

## Section 106 Webinar Closed Captioning Transcript

Thursday, January 23, 2020 at 11:30AM Eastern

Please stand by for realtime captions.

, For standing by. Welcome to the section 106 consulting final assessment of effects overview. At this time all participants are in listen only mode. Later we will conduct a question and answer session. If you wish to ask a question over the phone, please signal by pressing star one. I would like to turn the conference over to your host, Abby Monroe. Please go ahead.

Okay. Thank you everybody. For those of you looking at the webinar, I am showing up as Samantha primer, that is someone on our consulting team. This is the voice of Abby Monroe with the planning and development department. I am joined by sellable folks in our project team who were introduce themselves through the webinar. I will be the primary presenter along with Matt Fuller from the Federal Highway administration. I want to welcome everyone to this webinar for consulting primaries. Just to give a few tips for your participation today since this is a new format for the way we have been communicating with you, we wanted to make it easy for everyone to join, there for you can call in from your home or office. We will give a presentation for 20 to 30 minutes going over the final AOE and the changes we have made the comments we have heard from you all. Anytime during the presentation if you would like to chat a question, please go ahead and do that. There is a chat feature part of the webinar we are monitoring. If you wouldn't mind including your consulting party affiliation in your child, so we can make sure we know the nature of your comments. Then, we will select a few of those to read aloud at the end of the presentation, or if there is a very pertinent question, we will try to get to it in real time. All of the chatted comments will be included in a video and audio recording of today's webinar. We will post that online. Just so you know, this information will be public. At the very end of the presentation, we will open the phone lines for verbal questions and comments from the consulting parties on the line. Right now, we have about 47 participants in the webinar, including the advisory consult of direct reservation as well as the state reservation office. We will have a panel of speakers that can respond to questions. We ask if the question has already been asked, please do not ask it again. We share this time with other organizations, there are 47 groups on the phone and I am sure everybody wants a chance to speak. We are asking that you stay 23 minutes or less. With that, to go over a quick agenda for today. I will give a brief introduction about where we are in the process and then I will hand it over to our federal partners to go over the federal agency roles within the section 106 process. I will then give an overview of comments we received on the draft of assessment of effects of the agencies collected response to those comments. We will then go over next steps for consulting primaries in the section 106 process, then we will open it up for questions, as I just described.

Hopefully, this is not your first consulting parties meeting. Just to go over where we have been to date, the section 106 process includes four steps. We started with establishing a list of consulting parties, which you are a part of. Then, identifying the historic properties within our area of potential effects. We also completed an archaeology survey as part of the second step of the process.

Right now, we are at the tail end of the assessment of effects stage. We issued a draft assessment of effects back in August and we received comments on that from consulting parties and the general public. We have taken our time to be really careful in addressing those

comments. Here we are today. We are here to go over what changes have been made to you. Then, we will explain the next steps in the process later on.

This slide is included just to give you contact information for all of the different agencies that are involved in the project. I will leave it up here for a minute. But, we have all of these folks, except Becky instead of Brad today, able to participate and answer questions at the end of the call. I want to highlight we have a project one site where you can get the documents associated with this project as well as project schedule updates listed at the bottom of the slides.

Just to give a brief overview of where we are at in terms of the final assessment of effects, we have issued the final draft, it has been revised to include more contacts and analysis based on the specific comments we received from consulting parties and the general public. In addition, we updated the historic properties inventory via an addendum to include the new Chicago Park Boulevard system national register nomination. The most notable changes to the actual assessment of effects are enhanced background detail and organization of the adverse effect analysis related to cultural landscape of the Jackson Park and Midway. We also conducted a view shed analysis of the higher elevation as well as analysis of adjacent neighborhoods. Those are the overall findings of the report that remain unchanged. Then, lastly we extended the adverse effect findings for the Jackson Park historic district to include the Chicago Park Boulevard system. I will go into more detail about these things later on. We wanted to just give you an overview of the most notable changes.

This slide is included to , this is a direct excerpt screenshot from the report itself, this table in its entirety can be found on pages 81 and 82 of the assessment of effects. He will see that the effects findings for the report remain unchanged, except for the addition of the Chicago part Boulevard system historic district. We are still only finding a adverse effect to the landscape district, as well as adding the Chicago Park Boulevard system historic district.

So, now I will hand it over to Matt Fuller from the federal highway to give an overview of the federal agency roles under section 106.

Things, Abby. There are three federal agencies who have approval action associated with undertaking. Two federal agencies are the Federal Highway administration National Park Service and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Each of these three agencies must fulfill the requirements of 106 prior to issuing approval for funding or a permit. More than one federal agency is involved in the under taking, a lead agency which identifies the concern of an agency official to fulfill the collective responsibilities under section 106. The Federal Highway administration, or FHWA, has been identified as the lead agency. Federal highway is responsible for all aspects of the section 106 process and coordinate closely with the other federal agencies to meet the responsibilities. Federal funding is proposed to be used on a regular modification, which we require federal highway approval. FHWA's approval for the proposed funding of the modifications to change drive and Lakeshore Drive as well as the bicycle and pedestrian improvements in and around Jackson Park. U.S. Army Corps has jurisdiction over water resources within areas potential effects including permitting for impacts to waters in the U.S. And impacts to the Great Lakes fishery and ecosystem restoration program. Approval from the U.S. Army Corps is required if either of these resources are impacted. The National Park Service also has an approval related to the youth Park program. We received a number of comments during the comment period on the draft

assessment of effects. I am going to turn over the presentation to the National Park Service folks so they can explain more detail about the park program and how that operates.

