

[Background Sounds]

[Charlie Webb]

Good afternoon and thank you for participating in the public scoping meeting for the General Service Administration's Environmental Impact Statement to address the future of the four buildings at 202, 208 through 212, 214, and 220 South State Street. Let's begin with introductions.

My name is Charlie Webb. I work with [inaudible]. We're a company that's been hired by GSA to assist them with this study. Over at the table here is Joe Mulligan, GSA's Project Manager, Michael Gonczar, GSA's region five NEPA Program Manager, and Regina Nally, GSA's region five Historic Preservation Officer. A couple other speakers – we have Angel Dizon, the GSA's Regional Public Building Service Commissioner and Chief Judge Rebecca Pallmeyer from the Federal District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

So the purpose of tonight's meeting is to obtain public input on alternatives, impacts, and other information to be considered in the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, Environmental Impact Statement process. This meeting also provides opportunity for public involvement in the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 process. And for those of you who are familiar with that process, this does not – this meeting tonight does not initiate formal consultation under section 106. It is simply an opportunity to provide input to that process. This meeting is being recorded and will be made available on the project website GSA is developing. In the short-term, this presentation will be e-mailed to those who are participating in the meeting.

So here's our agenda for this evening. Joe Mulligan will go through the background on the study and the four buildings. Michael will talk about the National Environmental Policy Act process. Regina will talk about the National Historic Preservation Act process. We will have introductory remarks from Commissioner Angel Dizon and Chief Judge Pallmeyer, and then we will begin the most important part of the evening, which is public scope and comments. Joe?

[Joe Mulligan]

Thank you. So, again, I'm Joe Mulligan. I'm the project manager at GSA. We'll begin with going through some background of the site that we're here to discuss tonight. So, as Charlie stated, we're evaluating potential environmental impacts associated four properties, 202, 208 through 212, 214, and 220. So for those looking at the PowerPoint, that's identified in the yellow on the image between Adams and State, and the boundary to the south is Quincy Court. Immediately

west of the site is the Berghoff restaurant, a privately owned property, as well as the Dirksen Federal Courthouse. To the south are additional GSA properties, which we have federal tenants residing in as well. I'd like to spend a few moments just going through the history of the buildings.

So, again, we have four. They were acquired by GSA acquisition [inaudible] in 2007. By 2014, due to life safety reasons, they became unoccupied and were unsuitable for use. Currently, as noted in State imagery we have, there is scaffolding that surrounds all the properties for a public safety measure that is due to the falling [inaudible] façade. So we do have that in place. I'll review the descriptions on the slide just because the font may be small for some of the room, but we'll go through each.

So 202 South State Street is the property on Adams. It's also known as the Century Building. It's a 16-story commercial-style building with Late Gothic details, clad in terra cotta, designed by Holabird & Roche, and constructed in 1915.

Then immediately to the south of that is 208 to 212, also known as the Thompson Company building, a three-story retail building designed by Marshall & Fox and constructed in 1920, stucco façade dates from circa 1995.

Two fourteen South State Street was originally a six-story Italianate-style building designed by C.M. Palmer, constructed in 1887. It was later reduced to four stories circa 1920 and reclad in metal. This property also has an art deco storefront.

And then finally 220 South State Street, which is also known as the Consumers Building, a 21-story Chicago School office building with Classical Revival Details, clad in terra cotta, designed by Mundie & Jensen, constructed in 1913.

All four properties reside in the national historic district. That is the Loop Retail Historic District. So we're identifying that in hatched lines that you see on this screen. So it's a decent area in the loop. Our Federal Center is identified in the shaded region, but the four properties reside in that district. Two – the two high rises, 202 and 220, contribute to that district and are listed. So as we continue this discussion, we'll next go to the NEPA overview, and Michael will present that information.

