

Denise (Operator): Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for standing by. Welcome to the Jackson Park Project Section 106 Consultation Webinar 3. At this time participants are in a listen only mode. Later, we will conduct question and answer sessions. Instructions will be given at that time. If you should require assistance during the call, please press star then 0. I would now like to turn the conference over to our host, Allison Caloggero. Please go ahead.

Allison Caloggero: Welcome everyone to the Section 106 Consulting Parties Resolve Adverse Effects webinar. My name is Allison Caloggero. I am the Program Support Specialist for the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center and my colleague Angela and I will be facilitating the webinar and supporting the conversation today. As many of you know this is the third meeting of the three part webinar series and we're excited to continue the conversation today.

Allison Caloggero: So I just wanted to provide some information on the web room and its functionalities as well as your webinar participation. So in the center of the screen you'll see the presentation today. At the bottom you have the closed captioning pod which will provide the real time captioning. And to the left is the file share pod, where you have a downloadable PDF version of the slide deck as well as a list of the consulting parties for comment on the MOA portion of today's meeting. More info on that in just a second. On the left-hand side you will see a series of pods, the note pod, the attendee pod and the chat pod. In the top left corner is the note pod which includes the call in information. This line is for participants to use during our consulting parties MOA comment session and the Q&A portion of today's meeting. This line is managed by our Operator, Denise. Thanks so much, Denise, for being with us today. To queue yourself to speak, please dial 1-0 and then to take yourself off of the queue please dial 1-0 again. Again, this line will be used for our Q&A session of today's meeting in which all consulting parties will have an opportunity to comment and ask questions after the presentation. We ask that you please limit your comments to three minutes. And this line will also be used for our comments on the MOA portion of the meeting where we will ask one representative from each consulting party to provide comments regarding the MOA using the call line or chat pod. Please do not queue into the call line until we have reached this portion of today's meeting and at this time, you or your consulting party can decline to comment using the chat pod. I would also just like to mention one more thing. When using the call lines, please make sure that your audio on your computer is turned down so you do not cause any echo or audio feedback into the phone. The chat pod in the bottom left-hand corner will be monitored for questions and comments. You may use the chat pod throughout the meeting to voice your comments and concerns. Selected questions will be provided by the chat pod, will be read aloud and the remainder will be responded to after the meeting. We ask that if you do leave a comment or question or use the call line to speak, please identify which consulting party you are affiliated with. And lastly, this meeting is being recorded and the audio and video record of today's meeting will be posted online after the webinar today.

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

Matt Fuller: Thanks, Allison and good morning, everyone. My name is Matt Fuller and I work for Federal Highway Administration in Springfield, Illinois and my role is to work with state and local governments to complete the environmental review process for transportation projects. Today is the third in the series of three section 106 consulting party meetings that we're hosting to resolve adverse effects resulting from the undertaking in Jackson Park in Chicago, Illinois. Today we'll describe the Section 106 Consultation Schedule and the steps that have been taken to resolve adverse effects, provide a summary from our last meeting on May 20. We'll provide an overview of the mitigation stipulations and the draft MOA and describe next steps in the Section 106 process. We'll offer the opportunity for all the consulting parties to provide their feedback on the Memorandum of Agreement and we'll also have a general comment opportunity for the consulting parties as well after comments are taken on the MOA stipulations. I'll be presenting the first several topics on the Federal process and then I'll turn it over to Eleanor Gorski with the City of Chicago. Just note that we also have other agency representatives from the National Park Service and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers available to answer questions as well as folks from the Illinois Department of Transportation and Section 106 experts from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office.

Matt Fuller: Over the last several months we've held a series of three consulting party meetings towards resolving the adverse effect on Jackson Park. Our first meeting was held on May 6 where we first sought ideas from Section 106 consulting parties on mitigation ideas and including through an electronic survey tool. We held our second meeting on May 20 and at that meeting we summarized results from the first webinar, reviewed mitigation topics that were suggested and offered another opportunity for consulting parties to provide additional feedback for other ideas. The agencies considered the feedback from those first two consulting party meetings and developed in the mitigation ideas that are contained in the draft MOA which we circulated to all consulting parties in the public on July 9, which started a 30 day review and comment period on the draft MOA. Today we'll discuss the draft MOA stipulations and seek additional feedback and insight from the consulting parties and discuss next steps to finalize the MOA and conclude the 106 process.

Matt Fuller: In general, the mitigation process, mitigation measures that are identified and incorporated into the project are sought from the public and consulting parties and then they are considered by the federal agency who collaborates with the applicant to identify feasible mitigation measures. We were looking for mitigation measures that relate to the impact on the historic resource and be commensurate with the impact. We had several consulting parties suggest ideas that were considered but dismissed such as the location and design changes at the OPC site, location of the UPARR replacement recreation opportunity and retention of Cornell Drive. These mitigation ideas are outside of the Federal Agency's authority. Those are City decisions and the City's decision making process was documented in a letter to the Federal Highway dated June 25, which we provided to all consulting parties. The required signatories to

the Memorandum of Agreement must agree with the mitigation stipulations that are proposed by the federal agency. Typically, those mitigation measures are assigned to the applicant or other parties. The City is an entity that's ultimately responsible to implement any mitigation measures in the MOA. Federal Highway views CDOT as the representative of the City of Chicago responsible for implementation and CDOT will be Federal Highway's point of contact during the implementation of any mitigation measures. It's also important to note that the Federal Agency is responsible for ensuring the mitigations are implemented after the MOA is signed.

Matt Fuller: So the overall steps that we've taken to resolve adverse effects. As I noted, we sought ideas from a variety of consulting parties, the Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the public. Those measures have been incorporated into the draft Memorandum of Agreement, which when executed will be a legally binding agreement and assigns responsibility for the individual mitigation measures. The Memorandum of Agreement is signed or executed by the required signatories which on this project will be the Federal Highway Administration, the Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. We intend to invite other signatories that have a responsibility under the agreement or federal agencies that also have a permit or approval action associated with the project. And invited signatories will include the City, the Chicago Department of Transportation, Chicago Park District, Illinois Department of Transportation, National Park Service and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. We'll also invite all of the consulting parties to concur in the MOA as concurring parties. The MOA is considered final and fully executed once all of the required signatories sign the MOA.

Matt Fuller: Just to quickly go over the Memorandum of Agreement document itself, it's required under the Section 106 Regulations and it records the agreed upon resolution from a specific undertaking where adverse effects are understood. The draft MOA that we use to incorporate the mitigation stipulations was based off a template from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Matt Fuller: And I just wanted to go over the overview of the structure of that agreement document. You all have noted that there are a number of whereas clauses at the beginning of the document. And the purpose of those is to explain the purpose of the agreement and which parties are involved. The mitigation stipulation section describes the specific measures that the agencies will implement as part of the undertaking and again, those mitigation measures are commitments by the Federal agency and the project sponsor and they must be implemented. And then there are a number of required stipulations per regulations that talk about the duration of the agreement, if any disputes arise how those will be resolved. How amendments to the agreement would be addressed and then a termination clause. At the end of the document are the signatory pages for all the required and invited signatories. And then also individual concurring party pages for each consulting party who will invite to sign once the mitigation measures are agreed upon.

Matt Fuller: And with that, I will turn it over to Eleanor with the City to talk about a summary of the May 20 meeting. Eleanor.

Eleanor Gorski: Good morning, everyone. It's great to see you all back here again for our final discussion of the MOA. So as Matt stated, I'd like to go through a summary of our last meeting before we get into the meat of today's discussion. So again, the last meeting that we had had 75 participants. We had a very thorough discussion on the Section 106 mitigation process and then we also had an overview of the potential mitigation measures and these were lumped into a couple categories: research, interpretation, restoration and design review. And you see that the current MOA is organized in that same manner. We also had a great discussion about various ideas considered and why those would be dismissed. And Matt touched on that at the beginning of this call. So after meeting to follow-up, of course we posted the meeting transcript and the webinar video so that folks could revisit some of the discussion if needed and the public would also be able to review that. There was also some correspondence back and forth with between the Federal Highway Administration, SHPO and the City of Chicago. Those letters were sent out to you and they're also listed on the City's website again for the public to be able to see those responses. In addition, that proposed MOA was sent out to consulting parties and also posted online for public review.

Eleanor Gorski: So for today's meeting we would like to go through the Memorandum of Agreement, the particular stipulations, receive your feedback and answer any questions on what has taken place to date. We've had a great discussion in these meetings and many suggestions between meetings through letters, emails and the survey that was sent out to consulting parties. As you'll recall from meeting one, mitigation should relate directly to the adverse effect determined from the AOE and must be feasible. These were the guiding principles as the Federal Agencies considered with other parties the viable mitigation option.

