

Tom (Operator): Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. Thank you for standing by and welcome to the Jackson Park Project Section 106 consulting call. At this time all lines are in a listen only mode. Later there will be opportunities for your questions and instructions will be given at that time. If you should require any assistance today please press star followed by the 0 and an AT&T operator will assist you. And to ask a question today you simply press star-0. You'll hear an acknowledgement and you can hit 1-0 again to take yourself out of queue. At this time, I'd like to turn the conference over to our host, Program Support Specialist 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 from the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center and my colleague, Angela Berthaume and I will be facilitating the webinar and supporting the conversation today. As many of you know, this is the second meeting of a three-part webinar series and we're excited to continue the conversation today. I just wanted to share some information on the web room and its functionality as well as your webinar participation. So in the center of the screen you'll have the presentation being conducted today. At the bottom you have the closed captioning pod which will provide real time captioning and to the left of the closed captioning pod is the file share pod where you are able to download a PDF version of today's slide. On the left-hand side of the web room you'll see a series of pods, the note pod, the attendee pod and the chat pod. So in the top left corner is the note pod which will include your call in information. This line is for participants to use during our group discussion and our Q&A portion of today's meeting.

Allison Caloggero: This line is managed by Tom, our operator, and again, to queue your questions please dial 1-0. To take yourself off of the queue for questions please dial 1-0 again. So again, this line is used for the Q&A session of today's meeting which all parties will have the opportunity to comment during question and answer. And this will also be used for our group discussion. At this time a representative from each consulting party will be invited to call in at the appropriate time and we ask that you please limit these remarks during this discussion period to three minutes. I would also like to just mention that if you're using the call line to please make sure that the audio on your computer is turned down so you don't cause an echo or audio feedback into the web room. In the bottom left-hand corner, you have the attendee list and then in the bottom left-hand corner you have the chat pod. The chat pod will be used to ask questions throughout the presentation and you can voice your ideas and questions throughout the presentation. We just ask that if you do leave a comment or question or if you speak over the line to just please identify which consulting party you are being represented. Selected questions provided by the chat pod will be allowed for the remainder of the-- will be responded after the meeting. And lastly, this meeting is being recorded and the video and audio record of today's meeting will be posted online after today's webinar.

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: Thank you, Allison. Good morning, everybody, and thank you for participating in today's Consulting Party meeting. We had a good response to today's webinar with 75 registered participants. As Allison said, my name's Matt Fuller and I work for Federal Highway Administration in Springfield, Illinois.

Federal Highway is the lead federal agency for the Section 106 process and in my role I work with state and local governments to complete the environmental review process for transportation projects. Today is the second in a series of three Section 106 consulting party meetings to resolve adverse effects resulting from the undertaking in Jackson Park in Chicago, Illinois. The goal of these meetings is to reach agreement on measures that will resolve the adverse effects that result from the undertaking. We are interested to hear consulting party ideas for resolving adverse effect on historic properties. Today we will summarize the meeting from May 6. We'll discuss potential mitigation measures to resolve adverse effect, building off the ideas that you submitted during the first consulting party meeting and ideas submitted through the electronic survey. We'll have an opportunity for every consulting party to provide additional feedback on the mitigation ideas that have been presented and we'll describe the next steps in the process. And we'll wrap up the meeting with another opportunity for you to ask questions or provide additional comments on mitigation ideas. I'll be presenting a few slides related to the process and federal requirements and I'll turn it over to the City of Chicago, Eleanor Gorski, for the discussion on mitigation measures. We have agency representatives from the National Park Service and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers available to answer questions on the call today. We also have Section 106 experts from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

Matt Fuller: As you know, we held the first meeting on May 6, 2020 to discuss the process for resolving adverse effects and to begin soliciting ideas from the consulting parties to mitigate the adverse effect. Today we're going to build off the ideas developed in the first meeting and the ideas collected through the electronic survey. We're asking for you to consider the ideas we've received so far, expand upon them or offer additional ideas. We'll accept your ideas today and you can also submit them through next Tuesday, May 26 at noon. The agencies will consider all these ideas and develop a draft MOA to circulate to the public and the consulting parties for review. The third meeting will be held on June 17 from 1:00 to 3:00 PM and we'll discuss the draft MOA and the next steps for concluding the 106 process.

Matt Fuller: Our next slide, I'm going to turn it over to Eleanor.

Eleanor Gorski: Good morning, everyone. Again, I'm Eleanor Gorski with the City of Chicago assisting the Federal Agencies in this 106 process.

Eleanor Gorski: So the May 6 meeting we had 90 registered participants and we reviewed in general the 106 process, what has been accomplished so far and where we are now in the process. And that is, of course, at the mitigation stage, so we explained what it is, what it should address and the different types of mitigation that we have seen used throughout the country on other projects. And then ask the group to present ideas that they have and then we also presented ideas that we had received throughout the process and that included ideas that had been reviewed as part of reducing the adverse effects throughout the process as well. Transcript and video and response to questions were all posted on the City's website and as Matt noted, we distributed a survey afterwards to consulting parties to ask for further input as well as comments on what was discussed at this meeting.

Eleanor Gorski: The mitigation process. Matt, did you want to go through this slide?

Matt Fuller: Sure, Eleanor. I'll take the next two. The resolve adverse effects step is a consultive process where the Federal Agency works with consulting parties to develop measures to resolve or mitigate adverse effects which are then incorporated into a legally binding Memorandum of Agreement or MOA. The Federal Agency is ultimately responsible for deciding which mitigation commitments are included in the MOA, but mitigation ideas from all consulting parties and the public are considered in that process. The Federal Agency collaborates with the applicant to ensure the feasibility of the mitigation measures that are included in the MOA. We ensure that the mitigation measures are related to and commensurate with the impact to the historic resource and the required signatories must also agree with the mitigation proposed. In this case, it's Federal Highway Administration, the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Federal Agency is responsible for ensuring that the mitigation measures that are included in the MOA are implemented. However, the implementation of mitigation measures are often assigned to the applicant or other parties.

Matt Fuller: Mitigation ideas from consulting parties. We receive feedback from consulting parties throughout the 106 process and we've considered and dismissed ideas that are outside of the Federal Agency's control, which include location and design changes at the OPC site, location of the UPARR replacement recreation opportunity and the retention of Cornell Drive. The reasons why these ideas had been dismissed have been explained in writing and verbally and we're not considering these mitigation measures further. The mitigation ideas being carried forward for further discussion are centered on four themes: research, interpretation, restoration and design review. And I'll turn it back over to Eleanor to discuss those themes.

Eleanor Gorski: So the four themes that were developed to lead into this meeting today, the team here arrived at after the discussion with the consulting parties in order to further group the-- in order to further group the responses and to organize our thoughts on moving forward. So this was incorporated into the survey and the survey was available May 13 through the 18 and we had a good response with 77 folks representing 26 parties responding. We also received and considered additional correspondence from various consulting parties, and thank you for that, that provided more detail as to their ideas. So we asked in the survey to evaluate the mitigation ideas that were identified in the May 6 meeting and in general, the feedback was very positive and in fact triggered additional ideas to consider in each of the four themes. And again, as Matt noted that comments relating to avoidance measures that were previously considered and dismissed, we did receive those comments and those were recorded and we are not elaborating on those in today's meeting.

Eleanor Gorski: So going through the four different themes to summarize what we heard and new ideas, the first is the mitigation through research. Again, it was very positive and we heard a lot of great ideas from the last meeting. These we had heard before and they were added on to most notably the research and documentation on the themes in the Park. Of course, Olmsted design intent and then we heard new ideas, such as exploring African-American historic features and history in the Park, women's history and other significant events noted in the Park. New research ideas is to document current wildlife presence in Jackson Park and survey that coming up with a report, a bird migration setting and also a stunning report on citizens' use of parks to determine the best programming.

Eleanor Gorski: The mitigation through interpretation feedback again was positive and we went through the various information that was described at the first meeting, notably in terms of conservation in the Midway Plaisance as well as in the Park. There was a lot of discussion on historic plaques and signage. Again, engaging children, this was a theme that came up in our previous discussion and was seen in the survey. Create an indoor exhibit as well as an outdoor exhibit or interpretive map showing the history of Jackson Park and how it's changed over time. And again interpreting Jackson Park's women history through multimedia methods and signage.

Eleanor Gorski: I'm sorry, my connection was just lost so I'm going to move to another slide here. I apologize for the delay.

Matt Fuller: Eleanor, which slide do you want to be on? The interpretation or the next slide?

Eleanor Gorski: Interpretation. I can see it on my screen. Would you mind advancing it, Matt?

Matt Fuller: Not at all.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. So I just wanted to finish new interpretation ideas. A master plan for signs and plaques to ensure quality designer programming and we heard this extending outside the Park to link the cultural campus on the Southside. Again, the role of African-Americans specifically in the World's Fair and then the Nike Missile Site was also a noted resource that should be recognized by a plaque.

Eleanor Gorski: If we could go to the next, Matt.

Matt Fuller: Okay, it's on restoration now.

Eleanor Gorski: Yes. The mitigation through restoration. Again, we received a lot of good feedback. This has been discussed throughout the process. Many of the monuments and structures throughout the Park, and that includes the Statue of the Republic, English Comfort Station and the landscape features along Stony Island. The new ideas that we received, again, more landscape features in Jackson Park. The Wooded Island. Other structures such as the Coast Guard Building, the Beach House, 63rd Street Beach House, Iowa Building. And then we did receive some comments to enhance the wetland in the Midway, various design ideas there. And then other pedestrian bridges in other areas of the Park. Okay, next.