[Michael Gonczar]

Thank you, Joe. So good afternoon, everyone. Again, my name is Michael Gonczar, and I'm the NEPA program manager for the State Street [inaudible] Environmental Impact Statement or EIS for short. NEPA thanks you for taking the time to participate in today's public scoping meeting and welcomes your comments and feedback on [inaudible] action. In the following slides, I'm going to provide you with an overview of the level of NEPA analysis by GSA [inaudible], where we're currently at in the NEPA process, the purpose and need, and finally the [inaudible]

alternatives.

GSA is preparing an environment impact statement or EIS for short in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act for NEPA. NEPA is [inaudible] legislative charter for protection of the environment and provides for the consideration of a wide range of environmental issues and planning and decision making for federal projects. NEPA requires GSA to consider whether our proposed action can significantly impact the quality of the natural and human environment. Key resources to be evaluated in the EIS document include environmental justice, cultural resources, such as archeology and historic structures, safety and security, impacts to traffic and transportation, land use plan and zoning, and air quality, among others.

On November 1, 2022, GSA published a Notice of Intent or NOI for short, in the federal register. The NOI initiated the formal scoping process, which we are beginning tonight with this public scoping meeting. This is the area in which GSA and the public collaborate to define the range of issues and potential alternatives to be addressed in the EIS. The public scoping process will be discussed in more detail in the next slide. After reviewing all of the issues raised and potential alternatives identified during the public scoping period, GSA will conduct its environmental and cultural resources sites. These studies will be used to prepare a drafted EIS, which will be made available for public review and comment. In the spring of 2023, GSA will solicit public comments on the draft EIS and conduct a public hearing, which will be in a similar format to today's meeting. Publication of the final EIS, which will include GSA's response to comments made during the public hearing, is slated for fall of 2023. Finally, this process ends with the Record of Decision or ROD for short. The ROD explains GSA's selected alternative, describes the alternatives the agency considered, and discusses the agency's plans for mitigation and monitoring, if necessary. GSA anticipates the ROD to be issued in late winter 2024.

As I just mentioned, we are currently in the public scoping period for the NEPA and the NHPA planning process. In carrying out our responsibilities under these laws, GSA is committed to ensuring we provide proper consideration to the quality of the natural and human environments and how [inaudible] project [inaudible]. Scoping is an important and vital opportunity for you, the public, to provide your comments on the proposed project and identify concerns you may have so that they may be [inaudible] EIS.

The public scoping comment period will continue until December 12th, 2022. During this time, members of the public and stakeholders can continue to provide comments on the proposed action and undertaking. Comments may be submitted during this meeting verbally or using the comment form found outside this conference room in the back. You can also email statestreet@gsa.gov or the mail [inaudible] the mailing address on this slide. After the public scoping period concludes, GSA will issue a summary document of all of the comments received with our responses.

The purpose and need of the proposed action and undertaking is to address security. The Dirksen Federal Courthouse and its occupants are at particular risk of harm by the [inaudible]. Physical security surrounding the courthouse needs to be maintained and enhanced and respond to congressional intent. Congress passed the 2022 Consolidated Appropriations Act with the following expectations: A defined scope to demolish the four properties and funding through demolition of the four properties and finally, manage assets. There is no federal occupancy need for these buildings.

GSA will consider viable alternatives prior to making a decision. Your comments and participation with consulting parties may identify additional viable alternatives. The three alternatives identified today are Alternative A, demolition of four buildings at 202, 208 through 212, 214, and 220 South State Street, Chicago, Illinois. Alternative B, viable adaptive reuse. GSA will consider viable adaptive reuse alternatives if they meet the 15 criteria listed in the Notice of Intent that was published on November 1st, 2022, and it was also shared with you when you registered for this meeting today. We will review the 15 [inaudible] criteria next. Please note that no federal funds are available for rehabilitation, preservation, or restoration of these buildings. And finally, Alternative C, no action. GSA would continue the status quo. The buildings would remain in place, vacant with significant repairs needed and with limited federal funds available for maintenance. Now I'm going to hand it off to our project manager, Joe Mulligan, to go over the viable reuse criteria identified in Alternative B. Joe.

