revenue streams.

Civic Arena Re-Use

On July 6, 2010, the Tribune-Review reported, “Downtown Pittsburgh not saturated with venues, theater leaders say”. The struggling August Wilson Center is surrounded by at least 21 other performance spaces in and around Downtown -- many just blocks away -- and more are on the way. But local arts leaders and watchers say the abundance of theaters has not glutted the market.

The same can hold true for the Civic Arena and its $9.3 million debt. I advocate using the arena for public ice skating, needed ice time for youth hockey, concerts, circuses and more while providing the uniqueness of open air events. Yes, it would directly compete with the Consol Energy Center for all of these events.

The NHL boasts of the “Winter Classic”, a hockey game played outdoors in a football stadium. Clearly it is not designed for hockey, but the Civic Arena has had this extraordinarily open air opportunity since 1961.
Now that Lemieux has obtained his new arena by threatening to leave Pittsburgh, why should he be guaranteed all arena events? Competition will lower the costs to concert promoters, bringing more events to Pittsburgh. This would benefit the city in generating more parking, amusement and business revenues to city coffers.

The SEA published unsubstantiated figures regarding the “mothball” approach but failed to report the revenue streams available for the Civic Arena.

1. Using current RAD funding
2. Federal Grants
   “$29 million in Earmarks for demolition could be better used for preservation.”
3. DCED/State Grants.
   "If the state/DCED can give Red Tetter, Inc. $59.7 million to promote tourism and produce a pornographic video on Youtube.com, surely they can support a “regional asset” of historic caliber".
4. 20% Federal Tax Credits for historic preservation
5. Create Sports Player Tax, for assisting all sporting and civic facilities.
   "It’s about time sports owners and players pay their fair share".
7. Pouring rights (soda/beer brands)
8. Concession revenues
9. Indoor advertising
10. Ticket revenues/amusement taxes
11. Parking revenues from events
12. Parking revenues from Consol Energy Events
13. Parking revenues from downtown commuters
14. Corporate sponsors
15. Foundation support

The SEA is relying on the HOK report that supported demolition and using the HOK designs for the Consol Energy Center. An independent feasibility study needs to be completed on competing venues and revenue generation, especially since the Tribune-Review report shows that Pittsburgh can sustain multiple venues.

Meeting number 5:

**Point 10** - On April 21, 2010, I addressed the group and cited the Civic Arena replacement cost of $500 million and the RAD law is to “preserve, improve and develop” regional assets, not destroy them. The SEA agreed to investigate, but no discussion was made before the IP Committee about RAD Law or the $34 million spent on this facility.

**Point 11** - The SEA scheduled only one public meeting on May 13, 2010, at the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Pittsburgh’s hill district and is suspect of playing the race card and stir up emotion on the Civic Arena development of 50 years ago. This
meeting only serves County Council District 10, where the Civic Arena is situated. The high crime reputation of the Hill District kept attendance very low.

Only 10 people of color attended. Referring back to point #7 about the Hill District’s wishes, “tear it down, it has destroyed our neighborhood.” The comment is not reflective of the Hill Residents. There was only one comment in favor of demolition and one in favor of preservation.

This meeting only informs 1 of 13 county council districts on an entity that is owned by ALL Allegheny County residents. Meetings should be in all 13 County Council Districts, the facility is owned by all Allegheny County Taxpayers.

**Point 12** - The SEA gave away development rights to the Pittsburgh Penguins before a decision has been made on preservation or redevelopment. The SEA was aware of the IP Process and State History code well in advance as my application was filed and approved by the PHMC in August of 2001.

**Point 13** - The SEA is selling off assets of the Civic (mellon) Arena, with latest being the wood basketball floor. This is being done before the decision of the building has been completed.

**Point 14** - The SEA has removed all identification of the Civic (mellon) Arena on the structure and highway signs before a determination has been made on preservation or redevelopment.

**Point 15** - The SEA made an incorrect assumption that the IP Committee recommends demolition when that clearly isn’t true. This resulted in having the IP Members walk out of the June 9, 2010 meeting #5. See: http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/pittsburgh/s_685325.html

Mary Conturo’s comments in the Saturday, June 5th, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. "Any protracted delay we don't feel would be in the best interests of the community.”

The best interests of the community would hold meetings open to the public and media. The public supports preservation, as per letters to the editor, polls and public reaction at the James Taylor Concert, all supporting preservation.

---

**SEA HISTORY:**

The SEA is supposed to be stewards of the public trust.
The SEA tore down 3 Rivers Stadium with a $45 million debt after receiving $60 million in RAD funds over the last six years. They gave away the naming rights of the two stadiums to the tenants and a sweetheart deal to the Steeler's for land development.

The SEA gave away $18 million in naming rights to the tenant of the Civic Arena. They stuck the taxpayers with cost of highway sign changeover, from Civic to Mellon Arena. The SEA gave away the development rights of the Civic Arena before a determination has been made on preservation or redevelopment. The SEA auctioned off the Civic Arena basketball court before a determination has been made on preservation or redevelopment.

The SEA received $34 million in RAD money and failed to do routine maintenance on the dome. So now it is an issue to support $3.9 million in demolition costs for a "leaky roof". The RAD monies and/or naming rights money should have been used for that basic maintenance.

When asked if the SEA has determined if the cost of roof repair is less than the cost of demolition of the Mellon Arena, SEA Special Counsel, Rosemary Carroll replied, “The SEA has not made this determination.” The SEA failed to do a repair estimate for the dome but know the costs of demolition.

The SEA has tried to ignore the $29 million in federal earmarks.

A Tribune-Review report of July 7th shows the Convention Center is expected to post a $409,000 operating deficit and closes with a comment that the convention center's electricity and other utilities cost less than expected because "with fewer events, less utilities are consumed." A cursory check shows the SEA received a $1.5 million grant from the DCED. The grant went for salaries and utilities.

Mary Conturo was asked to open the dome for the James Taylor Concert, she referred the query to the Pittsburgh Penguins. When contacted, the Penguin office said their lease was only for hockey events, therefore they would not be able to make that decision.

For an Executive Director of the SEA making $126,290 in salary, Ms. Conturo does not know much about who's in charge or what the leases stipulate. The SEA has a very poor track record and is not fulfilling their fiduciary responsibility to the taxpayers.

**Recommendations:**

We could recommend the IP Process to start over and better publicize for IP Members.

We could recommend the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act be applied from the beginning.
We could recommend for Baker Engineering, Oxford Development, Chester Development, et al contracts be terminated to remove the political influence and conflicts of interest.

We could recommend for the Arena Development rights be rescinded.

We could recommend the monies for the Arena basketball floor be returned to the Arena’s general operating fund.

We could recommend public meetings be held in all 13 County Council Districts.

But since the SEA Board has the final decision, it will be based on politics and not historical merit. Therefore, I recommend that the SEA Board relinquish this decision and remove the dirty politics and place the decision in the hands of the Civic Arena’s owners, the Allegheny County voters via a ballot initiative on November 2nd.

Finally, I recommend that Ms. Conturo tender her immediate resignation as it is clear she it not serving the will of the people and has failed the fiduciary responsibilities to the taxpayers.

In conclusion, the communications section of the “EFFECTS REPORT” supports preservation. The IP Committee recruitment was not advertised, all but one meeting was closed to the media and public, SEA Consultants had conflicts of interest and would not recuse themselves from future contracts, SEA Consultants steering the IP Committee did not listen to IP Members, Presentations were not discussed and censored from the SEA Website, SEA “Effects Report” contained inaccuracies that I point out, SEA “Effects Report” did not address inaccuracies pointed out by 4Ward Planning on July 13, 2010, development rights and Civic Arena assets were given away before a decision was made on preservation or redevelopment and SEA Board members making the decision on preservation or redevelopment are “at will” appointments. This means the Board Members must vote for demolition and redevelopment, fulfilling the wishes of their appointers, Onorato & Ravenstahl.

To have government that represents the will of the people, I can only hope that more public meetings take place in ALL 13 County Council Districts and remove the dirty politics by placing the decision on preservation or demolition on the November 2, 2010 ballot.

Gary J. English
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August 5, 2010

Ms. Mary Conturo
Sports & Exhibition Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County
425 Sixth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Re: Response to Memorandum and Comments on the Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment Draft Reports

Dear Ms. Conturo:

We have reviewed the Sports & Exhibition Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County’s (“SEA”) response to our letter dated July 15, 2010 that was provided through a Memorandum from Ms. Chris Cieslak to Ms. Jean Cutler and the Interested Parties dated July 30, 2010 (the “Memorandum”). We would like to provide some clarification to that Memorandum and provide the SEA with some comments on the Draft Reports (as hereinafter defined) that were distributed to the Interested Parties regarding Mellon Arena (the “arena”).

I. Federal, State, and Local Agencies May Be Required to Comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

In the Memorandum, Ms. Cieslak properly states that the National Historic Preservation Act (“NHPA”) is a federal law. The NHPA, while it is a federal law, places a duty on both federal agencies and state and local officials who have assumed or have been delegated responsibility to comply with the law.

The Section 106 regulations state and define that an “agency official may be a State, local or tribal government official who has been delegated legal responsibility for compliance with section 106 in accordance with Federal law.” 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(a). For example, the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh, the City of Pittsburgh, and the Redevelopment Authority of Allegheny County, to name a few, regularly conduct Section 106 reviews of projects receiving federal assistance.

Therefore, if the SEA is to receive federal funds for the Lower Hill Redevelopment Project (the “Redevelopment Project”), as it anticipates, then it would be responsible for complying with Section 106 of the NHPA and other relevant federal laws prior to any undertaking.
II. The Potential for Federal Funding for the Redevelopment Project Does Impact the Applicability of Section 106 and Section 110(k).

Section 106 is being discussed not only because the SEA is mirroring parts of the Section 106 review process in conducting the Pennsylvania History Code (the "History Code") review, but, more importantly, because federal funding is anticipated for use in the "preferred development option" being advanced by the SEA. The "preferred development option" is Option 5 – Arena Demolition and Site Development. This option includes not only the demolition of the arena, but the "construction of a mixed-use development on the entire 28-acre site," including a new street grid system.

The SEA, its consultants and government officials have stated several times throughout the Interested Parties process and in the Draft Reports (as hereinafter defined) that federal funding is or will be sought for the Redevelopment Project. One expected source of funding is from the Federal Highway Administration to construct the new street grid. As part of the Redevelopment Project, it is necessary for the arena to be demolished to make room for the new mixed-use development and new street grid. The SEA may not "segment" the demolition of the arena from the rest of the Redevelopment Project.

To ensure that federal funds will be available for the Redevelopment Project, the SEA must conduct a proper Section 106 review prior to demolishing the arena. By demolishing the arena without the proper Section 106 review, the SEA is foreclosing on the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation's ("ACHP") opportunity to participate in and comment on the Section 106 review. This triggers the anticipatory demolition provisions of Section 110(k).

Section 110(k) prohibits "anticipatory demolitions" by placing a penalty on applicants of federal funds that intentionally destroy or harm historic properties prior to the completion of the Section 106 review process. The applicant under Section 110(k) would be the local or state agency that is seeking federal funds for a project.

Section 110(k):

prohibits a Federal agency from granting a loan, loan guarantee, permit, license, or other assistance to an applicant who, with intent to avoid the requirements of section 106, has intentionally significantly adversely affected a historic property to which the grant would relate, or having legal power to prevent it, has allowed such significant adverse effect to occur, unless the agency, after consultation with the Council [ACHP], determines that circumstances justify granting such assistance despite the adverse effect created or permitted by the applicant.

36 C.F.R. § 800.9(c)(1).
The SEA may proceed with the demolition of the arena, but its doing so without completing the Section 106 review will jeopardize the future availability of federal funds for the rest of the Redevelopment Project and make the federal funds vulnerable to legal challenge.

III. Comments on the Draft Reports.

We offer some general comments on the draft Determination of Effect Report dated June 2010 (the “Effects Report”) and the Development Options Comparison Report – Draft dated July 2010 both for the Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment (collectively, the “Draft Reports”) in regard to their compliance with the History Code.

A. It Should Be Clearly Stated That the Draft Reports Are In Compliance with the History Code, Not Section 106 of the NHPA.

