

Maggie (Operator): And ladies and gentlemen, thank you for holding. Welcome to the Jackson Park Project Section 106 Consultation Webinar. I now turn the conference over to your host, Allison Caloggero. Please go ahead.

Allison Caloggero: Welcome, everyone, to the Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting on Jackson Park Project. My name is Allison Caloggero. I am a program support specialist for the Volpe National Transportation System Center and my colleague Angela Berthaume and I will be facilitating the webinar and supporting the conversation today. I am joined by folks from the Federal Highway Administration, from the City of Chicago, the National Park Service and other state and federal agencies and I am just going to start you guys off on some information on the web room and its functionalities as well as your webinar participation. So the web room is pretty straightforward for you all. In the center of the screen you will see the presentations that will be presented today. And at the bottom you have the closed captioning pod which will provide real time captioning for you all. On the left hand side here in the bottom corner you will have the chat pod, which you may use the chat pod throughout the meeting to chat your comments and questions at any time. Please identify which consulting party you will be representing in the beginning of the chat messages and if you do leave a comment or a question. Selected comments will be read aloud to initiate the Q&A period after the presentations conclude. All chatted comments will be included in the video and audio record of today's meeting and will be posted online. If you look on the top left-hand side you will see the note pod which has the call in information. So after a few chatted questions have been answered we will open to participant phone line to take remaining questions and discuss ideas for mitigation. And during this time, please try not to repeat questions that have already been asked, share the time with other organizations if someone from your consulting party has already spoke, and limit your remarks to three minutes or less.

Allison Caloggero: So this line is managed by our operator, Maggie. Maggie, could you please provide our guests with guidance on how to queue up their questions and comments using the call line?

Maggie (Operator): Yes, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, if you wish to ask a question over the phone please press 1 then 0 on your telephone keypad. You may withdraw your question at any time by repeating the 1-0 command. If you are using a speakerphone please pick up the handset before pressing the numbers.

Allison Caloggero: Thanks, Maggie. So this line will allow you to voice any ideas, comments or questions, but both phone line and chat pod will serve as equal platforms to voice your questions and comments.

Allison Caloggero: So moving along here I would like to turn it over to Matt Fuller from the Federal Highway Administration to welcome you all and begin our discussion today. Matt.

Matt Fuller: Thank you, Allison. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for participating in today's Consulting Party meeting. We had a very good response to today's webinar with about 90 folks registered to participate in today's discussion. Again, my name is Matt Fuller and I work for the Federal Highway

Administration in Springfield and in my role I work with state and local governments to complete the environmental review process for transportation projects. Today is the first in a series of three Section 106 Consulting Party meetings to resolve adverse effects resulting from the undertaking in Jackson Park in Chicago, Illinois. The overarching goal of this series of meetings is to identify measures that will resolve the adverse effects that result from the undertaking. We're interested to hear your ideas resolving the adverse effect on historic properties. Today's agenda we will review the federal agency roles in the Section 106 process, provide an overview of the steps involved in resolving adverse effects, provide examples of mitigation measures from other projects to help generate other ideas for mitigation for this project. We'll have a Q&A session to answer questions related to the process moving forward. We'll have a discussion of potential measures to resolve adverse effects and talk about your ideas that we received throughout the process and solicit additional feedback from you. And finally, we'll wrap up today's session to describe the next steps in the process. I will be presenting the first several topics on the federal agency roles and the process for resolving adverse effects then I'll turn it over to the City for the discussion of mitigation measures. We have agency representatives from National Park Service and the U.S. Army Core of Engineers available to answer questions on the call today and we also have Section 106 experts from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office.

Matt Fuller: So just quickly talking about the federal agency roles in the 106 process, we'll start with this slide which many of you have seen before which lists all of the agency contacts from both the federal and state agencies that are involved in this project. As you saw, there are multiple federal agencies that are involved in this undertaking. The Federal Highway Administration is the lead federal agency for the 106 process. Our decision in context of this project includes evaluating alternatives to address transportation needs resulting from road closures as well as pedestrian and bicycle improvements in or near Jackson Park. It's important to recognize that the Federal Highway Administration does not choose transportation projects; rather the state and local governments pick projects they wish to pursue and then the Federal Highway Administration work with those agencies to make sure that federal requirements are met in order to maintain eligibility for federal funding. If the federal requirements for a given transportation project are met, then Federal Highway will approve the funding for that project. The National Park Service has a decision under the UPARR program because the undertaking proposes to remove portions of Jackson Park from an existing UPARR boundary. The National Park Service will consider the City's proposal to remove a portion of Jackson Park from the UPARR boundary as well as the proposed replacement site for the recreational opportunities that it will replace. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act and the Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Recovery Program. Resources under the Corps' jurisdiction would be impacted by changes in the roadways and are therefore subject to the Corps' approval.

Matt Fuller: Now we'll go through the overview of resolving adverse effects step starting with a schedule of consulting party meetings that we have planned over the coming weeks. As I mentioned before, we're planning to hold a series of three consulting party meetings to identify measures to resolve the adverse effects. Today is our first meeting and we're setting the groundwork so that we all have a common understanding of the requirements and the steps in the process. We will also describe some of the ideas that we received throughout the process to date and solicit additional ideas from the consulting parties both during and after the meeting. Our second meeting is scheduled for May 20th where we will

summarize and synthesize mitigation measures that we heard today as well as those that have been provided through an electronic survey the City will send out. We will also have a discussion of the feasibility of the mitigation ideas and how those would be implemented. Soon after the second meeting, we will incorporate the feasible mitigation measures into an MOA and circulate it for consulting party review and comment. We will also make it available to the public for review and comment. A third meeting will be held on June 17 and will focus on discussing the draft MOA and the next steps for concluding the Section 106 process.

Matt Fuller: Before we talk about the resolve adverse effects step, I wanted to take a step back and review the specific requirements that are in the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires two things. First, it requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties; and second, offer the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment. Those are the overarching requirements of the law and it's important to note that there is not a statutory requirement to avoid historic properties, just take into account the effect of the federal activity on historic properties and allow the Advisory Council to comment. The implementation of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is described in the 106 regulations that the Advisory Council established.

Matt Fuller: On this slide, many of you have seen it before, it shows the four basic steps of the 106 process that are described in the Advisory Council's implementing regulations. We have completed the first three steps including initiating the process, identifying historic properties and assessing effects to the historic properties and the result from these steps is that Federal Highway issued a Finding of Adverse Effect on Historic Properties. Specifically, the Jackson Park and Midway placed on the Historic District and the Chicago Park Boulevard Historic District.