[Joe Mulligan]

So this information is also stated in the Notice of Intent as well. All of this information is but, specifically, the criteria identified for viable reuse. So this was formulated by and in collaboration with the Northern District of Illinois and our federal law enforcement partners, but I think for those interested in this alternative, it's critical that these be recognized in this forum for your attention. So I do want to spend a few moments just going through each of them. There's 15 in total.

The first one is retaining – the federal government retaining ownership interest to achieve its security objectives. To elaborate on this with the most straightforward is out-leasing opportunities. However, developers may offer options for consideration. So it is a performing specification, and you may present something that may be more incentivizing under this criteria.

Occupancy/use. Properties shall not be used for short-term or long-term residential or lodging, places of worship, or medical treatment, services, or research.

No use that requires access to the outdoor area is permitted. Access to the roof is restricted to maintenance and repair activities. Personnel and materials that will be present in this area shall be subject to clearance and controls necessary to meet court security objectives.

Four, the developer would have no access or use rights to Quincy Court. As stated earlier, that's

that [inaudible] site and currently that is restricted already [inaudible].

Five, loading is restricted in a manner to achieve court security and prohibited in Quincy Court. Loading on State or Adams Streets would be subject to local ordinance requirements.

Six, occupants and users of the buildings shall have no sight lines into the Dirksen Courthouse, the Dirksen Courthouse ramp, or the Quincy Court properties owned by GSA.

Seven, no parking or vehicle access on or within the properties.

Eight, developer is responsible for staffing at their expense, security 24 hours with personnel approved by the Federal Protective Service or an entity to whom the security services are delegated by Federal Protective Services.

Nine, developer must obtain and maintain access control systems to prevent unauthorized access to any location within the structures. Each exterior entrance point must have an intrusion detection system and access control installed, and the developer must provide federal law enforcement access to each system.

Ten, developer must install and maintain interior and exterior security cameras and provide federal law enforcement officials with access and the ability to monitor the feeds in real time.

Eleven, developer must install exterior lighting necessary to achieve courthouse security objectives.

Twelve, perimeter security. The developer must prevent unauthorized access to the properties that would result in an unapproved sight line.

Thirteen, fire escapes and any structures that allow access from the street must be removed.

Fourteen, all construction documents and specifications for any renovation, rehabilitation, modification, or construction of any portion of the building (interior or exterior) will be subject to review and approval by federal law enforcement agencies.

And finally, no project may start without the advance approval of GSA. Now, Regina Nally will speak on the National Historic Preservation Act process.

[Regina Nally]

Thanks Jim. And thanks, Michael, for the slides that you shared today. My name is Regina Nally. I'm the GSA Regional Historic Preservation Officer, and I wanted to just take a few minutes to talk on some timeline issues and maybe a little high-level understanding of the National Historic Preservation Act of California [inaudible] situation.

So the National Historic Preservation Act has its own set of regulations that federal agencies need to follow, and they are referred to by the section within the act that they are numbered. That is section 106. That's how we get the nomenclature of section 106 process. These regulations require agencies to follow a consultation process, just like [inaudible] regulations required as well, similar to the [inaudible] focused on historic properties. In planning our process for the execution of these requirements, we believe that integrating the two processes together – which both require investigation, consultation, and analysis of potential impacts to the environment and cultural resources posed by the proposed action – and we thought that this integration of the two processes together would create an easier and more effective engagement approach for stakeholders and interested parties such as yourselves.

This chart provides a high-level overview of the timeline that we think it's going to take to bring us to a decision on what action we will eventually be pursuing and how any adverse effects resulting from the action would be addressed. So, allow me to run through the chart with you on the first column.

In fall of 2022 now, as Michael and Joe have just mentioned, we've issued our Notice of Intent. We already have initiated a consultation with the state Historic Preservation Office. For those that don't know, the National Historic Preservation Act identifies the state Historic Preservation office as essentially the monitor for federal agencies to ensure that they follow the regulatory process. And we are taking on the public engagement process here today. We will be requesting your input not only here but as we move forward for us to consider during this investigation and analysis process. This will help us identify who are appropriate consulting parties for our analysis on the facts for cultural resources, and I'll discuss the consulting party element of that on the following slide [inaudible].