Eleanor Gorski: Before we get into the specific stipulations I wanted to touch on a few of the various options that we heard during the meeting and on this chart we have listed some of the measures. And specifically I wanted to touch on two. Research and documentation and interpretation. Much documentation of the site and its history has been recorded during the federal process. However, documentation in the landscape and historic resources could be updated to get further planning for the park. Therefore, the National Historic Register Nomination and A Cultural Landscape Report were determined to be the two best ways to accomplish this. And you'll see that under A and C up above. Then the timing was considered. These are large multi-year projects. So in addition to those documentation, field documentation was added to record existing conditions now and when the MOA-- to record existing conditions now and when the MOA is reported. So for interpretation, you'll recall meeting two there was a robust conversation around plaques, historic events and park evolution. These were all great ideas that needed a good plan to implement. Therefore, these ideas will all be considered in a working group to develop interpretive materials and an interpretive plan. And you see that under stipulation D. So this is to summarize that all of the suggestions were taken into account and in order to make them feasible and implementable they achieve the form that you see in today's MOA and certainly there were some that were dismissed as Matt mentioned due to the fact that they maybe were not feasible or implementable.

Eleanor Gorski: So with that I'd like to go into the MOA stipulations specifically, the first category being research and documentation. As I just mentioned there would be an updated National Register nomination. And this would be coordinated by CDOT as a city agency and the Chicago Park District as a city agency in consultation with the SHPO. And this nomination would again be under the supervision of individuals to meet the relevant Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for history or architectural history. And the target to submit is by the end of 2025.

Eleanor Gorski: Field Documentation. We all thought it was important to document existing conditions of the site of where the undertaking would occur. So you see that we have specified the 19.3 acre site plan for the OPC, the east end of the Midway and the area's plan for traffic improvement in Jackson Park. This would all be prepared in accordance with the Historic American Landscape Survey Guidelines. And we would be looking at an existing conditions plan, a vegetative plan and scale photographs as well as aerial photograph. And again, this would all be prepared by individuals to meet the Professional Qualifications Standard. This is to be documented by the end of this year, 2020.

Eleanor Gorski: The Cultural Landscape Report. Again, this would be led by CDOT with her sister agency, Chicago Park District in consultation with SHPO to prepare a part one and a part two of a Cultural Landscape Report consistent with NPS Standards. And again, this would be under the supervision of professionals who meet the qualifications standards. And as well as Application of the Standards for the Treatment of Historic Landscapes. The target for this would be submittal by the end of 2024.

Eleanor Gorski: The next category, Interpretation. Again, I touched on this briefly. This would be led by CDOT with the Chicago Park District to develop a plan and collaboration with you all consulting parties, in addition, local museums, community groups, schools and universities, for the purpose of developing a plan on how to best commemorate and present the cultural, natural historic contributions to Jackson Park and its use by South Side residents.

Eleanor Gorski: The final plan for interpretive materials is targeted to be initiated by next year, 2021.

Eleanor Gorski: Next category, preservation. Comfort station and the Statue of the Republic are structures that are within the area of the undertaking. Therefore, they were both targeted for preservation. The first stipulation, for the comfort station, again, CDOT and the Park District will prepare a historic structures report for the English Stone Comfort Station located on the western perimeter of Jackson Park. The recommendation provided in the report will be consistent with the Standards for Treatment of Historic Property. It will be used as a basis to rehabilitation. The report on future rehabilitation design will again be prepared or performed by the direction of individuals, meetings of Professional Qualifications Standards for Historic Architects. We are targeting the end of 2023 to submit the final Historic Structures Report with rehabilitation work to follow upon approval of the Historic Structures Report and the recommendations therein.

Eleanor Gorski: Statue of the Republic. CDOT and the Chicago Park District will prepare a conservation assessment and proposed restoration plan for the Statue of the Republic. This plan will be consistent with Standards for Rehabilitation and it will be implemented in phases. The assessment plan and restoration will be performed by or under the direction of professional objects conservators with experience in applying the standards for restoration. The final assessment and restoration plans target would be submitted by the end of 2023 with restoration work initiated following the approval of the conservation assessment and proposed restoration plan.

Eleanor Gorski: The next stipulation is in regards to design review. And this is design review of the recreation replacement at the east end of the Midway Plaisance. Again, CDOT and the Chicago Park District will conduct a public engagement process with input from consulting parties and the public to review final design options from the Chicago Park District for the play area features to be used and the recreation plan for the east end of the Midway Plaisance and fulfillment of the City's responsibility under UPARR, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act. From this public engagement the City will decide on the final design to be implemented in the Midway Plaisance, taking into account the consideration of the consulting parties and the public. CDOT will then communicate the final design to the public and the consulting parties promptly upon the City's decision. We are targeting a public engagement process to be completed by the end of 2022.

Eleanor Gorski: And finally planting review. The review of planting plans for tree replacement will be conducted by CDOT and the Chicago Park District to ensure that the planting plans detail and the species and replacement of native planting as required in the GLFER mitigation area are consistent with the original GLFER approval.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. Now we're on to the next steps and I believe I am handing this back to Matt Fuller. Looking forward to the conversation as we move ahead with the questions on these mitigation options. And then finally, we will have an opportunity for discussion at the end.

Matt Fuller: Thanks, Eleanor. Before we get into the comment period for the consulting parties, just an overarching view of the next steps. We'll be accepting comments from both the public and consulting parties on the draft MOA through August 10 at 12:00 PM Central Time. And we ask that you send those to my email address and carbon copy Todd Wyatt at the City. The agencies will review and consider that input received and revise the MOA as necessary. And the required signatories and invited signatories and consulting parties will receive a copy of the MOA with the request to sign the respective signature sheets and the signature sheet should be returned to Federal Highway Administration. Other federal review processes are also being conducted concurrently including NEPA and Section 4(f)'s processes are ongoing and the implementation of the mitigation measures may begin once the MOA is executed. And just a reminder that again it has been our past practice on these webinars, the City will post meeting audio transcript and additional correspondence received on the DPD's website.

Matt Fuller: I think I'm turning it back over to Eleanor at this point.

Eleanor Gorski: Yes. Okay. We would now like to open the meeting up to comments on the MOA. Again, to restate, each consulting party will have an opportunity to call in and provide comments on the MOA. If you choose not to make the comment, please enter your organization name in the chat box and indicate that you have no comments at this time. And we're doing this so we can keep a record that everyone has a chance to speak to this issue. Each consulting party will have a maximum of three minutes to speak and after each consulting party is given an opportunity to speak we will open up a second round for consulting parties to speak regarding the MOA. And then as we did for the last meeting, consulting parties will have an opportunity to ask questions, in general, anything about the process following the comment period.

Eleanor Gorski: So with that, let's open this up.

Allison Caloggero: Denise, can you please inform our participants how to queue?

Denise (Operator): Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, if you wish to ask a question please press 1 then 0 on your telephone keypad. You may withdraw your question at any time by pressing the 1-0 command. If you are using a speaker phone, please pick up the handset before pressing the numbers. Once again, if you have a question you may press 1 then 0 at this time. One moment for our first question. One moment, please. [Pause] And our questions are loading at this time and our first question is from Al DeBonnett. Please go ahead.

Al DeBonnett: Hello.

Denise (Operator): Your line is open, Al. You may go ahead.

Eleanor Gorski: We can hear you. And Al, could you please state which organization you're representing?

Al DeBonnett: Hi, everyone. This is Al DeBonnett, Chair of the Jackson Park Golf and Community Leadership Council and 20 year Fifth Ward stakeholder and home owner. As everyone knows, in December of 2015, I was appointed by Alderman Harrison to lead a roundtable of community leaders and Jackson Park stakeholders that represent more than 5,000 residents, business owners, Jackson Park patrons and sports league members, golfers that use Jackson Park every day. And again, community members wanted to have a voice in the restoration of the golf course and the harmonious development with the OPC. So in four years I attended at least 120 community meetings, board meetings, PAC meetings, Harbor Boater meetings, Park District forums, OPC community meetings, CDOT meetings, 1Woodlawn meeting, homeowner's associations, renters, sports league meetings, Chamber of Commerce and so forth and so on. Unequivocally, these stakeholders support the development but there were four common threads throughout all these meetings and all of the input. Being one, people were still angry about losing the Lucas Museum and Lucas Museum and the \$10 billion dollar

economic impact it would have on Chicago and which would be much needed. Two, park vested stakeholders did not want to see that happen again to the multi-billion dollar economic engine that would be the OPC. Three, they wanted to engage in the long overdue restoration of a 19th century golf course that was built in 1899 and wanted to bring it to the standards of the 21st century. And four, the most important, the long overdue need to address Americans with Disabilities Act compliance and be it park development and restoration efforts that were now underway. So with this pandemic, no one foresaw that we would have these great leads and have this opportunity and would squander it by the voices of the few who do not represent the overwhelming voices. So I'm speaking to especially the Council, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. It is important to know that every one of the stakeholders in all of this area had the opportunity to participate in this process and they overwhelmingly support this effort. Their voices are few who do not and they are not vested stakeholders who do not speak for. So therefore I would say this in full confidence. We thank you for all that you've done and I will leave the rest of my time to the others to voice their opinion. But thank you for allowing this participation by the community and have a wonderful day.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you.