Matt Fuller: Which brings us to the fourth and current step of the 106 process which is resolving the adverse effects. During the resolve adverse effects step of the 106 process, federal agency consults to identify measures to resolve the adverse effect with consulting parties, the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation when they are participating in the consultation, and the public. Agreed upon mitigation measures are incorporated into a Memorandum of Agreement or an MOA. The federal agency works in collaboration with a project sponsor to identify feasible mitigation measures and the federal agency is the ultimate decision maker in terms of what mitigation measures are included in the MOA; however, those mitigation measures must be within the federal agency's jurisdiction to implement. The MOA is a legally binding agreement among the signatories and it assigns responsibilities for implementation of the mitigation measures to the various parties. The MOA is considered complete when it is signed or executed. The required signatories on the MOA are the Federal Highway Administration, the Illinois SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. At the discretion of the federal agency other parties can be invited signatories. Invited signatories are the agencies that have a responsibility assigned to them under the MOA and have the same rights as the required signatories. For this project we expect the National Park Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, IDOT and the City to be invited signatories. Also at the discretion of the federal agency it may also invite consulting parties to concur in an MOA. For this project, FHWA plans to seek concurrence from all the

consulting parties on the MOA. The 106 process is considered complete when the required signatories have signed the MOA and the federal agency files it with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Matt Fuller: So what are considered measures to resolve adverse effects? That may include avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures as described in the 106 regulations. The 106 regulations don't have a specific definition of mitigation but under NEPA it has a more broad definition of what mitigation includes and that can include avoiding the impact all together; minimizing the impact; rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating or restoring the effected environment; reducing or eliminating the impact over time; or compensating for the impact or replacing the resource. NEPA's definition is very broad and includes all types of activities that mitigate for adverse effects and for consistency that's the definition that we'll be using.

Matt Fuller: Throughout the process federal agencies consider mitigation measures throughout the project development process including avoidance and minimization of impacted historic properties as well as other environmental resources. Many of those mitigation measures have already been incorporated into the project and some examples of those include avoidance measures such as looking for highway locations to avoid 106 impacts, minimization measures such as reducing the footprint of highway improvements. And the full list of the measures that have been described in the Assessment of Effects in the Section 811E documentation which was sent to the consulting parties and is available on the City's website. Other measures were considered and dismissed that are outside of the federal authorities. For example, relocating OPC to another site; making design alterations to the private development for the OPC; or not closing the roads in Jackson Park. We will not be reconsidering avoidance and minimization measures that have already been dismissed.

Matt Fuller: Just a few tips to keep in mind when identifying mitigation measures as we begin to solicit your ideas for mitigation. Be creative and consider if they are likely to be technically possible or practical. Measures should address and impact related to the project and needs to be a reasonable public expenditure and commensurate with the impact. And the mitigation measure will need to be acceptable to the affected property owner. Again as I mentioned, it will ultimately the federal agency which decides which mitigation measures are incorporated into the project and the MOA and we can only implement mitigation measures that are within our jurisdiction.

Matt Fuller: Now that I've provided an overview of the process, I'm going to turn it over to the City of Chicago to provide a discussion on mitigation measures.

Eiliesh Tuffy: Thank you, Matt. This is Eiliesh Tuffy. I'm a planner with the Department of Planning and Development with the City of Chicago and I wanted to just run through a few examples. The team thought it would be beneficial to show a couple examples of other locations throughout the city where a similar 106 review process has been undertaken and what some of the mitigation measures from those projects resulted in.

Eiliesh Tuffy: The first one is Julia Lathrop Homes. This was an early public housing development from the 1930s and the entire site was rehabilitated as mixed income, mixed youth community. The complex

was listed on the National Register in 2012 and because federal funds were used for the rehabilitation the project was subject to the Section 106 process, which resulted in mitigation measures including a permanent exhibit on site which interpreted the history of the housing complex as well as the work of the social reformer Julia Lathrop for whom the complex was named after. And they are also collecting oral histories from residents of the Lathrop Homes and conducting panel discussions on the history of the site.

Eiliesh Tuffy: The second example is the CTA Red and Purple Bypass Project. This is the flyover that's happening on the Northside of the City and the CTA is rebuilding nine miles of track and station infrastructure that's been determined eligible for the National Register. Because the Federal Transit Administration is funding a portion of the project, the 106 process was followed. Mitigation measures for this particular project included seeking public input on the visual preferences for the track structures that were to be constructed as part of the project; an exhibit in the project area on the history of the city's elevated train system; documentation of the historic track structure prior to any demolition as part of the project; and a preferential option to relocate rather than demolish an historic building, the El Traverse Building which is adjacent to the project site. That entire building is being moved one parcel away to reorient it. It's not a spot, it's a whole building relocation one parcel over from the affected track site.

Eiliesh Tuffy: The third example is the East 43rd Street pedestrian bridge replacement project. This was constructed in '38 and 1954 and the pedestrian bridge spans over the Illinois Central tracks and Lake Shore Drive at 43rd Street and was deemed eligible for the National Register. The plan to replace this bridge with a new structure led to the 106 review resulting in a Memorandum of Agreement which was finalized last year in 2019. The mitigation measures included documentation of the historic bridge pursuant to the historic Illinois engineering record, which is something that similar to have drawings or HAER drawings for those of you who are familiar with those terms, and providing signage on or adjacent to the new bridge interpreting the significance of the historic bridge. So these are three examples that are relatively recent within the city that we just wanted to point out if any of you were involved in that or wanted to review these materials.

Eiliesh Tuffy: And next I'm going to hand it over to our first Deputy Commissioner within the Department of Planning and Development, Eleanor Gorski.

Eleanor Gorski: Hi, everyone. Thank you, Eiliesh. That was a good presentation, a good overview of different projects. Can you guys hear me?

Eiliesh Tuffy: Yes, we can.

Eleanor Gorski: <laughs> Okay, great. I didn't see it in the running description at the bottom. So, Eiliesh, thank you for that. And I'm so grateful to everyone who was able to make this call today. As we continue the federal process we're very much looking forward to the ideas on mitigation and as well as your questions as we continue this process.

Eleanor Gorski: So for this next section of the presentation we will be covering both Q&A of the process and the panelists that are on the line available to answer questions are from FHWA, Matt Fuller, Park

Service, Lee Terzis, the Army Corps, Colin Smalley, and myself and Nate Roseberry from the City of Chicago. So we'll start that section immediately following this slide. The format that we'd like to use in the 15 minute section is to kind of do a round robin of all the consulting parties to allow everyone a chance to ask a question either through the chat or on the phone. And if we aren't able to get to all the questions, of course we will record those and answer them and they will be documented.

Eleanor Gorski: And then following the Q&A on the process, we will be asking you for your ideas on mitigation. I'll revisit and a few of the slides following this, the two adverse effects that we'll be dealing with or the two properties that have adverse effects, rather, as well as some of the sample mitigation ideas that we have received throughout the process.

Eleanor Gorski: But before I go on to that, why don't we start with the Q&A now. I see that we've received a few questions. And Matt, I think that this we see in the chat box a question from Margaret Schmid, "On what authority can you dismiss proposed measures outside of the resolved adverse effects process?" And I believe Margaret is with Jackson Park Watch. Go ahead, Matt.

Matt Fuller: Yeah. Thanks, Eleanor. Yeah, so as I mentioned in our slide, one of our slides on the project development process that we go through, we consider avoidance and minimization efforts really throughout the project development process. It doesn't just occur at this step of the Section 106 process. And so there are certain concepts or ideas that have been presented throughout the 106 process that we've considered and evaluated and dismissed. And so while those were evaluated and dismissed earlier in the process there's no benefit in bringing those forward because they've been determined not to be feasible for very specific reasons. And so it's just part of the normal project development process where we are constantly evaluating those measures and they fall off as we go through the process.