As we stated in our previous letter, the Draft Reports need to clearly state that they are being completed to comply with the History Code and not with Section 106. Section 106 is referenced several times throughout the Draft Reports and at times the Draft Reports state that Section 106 is being followed. This either needs to be deleted or further clarified that only portions of Section 106 are being used as guidance to complete the History Code review process.

For example, the Effects Report states that “[i]ts format and contents also comply with Section 106 of the National History Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; [and] the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969....” Effects Report at 1. As discussed in our previous letter, there are several other things the SEA must do to comply with Section 106. We add that in relation to the assessment of adverse effects, Section 106 requires analysis that includes “reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.” 36 C.F.R. § 800.5(a)(1). This is also the first time that the National Environmental Policy Act has been mentioned in the Interested Parties process. The Interested Parties are being asked to review the Draft Reports for compliance with the History Code, not the other federal laws.

We concur with Ms. Jean Cutler in her letter to the SEA dated June 16, 2010 that states “the process to date [the History Code review] should not be construed as a substitute for an actual Section 106 consultation.”

B. The Draft Reports Comply with the History Code.

Subject to some minor revisions, the Draft Reports evidence that the SEA has complied with the History Code. We commend the SEA for providing additional information and meetings over and above what is required by the History Code.
Conclusion

We understand the SEA will incur holding costs associated with the arena and that it has other legal obligations that it needs to fulfill in a timely manner. It is in the best interests, however, of the SEA, the Hill District community and the potential developers of the Redevelopment Project, to delay the arena demolition until funds are secured for the Redevelopment Project and the proper Section 106 review process has been conducted. This will ensure that federal funds are available for the Redevelopment Project and that it is not further delayed by litigation. The SEA, its consultants and others can conduct non-destructive planning activities in the meantime while identifying funding for the Redevelopment Project.

Landmarks also requests to be a “consulting party” when the formal Section 106 review is initiated pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(c)(5) and 800.3(f)(3).

Sincerely,

Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr.
President

Sincerely,

Anne E. Nelson, Esq.
General Counsel

cc:  Bill Callahan  
     Chris Cieslak  
     Jean Cutler  
     Barbara Franco  
     David Morehouse  
     Maryann Naber  
     Timothy Zinn  
     Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr.  
     Yarone Zober
Towards a Civic Renewal:

REUSE THE IGLOO RESPONSE MEMORANDUM
Comments on the Sports & Exhibition Authority’s “Development Options Comparison Report”

August 6, 2010
Ms. Mary Conturo  
Executive Director  
Sports & Exhibition Authority  
The Regional Enterprise Tower  
425 Sixth Avenue Suite 2750  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
6 August 2010

Subject: REUSE THE IGLOO RESPONSE MEMORANDUM  
Comments on the Sports & Exhibition Authority’s  
“Development Options Comparison Report” Second Draft July 2010

Dear Ms. Conturo,

Attached are formal comments from members of Reuse the Igloo. We represent over 5,000 members, including a significant and growing number of residents from the Hill District. Our members represent the next generation of taxpayers who know that reuse of the Civic Arena is an act that sustains our region’s culture, environment and economy.

We also know, based on the sustained outpouring of support we have received over the last year, that our membership represents but a fraction of all those who support reuse of the Civic Arena. It is on behalf of these many thousands of voters, taxpayers and committed citizens that we formally submit our comments on the SEA’s “Development Options Comparison Report” (Options Report).

In light of the hundreds of letters and emails sent to the media and our elected officials, and by the long-time residents who attended the sole SEA public meeting in the Hill, we, the citizens for a sustainable reuse of the Civic Arena, formally request that the SEA Board table a vote on the future of the Arena for one year so that an independent and objective process can be undertaken to reuse this national landmark.

As a preface to our comments on the Second Draft of the Options Report, we must state that we are submitting the enclosed critique under protest. We strongly object to the methodology employed by the Sports and Exhibition Authority (SEA) and its consultants, which forms the basis for the entire Options Report.

In a fundamental, disingenuous and pervasive error, the SEA has conflated the Interested Parties (IP) process and the options analysis. In so doing, the SEA is derelict in its duties, first, by placing the burden on the Interested Parties to propose, develop, evaluate and defend alternatives, and second, by attempting to force the Interested Parties to develop a preferred recommendation. The burden for both clearly rests with the SEA and its consultants.

Having inappropriately conflated these two distinct processes, the SEA further erred by employing methodologies that have been called into serious question by two of the leading historic preservation authorities in the state—Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation (PHLF) and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC).
The concerns raised repeatedly by these two organizations (see detailed comments below in “Comments On ‘III. Purpose And Need’”) are not casual questions raised by some inexperienced commentators. Instead, these are highly experienced professionals presenting detailed criticisms of the foundation for the entire SEA Development Options Report.

While we are hesitant to deliver further comments out of concern that doing so could be misconstrued as our lending credence to the SEA’s faulty methodology, we will continue to participate in the “process,” such as it has been. We hope that when the board sees the failings of the current process and more importantly the opportunities to develop a truly collaborative community engagement process that it will vote to table demolition for one year.

**PROPOSAL FOR A ONE-YEAR PLANNING/RFP PROCESS**

As we outlined at the last IP Meeting and at the July SEA Board meeting, we propose the following steps to ensure a thorough, balanced, and complete analysis of options:

1. **Table the vote to demolish.** There is no need to expedite a decision to demolish. We propose an authentic, complete one-year process allowing a thorough and balanced technical, design and economic review of the Arena (see conceptual schedule attached). Baker Engineers implicitly agreed with us by stating that there were not enough resources or time at the outset of this process. Baker stated at that time, “We are only able to do broad brush studies.” We disagree.

2. **Commission a new economic analysis.** The Penguins’ AECOM analysis is at best out of date (February, 2009) and does not provide an independent look at the question of Arena reuse. The SEA should commission a current assessment of the market, and thus provide a second opinion to the Penguins’ (AECOM and Oxford) work. The SEA Board has a fiduciary and ethical responsibility to commission a new independent analysis of market conditions, beyond the Penguins’ interests and biases.

3. **Commit to unifying the disparate planning processes.** The SEA is an agency with a specific mission and experience in the construction and operation of sports and exhibition facilities. It does not have adequate staff and experience for complex planning and historic preservation projects. Therefore, we recommend that the SEA unify its planning processes for the Lower Hill with those of the Hill District Community, City of Pittsburgh and URA. The City Planning Department and the URA should lead these processes in accordance with their missions and legal obligations to facilitate planning and development. One only needs to look to the Northside and Southside to see the URA and DCP working with planning and preservation advocates with a real voice in the future of their communities. Since the URA will likely be the conduit for most federal infrastructure funds in the coming decade, a transparent, detailed explanation of all current, proposed and potential funding streams should be included in the final report.

4. **Commit to a development RFP for the Civic Arena, similar to that conducted for the Garden Theatre Block, or the Southside Works.** We recommend that this RFP be a collaboration of the Hill Development Corporation, URA and the Penguins. This would
To allow a full validation of the economic benefits and provide the kind of innovative solutions that are win-win for the Hill, Pens, City and region. Consider engaging PPND, CDCP and others to develop a neutral structure similar to Portland Oregon’s one year process (see our proposal and example attached).

5. **Completion of Meaningful Public Consultation**

As you know, the original design of the public participation process assumed a minimum of two public meetings. Planning professionals on our team have extensive experience in this regard. They have noted (and it can be verified by reviewing this with independent sources) that effective public participation requires not only more meetings, but more collaborative problem solving. Just throwing people in a room who have differing views is guaranteed to fail. We recommend that a workshop on economics be held to reconcile the differences of opinion and educate stakeholders. Then a public meeting with a final presentation and facilitated discussion by a third party facilitator should be held to review the final draft. This will allow all views to be properly informed and oriented to the options in the report.

In its haste to conclude the Interested Parties Process, the SEA has not even met the minimum standards for public involvement for a project based on Section 106 Review: “At a minimum, the Agency Official [SEA Director] has to provide an opportunity for the public to examine the results of the agency’s [SEA’s] effort to identify historic properties, evaluate their significance and assess the undertaking’s effects upon them. When adverse effects are found, the Agency Official must also make information available to the public about the undertaking, its effects on historic properties and alternatives to resolve the adverse effects, and must provide the public an opportunity to express their views on resolving adverse effects” (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Section 106 Section-by-Section Questions and Answers).

6. **Additional Analysis and Consultation**

Throughout our report response we have identified the need for additional analysis and confirmation of a wide range of issues. To assure trust and consensus, consultants should be collaboratively chosen by a steering committee representing all parties. Because of the political nature of the debate, an outside consultant with national credentials is most always preferable. Much of the information outlined below will be needed before the project is brought to the Planning Commission no matter the outcome on the arena.

**Urban Design**

Purpose: To validate and comment upon different approaches taken in the Options Report (and suggested in this response). Alternatively, this could be a “jury” of three or four experts from AIA, ULI and APA.

**Development, Market Analysis and Real Estate Economics**

There are really three areas of expertise: Innovative financing models and sources, market analysis and development economics for specific configurations (proformas). A team from ULI could evaluate these.

**Technical Review of the Arena and Site Engineering**

This would include additional electrical and mechanical reviews of the operational components of the dome. Structural work has been done for the removal of the
seating bowl and its impact on the dome structure, but not on the concourse structure during demolition and the types of slab rehabilitation (topping slabs and waterproofing) to makes sure that the building is weatherized properly during periods when the dome is left open to the weather.

**Transportation Planning**

An updated transportation parking study that is assessed independently from the Penguins’ consultants and includes a thorough review of street grid scenarios.

**Development Sequencing**

A scheduling and phasing schematic for each alternative could be accurately developed to demonstrate that site phasing during construction maximizes revenues from existing parking lots as parts of the site are redeveloped. This would put to rest the assertion that the Arena is an obstacle to development in the near term, whatever that will realistically be. (see figure #7)

It is important that the SEA recognize that the members of Reuse the Igloo are citizens of the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, and have donated thousands of hours to struggle with the involved regulatory process and complex agendas of the SEA and Penguins. We are passionate, knowledgeable citizens and expect the highest standards of public service from the SEA and its consultants.

Sincerely,

Robert Pfaffmann, AIA, AICP
for the Steering Committee and all of the supporters of Reuse the Igloo!

Aubrey Bruce
Audrey Reichblum
Charlie Humphrey
Connie Cantor
David Bear
David Conrad
David Roth, AIA
Dr. Earl Childs, DMD
Jason Harris
Jeff Slack, AICP
John Axtell, Esq
Ken Lee, AIA
Michelle Fetting
Scott Leib
Stephen George, FAIA
Syl Damianos, FAIA
cc:  Renee Sigel, FHWA Pennsylvania Division Administrator
     Don Klima, Director, Project Review, ACHP
     Jean Cutler, Director, Bureau for Historic Preservation, PHMC
     Barbara Franco, Executive Director, PA Historical & Museum Commission
     Victor Roque, President, Chief Executive Officer, Hill House
     Kim Ellis, Historic Hill Institute
     Arthur Ziegler, President, Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation
     Mindy Crawford, Executive Director, Preservation Pennsylvania
     Noor Ismail, City of Pittsburgh, Director of City Planning
     Katie Molnar, City of Pittsburgh, Preservation Planner
     Mayor Luke Ravenstahl
     City Councilman Dan Lavelle
     Rob Stephany, Executive Director, Urban Redevelopment Authority
     County Executive Dan Onorato
     County Councilman Bill Robinson
     Governor Edward Rendell
     State Senator Wayne Fontana
     State Senator Jim Ferlo
     State Representative Jake Wheatley
     US Senator Arlen Specter
     US Senator Robert Casey
     Congressman Mike Doyle
COMMENTS ON “EXECUTIVE SUMMARY”

The Executive Summary contains a number of incorrect assertions, assumptions and terms that clearly indicate bias in favor of demolition. The Executive Director and Chair of the SEA Board have repeatedly been on the record stating their neutrality while the consultants consistently exhibit bias towards demolition. This has made the effectiveness of the public process very low. The following sentences should be removed and rewritten to express support for an objective process that seeks to find feasible preservation possibilities.

"Preliminary plans call for the removal of the arena. . . ."  
This is potentially anticipatory demolition and threatens access to millions of dollars in future federal funds. Why should the SEA Board, taxpayers and residents take such a risk, caused by the rush to demolish?