Eleanor Gorski: The mitigation through design. Again, generally positive and some themes that were repeated. Use project architects and landscape architects and engineers that recognize the Secretary of the Interior standards and treatments of historic landscapes in any of the work moving forward. Also the public should have an opportunity to view and comment on the design of proposed improvements such as the replacement area in the Midway and other restoration projects. And new design review ideas. Consult a naturalist and use professional consultants for all restoration plans, getting into a little bit more detail there. So that kind of summarizes the four themes, if we could go to the next slide, Matt.

Eleanor Gorski: And in today's meeting we want to continue to build off those four themes, ask if there are further ideas in terms of what I just listed, the mitigation ideas. What resonates particularly with these groups. And then open this up to a conversation with each consulting party having an opportunity to give their opinion, their thoughts on this. And in order to ensure that everyone is heard, our facilitator as she mentioned will call groups of three going down the list of consulting parties that was sent out and you will have three minutes to convey your thoughts on this. And if you would prefer to put your thoughts in the chat box or if you'd like to decline to take your speaking time, please also convey that in the chat box and we'll record that.

Eleanor Gorski: I am going to leave this slide up on the screen, the mitigation ideas being carried forward, again, are research, interpretation, restoration and design review. So if you could indicate if you have an idea for one of those we can then group it within that. Okay. So I think we're ready to open up the lines if you'd like to go ahead.

Allison Caloggero: Hi, everyone. Tom, our operator, could you open the lines? The first three groups that we would like to call upon. To queue your questions, again, please dial 1-0 to queue your questions and ideas into the call line or provide it in the chat. The first three groups will be One Woodlawn and National Association of Colored Women's Club. The second group is Brown Books and Paintbrushes. And three is the Chicago Urban League. So please feel free to queue those questions or provide them in the chat pod, questions and ideas.

Eleanor Gorski: You know, I do see a call or something in the chat box from Mary Lu Seidel, "Please review how we can ask questions." So this section of the presentation is to have a discussion on mitigation ideas, so we'll go through each consulting party again in groups of three. When we're through the list then we will have a second round of anyone that has further thoughts. They can call in and that would not be in a controlled manner and, like, going through the list. You can simply call in and again provide your ideas or questions on mitigation. And at the end of the webinar there will be a general Q&A session where the agencies will be available to answer questions. So I'd ask that you hold any general questions till the end of the webinar.

Tom (Operator): And for participants on the phone lines again, if you have a question, just press 1-0 and one second. Would you like to take the first one?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes, please.

Tom (Operator): Okay. We'll go to Brenda, is it Nelms? Brenda Nelms line, please go ahead.

Brenda Nelms: Oh. Thank you. Can you hear me? Have I got everything turned off right?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes. And please list your consulting party that you're with--

Brenda Nelms: Sure.

Eleanor Gorski: So we can keep track.

Brenda Nelms: Sure. I'm with Jackson Park Lodge, so I'm initially thoroughly confused that I'm the first one on since I thought I was 14 and the-- I do think the process is confusing, I will say that. I would also like to say that I found it strange that the information about what had been received and everything was not put out in advance. I thought that was part of the survey collection thing and that we would have those in advance so that you could have a more rational, appropriate discussion of proposals rather than having to react in time, you know, quick time kind of off the hip kind of thing. So I would like to express concern about that. I do find it and hope that Matt Fuller will address at some point the issue of a mitigation measures that are commensurate with the impact because none of the things I've heard really addressed that, I think. They are the impact on completely undercutting the Olmsted design and changing the character of the Park from a nature area, a wildlife area to a theme park kind of thing is quite substantial and I think that should be-- I would like to understand how that is measured. With regard to some of the things that have put forward, with research, I had suggested in my comment on the survey that whatever updating of the National Register statement was done should include the complete AOE report to explain what had been there and what had been lost. I think that is important and I-- And that only leads me to think what-- how are the listings of suggestions and everything edited in ways. I thought we'd get the full list with all the text and that would have been perhaps more useful and interesting and leading, even if grouped and things, I approve of the grouping; it's the kind of editing of things that strike me as limiting in public input. The--with regard to design review, particularly, or restoration perhaps. Maybe it falls under that, of having to put these in-- One thing that was suggested and this is not, this really isn't linked to the UPARR, it's linked to generally, is that there should be if you're going to go with this proposal as designed, there should be 20 acres of public parkland under the control and programming of the Park District added to the neighborhood. I realize not in one lump sum, but others. Otherwise, it's a complete loss of parkland for the community at a time when as we have noted through the current pandemic, having access to such outside areas is extremely important. And to reduce, to have no replacement parkland, to give up 20 acres for 99 years and not have any replacement parkland is just a travesty of public responsibility.

Todd Wyatt: Brenda, I'm sorry, it's three minutes--

Brenda Nelms: Okay. Thank you.

Todd Wyatt: Thank you.

Allison Caloggero: Thank you. Again, the first three consulting parties that we'll hear from will be One Woodlawn and the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Brown Books and Paintbrushes and Chicago Urban League. If you are queued up and you are not one of these groups, you can dial 1-0 to come off of the queue.

Tom (Operator): And our next question will come from the line of Ward Miller. Please go ahead.

Ward Miller: Yes. Can you hear me?

Tom (Operator): We can.

Ward Miller: Can you hear me?

Allison Caloggero: Yes.

Ward Miller: Ward Miller with Preservation Chicago. You know, we from the very start have felt that the placement of the Obama Presidential Center in Jackson Park was flawed from the very start and we still feel like it could be located elsewhere. And it really is politics at its worse and but, you know, understanding all that and looking at restoration and research and interpretation design review, you know, the idea of plaques is wonderful, but you know, that's a token for what is being proposed in place of what's being lost. And, you know, I think we should really look at some big initiatives and I didn't see reference to our idea of the Lakefront, the entire Chicago Lakefront being a national park just as President Obama proclaimed Pullman a national monument and national park and of course, the recent Indiana Dunes becoming a national park. So we'd really like to see the politics of all of this taken out of the parklands and given to the National Park Service with the Park District and the City of Chicago realizing that could be a combined lift and that way we won't have all these decrepit roads and bike paths and buildings without roofs and buildings that are collapsing in Jackson Park which is really, really awful in so many ways. But so we'd like to see things like some type of regulation, landmark designation and national park designation to the Lakefront parks to protect them from other incursions like this in the future. Again, to take the politics out of the park, these are not for elected officials or others to give away. And we'd also like to encourage Friends of the Parks' proposal, the last four miles to especially realizing the high water levels, the current rainstorms that have flooded the entire city included the Sears Tower in Lower Wacker. And this does create a buffer between the Lake, which we all think is magnificent, and the built environment. And I want to encourage the greening of the U.S. Steel site as a park and encourage the City and all the officials that are involved in this and the Obama Foundation to help with this lift towards these goals and to get behind these ideas. That's a fabulous form of mitigation. You know, the idea of restoration is ridiculous in this conversation because we should really be restoring the Park without the 20 acre Obama campus which we very much welcome to the City of Chicago and to Chicago Southside. But there are a lot of available sites nearby where we could build on land. The Obama Foundation could build on land that could be included into a park site or made its own park. So we want to encourage some really positive big ideas. The big vision, you know, the vision that Burnham had in his 1909 plan and not, you know, these small mitigation issues that really minimize the fact that the Park is given away. So we want to encourage those kinds of things. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And next we'll go to the line of Kineret Jaffe. Please go ahead.

Kineret Jaffe: Hi. Can you hear me?

Tom (Operator): Yes.

Kineret Jaffe: Am I audible?

Tom (Operator): You are.

Kineret Jaffe: I'm with the Hyde Park Art Center. I'd like to speak on four specific topics. First I'd like to commend the Federal agencies and the City for their transparency and for all the consultation they have done. I find it extraordinary that people are still saying that they haven't been consulted and there hasn't been public input. We've had many years of public input and I'm very thankful for that. Secondly I'd like to challenge the notion that we are not being respectful of Olmsted in what we are doing here with the building of the OPC. Extensive thought has been given to how this really does respect Olmsted's vision of parks as places for people. Third, I'd like to say that we are restoring parkland through the building of the OPC, not diminishing it. Fourth, I'd like to speak to the fact that the landscape architects working with the Obama Foundation have paid a lot of attention to restoration of the plant life and the animal life in the park recognizing the climate change is going to affect and is already affecting what can and cannot grow in the park and that we need to be thinking about replanting trees that will be able to withstand climate change and to think about natural disasters, storms, et cetera that we need to be thinking about water runoffs, none of that is happening now. It will happen with the OPC. And finally in terms of interpretation, I guess this is my fourth point, the fact that we could pay attention to what Olmsted has done, I love the idea of having the virtual model of the World's Fair perhaps running in the museum. It would make it possible for people to see how much activity there was in Jackson Park during the World's Fair and we hope to see that kind of activity in Jackson Park going forward. Thank you very much.

Allison Caloggero: Thank you. May I ask if we could clear the lines and have the consulting parties from our first three call in, just them, and then we will follow through the line. Is that possible?

Tom (Operator): So there was one other person queued up. Should I go ahead and clear that one out?