During the winter of 2022, we anticipate establishing the consulting parties and setting the needs schedule. We also plan to identify the area of potential effects. That's the terminology used in the Historic Preservation Act, and it's defined as the geographic area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties. We will evaluate properties within this area of potential effects for National Register eligibility that have not already been assessed for that eligibility. We'll determine if or what historic properties may be affected beyond the [inaudible] of the GSA [inaudible]. And we will invite consulting parties to participate.

Come spring/summer of 2023, we anticipate we will continue to further assess effects on historic properties, those owned by GSA and those that are within that area of potential effect. We will continue to coordinate with the consulting parties.

And then by fall of 2023, we'll look towards establishing an agreement with our consulting parties on how to resolve adverse effects on historic properties. We anticipate that by winter of

2024, this will be the completion of our Section 106 process, and we will need to complete that before GSA can sign a Record of Decision, as Michael mentioned earlier, under the NEPA process.

[Inaudible]

So, in order to make you aware that we are in the process of assessing some deterioration conditions of the building, I think we all can recognize that there are some deterioration issues with these properties. We have recently completed a condition assessment and have concluded that the fire escapes and [inaudible] buildings need to undertake some stabilization and may need some selective disassembly of these features, probably happening sometime in the spring of 2023. The existing large canopies that are surrounding the properties currently are certainly ensuring public safety, but this would be an extra measure to further ensure that during the consultation process, as I just outlined, we're anticipating this is going to take some time so that we can feel more comfortable that everything is stabilized. For this activity, the stabilization of these elements, GSA will be entering a 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office. In fact, we already mentioned that to them, and we anticipate that we will probably have [inaudible] documentation and probably retention of some of these elements. This is a separate maintenance effort that will not be included as part of the environment impact statement that Michael mentioned earlier for the long-term future of the buildings. However, we will be concluding a NEPA review for this proposed action.

So, what is a consulting party? The National Historic Preservation Act defines different types of organizations that have standing or interest in the formal consultation process under Section 106. Some of these consulting parties are clearly the State Historic Preservation Office, representatives of local governments, Native American tribes that may have ancestral connection to the area, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other individuals and government agencies and organizations with a demonstrated interest in the undertaking or the affected historic properties. Those of you wishing to be a formal consulting party member are welcome to request that status, and you can do so at the web address that we've established also for the comment papers that you've received online [inaudible]. I also wanted to mention before I pass it back to whoever is next – who is next?

[Charlie Webb]

Charlie would be next.

[Regina Nally]

Charlie. Okay, thanks, Charlie. I also wanted to mention that if you are a member of an organization that kind of falls into one of these categories, we would like to encourage you to work with those organizations to identify key individuals that would participate in the consulting party process and the meetings in particular. And I say this from the perspective of we want to make sure that the number of participants can be balanced and that other members that will want to be part of this working group will have an opportunity to participate together and hear

each other equally. So with that, I will pass it back to Charlie. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Regina. So, I just want to briefly go over the role of GSA and other government agencies. The GSA is the lead federal agency [inaudible] is the lead federal agency for preparing the Environmental Impact Statement. Simply what that means is GSA is responsible for preparing the document and all of its contents. Other agencies who are – have an interest in the project, the three different courts that are in the Dirksen U.S. Courthouse, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Illinois, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Several federal law enforcement agencies are relevant. The U.S. Marshals Service, the Federal Protective Service, the FBI, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. So let's go through next steps.