"Operational costs would be minimized, but baseline maintenance costs would still be required to keep the building from becoming derelict which are estimated at $1,878,000 annually..."  
Baseline costs are highly inflated for operation/mothball options (see analysis below in our appendices). No matter what the final number is, we have demonstrated that there are interim events that could fund carrying costs from year to year until a final development plan is in place.

"Entertainment uses are also envisioned along Centre Avenue"  
Our market analysis indicates pretty clearly that the proposed conventional suburban multiplex is not a viable option and would threaten efforts to create unique venues as well as facilities such as the new cinemas at Southside works.

"The IP process was supported by a team of experienced economists, planners, architects, historians, public involvement specialists... Support was provided in the development and evaluation of alternatives..."  
In reviewing the credentials and performance of the IP support team there was a clear lack of urban design and planning capacity, which prevented a real dialogue and problem solving process. The facilitation techniques used were poorly conceived and minimal at best (as repeatedly commented upon by PHMC and PHLF). The result was confrontational debates and insufficient professional conflict resolution skills. This is not to slight the consultants—they just don’t have the track record and were also asked and/or pressured to take the approach they did. It is unfortunate to be in the position to criticize the credentials publicly, but a transparent and honest assessment is necessary to save a building for future generations.

"As a result of the process"  
Option 5 was identified as the preferred alternative. We understand that this statement may be modified to reflect that this is the opinion of the consultants, rather than of the Interested Parties and the IP process. A more transparent review of how the recommendation is derived is a matter of transparency under the Commonwealth’s Right to Know Law. Backroom discussions and strategy sessions are clearly happening. During a discovery process this would become obvious.
"Removal of the Arena allows for the establishment of a street grid system that is reminiscent of the grid that pre-dated the Arena. . . ."
This is pure rhetoric and not fact. The stakeholders need to have second opinion about applicability and effectiveness of street grids and their performance, as we have indicated in detail later in this commentary. If preservationists are accused of being nostalgic, then the urban designers who have advocated for historic grid patterns are also waxing nostalgic. The truth is that preservation and urbanism are compatible and complementary. There is more than one way to create a useful and effective street grid—and not all street grids are automatically effective on a complex sloped site.

"Conventional urban blocks enhance the opportunity for the orderly grouping and segmentation of specific uses into an efficient and memorable land use pattern"
Since when are conventional urban blocks automatically the right answer? An urban block pattern that responds to landforms and landmarks is a far more memorable planning and urban design strategy.

"Allow for the location of parking garages and surface parking lots throughout the development"
Surface lots are prohibited in the downtown GTE district and discouraged almost everywhere in the City. This contradicts the assertion that all parking in the Option 5 (Penguins’ plan) would be in concealed structured parking.

"Linear pedestrian corridors that are more likely to be compliant with the American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA)"
As we have detailed elsewhere in this report, the ability of the site to be made more accessible by regrading is patently false and all references to ADA should be removed as speculative or outright false. Robert Lynch, FAIA, a national expert is available to testify on this matter and will submit testimony in writing to back this up. He has further commented to us that Option 3 (Reuse the Igloo) is “far more pedestrian friendly and accessible in the spirit of universal design.”

"A redundant spectator facility that would be in competition with the Consol Energy Center"
This sentence should refer to Option 6 and should be deleted. We remind the SEA that the issue of competition with Penguins new CONSOL arena is a red herring if they are seen as complementary facilities and programmed as such. We understand from Jay Roberts that the smallest events for the new Consol are planned for audiences of 4,000 and above. We have respected that number in our design concepts for the removal of most but not all of the seating bowl. Since the Penguins own the development rights, any benefits would also accrue to them, so statements about competition are irrelevant.

"Removal of the Arena allows for the establishment of conventional urban blocks that enhance the marketability of the site"
This opinion has not been supported with evidence and, in fact, may be the opposite if the Arena can act as a destination almost immediately in concert with the new arena and new development in the Middle Hill. This comment should be revised to reflect the need for more careful study.
"Unencumbered development site with flexibility in grading. . . ."
This is an old urban renewal tactic of site clearance has been proven to not be successful in dense urban areas, except to build roads. It is common for conventional development thinking to arrive at this conclusion, as Oxford did in the early 1990s with the Forbes and Fourth Avenues historic district, and more recently when Urban Properties advised former Mayor Murphy to demolish a six-block area of Downtown. Have we not learned? Recently, a developer from another city toured Pittsburgh and commented to a public gathering and said, "I have never had to tear down a historic building and I never design my projects based on parking counts." This is the kind of developer this project needs.

"The consideration of the reuse concept applied in regard to stadiums in other cities and to reuse concepts outlined above result in the finding that reuse is not financially prudent. No reuse concept is powerful enough as a centerpiece for development to outweigh the advantages provided by Option 5 for furtherance of a mixed use development plan."
These two sentences reveal the misguided view and bias towards demolition by the consultants who wrote this. They do not have evidence to back up these assertions and if we can agree on a new process that is truly inclusive, transparent and innovative, the Arena will be shown to be a true asset and anchor for sustainable development. It can revitalize and transform a controversial landmark into a national model every bit as innovative and attention getting as New York’s High Line linear park and Chicago’s Millennium Park. In these difficult economic times, businesses are often advised to plan for the upturn and innovate!
COMMENTS ON “I. INTRODUCTION” AND “II. COORDINATION PLAN”

1. After reading the inaccurate accounts of the History of the Lower Hill Redevelopment Plan, we suggest that historian Larry Glasco of the University of Pittsburgh critique the historical overview for accuracy. See PG Next Page: http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/10185/1070250-109.stm We feel that although the leadership at the time made a great error at the time, that is not a reason to demolish.

2. Another reference to the SEA’s intent to demolish can be found in the fourth paragraph of the Introduction. For ready reference by all participants, the SEA/Penguins Memorandum of Understanding should be included in the appendices.

3. The Interested Parties process for the Lower Hill Redevelopment Project that has been conducted by the SEA and its consultants has so far failed to meet the criteria set forth in Federal statutes and regulations for Section 106 review under the NHPA. Criteria that this process fail to meet include:

- Under Section 106 and associated regulations, each Federal agency participating in an undertaking is required to ensure compliance with the provisions of NHPA. This is a forward-looking responsibility that must address new facts and evidence as they are discovered or asserted during the review process.

- While the completion of portions of a Section 106 review can be delegated to a non-Federal party, the responsibility to ensure that the process meets all applicable standards and guidelines rests with the Federal agency. In the absence of Federal agency oversight from the beginning to the end of the process, this responsibility cannot reasonably be met.

- The Section 106 process is predicated upon the execution of Memorandum of Agreement at the completion of the consultation process, signed, at a minimum, by the Federal agency and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). If the Federal Agency and SHPO cannot agree to the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement, then the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation must be invited to participate in the consultation process. None of conditions can be complied with in the absence of a Federal agency participating in the process.

- Section 110(l) of NHPA provides that in cases where the Federal agency does not enter into a Memorandum of Agreement regarding an undertaking that adversely affects a National Register-eligible property, the head of the agency shall document any decision made pursuant to Section 106. This responsibility may not be delegated. Neither such a Memorandum of Agreement nor such a documentation of decisions in the absence of such a memorandum can be executed in the absence of a Federal agency.

4. Define how “informed consensus” was sought within the Interested Parties Process. Stating this does not make it so. Explain how (in detail and by whom) the “preferred” option was developed. The recent memo from Baker indicates a change in the
characterization of the preferred option. This significant correction to their faulty methodology should be integrated throughout the final report, not tacked to the back.

5. Attendance records of Interested Parties is important and should be included in the Appendices. To date these have only been provided on the SEA website for Meetings 1-6. Inclusion in the Option Report of only the list of Interested Parties inaccurately suggests regular attendance. Transparency and full accounting will provide a better picture of who participated and more likely complied with the principle of full involvement.

6. The public involvement plan was a failure; only one meeting as conducted as a largely unfacilitated open house. There were no hands-on workshops or charrettes where real ideas could be developed and consensus built; nor were there facilitators or recorders during break out sessions. Many were confused and found the ranking processes to be rigid and not an effective way of expressing new ideas and common ground. Economic and urban design experts should have been there as independent resources.

7. Given the outdated nature of the AECOM (Penguins) economic study (i.e. much data is pre-2008 recession crash) and the flaws identified by 4Ward Planning, less emphasis should be placed on big bang development and infrastructure since all indications are that $30 million in federal funds is years away. More emphasis should be placed on innovative incremental development, building off what exists. The Arena and parking lots could be part of an innovative planning process that uses pop-up urbanism as its foundation. This is a serious program developed at Harvard GSD and applied in many cities. http://popupcity.net/about/

8. A comparative matrix or chart should be used to graphically sharpen and correct misperceptions about the capacity of the site with and without the arena. And, of course, the SEA will have Oxford use the SAME numbers for housing in both options 3 and 5. An “Option 3A” should be added, which explicitly removes the hotel as an immediate option to be considered later. This way, at least, there will be greater honesty about the phasing/incremental evolution of development.

9. Opening and closing of dome questions must be resolved: There is considerable misinformation about the condition of the Arena’s central character-defining feature—its retractable dome. As we have suggested in our commentary elsewhere, this is a great opportunity to put to rest the technical and cost questions as well as to document for HABS/HAER purposes in case the SEA were so misguided as to tear the building down for a parking lot and lesser uses.
COMMENTS ON “III. PURPOSE AND NEED”

As introduced previously, the SEA has conflated the Interested Parties (IP) process and the options analysis and further erred by employing methodologies that have been called into serious question by PHLF and PHMC. The criticism issued by those two organizations is summarized here:

In a January 25, 2010 letter to the SEA, Jean Cutler, PHMC’s Director of the Bureau for Historic Preservation expressed the following concerns:

• "Six months is quite an aggressive time frame for a project of this nature and scope."
• The purpose and need exercise "treats a large variety of commendable themes as competing interests," and will "create factions amongst interested parties."
• "Our suggestion is to simply scrap this well-meaning but potentially destructive 'ranking mechanism . . . .'

In a subsequent letter from Jean Cutler to the SEA dated June 15, 2010, PHMC continued to express similar concerns with the SEA’s methodology nearly five months into the process:

• "As we have stated several times, both in writing and verbally, the SEA has undertaken an extremely aggressive schedule to attempt to compete a cultural resources review for the Arena. In so doing, the SEA has overlapped a number of elements the Section 106 [historic review] process would require."
• "Additionally, as we have mentioned both in writing and verbally, the ‘purpose and need’ exercise and its accompanying arbitrary evaluation system as it was developed and has been instituted in this process is not something we would recommend as an appropriate method of evaluating alternatives."

On June 28, 2010, SEA consultant Baker Engineering attempted to justify the chosen methodology in a letter to PHMC. However, a spoken response from Bill Callahan of PHMC presented at the July 13 SEA Interested Parties meeting made it clear that PHMC’s opinion had not changed and that the historic review process could not be recommended.

Two days later, on July 15, 2010, Arthur Ziegler, President of PHLF, agreed:

• "We concur with PHMC’s comments in their letter dated June 16 [sic.], 2010, and as were reiterated by Mr. Bill Callahan at the July 13th Interested Parties meeting."
• "As we expressed to you verbally, the ‘purpose and needs’ exercise and statement added confusion to the review process. If mirroring Section 106, then the purpose is clearly defined in 36 CFR §800.1(b)—‘to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects and seek ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties.’"
• "Please note that the SEA is the entity responsible for the process and the evaluation of alternatives, not the Interested Parties."
While the SEA is attempting to mirror the State History Code review process with the procedures set forth in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), this does not put the SEA in compliance with Section 106 as the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) and Landmarks have advised numerous times.

Without wanting to lend further credence to this faulty process, some additional comment is necessary. Facilitation of the 'Needs' portion of the exercise contains significant redundancies that we tried to correct, but due to the format of the meetings and the push to close discussion on the list we were not able to come to agreement on the final list.

Why is this important? Because the criteria developed became part of a larger matrix used in a workshop in subsequent IP meetings. From these matrices Baker drew its conclusions about "compatibility" and "economics." For example, the Criteria of Affordability and Economic Development are really largely redundant criteria describing the same general subject areas.