Matt Fuller: Yes, go ahead and please clear it out and we'll announce the names of the first three consulting parties again that we asked to speak first. But, yeah, please go ahead and clear out the line so we make sure that we start this in order.

Tom (Operator): Okay, so I'll go ahead and clear this one out.

Allison Caloggero: Thank you, Tom. So the first three consulting parties that could call in, please, by dialing 1-0, could those be One, Woodlawn and National Association of Colored Women's Clubs; two, Brown Books and Paintbrushes; and the Chicago Urban League. Please dial in now or produce your comments, whether you decline, in the chat box.

Tom (Operator): It looks like we're having one queue up.

Tom (Operator): And as the operator gathers your name, if there's anybody else, go ahead and hit 1-0. And we are getting a number of participants queued up and we will go to Lanita Ross. Please go ahead.

Lanita Ross: I have no questions at this time.

Tom (Operator): All right. We'll take her out. And our next question is from the line of Al Devaney. Please go ahead, sir.

Al DeBonnett: You got a great try. This is Al DeBonnett, everyone, Jackson Park Golf and Community Leadership Council. I've been appointed by the Alderman, I guess it was December of 20-- well, 2015. I've been a part of over 100-plus meetings including the OPC Jackson Park Advisory and the Chicago Park Golf Alliance and on and on. And I wanted to let everyone know on this call, and everyone's well aware, there's two organizations that do not represent the Jackson Park community. The ones we've done, they have had meetings of 4,000 participants in support. And every bit of the entire footprint has been analyzed, researched and toured by all the leadership. So when I say these things please know that the entire community is supportive and ready to go with the current design of the OPC and the South Loop-- excuse me, South Lakefront framework plan that has been fully thought out and participated in all community members for the last going on four years. So if we had started that and implemented the remediation of the Lake erosion would have taken place. If we continue to delay the cost will triple as it has now if we had started before. So I say these things, you know, again, and I love each one of you all but Jackson Park Watch does not represent the community. Preservation, Ward, love you; you do not represent the community and what's needed. From the year of significance in 1972, you guys were not there and saying we need these remediation. It's only when there's restoration, the development process started, did you participate when we needed this a long time ago. So again, I want to speak this in the spirit of love, Eleanor and you know, all the Highway administration officials, Matt, you guys have been fantastic, but we beat this horse till it's dead and beyond. So at this point in time any delay will only cause greater cost and as the one who's trained in construction management by training in the University of Chicago and a variety of other very key resources, the delay has caused cost increases that will result in I think as everyone that is on this call knows, even greater cost anticipational loss and future opportunity. So with that said, thank you for all that you guy have done, but let's get it done and proceed. And everyone have a wonderful day. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And next we'll go to Frederick Bates line. Please go ahead.

Frederick Bates: Yes. I'd like to raise two very specific points and then one general one--

Eleanor Gorski: Excuse me, can you please--

Frederick Bates: I represent Friends of the Parks--

Eleanor Gorski: I'm sorry, can you please-- Oh, you were just going to announce it. Yeah. Your consulting party affiliation, thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

Frederick Bates: Yeah. Sorry. And the kind of how do we deal with this over time. We know that all institutions are subject to change and can be very vulnerable and that they may cease to exist. And if this presidential center were to cease, I think it would be important that they provide secured funding to restore the Park to its original condition and to remove the building. So that's a kind of dealing with adverse effects suggestion. They can certainly I'm sure provide the adequate assurances that that can be

funded and that could be in the agreement with the City. Secondly, just in the monument arena, the Lorado Taft and others had a huge plan for beautifying the Midway pre- and post-World War I, which included the Fountain of Time which is probably the most extraordinary sculpture in the City of Chicago at the moment. And he also had another equally extraordinary design to match it which has never been implemented, so I think that could be a good mitigation opportunity. And finally, I'd like to echo Ward Miller's thought that this is probably a good time to deal with our whole Lakefront Park system. Thanks.

Tom (Operator): And next we'll go to the line of Candace Washington. Please go ahead.

Candace Washington: Hey, I'm Candace Washington--

Eleanor Gorski: Before Candace--

Candace Washington: Oh. Hi.

Eleanor Gorski: Hey, Candace, I'm sorry. Before you start, I just want to interject. I'd like to remind everyone that we are focusing on mitigation at this point and those four categories are research, interpretation, restoration and design review. Any other general comments or questions please hold to the end of the webinar and then we will open up the line for those. Thank you very much. So go ahead, Candace.

Candace Washington: Okay. Hey, everybody, I'm Candace. I am one of the consulting parties called upon from Brown Books and Paintbrushes. Just want to know, how can I be involved in the process or how to get children engaged in the mitigation process? And will you guys be reaching out to schools?

Eleanor Gorski: Candace, this is Eleanor. We do have that as one of the mitigation comments and it was noted by many folks, so I think that will definitely be part of the discussion going forward for the MOA.

Candace Washington: Thanks. Thanks, Eleanor.

Eleanor Gorski: So we'll have more information. I would say hold tight, but it's definitely on our list. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And next we'll go to Lisa DiChiera's line. Please go ahead.

Lisa DiChiera: Hi. This is Lisa DiChiera with Landmarks Illinois and I wanted to raise two design-related issues that we have raised in the past and I'm wondering even though we had raised them in the context of avoidance and minimization, that I think there still may be an opportunity to review them from the design review perspective now within mitigation. And those two design issues were if it was conceivable to evaluate the ability to just shift the northern edge of the OPC campus slightly to the south to avoid the southern twin roadway that's on the south side of the Midway Plaisance, as well as the ultimate design of the Women's Garden. And so I'm thinking there's an opportunity here within this design review section of mitigation to just again look at those things truly from a design standpoint. From our perspective it could

be a 200-foot shift to the south to avoid that southern roadway. And with the women's garden, again, it could be-- The opportunity to talk about how the integrity of that garden could be further preserved. Right now it's being pretty radically changed. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And our next question will come from the line of Louise McCurry. Please go ahead.

Louise McCurry: Hi, can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes. Go ahead, Louise.

Louise McCurry: Okay. So I'm going to be brief because you guys have a lot to do. First I want to say thank you. This has been a long process. I'm going to echo, again, Al saying let's get it done because the longer we waited, the more damage we've had to the Park and it's time just to get this done and get it started. But first interpretation, I'm just going to cover the area that you were talking about. I really believe and all the mini tours I've given in the Park, the interpretation part of this needs plaques for Ida B. Wells at the Haitian Pavilion and her part in solving the lynchings by getting the word out to the 27 million people that came to the Fair. We need a plaque for Olmsted in Burnham Park. It's always amazed me that a World's Fair Park doesn't have a plaque explaining the folks who designed it. In terms of restoration, high important-- our progress is to get the Women's literature to share, since the Women's Building at the Fair had a major role in giving women the right to vote and some interpretation that this was where it all started is important. I like the idea of the virtual mall in the museum but I think we're probably more likely to get the Women's literature. Third is handicaps. We frequently give tours in which I'm pushing wheelchairs around the Park of people, of elderly folks or folks who don't have accessibility, so some kind of better signage and accessibility for handicaps as part of the design idea would be really, really important because those are the folks who so far don't have access to many parks. And finally for me, near and dear is getting children engaged. This really is about our future. It's not about us, it's about our children who come after us and so getting children involved in the design ideas and approving the design ideas really, really near and dear to our hearts. There are so many amazing parts of Jackson Park that children don't get involved in because they just don't know it's there, so getting children involved in local schools and local school groups would be really important. And that's all. Thank you so much for joining us and again I say it's time to get it done. We've been waiting a long time and we're looking forward to making it happen. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And next we'll go to the line of Karen Freeman-Wilson. Please go ahead.

Karen Freeman-Wilson: Good morning. This is Karen Freeman-Wilson and I am with the Chicago Urban League, a consulting party, and I would like to add my voice to those who first say it's time to get it done because we are in support of this project. I also wanted to comment specifically on design and restoration. As we look at these spaces, I think that this presents a tremendous opportunity for training, both training of those who are in professional architecture and engineering and other aspects, but also for the training of those engaged in restoration. And so the opportunity for both training and then as we get more involved in the project and I know that you all have considered this extensively, the work that will be engaged in the restoration of the project and in the full implementation, it's extremely important as you

think about mitigation to engage those residents who are in that area who will be impacted by the work that's being done but who will also be uplifted by the work that is being done with this project.

Tom (Operator): And we will go to the line of Dan Marriott. Please go ahead.

Dan Marriott: Can you hear me now?

Tom (Operator): We can.