Thank you Matt. This is Joe Lynch and I and with the national Park services and I am the chief of state and local systems, which has the administrative responsibilities for the park program. I have a colleague in my room with me, Emily, who I will pass it on to after this slide. So, the urban recreation, urban Park and recreation recovery program was created in 1978. It provides direct matching grant to a predetermined list of economically distressed urban communities. The purpose of those grants were to stimulate those local governments to revitalizing their Park and recreation systems. There were three grant types available at the time, planning which was a prerequisite for participation in the program and those funds went toward cities and urban counties to identify needs prioritizing strategies to revitalizing the total recreation system within their communities. The program goal was the rehabilitation grant, which were brick and mortar type grants and grant that were intended to rebuild both indoor and outdoor recreation facilities. And not just the recreation for components but the entire park itself with walkways and things of those sorts. Finally, there were grants that were available, we call them innovative grant, they were designed to allow the cities and communities to demonstrate innovative ways to enhance Park recreational activities in the community. Finally, it created a unique legacy, it required existing parks to remain in perpetuity unless the Sioux City request to convert the site to a non-recreation use and gives approval. This time, I will pass it over to Emily.

Good morning. The you partner program published migrations outlining prerequisites to be completed to receive approval from the conversion from the National Park Service. Under UPARR, there was a loss recreation land that had to be identified to define the footprints, determine the needs and the current site offers through existing facilities and they had to determine the types of recreation resources and opportunities available. That is for the property that will be taken out of the UPARR boundary. Then, for the replacement property, we need to know the following things, these are the prerequisites that had to be administered by the clinical jurisdiction. That means they also collected. It can be new parkland or existing parkland. It does not need to be adjacent or close to the lost recreation land. It must meet existing public recreation needs through community involvement, and has to provide equivalent recreational activities opportunities to those laws. They don't need to be the same recreational activities, if we lost the basketball court, we can put in a tennis court instead.

So, conversion under UPARR is how it works and how the correspondence for section 106. The National Park Service has to review the condition and approve a boundary and adjustment that is done through a memo to the grant. The Commissioner includes it has to be in accordance with the current local park chorion for action program and the city of Chicago has just updated their plan for Jackson Park. They have to ensure the recreation properties. Under section 106 for our program, the area of potential effects is declined. The remaining UPARR protecting park lands and any extent, any areas we have seen from any of those places. Our complaint is focused on the recreational opportunities that will be developed on the proposed replacement property. Thank you.

I will go over the comments and agency responses. I can see people are having a little bit of challenge hearing others in the room besides those of us next to the form. I will ask all of the speakers to make sure you're speaking loudly and come over here if you need to. So, we received over 40 letters from consulting parties and over 100 70 public comic emails during the comment period of the draft draft assessment of effects. We have revised that to incorporate the applicable comments and responsive bids responses. Those of you interested, we reviewed a disposition of comments that were shared in the package of documents

released to the final AOE. It is also available on our website currently. All of the comments during that period, as well as comments today will become part of the project record.

For organization, we have boiled down the key themes from the comments we received into 7 categories. The remainder of the presentation will walk through each one of these seven topics and present a response.

The first, was the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be included as a primary federal agency due to its federal action based on its permitting responsibilities. We agree with that. The AOE was then updated to describe and evaluate to the Army course actions as part of the overall federal undertaking. We worked with with the four things that Army Corps will do. If you have any questions about these sections of the 44 permit, we will be happy to answer that.

The next, was how will traffic affect adjacent historic neighborhoods due to the road closures? Our response is that the traffic analysis we provided is based on information from see map, which is a federally recognized planning agency for the Chicago region. The road closures affect Sterling Avenue, Hayes Drive and Lakeshore Drive and therefore create unacceptable levels of service on those roadways without capacity improvements. The traffic increases on other roads are modest and do not require roadway modifications and do not perceptively increase noise. Therefore, the historic integrity, which is what the true view is about, of the adjacent historic neighborhood, are not affected by the road closures or additional traffic. In the AOE has been advised to elaborate on this and conclude these documents in the conclusion.

The next comment is why is Washington Park not included in the area of potential effect? It is not included because there are no perceptible changes in Washington part as a result of increased traffic. There are no direct or indirect effects as a result of the undertaking. Jackson Park, Midway croissant at Washington Parks are managed separately for historic significance despite having overlapping histories. We have included a map of the area of the potential effects. The area of potential effect is defined as areas in which the character or use of historic properties could be altered. In this case for this project, the area of potential effect is very broad including all of Jackson Park all of midway bosons and neighborhoods between 56 and 5060 fourth Street. It's area was concurred by the state reservation office during the inventory portion of the 106 review.

The next comment is that the patient analysis should be completed from a higher perspective to ensure all visual effects are assessed. We agreed and we enhanced the view shut analysis and revised it to include elevated views within the area of potential effect. To do that, photos were taken using drone technology captured at elevated views from buildings within the area of potential effect that are taller than the existing tree line, which is generally more than three stories, and that were individually eligible or listed on the national historic historic places or contributed to ineligible listed historic district.

These photos are an example with the red arrow highlighting what these fees may look like. While the museum building is visible in several images, you can see all of the images in the appendix D of the assessment of effects. This is the big reason for those built-ins, this is the big reason those buildings are listed on the national register are described in table 1 of the assessment of effects do not include views. Therefore, effects to these properties remain not at first.

The next comment is the assessment of effects should be very nice to articulate how the undertaking is altering or diminishing the integrity of the character the founding cultural landscape characteristics of Jackson Park. The assessment of effects was revised to incorporate more information regarding effects on the cultural landscape.

Specifically the revisions include additional background and detail on conserving resources including the women's garden and the cultural landscape components. There is a new summary of adverse effect to cultural landscape that organizes the information and discusses spatial organization, land-use and views, circulation, topography, vegetation, building structures and small-scale elements. And finally we included a New summary of effects to the east and of the Midway Plaisance.

The next comment is that it is not clear why the Midway Plaisance was selected as a UPARR replacement site and whether other sites were considered. The replacement site is selected by the Apple and that is the city of Chicago. The National Park Service evaluate the proposed replacement site to ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements. Including the proposed replacement is administered by the same political jurisdiction, it may be either new or existing parklands, it is not required to be adjacent or close to the lost recreation, meets the existing recreation needs and provides equivalent recreation activities to those that were lost, although it does not have to be the same recreation activity.

