

Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting Summary Report

March 29, 2018

On March 29, 2018, the Chicago Department of Planning and Development (DPD) and the Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) jointly hosted the second Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting at the Logan Center for the Arts at 915 E. 60th Street, Chicago Illinois from 3:30 PM – 5:30 PM. Three options were made available to participate in the meeting: attendance in person, attendance by phone, or attendance by webinar format. The meeting was attended by 96 people, with roughly 20 people participating via webinar. Representatives from the Federal Highway Administration, Illinois Department of Transportation, Obama Foundation, Chicago Park District, DPD, CDOT and project consultants were present in addition to representatives from consulting parties as outlined below:

Section 106 Consulting Party Attendance Record (status as of 03/27/18)		
Agency	Accepted	Meeting Participant
1Woodlawn	YES	
20th Ward Service Office	YES	
51st Street Business Association	YES	
5th Ward Service Office	YES	
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)	YES	YES
Blacks in Green	YES	
Business Leadership Council	YES	
Chicago Historical Society	YES	
Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights	YES	
Chicago Park District	YES	YES
Chicago Transit Authority	YES	YES
Chicago Urban League	YES	
City of Chicago, Office of the Mayor	YES	YES
Coalition for the Obama Presidential Center	YES	
Community Task Force for Promontory Point	YES	YES
Cultural Landscape Foundation	YES	
Federal Highway Administration	YES	YES
Federal Transit Administration	YES	
Friends of the Parks	YES	YES
Hyde Park Academy	YES	
Hyde Park Art Center	YES	
Hyde Park Historical Society	YES	YES
Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference	YES	
Illinois Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Land and Water Resources	YES	
Illinois Department of Natural Resources	YES	
Illinois Department of Transportation	YES	YES

Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting Summary Report

March 29, 2018

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency	YES	
Illinois Natural Resources Conservation Service	No Response	
Illinois State Geological Survey	NO	
Illinois State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)	YES	
Jack and Jill Moms Chicago	No Response	
Jackson Park Advisory Council	YES	YES
Jackson Park Highlands	YES	
Jackson Park Watch	YES	YES
Jackson Park Yacht Club	No Response	
Kenwood-Oakland Community Association	YES	
KLEO Community Life Center	YES	
La Rabida Hospital	No Response	
Landmarks Illinois	YES	
LISC	No Response	
Metra	YES	
Midway Plaisance Advisory Council	YES	
Museum of Science and Industry	YES	
Museum Shores Yacht Club	YES	
National Association for Olmsted Parks	YES	
National Park Service	YES	YES
National Trust - Chicago Office	NO	
Network of Woodlawn	YES	
Obama Foundation	YES	YES
Openlands	YES	YES
Preservation Chicago	YES	YES
Promontory Point Conservancy	YES	YES
Real Men Charities, Inc. and The South Shore Current & West of the Ryan Magazines	YES	
Save the Midway	YES	
School of the Art Institute of Chicago	YES	
South Shore Advisory Council, South Shore Cultural Center	YES	YES
South Shore Chamber	YES	

Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting Summary Report

March 29, 2018

South Shore Works	YES	
South Shore YMCA	YES	
Southern Shores Yacht Club	YES	YES
Southside Together Organizing for Power	YES	
Tribes - Ho Chunk Nation	No Response	
Tribes - Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	YES	
Tribes - Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	No Response	
Tribes - Potawatomi – Forest County	YES	
Tribes - Potawatomi – Prairie Band	No Response	
Tribes - Potawatomi-Citizen Nation	No Response	
Tribes - Potawatomi-Hannahville Indian Community	No Response	
Tribes - Potawatomi-Pokagon Band of Potawatomi	No Response	
Tribes - Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri	No Response	
Tribes - Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma	No Response	
Tribes - Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa	No Response	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Chicago District – Planning	No Response	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Chicago District – Regulatory	YES	
U.S. Department of the Interior Fish & Wildlife Service	YES	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	YES	
University of Chicago	YES	
Vista Garage Building Cooperative	YES	YES
Vista Homes	YES	YES
Westside Health Authority	YES	
Woodlawn Community Development Corporation	YES	

The meeting included a presentation discussing the Section 106 process, results of the identification of properties (both archaeology and architecture/landscape), and the next steps in the process. A question and answer session followed the presentation, including questions from attendees in person, on the phone, and via webinar.

On March 19, 2018, a draft Historic Properties Inventory (HPI) Report and a draft Archaeology Report were distributed to Consulting Parties for a 30-day review period. The goal of the meeting was to

Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting Summary Report

March 29, 2018

provide a summary of the two reports and request input from Consulting Parties on the eligibility recommendations included in each report.