Dan Marriott: Very good. I'm with National Association for Olmstead Parks. A couple general comments. Thank you for the opportunity. First of all in terms of interpretation opportunities, I think interpretation should be a part of everything; no matter what happens and what's done, it's about telling stories that are important to the Park. But interpretation on its own is a very limited response to the significant changes happening to Jackson Park so it should be a part of everything that's being discussed but it really shouldn't be I don't think a standalone solution to what's happening to the Park right now in terms of being a full mitigation. Second point. As Lisa DiChiera said earlier from Illinois Landmarks, the idea of shifting the OPC slightly south to maintain the integrity of the historic intersection between the Midway and Jackson Park I think is very important and very doable. Cornell Drive, I'm not quite sure what it means but I am having an off conversation about that right now, but I believe that Cornell Drive should recognize the original cross section. Even if it becomes a pedestrian and bike pathway, it should recognize the historic cross section of the carriage drive that was part of the original design and not be redesigned simply as a decorated pathway. Next point, I'd like to also have people be thinking about the possibility of mitigation being applied to Washington Park so that future changes in that area will be a better advanced idea about what can and cannot happen within Washington Park going forward. This is the Chicago South Park System, Washington Park, the Midway and Jackson Park. I would like to suggest as well that all mitigation ideas, I'm hearing a lot about involving local children, job opportunities, education. Again, I think regardless of what happens, wildlife studies, water studies, transportation studies, every one of these has an opportunity to engage children and provide education opportunities for the local community. So again, I don't think this should have to be a standalone but it should be an inherent part of whatever mitigation is developed. And lastly, I'm hearing comments about the speed and the urgency of this project. It is a national. It's a large project and it's a public landscape that is not as significant locally in Chicago, but nationally. So these types of projects nationally bring lots of conversation and lots of debate because it does affect people's use of values across a long range of areas. So when you take a site like this it's going to involve questions like this and comments and it also takes a while for this to happen, so I appreciate the sense of urgency but I do believe this is an important process and I appreciate the way it's been undertaken so far. So Dan Marriott, National Association for Olmsted Parks. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And there are no other questions queued up at this time.

Matt Fuller: Thanks, Tom. This is Matt Fuller with Federal Highway Administration. We have heard from a number of consulting parties and we had a list we were trying to go in order and we've kind of hopped around a bit. So I do want to circle back to the top of our list and give everyone an opportunity that hasn't had a chance to speak yet to speak. And I'm going to start at the top of our list. One Woodlawn and

National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, if you would like to comment please dial 1-0. We're going to queue up several groups. Also Don Nash Park Advisory Council, if you're interested, please dial 1-0. The DuSable Museum of African-American History. Emerald South Economic Development Collaborative. If any of those consulting parties would like to speak, please dial 1-0 now and you'll get into the phone queue. We'll just give a few seconds for those folks to dial in. Tom, could you let us know if we have anyone in the queue?

Tom (Operator): We do have a few queuing up. One moment, please. The operator's gathering names.

Matt Fuller: Thank you.

Tom (Operator): Thank you. For everybody else, call in at 1-0 to put yourself in queue. We'll have one queued up in one second here.

Eleanor Gorski: And I'd like to remind everyone, again, we're still trying to get each consulting party to participate in this first round so we'd ask that if you have multiple folks representing your consulting party that you hold for your questions or comments until we're through this first round. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): Our first question will come from Mary Lou Seidel. Please go ahead.

Mary Lu Seidel: I'll go ahead and hold my call till later because somebody from Preservation Chicago just spoke, so I'll wait till later. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): Real good and we'll go to the line of Alicia Starks. Please go ahead. Ms. Starks, your line is open. Are you muted? Alicia, we did open your line. Are you muted on your end? And she's not responding. We will go-- Oh, she just queued up again here. Okay. Ms. Starks, can you hear me?

Alicia Starks: Don Nash Park Advisory Council. Can you hear me?

Tom (Operator): We hear you now.

Alicia Starks: Great. I'd like to echo some of the comments that were made previously just to make sure there's a running tab of those comments. I also want to applaud the Federal Section 106 review process and all the agencies involved. I do feel this has been a very transparent process. I'd also like to reiterate the comments that were made about in every area of mitigation that we look at involving the local communities that are most going to be impacted by this in terms of not only learning experiences we do, but also employment opportunities whether they're training opportunities or even hiring people from within the community to perform some of these areas. I also was glad to see some of my own comments incorporated from the survey today and I'd like to highlight some of them in as much as possible that we have a large minority population that as much as possible we look at ways to highlight the historical significance of those. A lot of the Olmsted historical connotations and other related to the historical nature of Jackson Park are already well-documented and even though there may be a plaque of Frederick

Douglas in somewhere in the Park that I've never seen, we need to highlight these areas because they're most important to the community that lives here every day. Thank you.

Matt Fuller: Tom, do we have anyone else on the line?

Tom (Operator): One is queueing up.

Matt Fuller: All right. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): Thank you. One moment. Be with us any moment, thank you.

Matt Fuller: And while we're waiting for the next caller to queue up I'll name the next consulting parties. If you have something you would like to comment on please dial 1-0. Those three consulting parties next up are Federal Transit Administration, Golden Shore and KLEO Community Center. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And we do have a question and we'll go to the line of Russell Pike. Please go ahead, sir.

Russell Pike: Thank you. This is Russell Pike. I'm the President of the Jackson Park Highlands Association. It's a community that's the north boundary of it is 67th Street between the streets of Cregier and Euclid. I've lived in the neighborhood for 37 years come this September and the area which is being proposed by the Presidential Center is very-- has been limited use, has limited use for the years I've been here. I hear all this talk about the land that's being taken up but yet I've not seen a lot of activity in this space at all. Matter of fact, it's a deteriorating space. They don't even cut the grass properly. So I have watched and listened to all of the various meetings I've attended. I think all of the ideas that have been brought up in the last session and some additional ideas are great, I don't think anything should be changed as far as the current design. It's appropriate for how it's already been designed. The only thing I haven't seen though is anything as far as the fieldhouse and I think we need a new fieldhouse in Jackson Park. It's deteriorating rapidly. I think that the various ideas that have been presented are well within the design of the Park and will give credence to the original design of Jackson Park. I don't think it will take anything away. I think this talk about what's going on with the Midway is irrelevant and as well as the discussions for moving the design is irrelevant. From my point of view the only reason that this is becoming a point of interest is because it's being placed in South Shore. Where was all this interest before? I just don't understand the comments that are being made but I do wholly support that we move forward with this and I think that the job that has been done has been a great job. Everybody has had opportunity above and beyond what's been required. So I think we've done our job and we should move forward with this plan. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And next we will go to the line of Perri Imer. Please go ahead.

Perri Imer: Good morning, everyone, and thank you so much. Again, I am President of the DuSable Museum of African-American History. Most of you know we are the oldest independent black history museum in the nation and are very, very excited about the construction of the Obama Presidential

Center. I have a couple things to say. One in the nature of comments that have been made, comments to the comments. The idea that someone would refer to the Obama Presidential Center as a theme park I find highly insulting. The other comments about the Obama Center potentially failing as a business or as an institution or organization I find equally insulting. I don't think either of these would ever be used, either of these comments would ever be made in relation to a non-African-American organization or honoring a non-black person. And I really want to say that I would love for the folks who are commenting in that way to understand how truly insulting and discouraging those types of comments are to members of the black community not only in Chicago but everywhere. And just a reading of the day's headlines that are getting more and more and more violent and ridiculous and racist and unfair should give you some pause to think that we in this community in Hyde Park where I was born 61-1/2 years ago and still live, this is not the place for that type of an attitude or that type of an approach which as Al DeBonnett and others have said seems peculiar and suspect in relation to this particular project, the timing and sudden interest when it never happened before. So those are my comments and, you know, I don't need an answer or comment back to those. You're welcome to call me privately. Any of you who want to do that, you know how to reach me. Secondly, I have questions relative to Washington Park, the Midway and Jackson Park which as we all know are part of the same original South Park System designed by Olmsted and equally relevant in terms of history, landmarks, et cetera. I would love to have Washington Park considered as a mitigation area, particularly potentially creating a secondary parking area because there won't be enough parking on the OPC site to capture the vast amount of traffic that's going to be coming from the Dan Ryan Expressway and also from Midway Airport utilizing the Garfield Blvd. Corridor. Secondly, I'd like-- Yeah, I'd like to also-- Yes, I'd like to also put the DuSable Museum on the radar as a mitigation site for internships for training of volunteers and workers at the Obama Center and all of that can go on during the construction period so that the youth and the interested, folks who are interested in working there can utilize the DuSable Museum as a training site, fellowship site or internship site. And we would also be pleased to be an historical research partner utilizing our extensive historical archives as the basis for answering some of these questions that have been raised and with that, I'll...

Todd Wyatt: Great. Thank you, Perri.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you, Perri.

Todd Wyatt: I would encourage you to come back for the second round of comments. It sounds like you have much more to say.

Perri Irmer: Thank you.

Todd Wyatt: Thank you.

Tom (Operator): We will go to Robin Kauffman's line. Please go ahead.

Robin Kauffman: Hi. Yes. I'm a member of the Nichols Park Advisory Council. I live in Hyde Park. I've been using Jackson Park and the Wooded Isle for close to 60 years. On the question of interpretation, I'd like to see a plaque showing Olmsted's initial design, both the first one in 18-- I think it was '72 and the

second one in 1895. Perhaps that would set to rest the question of was Cornell Drive part of the original plan. It was. Because Olmsted believed that people deserved a good route to get to work, that they benefited from the beauty. He worked hard to construct a road with a delightful view and I think we're going to lose that. Not only that, but all those folks in the wheelchair and thousands who don't use wheelchairs who enjoy the ride through the park which was originally designed that way will lose that, okay. It's, you know, it's going to be a great loss for people of all abilities including the growing numbers of senior citizens in our society. In the summary of the May 6 meeting it was commented that Cornell Drive needed to be gone in order to improve access east to west through the Park. That could be done with an underpass or an overpass. It would be a lot cheaper. We wouldn't have to spend all the money, at least 200 million dollars, on the roadwork which is I'm sure some of the money for the roadwork is going to be Federal Highway Authority money. And on the question of the urgency, yes, it's urgent. When we're done with the pandemic we're all going to need something cheerful. This thing has gone on too long, I agree. The reason it has gone on so long is because there was an outrageous plan. The people who did the plan knew that Chicago had a long history of trying to protect its Lakefront and that fighting is probably going to go on. I'm also a member of Protect Our Parks. The lawsuit is going to go forward. There will be appeals. If this plan-- The way to get the Obama Center built is to come up with a sensible plan that does not destroy our beautiful historic park, that does not take away two basketball fields, three ball courts, tennis courts and all kinds-- you know, another 50 acres of land for other modifications. It's outrageous. And let's get the Obama Center built in an appropriate place.