Denise (Operator): And the next comment is from Lisa DiChiera.

Eleanor Gorski: Again I'd like to remind participants that we really want to focus this section of the meeting on comments on the MOA stipulation. General comments please save to the end or if you have general questions. Thanks. Go ahead, Lisa.

Denise (Operator): Your line is now open.

Lisa DiChiera: Hi, Lisa DiChiera with Landmarks Illinois. What I'd like to know, Eleanor, is out of the stipulations you mentioned in describing them a series of dates by which you hoped to have these processes begin and end. None of those dates are outlined actually in the draft MOA, so I'm wondering if those dates will be added to be more specific on those deadlines and that type of timeline for each of those items. And then if any of those projects are not completed whether it's the assessments, the recommendations, the actual rehabilitation of those structures, the Republic Statue as well as the Comfort Station, what are the legal obligations if they are not completed? What assurances do we have that that work will be done? And lastly, I'm just wondering why the decision was just those two structures, the Republic and the Comfort Station, because we know there's other structures and needs in the Park that have been identified in terms of in need of rehabilitation and conservation. And will there be opportunity to still add those, such as the Burnham designed structure on the east side of the Park as well as other things people have raised. So I'm just wondering where the legal obligation will be and if that will be further detailed in the MOA. I just have one other last question, too, which is the consulting parties that are listed in the draft MOA, many of those parties ended up either not participating or outright deny-- you know, not accepting 106 consulting party status. So that list is a little misleading in the document right now. There's a lot of organizations in there that have not participated at all.

So I'm wondering if there will be clarification as to which of the consulting parties truly that have participated versus that long list. And if the blank pages where one page is dedicated to each organization, if those will all be included even for those who never participated.

Eleanor Gorski: All great questions, Lisa. Thank you. And thank you for being precise and directing this towards the MOA. I'd like to take a stab at partially half your question and then I would ask Matt to step up for the legal questions that you had in regards to the MOA. So attachment C to the document does list the target schedule and the dates that I combined on the slide essentially combined the stipulations with attachment C so it was easy to read and you could see the link between the two. But they're separated so that you could see the target schedule all in one attachment and it's listed chronologically so the public can understand when different things are happening. And then two, when you asked why the two restoration projects were happening and why those were chosen, again, they were close to the undertaking, to the work happening. There's directly road work happening next to each one of those structures and also they appear to be the most in need of restoration compared to their proximity to the undertaking. Certainly if this group has suggestions where they would like to see something else done now is the time to suggest that. We don't doubt that there is a lot of work that needs to happen in Jackson Park and as you know the South Lakefront Framework Plan that was done by the Park District speaks to not just historic structures but other recreational opportunities that also need to be addressed. And that's part of the reason why we are also doing the documentation section of this where we're documenting existing conditions. So that as the funding presents itself to make improvements to the Park, that we're doing it in connection with some of the historic principles that we've outlined through this process.

Eleanor Gorski: So with that, Matt, would you mind jumping in on the legal issues that Lisa asked about?

Matt Fuller: Sure, Eleanor. So I'll try to go through the items that Lisa outlined. I think I captured them all in my notes. One is regarding the legal obligation to complete the mitigation stipulations. And again, just to reiterate the stipulations that are in MOA are legal obligations that Federal Highway must ensure that those are complete. And we work very closely with our applicant, in this case the Chicago Department of Transportation and IDOT to make sure that those mitigation measures are implemented as committed to in the agreement. And we've had very good success with our applicants both with, you know, IDOT and the Chicago DOT implementing mitigation measures as part of projects at large and then also specifically historic preservation commitments. And so our commitment, Federal Highways commitment is that if we sign the document, those mitigation measures are going to be done. And we do everything we can to work with the applicants to make sure they get done in a timely manner as committed to in the document. Lisa also mentioned the list of consulting parties and that some of the parties that are listed may not be active in the last several meetings or maybe there's some issues with the list. And so we can work over the next several weeks to try to really identify which consulting parties are still actively engaged and make that list kind of match up with folks that are actually involved in the consultation at this point and get that prepared for the next version of the MOA.

Matt Fuller: Eleanor, did I capture the items that you anticipated that I would capture?

Eleanor Gorski: Yeah. I believe so. That's what I had as well.

Matt Fuller: Okay.

Eleanor Gorski: So I think we're ready for the next caller.

Denise (Operator): And now we have the line of Louise McCurry. Please go ahead.

Louise McCurry: Hi, can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes. Hi, Louise.

Louise McCurry: Hi. First just let me say thank you. Having been doing this now for the last 11 years, this has been a long process and you can't know how grateful we are. I represent Jackson Park Advisory Council where we have thousands of volunteers who are out in that Park every single week cleaning, repairing, taking care of the Park, trying to make it a safe place for our kids. Two things that come out of the MOU that really make me excited. One is the Comfort Station. Once again, we have when we started working the Park ten years ago there were maybe two or three people we would see a day. Now we see on the average of about 20 to 25 wheelchairs making their way through the Park. So one of the things with the MOU I hope gets covered in that the conversation is a handicapped accessible place because it truly, truly is needed by the people that come through the Park every day in wheelchairs. We had to come the side where people feel safe to come in the chairs and just sit and roll through and enjoy the Park. The second thing is the amazing playgrounds for children. We've had a long couple of weeks in which violence in the neighborhoods had been really severe. Our children desperately need a safe play space and so we really hope that in the MOU we can put together a plan for a space that kids who are traumatized in neighborhoods around Chicago who come to Jackson Park anyway will have another safe play space to play in. And then third, it's just the incredible work with the GLFER process. We spent, oh, my goodness, days and days going through all those GLFER plans for which plants and which trees and which designs. We really, really were enthusiastic about that process and how it came together creating a place that looks much like the original plan for the World's Fair in terms of planting. It's really exciting to see much of that's going to be replaced and the GLFER project will be a way of greater accessibility for people coming from the Park into the western border of the Park into the interior of the Park. So all three of these things we think are really, really wonderful. We enthusiastically support it and hope that we can be part of the process of making it happen. The MOU was like music to our ears. It was a really wonderful way to say that these things might actually happen. It's not just a dream. The Southside often gets great plans and they don't get followed through with. We're really excited this might actually happen, so we say thank you so much and sincerely are grateful for your time. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Thanks, Louise. We have your comment about accessibility for the restrooms. Much appreciated. And we're ready for our next caller.

Denise (Operator): And the line of Ward Miller is open. Please go ahead.

Ward Miller: Oh, yes. Good morning, everyone. Can you hear me all right?

Eleanor Gorski: We can. Good morning, Ward.

Ward Miller: Good morning, Eleanor and everyone. I'm Ward Miller with Preservation Chicago. You know, I think it's pretty clear that we've been opposed to what we feel is an extremely damaging proposal to Jackson Park with extreme adverse effects. And unfortunately, none of these mitigation measures for Jackson Park reflecting really meaningful suggestions and ideas have been reflected in the MOA. And I just want to stress that because, you know, plaques are great but they're only tokens. And we really need something meaningful here. And these are tokens and crumbs, considering the loss of 19.5 acres of this Frederick Law Olmsted landscape. And, you know, reflecting on the MOA, you know, we really should be looking at repair of all of the structures even beyond the "undertaking area" of English Comfort Station. And it should include the Iowa Building which is, you know, very close by and the Daniel Burnham Comfort Station as we call it on South Shore Drive near 67th Street, which is literally falling apart in every way. It's fenced off. Its roof has collapsed. You know, these are embarrassments. And you know, certainly we should be getting something in terms of repairs. You know, pathways in Jackson Park are falling apart. The Park District doesn't have the funds to do it. Now this is where the City and the Obama Foundation could really come together and do some meaningful work that would really encourage more usage in the Park, you know, tied to everybody's usage. So we really want to encourage that. You know the Statue of the Republic really should be repaired by B.F. Ferguson Fund, which repairs statues and monuments throughout our park system and our city. And, you know, these are really just tokens. How about something with teeth. You know, how about making Jackson Park Midway in Washington Park, you know, a national park or part of the National Park Service idea where, you know, maintenance and care and policing could all be part of a shared idea with the City of Chicago, the National Park Service and the Chicago Park District. And how about a landmark designation for these parks so we don't have this happening again and again and again? We see this happening time and time again. So you know, here are some real solid ideas that wouldn't really cost a lot of money to implement. But, you know, certainly if we're going to give up 19.5 acres of Jackson Park, we should have as part of the MOA Agreement the Iowa Building and the Comfort Station and the pathways and roadways in Jackson Park repaired. And just want to also mention that, you know, the SHPO's comments, the Illinois SHPO's comments, we don't feel we're reflected in the MOA and we'd like to see more of that. And if this is going to happen in Jackson Park, I think we'd like to see a plan that's a little more integrated into the Jackson Park idea of the Olmsted idea, sort of nestled in the Park rather than, you know, an obelisk and a monument, you know, extending up 230 feet in the air in the closure of all these Olmsted roads. Our city is really broken. It's time to recognize that. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Thanks for your comments, Ward. I think we're--

Ward Miller: You're welcome.

