

University of Pittsburgh
Institutional Master Plan
Public Meeting No. 1
February 11, 2019
MEETING MINUTES

PRESENTERS

Ron Leibow:	1.0 Introduction, Planning Context
Kevin Petersen:	2.0 Existing Conditions
Ron Leibow:	3.0 Needs of the Institution
Kevin Petersen:	4.0 Long-term Vision and Growth
Kevin Petersen:	5.0 Ten-year development envelope
Nat Grier:	6.0 Mobility Plan
Illona Beresford:	7.0 Infrastructure Plan (Sustainability)
Sean Donnelly	7.0 Infrastructure Plan (Environmental Protection & Storm Water)
Kevin Petersen	7.0 Infrastructure Plan (Open Space and Pedestrian Circulation)
Ron Leibow	8.0 Neighborhood Enhancement Strategy

The purpose of these minutes is to document the questions and comments offered by meeting attendees and University responses or action items to specific questions or comments. Where context/purpose is relevant, the name of the commenter/questioner is documented. Documentation here does not indicate the University agrees with or verifies the absolute accuracy of any of the questions or statements. Items identified in yellow will be specifically confirmed/answered/revisited at Public Meeting #2.

• **1.0 INTRODUCTION, PLANNING CONTEXT**

QUESTIONS ASKED BY ATTENDEES

- (Q) Will meeting minutes be posted on the website?
 - Meeting minutes will be posted on the website.
- (Q) Carlino Giampolo –Did you (Jim Earle) get the 18 questions issued in October? (18 questions can be found at Oakland Dignity, link 83)
 - Jim Earle – yes he received them.
 - The answers will be published on the web site.
- (Q) The in-depth comprehensive impact statement study – should be as extensive as Brooking Report. What are the code requirements?
 - Pitt will confirm in Public Meeting #2.

COMMENTS OFFERED BY ATTENDEES

- Code 90503 – is the Quality of Surrounding Maintenance and Enhancement.
- The past Master Plan was more engaging with community – Had over 100 meetings
- 905.03 D – Protect integrity of adjacent neighborhoods. We want that impact study.
- Environmental Impact Study – requested Code compliance. Code requires to maintain quality or improve adjacent neighborhoods.

- Brookings Institute data does not include Oakland residents.

- **2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS**

QUESTIONS ASKED BY ATTENDEES

- None

COMMENTS OFFERED BY ATTENDEES

- None

- **3.0 NEEDS OF THE INSTITUTION**

QUESTIONS ASKED BY ATTENDEES

- (Q) The 250 beds Pitt is leasing, how does that fit into the 750 new bed count?
 - Interim solution until new building is built.
- (Q) Is 750 on top of 250 beds?
 - No – when 750 built, 250 lease will stop.
- (Q) What do you mean by de-densifying the Towers?
 - Eliminating rooms on each floor and making lounge space.
- (Q) Are they being demolished?
 - No they are not.

COMMENTS OFFERED BY ATTENDEES

- None

- **4.0 LONG TERM VISION AND GROWTH**

QUESTIONS ASKED BY ATTENDEES

- (Q) Where can our communities get a list of the buildings that Pitt owns?
 - Pitt will bring the list to Public Meeting #2.

COMMENTS OFFERED BY ATTENDEES

- None

- **5.0 TEN YEAR DEVELOPMENT ENVELOPE**

QUESTIONS ASKED BY ATTENDEES

- (Q) Curious about One Bigelow's height in context of smothering Solider and Sailors which is an icon of the Oakland Civic Center. Oaklander is a "stain" on the PAA. How far are we getting from original buildings so they are not smothered?
 - The bulk design guidelines will eventually be documented in the IMP. The next two public meetings will vet out those guidelines for One Bigelow.
- (Q) Is One Bigelow a site for the Innovation District?
 - NO

- RL stated there will be a separate presentation in the near future specific about the Innovation District. POST NOTE: That presentation will be via sponsorship by the OBID.
- (Q) What about the County Health Building? Is that a site for the Innovation District?
 - The County Health building site could be a candidate for the Innovation District development.

COMMENTS OFFERED BY ATTENDEES

- None

• **6.0 MOBILITY PLAN**

QUESTIONS ASKED BY ATTENDEES

- (Q) What is Shared Parking Opportunities noted in strategies?
 - These refer to the opportunities for Pitt to partner with others (institutions and private developers) to create shared parking resources allowing better efficiency of use and potentially intercept traffic before it goes into Oakland or the heart of Oakland.
- (Q) Shuttles – Is that a loop going through the Hollow?
 - It's the 30A bus going to South Oakland to Frasier Street.
- (Q) Will Pitt consider opening up shuttles to community residents?
 - Evaluating that option is a strategy that Pitt will document in the IMP.
- (Q) The large intercept garage at river to capture cars before they get on campus, is that still on the table?
 - TIS scope + Parking analysis required by IMP is in depth. Intercept garages are being studied. The Oakland Task Force is looking at this as an option as well.
- (Q) Why rework if intercept garage is the right solution?
 - All options are being analyzed and evaluated.
- (Q) Will traffic studies happen while school is in session or in summer when traffic is less?
 - Pitt studied 30+/- intersections for IMP. Data was collected in Mid-October/November.
- (Q) What is direct ride?
 - Non-stop routes from Suburban areas.
- (Q) Why is Pitt supporting a road through Panther Hollow?
 - Pitt has not declared its position for or against this project (Mon/Oakland Connector). It remains under consideration.
- (Q) We haven't seen the Chancellor oppose this. Why? Pitt wouldn't defend the community?
 - The project is still being evaluated and under review.
- (Q) Does the parking study document illicit parking?
 - It does not. It would be a challenge to analyze and document.