The criteria are "loaded" with multiple issues about overlapping topics. Urban design performance includes concepts of harmony with existing assets. Affordability and Financial Prudence are also generally one and the same. The report then uses these "criteria" to repeatedly make claims against reusing the arena. There are many examples of this bias throughout the evaluation, which we will note in the commentary on Section VII Comparisons.
COMMENTS ON “VI. DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION”

Development and Ownership Structure:
A factor in any assessment of the economics that has not been addressed by the SEA or its consultants is innovative ways to structure ownership/partnerships that maximizes benefit for the Penguins (since they have the development rights) and the Hill (a community-based structure similar to what has been developed by CDCs on the Northside and Southside).

Within the ownership structure as a partnership between the community, developers and the Penguins, access to funding streams and benefits to small businesses from the Hill could be part of an expanded community benefit, not included in the current CBA agreement.

Since the Penguins have in their MOU a complex arrangement of development rights and $15 million in “credits” from the SEA, we would also further explore creative ways to prorate portions of this fund. In exchange the Penguins could access New Market tax credits to offset the loss of parking income by not demolishing the Arena.

Holding (Carrying) Costs (Years 1-3)
The SEA’s consultants have made no real effort to identify ways to offset the holding costs for the Arena before it could be put back into service for a new use. Working with our economic planner and the Oxford template, data obtained from SMG, and independent property management experts, we have determined that the Arena’s annual holding cost may be around $410,000 per year; substantially less than the $1,200,000 estimated by Oxford. Oxford’s contract of $300,000 for three months only demonstrates the SEA has not competitively bid its services.

With just one major fundraising event designed to bring together a diverse range of stakeholders, advocates from a wide range of interests and socioeconomic backgrounds, we estimate we could easily raise up to a half million dollars for each year that the Arena is “offline.” With proper planning and community input, we have no doubt that costs during the interim period of planning and construction could be more than covered.

Operating Costs (Post Reconstruction Beginning Year 2)
The SEA’s consultants have not estimated the annual operating costs for the proposed reuse developed for Option #3 or its variants. Likewise, they have not placed the same detailed attention on the needed future subsidies and operating costs for the proposed public open spaces in Option #5.

In addition to the development of carrying costs as the project is brought on line, we have developed a detailed cost model for typical yearly operating costs. We have utilized historic data and additional research to develop an annual operating cost of approximately $800,000 per year. This number is lower for a number of reasons, but a key reason is utility costs. It is important to note that the Arena will have undergone a major rehabilitation using sustainable design technologies, and reduced energy consumption...
by not heating and cooling the dome space will combine to achieve extremely low energy consumption. The SEA has not provided detailed system-by-system costs during unoccupied periods vs. event periods; and it appears no energy audits have been conducted.

We have demonstrated that carrying and operating costs can be covered. The problem is not an economic one; rather it is a lack of commitment and good faith effort about the economics of reuse by the SEA and its consultants. While the consultants have a proven track record in the development of suburban style development, highways and urban renewal style “clean slate” development, they have little experience with innovative green design and historic preservation in urban settings.

Recommendation: Revise the Options Report to include an objectively developed analysis of holding and operating costs placed in context with the broader economic context of the deal between the Penguins and the SEA, since there is little agreement between both sides, and we have demonstrated at a minimum a way to provide a community asset that improves the value of future development in the Lower Hill.

**Capital Project Costs**

It is well documented that Oxford Development and Baker Engineering made no effort to develop economic models for reuse, but rather relied on our early square foot estimates that we developed a number of years ago. In response, we have committed additional probono time to look more closely at the likely costs for a rehabilitation outlined in Option #5.

The estimate is based on a basic conversion that is highly conservative in tested rental capacity. It also conservative because a number of elements of the renovation can be accomplished in phases or incrementally.

Incremental development is an important and conservative principle of sustainable urban development. The lessons learned from the Fifth and Forbes proposals of the last decade are very relevant. None of the economic models used for the adaptive reuse of GC Murphy complex would have been recommended by Oxford had they been advising the city. We would, in fact, be facing a sea of parking lots today had we taken the disproven “clean slate” approach.

In summary, we have developed a capital project cost that could run between $10 million and $14 million. With innovative and conventional funding sources used in other projects of this scale (repurposing of demolition costs, savings achieved in infrastructure redesign, New Market tax credit, etc.) the capital costs can be achieved.

The largest single cost for demolition of the seating bowls (new and original) is budgeted at $2 million. This cost and the Level 2 (main concourse) topping slab modifications and extensive green roof would result in a cost well under $5 million. This is very close to the cost estimated by SEA for the arena demolition and regrading for a parking lot! Documents on the SEA website indicate that the sources of funding will come from “savings” in the construction of the soon to open Consol Arena.
As the proforma indicates, the Arena has the additional capacity to accommodate development such as a "boutique" hotel such as a "Standard" or "W" brand. We believe additional development will be driven by the demonstration of the reuse as an innovative magnet for additional private investment, further providing for long term economic sustainability.

**Future Hospitality Option:**
The concept of a hotel (or a sports themed "condo hotel") is not included in our initial proforma. We should point out that the Baker report indicates that a "single loaded" corridor plan for the hotel is more expensive. The higher construction costs for a boutique hotel of this type would be negligible. We have consulted with boutique hotel developers and designers to confirm this. Oxford's assertion on this matter is based on conventional hospitality development not the unique boutique approach that could result in higher demand and income. The choice between plain suburban style hotel product and a unique one-of-a-kind experience would complement the existing hotel products in the long term.

There are a number of other sources of funding that can be restructured to meet the capital development costs of reuse. It is important to emphasize that a much more detailed feasibility study is needed to confirm these figures. Since the SEA made no effort to develop a feasibility design and associated proforma, we believe that SEA Board should take the time to develop second opinions through the use of a technical design charette (workshop with all disciplines participating).

**OPTION: Historic Preservation Tax Credits** (and Secretary of the Interior’s Standards): While not needed to make the project successful, we believe that with careful design and analysis, it may be possible to gain 20% historic tax credits. The key to this will be working with SHPO and Federal agencies to confirm "character defining features" of the structure. The removed features, would focus primarily on interior elements such as the original seating bowl and the perimeter storefront. We believe that even if the proposed reuse approach is determined not be eligible to the strict definition of the tax credits, other preservation grants and loans would be likely available. Conservatively, we have not included these until more design and research can be conducted.
COMMENTS ON “VII. DEVELOPMENT OPTION EVALUATION AND COMPARISON”

Introductions to commentary:

1. PURPOSE & NEED BIAS
The evaluation of the Purpose & Need statement in Section III, outlines a number of criteria that focus on physical planning, design, and economic benefit. The Purpose statement:

The purpose of the Interested Party process is to consider feasible preservation possibilities for the continued use of the Mellon Arena site given its cultural value as a historic resource eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Before we critique the options outlined in the options report, we must note that Option 5, demolition, is really not an option if one rereads the purpose statement. We continue to protest the inclusion of the demolition option because it does not conform to the spirit and intent of the purpose statement. The question of whether this IP process looked at the building or the site or both is a very important one.

While the APE rightfully looks at the entire site (28 acres), it is not the historic redevelopment area, it also included the new arena site up to and including Washington Plaza (which could in fact be a future National Register structure due to its architect, IM PEI) as well as the parking lot near the proposed cap on the Crosstown Expressway. Why is this important? Because we continue to maintain that the SEA has artificially broken the historic and administrative redevelopment areas and master plan developed by Mitchell & Ritchey and the impact of other development around the arena site need to be included.

2. RELIANCE ON THE PENGUINS CONSULTANTS EMBEDS BIAS
Working with the Arena as a given was never the intent of the SEA. It is not a planning department with experienced, innovative urban planners and architects. Its consultants resumes show they are not that either. This is not to say they are not qualified as cultural historians and transportation engineers; they are just not urban designers and architects with any significant experience in high profile urban design.

This left the SEA relying on data from consultants that are loyal to the Penguins wishes (UDA, Oxford and AECOM), rather than truly independent consultants from outside the region. Portland, Oregon did just that by hiring firms from Chicago.
Commentary on Development Option 1: "Do Nothing"

There are a couple of key criticisms and commentaries that need to be included regarding Option #1. The theory behind a "Do nothing" option appears to be, according to Baker Engineering, a way of developing a base line comparison for performance comparisons with the other identified options. In the engineering world this is known as the "No Build" option when comparing bridge designs for example. There are significant differences between a "do nothing" option and an option that just uses the building as is. Mothballing is yet another idea that assumes no active uses or costs associated with actual occupancy.

Economic development:
1. The three sub concepts should be considered for separate economic benefit analysis. All commentary related to site development around the arena is purely speculative and biased towards demolition. For example, 1C could conceivably include new housing and development around the building just like option 3. So the comments "Housing opportunities would not exist" on page 17 should be stricken.

2. The simplistic economic calculation that takes parking revenue and subtracts operating costs is not an honest assessment of potential. If that is used, one also should point out the terms of the Penguins lease for use of the arena site after demolition. One could in fact build new housing on the upper two parking terraces integrated with housing as per options 3 or 5. Density should be equal to the Penguins' plan (units per acre would be a good way to express this). This would produce substantial economic benefit. Mario Lemieux Place could in fact become the transitional urban fabric (mixed use mid-rise no higher than Crawford). This edge along Lemieux with two gently curving blocks with multiunit housing and ground floor retail that would be better than conventional blocks, and would focus pedestrian connections and architectural character on one street instead of spreading around questionable mixed use sites that would not be easily rented or sold.

As one moves up the hill to Crawford, the development of the upper parking terraces can house single family dwellings configured almost exactly like the UDA plan.

The report confuses the more specific opportunities and constraints of arena renovation options with opportunities surrounding it. There is great bias in this because no drawings or urban design analysis was done by Baker to communicate these complex design issues. Instead they cut and pasted a couple of images from the Penguins and Mr. Pfaffmann's sketches. Where is the needed critical design thinking and drawing independent of both? The SEA's charge to Baker should have made explicit a neutral analysis thru a comparative SketchUp model of the entire site. This would have saved so much wasted time in meetings with poor analytical supports.

Affordability:
Overall affordability calculations do not include the costs of public financing for garages and public open space. Again we don't have apples to apples in the comparative analysis. Affordability is all relative; depending on the market themes for new development, what does the design quality do to support and enhance economic
value and thus affordability? These are questions that are brushed off in biased irrelevant comments about the shape of buildings and the width of Mario Lemieux Place.

1A. Do Nothing;
Means truly do nothing, as often happens with many old buildings. Systems are not run, the building is sealed in preparation for some future demolition. In this case the holding costs and the impact on finishes etc. are not of concern. The old Pittsburgh Airport terminal is a good example. The paint peels due to lack of heat and the plaster cracks. In a structure like the Arena it is questionable that the building would have many finish failures (no plaster) and the lack of heat would be mean the plumbing would be shut off to prevent leaks. A “water cop” type alarm could be installed for leaks. But the truth is this is an anticipatory demolition option where the condition and degradation of the building is of little concern since the building would be demolished with in a couple of winter seasons max.

This appears to be the preferred option of the SEA and its consultants if there were more honesty and transparency.

1B. Mothball
Shut down the building and secure it, waiting for a new use proposal down the road. The costs for this option should be much lower than indicated by Oxford especially for utilities. Mothballing assumes that reuse (like and old coat or an old ship) is possible or even likely. The costs for mothballing, while slightly higher would not be significant. Minimum heating of basement mechanical spaces would be all that is necessary. With detailed knowledge of existing systems (fans, compressors, pumps and switchgear), a proper mothballing strategy could be employed that anticipates some systems that have continued service life and others that are likely to be replaced. As a former facilities manager advises us, this question of useful service life is highly subjective based on performance criteria, current use vs. future use.

The ice making systems and air conditioning systems are a good case in point. If the building is to be reused for recreational sports, the ice making systems do not need to be as “perfect” or reliable as for an NHL rink.

1C. Use Arena "As Is"
The use of an arena “as is” carries with it higher operation costs closer to recent experience. However, from an economic benefit perspective, the arena would have the potential for income to cover operating costs to some degree. The operating costs of the building would not be identical to its former use as an NHL grade facility. In our research we have learned from Portland, Oregon and Pontiac Michigan, that viable venues are possible. The use of an older facility to serve new programmatic uses that are incompatible with the new facility, (outdoor festivals, semipro sports with less than 4,000-5,000 paid attendance, etc). Another example is the Annual Dollar Bank Jamboree or Pittsburgh Blues Festival at Hartwood Acres. These events would compliment the new arena and attract other tenants or rentals that cannot pay the high costs of the new facility. There are many examples of this economic hand-me-down process with airports, schools, and of course, old warehouses. Creative programming by groups like Squonk Opera, Blue Man Group, Quantum Theater and others could create a buzz that attracts
interest to take the building to the next level and make major changes such as removing major parts of the added seating bowl from 1980s and 90s. That logically moves the concept to Option #6, if a developer could justify reuse and a rehabilitation strategy that targets Rehabilitation Tax credits (see commentary on option #6).