Eleanor Gorski: Ready for the next comment.

Denise (Operator): The line of Stephanie Franklin is now open. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Franklin: Good morning. This is Stephanie Franklin. I represent the Nichols Park Advisory Council of which I am the President and I have a brief statement. This proposed Memorandum of Agreement is a betrayal of the Section 106 process and reflects a total failure to make a good faith effort to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse effects of the proposed projects. The City's apparent reliance on processes that took place prior to the Development of the Assessment of Effects is specious because it renders the Section 106 process a nullity that was over before it even started. The refusal to give no more than pro forma consideration of avoidance and minimization is in conflict with applicable federal regulations under Section 106 in the Code of Federal Regulations §800.1 which states that, while planning activities may take place prior to the completion of compliance with Section 106, that is only true if "such actions do not restrict the subsequent consideration of a alternatives to avoid, minimize or mitigate the undertaking's adverse effects on historic properties." To be absolutely honest, all parties already know there is no possible way to mitigate the destruction of Jackson Park after 500 to 1000 trees are clear cut, Cornell Drive is closed creating a traffic nightmare and a landscaped campus complete with a huge tower in the path of a national migratory bird flyway is constructed, except by refusing to fund or otherwise authorize it. The excuse that any of these agencies cannot refuse funding or authorization as long as the paperwork is correctly completed is not only insulting but also untrue. Under §800.6 the lead agency is required to work with consulting parties to seek ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse effects. Under §800.2, the views of the public are described as essential to inform Federal decision making. Under §800.10, the lead agency is required "to the maximum extent possible to undertake such planning and actions as may be necessary to minimize harm to any national historic landmark that may be directly and adversely affected by an undertaking." For example, the City's concession that it will engage in a public process concerning UPARR replacement is illusory. The City chose the eastern end of the Midway as its UPARR replacement site in a secret process without any public input. It then stalled the--

Todd Wyatt: Excuse me. Stephanie.

Stephanie Franklin: Excuse me?

Todd Wyatt: That was the three minute timer. We would invite you to resume your comments at the end of the presentation.

Stephanie Franklin: I have two more-- two more sentences. It would be wrong as well as illegal to shortcut the Section 106 process without having a complete and full public discussion of the justification for any previous determination that avoidance and minimization were considered unfeasible or unreasonable. That complete and full public discussion has yet to take place. We believe the first Black President of the United States deserves to be recognized and honored for what he accomplished, not remembered for what he destroyed. He deserves his own monument, not someone else's. We will not sign the Memorandum of Agreement in its proposed form and urge all other parties, including the Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, to refuse to sign. Thank you so much.

Todd Wyatt: Thank you, Stephanie.

Denise (Operator): The next line is from the line of Brenda Nelms. Please go ahead.

Brenda Nelms: Hi. This is Brenda Nelms with Jackson Park Watch. I want to echo to a large extent what both Ward and Stephanie Franklin have said and that the MOA as its currently drafted does nothing to address the identified adverse effects and it's kind of a contradiction of the definition of the undertaking that's included in the MOA which does include the whole-- all the changes to the Park. And this does a disservice, I think, to the Obama Center Plan, which has been stalled now for three years or four years, but it's also making a focus on the fact that what we're reviewing now is a plan that's really outdated and outmoded and it's been superseded by the developments of just the past few months. The COVID pandemic, the rising lake levels and so on have really undercut all the basic assumptions for the Obama Center as it's currently designed. And we no longer think crowds are great. We are questioning how we handle museums. Our projections for tourism and visitors that were part of the planned economic impact of the Center are in doubt and at the same time the City has enormous physical problems and it's difficult to understand how they or the State can pay the tens of millions in public funds that are needed to enact the current plan, which is when there are many, many urgent demands on public funding. And all of this including the rising lake levels that challenge the wisdom of closing Lake Shore Drive when-- closing Cornell Drive and relying on the widened Lake Shore Drive right next to the Lake within spitting distance there as the primary artery for southbound commuter-- northbound commuters I guess, too. It just calls everything into question. So it's time to rethink the whole plan to address 2020 conditions. This is not saying the Obama Center should not be built. It's not even say where it should be built, although I think the challenges in Jackson Park are enormous. It is saying that we need a new plan and we need to rethink this so that it can actually get built in some near-term situation. Regarding this, I would like to ask for clarification for what the FHWA actually who pays for the various mitigation plans that are put out there? And I'm particularly interested in the one for the Midway.

Matt Fuller: Hi, Ms. Nelms. This is Matt Fuller with Federal Highway. I'll take the funding question at a very high level and then ask the City if they want to respond more specifically. What I can say is that any mitigation measure that's part of a project that we fund, those mitigation expenses are eligible for federal aid funding. Whether or not the applicant chooses to

use those funds is ultimately up to them and sometimes they make those decisions based on a number of different factors, but they're certainly eligible for federal aid funding. But again, the bottom line is that any mitigation measure that appears in the MOA is enforceable and it will be completed regardless of what the funding source is. So Eleanor, I don't know if you want to speak to any specific funding of those mitigation measures at this time.

Eleanor Gorski: I would say that with all the City agencies that are involved we plan on working that out through our individual budgets and our planning budgets and the construction budgets that we already have in place to do these type of improvements. More specifics have not been determined at this time.

Brenda Nelms: Is there any estimate for what all this would cost? The current, the ones that are actually included in the MOA?

Eleanor Gorski: We do know the general cost of these types of projects as the City has done this work before, yes.

Brenda Nelms: And will that be released?

Eleanor Gorski: It will be released when we bid out the work, certainly, yes; as the work comes online as we do for typical City projects, correct.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay, I think we're ready to move on to the next caller. Thank you, Brenda.

Denise (Operator): The next caller is Perri Irmer. Please go ahead.

Perri Irmer: And then I just want to say thank you to the city, state and federal agencies. You have been amazingly responsive and responsible throughout this process of the 106 review, all the reviews. It's been a long time, many years, of course, that we have been engaged in these conversations. I certainly don't know of any group that has not been allowed to voice its opinion. I know that a lot of opinions are disagreed with and a lot of folks whose opinions are not being accepted by the community want to just keep hammering that nail and it's time to move on. I'd like to start first of all, I apologize. I am the President and CEO of the DuSable Museum of African-American History. As you know, we are located at the west end of the South Park system in Washington Park and we are a 106 consulting party. I provided a statement that I'm happy to forward to any of you who might be interested in reading it. You can email me at pirmer@dusablemuseum.org if you'd like that information. I'd actually like to start with the most recent comment from Jackson Park Watch. I think it's very interesting that now you're okay with addressing 2020 conditions. So why not address 2020 conditions with respect to Jackson Park, not just with respect to the OPC? This is a position that we have been discussing for years now. The 2020 conditions put people over parks. It is not an homage to the designers of the Park centuries ago; it is the home to a predominantly African-American community which to pick up on some other terminology used earlier has been dealing with tokens and crumbs and

embarrassment in the conditions of our communities for decades and decades. So I would encourage you to step on the other side of the mirror when you're using terminology like this and understand how insensitive and frankly insulting it is for us as African-American residents of these communities that are directly affected, not folks from the North Side, not folks from other areas that have literally nothing to do with the communities that are going to be improved around this Park, but continually want to put centuries old designs and assumed intentions of designers ahead of the communities that this will benefit. So the 2020 conditions, to echo Al DeBonnett, aren't just the pandemic. The 2020 conditions are widespread protests on racial inequities and racial inequality which a blind man can see has been part of this issue for opponents of this project from the very beginning. And to refer--

Todd Wyatt: Excuse me, thank you. Three minutes is up and we would like to invite you to participate at the end for additional--

Perri Irmer: Thank you very much and just I would just want to say that I am in complete support of the MOU as it has been reviewed and presented today. Thank you.

Denise (Operator): Our next line is from the line of Bronwyn Lodato. Please go ahead.

Bronwyn Nichols Lodato: Hello, can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: We can. Hi, Bronwyn.

Bronwyn Nichols Lodato: <laughs> Hello. Hi, good morning, everyone. And it's Bronwyn Lodato. I know it's a mouthful. I'm with MPAC, and just had a couple of questions about the MOA. The first one is, is there a process for correcting errors where there's been a comment attributed to MPAC that's incorrect? I don't want to spend my time kind of figuring it out, just wanted to know what that next step would need to be. And then we did have a question one of our members had submitted I wanted to share, a general question about whether pedestrian overpasses like the ones downtown between Art Institute and Grant Park and the silver bridge over Cornell Drive connected to Maggie Daley Park have been considered to the greatest extent possible in lieu of permanent street closures? And then my final point is just to--just acknowledge that it's distressing, certainly, to hear that there are adverse effects to the Midway Plaisance. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: I'm sorry. I did have a follow up, if you wouldn't mind, Bronwyn. In the chat I guess if you're off the line, if you do have corrections if there was something stated in error in the MOA, could you please indicate that? Because now would be the time to correct that. This is a draft and we're looking to make this as accurate as possible. And for the record, I don't believe there were adverse effects indicated for the Midway in the Assessment of Effects.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay, please go ahead for the next caller.