So as the [inaudible] public scoping periods this fall. Following that, as Michael mentioned, the EIS will be prepared and will be available in the spring for public review and comment. Comments on the draft EIS will be incorporated into what's called the final EIS. That should be available in the fall of 2023 for public review. That will identify which alternative GSA has identified as a preferred, but no final decision is made until the record of decision is issued. We envision that in early 2024. So, now, I noted this a couple times, but scoping comments need to be submitted to GSA by Monday, December 12th. They can be sent via email to statestreet@gsa.gov or by regular mail to Joe at the address listed here, GSA, 230 South Dearborn, Suite 3600, Chicago, 60604. Comments – written comments can also be left here tonight. As mentioned, there's a comment box just outside this room. You can use the comment sheet that we provided. You do not need to use this comment sheet. A simple email, any way you want to send the written forms is just fine. All right.

Okay. So now we will have introductory remarks. Angel Dizon is the Commission of GSA's Region 5 Public Buildings Service. Angel.

[Angel Dizon]

Yeah. Thanks everybody for coming out in person. I really appreciate that, and for those of you attending virtually, you're missing a really wonderful seafood bar in the back so that's [inaudible]. We don't all have to be so serious about this. I think collaboration between the government and the public is a good thing. Being able to, you know, suss out opportunities is a good thing. So that's how I would ask you to sort of join in in the spirit of, you know, trying to do the right thing here. So I'm actually getting really excited [inaudible] to hear your thoughts about the draft environmental impact statement and how we move forward. Before I turn it over to Judge Pallmeyer, I will say a couple things about myself, and the first one is, you know, as an architect, I completely understand the value of preservation. And as someone who has been working on U.S. embassies and consulates overseas for the last 20 years, I also understand the need for security. And so my hope is that with this public engagement we'll find a place that satisfies, you know, those needs. Judge Pallmeyer. No reason [inaudible]. [laughter]

[Judge Rebecca Pallmeyer]

Thank you, Angel, and thanks everybody for being here. I think, you know, if the current situation is an indication, it is so important for Americans to come together whether they agree or disagree and talk to one another, and I'm happy to see that we're going to be doing that this evening – or this afternoon. I'm happy to be here.

My name is Rebecca Pallmeyer. I'm the Chief Judge of the Federal District Court. I've been a judge in the courthouse for 30 years plus. It's been my professional home for the entire time. As the Chief Judge, I chair the Dirksen Courthouse Building Safety and Security Committee. I do continue to carry a caseload as a district judge, but I take my responsibilities as the chief judge for our court very seriously. And one of those responsibilities is ensuring the safety and security of our federal courthouse and all those persons who visit every day. The building in itself is a symbol of the strength and dignity of the judiciary, of persons who are in that courthouse, whether they're jurors, attorneys, new citizens (we swear in hundreds of new citizens in our building every week), employees, judges, all of us are entitled to a safe environment. This responsibility that I have, and I think that my colleagues on the court share, is a grave one, because I think all of us know all too well the concerns that we face on an ongoing basis with our courthouse.

I want to thank GSA and including Angel Dizon, our Regional Commissioner, and Joe Mulligan, our project manager and the others who we've already met this evening. I really do appreciate the fact that we're working together on this, as a transparent communication between our agencies and also with law enforcement and the public is very important. These agencies and the court are all committed to following the law, including, obviously, the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 106 process and the NEPA, environmental policy act.

You know a little bit about the history of the buildings on State Street. I also want to share with you a little bit of information about the courthouse itself. As you probably know or may know, the Dirksen Courthouse is the largest federal courthouse in the United States. It's a striking and iconic steel and glass courthouse building designed by a renowned architect, Mies van der Rohe, and it's an early and significant example of Mid-Century Modern style. The Dirksen Courthouse is the only courthouse that Mies ever built, and since it opened its doors in 1964, it has been notable not only for its architectural significance but for the cases of historic significance that had been tried there. The Chicago Federal Center, these three buildings, all generally designed by Mies and his colleagues and completed in 1974, includes three buildings, including the one that we're in right now, arranged and defined as Chicago Federal Plaza.