**OPTION 2 Commentary**
Although Option 2 was not brought forward for additional analysis its inclusion in the IP process was a red herring and disingenuous. We had the opportunity to read the full report created by HOK and Turner a number of years ago. It was one of those reports that architects and engineers laugh about because they are not seriously and objectively designed to study ways to increase the economic capacity of the existing arena, but rather justify a decision after the fact. If these shallow studies ever saw the light of day in the design community they would be an embarrassment.

**OPTION 3 Introduction:**

**INCREMENTAL DEVELOPMENT**
Before we comment on Option #3, we believe the report must address the phasing or implementation of development. We have worked to address this in our critique of option 1 (A, B, C) and Option 3A that describes phase 1 of our proposed adaptive reuse framework. It is important to emphasize that in development of existing structures and planning in the city, it is rare that a large structure such as an old warehouse is developed or built out all at once. This is often done out of economic necessity but also to allow the market to improve and support expansion. Examples abound in Pittsburgh of this, including the History Center, Station Square, Heinz Lofts, and Fifth & Forbes.

One of the lessons learned from urban renewal and more recently with the Fifth & Forbes district is the need to plan large areas both in comprehensive manner but also in an incremental manner, to address the long periods of time for community approvals, design and engineering, funding (both public and private) and construction of infrastructure (roads and utilities).

All options that keep the arena in one form or another can fit into the normal, incremental development likely to occur in the Pittsburgh economy for some time to come, without incurring liabilities in terms of development capacity or economic development. We can and will continue to demonstrate that the reuse of the Arena can provide a better quality economic and community benefit, that is directed more to the local economy with new outside dollars.

Likewise, changing market conditions over the course of the 10 year development rights agreement show us that master plans are rarely fulfilled exactly the way they were envisioned.
DEVELOPMENT OF OPTION 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Option 3 Reuse</th>
<th>Option 5 Demolition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony (Land Use)</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Community Fabric</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>MODERATE/HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>MODERATE/HIGH</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources</td>
<td>HIGH (MINIMIZED)</td>
<td>LOW (ADVERSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Barriers</td>
<td>LOW-MODERATE</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Barrier</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Transport</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>MODERATE/HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above summary chart is drawn from the Options Report and illustrates quite readily a bias in the recommendations.

Let’s focus first on the criteria that are overlapping/redundant. Of the nine criteria three are essentially identical, so for purposes of analysis, let’s set those aside. They include Compatibility, Harmony and Visual Barriers.

STREET GRID MISCHARACTERIZATION

Now let’s take the effectiveness ratings of Historic Community Fabric or in the political and new urban rhetoric “the street grid.” The report repeatedly uses the term “historic community fabric.” We object to the use of the word historic in context with “street grid” or “community fabric” because it implies that a reconstruction of the old street grid of the Lower Hill will be recreate from the past in some nostalgic way. This misleads or implies that more streets are better. This is just not true, and there are many ways to develop a successful new grid that meets all of the community’s needs and expectations. This can be demonstrated through additional studies of the grid and topography to confirm our position.

The size of the blocks proposed by UDA do NOT in any way match the same size, pattern and connectivity as the old grid. Analysis of historic Hopkins Maps indicates that the original street grid within the twenty-eight acres of the Lower Hill contained approximately 11,340 linear feet of named thoroughfares containing buildings with street addresses. The UDA plan proposes approximately 4,810 linear feet of streets, or roughly 42 percent. Few of these would be located where original streets were located because of the large, nontraditional block sizes being proposed — far from “restoring the grid.”
We ask that this section on the top of page 19 be rewritten to include a more careful wording and analysis of the benefits of an urban street grid. Many urban designers will testify to the fact that some of the best urban spaces and fabric are created by uneven, warped and curved inflections caused by topography, existing buildings and other unique character-giving aspects of cities. The curve of Mario Lemieux Place is the best example, and would build a string effective connections across Center Avenue to the new Consol Arena. If developed, it would increase the value of the Centre Avenue edge that is by all assessments a blank beige wall. This wall is a liability to new development along Center with higher speed traffic. Mario Lemieux place then, becomes an asset to improving the pedestrian experience by drawing people into the heart of the development and the Arena’s amenities. Lemieux Place could be closed on game days like Federal Street in front of PNC park, to create an even more festive atmosphere and drive new development along it at early stages of the redevelopment process.
COMMENTS ON “VIII. SUMMARY FINDINGS”

General Comment:

We have commented in Section II on a number of aspects of the options development. In this summary section, we will focus on the most important differences with the findings.

OPTION 3: DISADVANTAGES COMMENTS

Hotel vs. no Hotel:
Despite our repeated requests to look at the Arena with different internal programming models, the report fixates on the hotel’s supposed weaknesses that are questionable at best. Our economic consultant has provided a constructive critique of the hotel and suggested we defer the idea to a later phase of development.

Before we hired Mr. Poole, at meetings with Oxford in the spring, we suggested a number of variations such as leaving the hotel out, doing unique sports lofts, etc. The response was “we don’t have time to study a dozen alternatives” (Larry Castonguay). This lack of cooperation and effort when we have volunteered hundreds of hours was indicative of the bias for demolition.

As volunteers we have raised funds to study the economics more deeply in order to make up for this lack of cooperation and effort. Throughout the process we were frustrated by a “can’t do” attitude and stonewalling of efforts to find ways to make an idea work. Development proformas can be developed quite rapidly and tested if there is a commitment to “get it done.” It didn’t get done. See our Prospectus under separate cover. You might call this Option 3A as we had suggested at meeting #7. Thus please delete the hotel from initial phase 1 (year 3 in our proforma). If comparing full build out in year ten then you should include it.

In this report we strongly object to the characterizations about the hotel; a proforma for just the hotel should be developed. Comments are overly speculative rather than based in fact.

Pedestrian-Only Wylie Avenue and “ADA Compliance”
We request deleting the incorrect statements scattered around the criticisms of Option 3 that the idea for Wylie Avenue is not ADA compliant. We have sent our Options 3 and 5 to one of the nations experts on ADA and accessibility, Robert Lynch, FAIA. Bob is a fellow of the AIA because of his work on ADA and is a recognized leader in Accessibility Law and Design. He has agreed to provide the SEA with testimony that Option 3 is a better plan for accessibility. His basic view is that the attempt to achieve 8% grade in Option 5 is not a reason to demolish the arena. There are many issues when building on slopes relative to building entrances and creating buildings with areas with no entrances and blank walls or high retaining walls. Our approach to the site is more efficient and more accessible by working with the terraced lots above the arena and then developing four development parcels of 35,000 sf around the Arena. Vertical access is NOT just provided by elevator. The garage can provide van access directly to each landing on
the “Wylie Steps” and the existing Bedford and Center Avenues provide sidewalks as they do today. That provides four (4) different ways to travel from Crawford to Lemieux; the existing ramps around the arena plus existing elevators within the arena provide access down to Washington Place as they do today. The office buildings flanking the arena would likely be a later development phase and provide additional access from multiple levels and as one travels down the Centre and Bedford Avenue facades.

"No Vehicular Connection from Crawford to Lemieux"
There is no evidence from traffic studies and observations that a single new vehicular road (Wiley) will provide better access. In fact, if one thinks about the character of the Crawford Square streets that would be the likely scale of streets as UDA has shown, no residents would want arena traffic using their street as a short cut or a tailgating area. Permit parking and one-way streets would be the natural real world result in Option #5 (Penguins plan).

"Discontinuous street grid"
Based on additional grading analysis there is plenty of opportunity to provide a similar internal street grid pattern on the upper site in a manner similar to Crawford Square (see comparative analysis of street grids). A proper traffic and parking study is needed for both options to truly confirm the needs and performance of the options. Again there is no real evidence significant enough to justify demolition.

"Connection to Downtown"
Without a cap at the Crosstown Expressway (also grade challenged against the Double Tree Hotel), there will never be more than two routes across the Expressway. Interviews with residents indicate that they have had no problems with pedestrian or vehicular access. Often the comment we hear most is the damage done to access along Bedford at Washington Place. Traffic calming and making suburban commuters stop more often is the most effective way of accessing the city more comfortably.

"Annual Operating Costs"
It is common practice for any private development to receive substantial subsidies, credits or incentives. Our Arena Prospectus shows that annual operating costs will not exceed income. This “disadvantage” should be removed from the Option 3 disadvantages list.

>> If after review, there is continued disagreement between consultants, a third party satisfactory to both should be consulted before this issue is considered fact.

"Position of the Arena is an obstacle"
Elsewhere in this report we have demonstrated that it is not an obstacle but an asset to development. The upper lots are easily accessed and developed without demolition of the Arena and the lots around the Arena are similarly accessible from Centre and Bedford. Compared with sites like the new Consol Arena and Fifth & Forbes, access is actually easier to “stage, grade, market and construct.” Another important drawing that would demonstrate this debate is a phasing plan for grading. We suspect that a preliminary plan for the proposed lots for the Penguins leasehold already exists.
We formally request that an interim development plan be included in the appendices for BOTH plans.

This would essentially show the evolution of the current lots and terracing to the proposed lots over the next 5 years. We estimate that this is the earliest based on consultations with representatives of the development agencies and federal officials. The Federal transportation funds and earmarks are nowhere near enough in budget or delivery, with all the competing needs of the country and region.

A road map of funding and delivery of funds, engineering, design and construction should be included to demonstrate the timing of development. The Mayor has been quoted as starting development in 2012. Please show us how this possible in the form of a critical path development schedule.

"Structured Landscapes"

It is common practice to develop structured landscapes in urban areas. Examples in Pittsburgh include the historic Mellon Square, USX Plaza and Gateway Center, a combination of structures shallow extensive and deep intensive landscapes are NOT challenges, if planned and designed properly. Compared with the other design challenges normal to urban development, this is truly a minor issue. We have consulted with landscape architects and arborists and none would say that the issue is anywhere near a reason to demolish a landmark!

The SEA and its consultants could have easily done the proper research to confirm the cost and technologies. We request this comment be removed until a confirming report/appendix can be created for this subject.

Based on the Six (6) Disadvantages itemized on page 10, NONE of them are unresolvable in a reasonable and economic manner. There is no mention of the economics as a disadvantage but there is under the Option 5 analysis.

We note that a simple one-page illustrative comparative matrix of reconciled development densities and economic benefits would show a more accurate comparison, and could be inserted after page 31.

We urge the SEA to develop a third party independent analysis that properly compares reconciled concept plans. The AECOM report, as we have demonstrated, is not an accurate model to justify the demolition of an architectural and engineering landmark. The SEA Board has a fiduciary responsibility to have an updated economic report independently.

Identification of a "Preferred Alternative"

As we strongly demanded in meetings #7 and 8, a preferred alternative should follow the statement of need. If the spirit and letter of Section 106 and 110(K) are followed, as well as statements at the beginning of the IP process by Executive Director Conturo implying
the SEA had an open mind, alternatives reusing the arena should be preferred alternatives. There is no evidence of such a substantial nature that can justify the demolition of such a sound structure. Commentary on technical issues by Amman & Whitney confirms no technical reasons the dome cannot be opened as proposed.

Before any final decision is made, the SEA Board should direct the staff to plan a dome opening to test the ideas and assess concerns expressed or implied by SMG and others. Full access to this information collected by SMG has not been shared with the public. Reliable sources indicate the Penguins did not want a demonstration opening and got their way.

We formally request a demonstration opening open to the public before a demolition vote is taken and independent technical review of all data and historical records including those of SMG and their employees. This would be in the spirit of HABS/HAER documentation of innovative engineering.

On page 32 we note that there are repeated misstatements regarding ADA and grading of the site, miscalculated public benefit, and misrepresented statements about a "redundant spectator facility."

REPORT ACCESIBILITY AND FORMAT
A comment about formatting: The report is not organized well with no proper paragraph and line numbering, making the referencing of specific statements difficult and time consuming.