To give more detail, the city evaluated seven sites under placement recreation options. We considered sites to be similar in magnitude and impact for user communities and sites that served the same communities where the lost recreation is. The city also considered walk ability to Chicago's lakefront, walk ability to neighborhoods surrounding the Obama presidential Center site, potential for recreation act opportunities at of improvement, cost and feasibility of each site and the similarity of sites to the one that is being lost to recreation. The Midway Plaisance in our view fulfills the city's criteria to satisfy the community's recreational needs and meets the UPARR replacement criteria.

The next comment is that will Jackson Park and the Midway plus aunt remain on the National Register of Historic Places and retain its eligibility if the undertaking is implemented? Under section 106, adverse effects may occur without affecting eligibility resulting in a property being removed from the National Register of Historic Places. Jackson Park and Midway Plaisance will remain eligible for listing on the national register for historic places. And a letter that evaluated that is included in appendix B of assessment of effects as written by the Illinois Department of transportation.

That concludes the overview of the changes we have made it to the assessment of effects. I will ask Matt Fuller to go over the next steps for consulting party specifically in the section 106 process and we will get to answering some of your questions.

Things, Abby. To remind everyone, the final assessment of effects was posted online on January 16, 2020. Which is the beginning of the review and opportunities to either concur or object with the findings obtained in the assessment of effects. If a consulting party disagrees with the effects frightening, they may object in writing within 30 days and must specify the reason for the disagreement when they notify us. That notification can either be sent to Abby Monroe or myself at the contact emails on the screen. The deadline for receiving either agreement or disagreement or objection to the findings is February 18. If you we do receive any objections, the federal highway has two options, we can either consult with the party to resolve the disagreement, or we can ask the advisory Council and historic preservation to

review the findings and provide us with their opinion is no consulting parties object within the 30 day period, we are able to move on to the discussion process which is to resolve the adverse effects with consulting parties and the general public.

Once we are able to conclude the assessment of effects, we will move on to the resolution of adverse effects step. We will host a consulting party meeting or workshop to identify avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures to address the adverse effects. In conclusion of the process, we will compare a draft 106 moment of agreement. We will make that available to consulting parties for review and the section 106 memorandum of agreement was fined by the common Tory that concludes the process. Other federal review processes are being conducted in parallel with the section 106 process including the section for evaluation for the transportation element of the project as well as a knee but document which covers Park service, federal highway and U.S. Army Corps of action.

Okay, great. We will go ahead and see if there are any questions that have come through in the chat that we want to answer, just give everyone a minute to look through that. Then, while I go over the panelists here and available to answer your questions. We have not Fuller from federal highways, lead treasures from the national Park service who is a section 106 expert, Joe Lynch and Emily Ferguson also for the National Park Service I can speak to the UPARR program. Colin Smalley from the Army Corps of Engineers. Nate Roseberry with the city of Chicago's Department of transportation. Eleanor Gorski with the city of Chicago's Department of planning and development, and Greg DeVries who is a cultural landscape expert and helps us from the consulted of effects from Quinn Evans. We have any comments we want to address? I think we will just go ahead and open the phone lines. Angela or the operator, will you mind going over the process for those participating in how they can ask a question? Yes, thank you. If you wish to ask a question over the phone, please signal by pressing star one. That is star one to ask the question over the phone.

I believe you will be placed into a queue where we will just move through the questions.

That is correct. We do have some questions. Collar, please go ahead, your line is open.

Please tell us which consulting party you represent.

This is Stefan from the cultural landscape foundation, can you hear me?

Yes.

Here is my question. The letter dated September 24, 2018, the Federal Highway administration determined even though the relocation of the new track and field Park was not subject to federal permits funding or approval, but the work was however an indirect effect with the proposed federal action, and that therefore is part of the federal review process, the effects of relocating track and field will be taken into account under 106 and NEPA. The recent version of the AOE, Federal Highway administration seems to support the claim that the city's actions do not require federal funding or approval and therefore are not subject to an HP age requirements. In addition to being contracted, this recent claim contradicts Federal Highway administration's earlier position. My question is this, why has FHWA adopted this new position, one that ignores the reasonably foreseeable effects of the undertaking and at what administrative level that decision was made? Thank you.

, For your question. I am think I am going to ask federal highways to respond to the federal highway to respond to whether they wrote --

This is not Fuller with the Federal Highway administration. The AOE does address the track and field and the effects as part of the undertaking. But, just because we analyze it as an indirect effect, it does not mean that the federal highway has any approval over that action. That means a city and park district decision where to locate or relocate track and field.

Thank you. I guess it will take the next question.

Yes, thank you. Please go ahead, your line is open.

Hi, this is Lee Slidell with preservation Chicago. Can everybody hear me?

Yes, go ahead.

I have a question for the Federal Highway administration and the National Park Service. At the federal level, the participants, with the city of Chicago being the lead, the Davila tater of this project and coordinator of the assessment of effects, does it strike anyone, with all due respect to the city of Chicago as a conflict of interest when this entire process, this entire project has been approved by the city of Chicago and assessed and ready to move forward, yet they are serving as the lead organizer of this process now, thanks.

This is not Fuller with the Federal Highway administration. I will go first. It is allowable in the section 106 administration that the applicant can compare information on behalf of the federal agencies. We are required to review that and make sure that we solve that requirement. Is there a second part to your question?

Is my line still open?

It is, yes.

Okay. It's just a conflict of interest. Should there be another party directly correlating with the project that does not have a direct contact center?

Either tactic is for the applicant. Again, we review it very carefully and we make sure that all of the requirements are fulfilled and that documentation and if there are changes that are to be made we ensure those changes are made. While the city prepares the documentation, ultimately it is the federal agency's responsibility to make sure the information is accurate and those findings are the Federal Highway administration's.

This is Emily Ferguson from the NEPA program. Our applicants that receive the program are the ones that have to put together the conversion package to provide to us. All of the documentation has to be put together by them for our review and approval. We do take a look at everything and we make sure it is consistent and makes sense that it meets the requirements of the program before we move forward with anything. It is delegated to our applicants because that is the way the program is set up and the file was for him and our regulations.

Okay, thank you we will take the next question.

Thank you, please go ahead collar, your line is open.