We treasure the courthouse, but we also recognize the efforts that have been made to cause harm to it. In September of 2024 [sic] Dale Nevels [phonetic] was indicted in our court and ultimately convicted of attempting to destroy the Dirksen courthouse with a tractor trailer hauling what he believed to be [inaudible] nitrate. It was in the wake of that episode in 2005 that GSA's

congressional budget justification requested congressional permission to allow the federal government to create a [inaudible] integral to the security of the courthouse. The goal of the land acquisition was to increase security by eliminating the possibility of private sector development proximate to the courthouse. So as you now know, the result was GSA's ownership of these properties along Jackson, State, and Adams, all the buildings except the Berghoff restaurant.

At the time of the purchase, we needed those properties not only to secure our safety but also because of the expected need for additional federal office space. As most of you know, over the years the need for federal office space has decreased. The need for office space, generally, is on the decline right now, but the need for security measures for our courthouse has only increased. Additional office space was never needed, so over time, the buildings have become vacant. We asked security and threat experts from various federal agencies, the marshals, the FBI, ATF, the Federal Protective Service, the administrative office of the United States [inaudible], all of those agencies have provided their analyses as well as that of a private security expert, and that is the source of the information that we have and the viable reuse criteria that we've been – I think Joe Mulligan just walked us through. So years ago, there were plans to sell the building, but there was a three-way sale proposed, but the proposed use, which involved micro [inaudible] was inconsistent with our security requirements, and that didn't materialize. The buildings have been vacant all this time and continue to deteriorate because there is a lack of significant federal funds to make [inaudible] long-term improvements.

The law of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2022, which was signed into law earlier this year, provides GSA with funding in the amount of \$52 million for demolition and protection of the adjacent buildings during the process, securing the [inaudible] site and landscaping [inaudible] site. This project would address our security concerns and manage the assets owned by the federal government, but the Clerk of the Court is here with us, Tom [inaudible], and Ladonna [inaudible] is our marshal. We have representatives of his office with us today as well. We've all met with interested parties since September because we are willing to discuss security concerns and plans for potential viable and adaptive reuse of the properties.

I've been talking now for a few minutes, and I know that the purpose for all of us is to hear from you, and I'm here to hear from you. I'd like to listen to your ideas, get feedback, and learn about the impacts and concerns that we need to be sensitive to. I'm going to be here for the whole rest of the hearing, and I hope to hear from you. And I know that GSA is committed to considering public input during this scoping process in preparing the draft environmental impact statement, and I'm sure that your comments will be useful to all of us. So I want to thank you for the opportunity to make comments at this event and look forward to hearing from you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Judge Pallmeyer.

Did I – did I mess it up [inaudible]?

Okay. So we will now begin our public scoping comments. A few ground rules. Speakers will be called in the order to which they signed up, and we will begin with people who are in the room and then go to those on Zoom who wish to speak. We will ask people to limit your remarks to three minutes. At the beginning of the comment, if you're comfortable, please state your name. The panel will listen to the comments. The panel will not be responding to comments tonight. They will be responded to in the public scoping meeting summary and/or in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. If there is time remaining after the registered speakers have all spoken, additional opportunities to speak will be provided. And if there is – again, there are several ways to provide comments. So I'll call people who want to come up to [inaudible]. If you'd like to give verbal comments but either don't care to speak in front of the group or you don't have time to wait, there is a court reporter just outside this door in room 335. You can go give verbal comments [inaudible] stenographer is in there right now. You can go give a comment at any time. And as well, you can also provide written comments, as I mentioned a moment ago. All comments, whether they are verbal or written, whether we receive them tonight or receive them in the mail before December 12th, whether you speak in front of the group, or whether you speak to the stenographer in the other room, all comments are considered equally. If you – well, let's see. All comments will be part of the public record. If for some reason you do not want your name attached to the comments, in your written comments, just let us know that, or you can simply not put your name on there. I do have a list of people who I'm going to call by name who want to speak tonight. If for some reason you don't want your name given, just come up here and let Carla know, and we'll devise a way to call you up.