Jaime Loichinger: Matt and Eleanor, not to interrupt, but I just wanted to let folks know that the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is also on the call and also able to answer questions should they come up during the rest of the webinar.

Eleanor Gorski: Great. And this is Jaime, correct?

Jaime Loichinger: That's right.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. Good to hear you, Jaime. Thank you. Good to hear you. So are we going to a call now or we have one other question in the chat? Angela, do we have someone on the line? Otherwise we can go to again more questions in the chat room.

Maggie (Operator): You do have a question over the phone from the line of Louise McCurry. Please go ahead.

Louise McCurry: Can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes.

Louise McCurry: Good, okay. So as one of the mitigation efforts could we put together a plaque honoring Ida Wells and Frederick Douglass for their role in the Park?

Eleanor Gorski: I believe that's consistent with other mitigation measures that we've seen, so we'll add that to the list. Thank you.

Louise McCurry: Thank you.

Maggie (Operator): Thank you. And next we have a question from the line of Scott Craver. Please go ahead.

Scott Craver: Hi. My question is for Matt Fuller. Matt, you just said that FHWA will only implement mitigation measures if it's within your jurisdiction. Are oral histories and exhibitions within your jurisdiction?

Matt Fuller: I think if it's consistent with an impact from our project, Scott, then that would be a measure that would be on the table.

Scott Craver: So I guess I'm not sure what the phrase consistent with the impact of your project, why would an oral history be more applicable to the impact of your project than a road?

Matt Fuller: Well I think the mitigation measure would need to be tied to the impact from our project.

Scott Craver: I understand that. My question is why would a road be less tied to the impact of your project than an oral history?

Colin Smalley: Matt, this is Colin Smalley--

Matt Fuller: I'm not sure if I'm understanding the question, Scott. I thought the mitigation measure you were suggesting was an oral history. Is that not correct?

Scott Craver: I'm trying to understand the relationship between your jurisdiction and what is counted as mitigation. And you have said repeatedly that certain measures will not be counted as mitigation because they're not within your jurisdiction. And so I'm just trying to understand why an oral history is within your jurisdiction but a change to a road is not.

Matt Fuller: I think both of those measures could be mitigation measures.

Scott Craver: So therefore you would consider changes to roadways?

Matt Fuller: So, yeah, when I say within our jurisdiction there are certain things that we would not be able to do just because we don't have the authority to do it. And an example would be if someone

proposed why don't you rehabilitate a private home that's next to the park, that would be outside of our jurisdiction. We couldn't force someone to rehabilitate their home.

Scott Craver: Can you force someone to mount an exhibition?

Colin Smalley: So, Matt, can I take a shot at this? This is Colin Smalley.

Matt Fuller: Sure. Go ahead, Colin.

Colin Smalley: So one of the ways I think about it is that if you think about the MOA, it's between the applicant, so in this case the City of Chicago or the Park District for one of the Corp's actions and the SHPO and the federal agencies and in this case the HCHP. And so a lot of times as the federal agency on the permits I issue, we will work with the applicant to help address which types of mitigation they might be willing to undertake in order to resolve the adverse effects, right. So in this case, you know, changes to the road configurations other than the city's what they've already chosen, those have been considered but they ultimately weren't accessible to all of the parties, so now we're looking for other ideas. So it was on the table; it was an acceptable potentially mitigation option or, you know, other option for resolution but now we're looking for more options that may be, you know, something that all the signatories can agree on. So that's really how I look at it is we're not forcing anybody to do for, you know, in this hypothetical an oral history, but if that was something that the parties were willing to do then that would be something that might be part of this step of resolving the adverse effect.

Scott Craver: Oh, I see. Thank you for that clarification. So does that mean that some federal agency has already asked other consulting parties, that is the City, about design changes and they have said no? Is that what you're telling me?

Colin Smalley: Well, I can--

Matt Fuller: I'm not sure what design changes you're referring to, Scott. Design changes that we can affect include roadway design parameters and those have been evaluated very thoroughly by the Chicago DOT and that's resulted in minimization efforts of the roadway size.

Scott Craver: Here again I think we're going in the same circle about what you can and can't affect; but what was just explained is in fact it's not a question of jurisdiction, it was just it's a fact of what was willing to be agreed upon. That's what was just explained. So which is it? Is it a jurisdiction matter or is it the fact that other parties were not willing?

Matt Fuller: Again, There are certain things like roadway design criteria that we can have an effect on; we can't have an effect on a private development.

Scott Craver: Okay, but you can make the private entity hold an exhibition?

Matt Fuller: No, we cannot.

Scott Craver: Oh. Well, then I guess that's not a mitigation measure that we can pursue, is that correct?

Eleanor Gorski: You know, if I may interrupt, this is Eleanor Gorski, we do need to get to other consulting parties. Can we circle back on this and let's move to another question please. I'm going to ask us to look at the chat room at this point. Nicholas Lodado, "Do you have examples in which parks or the boulevard system was the subject of an adverse effect and what steps were taken?" Who would like to take that question? I know that Eillesh on the City side did a lot of investigation into different mitigation examples and we were looking for some that affected parks and boulevards. I don't know if you'd like to add anything to this or anyone else on the team?

Eillesh Tuffy: Sure. I'm on the line. We did reach out to our preservation partners in a number of different cities across the country, specifically looking for some comparable projects and effects so that they would align best with what we are reviewing. There were no projects within the City of Chicago that created, that triggered 106 and created adverse effects to our boulevard system, nor did we find any that was as specific as the question that you're asking, Mr. Lodado. So, no, we did not find any other examples that were adverse effects to a boulevard system unless there is someone else present on the line here today that knows of one.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay, do we have anyone else on the line? Otherwise we'll go to another chat question.

Maggie (Operator): Yes, we do have a couple other questioners on the line. The next is from Mary Lu Seidel. Please go ahead.

Mary Lu Seidel: Hi, this is Mary Lu Seidel with Preservation Chicago. I would like to see-- have Matt-- this is directed to Matt Fuller. On this conversation about what the Federal Highway Authority's ability to act in this case is or is not, you've indicated you cannot ask them to move the project out of Jackson Park. You have indicated you cannot ask them to change the design maybe from a 230 foot tower to a 2-story facility that is more in line and respectful of the project. You do have the authority I assume to just reject a plan to alter the roadways? And then, I want to know who has the-- So I have a number of questions in here, sorry. Who has the authority to impact that design? Because since the very beginning of this project the City of Chicago made it very clear they would not consider avoidance or minimization. Now you are saying this is mitigation, but what you think mitigation means is actually avoidance minimization and mitigation which is not the National Historic Preservation Act definition of the three separate solutions. So I would just like this on the record today to reflect your defense of not taking any action because you don't have any authority to take that action. You could deny the project the request of the Federal government.

Matt Fuller: Thanks. Thanks for that question, Mary Lu, and it's an important point. We, Federal Highway, we don't have the authority to reject transportation projects. As I mentioned in a presentation piece, state and local governments essentially are the ones who pick their transportation projects they want to pursue. They decide which ones they want to pursue federal aid funding for and in our role we don't pick or not pick transportation projects. We work with those entities to make sure that they follow the federal environmental processes which includes Section 106. So provided they meet all those requirements, then we will approve the funding for their transportation projects. That's the way the federal

aid program has worked for really its inception. It's commonly referred to as a state-driven federally assisted program because the states and local governments are the ones that pick and prioritize projects, not the Federal Highway.