This is Jenny from the NCH HP. I did have a quick question, or I guess more accurately wanted to clarify something. Because of where we are in the process, any objection should be forwarded to FHWA as the lead agency for section 106, not to the city, although this can certainly be copied to them. But it is up to FHWA to resolve any objections. Second to that would be on one of the sides, the previous one, it was mentioned there would be a meeting or workshop to put together the resolution of adverse effects. Typically speaking, that kind of resolution takes place over multiple meetings or teleconferences. I would like to have additional detail on the timeline and the proposed scheduling for those kinds of meetings so that consulting parties have the ability to participate in the resolution of adverse effects and provide additional ideas on mitigation efforts.

Hi, Jamie. It is not Fuller with the Federal Highway administration. We do not have a specific timeline right now because we are in the middle of the U.S. assessment of effects objection.. Our objection will be as soon as we can get through the assessment of effects process and resolve any objections, you would have the meeting on resolving adverse effects in short order after that process is complete. We do not have specific time frames right now because we do not know exactly the time frame for resolving the objections to be getting.

We will release a schedule for the mitigation process at the beginning of section 106. We will share that information as it becomes available.

Abby, was that you that was just speaking?

Yes. Again, I understand that applicants can have a robust role can play in the section 106 says, but when it comes to the resolution of adverse effects, it is critically important that the federal agency, the lead federal agency, come back and manage the resolution of adverse effects. So, questions for FHWA in regards to developing that schedule with all of the other consulting parties.

That is how we have managed the process throughout and we will continue to do that in the next step.

Before we go on to the next global question there were a couple of questions in the chat pod. The first one is for the National Park Service. The question is when is the National Park Service component of the review expected? If anyone wants to take that. Maybe you can talk about both.

This is Lee from the section 106 point contact for the National Park Service. We have been embedded in the process with federal highways. We will continue to be embedded in terms of making sure all section 106 documentation meets federal regulation and Park service policy in terms of analysis and working with consulting parties in the public. I will let my comrade speak to the UPARR schedule.

This is Emily. What will happen is we will proceed through the section 106 process. We will get to the point where an MLA or -- put together and everybody will sign it. Then we roll into the NEPA process because that informs the NEPA section. And once we have the NEPA document that is released to the public, it goes through a 30 day comment period. Sometimes that could be extended. At the conclusion of that, the National Park Service will write if that is the direction we can go to include NEPA, we would write an amendment to approve the conversion with her at that time. That is all contingent on all pieces being done and in the correct order. We have adequate information and documentation.

Great, thank you Emily. The next question is can you please explain how you define modest increase in the traffic study.

This is Nick Nate Roseberry with C.. We will determine the level of increase and what the potential impacts might be. There are plenty ways in the project area where we determine the traffic volume increases would require roadway changes to adequately accommodate those increases in traffic. The remaining roadways, what we look at is number one does require changes? All of the other roadways did not. And number two, what level of traffic is happening on the road? You see fluctuations in traffic on our roadways. Typically with changes in development and such. All of the other changes within the context of those typical cross-section of roadways could accommodate. They are in that range of what people would expect to see traffic flow, for instance on a two-way collector or our two lane global roadway.

One last question before I move on. The provisions are being made for consulting parties that are objecting and went to delay the process? Is there a final deadline for section 106 to conclude?

This is the Highway administration. I will address that comment. Each consulting party has the opportunity to concur with our determinations or object to the findings. Within the section 106 process, there is a step-by-step process for resolving those objection. So, if we receive an objection, then the Federal Highway administration can go you two routes, either talk to that party to resolve the disagreement, or admit that objection to the advisor, we cannot resolve the objection locally. If we submit something to the advisory Council, their typical response time is 15 days, although they may extend that if they find it necessary. So, there are some timelines associated with the objection process to make sure that the section 106 process keeps --

We can move on to the next question on the phone.

Thank you. We will take our next question, please go ahead, your line is open.



This is Mike from safe midway, can you hear me? So, my question is for Lee, Joel and Emily. There are some areas that are currently underserved for public parks and playgrounds. Some of these have been identified by the Midway Council and other community organizations. My question is, if the city Department of planning works with Midway and other community organizations to identify a parcel now owned by the city, appropriate for park and playground, that was not on the Midway, and that theoretically be eligible to be considered as a replacement location?

This is Joel Lynch, thanks for the question. Yes it would be to keep it a simple response. Okay, great.

Move on to the next question.

That was my question.

Great, thank you.

We are going to take our next question, please go ahead, your line is open.

This is for Matt Fuller. I want to follow up on my last question and be more direct about it. It's the FHWA's position that it is going to deal with the reasonably foreseeable effects of the city's actions when it comes to consultation and resolving adverse effects, or is it not going to do that?

The reasonably foreseeable effects or actions that occur, we do identify as effects in the section 106 analysis. Those effects are not directly related to the federal highway project. So, those aren't going to be subject to mitigation requirements for federal highway.

I am sorry Scott, I just jump in to point out. One point that I think is important to make is that while the city's actions may not be subject to section 106, they are part of the undertaking. Part of that, the area of potential effects. The agency, FHWA in this case, when it looks at resolving those adverse effects would take into account the level of federal involvement, which is one of the factors. But, it is part of the section 106 analysis it just being kind of scaled at an appropriate point, recognizing the level of federal involvement.

I'm sorry, that was Jimmy with the advisory Council. Can we go on to the next question then?

Thank you. We will take our next question, please go ahead, your line is open.

Hi. This is -- from community leadership Council. One of the things I have to press upon and thank you for this process, I participated in at least over 100 forms, meetings, community as well as stakeholder meetings since 2016. And the city Department of planning, Department of Transportation, the Obama foundation, Jackson Park, advisory Council stakeholders including the park district has had all of these meetings where there is tremendous community input every step of the way. And, there will be those, who again I have a question for, who no matter what will satisfy. I appreciate you articulating the process of moving forward, being able to advance in the 15 day process for the advisory Council. One of the things I have to press upon is that this whole entire footprint, including this 120-year-old golf course, with all the stakeholders and community members who had overwhelming support, which is only a few that will take that opportunity to delay even more. We would rather the Army Corps of Engineers, when you are at a process of inflection point, where there is danger to the entire shoreline. Is that also going to move the ball forward? If this emergency arose in registration environment going to propel and not allow there to be additional disruption in delays? Colin, I know there are a few other Army Corps personnel, they are very cognizant of this entire process in accelerating. I hope that everyone understands, every stakeholder organization and those numbers, who really participate, have expressed overwhelming support when moving it forward. Thank you again for allowing me to talk.