Denise (Operator): The next line is Dan Marriott. Please go ahead.

Dan Marriott: Hello. Dan Marriott with the National Association for Olmsted Parks. A little bit of clarity, please, regarding some of the details. If I heard correctly, and I couldn't find the Appendix mentioned, that the HALS survey, Historic American Landscapes Survey, needs to be completed by 2020. If I heard that correctly and having done HALS surveys in the past I think it's an extraordinarily quick time and turnaround to complete them. It's very, very important and to me very much at the core of this whole conversation about the identification and documentation of the park heritage if there is to be change. So I'd like some clarification on that and ask that if that is the case that a more reliable and responsible due date for HALS determination to be considered. Secondly, a question early on Matt mentioned that Cornell Drive was one of the ideas that had been raised initially and was considered dismissed because it wasn't related to this undertaking. I'm curious how a project that has been driven largely by transportation funding and transportation changes for this part of this review can determine a Park drive is not part of a consideration. And lastly regarding UPARR, I believe that, you know, taking other bits of historic parkland and transferring things that are being lost in terms of recreation to historic sites is missing the whole conversation here. In a part of the city that is severely lacking in public park space, it seems to me that new properties could be identified and acquired for new parks that might be closer to residents that are severely under-parked. Those are my three comments, National Association for Olmsted Parks. Thank you very much.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you, Dan. I'd like to take a stab at two parts of your question. The field documentation is the documentation to be completed by 2020 and that is stipulation B. And specifically if you'll bear with me, I would like to read that stipulation so it's on the record. "CDOT and the Chicago Park District will prepare photographs and drawings documenting existing conditions on A, the 19.3 acre site plan for the OPC; B, the east end of the Midway Plaisance; and C, the areas planned for traffic improvements in Jackson Park. The work will be prepared in accordance with the Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) guidelines for an existing conditions plan, vegetative plan, field photographs, keyed off site plan, and aerial photographs. The work will be prepared by or under the supervision of individuals who meet the relevant SOI Professional Qualification Standards for History or Landscape History." So I hope that that clarifies it a bit for you. And then I believe that Matt can answer anything further in your question.

Matt Fuller: Yeah, so the question was about Cornell Drive and from Federal Highways' perspective, again, the Cornell Drive is a roadway that's really owned and maintained between the Illinois Department of Transportation and the Chicago Department of Transportation. And so any decision by those entities to close those roads are really up to them. Federal Highway doesn't have a say or a decision making authority in those kinds of decisions by local and state agencies, so while those decisions drive the need to look at transportation alternatives to address the traffic impacts from that change, the decision to close it itself is not within our purview to change.

Dan Marriott: Matt, just one question regarding that. Can you hear me?

Matt Fuller: Yes, I can hear you.

Dan Marriott: Yes. The question with that is even if they're owned and maintained by city and state, I assume there's going to be some federal funding involved with all of this?

Matt Fuller: Not in the closures or removal of the roadways, no.

Dan Marriott: But with the other activities going on, it just it seems odd to me that this can be completely out of the conversation. And I'll leave my comment at that.

Matt Fuller: Yeah. The potential federal funding would be for changes, Hayes Drive and Lake Shore Drive there's no federal aid funding proposed for the road closures or removal. Maybe the City can provide further clarity on how that is going to work. That's part of the OPC site itself and so I'm not sure how the, you know, the mechanisms for funding that work, how that's going to happen.

Emily Ferguson: This is Emily Ferguson from the National Park Service and I wanted to answer the piece about the UPARR question. The Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program was all about revitalizing areas of parks and that needed to be sort of beautified or bolstered or reinvigorated. So the program was never about purchasing property, so in the conversion provisions for UPARR it is about identifying replacement park property. It does not have to be a new piece of property. It can be an existing park property. And I hope that helps.

Dan Marriott: So just my last comment on that is these could be other parks within the neighborhood, within the South Side beyond just trying to solve this within Jackson Park and the Midway?

Emily Ferguson: It would be whatever the sponsor for the grant, which is the City of Chicago, identifies where they want to replace the lost park. So they've identified Midway as where they would like to provide more an updated outdoor recreation or actually recreation opportunity.

Dan Marriott: So that local communities could suggest other locations for park improvement then?

Emily Ferguson: They would have to probably provide those to the City.

Dan Marriott: Thank you.

Denise (Operator): We now have the line of Karen Adams. And it is open, go ahead, please.
[Pause] Karen Adams, your line is now open.

Erin Adams: This is Erin Adams. Is that--? Can you hear me?

Denise (Operator): My apologies. Go ahead.

Erin Adams: That's fine. So Erin Adams, South Side Neighbors for Hope. I first want to thank all of the agencies involved for the City and federal for a really long and thorough process. You know, I've been engaged with this process from the very beginning and have been disheartened to see the delays that have occurred. But I know that, you know, the city and the federal agencies really have put their greatest efforts into making sure that all of the voices were heard in a fair and equitable way. I did want to just give some perspective because I've heard over and over again at the many meetings that I've attended similar words being used and similar refrains from a very few members that are opposed to this project. And I've always really been bewildered as to how terms like destroying Jackson Park with the OPC being built are being used in this context. And I just want to reflect a story of something that happened to me very recently. I was talking to a colleague who has been opposed to the OPC in Jackson Park and he was saying, "Oh, you know, I was out walking. It was beautiful and so quiet. And I was in Wooded Aisle and, you know, the OPC is just going to destroy all of that." And I said, "Well, actually, you know, the OPC is not going to be located in Wooded Aisle or, you know, even abutting it." And he said, he looked at me and he said, "Oh, well, where is it being located?" And it really just made me think that so many of the people out there that had been on this bandwagon of repeatedly saying that it's destroying Jackson Park, might not have actually looked at the plan for the park. And so I encourage all of you to maybe go back and look at the environmental plans, all of the planting. The fact that every tree that will be taken down, many of which are diseased or not in good state or don't represent the diversity that probably should be there and probably won't be there in 10 or 20 years due to climate change, that these are being replaced with a very incredibly well thought out environmental plan to make sure that the parkland that the OPC will be sited on is going to be suitable for wildlife, for children and for people of our South Side communities but also people from our nation to bring them together. And I think that's the keyword is together. I also, you know, there are arguments about Cornell being closed and the affect that it's going to have on traffic. Have people actually looked at the traffic plan to see? You know, there's actually a net positive effect of traffic flow that's being predicted by the rerouting along Hayes Drive and the expansion of Lake Shore Drive. The expansion of Lake Shore Drive--

Todd Wyatt: Excuse me, thank you, Erin. That was three minutes.

Erin Adams: Okay. Let me just finish. I totally support the MOA and my organization looks forward to singing it.

Todd Wyatt: Thank you.

Denise (Operator): The next line is the line of Naomi Davis. Your line is now open.

Naomi Davis: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We believe strongly that the UPARR replacement should include new parklands including parcels in historic West Woodlawn--

Todd Wyatt: Excuse me. Naomi, can you state your consulting party affiliation?

Naomi Davis: Hello?

Todd Wyatt: Hello. Can you state your consulting party affiliation before we begin?

Naomi Davis: Certainly. Naomi Davis, President and Founder of Blacks in Green.

Todd Wyatt: Thank you very much.

Naomi Davis: Mm-hmm. I'll start over. UPARR replacement should include new parklands including parcels in historic West Woodlawn honoring the journey of great migration strivers who settled Chicago's first black middle income neighborhood, including icons of the American story, such as Lorraine Hansberry, Emmett Till, Gwendolyn Brooks and renowned sculptor Richard Hunt. The replacement parkland should not be limited to the Midway and Blacks In Green, otherwise known as BIG, has been advancing international heritage tourism here since 2013 by beginning the cultivation of the 16 great migration gardens of West Woodlawn and that 2016 homage, 16 Great Migrations. The gardens are an homage to the 2016 Centennial. City-owned land and other supports could and should be wisely invested in the establishment of such green spaces which would be privately stewarded as community land trusts public spaces. And it's our great joy and honor to support the process by fulfilling the requirement for replacement land in a way that genuinely reflects the amount of parkland that is being removed from public circulation. We stand ready to partner in that regard.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you, Naomi. We appreciate your comment. Can we have the next caller, please?

Denise (Operator): We have no more callers at this time.

Eleanor Gorski: I think that this point--

Denise (Operator): Oh, we do-- Oh, I didn't mean to interrupt. We do have one line that is queuing up for a comment if that is okay.

Eleanor Gorski: That's fine and I was just going to say to my colleague, it may be good, Todd, I believe you're keeping track of the consulting party list for us just to run through who has not spoken yet, just verbally to make folks aware that if they would like to speak now would be the time. But we can hear this party first.

Todd Wyatt: Okay.