Todd Wyatt: Okay. Thank you for your comments.

Tom (Operator): And as a final reminder, 1-0 for questions. And we will go to Brenda Nelms. Please go ahead.

Eleanor Gorski: And if I could please add-- this is Eleanor Gorski again-- if you have, if a member of your consulting party has already spoken, please leave time for other members to speak. And two, again a reminder that this part of the webinar is about mitigation and we're happy to take comments about other issues at the end of the webinar. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): Ms. Nelms, your line is open.

Brenda Nelms: All right. So this is Brenda Nelms again with Jackson Park Watch. I have spoken before. I would like to address the concerns expressed both in the chat--

Eleanor Gorski: Brenda, I'd ask you to wait then until the end of this round. Thank you. We'll have the--

Brenda Nelms: Before-- For the-- Could you clarify, is that for the next round or the end of this round I'll be able to speak again?

Matt Fuller: Brenda, we're going to go through all of the consulting parties and let everyone have a chance to speak and after we're done with that round we'll open up the lines again.

Brenda Nelms: Okay. Thank you.

Matt Fuller: So the next consulting parties on the list include Metra, Midway Plaisance Advisory Council, Obama Foundation, Office of Alderman Hairston and Openlands. So if any of those consulting parties would like to make a comment on mitigation ideas please dial 1-0 now.

Tom (Operator): And we will go to the line of Mary Anton. Please go ahead.

Mary Anton: I want to make a couple of comments quite briefly I hope.

Eleanor Gorski: Mary, please state who you represent.

Mary Anton: Oh, I'm sorry. Rosalie Villas Home Owners Association. I'm also a member of Jackson Park Advisory Council and the Midway Advisory Council but I'm speaking on behalf of Rosalie Villas.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you.

Mary Anton: Thank you. I'm getting started again. Just a couple of brief comments. I want to focus on research and interpretation. One of the things that I'd like to say is that a part of the discussion here has been basically a battle over preserving the Olmsted legacy with a focus on landscape. But the point is that Olmsted's ideas about parks come out of his feelings about democratic spaces and open spaces for all people, not just for giving city dwellers a place of respite from their daily work at the time. So I think more emphasis really needs to be placed not simply on landscapes but on the Jackson Park as it has evolved historically from being a swamp to the site of the World's Fair, which basically lifted Chicago out of the misery of the years of the Chicago Fire. And then as the Southside has evolved into becoming the kinds of communities for African-Americans over the years. There is a story there that I think parallels the City of Chicago and parallels the history of the United States that I think is incredibly important, as important as the trees in the park. And that brings me to my second point which is parks are really a renewable resource and what we have here is a park that needs to evolve over time. I don't know how many people on this call have looked at the ecology reports that have been done by the landscape design architects, but they are deep and thorough and thoughtful and they basically are focused on building basically landscapes that are good for people but also good for migratory birds and for insects and for pollinators and so forth. So that in itself is an important story about extending the life for the next 100 years of Jackson Park. And then finally, I want to build on a couple of comments that were made about the South Park Systems, which is Jackson Park, the Midway and Washington Park. I very much support the UPARR recommendation of turning the east end of Midway Plaisance into a better connector between Jackson Park and the Midway Plaisance. I also am very much interested in the idea of recreating connections among the three parks, most specifically by renewing and renovating bike paths that go between parks so that over time you have the opportunity to be able to bike not only north and south across the entire Lakefront but also from east to west across the Park. Thank you. Those are my comments.

Tom (Operator): And we will go to Ted Haffner's line. Please go ahead.

Ted Haffner: Yeah. Openlands, our consulting party, has better ideas to <audio cuts out 01:08:07> interpretation section linking all these cultural resources in the South Park system. This would include DuSable, Smart Museum of Art, Renaissance Society, the OPC, the ASI <audio cuts out 01:08:25>

Eleanor Gorski: Mr. Haffner, I'm sorry, this is Eleanor Gorski. I didn't catch your consulting party affiliation.

Ted Haffner: Openlands.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay, thank you.

Ted Haffner: Yeah. <inaudible 01:08:37>

Tom (Operator): You're breaking up.

Ted Haffner: A cultural museum campus South Trail. In design review we would like to see the impacts of the storm water from the site being sent to the lagoon, removed and dealt with differently because of the Gliffer project. And then restitution, we would like to echo the theme of the South Park System and looking at the circulation and sidewalk in <audio cuts out 01:09:17> And thank you very much. That's all I have.

Matt Fuller: Ted, this is Matt Fuller with Federal Highway Administration. You broke up quite a bit during your comments. Would you mind writing those out and sending them to us in an email just to make sure that we capture those completely?

Ted Haffner: Certainly. Thank you.

Matt Fuller: Sure. I'm going to go ahead and announce the next batch of consulting parties to call in if you have a question or a comment. The next groups on my list are Pullman National Monument Preservation Society, Save the Midway, School of the Art Institute of Chicago and South Shore Works. Please dial 1-0 if you have a comment on the mitigation themes that are up on the screen right now. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): Thank you. And we have a follow-up from Brenda Nelms. Please go ahead.

Brenda Nelms: No, I didn't mean to call in. I think the, all the-- I've been told to wait. I'm waiting. But I pushed I thought 1-0 to remove myself from the list and evidently I'm on it again. I think the whole mechanisms are very, very confusing. I'm happy to talk now but I believe Mr. Fuller wants me to speak later. Am I correct?

Matt Fuller: Yes, please, Brenda, if you wouldn't mind holding until we get through this first round.

Brenda Nelms: Okay. Do I push 1-0 now to exit out of the queue or not? That's what I didn't--

Tom (Operator): I'll release you, ma'am, and then when they're ready at the end you can re-queue, okay?

Brenda Nelms: Okay. Thank you very much.

Tom (Operator): Thank you. Have a good day. Next we're going to go to the line of Michael McNamee. Please go ahead.

Michael McNamee: Hi. It's Mike McNamee, Save the Midway. So Mike, can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: Yes, we can hear you.

Michael McNamee: So I got-- I have a comment on the restoration and design review mitigation categories. So Save the Midway supports that and has suggested that the City should not drain the ephemeral wetlands on the east end of the Midway but should rather replace it with some small narrow designed water feature that could possibly use natural plantings to restore some habitat for birds and pollinators that some other consulting parties have mentioned. And but also while remaining consistent with Olmsted's design intentions and principles for the Midway. So in this way overall we would like to see that the Midway be respected as a resource that promotes the richness of the wildlife in the area while it also retains its historic integrity. Thanks.

Tom (Operator): Thank you. And we do have one more participant I think that's queueing up. One moment.

Matt Fuller: And while we wait for that consulting party to queue up, I'll name off the next six consulting parties. If you have a comment on the mitigation themes identified on the screen please dial 1-0. Southside Neighbors for Hope, the Cultural Landscape Foundation, the Neighborhood Network Alliance, the Sanctuary and South Shore Historical Society, the University of Chicago and USEPA Region 5.

Tom (Operator): Be with us in one moment. And we'll go to the line of Carol Adams. Please go ahead.

Carol Adams: Good morning. Carol Adams, South Shore Works. I want to just say quickly with regard to the references to Olmsted and Burnham, that they were both visionaries who did not believe that vision began and ended with them. I believe they left us a legacy, not a life sentence. I think the Parks are organic. They're living expressions of not just nature but of culture, of the people who live and the people who surround the parks who desperately would like to see this project move forward. I believe the project itself is a mitigation. It is a mitigation against neglect, underutilization and all of those things that have left us with a park that's sort of a montage of disarray. I believe that there is a selective preservation-ism that does not mind when certain historic things are cast aside but just decide in a selective way which things you want to promote and not promote. There's no consistency in this thing. So I think we need to see this as a mitigation as an opportunity to bring more people into the park. I'm fine with the current design. I don't think that the original design foresaw a highway moving through the park. It's a great difference from the carriage pathway that was characteristic to it in the beginning. I agree, Ward Miller, with you that

plaques are not mitigation, that we should be thinking bigger just as we were told by the Park's designers that this was about big ideas, and the Obama Presidential Center is the epitome of a big idea. It is not, the Park is not an exhibit, it's a living thing. We've never told its story properly and when you think about those who talk about the Midway, what it was like when it was teeming with people, when it had the big Ferris wheel and all of those things, it was about bringing people to it. It's an extremely underutilized asset at this point and we have a chance I think to make it sing. I believe that-- I'm a historian myself because-- and I know that history is still being made and this is an opportunity for us to make it even better. A true legacy does not imprison, it liberates, and we just need to be free to think differently, to think big, to do something that the community wants to see happen and we are tired of being held hostage by these delaying tactics and the mean spirit that comes along with them.