Thank you all for sharing those comments. I didn't hear a specific question, but we definitely have your comments recorded. Is there anyone else on the line that would like to ask a question?

Yes, we do have one more question. Please go ahead your line is open.

Hi, this is Aaron items. I just wanted to reflect what Al commented on and also asked again about what I feel like is an attempt to further delay this process, I think it has been a real rigorous one. So, we have had hundreds of meetings, we have had delays in the section 106 process in order to accommodate all of these comments. Now, I feel like there are being additional comments on this. You know, we have almost 600 signatures on a letter of support for this process. Thing for all of the opponents that are trying to throw sand in the wheels of this process, there is easily hundreds of supporters that are getting frustrated at this. I hope that we can move forward with continuing this process but continuing it and not further delay.

Okay, thank you Aaron. Is there anyone else waiting to ask a question?

Yes, can you hear me?

Just barely.

Let me speak louder than.

Yes, thank you.

This is Louise from Jack Stone Park advisory Council. We have waited for this process to be complete. This comes from the next stage, which is our children's play area and adverse effects because we can't use the new process being built. My question is if we decide -- can reuse the reports from this process as part of the sediment or do we have --

Louise, we are having trouble hearing you, it sounded like a question is if you can repurpose the section 106 report for something else. We could not hear what that was. Can you speak louder?

Let me try again. If we have this wonderful report that will now be approved or disapproved, shouldn't -- decide to add a new play area or a new swimming pool, do we have to repeat this entire process again, or is this position considering players throughout --

A question about changing a recreation element of the park separate from this process and what would apply in terms of regulatory.

This is Emily Ferguson from the UPARR program. The city of Chicago and Parks district, I don't always know everything about how it functions here, they are allowed to make any changes they want to Jackson Park, as long as it stays in recreation. The National Park Service does not need to be involved. The addition of another. Ground, addition of another basketball court, pickle ball court for seniors, they would not come to the National Park Service to get approval to do that.

Thank you.

I believe I have answered the question. Is there anything else? Okay, we can go on to the next caller.

Thank you we will move on to the next question. Please go ahead, your line is open. Please go ahead, your line is open. It appears they may have stepped away, we will move on to the next question. Please go ahead, your line is open.

This is Margaret Schmidt from Jackson Park March. I want tremendous all the purpose of the section 1 of six review is to assess the impacts of the proposed project of a historic landscape, a historic property. That said, the city is the sponsor of this project. This revised AOE makes it abundantly clear that the project will have significant adverse effects on Jackson Park and its roadways. This is a question for the city, is it the city's position that is unable and unwilling to work to alter the project designs for the OPC buildings in the roadway changes to avoid and/or minimize these adverse effects?

Thank you Margaret. I am going to ask Eleanor for a response.

Hi, Margaret. L it is Eleanor. I think you are aware of the process the city has gone through up to this point to determine the roadway configuration as well as review the design and placement of the Obama center. It was through that process that we looked at minimizing the

effect on the landscape, receiving comments from advocates as well as in the neighborhood. There were many public hearings held on this especially going to plan commission and our city Council, considering that entire record. We do feel we have gone through the process to consider that.

I would like to push back on that. It sounds like a framework process what you have now inserted in this AOE was not a process that reviewed the proposal for the OPC design for the roadway changes. We will certainly put it in comments going forward. We think that more can be done and should be done, thank you both, Eleanor.

Thank you for your comments. We will go on to the next caller.

Thank you. We will move on to the next question, please go ahead, your line is open.

This is Scott from TC LF. I want to follow up with Eleanor on Margaret's comments. The AOE versions repeats that same idea that the opportunity to avoid adverse effects were part of what the city did to its approval processes and its public hearings and community meetings. That is within their. My question is aside from that directing a parking garage on the midway, can you tell us one single example of the modification to the proposed OPC design that resulted from the city's efforts to avoid adverse effects?

Very much. The roadway design, that was probably I want to say five different iterations and tweaking throughout the process. The details of which are visible on our website, the different presentations that were given over time. As for the center itself, it's the building design and the evolution of the site has will change over time. As you may be aware, many of the buildings I should say, the landscape will rub onto the roof of the building. That was very fine tuned in order to reach us into the landscape and was very much discussed in the public, not just in presentations, but in workshop community meetings. As well as there are multiple models built to demonstrate to the community at large, the changes and how it would appear in the landscape.

Thank you. If I may, the two examples you made show the opposite is true. The roadways are and adverse effects. That is hardly something that the city did to avoid an adverse effect. A change in the roadways according to the AR ER adverse effects. As for the OPC building that has grown taller during the section 106 process. It has gotten to be out of the building. I can hardly be an example of what the city has done to avoid an adverse effects. I would like to ask again, is there a single example outside of replacing the midway Park garage everything that the city has achieved to mitigate an adverse effect on the design itself?

The other area I was reminded of the replacement parcel in the design of the Parkland recreation that will be included there. That has been tweaked again to reduce the impact on the overall district.

Do you feel that is a significant tweak as he put it?

Yes, in particular because in the first draft, we thought that the impacts and midway would be adverse given what we were proposing and we treat the design in this latest final version to remove the adverse effects signing. There are impacts that they are not at first.

I would say to you that looking at this project for many kind of distance, I cannot see evidence that the city has asked the Obama foundation to do a single thing to avoid adverse effects. I think the best thing is to report the city what they had just produced. I am prepared to do obligation when it comes to avoiding and mitigating adverse effects, the city certainly did not. Thank you.