Denise (Operator): We're waiting for that party to load. It will be just another moment. Thank you. [Pause]

Denise (Operator): And the line of Gary Ossewaarde is open. Go ahead, Gary.

Gary Ossewaarde: Yes. Gary Ossewaarde, Jackson Park Advisory Council. Naomi noted the need for parkland, especially West Woodlawn and other areas around there. If this can't be done through the UPARR system, then we ought to work for it anyway and make sure that that happens. Also the same is true for the other historic properties that certainly need help and we've been pushing for it for them for years and also for the not historic but a new fieldhouse and other things that need to be done in the park. And the fact that some things are being done will help encourage that. One historic thing hasn't been mentioned that should be, because it's under the UPARR area and will directly interact with whatever is done on the Midway, is the Women's Bench on the hill for the train tracks. It's very historic and I think that its restoration, which is cheap compared to the Comfort Station and Statue of the Republic, ought to be definitely be put on the list because it will be affected by any changes to the Midway. I want to thank the process and want to thank the people, both the people who have strongly supported and the people who have criticized, have given considerable help in understanding not only the plans, the current conditions, the past and future trajectories of Jackson Park. I hope that a lot of these good ideas and ideas for mitigation which really are in many cases improvements for the Park be passed on to the interpretive due process and that that be an open process so that we all can give our ideas to flesh out the framework plan and memorialize and honor the people and bring the history story up to date, especially in these times when we're questioning some of the namings of parks and some of the other things that have been happening. But the story is incomplete as far as including everyone, all Americans in the wonderful story that can be told to Jackson Park which can become more and more a welcoming place and yet honoring nature and its needs. Thank you.

Denise (Operator): The next line is the line of Alisa Starks. Please go ahead.

Alisa Starks: Good morning. My name is Alisa Starks and I'm a consulting party today representing Don Nash Park Advisory Council. And I wanted to provide our membership support of all of the mitigation efforts that have been presented. I want to also say that we support the way the entire process has been done. This has been a very transparent process, even though it at times has been frustrating to hear the continuing comments from naysayers over issues that have nothing to do with the process for mitigation. And that's basically it. Thanks so much for all the work that you've done and I look forward to moving forwards and seeing the OPC come to fruition. Thank you.

Denise (Operator): The next line is the line of Mary Lu Seidel. Please go ahead.

Mary Lu Seidel: Hi, thanks. This is Mary Lu. Can you hear me okay? Hello?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes, we can, thank you.

Mary Lu Seidel: Okay, great. I'm Mary Lu Seidel with Preservation Chicago. I want to note that organizations like Preservation Chicago that are looking at the impact of this project

objectively have a complete and extensive awareness of the project's considerations, the flawed traffic study, the UPARR non-replacement of new parklands, the rising lake levels and the decades of disinvestment of communities of color in Chicago and throughout the nation. This internationally renowned park system that includes Jackson Park, Washington Park and the Midway Plaisance makes everyone a stakeholder in this process. Preservation Chicago supports the development of the Obama Presidential Center on the South Side of Chicago. All of the extraordinary impacts of such a development of a great president that has ties to Chicago and community organizing will be received if it is built on private land adjacent to one of these park spaces. I think the comment earlier about President Obama deserving his own monument and not someone else's are pretty incredible and right on. There is a great opportunity to improve Jackson Park, Washington Park and the Midway Plaisance without, and sorry, Anne, I'm going to use the word "destroying" the internationally significant value of this parkland. We can put people and our parks together without having this negative impact. I think it's essential that we don't make this if we don't support destroying Jackson Park we don't care about people of color. That is a preposterous and offensive attack on a process that is a federal process to ensure that we protect the legacy -- so many incredible historic legacies have been destroyed on the South Side of Chicago in the decades of urban renewal and not caring about people of color and communities of color. And here we have this opportunity to both improve the South Side, invest substantially with the Obama Presidential Center and have this great legacy for the city of Chicago. So thank you.

Allison Caloggero: Denise, could you please repeat the call line, how to dial in and queue as well as if they need help? I see in the chat pod that there is Kineret Jaffe who is not able to or says that she's able to dial in but she hasn't been accepted yet.

Denise (Operator): Oh, okay. As reference to queuing up for a question, you may press 1 then 0 on your telephone keypad. You may withdraw your question at any time by also repeating the 1-0 command. If you happen to be on the speaker phone it is best to pick up the handset before pressing the numbers. Once again, if you have a question you may press 1-0. And we'll go ahead to the next comment we have here. And then also to make you alert, when you press the 1-0 later an operator will answer the line and you will need to provide your name. The next line we have open-- Oh, go ahead.

Allison Caloggero: If they need help, what is the number to dial?

Denise (Operator): If they do need further assistance they may press star-0. An operator will assist them. Okay.

Allison Caloggero: Thank you.

Denise (Operator): Thank you.

Allison Caloggero: I think just while we're paused here, I think we want to just run through the list of those consulting parties who have not already spoken, just that we encourage you to call in or decline to comment in the chat pod, provide your comment in the chat pod or to call in dialing 1-0. So at this-- Todd, would you like to read them off?

Todd Wyatt: Yeah, sure. Thanks, Allison. Okay, these are the consulting parties that have registered for the webinar that have not called in yet. I'll read the list and then if you decline to comment we would appreciate it if you let us know that you decline to comment in the chat box. Otherwise, please call in if you'd like to comment.

Todd Wyatt: The first is One Woodlawn; Chicago Urban League; CTA; Emerald South Economic Development Collaborative; Friends of the Parks; FTATRO5; Golden Shore; Heritage Consulting Group; Hyde Park Art Center; Hyde Park Historical Society; Museum of Science and Industry; Nash Sanctuary; Obama Foundation; Open Lands; Rosalie Villa's Homeowners; SAIC; Save the Midway; South Shore Works; SOW Solutions; The Cultural Landscape Foundation; the University of Chicago; USEPA Region 5; Vista Garage Building Corp.; Vista Homes Building Corp.; Washington Park Advisory Council.

Todd Wyatt: And after we run through the parties that would like to comment then we will invite the Illinois SHPO and the ACHP to comment before we move into the question period. Thank you.

Allison Caloggero: Thanks, Todd. Denise, could you give us the next caller please?

Denise (Operator): Yes, the next caller is Donald McGruder. Your line is now open. Please go ahead.

Donald McGruder: Good morning, everyone. This is Donald McGruder representing the Midway Plaisance Advisory Council. Basically first I'll comment just to thank everyone for their efforts in providing this forum to be able to articulate our thoughts and positions. So I definitely do appreciate while it might not be perfect the efforts made to be as transparent and to be able to allow inclusiveness as far as our comments, so thank you for that. I do have a question that I want to-- that came from one of our members. And I think the question was asked earlier and I'm just not sure if it was answered to what we were looking for. And that question is whether or not pedestrian overpasses like the ones Downtown between the Art Institute and Grant Park and the—connected over Columbus Drive connected to Maggie Daley Park, have they been considered to be to the greatest extent possible in lieu of permanent street closures? And that's my question. Hello?

Eleanor Gorski: Hi, thank you.

Donald McGruder: Oh, okay.

Eleanor Gorski: I'm just considering who could answer this and how it relates to what we're discussing now. I would say Nate, were you able to, Nate Roseberry from CDOT, were you able to see this question and--

Nate Roseberry: Yeah.

Eleanor Gorski: Do you have any comments on that?

Nate Roseberry: Thanks, Eleanor, yeah. I understand the question of how do we look at treatment for determining how to improve pedestrian access within the Park. You know, there's a variety of improvements we look at and I think what you see for the design is that is the case. You'll see with the proposed design that there are new proposed pedestrian underpasses underneath roadways. I believe there's five new pedestrian underpasses trying to provide better access throughout the park and also connecting to the Lakefront Trail and the Lake Shore. For the question specifically about using underpasses in place of closing roadways, what we also looked at with the design for this was the integration of the land within the park. So it's not only providing pedestrian access, it's providing contiguous park space. So where we deemed roadways to stay open we looked at pedestrian crossings for those. Where we had opportunities to provide more contiguous parkland, there's the recommendations for the roadway closures.

Donald McGruder: Okay. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Thanks, Nate. Thanks. And I would remind everyone, let's try to finish up the comments on the MOA specifically if you don't mind and then we will move to general comments about the process after we have finished up the section because we do still want to go to our partners ACHP and the SHPO. Who do we have next queued up?

Denise (Operator): Your line is now open.

Mike McNamee: Hi. This is Mike McNamee from Save the Midway. Can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes, we can. Hi, Mike.

Mike McNamee: Hi. So I just want to echo Don. I appreciate everyone's participation and contributions and the process that's made all this work pretty well. We support the Illinois State Preservation Offices request in their letter to the City's Department of Planning and Development of May 26 for partly including a request for additional design review to shift the proposed Obama Presidential Center campus south to allow the historic roadway connection between the Midway and Jackson Park to remain in place and to avoid the demolition of the historic Women's Garden. And also the work, additional design review of the work of the UPARR conversion to the east end of the Midway Plaisance must meet the standards for rehabilitation as determined by the Illinois SHPO. And I believe that second is not included in the MOA as it's written right now. Okay, thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you, Mike. Do we have someone else on the line? We have a lot of folks that are not providing comment as you can see in the chat, but please, do we have someone else queued up?