Tom (Operator): And we will go to the line of Scott Craver. Please go ahead, sir.

Scott Craver: Yes, hi, this is Scott Craver with the Cultural Landscape Foundation. Am I audible?

Matt Fuller: Yes, Scott, we can hear you.

Scott Craver: Thank you. First just a brief comment to say that it does bear reminding that Jackson Park and the entire South Park System are sites of national importance. And moreover, the manner in which this review is being conducted and the way federal agencies handle the review, those things have implications for historic and cultural sites across the country, not just in Chicago, both now and in the future. And so it's important that the process be done correctly. With regard to that we would refer the City of Chicago and the federal agencies to our many correspondences to date, including our letter of May 19, 2020. We continue to feel that because avoidance and minimization has been essentially taken off the table, that the Section 106 review is deficient. We continue to believe that federal agencies do, indeed, have an obligation to consider avoidance and minimization in their discussions with applicants and that those obligations have not been met in this case, at least we're not aware that they've been met. Finally, in a prior webinar we discussed the idea of what the City has done with regard to avoidance, to avoid adverse effects so far beyond moving the parking garage and we've noted that the height of the tower has only increased since the Section 106 review began and that ACHP was expressly interested in the question of what the City had done to avoid adverse effects to date. It's unclear to us whether that question has been answered to their satisfaction, so I hope that that is discussed later in this meeting. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And we'll go to the line of Erin Adams. Please go ahead.

Erin Adams: Hi. Can you hear me?

Matt Fuller: Yes, we can hear you.

Erin Adams: Okay, great. So thank you. First, I want to thank the various people involved in the administration of this process. Like others that had said this on the call, I think it has been very transparent. And having been involved in many of the public meetings that have been presented, I think

it's been very thorough. I wanted to comment first of all more on kind of a global sentiment and it was actually I think Mr. Coffey from the School of the Art Institute had written in the chat something that really summed up my feelings that we value what has come before us but we also remember that we are making history. We're making history in this process. President Obama made history in being elected the first African-American President. And I can say from my heart, boy, do I miss him being in office. This I think site is honoring that legacy and it's honoring everything that came before him and it's hopefully what is going to come after him. So, so I want to emphasize that and I do think that this waiting of Frederick Law Olmsted who I believe was, you know, a genius in his architecture, but that should not outweigh the significance of President Obama. And there are so many of us here on the Southside and I think across the country and world that are so grateful that this is actually going to be held in Jackson Park close to us. One thought that came off of the previous discussions, so this is a very specific suggestion, was that of course the intent is to involve a lot of the Southside community members in the actual building of the Presidential Center. And so being able to document that process of where these people came from, how this has helped them transform their lives, I think would be a really important part of this process. And I don't know if the Foundation is planning on doing that, but and I don't know if that would really feature into a mitigation type approach, but I do think from historical perspective that we will look back on this and see this is one of the many ways that the Presidential Center has transformed the Southside in positive ways. So I'd like to maybe throw that in just for thought and comment on this process and maybe from the Foundation leaders. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And there are no further questions in queue at this time.

Matt Fuller: Okay, Tom. We have two more consulting parties on the list as well as the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. But first we'll see if the Vista Garage Building Corporation or Vista Homes Building Corporation would like to dial 1-0 and offer comments on the mitigation themes on the screen.

Tom (Operator): And we do have a question. We'll go to the line of Robin Boyd and for everybody else, go ahead and hit 1-0 to put yourself in queue. Ms. Boyd, your line is open.

Robin Boyd: Oh, okay. Great. Great day, everyone. Great day. I just thought I would call in since they did mention me as a consulting party. I'm really participating with the Don Nash Advisory Council, but also representing my business, the Sanctuary on 71st Street and the South Shore Historical Society. And so one of the things that I've been-- I've been listening to the call and I just need to say that Presidential Centers are historic but the <audio cuts out 01:23:12>

Matt Fuller: I think we've lost Robin.

Tom (Operator): Robin, could you please go ahead and hit 1-0 at this time? We did lose you, ma'am, I'm sorry. And we will reopen Ms. Boyd's line. Ms. Boyd, your line is reopened, thank you.

Robin Boyd: Oh. Okay, thank you. And so I don't know where you lost me at, but so I'll just say that Presidential Centers are historic and they are an international draw and I think that they should be both

monumental and extraordinary. And I have to say, a long time ago in the very beginning of this thing I actually felt like south of where it is was a good site. But we're past that now and I'm with the site that has been selected and so I just want to say, I love historic preservation. I love parks, trees and birds. But I love people, okay, <laughs> and I love black people, okay. I try to, anyway. And I just think it's critically important that, you know, we do remember that original plans really did include black folks and we have to be included and we have to decide the ways that we would like to be included. And so I just want to say that the building where my store is was President Obama's first campaign and legislative office and that is historic, okay. No matter what 71st Street looks like now, it's historic. And the South Shore Historical Society, we have been concerned about history and the telling of it and our version and our inclusion in it and I just hope that people will be respectful and excited about our involvement as much as they are about birds, trees and you know, and parks, okay. So that's my take on it from what I've been hearing. I think we need to stay at high level conversation. People can have other kinds of conversation offline but while we're online we need to keep it at high levels so we can move through the process. Okay. Thank you very much. I'm done.

Tom (Operator): And as a reminder to everybody, go ahead and hit 1-0 to put yourself in queue and we will go to Kay Brown's line. Please go ahead.

Kay Brown: Hello. Can you hear me?

Tom (Operator): Yes.

Kay Brown: I represent the Vista Garage Building Corporation. I'm a below grade facility very near the Midway, so my-- from my organization's perspective, I'm concerned about the groundwater and the natural wetland that accumulates on the east end of the Midway. And I encourage the planners to think about some kind of a wetland retention pond, water garden or some other facility that allows for that water to continue to be present. The gentleman from the Save the Midway Foundation expressed that very well. It is currently a refuge for trees and could be planted in a way that would-- or excuse me, a refuge for birds and could be easily planted in a way that would make it a very attractive and educational water feature connecting back to the original landscape of the area that Olmsted chose to incorporate into the original design. Secondly, I'd like to comment on the long-term maintenance of all of these plaques and plans and recognitions for all the parties that use and have used Jackson Park in the past. Being somewhat involved in museums and historic preservation, you make a plaque and then it sits there and fades in the sun and in five years you can't read it. So I would encourage the planners to consider some kind of a maintenance plan and perhaps an interpretation plan for the park and for its various historic features. Perhaps the DuSable Museum and the Museum of Science and Industry, who already has a vast team of young people trained as interpreters, could expand their outreach into the park so that there are park tours along with the other events that will be orchestrated by the Obama Foundation. I'd also like to point out that the only national park in the State of Illinois is Lincoln's home. This would be a reasonable place to make a second national park or at least a national historic monument. If you look at the resurrection of Pullman before national monument recognition and today, it's astounding. Pullman sat unrecognized for 100 years until the National Park Service became involved and provided some

meaningful interpretation that the park and its history, while I agree with Ms. Adams and her eloquent statement, we're creating more history but let's not forget the past. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And we'll go to Dave White's line. Please go ahead.

Dave White: Good afternoon, everybody. And I want to thank both the participants and the hosts for putting this on today. I agree that there's been a lot of meetings. I'm somewhat less enthusiastic about the fact that, you know, it seems that certain points come up again and again and they get ignored. And one of them is if the AOE from definite adverse effects from siting the OPC where it's currently proposed. And these mitigation steps, I would like to know if many of these are intended or hopefully going to reverse some of the adverse effects and if so, was that considered at all in drafting up the four proposed mitigation approaches. I would like to have at least seen them rated--

Eleanor Gorski: Excuse me, I'm sorry. What was your consulting party group again?

Dave White: Yeah. Nichols Park Advisory Council. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: We've already heard from someone from Nichols Park. Could you please limit your comments--

Dave White: Oh, I thought we had two.

Eleanor Gorski: No, no.

Dave White: Oh, I'm sorry.

Eleanor Gorski: Yeah. Let's hold your comments and then we'll go for the general round if you don't mind.

Dave White: Fair enough.

Eleanor Gorski: Thank you.

Dave White: Good deal. Thank you.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay.

Tom (Operator): And we'll go to Stephanie Franklin. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Franklin: Good afternoon. You probably want to hear from me later then because I also represent Nichols Park Advisory Council. So I do have two questions--

Eleanor Gorski: Yeah, please.

Stephanie Franklin: And I can ask them somewhat later if you prefer.

Eleanor Gorski: Yeah, please. Thank you.

Stephanie Franklin: Okay.

Tom (Operator): There are no other questions queued up at this time.

Matt Fuller: All right. Thank you, Tom. So we've made it through the list and we've given all the consulting parties an opportunity to comment except for the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. I saved them until the end of the conversation just because they have a unique role in the Section 106 process and I wanted to give them the benefit of hearing from all the consulting parties before giving them the opportunity to speak so I'll open it up to both the State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and I'll let you decide which agency wishes to go first.

Tom (Operator): We did get one other person queue up right when I said that, so I'll open this line and I'm not sure if it's for the new one. It's Mary Lu Seidel, please go ahead.

Matt Fuller: Actually, could we hold that, Tom?

Mary Lu Seidel: Yeah.

Tom (Operator): Okay. I'll have her re-queue.

Matt Fuller: We should have-- Thank you.