Scott, I just want to follow-up. The federal government does not have any authority to evaluate what should be built or what it will look like. We will not be looking at those kinds of measures to avoid in terms of where the OPC is located, that is beyond our decision-making authorities and the Federal Highway administration.

Section 106 is your authority, that is a process we are involved in. I find it distressing that you are so willing to advocate that. That is exactly what we have been doing here for two

years. I think representatives from the AC HP commented you will be obligated to do that in your proportion in scale to the federal undertaking. I suppose that will have to be ironed out in more detail later.

Just to follow, we took a broad approach to identifying effects. The Federal Highway administration approves would roadway projects. We looked at multiple alternatives to avoid and minimize effects to Jackson Park only to the roadway improvements. These development decisions are not federal highways, we have no role in that process. We certainly identified what the effects are as part of this broad scope undertaking. Ultimately, we cannot tell the city how to develop their property.

This is Marvin from the Corps of Engineers. If I can just real quick, I wanted to differentiate between authority and procedure. There are certain procedures we have to follow when we are issuing federal permits. But, our authority to do the federal action comes from other places here in my case it is the Clean Water Act. And a particular funding authority for our project. That is what we mean when we say authority. Each agency has something that allows it to do the federal action. We even have other procedures that we have to follow with section 106 and NEPA are our two prominent examples.

Thank you, Colin. We go on to the next caller.. We will take our next question, please go ahead, your line is open.

Hi, this is Mary with preservation Chicago. I do want to concur with Scott's point about the avoidance. There is no avoidance in this AOE and there was no avoidance in the last AOE. I know that the design of the building is outside of the federal government's review. To suggest, which I think I heard that they can't tell the city how to develop their land, they can oversee a process that in fact it spells out some avoidance strategies that can be considered and that can mean not closing off some roads or narrowing existing roads instead of closing them. That is certainly within your authority. I guess I have two quick questions about the access to the public spaces outlined in this assessment of effect. I am assuming that access to public space is immediately adjacent to the Obama presidential Center will have limited accessibility. It will be reverently controlled the publicly assessable. If there are special events, or the president is in town visiting the center for an event, that those areas will be off-limits. I also have a question about again finding replacement parks. I see details of the seven sites considered. But, the section on Park relocation was talked about. It was really hard to look out sites because there could be unknown soil conditions. There is due diligence, they are not unknown conditions, you can assess that stuff before a new Parkland is considered. I really think to the point earlier about having newer Parkland in an area that is underserved by parks is more important than finding a way to make these changes to the midway.

There were three parts to that question.

Sure. This is Matt. You know that there were not any avoidance options evaluated in the AOE. I would want to do the roadway valuation we undertook to evaluate different options to avoid impacting Jackson Park, that was a very specific process impacting AOE as well as other documents that have been prepared under the Federal Highway administration. It is not accurate of all the options that have been considered. With respect to the close roadways, again similar to what the city decides to place the OPC, the Federal Highway administration has no approval action or approval authority over those decisions. The city can choose to close roadways and it is not the federal highways role to take any action on those decisions. I'll turn it over to the city for the other questions.

Mary Lou, this is Illinois. I think the two questions I heard, you stated about the access to the public space on the Obama center site. Did you have a question about that?

That is counted as we are returning this on this land to publicly accessible recognition space. The question is I am assuming that has to be those areas adjacent to the center that will have limited public assess ability. I just wanted to know if there is anything outlined in agreement

with the Obama foundation to when those public spaces, those privately controlled public spaces will actually be accessible to the public.

Mary Lou, this is again something that was reviewed by counsel. So if you plans, the lamb seems to be owned by the city, the foundation leases it. There is a lease agreement that outlines those terms. I am sorry, use agreement that outlines those terms. That is separate from this process. Now, the third question you have, remind me.

It was about the alternate sites for the replacement part being a place that is in area near the Jackson Park that has limited access to parks day. And I think the gentleman from save the midway brought up a similar question related to that. Considering other spaces to expand access to areas within the neighborhood that are part two prize.

Mary, the city had to take into other consideration aside what was the youth requirements. We consider cost, feasibility, ownership, the complexity of turning a space or land into Parkland, and the quality of the recreational opportunity within a mature landscape. We also looked at workability to neighborhood surrounding the OPC site so it was served in the same community. That in a nutshell is where we ended up with the east and midway. We thought that was the best choice.

All right, thank you. We will go on to the next caller.

Thank you. We will take our next question. Please go ahead, your line is open. To make this is Brenda Nelson. I actually have two connected questions. The first one is a follow-up to the discussion about the selection of the midway for the you par replacement. My understanding earlier in this conversation this morning I believe it may have been Emily Ferguson from the Park service was that part of their consideration was that the recreation needs to be defined by public involvement, that there needed to be discussion and engagement in the determination of what would be used if it was a different site. Forget it didn't have to be adjacent and the issues of that workability to the lakefront. There has been no public definition of the plan there now. I just want to ask the city and Park service about that. My second question has to do with where the federal funding for the roadwork is going to be used specifically, exactly what areas will be used for federal funding and for the other areas specifically getting the money from the other work.

I will go ahead and answer the first question related to public engagement selecting the recreational opportunity proponents that will be proposed for the midway. I believe that you are intended Brenda. We did host more than one meeting with several stakeholder groups related to the midway area. The are different initial ideas and narrowed it down based on community input to the proposal that you see today evaluated in the assessment of effects. The belief we have had quite a bit of public input on what the recreation opportunities should be. The park district has been pretty receiving in that. We know there needs to be public engagement on specific design details which we have planned at the beginning of the federal review process.

The second question on funding. We are going through this process to be sure the project is eligible for the proposed transportation. There is an agreement with the state of Illinois to provide funding for the transportation improvement to save all of the funds for those as state funds.

I understand that, but can you specify will the funding go for Lakeshore Drive, Hayes Drive, closing Cornell Drive, all of it, none of it, parts of it? That is the part that is a blank.

The way we have it structured is we are approaching the transportation in three different instances. We have come to agreement on the funding of the first sect which will include Lakeshore Drive between 63rd and 57 and between Coney Island and Lakeshore Drive and so many islands between 64 and 59. There are no proposed federal forms in that. And there are no proposed federal funds for any of the closure or removal of roadways.