Denise (Operator): Yes. The line of Carol Adams is now open.

Carol Adams: Good afternoon and thank you all for the work that has been put in on this MOA. We absolutely support it. I am a consulting party for South Shore Works and we are hoping that soon we'll be at a groundbreaking instead of our endless efforts to keep this project alive and moving forward. The notion that using 19.5 acres of a park that's in excess of 500 acres for the Obama Presidential Center is giving up parkland is interesting to me in this space, because I don't think it's giving up land, I think it's using land and I think it's using it for a very elevated purpose for something that we really have been wanting to see happen for a very long time. This dogged refusal of a few who want to take over and just trash the aspirations of the many is getting to be just extremely frustrating. I think the question is not just what trees do you save but what trees do you plant? How do we propose to see growth and development in our communities? How do we propose to activate and yes cultivate the promise of the future instead of idolizing a past that has been historically detrimental to many of us? We have to sow new seeds. We have to plant new ideas. We have to grow a new beloved community and this is an opportunity to do just that. Most of the people I represent do not have the luxury of obstruction, to devote 100 percent of their time to trying to stop something. They are too busy working or looking for work, training for jobs that you are trying to stop them from having. You show them your priorities every day that you are not the historic purists that you claim to be often in these forums because if you were you wouldn't have approved some of the things you have like the illegal dog run where the historic tennis courts used to be. Or the little square skating rink right in the middle of the beloved Midway Plaisance. So we want to move forward. We don't want the satisfaction of the few to trample the desires of the many. We support this. We enthusiastically endorse it. Let's get moving. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you, Dr. Adams.

Denise (Operator): On the line we have Kay Brown. Oh, I'm sorry. We'll go ahead and open the line of Kay Brown. Go ahead, please.

Kay Brown: Hello. I represent the Vista Garage which is accessed from 59th Street and immediately across from the east end of the Midway. So I would like to say a couple of things. First of all, I'm pleased to hear that there's additional planning and community involvement involved in the development of the east end of the Midway in whatever way it is ultimately utilized. I would support scattering the 19 acres of absented parkland to other parts of the community to ensure parks are closer to the residents that might use them, but I fear that bus has already departed and here we are. So glad to hear that there will be additional consultation. I encourage considerable input and study into water mitigation on the Midway, which will be a discussion for that future planning process. Today my primary question is, over and above the

Federal assurance that these mitigations will take place, I'm very concerned that they will fall by the wayside as funding and other priorities raise their heads. The City does have many, many other priorities and if the implementation of all of these mitigations falls on the City of Chicago, how can we assure that they will actually take place? Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you. I believe that that was addressed by Matt Fuller earlier in the conversation in terms of the legal ramifications and an answer to Lisa DiChiera. Do we have anyone else on the line that's queued up? Otherwise I would like Todd to go ahead and list the final folks that we are missing to add comments on the MOA because we are at a time check. We have 20 minutes left. And I do want to give a chance to SHPO and ACHP to give comments.

Denise (Operator): The next person on the line is Kineret Jaffe if that's okay. Your line is now open, Kineret.

Kineret Jaffe: Thank you, yes. Kineret Jaffe, Hyde Park Arts Center. Considering how late it is in the process I have thought about these comments much, much earlier on and kept trying to get in the queue so I will concede my time. I just wanted to have on the record my thanks as representing the Hyde Park Arts Center for this thorough and thoughtful process. You engaged so many people in the community in this process and like many, I am so tired of the delays. I think it's one of the few areas where I actually agree with Brenda Nelms and Jackson Park Watch. It is time to move forward. I speak and I've put these comments in a written form to you before August 10, but I speak as a cultural historian who's excited in thinking about the history of this park and all the things that have happened there and that can continue to happen going forward. And I'm also a master gardener and I will think about and then plead that the landscape plans will reflect our changing climate and will make the park even more beautiful and accessible. I'm baffled by those who are opposed to removing Cornell Drive and do this in the guise of thinking about Olmsted who never, ever would have imagined a six lane highway going through one of his beloved parks. So there are many aspects of what people have already said that I will want to reiterate and put in more detail, but I want to thank you again for all the work you've done and say let's get forward. Those who talked about the future, that's where we need to be focused. Let's move forward and get the Obama Presidential Center built. Thank you very much.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you. Todd, do you want to go ahead and list off who we haven't heard from?

Todd Wyatt: Yes. Sure, okay. These are the consulting parties that we have not heard from yet: One Woodlawn; Chicago Urban League; CTA; Emerald South; Friends of the Park; Nash; Obama Foundation; Rosalie Villa Homeowners; SOW Solutions; Cultural Landscape Foundation; USEPA Region 5; Vista Homes Building Corp.; Washington Park Advisory Council. So if I just called your name would you please either call in if you have comments or indicate in the chat box you decline to comment? And then we can move on to the question section of the presentation.

Eleanor Gorski: Do we have anyone calling in?

Denise (Operator): Yes.

Eleanor Gorski: There are people in the queue, because otherwise we could move to SHPO and ACHP while people queue up.

Denise (Operator): Yes, so we have more lines in queue.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay.

Denise (Operator): I could go ahead and get the next caller if you like.

Eleanor Gorski: Sure.

Denise (Operator): Okay. Ghian Foreman, your line is now open.

Ghian Foreman: Hi. Thank you very much. Eleanor, I'll be quick. A couple things I just wanted to comment on some of the previous statements. Number one, Chicago does have an--

Eleanor Gorski: Ghian?

Ghian Foreman: Yes.

Eleanor Gorski: Ghian, I'm sorry, can you say which consulting party you're with?

Ghian Foreman: Oh, okay. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Ghian Foreman, Emerald South Economic Development Collaborative.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you.

Ghian Foreman: So the first part that I wanted to say is that Chicago does have a robust park network and there have been improvements to those parks. Certainly, we would welcome additional improvements to those parks, so welcome to work with any parties who are really concerned about the state of the parks on the South Side. Absolutely willing to work with them to make sure that we can do that, as well as with the City. I think that we would be a great partner so that we can improve that. Second, in talking about 19 acres of land in the park that this proposal is seeking to improve upon, the surrounding communities, there's 200 acres of vacant land in the surrounding community; that's the size of Disneyland. The same amount of effort that we're using right now to think about these 19 acres, most of which will still remain green space to start to help us in the community and because it benefits the City as a whole, think about how could we repurpose those 200-plus acres to create economic benefit which leads us to the last thing. We're in a state of emergency right now. We're in a state of emergency due to dealing with

the pandemic, which has long lasting repercussion. The amount of businesses that we've seen close in these communities, record breaking. The amount of violence that's taking place, not necessarily record breaking, but there's no solution in sight. Jobs is one of the things that we ultimately, desperately need in the community, right. And so its projects like this that will directly create jobs and the economic impact that it will have will reverberate far beyond the 19 acres of this park. We invite all of those who are willing, who want to see the things kind of stay in place to preserve history, I invite you guys to let's make new history. Thank you very much.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you.

Denise (Operator): The next line is from the line of Stephanie Franklin. Your line is now open.

Stephanie Franklin: Thank you very much. I'd like to repeat a previous question which I don't believe was answered and that was the question of overpasses. Matt Fuller replied to that by talking about as to underpasses. But what about overpasses? Are those being considered?

Eleanor Gorski: Ms. Franklin, that is not pertaining to the MOA and due to time we'll come back to that when we are in the next section of the call. And what consulting party are you from?

Stephanie Franklin: Nichols Park Advisory Council.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. Thank you. And we will have that in the queue to answer with the next section. I appreciate it. Thank you. And again, I'd like to remind folks we're hearing from people for the first time who have not responded before. Is there anyone who meets that qualification? Otherwise I'd like to move on to SHPO and ACHP.

Denise (Operator): Currently there are no other lines that want to provide a comment.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. So can we please move to SHPO or ACHP, whoever would like to comment first?

C.J. Wallace: Hi, am I coming through?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes, you are.

C.J. Wallace: Great. This is C.J. Wallace at the State Historic Preservation Office and I would like to comment that we are satisfied with FHWA and the City of Chicago's response to our mitigation comment. We are in agreement that the mitigation measures stipulated in the MOA are representative of the scope and nature of this undertaking and we look forward to executing this MOA and moving forward with the project.

Jaime Loichinger: Eleanor, this is Jaime with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. It's been a great conversation today--

Eleanor Gorski: Go ahead Allison, sorry.

Allison Caloggero: No, I didn't say anything.

Eleanor Gorski: Oh, Jaime. I'm sorry. Go ahead, Jaime.

Jaime Loichinger: That's okay. Can you hear me, Eleanor?