COMMENTS OFFERED BY ATTENDEES

- Shuttle routes open the door of an opportunity for Pitt to serve the community.
- There is an illicit market for parking not addressed by code. They include sub-leases for backyard parking.
 - (Nat G.) Perhaps an estimate could be developed comparing mode survey with permit sales. To be confirmed at Public Meeting #2.
 - Investigate spaces being revoked by private landlords and given to non-residents.
 - It is cheaper for non-residents to risk ticket with illegal parking in the neighborhood with limited policing.
- Hazelwood Site – City is aware of a CMU study to build a bridge from Oakland to Hazelwood.
- Through the run, Panther Hollow and the Parking Lot – Ray Gastil from the City showed thin roadway.
- CMU Study: Mon Connector Hazelwood Green site connection to Oakland. There is a concern for the Panther Hollow neighborhood and a concern that Pitt will not defend community.

• 7.0 INFRASTRUCTURE

QUESTIONS ASKED BY ATTENDEES

- (Q) Does LEED ever include noise pollution? Benedum and Chevron are some of the noisiest buildings.
 - Will confirm. POST MEETING NOTE: The old 2009 LEED version did not. However the current LEED V4 version in effect since October 2017 includes a category for enhanced acoustical performance.
- (Q) Any consideration to noise?
 - We consider all neighborhood impacts including noise in project design.
- (Q) There are 2 Edible Gardens – can you confirm the garden locations?
 - Oakland Avenue is one but it recently closed. Currently identifying a replacement location.
 - Will confirm second location. POST MEETING NOTE: Location is adjacent to Darragh Street Apartments.
- (Q) The University had expanded beyond their electrical powers. Duquesne is drilling in our community. What impact will that drilling have on our neighborhood? What is Pitt doing on the site for Duquesne Light?
 - Pitt will confirm at the next public meeting.

COMMENTS OFFERED BY ATTENDEES

- None

• 8.0 NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCEMENT

QUESTIONS ASKED BY ATTENDEES

- (Q) Macro-Economic Impact (e.g. charitable donations at \$74M, \$190 million in local and state tax revenue) – What’s the time frame? Is it every year? How much did the Oakland community get?
 - Pitt will verify. POST MEETING NOTE: The figures are for fiscal year 2017, therefore they are annual figures. The distribution specifically to Oakland of charity, tax revenue, jobs, etc. quoted in aggregate on this slide is not available.
- (Q) Can you provide a list of organizations getting direct financial support from the university?
 - Pitt will provide list at Public Meeting #2.
- (Q) How much of \$2 Billion is still available for Capital Improvements that Nordenberg raised?
 - We are not really sure how that can be answered.
- (Q) Who are the Innovation Partners?
 - Wexford Development is the University’s developer partner.
- (Q) How are we investing in Almono Connector?
 - We are not. It is a project under evaluation.
- (Q) What are the University’s recent acquisitions going to be? Former Syria Mosque/UPMC parking lot as One Bigelow? County Health Building?
 - One Bigelow will be mostly academic.
 - The County Health building site could be a candidate for the Innovation District development.
- (Q) Why has the University not supported an amendment to City zoning law that would prohibit students from living in Schenley Farms?
 - The University will confirm the answer to this question at Public Meeting #2.
- (Q) What is Pitt doing to support the Arts? Where are Pitt’s priorities? Where are arts in the Campus Master Plan? Is Bellefield still part of plan?
 - Recognizing the deficiency, the breadth of arts academic programming in the CMP is being reviewed by the new Provost.
- (Q) Plans are to tear down the Music Building, but what’s the plan to replace and enhance? It is where Mr. Rogers first broadcasted.
 - That will be revisited in the IMP process and confirmed at Public Meeting #2.

COMMENTS OFFERED BY ATTENDEES

- Please remove OCC reference, it is not correct.
- For purpose of the IMP, distinguish the things that are generally useful for the City, Allegheny County Region, versus useful directly to the adjacent neighborhood. The intention of context is to focus on the neighborhood in which it resides. Distinguish the Oakland neighborhood. When we discuss neighborhood, we should just be focusing on the immediate surroundings.
- RL stated that the IMP guidelines require/request documentation of what services Pitt provides, and what impact Pitt has on the Region, the City, and the neighborhood.

- No quotations on neighborhood – FOCUS ON OAKLAND.
- No acknowledgement of negative impact on housing/neighborhood.
- Show Pitt really cares about residential impact.
- We are missing the main ingredient which is ignoring/not acknowledging the devastation that has happened to Oakland due to the University.
- We don't believe Pitt cares about the neighborhood of local Oakland.
- Zoning mechanism for student housing districts. Students can end up in any location, any neighborhood. Zoning mechanism without a code that says students can't live in certain areas of Oakland.
- Wanda Wilson (OPDC) – commented specifically on dialogue with the community.
 - Pick dates that work better for the neighborhood and better locations. We can help with that.
 - It will be great if we can see the presentation ahead of time so that they can do homework and it be more of a workshop.
 - Pitt will do its best to get information in critical hands before the meeting.
- Pitt never talks about the worst litter and trash in the City. We asked Nordenberg to give \$4 out of each student tuition payment to address the problem
- Brookings Report never engaged with the Oakland community.
- Music Department – the Campus Master Plan has a complete disregard for the Arts.
 - Art/Music facility doesn't have practice spaces. No rehearsal rooms, no recital hall.
 - We have high schools in the area that put Pitt to shame.
 - Not adequate practice spaces – sewage filled spaces when it rains.
 - \$5M Project never happened.
 - Don't tear down the Music Building
 - It's a benefit to the community if we have Arts.