The closure of Marquette or the closure of Cornell are city responsibilities?

Correct. There are no federal funds.

Okay, thank you.

Is the city paying for the closure of Cornell?

The closure of Cornell is included in that as well so that would be state funded.

It would be part of the state funding, I am having a hard time understanding the transmission, I am sorry to ask for the repetition.

Sure. That will be state funded and including the improvements listed and the closure of Cornell and midway. Future sets will include other improvements and other closures. We do not have a final agreement of funding on the those of us yet.

Thank you.

Okay, thank you. We can move on to the next caller.

Thank you, we will take our next question please go ahead your line is open.

Hi. Mary Hansen. I am with the homeowners association. I also have membership associations for the clerk advisory Council in the midway advisory Council. I was also at that meeting you reference to Brenda. I believe one of the things discussed at that meeting was the idea of the midway and a regional Park and therefore wasn't appropriate for you Park sign and having one person from one member of the midway advisory consult who was present who happens to be a resident of Woodlawn basically saying I live across the street from that site and I would love to have a children's park there. We also had several people who noted that there are a lot of seniors who live around the midway and having passive park locations there would actually be lovely for seniors as well as children. I don't think there is a consensus, you talked about there being public meetings. There will be lots of people who would be interested in attending that. Another point I would like to make is I really appreciate all of the work that all of you are doing, both the city and federal agents to get through what is a fairly complex and convoluted process. I think in the conversations we are having today, it actually sort of undervalues the work that the city and the Obama foundation has actually done to modify the plans for the site. Just to comment, not really a question, but thank you all for all of your work.

This is Jackie from the Hyde Park Art Center at the consultants party. The discussion so far has focused on many aspects of Jackson Park as a board member and a cultural institution in the neighborhood. I would like to point out them rather than seeing the building with the OPC Jackson Park as an adverse effect, I understand the narrow definition of that based on the federal statute, but here we live in the 21st century, we believe resources are to be available to people both in their neighborhood both in the world and we tried for many years to define the outside as South coastal coast. We were never successful in that but we have wonderful museums in the park already on the south side. And we would love to see the building of the OPC as historic in that part to add to our neighborhood and cities in the country as a whole. Thank you for listening to this,

Mary, I want to go back to one comment you made about the consensus around what should be as part of the midway replacement recreation, I agree that we have heard comments in favor of a children's park and we have heard comments in favor of a passive open space. That is why my now our proposal includes both of those opportunities. We imagine that the playground will be designed in a way that is respectful of the historic surroundings, but we understand that many folks that we have are wide open space and very flexible for many types of recreation. That is what is described in the final assessment of effects.

Abby, thank you for saying that. I think the other aspect of it is that, that particular midway site at the moment tends to be underwater a lot. And therefore, part of which we are dealing with here is also making it a habitable space, whether it has any amount of programming, it is a dumb pond right now. I think that is another point that is noteworthy in terms of the evolution of the planning for the OPC site. There is amazing detail and focus on putting

together a landscape site that is companionable to people and birds and creatures and really is focused on being really a laboratory for what you do in climate change in terms of keeping an area. Thank you again.

Just to clarify, we are planning to resolve the water retention issues. We can go on to the next caller.. We will take the next question. Please go ahead, your line is open.

This is Mike again from save the midway. I have a follow-up question for the National Park Service virtual, Emily and Lee. So, if there is a simple way to cure the replacement site that avoids adverse effects in the midway, will the National Park Service prefer that result?

This is Emily Ferguson from the National Park Service. We believe that the city is allowed to put forth any parks that they would like to for replacement property, we don't make a decision or have any involvement in that part. If it is a culturally sensitive area, then we will complete a section needed associated with that and mitigate as needed. If it was a non-historic Park, he will still have to go through section 106 to make sure there had are no historic property evidence nearby or underground. And before we went forward, it does not prevent it being used for --

., Emily. Again, we can go on to the next caller.

Thank you. We will take our next question, please go ahead, your line is open. Please go ahead your line is open. It appears they may have stepped away. There are no further questions over the phone.

This is Jamie from a CHP, I just had one question and one sort of comment could the National Park Service, you are responsible for the national policy act review, could you please provide information on what the schedule is for releasing the draft environmental assessment and what opportunities there may be for some consulting parties hereto participate in the public review process under NEPA? I think people might appreciate caring for that additional information. And one note on any objections that may come up here in the section 106 review. At this point, any objections that are lodged should relate to the application of the criteria of the adverse effect contained within the regulation. It is important to note that an adverse effect to any historic property that was identified means that the undertaking itself result in an adverse effect. People are worried about or concerned that perhaps an adverse effect to historic property wasn't exclusively stated in the attachment of effects. It is important to know that there already is an adverse effect to the store properties, which is the undertaking overall is an adverse effect that does require resolution of those effects through the execution of the memorandum of agreement.

This is Morgan Elmer from the National Park Service, project manager for the EA. We have reengaged analysis and assessment of the apex to the project under NEPA. And we invite all stakeholders to dissipate in public involvement and we expect to release the EA later this summer and we will provide a schedule on the city's website as it is confirmed.

On it, is anyone else come on the line to ask a question?

Yes, we have a question on the line, please go ahead, your line is open pick

Hi, my name is Candace and I and run a children's program that caters to children and families that live in the community as well as around the community. What I find what is significant and important is what is happening right now in the present in these communities are very important. What is important is that these children in the communities are able to benefit and will be able to benefit. It is frustrating that these statements are telling this process. I am sorry about hearing about the symptoms and delays. I am looking forward to moving on with this process thank you so much.

Thank you for your comment. I think we have one more question coming through on the chat. Specifically related to describing the different, now that we have a second adverse affect funding for Chicago Park Boulevard in the historic district on top of Jackson Park and

Midway District. It reads from Quinn Evans who is our cultural landscape consultant can speak to that and what that means in terms of the section 106 review process.