Eleanor Gorski: I can, thank you. Please go ahead.

Jaime Loichinger: Okay, sure. So this is Jaime Loichinger with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and I just wanted to go ahead and say thank you to everybody who participated today. It's been a really thoughtful and thorough discussion. A few primary notes and this is just in general on the MOA but also on this particular step of the Section 106 process. One of the things that's concerned me has been kind of the implication that this is the final consultation meeting. I do think given the range of the comments as well as the detail that needs to be added to the MOA, it's likely that there will need to be another couple or at least a meeting to discuss the mitigation and to make sure that those stipulations have adequate detail and reasonable timelines. So FHWA should be prepared to have additional conversation. Also, you know, one of the other things we noted on one of these slides in the presentation earlier, and I'm not sure if this was intended or if this could be clarified right now, but it seems that the next step would be to revise the MOA and then ask the consulting parties to sign it. It's critically important that we all see the revised MOA before it goes out for signature. I know we at the ACHP spent a fair amount of time going through it to make sure that the references are appropriately included, that the cross references are correct and so on and so forth. So I just wanted to kind of call your attention to those items that, you know, this is a process, not an event, and generally resolution doesn't just happen in one meeting but we are getting much closer to an appropriate conclusion of the Section 106 process. So and with that I'll go ahead and turn it back over to the FHWA.

Matt Fuller: Thanks, Jaime. Will the Advisory Council be providing specific comments on areas where you see more detail needing to be provided then?

Jaime Loichinger: Yeah. We will be providing those comments to you shortly, but of course our comments are also informed by what we hear from the consulting parties. So today's conversation has been helpful in that regard.

Matt Fuller: Sure, understood.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. Matt, is there anything further that you would like to discuss or anything to tie up this meeting, at least the official MOA discussion, because I believe that we can then open it up to general comments and questions.

Matt Fuller: No, I don't have anything more to add, Eleanor, other than just to thank everyone for taking the time again today to participate in the meeting and provide your views and just a reminder that we have a close to the comment period of August 10, so please submit your comments to us no later than August 10 at 12:00 Noon.

Eleanor Gorski: And I would suggest as well, I'm seeing some messages in the chat, about asking for consulting parties to comment on additional time, et cetera. So if you could also include any comments that you have about that, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. Well, with that I would like to open it up to general comments and questions. Even if you've spoken before, now's your time. And before we move on from that, Matt or Nate, could we address the question about overpasses that came up from the Vista Homes Consulting party?

Nate Roseberry: Sure, I can take that, Eleanor.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you.

Nate Roseberry: So the question about whether-- Yeah, happy to-- the question about whether to look at overpasses or underpasses, when we look at what we call grade separating pedestrians and bicycles from roadways there are two ways to do it, either going underneath the roadway or over the roadway. It was in our recommendation that any new grade separations within the park be done under the roadway to minimize the visual impacts within the park. Our cursory review of any overpasses is the grades required to be able to get pedestrians up to a level where they would be adequate to get above the roadway, any clearances would have a greater impact to the park, so that was why the recommendation was to pursue underpasses.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay, with that, do we have anyone in the queue again for general comments or questions?

Denise (Operator): We do have a question loading up at this time or a comment and it is from the line of Al DeBonnett. Please go ahead. One moment, please. Your line is now open, Al.

Al DeBonnett: Again, thank you for really allowing this. And again, to Jaime and Emily and AHP Advisory Council, I have a question more than anything. Because we've been monitoring the entire process from beginning to end before obviously it started, and there is now the time that will pass. There is a point of no return with respect to certain shoreline and infrastructure projects built out because of the south lakefront framework plan that we first devised in 1999 and updated in 2017 and here we are at 2020. And we just, Jaime just stated another two, three meetings and I'm saying to myself, "Everyone else on the call, really? Really?" So of course there is revision needs with respects to the MOA with consultant parties, yes; but do we need another meeting and calls for that? And again, who am I? And again, you're the Assistant Director, so I defer to your judgment, but I would like to speak on behalf of the thousands that

have participated over the years. They are ready and willing and able and there has been tremendous community input in this process. So we can-- and of course I'll enumerate this in writing-- could strongly suggest that it really should be minimal to no other meetings but another. But again, I defer to your judgement as Assistant Director thereof and I really appreciate your time, lending your time to this process and everyone else on this call and throughout this entire process. Again, I'll yield the balance of my time and thank you for your accommodation.

Jaime Loichinger: Matt, this is Jaime. May I go ahead and reply to that?

Matt Fuller: Yes, Jaime, go ahead.

Jaime Loichinger: Great. Thank you. I appreciate the comment and I certainly don't want to give the impression that we're looking to somehow delay this any further; but rather, what are the things that particularly in the ACHP we've experienced that we've noticed is when one also does the flip side of this of rushing too quickly to get to the signature process on an MOA that critical details can be missed within the MOA. Given that it's a legally binding document it is important to make sure that that review of the document is thorough and correct, otherwise people are signing on to things that aren't legally enforceable and it creates other situations down the road that are often more problematic for the federal agency and the consulting parties involved. So I apologize if I was giving the appearance that this was somehow or that I was somehow thinking that this would, you know, be another year or anything along those lines. That wasn't my intent. But rather just we should make sure that what we're doing right now is carefully considering the language that is being agreed to by the federal agencies to mitigating the undertaking's adverse effects.

Al DeBonnett: No, Jaime, thank you. I did lean upon my law school understanding. I don't practice law but that is my background, so I concur because we have litigious individuals on the call who would love to use any and all means to continue their obstruction and delay. So thank you again for your patience, presence and continued efforts for the organization and all those. Thank you.

Jaime Loichinger: Absolutely. You're welcome.

Denise (Operator): Once again, if you have a question or would like to make a comment you may press 1 then 0 at this time. And we do have the line of Louise McCurry. Your line is now open. Please go ahead.

Louise McCurry: Can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: We can. Hi, Louise.

Louise McCurry: Oh, good. Hi. So I just want to say having been doing this for a long, long time with kids and families in the park, I want to just concur with what Ghian said which is we

are now in the middle of an emergency. We really have this wonderful opportunity, a once in a lifetime opportunity to create a space where kids and families can feel safe in the park, to create an area where we can have jobs and an area that will in fact encourage more community developments and a process which allows both folks that watch birds and folks that ride bicycles and folks that are in wheelchairs and children that like to play on swings and slides, people that like to swim and boat, people that like to go out and just enjoy the pleasure of a walk in a greenspace or those who like to do amazing projects in the park, this is our time to make that difference. We can delay and delay and we've seen the groups that like to do that. We understand their motivations. It's clearly a process now if you look at this between those of us who are on the South Side who have children who are going to directly benefit from the changes to this amazing park and bringing the Obama Center in and those who don't. And I think for those of us in the community whose kids are going to benefit, this is our future. We have this chance to change the future for our children. I don't think we can delay any longer and let this go. So I strongly, strongly, agree with you, Ghian. We hope it gets done quickly. Let's get the shovels in the ground to be able to create this space for our kids to have a future they can be proud of. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you, Louise. Anything further?

Denise (Operator): The next line is the line of Al DeBonnett. Please go ahead.

Al DeBonnett: No, I accidentally hit 10 again. No further comments, so no more delaying. Thank you again.

Denise (Operator): Currently there are no other lines for questions or comments at this moment.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. Well, I think that concludes our meeting unless there are any other comments from the agencies, ACHP, SHPO, any one from the presenter side that would like to say anything?

Denise (Operator): I do have the line of Stephanie Franklin if you are still taking comments. May she go ahead?

Eleanor Gorski: Sure. This will be the last question.

Denise (Operator): Oh, thank you. Stephanie, your line is now open.

Stephanie Franklin: Thank you very much. I'd like to respond to the idea that this is a once in a lifetime opportunity. It is a once in a lifetime opportunity to honor the first Black President of the United States. There never will be another first Black President of the United States ever, so because there already is one. So to honor him, we think he deserves his own monument. We can always put in other parks and other parks are sorely needed on the west side of the city. But this

once in a lifetime opportunity is not the building of playgrounds, it's a question of honoring the first Black President of the United States and he deserves his own monument. Thank you. That's it.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay, well, with that--

Denise (Operator): Oh, no more comment lines at this time.

Eleanor Gorski: With that-- <laughs> Thank you. Well, with that, I'd like to thank you all for participating. This has been a terrific conversation as always. And again we look forward to written comments on the MOA and emails are certainly welcome as well. Todd, are there any last minute directions you want to give the consulting parties to remind them?

Todd Wyatt: Sure, just a quick reminder that a video of today's webinar will be posted on the DPD website along with rough transcripts at first and then cleaned up transcripts maybe in about a week down the road. And then a reminder to send your comments to Matt and copy myself by August 10. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay, well thanks, everyone. Have a wonderful day and weekend and we look forward to hearing from you soon. Thank you.

Denise (Operator): That does conclude our conference for today. Thank you for your participation and for using AT&T Event Conferencing Service. You may now disconnect.

####