Several participants spoke during the question and answer period and there were 29 written or emailed comment letters received after the meeting (before the end of the public comment period on April 19, 2018). The following is a summary of key topics raised:

Comments Regarding the Section 106 Process

- How can the Section 106 process begin without final OPC plans?
- How does the Section 4(f) review fit in with Section 106?
- Will replacement UPARR land be considered in the Section 106 process?
- How will visual impacts to historic resources be addressed?

Comments Regarding the NEPA Process

- Concern for content and timing of the elements of the NEPA process.
- Questions regarding how the Section 106 process fits within NEPA.
- How will the public be able to participate in the NEPA process?
- What is the schedule for the NEPA process?

Requests for Historic Resource Additions

- Southern Shore Yacht Club

Comments on Area of Potential Effect (APE) Map for Architecture

- Consider including Jackson Park Highlands and/or entire South Shore neighborhood.
- Please remove the request to remove Promontory Point from the APE.
- Please consider “flatness” as a contributing feature to the historic landscape.

Comments on the Historic Properties Inventory (HPI) Report

- Why would a structure be deemed eligible or not eligible for the National Register?
- Provide more information regarding specific types of trees within Jackson Park.
- The 1930 plan that includes drawings from Alfred Caldwell showing vegetation, tree plantings, and golf course plans should be included.
- Clarify the selection of 1953 as the end of the period of significance. Does the selection of this date make critical historical changes outside of this period vulnerable?
- Period of significance should be adjusted to 1981 to account for social history.
- Period of significance should be adjusted to the 50-year cutoff (1968) as is customary.

Comments on Archaeology

- Recovered artifacts should be used for educational purposes within Jackson Park.
- More information can be extracted from the artifacts that were recovered.
- The borings collected seem limited, will more borings be conducted on the OPC site? What if volunteers can help?
- Please develop an inadvertent discovery plan for items recovered during construction.
- Please clarify why Criterion D was the only criterion used for archeology eligibility analysis.

Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting Summary Report

March 29, 2018

Comments Regarding Historic Roadways and Circulation

- Are all of the roadway closures within Jackson Park needed?
- Roadways and paths contribute to integrity of Jackson Park, why couldn't Cornell Drive be narrowed instead of removed completely?
- Is the roadway configuration considered a defining characteristic of Olmstead's plan?
- How will the roadway closures and improvements be sequenced?
- Significant roadway changes are listed between 1895 and 1953. What is considered a 'major roadway change'?
- Please acknowledge the historic significance of the Midway Plaisance terminus.

Comments Regarding Historic Landscape Analysis

- Evaluate the historic landscape by section for the entire park
- Tree loss will be important to mitigate.
- Too many park features are listed as contributing.

Other Topics Raised*

- How will changes in the park provide adequate access for people with disabilities?
- The FHWA Purpose and Need Statement should change the No-Action condition to only include roadways that would be closed if OPC was not in Jackson Park.
- Removing parking on Hayes Drive will affect hundreds of people who use the athletic fields on either side.
- How will NEPA reviews address cumulative effects?
- How can the OPC continue moving forward through City approvals before the federal review is completed?
- The decisions to locate the OPC in Jackson Park and close roadways were made prior to the completion of the SLFP.
- Safety is a concern for users in the park.
- Consider selecting replacement recreational opportunities somewhere that is not currently parkland.
- How many UPARR grants were received for Jackson Park?
- Has there been coordination with NPS regarding the recreational uses of the OPC?
- What is the timeline for determining replacement parkland?
- What categories of recreational opportunities are recognized by NPS?
- Consider the plans included in the existing Midway Plaisance Framework Plan.
- Is additional area outside of the OPC 19.3 acre footprint needed for construction equipment?
- Has a delayed replacement option for replacement parkland been discussed with NPS?
- How will displacement and the potential for rising home values be addressed?
- Please do not put baseball on the Midway Plaisance.
- Will OPC campus remain available for public use?
- Will the OPC actually include a Presidential Library?

**These comments are unrelated to topics covered under Section 106 but will be shared with colleagues managing the South Lakefront Framework Plan Update, the Federal NEPA review and development of the Obama Presidential Center.*

Many of the above questions are addressed directly in the revised HPI and/or through the FAQs published online. The next step in the Section 106 process is to finalize the Historic Properties

Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting Summary Report

March 29, 2018

Inventory Report with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), National Park Service (NPS) and State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to determine final eligibility recommendations. After the report is finalized, the effects of the FHWA and NPS undertakings will be documented in an **Effects Assessment Report**.

Project updates, including distribution of the Effects Assessment Report, will be disseminated via email as well as posted online at: www.tinyurl.com/JPIImprovements.