Tom (Operator): I'll release you right now, Mary Lou. Just re-prompt at the appropriate time.

Matt Fuller: So it's open to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer right now.

C.J. Wallace: Hi, can you hear me? This is C.J., C.J. Wallace with the SHPO.

Matt Fuller: Yes, we can hear you, C.J.

C.J. Wallace: Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. We really do appreciate everyone's input in discussing mitigation. I right now we're considering this wide spectrum of mitigation ideas from all parties and we'll suggest implementing the appropriate proportional and feasible levels of mitigation within the themes that you have up on the screen that are research, interpretation, restoration and design review. We appreciate all of this input from all of the parties and would like to take all of those ideas into consideration as we work to mitigate this project at Jackson Park. And basically, for right now, that's what we'll be doing is taking all of these ideas into consideration and I appreciate all of the input. Thank you.

Matt Fuller: Thank you, C.J. Anyone from the Advisory Council?

Jaime Loichinger: Hi. This is Jaime Loichinger. Can you hear me so far, Matt?

Matt Fuller: Yes, we can hear you great. Thank you.

Jaime Loichinger: Great. First I'll touch on a few points that have been made by other consulting parties that question whether FHWA has adequately considered avoidance and minimization measures throughout the process. We had understood that those questions had been addressed by FHWA in the final assessment of the facts but in any event our regulations are clear that information developed to comply with other applicable regulations including local laws can be incorporated into an agency Section 106 review. So right now, based on the conversations that we have all had with FHWA, avoidance or minimization measures that had already been explored under those applicable regulations were determined to be infeasible or impractical and so therefore should not be considered any further or would benefit from additional conversation. But another point that we've heard is that the agency has to first, you know, consider avoidance or minimization before moving on to any sort of conversation about mitigation. While the regulations kind of have that prioritization, of course, that moves from avoidance all the way through to mitigation, there isn't a requirement that the agency exhaustively, you know, explore every single avoidance option before then moving into mitigation or minimization discussions and then exhaustively explore every alternative there before finally being able to move into mitigation discussions. Rather, the regulations talk about the agency incorporating ideas that would avoid or minimize adverse or potential effects to historic properties throughout the entire process, not just at the end when an adverse effect is identified. So at this point if consulting parties have other minimization or avoidance ideas that have not yet been explored, we would encourage them to be shared with FHWA for their consideration. The mitigation discussion that's been had today has been really beneficial. I think we've really appreciated hearing that these ideas are comprehensive. They're in the interest of the public and in particular for the people who live there, who ascribe the, you know, a significant amount of value to these areas. And really, when it comes to mitigation, at the end of Section 106, that's the most important goal, to identify an outcome that represents the broader public interest. So to that end, FHWA should really consider that public interest and what are the benefits to the consulting parties who ascribe importance and value to these properties and how will any interpretive materials or knowledge be provided to the public, to schools and to others who have an interest in the undertaking and its effects on historic properties. So thank you, Matt.

Matt Fuller: Thank you, Jaime, for those comments. I'll turn it back over to Eleanor.

Eleanor Gorski: Yes, thanks. And we really appreciate everyone's comments that we've heard so far and we are checking right now on the time of the webinar and to try to extend the time if we're able to in order to hear some more conversation about many of these topics. It looks like we have about 15 minutes left so what I'm going to suggest is that we finish up with this webinar itself and then have a round of general comments and questions. We only have a few more slides so let me move on here. So then the next step after this particular meeting, this is just some housekeeping issues and Matt can certainly go over this as well. But I think the important thing that I'd like to stress is this is not the end of the

conversation today. I'm actually hoping that this has provoked more thought on the process, more details, that folks will have some more ideas and we would like to solicit those comments from you all by May 26. If you could email any additional comments or thoughts to Todd Wyatt at the email address you see on the screen above, Todd is compiling all of these comments. We will convey those to the federal agencies for their review. And then again, as everything is done for these meetings, we'll post everything on our website for the Section 106 process and then we will be distributing a draft MOA to start the conversation for the next meeting and we'd like-- We will be distributing that ahead of time, so you will have a chance to take that back to your respective group and really look at that thoroughly to come to the next consulting party meeting on June 17 prepared to discuss.

Eleanor Gorski: So with that, Matt, do you have anything else you'd like to do to conclude this part before we open up to more just general comments and questions?

Matt Fuller: I don't have anything specific to add. Just appreciate everyone's time today and thoughtful comments on potential mitigation measures and the process will, as Eleanor said, we'll be taking those back and taking a hard look at them and preparing a draft document that we'll be sharing with all of the consulting parties and the public prior to our next meeting. So let's go ahead and open up the phone lines for the next round of discussion.

Tom (Operator): And again, go ahead and hit 1-0 to put yourself in queue and we will go to Mary Lu Seidel's line. Please go ahead.

Mary Lu Seidel: Hi. Thank you. Can you hear me?

Eleanor Gorski: We can, Mary Lu.

Mary Lu Seidel: Okay, great. I'm sorry, I got to get my notes up here. I'm Mary Lu Seidel, the Director of Community Engagement for Preservation Chicago. In the summary of the comments on the themes of research, interpretation, restoration and design review I feel like I'm being asked to pick a headstone for my dearly beloved parents. Do we want the lilies or a dove? Do we include their anniversary date and should it go between two rings or be encapsulated by a heart? Black granite or gray? A plaque is a headstone of something that has died. Interpretation is storytelling that lacks a place from which to tell the story. We love this place so much we destroyed it and now we are erecting a beautiful headstone to honor it. In the spirit of community engagement, we will seek public input on the color, design and placement of these wonderful headstones. Enjoy. It is exactly this destroy and build mentality that is threatening the Washington Park National Bank at 63rd and Cottage Grove, a demolition plan that Preservation Chicago also opposes. I understand no one wants to hear about the idea of moving the OPC out of Jackson Park, but I will continue to say that as we seek to increase density and spur redevelopment on the Southside, the powers that be choose to build new on already improved and historic sites. So much vacant land is available throughout Woodlawn with better access to public transportation on land that's already owned by the University of Chicago, the City of Chicago and the Chicago Transit Authority. How would moving the OPC just west of Washington to Park diminish President Obama's extraordinary legacy? It would rebuild the Southside, a goal President Obama fought

for in his years as an organizer here, as a U.S. Senator and then as a great President. So I will not contribute my ideas for the design of headstones to honor what was lost in Jackson Park. I will instead focus on design review, since the Federal Highway Authority has said it does not have the power to tell the City of Chicago and the Obama Foundation to move the proposed OPC out of Jackson Park, a position that I disagree with since it could choose to deny funding for the project, it does seem to think it has the power to dictate design. So here are design ideas. Move the OPC further south in the Park. Keep the Center's height below three stories. Make all the land around the Center open and accessible just like the rest of the park regardless of special events. Improve accessibility to the Women's Garden without destroying it. Reduce the lanes of traffic on Cornell and add a bike and walking path beside it. For some, cutting off automobile access eliminates their ability to access the Park. Do not widen Lakeshore Drive and Stony Island. Figure 20 acres of real park replacement. The creative math and loose interpretation of replacement is about the only transparent thing in this process and it should be stopped. I fully acknowledge systemic racism and inequity have pervaded our country since the beginning of the time of white settlers choosing to make this place their home. It is the exact systemic racism and inequity in disinvestment that has led to decades of disinvestment in the parks and communities of color. The Southside has long endured disinvestment by the City-- Chicago Park District, the same entity which is now telling you, telling the Southside that this is all good. Finally, the positive survey summary at the beginning of this webinar skipped over a number of comments I know were submitted that did not reflect that cheery perspective. Standing for this park does not make me racist. It makes me a responsible urban planner, community organizer and community builder. The vision of President Obama inspired me with hope and progress. I am certain his team and City officials can come up with a creative way to honor his legacy, build a Presidential Center and keep intact an internationally significant park. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): We'll go to the line of Brenda Nelms. Please go ahead.

Brenda Nelms: I would like first to address the issue about the reference to a theme park that had set off lots of comments on that and it was not meant to do that. It was not in any way meant to be a slant against President Obama. I would wager my diminishing savings that 99.9 percent of us are great admirers and supporters of President Obama. The reference was to not contrast between the kind of program structured landscape and controlled landscape that will be the OPC and the open landscape that was there before. When President Obama announced-- unveiled plans for the OPC in May of 2017, which have pretty much not changed since then except the building has gotten higher, he made reference that he wanted to create something like a Millennium Park on the South. That's a very different kind of park than Jackson Park has been. Chicago needs both kinds of parks, but by diminishing and removing the natural open space, much of Jackson Park, which is through the core, center core of it. The top is the Museum of Science and Industry, the bottom is the golf course. In between, you have this other section that's a respite and is something that's unusual and something should be open to all. That is what is worth preserving. That is the contrast. I would advocate to support what Mary Lu Seidel just talked about in terms of resituating and the Obama Center to isolate it some from that section and try and preserve as much as possible of that. That's the contrast that is trying to be made. So I hope that perhaps resonates with some of you. Maybe it doesn't. But that was the intent. We, again, I advocate beyond what the issue of moving the Obama Center a little bit south and westward, also replacement parkland throughout the

South Shore and Woodlawn is a necessary and appropriate mitigation for giving up that 20 acres of parkland for the OPC. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): We'll go to the line of-- Go ahead.