Appendices:

1. The appendices are not explained in and cross referenced to the main report.
2. The compendiums of media, letters and other expressions of support, especially in the Hill community are not complete or well expressed (tiny type), making it difficult to evaluate.
3. From the start of the project the meeting schedule and location was questioned. This was clear when Hill residents asked for more meetings in the Hill.
4. A second public meeting was proposed. Any public process should always have an initial orientation and information collection/problem definition meeting followed by at least a meeting to review draft results of report. Ideally there are three: Orientation/analysis, Synthesis/problem solving and Draft Report/final presentation.
OPTION 6:
The process of advancing options was flawed by lack of proper definition of Option 1, as well as option 6. While we believe that at this early stage of consideration the reuse of the arena "as-is" or restored to its original configuration for 12,000 people is less likely, it is not as obvious a decision as the SEA's consultants have made it. Portland, Oregon appears to have identified advantage in marketing their region by utilizing and coordinating the marketing of their new and old arenas. We should not rule out these options until they are fully explored. There are other ways to reconstruct the interior without demolishing the seating bowl. They just have not been studied.

We strongly recommend a competition that is designed to test a wide range of scenarios of physical design and economics. We can't help but note that the $97,500,000 estimate is just plain exaggerated by huge magnitudes. While we are not advocating Option 6 as our preferred option, it makes us wonder how careful and objective the analysis was. Option 6 would have been more viable in economic context had the State not given the Steelers $10 million and cheap land to build a questionable "Amphitheater" design for the Northside. That $10 million could have funded a substantial transformation of the arena to a complementary venue.
COMMENTS ON “IX. ADDEDUM 1”

Addendum #1 consists of a statement that additional “broadened” efforts were undertaken. This overstates tasks that should have been part of the original effort (benchmarking). This makes a considerable difference in how the public understands the often-complex bureaucratic and technical discussions.

Benchmarking:
The Benchmarking was never presented to the IP participants and one of the consultants blatantly misrepresented the benchmarked Portland Process, which has taken a year NOT nine years. In spot-checking the claims about other stadium reuse efforts, we find continued bias and no effort to collect best practices to use for the Civic Arena Process. The SEA Board should explore the far more accessible website for the 25-acre Rose Quarter, that includes detailed videos and reports. The most important feature is the public engagement and development process that is far more sophisticated in scope and transparency.

Benchmarking as conducted by the URA and its partner organizations has traditionally included fact-finding visits and more extensive comparative analysis.

There are two sentences that are extremely overstated and should be expunged since they reflect a clear bias in opinion not demonstrable fact:

“No reuse concept is powerful enough as a centerpiece for development to outweigh the advantages provided by Option 5 for furtherance of a mixed use development plan.” And,

“The results of this evaluation conclude that arena reuse options considered are not as effective in the extent to which they address the evaluation criteria or needs.”

Based on the corrections, clarifications and new information about the economic viability of the arena reuse, we ask that these and other inconsistent and misleading conclusions be withdrawn in favor a statement that proposes further study and analysis as proposed by Reuse the Igloo and unified with the Hill and City planning processes.
**Comments on Section 4.0 MITIGATION**

**Introduction**
The purpose and need for a report on mitigation, is to provide offsets to the loss of character-defining features defined in the preferred alternatives section of the report. We formally request no action be taken on mitigation until after an agreed upon consensus of the IP process is reached on the preferred alternative and associated adverse effects.

**Commentary**
The draft mitigations dated 6/9/10 include, for the most part, typical suggestions for a resource that is to be demolished, and not very innovative or appropriate for such an important resource. The cultural resource profession has not developed very innovative solutions, because most of its members have unavoidable conflicts of interest in the infrastructure engineering business. A true mitigation process would focus on ideas that might end up costing the client/agency more money than they are willing to spend. All of the agencies mentioned such as the History Center should comment on their willingness to provide resources or space, for example. Too much mitigation are weak, poorly funded and frankly an embarrassment to the historic record and legacy of the resource.

That said, there is one key mitigation that should occur before a decision on preferred alternatives, because it could actually change the outcome on technical, economic and political opinion:

**Operational Demonstration and analysis:**
Unlike most large resources like old steel mills and warehouses, the key, character defining feature is an operational characteristic: THE ARENA’S OPERABLE DOME. We propose that the SEA share all technical reviews conducted by its consultants and the Penguins. In a conversation with SMG staff, this information was and is being collected and has not been shared with the Interested parties. This lack of good faith makes it difficult to do the independent programmatic, technical and economic analysis.

Proposal: No matter which option is chosen, the SEA should:
1. Share all existing technical and financial assessments regarding the operation of the roof.
2. Convene a meeting that includes known consultants such Astorino, Amman & Whitney and SMG engineering/maintenance staff with the interested parties counterparts.
3. Schedule a public demonstration of the dome opening during a weekend event so that a technical and public evaluation of the dome can be recorded for historical record. This could follow HABS/HAER procedures and include the Society for Industrial and Commercial Archaeology experts to plan the opening and record the results. This should be done before the SEA Board votes.
Appendices:

Figures:

a. Option 3A Illustration of Arena

b. Conceptual Context Plan

1. Support Survey Summary
A preliminary and non scientific survey of popular support

2. Comparison Summary Options 3 & 5
A Summary of evaluations drawn from SEA Options Report

3. Historic Street Grid Overlays
A map showing historic and contemporary Street Grids (pink areas are Penguins proposal)

4. Blocks & Streets Comparison
A map showing key streets in options 3 & 5 (pink areas are Penguins proposal)

5. Conceptual Development Sequence
An overlay sketch showing the how development zones (residential, recreation/entertainment/Office) can be developed without demolition.

6. Rental Capacity Analysis for Reuse Option #3A
A sketch overlay illustrating rental capacities of the Arena without the upper seating bowls, to support a proforma by 4ward Planning, Land use economists.

7. Conceptual Schedule for Civic Engagement And Unified Planning Process
A proposed plan if the SEA board were to vote to table demolition and support a unified public process to develop an accurate and complete planning process for the Lower Hill, including a development RFP to gauge interest. Attached to this is an example from Portland Oregon. Note the one year length, NOT 9 years indicated by SEA consultants.

8. Conceptual Development Schedule
An analysis of the timing of site development according to the unrealistic/optimistic MOA between the Penguins and SEA combined with a conservative look at the redevelopment of the Civic Arena.

9. Follow the Money: Analysis of Funding Streams
An attempt at interpreting flows of money for the arena and lower hill development from public sources.
Option 3A: Conceptual Illustration Year 1 Arena Only

Phase 1: Illustration of “Basic park” ready for up to 75,000 SF of local development after removal of seating bowl. Could be completed by 2012. Dome shown in full open position during warm weather.

Phase 1 Reuse Key:
1. Future Rental Development Pad (25k)
2. Lower seating bowl to remain (4k max)
3. Rink/Flex Recreation Surface
4. Old Stage/Adapt old Igloo Club below
5. Urban History Walk
6. Entry to Lower Level (50k rental)
Option 3 (with full build out)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Estimated Favor</th>
<th>Estimated against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles in Press (SEA and RI surveys)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to Public Officials</td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition Signatories</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Members</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Leaders &amp; Officials (Private Support)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials (Public Support)</td>
<td>2 known</td>
<td>4 known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA Fellows</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public meeting in Hill (SEA)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence SEA (Chronicle Consulting)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KQV Poll (phone and internet)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Polls (nic including July’s hacked poll)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trib Poll</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: While these surveys are not comprehensive or polls scientifically commissioned, they do provide a reasonable snapshot of General support.

Reuse the Igloo vs. Penguins Comparison Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Option 3 Reuse</th>
<th>Option 5 Demolition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony (Land Use)</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Community Fabric</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>MODERATE/HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>MODERATE/HIGH</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources</td>
<td>HIGH (MINIMIZED)</td>
<td>LOW (ADVERSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Barriers</td>
<td>LOW-MODERATE</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Barrier</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Transport</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>MODERATE/HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Baker Engineering, Oxford Development, Chronicle Consulting
Street Grid Historic Overlays

Option 5 (penguins plan)  Figure 3
Streets Comparison

Figure 4
Conceptual Development Sequence (3 zones)

Figure 5
Option 3A Arena Reuse

Rental Capacities

- Rental (Old Exhibit Hall & Igloo Club)
  - 4,000 max capacity
  - Fixed Roof Above
  - Open Space with seating bowl

- Small Biz Pavilions
  - 3 @ 1200 each

- Future Development

Old Gate 3 to Washington Place

Centre Ave
Bedford Ave

Wiley Steps

Figure 6
Conceptual Schedule for UNIFIED Planning Process

- Complete SEA “IP” Process
- Technical & Financial Feasibility Confirmation Process
- Unified Hill Planning Process
- Ideas Competition
- Development RFPs
- URA/SEA/Planning Commission

Figure 7
Figure 7 Portland Oregon example
Conceptual Development Schedule (Options 3 & 5)

- **Option 3A**
  - Federal Funding ???
  - Infra (NEW Roads & Structured Parking)
  - Engineering/Construction
  - MOA Required Build out 2.8 acres per year x 10 (new construction)

- **Option 5**
  - Interim Use
  - Occupancy
  - Arena Lease Up
  - New Sites Ready

Figure 8
Casino
$7m\times30\text{yrs}

State
$7m\times30\text{yrs}

Pens
$7m\times30\text{yrs}

Igloo Demo?

$320m
Consol Arena
$900k

$300m ?
Lower Hill

$1.5 million
Earmarks
2011-12

$75 million
TIF for Garages

$30 million
TIP for Street Grid
(SP?)

Congressional
Earmarks

Local Tax Increment
Financing

Federal
Transportation Bill

“Savings”

$1\text{m/yr}$

$600k$

$900k$

$15$ million
SEA Credits
For Land

Figure 9
6 August 2010

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

Subject: SEA Report

Dear Mary,

Preservation Pittsburgh’s specific remarks about the SEA Arena Report are being submitted with those of Reuse The Igloo. The purpose of this letter is to notify you of my disappointment regarding the SEA “Interested Parties” process. From the beginning, I was concerned that the SEA was only going through this process because it was required by law. Unfortunately, as I have personally attended nearly all of the meetings, I can tell you that my concerns were justified. It is as if the process was designed merely to justify the SEA agreement with the Penguins to demolish the Civic Arena.

If the process was genuine, the SEA and its consultants would have made their own investigation of possible reuse alternatives. You would have created public forums to gather innovative adaptive reuse ideas and open up dialogue with Hill residents, other city residents, and those in Allegheny County. You might have sponsored design competitions. You would surely have talked to other cities about what they are doing or considering (see Portland for the Memorial Coliseum or even Houston which is considering reuse AND demolition options for the Astrodome). Instead, the SEA used the process to compare the Penguin’s plan to only one other. The comparison itself is invalid because the Penguin’s plan tries to pack too much into the 28-acres. In today’s economy, their plan is not realistic or achievable. So, why is it being used as a basis for good economics? Even the Penguins admit that they have yet to find a developer who is interested. Based on the current economy, we know that the current SEA plan will yield a 28-acre parking lot for many years to come.

The SEA continues to talk about “fiduciary responsibility” and that the carrying costs for the Civic Arena are too great. We don’t want the building to sit vacant or moth-balled for many years either. And yet, the SEA fails to properly acknowledge the expense to demolish the Civic Arena, install new infrastructure, re-grade, pave, and stripe the parking for the Penguins – all at tax payer expense. This will cost far more than delaying demolition for one year. Which option is really more prudent for the taxpayers?
The SEA, our political leaders, and the Penguins talk of “restoring the historic street grid” and “reconnecting the Hill to downtown.” While this sounds good to the public, the reality is that the Hill already has easy access to downtown through Center and Bedford Avenues. And most leaders in the Hill agree that their concern is not hockey or architecture – they want a plan that has the most economic benefit for the Hill. That plan could include a reuse of the Civic Arena or demolition.

**Equity.** When the Pirates and Steelers made their agreements with the SEA, they got new Stadiums and the development rights between them. The agreement also called for the demolition of Three Rivers Stadium at the SEA (taxpayer) expense. It only seems fair, then, that the Penguins get the same deal – a new Arena, demolition of the old one, and rights to develop the land. Right? Not so fast! The difference is that we are talking about the Civic Arena, not Three Rivers Stadium. You did not see us raising issues about razing Three Rivers Stadium. The Civic Arena, on the other hand, offers huge potential for adaptive reuse and is architecturally and historically significant. Who could have imagined that the Civic Arena could become something other than an arena? We can! We could never afford to build a structure like it today. So why tear it down just so we can build something ordinary?