Mary Lu Seidel: Yeah. So I appreciate especially in these times this differentiation between state and federal authority, but when somebody is asking the federal government for an awful lot of money to alter an historically significant park, it seems like that would be within your purview to say we will not fund a project that-- And again, please tell me the difference, why you think there's a difference between how mitigation suddenly includes avoidance and minimization when nobody else thinks that an actual thing.

Matt Fuller: Well, again, it's just a fact of how the Federal Highway program has always operated. The state and locals, they're allocated a certain amount of federal aid dollars for their state for state and local projects and those municipalities decide how they use those funds. We make sure they follow the regulations and meet all the requirements and they have to meet those before they actually receive funding for those specific projects. In terms of the avoidance, minimize and mitigation, the NEPA definition includes all of those things and that's in its broadest sense, that's what mitigation is. From the beginning of our projects we're looking for ways to avoid, minimize and if we can do those things we end up with the actual mitigation measures.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. This is Eleanor. We have some folks that very much want to move on to the mitigation, so how about one more question and then we can come back to some of these questions perhaps at the end after we have the mitigation discussion. So do we have another person on the line and then we can come back to the text question?

Maggie (Operator): Yes. You have Margaret Schmid on the line. Please go ahead.

Margaret Schmid: Margaret Schmid, is that what you said?

Maggie (Operator): Margaret Schmid and please turn down the volume on your computer.

Margaret Schmid: Sorry. It's very hard to. The audio is-- I'll just try to-- Can you hear me now? This isn't working so I'll have to pass.

Maggie (Operator): When asking a question over the phone, please turn the volume down all the way on your computer to avoid feedback and echoes. That was our last question over the phones. You may go ahead. Oh, we have Margaret Schmid back. Do you wish to try again?

Eleanor Gorski: No. I was just going to suggest that if Margaret could type in her question we'll move on to the mitigation discussion now and that we'll try to come back to these questions at the end.

Maggie (Operator): All right.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you. Thanks, Margaret. Sorry about all that. Okay, so moving on the discussion of potential measures to resolve adverse effect, Matt gave a great overview of the process to date and what we'll be handling today as well as consulting parties were all sent out a packet of information that revisits the background on this project, the authorities of the different federal agencies and again, some of the mitigation examples that were covered here. As a reminder, Matt covered this but also there were an adverse effect identified for both the Jackson Park Historic Landscape District and Midway Plaisance as well as the Chicago Park Boulevard system. And these were discussed detail in the assessment of effects and that again is on the city's website that you can view for more detailed discussion on how the adverse effect was found on these resources.

Eleanor Gorski: Previous ideas that were suggested by consulting parties in our past meeting include the following. We broke them into two groups, improvements in buildings and structures and then related to process. You see some interpretation. That's a common way to look at mitigation. Someone mentioned oral histories. This was done also at least for home [ph?] restoration of different structures. That includes Statue of the Republic as you see, some of the Park Buildings that have need of some repair, restoration of landscape features as well as looking at an Olmsted landscape architect to become involved with the project and help as we move forward looking at the landscape in the park as we continue to improve it. And then related to the process, monitor traffic impact, update the National Register nomination and many other ways that the public can get involved in Jackson Park itself and on the project as we move forward.

Eleanor Gorski: So at this point I would like to open up the discussion again through calls, through chat if we have suggestions. We will note these and as Matt suggested at the beginning, these will be summarized. We will send these back out to consulting parties as notes from this meeting. And then at meeting two, we will have a discussion on which mitigation ideas are feasible, how they can be implemented, et cetera. So with that I'd like to open up the lines please.

Maggie (Operator): Okay, ladies and gentlemen, once again if you wish to ask a question please press 1 then 0 and you will be queued up for questions. And we do have one line in the queue already from Ward Miller. Please go ahead.

Ward Miller: Yes, hello. Can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes. Hi, Ward.

Ward Miller: This is Ward. Hi, hello, everyone. Good afternoon. Thank you for hosting this webinar. As part of the-- My question is as part of the mitigation and minimization efforts in this process, has the City and the various agencies involved on the line considered a reduction of the Obama Presidential Center Tower? You know, as we understand, you know, this would be in alignment with the original proposal that the University of Chicago and the Obama Foundation put together that was a modest two or three-story building, certainly not taller than the dome of the Museum of Science and History, which would be, you know, the next-- the most important building and landmark in the Park. And this would also substantially lessen the impact on the Historic Park in the view sheds if this Presidential Complex is reduced in size

and perhaps in more alignment with the Presidential Library concept originally presented and regulations set by Congress that a building be, you know, no more than two stories tall and 70,000 square feet I believe are the numbers. And I'm just wondering if that would be a great possibility which would greatly reduce the impact on this historic landscape.

Eleanor Gorski: Ward, thank you for your comments. This, as you know, this project ran through a public process, a City Council process, et cetera, so the comments were made at that time I believe too, but we will thank you for your comment for this and add it to the list for consideration.

Ward Miller: Thank you.

Maggie (Operator): And next we have Margaret Schmid would like to try and make a comment. Please go ahead.

Margaret Schmid: Thank you very much. Yes, Jackson Park Watch had extensive consultation with Matt Fuller over the last week or so about how participation might be enhanced in this kind of a format. Because we, and we were encouraged by Mr. Fuller to submit our proposal which we did yesterday to Mr. Fuller and a number of people on this call actually, so we have a multi-part proposal to resolve a number of adverse effects which would include keeping Cornell in, Cornell Drive in place but calming, slimming it, adding a number of pedestrian and bicycle-friendly access features and therefore and keeping the stub end of the east of the Midway Plaisance in place, therefore retaining the historic design of those important roadway features and also being-- allowing the Women's Garden to be retained much as it is now. This would also, because it would require resiting the Obama Building Complex, it would allow a redesign of in particular the Tower could be more harmonious with the existing landscape and to avoid conflict with the Museum of Science and Industry. And as a final important feature, we think it's really essential that there be actual genuine replacement Park land and we wanted-- appreciate the opportunity. We would like to share this proposal widely and had hoped-- and it's in writing, and so we were happy to share it and it's hoped that the Federal Highway Administration might be doing that. And finally, we wish to point out, to echo what some others have suggested that neither the Federal Highway Administration nor the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers nor the National Park Service are required to approve every single proposal that is brought to them. Indeed, so indeed, there is authority to require alterations that would be consistent with federal guidelines and with the National Historic Preservation Act. Thank you very much.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you, Margaret. Again, everything shared today will be recorded and discussed at the second meeting, so thank you for your comments.

Maggie (Operator): Thank you and that was the only other question we had online.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. Well, if I look in the chat room, we have a comment from Ghian Foreman who likes the plaque idea. And I think he's referring back to the plaque idea for Ida B. Wells and Frederick Douglass and he is stating perhaps we can expand the idea of a plaque throughout the surrounding community. I'm going through the chat right now and seeing what type of mitigation suggestions we have, since that is the section of the meeting we're in. I will look at this question, "Who pays for and maintains

the agreed upon mitigation measures," and since that does pertain to mitigation and Matt, would you like to answer that?