Okay. So we will now start the public comments. We do have a timer that will appear on the screen to help people manage their time. Carla will start that speaker at the appropriate moment. So I'm going to call off a few different names so you have a – a little advance notice of when I will call your name. So, excuse me a moment.

Okay. So Ward Miller will be the first speaker, and bear with me just a minute, Ward. Let me make sure I understand the notes here. So who is number two?

[Inaudible]

Mary Lu?

[inaudible] gone.

Oh, he's [inaudible]. So Mary Lu is next. Okay. Okay, then after Ward will be Mary Lu Seidel, and then after Mary Lu will be Kendra Parzen. Okay. Ward, go ahead. Thank you.

[Ward Miller]

Thank you so much. My name is Ward Miller. I'm executive director of a nonprofit Chicago-based advocacy organization, Preservation Chicago. With Preservation Chicago, we wish to express our great concern and fierce opposition to the proposed plan along with \$52 million taxpayer expenditure to demolish the historic buildings on the 200 block of South State Street, located in the southwest corner of State and Adams and extending to Quincy Court in the heart of the loop. And [inaudible] also within the National Registry Historic District, two of these structures are contributing buildings and are extremely significant to the National Register and the State Street street law. These two buildings are the Century Building at 202 South State by architects Holabird & Roche, and the Consumers Building by Jenney, Mundie, & Jensen at 220 South State Street. Both buildings and the architects that designed them are highly significant, known on the world stage for their work in the field of architecture, and are a part of the collection of structures that define the Chicago School of Architecture in the development of the skyscraper building. It [inaudible] perfected by these firms and others, many of these technologies are still employed by tall buildings constructed around the world today. These are extremely significant to the City of Chicago and to Enter Chicago in the architecture community and therefore derives much of its architectural and heritage tourism, representing and hosting tens of millions of visitors and contributors to our local economy. The loss of these two historic skyscrapers will disqualify our city from receiving the UNESCO World Heritage nomination for the Early Chicago Skyscrapers as UNESCO would not want to associate dishonor of the destruction of our heritage. So perhaps an opportunity lost forever for Chicago as the UNESCO world heritage site could be transformative. It's also important beyond these buildings representing great works of art and architecture to recognize the relationship of Mies van der Rohe's Federal Center in context to these buildings. Mies, in his design of the Chicago Federal Center, also known on the world's stage, was known for honoring these buildings. The Marquette Building, one of them [inaudible] Building, of course, the Consumers Building, which fronts the front – which was really the formal entrance to the State Street entrance to the Consumers – from the – from State Street to the Dirksen Federal Center.

So we want to encourage the GSA to realize that this is an adverse effect and to encourage the preservation of the Century and Consumers Buildings. These are really important, and just want to offer that we have 23,000 people on a change.org petition to save these buildings. It's a very public platform, and there was also a story and a video from the B1M out of London with almost a million views of. And that shows the importance of these buildings to the larger architecture community and to that world beyond. We find this to be an incredible opportunity to find – to reuse these buildings as a Chicago Collaborative Archive Center, a reuse that would be in tandem with the 15 nominations or the 15 qualifications that are listed. So thank you for this opportunity.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Ward. Mary Lu, followed by Kendra and then Keith Giles.

[Mary Lu Seidel]

Thanks [inaudible]. You can pause my timer [inaudible].

[Charlie Webb]

I wasn't going to start until you got started.