**Opportunity or Missed Opportunity.** We have a real opportunity to do something extraordinary. By reusing the Arena, we can make an exciting uniquely Pittsburgh destination that serves our region well into the future. We can bring people together to achieve these common objectives.

The Hill is in favor of a reuse option only if makes good economic sense. Preservation Pittsburgh agrees. We believe the Arena could have a vibrant and sustainable future. We want an appropriate process to explore all options. This should all be part of a new unified planning process that considers the Hill Master Plan, the Green print, the Lower Hill development, and the Golden Triangle – together, not separately.

Unfortunately, many see preservation as a roadblock. However, history has shown that preservation is a valuable resource, not a roadblock, to great economic development. (Isn’t it ironic that the SEA is planning to demolish a building that is right next to the new Connelly Green Innovation center?) It’s time to be green, innovative, sustainable, and creative. Together, let’s put our Pittsburgh know-how to work. We can do amazing things with this amazing structure. Think outside the Igloo!

Mary, please support an appropriate process before discarding this one-of-a-kind public asset. This is your charge and your responsibility.

Best regards,

Preservation Pittsburgh

![Signature]

Scott D. Leib, President

cc: Chris Cieslak
August 6, 2010

Mary K. Conturo
Executive Director
Sports and Exhibition Authority
Regional Resource Center
425 Sixth Avenue
Suite 2750
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Dear Mary:

The Pittsburgh Penguins (the "Penguins") have reviewed the Determination of Effect Report Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment dated June 2010 (the "Report") prepared for the Sports & Exhibition Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County (the "Authority") by Michael Baker, Jr., Inc. It is the Penguins' strong belief that, of the various development options for Mellon Arena (now Civic Arena) discussed in the Report, Option 5 - Demolition and Site Development is the only financially viable and prudent option for the Authority, the Lower Hill District and the broader Hill District and Uptown community. While the Authority may need to expend public funds to demolish the Civic Arena, the amount of such funds would be far less than the monumental costs to the Authority and to the public of maintaining, restoring, or converting the Civic Arena to any other use, including its original configuration as a retractable-roofed public performance venue. Indeed, the continued use of the Civic Arena as a public performance venue following any future restoration or conversion would result in the Civic Arena directly competing with other publicly-funded performance venues such as Heinz Field, PNC Park and the new CONSOL Energy Center.

If the Civic Arena is demolished, the Lower Hill District can be redeveloped in a more cohesive and connective fashion that would, over time, generate more tax revenue for our local municipalities. The Penguins hold the development rights for the 28-acre site of the Civic Arena and its surrounding parking lots and are willing to and have engaged the residents of the Lower Hill District and other local stakeholders in a process to support a redevelopment of the Civic Arena site that will be in concert with the ongoing Hill District Master Plan process. It is the Penguins' firm belief that an effective, cohesive and financially sound redevelopment proposal for the Lower Hill District requires the demolition of the Civic Arena.

In addition, the Penguins strongly believe that the criticism of the effective Lower Hill District redevelopment proposals presented by Todd Poole of 4Ward Planning at the Interested Party Meeting #8 for the Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment on July 13, 2010, should not be taken into consideration by the Authority in evaluating redevelopment options for the Lower Hill District. The many significant flaws in Mr. Poole's data, analysis and conclusions are described in detail in the Memorandum dated July 21, 2010, prepared by Patty Folan of AECOM, a copy of which is enclosed with this letter.

Sincerely,

Travis Williams
Senior Vice President
Business Affairs/General Counsel

Enclosure
Memorandum

To: Travis Williams, Pittsburgh Penguins

CC: Response to 4Ward Planning Presentation—Mellon Arena Site Redevelopment

Subject: July 21, 2010

From: Patty Folan

Following is a summary of ERA/AECOM’s response to the recent presentation by 4Ward Planning (Todd Poole) at the Interested Party Process Meeting #8 for the Lower Hill (Mellon Arena) Redevelopment.

- The ERA/AECOM market study is based on the following approach; each separate analysis is critical and informs the entire market findings:
  - A quantitative analysis of demographic factors such as employment and population growth and trends, real estate trends with respect to absorption, vacancy, new construction, etc.
  - A case study and comparables analysis. The comparables analysis is critical as it indicates what is viable from a developer’s perspective (and also from the perspective of the financial markets), as opposed to an isolated market analysis.
  - An analysis of submarket trends. Similar to other large metropolitan areas, submarkets within the larger Pittsburgh region are vastly different and impacted by geography, competitive surroundings, access, relative submarkets, and so forth.

- The analysis presented by 4Ward Planning cited several factors from the market study out of context, which can be misleading and ignores a more comprehensive approach. In many cases, the 4Ward Planning analysis over generalized market conditions, or, conversely, narrowly defined specific market conditions or factors relative to a ten-year planning time frame.

- It should also be noted that the Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis issued in February of 2010 reflects findings from the Market Analysis report issued in July of 2009. The market analysis report was not updated subsequent to the final report which was issued in 2009. Also, the math error noted in the Poole presentation was acknowledged during the draft report review of the economic and fiscal impact analysis and corrected in the final report.
A separate and independent market analysis (and “fiscally responsible” plan) was to be presented by 4Ward Planning for the reuse of the Mellon Arena site. The presentation did not include a separate market analysis, or, more importantly, a viable development program based on an independent market analysis.

The following comments are directed to specific points raised during the presentation:

**Office Analysis**

- As stated in the ERA/AECOM report, it is not likely that new employment growth alone will drive substantial new office construction in the region. Little new office space would have been constructed in the Pittsburgh area over the past thirty years based on historic (and forecast) growth trends in employment. New businesses have been attracted from outside of the region as a result of several factors including the presence of nationally recognized research based universities and an established and diversified base of companies and institutions (and a growing energy sector). In fact, according to data provided by Costar, close to one million square feet (935,768 square feet) of new office space was built in the Greater Downtown submarket from 2005 through 2008. According to the same source, over the same time frame, the vacancy rate in the Greater Downtown submarket decreased from 14.9% to 10.0% and average quoted lease rates increased from $18.29 to $19.56, again pointing to the importance of a considering individual submarkets.

- The Class A vacancy rate in the CBD is currently 8.2% (Costar First Quarter 2010 report) - lower than many comparable metropolitan areas. According to CB Richard Ellis, over the last two years, Pittsburgh is one of the few office markets to have experienced growth based on fundamental indicators. The banking industry has also fared well with PNC Financial Services Group acquiring National City and the Bank of New York Mellon increasing its presence in the area.

- As also stated in the ERA/AECOM report, from 2006 to 2008, the Pittsburgh office market's standing relative to other metropolitan markets increased significantly (based in part on change in vacancy and effective rent) while other office markets faltered.

- The 4Ward Planning presentation pointed out that almost one-half of the regions office vacancy is located in the downtown district. This is due to the fact that approximately one-half of the metro-wide office inventory is located in the CBD/fringe area (currently, there is approximately 50.5
million square feet of office space located in the Pittsburgh region, of which 28.0 square feet is located in the CBD/Fringe submarket).

- The office market within one-half mile of the project site was reportedly only 8% vacant as of the 4th quarter 2008, decreasing from 17.8% recorded in the fourth quarter of 2004.
- The office demand analysis (based on employment growth alone) showed 2.1 million square feet of new office space supportable over ten years within the entire region, with a downtown/fringe capture based on the fair share of current employment.
- As acknowledged in the ERA/AECOM report, there is little developable land available in the central business district. Given the lack of developable land and proximity to Oakland and Grant Street, a developer would likely favor a Hill District site over other nearby locations such as the North Shore and the Strip District.
- Office space per employee varies greatly from a low ratio for back office space to a relatively high ratio for research and development oriented space. Approximately 200 to 250 square feet per employee remains a commonly accepted ratio by developers, especially in light of a long-term time frame.

Retail/Entertainment Analysis
- With respect to the cinema overview presented:
  - First-run theaters are not considered part of the same market as art house/second run theaters as stated in the Poole analysis. There may be an opportunity for a new theater at the Mellon Arena site given the lack of first-run theaters located north of the river and proximate to the project site (Cinemagic is an independent operator that serves a large portion of the immediate market and shows primarily independent/art films). Movie theaters typically operate on the opportunity to dominate a “zone”, such as a downtown region or suburban retail node. In turn movie demand is driven (and calculated) based on movie demand by age. In addition, the presence of nearby sit-down restaurants provides synergistic benefits to a theater operator. General rules of thumb for an entire market can be misleading.
  - In addition, as with the introduction of large multi-screen theaters in the 1990’s, the theater industry continues to evolve with the growth of 3-D cinemas and increased access to downloading films. Rules of thumb applied today will likely not apply five to ten years from now.
  - The ERA/AECOM long-term forecasts for entertainment retail space are relatively conservative based on comparables for sports driven venues. The number of restaurants listed in the report was intended to give scale to the square footage figure as restaurant sizes can vary greatly from
a 20,000 square foot Hofbrauhaus to a local operator encompassing less than 5,000 square feet (Big Burrito Restaurant Group). Entertainment retail could include a combination of national as well as regional operators for restaurants, night clubs, a health club, etc. A specific leasing plan will evolve later in the planning process.

- Again, this is a ten-year forecast and comparables reflected a viable range of retail space from 115,000 to 300,000 square feet. As an example, the Banks in Cincinnati, Ohio will include 200,000 to 400,000 square feet of retail space and Ballpark Village (San Diego) was slated to include 115,000 square feet of retail in a downtown area which already includes a significant amount of existing retail space. The Arena District in Columbus, Ohio, and the Verizon Center district in Washington D.C., as referenced in the report, are examples where a new arena became the catalyst and anchor for a mixed-use development in a neglected and declining area of the city. The Arena District includes about over 200,000 square feet of retail and entertainment space, including six restaurants, three smaller food service operations (e.g. Starbucks, Chipotle Mexican Grill), and one nightclub.

- How was restaurant demand calculated? Do restaurant sales cited also include fast food operators, take-out delis, etc? Restaurant demand is a complex measurement given the difficulty in quantifying restaurant spending for a large population. Supply is also difficult to quantify given the variety of operators and the constant flux of the industry as well as the importance of other factors such as the experience of the operator, proximity to other traffic generators, etc. Typically, dining out data includes eating at a mix of establishments such as restaurants, fast food operators, coffee houses, etc. Dining out data also reflects dollars spent outside of the region. As a result of the difficulty in accurately quantifying restaurant demand for a larger mixed-use development, the comparables analysis provides the most realistic and market based indication of the type and amount of retail that can be constructed proximate to a development anchored by a sports venue.

- There was no mention of the existing retail market with respect to real estate conditions, as well as submarket real estate conditions. Vacancy rates in the CBD/fringe area remain relatively low and brokers report that most deals currently occurring in the fringe area are market rate deals (e.g. no incentives offered). Various submarkets continue to evolve and perform relatively well (e.g. Carson Street, Lawrenceville is emerging, new retailers have expanded from the Strip district to downtown locations).

- While it is acknowledged that retail markets across the country are saturated, new retail continues to come on-line due to obsolescence, the construction of new anchors (such as new stadiums), and infill and redevelopment initiatives. Submarkets located near the Mellon Arena site remain distinct. For example, Strip District tenants are primarily independent operators, focused on the
wholesale legacy of the area. Its character is unique and cannot be replicated, thus distinguishing it from retail tenants likely to locate near a new arena.

We would be happy to discuss any of the points highlighted above in greater detail.
August 10, 2010

Ms. Jean Cutler
State Historic Preservation Officer
Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0093

Re: Proposed Demolition of the Mellon Arena
Pittsburg, PA

Dear Ms. Cutler:

We received your letter on June 21, 2010 requesting our advice regarding anticipatory demolition of the Mellon Arena and possible future development of the site. Your letter also inquired whether the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) would be willing to enter into consultation at this early stage before there is a proposed federal action or Federal agency of record. Pursuant to Section 800.2(b)(2) of our regulations ("Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800)), we are providing the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) with the following advice for your consideration.

With regard to anticipatory demolition, the information provided about this undertaking does not establish that Section 110 (k) of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is applicable since there does not appear to be an applicant that has carried out an activity that would require Section 106 review. Further, all discussions regarding the Mellon Arena and its future prospects are more speculative than definitive with no firm assurances, to date, of future Federal funding.