Matt Fuller: Sure, I can answer that. The mitigation measures if they're incorporated as part of our project, then they are certainly eligible for federal aid funding as part of the project. So any kind of mitigation measures that are incorporated into a project that are related to our Federal Aid Highway Improvement project, federal funds can be used on that. Generally on local projects I believe the split can go up to 80 percent federal, 20 percent local match.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. I have another comment on plaques, this one from Aaron Adams, Southside Neighbors for Hope. "Can a historic review of Jackson Park--" Let's see. Sorry, I'm paging through this. "All the way from Olmsted design to the role of African-American historic features like Ida B. Wells and Frederick Douglass as well as others could be incorporated in the current design along the promenade or other walking path. I like the idea of plaques but perhaps this could be spread out throughout the site so it can be connected with particular parts of the Park." Okay, so noted.

Eleanor Gorski: There is a comment from I saw from Mr. Marriott. I go back up in this chat. "Cornell Drive should maintain its historic cross section width. This can allow for a pleasant pedestrian bike corridor." And he is with National Preservation for Olmsted Park. He also has another suggestion for mitigation. "Could we consider an archeology survey investigation of a historic carriage drive, a study of the historic engineering below existing roads proposed to be changed or removed? This could provide valuable insights into the construction technology of the period." Do we have anyone else that has an idea that they'd like to call in about for mitigation? Looks like a couple folks are typing right now.

Eleanor Gorski: We do have Michael McNamee of Save the Midway typing in. "UPARR protection and new play areas should be placed in a different location to avoid any adverse effects to the east section of the Midway and leave the east section as primarily an open space, an open meadow space."

Maggie (Operator): I do have one on the phone line from Mary Anton.

Eleanor Gorski: Please go ahead. Great.

Mary Anton: Hi. Can you hear me or am I having--?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes, we can hear you, Mary. Nice to hear you.

Mary Anton: Okay, great. A suggestion for a mitigation item and also a comment. It should be--

Eleanor Gorski: Mary, could you speak up? You sound very light to me.

Mary Anton: Okay. Can you hear me now?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes, please.

Mary Anton: All right. I think I may have that problem with-- Hi, can you hear me now?

Eleanor Gorski: I'm sorry. I'm so sorry about this.

Mary Anton: I have a suggestion for a mitigation item but also a comment about the discussion about the Park. One of the salient features of Jackson Park is that it has, it changed its use and it's morphed over time. And particularly the particular site of land that the Obama Center is going on has had a number of uses. One of them was the manufacturing building which was actually wider than the Obama Center Tower is tall and then after the Columbian exhibition it became the area for outdoor gymnasias for people. I'm wondering if one of the mitigation items might be to basically map the history of if not Jackson Park as a whole, at least that site in terms of how it has changed with the times and changed with what people are interested in seeing. The other is a comment that I would make specifically about the Midway Plaisance. Right now on the Midway Plaisance there is a skating rink and there's also lighting, which we all call the Star Wars Piers that essentially were listed as adverse effects in the studies and neither of them have actually despoiled the landmark status of the Midway. So and for all I know is that neither of them ever underwent a Section 106 review. So it strikes me there are things that can be done on the Midway including the inclusion of better landscaping and drainage on the east end of the Midway that would be done that would have a much lesser effect on the historic value of the Midway than the changes that have already been made on it. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Mary, before you <audio glitch 00:55:08>. Oh, I think I lost her. I believe that Mary is with the Jackson Park Advisory Council, if I'm not mistaken. But I have been reminded by the group that if you're able through the chat or on the phone to identify not just your name but also which group you're with. Thank you.

Maggie (Operator): And we do have one more line on the phone from the line of Ward Miller. Please go ahead.

Ward Miller: Yes. Hello again. You know, I think we're all-- Ward Miller with Preservation Chicago-- I think we're all concerned about, you know, how Cornell Drive is handled because this is an original Olmsted feature to the Park. And along similar other questions, is there some way that this could be retained, the feature could be retained, reduced in size maybe to its original proportions and remain open even if to limited traffic? And this would, you know, substantially reduce the need for a very big and substantial expansion of Lake Shore Drive and Stony Island Avenues, which makes access to the Park and the lakefront more difficult to pedestrians and also community residents. This would be an interesting idea to retain and somehow integrate into the larger plans for the OPC site. Is this possible?

Eleanor Gorski: Thanks, Ward. Okay, I'm looking through the chat. We have more questions. I'm not seeing a lot of mitigation suggestions, though. Candace Washington has suggested, "Will/can children be a part of a historical plaque idea, making them accessible so that they are educated through history and art activities and lessons?" And I think that I did see her identify herself as Southside Neighbors for Hope and Brown Books and Paintbrushes. Anyone else on the line that wants to call in with a mitigation idea? And remember, it can be related to the process as well as related to specific buildings and structures.

Maggie (Operator): And at this time I have no one else queued up for questions. Oh, wait. Louise McCurry would like to respond. Please go ahead.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay.

Maggie: Louise, your line is open.

Louise McCurry: Can you hear me?

Maggie: Yes.

Eleanor Gorski: Yes.

Louise McCurry: Good. So I am President of Jackson Park Advisory Council and also the founder and originator of the Midway Park Advisory Council. One thing that's become very clear in this process for the last three years is the incredible amount of underground water and seepage that exists in the section of the Midway that will be considered for UPARR. Could one of the mitigation efforts be a really wonderful display or plaque describing how water can be removed, replaced, taken away from that area in the Midway using conservation techniques, using ecological techniques that could in fact help parks all around the city? I could think of a plaque or a presentation but it's an area where you can see clearly the effects of global warming and groundwater under the ground. And this would be a great demonstration project either on a plaque or in presentation, it would be a great mitigation effort for the area.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you. I do see a suggestion by Al DeBonnett. "In light of COVID-19, sanitation processes, ADA compliance remediation is long overdue and consistently discounted by those who oppose development and restoration efforts." He goes on to say, "Over attending more than 100 meetings over the last 4-1/2 years I believe any further opposition is counterproductive." I would like-- and Al represents Jackson Park Golf and Community Leadership (JPAC) -- I would like to take from his comment from mitigation and we have heard this mentioned in previous meetings, ADA compliance throughout the Park, I think that that is something that was mentioned in previous meetings. I would like to bring that up again. I know that it's something that the Park District will be looking at for the various new paths as well as CDOT. So I think that that would be a great thing to highlight as incorporating it in the mitigation.

Eleanor Gorski: Do we have any further callers with mitigation ideas?

Maggie (Operator): No, we do not have any further callers.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. Matt, it seems that we're at an end of the mitigation suggestions, so would you like to move on to next steps? And then we can go back and try to answer more questions. What would you like to do at this point?