This is great. I just wanted to note that Jackson Park and midway place historic district are two resources that are contributing to the parks and boulevards historic district. So, because of the proposed changes within Jackson Park specifically, there is a determination of adverse effect for the overall a much larger Chicago parks and Boulevard district because of the impacts on proposed impacts on Jackson Park. As far as the midway + CU Paul replacement recreational action goes, the city has proposed a design process that would adhere to the secretary of interior guidelines for the treatment of historic properties, specifically cultural landscapes. And so, that is a change within this version of the --

Thank you, Greg. I am going to go back up since we are nearing the end here to the next steps for consulting parties to quickly remind everybody that the deadline for submitting any formal objection letters is February 18 and they should be emailed to both Matt Fuller at federal highways and myself, that we can be as responsive as we possibly can. And as a reminder, this webinar audio and video will be posted online tomorrow if you would like to share that with anybody. Can the operator let us know if there are any other people waiting to ask the question, if not we will close.

Yes, we have some questions on the phone. Please go ahead caller, your line is open.

Hi, this is Robin Hopp. With the Nichols Park advisory Council. On question of adverse effects, when the design was first created for the process, said I know changes will come as times change. What is critical is no matter how good a project may be that it has not changed the basic ruling purpose of the park. Which in this case was the place for city dwellers to escape. The basic premise of the Obama center, and I have listened to the tapes of President Obama is to create a very vital space which is the antithesis of the design of the park. Now, I am also concerned on page 75, where they are saying, because the federal highway authority, if it is involved, you don't need to look at the avoidance and minimization of facts. I would be very surprised that they wouldn't eventually get involved. Finally, I want to read from something here. When we first looked at the beginning and considering the proposal the city had two practical alternatives, denied the foundations proposal and lose the opportunity to host the OPC. Or, approve the foundation's proposal subject to development. Times have changed, they aren't committed to being in Chicago. Everybody agrees, we want to see the Obama center, we want to see it soon. If we want to see it soon, the best thing would be to look at the avoidance and minimization, because what we need is more park space on the south side, not less. Thank you very much.

Thank you. Go on to the next caller if there is one.

Thank you. We will take our next question, please go ahead your line is open.

This is Margaret Schmidt from Jackson Park watch, just a quick comment. It was pointed out earlier in the webinar that the ideal to culture resources section has written a letter saying that despite the significant adverse effects, Jackson Park will remain on the National Register of Historic Places. I would like to point out that is not a determination that the idea T cultural resources section has the authority to make. That is an open question and we will see what happens, thank you much.

This is Matt Fuller with the Federal Highway administration. The federal D.O.T. has qualified professionals and historic architecture to complete that analysis and provided that to support our conclusion that Jackson Park midway will remain eligible for the national register. In order for properties to be removed from the national register, there is an entire process that will have to be gone through. Our conclusion is that even after the -- will still remain eligible for the national register.



We understand, but your section has released. We just want to point out again, it is not really in your the authority to determine that, this is a process. Many others would be involved in as well. Thank you as well.

Under the section 106 process, the federal agency, the agency that meets the eligibility determination, if there are challenges to those determinations, there is a process of elevating those to the national Park service. Several comments is that whether Jackson Park and the midway Midway Plaisance will be eligible after the undertaking and we provided our input on that.

Margaret, this is leave with the National Park Service. We concur that it is a federal agency to make that determination and we do concur with the idea T conclusion on the undertaking, although adverse would not rise to the level where it would be potentially jeopardizing the overall listing on the national register of historic places.

So that there is an additional process that I D.O.T. send this to requesting a recurrence, or can you share that with the public more broadly?

The letter is in the assessment of effects and it is available online. It is clearly described in the disposition of comments. That is the federal agency's position and it is described in the AOE.

Again, it is ideal to his position, we have not seen anything prior to this comment right now from the Park service, the National Park Service saying the National Park Service has been in any way involved. I would ask for leave from the National Park Service to please provide documentation about your involvement in the process, that would help us understand it, thanks again.

Margaret, the assessment of effects document speaks to what the Federal Highway administration and the National Park Service as well as the Corps of Engineers have conferred upon, as far as describing the effects under the provisions of 106 and also the conclusion. We do stay quite clearly that we feel that the listing requirements for the national register are not being jeopardized by this undertaking. In other words, our assessment of affect is a federal document and has been approved by federal agency and we are very clear in that document, that is our finding.

Okay, were there any other colors waiting?

Yes, we do have one more question. Please go ahead, your line is open.

Hey, I am going to try and equip. I have a couple of -- I thought about the impact on the liver and historic districts. You know, the language in this AOE indicates that quite honestly that this won't affect the national register designation because we are chipping away at a little part of the Boulevard district and there are plenty of other miles of Boulevard within the district to keep it eligible except the president setting in just a and to delay at another section of the Boulevard until ultimately the Boulevard district loses its integrity. It is more of a I also want to go back to the avoidance measures on page 75 in the city saying there were only two options to approve this project or deny it, and I would argue there is a third option that would satisfy everybody, and even eliminate the need for this 106 process is to remove the Obama presidential Center west of Washington Park to an incredible sight that would have the same overwhelmingly positive impact, only more so, an area in greater need of redevelopment in the area immediately adjacent to Jackson Park, that is just another comment, there is a third option, and it is one that was considered and was actually I believe by the University of Chicago proxy. We do not want to lose, I think an end everybody on this call agrees that having the Obama presidential Center and show in Chicago would be the most extraordinary outcome for the city. But, how we get there that is the issue, thanks.

Thank you. As someone one question come in through the chat. Which is a question about whether or not any objection letters we receive, whether they will be made public and posted on our website, I'll have not respond to that.

This is Matt Fuller from the Federal Highway administration. All of the letters that we receive as part of the comment period and objection period will be made available as part of the public record, whether or not they appear on the systems website, we will have to check that.

Were there any colors waiting to ask a question?

There are no other further questions over the phone.

Great, thank you everybody for your process of patient today. I hope this was informative and we were able to resolve some outstanding questions amongst the group. As you know, you can email us at any time and we look forward to talking to you again at the next stage of this process. We will close for now, have a great day.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your dissipation, you may now disconnect.