Although the Sports Exhibition Authority (SEA) may anticipate federal funding for the redevelopment of the parking lot, there is no evidence that Federal applications are pending. Therefore, there would be no basis upon which a Federal agency could deny Federal funding as specified in 110(k). For anticipatory demolition to apply, the Federal involvement must be clear along with the intent to take actions to adversely affect a historic property and avoid the requirements of Section 106. While such a linkage is assumed, it would require evidence. Unless SEA has an application which is awaiting Federal review, it is...
difficult to associate the proposed demolition of Mellon Arena with a Federal statutory requirement such as Section 110(k) of NHPA.

In terms of our involvement in the consultation, we would be amenable to consultation with the SHPO and others when, and if, a Federal action is proposed that is related to the Mellon Arena. Until that time, the ACHP has no jurisdiction over non-Federal actions proposed by local entities. If you have any questions regarding these comments or need further assistance, please contact Najah Duvall-Gabriel at (202) 606-8585, or via email at ngabriel@achp.gov.

Sincerely,

Charlene Dwin Vaughn, AICP
Assistant Director
Office of Federal Agency Programs
Federal Permitting, Licensing and Assistance Section
June 16, 2010

Mr. Reid Nelson
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Old Post Office Building
1110 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 803
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Reid:

Several months ago, if not a year ago, I called to speak to you about the Mellon Arena (Arena) in Pittsburgh. The Arena is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Arena is owned and operated by the Sports Exhibition Authority (SEA) in Pittsburgh. In March of 2007 a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the SEA, Allegheny County, the City of Pittsburgh and the Lemieux Group LP agreeing to the construction of a new sports facility, The Sports Exhibition Center (see attached MOU). This MOU did not include the SHPO and the SHPO was not consulted about the agreement.

Although the new facility was built as a multi-use facility, its primary tenant is the Pittsburgh Penguins National Hockey League team. In Section 2(iii), the MOU, which is still in force, states: "Upon the opening of the new arena, the SEA, at its expense, shall promptly demolish Mellon Arena and pave, stripe and in all respects prepare the land under Mellon Arena for use as a parking lot. Upon completion of this work, the Penguins shall pay an additional $200,000/year over the life of the lease. This use shall continue until the land under Mellon Arena is developed." This section of the MOU, the quasi-Section 106 consultation and the "anticipated" federal funding which the SEA has told us it will receive for the redevelopment (replace a street grid) of the 28 acre site, makes the preservation advocacy groups believe the SEA is pursuing anticipatory demolition. However, several months ago, the executive director of the SEA told me verbally that the SEA does not have funds at this time for the demolition.

In the meantime, the new Sports Exhibition Center is complete and the old Arena is considered redundant by the SEA. The last concert in the old Arena is scheduled for June 30. The SEA is ready to make a decision about the future of the Arena and it appears from the recent report that the SHPO has received, that the intent of the SEA is to demolish the old Arena.

The SEA has consulted with the SHPO as required under the State’s historic preservation statute, known as the History Code. At this point, the SEA has, for all intents and purposes, fulfilled state requirements for consultation. The History Code has no clearly defined procedures for consulting about project effects: it merely states the Agency “will consult.”
A while ago, as mentioned in a paragraph above, the SEA informed our office that they were “anticipating federal funding” for the redevelopment of the acreage under and around the Arena, specifically to re-establish some semblance of the pre-Arena street grid. For this reason, the SEA suggested that they use Part 800, the regulations that govern Section 106, as a procedural template in order to impose some structure on the process for a project that was known to be controversial, and we concurred with that course of action. Obviously, the process could not exactly mirror a Section 106, because there is at this time no federal undertaking. SEA is, nevertheless, still anticipating federal dollars which may come in the form of an earmark for the street grid. This is what I originally called to speak with you about; i.e. would the ACHP be willing to be involved and could we get FHWA to be involved before there is an actual undertaking. You informed me that this would not happen.

Advocates for preserving the Arena have inquired as to whether it would be considered anticipatory demolition if the SEA demolished the Arena when it is commonly known that it is anticipating federal dollars for the redevelopment of the site (street grid). From their perspective, the existence of the MOU that calls for the SEA to demolish the Arena (see attached MOU), which, but for the demolition, federal funds for re-establishing some semblance of the street grid would not be used.

The consultation continues, but the SEA has a deadline, around mid-July, by which it wants to reach a decision about demolition, preservation or mothballing the building. The last event will be held in the Arena on June 30. A draft report from SEA we just received states that the preference is for demolition.

I would appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience as to whether you believe that, if there is a federal undertaking, post demolition of the Arena, that the federal agency would consider the demolition anticipatory. I would also like to know whether the ACHP would be willing to enter into consultation now, prior to the determination that there is a federal undertaking, because it seems clear that there will be one.

Sincerely,

Jean H. Cutler

cc: Barbara Franco, PHMC
    Bill Callahan, PHMC
    Mary Conturo, SEA
    Rob Pfaffman, Save the Igloo
    Anne Nelson, PHLF
    Scott Leib, Preservation Pittsburgh
    Christ Cieslak, Oxford Development
    Tim Zinn, Michael Baker
    Gary English, aviglantone@verizon.net
August 19, 2010

Ms. Mary Conturo, Executive Director
Sports and Exhibition Authority of
Pittsburgh and Allegheny County
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2750
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: ER#06-2823-003-Y: Pennsylvania History Code Process, Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena) and Lower Hill Redevelopment Project

Dear Mary:

I am writing concerning my letter to you dated August 12, 2010. Due to a mix-up in our office, the letter you received was actually part of a draft which transposed two paragraphs and did not include what we believe to be important information regarding our comments to you.

Please find attached the letter that was intended for you which hopefully will read more smoothly and includes the missing 7th paragraph. I would appreciate it if you could remove the letter that is now posted on your website and post the letter that we intended to send.

I apologize for this confusion.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jean H. Cutler, Director
Bureau of Historic Preservation
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission

cc:
Reuse the Igloo
PHLF
Preservation
Pittsburgh
Oxford
Baker

ACHP
FHWA PA Regional Office
Barbara Franco
Senator J. Ferlo
Kirk Wilson
August 12, 2010

Ms. Mary Conturo, Executive Director
Sports and Exhibition Authority of
Pittsburgh and Allegheny County
Regional Enterprise Tower
425 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2750
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

RE: ER# 06-2823-003-Y: Pennsylvania History Code Process, Pittsburgh Civic Auditorium (Mellon Arena) and Lower Hill Redevelopment project

Dear Ms. Conturo:

We have received and reviewed all materials relevant to the Sports and Exhibition Authority’s (SEA) Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment project. Thank you for providing our office an opportunity to comment. Our review included, but was not limited to, documentation provided in the Options Report and Determination of Effect Report and the July 31, 2010 memo from Chris Cieslak to Jean Cutler all prepared by the SEA’s consultants; the analysis submitted by 4Ward Planning (including Oxford Real Estate Advisors’ rebuttal) and extensive public comments.

As we have stated in the past, we are aware of no federal undertaking which would invoke Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for this project. Furthermore, you confirmed to us in an August 11th email that no entity has submitted any application that is pending or awaiting review by a Federal agency. The Federal Highway Administration has confirmed there are no current or planned FHWA undertakings that may affect the Arena, and that they cannot consult on the project pursuant to Section 106. We are also aware that Senators Specter and Casey have requested earmark funding for the Lower Hill Redevelopment project. We have been advised by an August 11th email from Charlene Vaughn of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation that since Congressional funding requests may or may not be funded, depending on the final budget approved by Congress and signed by the President, it is premature to consider the project a federal undertaking as defined by Section 106.

Therefore, our participation in this process is governed only by Chapter 5 of the Pennsylvania History Code, which requires that Commonwealth agencies consult with the Historical and Museum Commission before demolishing, altering or transferring significant historic properties and to seek the advice of the Commission on possible alternatives to the demolition, alteration or transfer of significant historic properties under their control. Our role in this process is to consult with SEA and to provide advice when sought. At this time, SEA is solely responsible for compliance with the requirements of the History Code.

Our understanding from the materials provided to us is that the SEA staff finding for this project, called the “preferred alternative,” is to demolish the Mellon Arena and that SEA staff will be making that recommendation to the SEA board. Our comments, therefore, are based upon the facts that there is currently no Section 106 undertaking for this project and that the SEA has determined demolition of the Arena is the preferred alternative for this project.
In our view the SEA has completed the consultation requirements of Chapter 5 of the State History Code. The History Code does not have procedures or regulations for implementation: Chapter 5 merely states that the Agency shall “consult” with and “seek the advice of” the Commission. Additionally, as you are aware, unlike the Section 106 consultation process there is no mention in the History Code requiring the involvement of the public or requiring public input or comment on Commonwealth Agency undertakings. The SEA has consulted with the Commission and has requested our advice on the demolition of the Arena. The remainder of this letter provides that advice.

Our review of the materials provided indicates there is significant public interest in pursuing adaptive reuse of the Mellon Arena. A new advocacy organization, Reuse the Igloo, has been sufficiently successful in garnering public support to employ the services of a nationally-recognized firm to provide the outlines of an alternative economic analysis based on a concept of adaptive reuse.

Virtually all of the public comment promoting adaptive reuse, in one way or another, requests that more time and resources be provided to develop alternatives to demolition. As you will recall, we have been concerned about the aggressive schedule for completion of this process since the beginning. We find in the public comments a reflection and reiteration of that concern, and we believe SEA should very carefully consider them. Our advice, therefore, is that the SEA should seriously consider delaying demolition of the Arena to allow for and in fact assist in the development of a more fully articulated economic and development opportunities for the Mellon Arena and Lower Hill Redevelopment based in a context of adaptive reuse.

We fully understand and appreciate that there would be “carrying costs” associated with delaying demolition of the Arena. However there are significant costs associated with the demolition of the Arena. Also, the entire purpose of the History Code requirement for consultation is that there is an understood intrinsic value to pursuing adaptive reuses of historic properties beyond that of expediency or cost. That intrinsic value coupled with the public’s concern about the timing of the proposed demolition leads us to advise a delay in the proposed timeline that will allow for the development of alternatives.

We believe a delay would allow the SEA to more fully engage in assisting Arena preservation advocates in creating a redevelopment plan based in the context of adaptive reuse of the Arena site. In our view this property is sufficiently significant to justify an RFQ that could be distributed nationwide soliciting developers and designers that could potentially provide much wider perspectives on the long-term viability of adaptive reuse than has been the case so far.

Our view is that is entirely possible that the pursuit of additional perspectives on adaptive reuse may help support the SEA’s current position that there is no viable alternative to demolition. However, we believe that to truly understand whether this is the case, broader perspectives can and should be brought into the investigation, and that the perspective raised by 4Ward Planning and Reuse the Igloo do, at the very least, raise questions about whether reuse is truly viable or not.

As we have stated previously, the SEA has completed the requirements of Chapter 5 of the State History Code. We would like to reiterate, however, that in our opinion the former Civic Auditorium, now known as Mellon Arena, is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Indeed, in our opinion, Mellon Arena is an exceptionally significant historic resource. Generally speaking, only properties with exceptional significance are considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places if they are less than fifty years old.
In our view, Mellon Arena embodies a significant and distinctive type of classic mid-20th century civic architecture. In addition, the Arena conveys and is related to the history of “urban renewal” in the mid-20th century, a controversial but unquestionably significant chapter of American history. Our position is and has been that if a satisfactory adaptive re-use for the Arena can be found, part of that re-use should be a renewed, ongoing emphasis on interpreting that history.

In our opinion, adaptive re-use of the Arena would solidify Pittsburgh’s growing reputation as a city that recognizes the value of pursuing development opportunities that are economically, environmentally, and culturally sustainable. Promoting and implementing the adaptive re-use of existing assets is a necessary component to any city’s claim to sustainable development policies. Premature demolition of the Arena could tarnish Pittsburgh’s claim to be a leader in sustainable development, and we encourage the SEA to consider delaying demolition of the Arena so that adaptive reuse opportunities may be more fully explored.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call Ann Safley at 717-787-9121 or Bill Callahan at 412-565-3575.

Yours Truly,

Jean Cutler
Director
Bureau for Historic Preservation
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission
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