Matt Fuller: Sure. We'll go ahead and describe the next steps and if there are any other questions in the chat pod that we think we can address now or we can always address those between this webinar and

our next webinar later this month. So for the next steps, the project team will be reviewing all the input that we've collected from this meeting as well as sending out an electronic survey tool to consulting parties to solicit additional ideas for mitigation measures. We'd encourage you to use that tool that the City sends out or if you just want to send an email or anything by U.S. mail, we'll accept the comments either way. Expect to be receiving an email from the City on the electronic survey tool in the coming days, probably at the end of this week or early next week. We will be having the video and audio of this webinar posted on the City's website soon. There will be a transcript prepared as well. That will take some time to produce, so that may lag the audio and video by a few weeks, but that will also be posted on the City's website. We're planning to hold consulting party meeting number two on May 20th, again to just circle back with everyone to discuss all of the mitigation ideas that we received and then start talking about feasibility of those and preparation of a draft memorandum of agreement. Just a note that other federal processes are continuing to be advanced in parallel to the Section 106 process including the NEPA process, which is being led by national park service and the Section 4F evaluation which is available on the City's website. So those are ongoing as well, so thanks everyone for participating in today's meeting and we look forward to working together as this process advances.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay, so Matt, I'm looking through the chat box and looking at some of the questions. I'm not sure if you've been looking through them if there are some that you want to answer off the bat, or would you like me to just go through them and read them aloud here?

Matt Fuller: Sure. I haven't had a chance to look through those yet, Eleanor.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay.

Matt Fuller: So if there's some that are jumping out that we may be able to address.

Eleanor Gorski: Sure. This question is from Ted Haffner. How does federal and state funding tie into the mitigation measures as a potential carrot and stick vehicle, especially for seeing large deficits due to the current pandemic response?

Matt Fuller: Yeah, I think we answered a similar question before. Essentially as part of the federal aid program, any mitigation measures that are identified because of an effect from our project then those mitigation measures are also eligible for federal aid funding and would be covered as part of the project cost.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. This one is from Ghian Foreman, Emerald South. "Does the federal government have the authority--" I'm sorry, this just jumped on me-- "Does the federal government have the authority to alter decisions made in City Council regarding the OPC location and design?"

Matt Fuller: The answer to that question is no. Again, there's a very distinct separation between state and local government decision making, especially with respect to land use decisions and Federal Highway providing federal funding for roadway projects. An example that may be a little more relatable is if you consider a municipality that wants to have a big box store next to a roadway, their decision to have

that big box store at a certain location is up to the municipality. There may be roadway improvements that are necessary to support that big box store going in. Federal Highway looks at alternatives for addressing that transportation need but it's not our role to second guess or try to alter local land use decisions made by municipalities.

Eleanor Gorski: This is from Brenda Nelms. "Could Matt Fuller explain how still active reviews by NPS and USACE fit into the Section 106 conclusion?"

Matt Fuller: I can say that as I mentioned in the next steps, those other review processes are ongoing and they're working in parallel. The draft Section 4F evaluation, which is a Federal Highway document, is out for the officials with jurisdiction over Section 4F properties. It's out for their review. I believe Morgan Elmer is on the line with the National Park Service. I don't know if she wants to speak to the NEPA process and how that fits in with this 106 process. Morgan, are you still on the line?

Morgan Elmer: Hi, Matt.

Matt Fuller: Hello.

Morgan Elmer: If I understand the question, correctly, how do they fit into each other, they're two separate federal processes and the NEPA process, well, its intent is to analyze what the impacts are to natural and cultural resources by proposed projects and our proposed projects are associated with the federal actions that you've described as well as some indirect projects-- as well as the indirect impact of the Obama Presidential Center that the City has proposed. Is there a specific question on how we were going to tie that in?

Eleanor Gorski: No. No, I think that's it. It specifically asked how do those reviews fit into the Section 106 conclusion. So I think you've answered that.

Morgan Elmer: Okay, thanks. So it's separate and parallel.

Eleanor Gorski: There you go. Again, I'm paging through here to see if we have any other chat questions.

Colin Smalley: While you do that--

Eleanor Gorski: Yeah?

Colin Smalley: So while you're doing that, this is Colin Smalley from the Corps of Engineers and I would just echo that from-- to answer that last question, from our perspective, we aren't going to retake the final conclusion on our actions until the 106 process is concluded, whatever that ends up looking like. And so, you know, it's not-- it is that separate process where we do have to be part of that solution but it's not like one is for closing options in the other.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay.

Colin Smalley: And I would also note that we also have a document on public-- out for public comment right now with our Jackson Park authorization under a Section 408 that the details of that are on the City's website and the Corps of Engineers' website as well.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay, we do have a question about mitigation from Donald MaGruder to Midway Plaisance PAC. "In order to come up with a mitigation suggestion I'd like to get a bit of information of how are the ideas evaluated. Want to be sure the mitigation is an appropriate remedy for the adverse effect." Who would like to take that one? And I would ask one of our federal partners to take that since this is ultimately under your jurisdiction.

Morgan Elmer: Can you repeat the question please, Eleanor?

Eleanor Gorski: Sure. "In order to come up with a mitigation suggestion I'd like to get a bit of information on how are the ideas evaluated. Want to be sure the mitigation is an appropriate remedy for the adverse effect."

Matt Fuller: I think, you know, it may be beneficial to just submit any idea that you may have and explain the mitigation proposal as much as you can as how that may remedy an adverse effect caused by the project. It's kind of difficult to set specific parameters on what would or would not be considered acceptable mitigation, so I think just to lean on the side of inclusion at this point I would just recommend that if you have an idea to submit it and then a project team can evaluate that for its kind of reasonableness and feasibility to implement.

Eleanor Gorski: We do have a comment from Alisa Stark with the Jackson Park Advisory Council, President I believe is what this-- "I want to commend the federal and local agencies for this process. It's been very transparent. The mitigation efforts already submitted in the final AOE report are on point. If questions presented do not address mitigation issues, let's move on." And then following from Liz Moyer, "As a bird watcher and parks user, I should say that I would also highly support bike lanes that can connect existent nature areas in Washington and Jackson Park, which would be in line with Olmsted's original conception of the Midway as a link between these parks. If Midway is to link them, it should be possible and safe and pleasant to walk or bike between them. And a couple folks ask or agreeing.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay and now we do have a question from Liz Moyer who is a member of Southside Neighbors for Hope. "How can we ensure that any mitigation measures will benefit the entire community given the public comment process which tends to favor voices of those who are not working full-time in the middle of the day? How can we ensure that all interests and voices are represented and not tilt decisions in the interests of the well-off?"

Matt Fuller: So I'll take that one, Eleanor.

Eleanor Gorski: Sure.

Matt Fuller: Our intent is that through this group we'll have hopefully a very well-rounded list of potential mitigation measures to consider and at some point after meeting number two we'll put that together in a draft Memorandum of Agreement that will be made available to all the consulting parties to review and comment, but it will also be shared on the City's website and we'll be seeking input really from a broad range of folks in the public as well as the consulting parties to look at those mitigation measures and provide comment. So our hope would be that anyone out in the community could review that document and be able to provide feedback on what mitigation is proposed and if they have other ideas that would be beneficial to the community then we would certainly be open to those as well.

Eleanor Gorski: We have another comment from Michael McNamee, who I believe is with Midway Plaisance. "I personally like Liz Moyer's suggestion of increasing planting to provide more bird habitat. Hopefully that could be done while maintaining the Park's historic integrity. And then I want to go back to Louise McCurry's idea with the JPAC. Kay Pointer-Brown has seconded the idea about a demonstration water garden as part of a groundwater explanation."

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. I think that we've gone through most of the comments on mitigation and the questions that we could answer so I'm going to have one last call if anyone has a further mitigation suggestion or a question; otherwise, I believe that we can end the meeting.