Allison Caloggero: Tom, it's Allison. I just had one question for you. It looks like that we're going to go a little-- the comments and questions might run a little over 11:30. I was wondering if we're able to keep the discussion going for about 15 minutes longer.

Tom (Operator): Of course.

Allison Caloggero: Okay. Thank you so much.

Tom (Operator): Yeah, thank you. And again, please press 1-0 for questions and we will go to Stephanie Franklin. Please go ahead.

Stephanie Franklin: Thank you very much. I'm representing the Nichols Park Advisory Council. I'm also a member of the Midway Park Advisory Council and of Jackson Park Advisory Council and members of those also. And I have two questions. One is the discussion of avoidance, which is not what we're talking about here, although avoidance and mitigation are not synonyms. If there was a discussion of avoidance measures and they were not-- they were considered because you're saying in your synopsis here that those measures were discussed or determined to be not feasible or not reasonable early on. And I'm wondering by whom this was considered and decided and when was this avoidance process under-- When were the avoidance, suggested avoidance measures discussed and were they discussed publicly? Because I don't find anywhere in my notes that they have been part of the review by the consulting parties or that the consulting parties were involved in the discussion of avoidance measures. So I think that's part of the Federal Regulations on the 106 process, that avoidance should also be publicly discussed and perhaps I missed that part but there must be somewhere that the discussion on that is in writing and available to everybody and so I would like to have a copy of those discussions. That was my question number one. Question number two is about the roadway changes and I will not say improvements. They are definitely changes. And my understanding is that the widening of Lakeshore Drive, which I believe is a federal highway, has to be done before Cornell Drive could be closed. And I'd like to know what the Federal Highways Plan B is for while that work, if that work gets done on Lakeshore Drive, where-- what is the plan for diverting the traffic off of that stretch that would be under construction and where would that traffic be diverted to? And especially because of the rebuilding of the bridge, I'm not sure how you close half a bridge and whether you close the north half and then the south half and how you do that with a bridge. So that's my second question if you could address that. Where does that-- when can-- does that happen? Where does the traffic go and who pays for it? Thank you. Hello?

Matt Fuller: Hi. This is Matt Fuller with Federal Highway Administration. North Lakeshore Drive is certainly eligible for Federal Aid funding for projects on it, but it's not owned or maintained by Federal Highway Administration, so that question would be more appropriate to be directed towards the City of Chicago. In terms of mitigation measures that have been considered and dismissed, I would refer you to

the assessment of effects that's on the City's website and there's also a number of documents related to comments we received on the assessment of effects that documents are a consideration of avoidance measures that we talked about early on in this presentation that have been considered and dismissed. So Nate, I don't know if you're on the line, if you want to address the staging question on North Lakeshore Drive.

Nate Roseberry: Yeah, I'd be happy to, Matt. And I think you meant South Lakeshore Drive for this location. The, yeah, so for Lakeshore Drive the construction, proposed construction on Lakeshore Drive would maintain all three northbound lanes during construction and at a minimum one southbound lane. There are currently two southbound lanes from 57th to 63rd. During construction we'd maintain one of those, so we would never detour all traffic off Lakeshore Drive during construction. The proposed plan also includes a maintenance traffic plan that considers the staging of different work. So we would maintain Cornell Drive open to traffic while work was occurring on Lakeshore Drive to handle any diverted traffic and also maintain Stony Island open to traffic to handle any diverted traffic.

Stephanie Franklin: Okay, I'm hearing that but I'm not hearing what happens when the traffic load becomes more than those existing roads can handle.

Nate Roseberry: So the proposed improvements have taken into account the regional model to try to determine growth and that's a model that takes into account land use and transportation growth. So the proposed improvements have been designed based on that model to determine what are projected traffic volumes. We've done it during this process for both the years 2040 and 2050 to ensure that the proposed improvements can accommodate the regional traffic growth and based on analysis, it can.

Stephanie Franklin: Okay. And on the first part of my question about avoidance, could you repeat when that discussion took place and where those public documents are that discussed avoidance? And what were the reasons for deciding that the things were either reasonable or not reasonable or feasible or not feasible? I'd like to know where that public document is and how I can read it. I wasn't talking about mitigation, I'm talking about specifically avoidance because as I say, those are not synonyms.

Matt Fuller: Right. The City is maintaining documents, public documents on their website and that's where you can find this information, the assessment of effects that was prepared earlier this year in response to comments, contains all of that rationale for why we dismiss those. So I would just refer you to that website.

Stephanie Franklin: Okay. I do have a design mitigation review idea. And that is that instead of clearcutting the location you leave the trees and that would help a great deal to alleviate the shock to the system of having 500 to 1000 trees removed from that location. I'm agreeing completely with everything that Mary Lu Seidel said and also Brenda Nelms.

Eleanor Gorski: Okay. Thank you very much. I think we need to allow time for other folks to ask their question. Could we have the next caller?

Tom (Operator): Yes. Moving along, we'll go to the line of Michael McNamee. Please go ahead. Mr. McNamee, can you hear us?

Michael McNamee: Can you hear me?

Tom (Operator): Yes.

Michael McNamee: Okay. So this is Mike McNamee from Save the Midway again. So this is regarding the Landmarks Illinois comment earlier on the design review item of retaining the alignment of both east and westbound Midway in Jackson Park with-- and adjusting the OPC footprint to allow that. And we support that idea and this would mitigate any adverse effect to the Women's Perennial Garden as it could be preserved as it is and with whatever minor adjustments we would need to do to bring it into ADA compliance. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And we will go to the line of Louise McCurry and as a final reminder, please press 1-0 for comments. And Ms. McCurry, your line is open.

Louise McCurry: Can you hear me?

Tom (Operator): We hear you.

Louise McCurry: Can you hear me? Okay, good. So first of all, just want to say thank you again for doing this. I know it's a long and arduous process but greatly appreciate it. Quick answer to the person who said that the OPC should develop a way to honor his legacy, well, the OPC has developed a way to honor his legacy which is the plans for the Obama Center in Jackson Park. And it's a really wonderful plan put together by the community coming together over hundreds and hundreds of meetings which I've been really proud to be part of. Secondly, I just want to go back to the concept of handicap accessibility and take that on to the Midway. In terms of mitigation, one of the things that during the World's Fair Olmsted was very clear about was that he was handicapped. He had one leg that was run over by a wagon and therefore one leg was about eight inches shorter than the other, so getting around was really difficult for him. Burnham had COPD, which is a severe lung disease. So Burnham didn't allow automobiles in the park nor did he allow boats that used smoke-fueled engines that put smoke into the air. So both of them would be aghast at having Cornell Drive running through their park. But conceptually, they put together what was called wheelchair-- put in wheelchair carriers, and those were young men who took people who were handicapped along a very carefully designed pathway that went from the boats that got off at the harbor all the way through the parks. They understood that many handicapped people would be visiting the park, so having wheelchair paths that were in good repair and were safe was really important. In terms of the Midway, we have a really wonderful opportunity now to restore, literally restore those old wheelchair paths. And this would be a wonderful, wonderful historic mitigation, I think, for what we're doing both in the Midway and in Jackson Park. And that's all I have. Thank you so much.

Tom (Operator): Thank you. And we'll go to Louise McCurry. Please go ahead. Louise McCurry, your line is open.

Louise McCurry: You just had me.

Tom (Operator): Oh, you were in there twice. I'm sorry. One moment. We do have one more queuing up who should be with us momentarily. And we will go to Gary Osswerwaard. Please go ahead, sir.

Gary Osswerwaard: Well, I wanted to say that this discussion has been quite thorough. A lot of the different ideas and thinking out ideas that others had and fleshing them out is tough, too, so I would encourage the further comments. One thing that was said, though, by people is it's easy to say to move something, so and so to the south, but then you have to consider what gets bumped out there. And in this case it would be the track, the athletic, the major athletic track used by the schools. So if there is to be a change in that area with the, you know, by the Women's Garden, then you have to figure out what to do elsewhere. And already there's been complaints because it is part of it is too high, so are you going to fill the whole space with buildings? You know, so if you don't move it to the south in the sense of eliminating the track. So any-- And then that's, I think, one of the reasons why some of the solutions with adjusting with design were eliminated was probably because it's a matter of push and shove and the same would be true with the roadway changes. So if it's possible there could be further changes in the design, but then they're not going to be easy. And I want to thank everybody who contributed and also the, well, the staff. And I think they've given a good deal of thought to it, too. And there must have been many diverse voices among the Highway Commission and the Park Service and US Aid's and the others and to have come to a consensus on this, and I think it's an honest consensus. I don't think <laughs> there's a conspiracy or anything, because I mean, what's going on in Washington. I think that they really wanted to do the best for the park and let's see that we do the best for the park. And I think we'll go ahead with the project and maybe change some, but and certainly to celebrate all the people on the Southside, to celebrate the whole long history of the park as well. Thank you.

Tom (Operator): And that does conclude our questions. There are no other participants queued up.

Matt Fuller: All right, thank you. I think we'll go ahead and close the webinar for today. Again, just another reminder that we are accepting additional comments and we'd like those focused on the mitigation themes that we presented earlier in the webinar. Those can be sent to the City or to Federal Highway by 12:00 Noon on May 26. And thank you again for everyone's participation.

Tom (Operator): Ladies and gentlemen, that does conclude our conference for today. Thank you for your participation and using the AT&T Executive Teleconference. You may now disconnect.

####