Maggie (Operator): I do have two comments on the phone.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay.

Maggie (Operator): First from Margaret Schmid. Please go ahead.

Margaret Schmid: Hi, this is just really quickly about the next steps. Margaret Schmid with Jackson Park Watch. You, to have the next meeting on May 20, that's actually coming up pretty quickly. It would be extremely helpful if the transcript could be made available or minimally if I have never-- minimally if the record of the captioning could be made available so that prior to that next meeting we could have the ability to try to go over the many points that were raised. So I'd like to ask if that's-- is that possible, to really expedite the transcript or minimally get the caption out really quickly to every-- to make it available? Is that possible?

Eleanor Gorski: That is the intention, Margaret.

Margaret Schmid: Okay.

Eleanor Gorski: Matt, I don't know if you have any further detail you'd like to add.

Margaret Schmid: Well, the other detail is you mentioned doing a poll with an electronic survey instrument. So are there going to be just closed ended possibilities or are you going to be actually getting a broader sweep of opinion than is typically possible with that kind of a survey instrument?

Eleanor Gorski: A very good question. We do intend to continue to solicit ideas on mitigation. You know, if folks are thinking of things that they may have heard today or they think further on ideas, we do want that to be a vehicle by which you can make suggestions and have an open ended comment section on that.

Margaret Schmid: Great. That's good. And also I just want to say about mitigation, I mean, this is, you know, we've been sort of batting around what is mitigation and Matt Fuller had explained to us in an email that actually the Federal Highway Administration is approaching this in a very broad sense. And so I just want to stress that to everybody so we can all be thinking broadly. That's what it sounds like you are encouraging also, Eleanor.

Eleanor Gorski: Yeah. Very much. Very much.

Margaret Schmid: Great. Thank you so much.

Eleanor Gorski: And so there, you know, idea gathering phase. So, you know, we'll be narrowing those down more at the second meeting, but I thank you for your comments.

Maggie (Operator): Thank you. And next from the line of Ward Miller. Please go ahead.

Ward Miller: Yes, hello. Ward Miller with Preservation Chicago. On the topic of mitigation, realizing that many of us are not pleased with the concept of giving parklands and the Chicago lakefront lands away to private entities and realizing that the limited Chicago Park District budgets and resources, would the City and other agencies as part of this mitigation process promote the idea and concept of the Chicago lakefront lands and parks as a national park? This would protect resources in the future from other such developments and also help with maintenance, sharing of resources, the burden of keeping many park district structures we see in Jackson Park which are falling down, several without roofs; there are holes in their roofs. And this would help with the burden and share that burden with not only the National Park Service and the federal government but also the Chicago Park District and the City of Chicago. And we've seen something similar in the Indiana Dunes which just became a national park and of course the Pullman National Monument, also under the National Park Service. And this would be an idea to help with that great lift and this would extend over the entire Chicago lakefront accessible park systems from, you know, let's say Hollywood or Rogers Park all the way to the U.S. Steel site and perhaps even including that, which could also be converted from a brownfield to green parklands as an idea. But I think this is a really big idea but a really interesting concept and a way to help with the big lift of these big park systems, especially those fronting the lakefront. And it would also encourage more development and more programs of parks and development of new parks in the inner city neighborhoods. I think it would be a really great option to consider and I'd love to have the City on board with such an idea and promoting this as a form of mitigation, realizing what's occurring here.

Eleanor Gorski: Thanks, Ward.

Maggie (Operator): Thank you. And next from Stephanie Franklin. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Franklin: Thank you. Can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes. And Stephanie, please remind us which agency or group you're with.

Stephanie Franklin: Nicholas Park Advisory Council.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you.

Stephanie Franklin: I have a question for clarification. Matt seems to me to be implying that federal funds would be awarded for a project if the mitigation suggestions were accepted by all parties. Does that mean that the various federal agencies do not have the option of saying no to the request for funding?

Matt Fuller: Just to make sure that I understand your question, could you repeat it one more time? I'm sorry.

Stephanie Franklin: Well, it seemed that you were implying that if the mitigation suggestions are accepted by all parties then the federal agencies that are being asked for funds would fund the project. And my question is do you not have the option of saying no, you won't fund it?

Matt Fuller: That's correct. So the way our program is set up is if a state or a local entity wants to use federal aid funds on their transportation project, we work with them to ensure all the federal requirements are met. If they meet those federal requirements then we will fund the project.

Stephanie Franklin: So you don't have the option of saying no.

Matt Fuller: As long as they meet the federal requirements we do not, no. Part of meeting the federal requirements is completing the 106 process, which we're working on right now, and we're in the fourth and final step of that process which is to complete the Memorandum of Agreement which identifies all of the mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the project to resolve the adverse effect and that would satisfy the federal requirement for the 106 process. There's a number of other federal requirements that also apply but completing the MOA and filing that with the Advisory Council on Short Preservation Set Aside is 106.

Stephanie Franklin: So if the City and the Obama Center and the Parks Department approve the mitigation suggestions that 106 comes up with, the Department of Transportation would have to agree to funding the changes in Cornell Drive and the other roads?

Matt Fuller: There's a little bit of a nuance in terms of the Memorandum of Agreement. Technically, the only agencies that are required to approve the MOA would be Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Illinois SHPO. From a practical standpoint we work closely with the project applicant which is the City and the Illinois Department of Transportation on what mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project. So they're also very key players in that discussion in identifying what mitigation measures get put into the MOA as well as our other federal

partners at the Corps and at the National Park Service. So it's a collaborative process on our end. Ultimately, it's Federal Highways' decision but we work very closely with our partners to ensure that the mitigation measures that are proposed are both feasible and reasonable to implement and there's a party that's available to actually implement the measures.

Stephanie Franklin: So for example to use Cornell Drive, if the Illinois Department of Transportation thinks that closing Cornell Drive is a good idea, you don't have the option of saying no, we won't put federal funds into that?

Matt Fuller: And it's my understanding they're not seeking any federal money for that portion of the project; they're seeking federal approval related to the improvements that are necessary to accommodate changes in traffic patterns once those roads are closed, so.

Stephanie Franklin: Right. Lake Shore Drive and Stony Island--

Matt Fuller: Right.

Stephanie Franklin: Fit into that picture. But it's all tied together, so I'm asking whether you have the-- if the Department of Transportation likes those ideas you don't have the option of saying you won't fund it or you won't put the federal funds onto it?

Matt Fuller: As long as we meet all the-- Right. As long as they satisfy all the federal requirements, no, we do not.

Emily Ferguson: This is Emily Ferguson from the National Park Service and I'm on behalf of UPARR. And for UPARR when there is a conversation of use, the National Park Service shall approve it once the pieces that are outlined in the Act are met. So we also don't have the authority to say no once the City has met the provisions outlined in the Act and regulations.

Stephanie Franklin: So to take the east end of the Midway, for example, that is already parkland. Are you saying that because it isn't developed into a playground or something even though it may be parkland that could still be used as replacement recreation site?

Emily Ferguson: Under UPARR, the program was put together in order to revitalize parks across the country. I think it was back in '76 when it came out. And the premise of that was-- or actually it was '78-- the premise was to make sure that we were revitalizing and bringing people to parks to use them so they were not left in a state of disrepair. That's not what the case is here at all. So the replacement property does not have to be a new piece of park property or a new property that's going to be made into a park. It can be taking existing parklands that was previously funded or supported by UPARR and improving that land in order to make it more accommodating for the needs of the community around it with recreation opportunities.

Stephanie Franklin: So the decision on what constitutes an improvement is whose decision?

Emily Ferguson: That's under the National Park Service purview. So we're going to be looking at the equivalency of what is lost and the footprint of what is concerted out of Jackson Park and the equivalency of what is being proposed as replacement opportunities at the end of Midway Plaisance.

Stephanie Franklin: So even though that end of the Midway is already a park you could change it if you like the plans that the City is proposing?

Emily Ferguson: I'm not sure I understand change it. What do-- I'm not sure what you mean by that.

Stephanie Franklin: Well, because it already is a park. It happens to be a-- It doesn't happen to have a playground on it, but it is already used as a park.

Emily Ferguson: Correct. So as I said, land that is already in park use can be revitalized through the UPARR program and that is applicable and acceptable as replacement property. So if they want to use the end of the east end of Midway Plaisance as replacement property, they have to show us how they are going to improve the property with recreation opportunities that would be equivalent to what is lost for the place that is being taken out of the park for the conversion. And it's a partial conversion, sorry.

Stephanie Franklin: Do activities such as birdwatching fit into that definition of revitalized?

Emily Ferguson: If that's a recreation opportunity that is warranted and needed in that area and the public is looking for it that would be taken into consideration.

Stephanie Franklin: Okay. Which means you'd have to reforest the east end of the Midway. I mean, that's a possible mitigation idea since a great number of trees, 500 or more, will be lost in the conversion or the re-purposing or whatever you call it of Jackson Park. You could reforest the east end of the Midway and create the lost habitat for wildlife. Would that count as revitalization?

Eleanor Gorski: So if I could interject, this is Eleanor Gorski, I think we do need to give other folks, if we have anyone else on the line, an opportunity to chat with our presenters. But in terms of that last question, remember we're also balancing historic preservation issues and so that would have to be carefully looked at, any mitigation proposal like that. Did any of the presenters want to add anything further in this line of questioning? Otherwise I do see something in a chat from Erin Adams that I'd like to touch on before we end.

Matt Fuller: Eleanor, I just wanted to circle back to Jackson Park Watch's question about the transcript. It appears to be a three to six business day process to provide a cleaned up version of the transcript; however, the video and audio file that will be posted on the website will have a copy of the closed captioning pod, so the words will be there in the video. The issue has been on the closed captioning, sometimes that's not shall we say a perfect representation of what was said. There's some issues with it. So it will be available and we'll have the cleaned up transcript in three to six business days.

Eleanor Gorski: Thanks, Matt. So Erin Adams, Southside Neighbors for Hope, suggested that perhaps the organizers can provide the consulting parties again with a clear document stating who has what authority over what so that we can move on from these types of questions in the next webinar. So of course we'll have the transcript for everyone to read these answers that have been given today. So I think we'll certainly take that suggestion to heart, so thank you for that.

Eleanor Gorski: There was a lot of good questions.

Maggie (Operator): And do you have time for one--?

Eleanor Gorski: Yeah, I was just going to--

Maggie: Do you have time for one caller that you haven't heard from?

Eleanor Gorski: I believe so and I just wanted to say there's still a lot of discussion about ADA accessibility throughout the Park, so this is definitely a mitigation measure that we'll have to think about for the next meeting. Okay, go ahead.

Maggie: All right, next from the line of Perri Irmer. Please go ahead.

Perri Irmer: Hi. This is Perri Irmer and I'm President of the DuSable Museum of African American History. Wonderful to hear all of you today and thank you for the call. My question is really, our comment is really directed towards the City as opposed to the federal representatives here as I think that this is outside of the federal review process. But what consideration has been given to the connecting elements between Washington Park and Jackson Park? As we all know, Washington Park, the Midway, Jackson Park are all part of the original South Parks Historic system and I would be very interested in hearing about opportunities from the Planning Department and CDOT and the Park District as to what's being considered to reintegrate those two parks and thereby providing much improved access and participation by both communities, the community surrounding Washington Park as well as the community surrounding Jackson Park?

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you, Perri. This is Eleanor Gorski. I appreciate your question. As you know, this was part of the discussion in terms of the Park planning and the lakefront plan where folks were very much aware of connecting these parks, they had historically been connected, and following through with this in terms of bike paths, connectivity directly that way and also through signage and wayfinding. And a cultural trail as well, that was also brought up. I would say that all of those items are still part of the planning for the parks as well as for the Greater Woodlawn and Hyde Park community. And from the Planning Department perspective we are working on a Woodlawn plan for the neighborhood that's going to Plan Commission on Friday. And that mainly deals with affordable housing, density, some of the other issues that are occurring in the neighborhood, but certainly preserving culture and celebrating what those neighborhoods have to offer would be a big part of our process there. And I want to say that that is a separate but certainly linked track to what we're discussing here today.

Perri Irmer: That's wonderful.

Eleanor Gorski: Nate with CDOT-- Oh, I'm sorry.

Perri Irmer: No problem.

Eleanor Gorski: Nate with CDOT is also on the line so I'm not sure if she had anything to add.

Nathan Roseberry: Great. Thanks, Eleanor. Yeah, just to echo that, I think that that was a good comment and I think from a transportation perspective, we as well see Midway as an east-west connection in the neighborhood but also an east-west connection between the parks and I think the comment earlier about the new review of bicycle connections I think was a good one so that when we're looking at designing our roadways, we're really trying to think of all users of the roadways, ones that are maybe walking, biking, driving or taking transit. So I think we'll take a look at that recommendation and review for enhancing that connection between the parks.

Perri Irmer: Okay. The DuSable Museum's Federal 106 submittal as a consulting party included a description of a proposed project that would take into account the improvements to the south end of Washington Park along Cottage Grove. And if Ghian Foreman is still on the call, he and I had a conversation about this recently. I would love to be able to speak with the group or make a submittal to the Plan Commission and the Department of Planning regarding this proposed project and some improvements to that area of Washington Park that would be south of the DuSable Museum all the way to the Midway where the Lorado Taft sculpture is located. And also I'd like to discuss improvements to Paine Drive that runs on the west side of the Museum and looking at all of that as an area that may potentially count as a mitigation within the process. So I'm available. I've, you know, registered for the call. Many of you have my email address and cell phone number so if you could please give me any information, I need contact information to either participate in the Plan Commission hearing on Friday or to submit information for review. That'd be much appreciated.

Eleanor Gorski: Perri, this is again Eleanor Gorski. I will contact you via email and send you the information. Thanks again for attending.

Perri Irmer: Wonderful. Thank you so much. This was a great call. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Great. Matt, I think that's it. I've been watching the chat and we're having chats but no real questions or mitigation suggestions so it looks like we're at the end of the content for our call.

Matt Fuller: All right. Again, thanks everyone for participating today. We appreciate hearing your ideas today and we look forward to hearing more from you in the coming week and a half or two before our next meeting on May 20 and we look forward to hearing from you all then. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Thanks everyone.

###