[Inaudible]

[Mary Lu Seidel]

My name is Mary Lu Seidel, and I'm the Director of Community Engagement at Preservation Chicago. Thank you for the time and space to have this conversation about the Center and Consumer Building as well as the other two buildings between them. You have heard and will continue to hear how important historic value of these buildings is to the streetscape on State Street to our international tourism and to the City of Chicago. You all know that the historic districts will be compromised by the demolition of these buildings, and you will also know that our UNESCO World Heritage Site designation will be in jeopardy if these buildings are demolished. All that sounds somewhat trivial when compared to the real need to ensure the security of judges and personnel at the Federal Building in a world where threats to judicial staff are all too real and common. No one in this room would suggest that we do not care about the lives of the people who are committed to working in our federal judicial system. We want them to be safe, have a safe and comfortable place to work to continue to carry out their justice. I think the comments by Chief Judge Pallmeyer were very sincere, and we agree with that. However, is demolition of two tall buildings near the federal courthouse the appropriate response to ensuring the safety [inaudible] building. With literally our small 21st Century weapons that have ranges in excess of 2,000 feet, is the demolition of these two buildings that cost in excess of \$52 million best use of federal resources to offer the highest protection possible for the staff in that federal building. To be clear, we value human life more than we value buildings, and we are confident that the federal government can put together a safety protocol to protect federal employees without tearing down our city's heritage, culture, and place. When the Citadel Building at Adams and Dearborn was built in 2003, the federal – I just want to list off another one at the time. The Citadel Building, which is at Adams and Dearborn, the Marquette Building, which is also at Adams and Dearborn, the Monadnock Building, the building at the corner, there's a little – the Garrett's Popcorn building, the building south of that on Plymouth Court, these are all buildings that have similar sight lines and access and range to the Federal Courthouse building. They have billions of dollars invested in them. If this demolition strategy is in fact the only option or is deemed to be the only option, I want to know where the federal government is going to get the funds to acquire all of those additional buildings around it, relocate the employees, and demolish those structures as well, because they offer the exact same recs to this building as is being proposed for the Century and Consumer Building. Balancing preservation, cultural heritage, and sense of place for security threats to Federal Courthouse personnel is no small

task. We look forward to GSA proceeding with security planning that takes a more surgical rather than a wrecking ball approach. Take demolition off the table. It is not an appropriate response to the goals you are pursuing. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Mary Lu. Kendra and then Keith, and then after Keith, I believe, Michelle Murphy.

[Kendra Parzen]

Good evening. My name is Kendra Parzen. I am advocacy manager for Landmarks Illinois, the statewide nonprofit organization helping people across Illinois to safer places that matter to their communities. [Inaudible] Landmarks Illinois including the Century and [inaudible]. Sorry about that. [inaudible]

[Charlie Webb]

I'm giving you a little more time.

[Charlie Webb]

Earlier this year at Landmarks Illinois included the Century and Consumers Building [inaudible] Illinois [inaudible] funding request of \$52 million for demolition [inaudible] publicly then, as we do now, [inaudible] misuse of public taxpayer funds to pay for the demolition of these buildings when private funds could finance a rehabilitation and reuse [inaudible] creative solutions to address [inaudible] concerns, which we in no way wish to minimize. The Century and Consumers Buildings are only two of many skyscrapers in close proximity to the Dirksen Federal Courthouse. Their demolition would not erase potential threats that arise from the Federal Courthouse's location [inaudible] Center. [inaudible] federal courthouses and other government buildings and similar urban centers across the United States and is a leader and innovator in meshing preservation and design with security. This is [inaudible] leadership and innovation to take center stage. We [inaudible] concerns can be addressed [inaudible] for a viable, adaptive [inaudible] found through cooperation between the federal government and the private sector. Once rehabilitated, the irreplaceable historic buildings included in the National Register of Historic Places listed Loop Retail Historic District for contributing to Chicago's economy and help anchor needed investment in the South State Street corridor. [inaudible] public consultation process, we encourage all parties to focus their energies throughout that process on developing strong reuse [inaudible] alternatives to demolition. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Kendra. Keith and then Michelle Murphy, and after Michelle will be Elizabeth Lazius

[Keith Giles]

Good afternoon. My name is Keith Giles, founding principal of K. Giles, LLC, a long-time city of Chicago developer and is representing the private sector. In early 2007 [inaudible] city's

Department of Planning and Development issued a request for proposal to acquire and develop the buildings we're talking about today. On May 19, 2017, the opportunity was awarded to a joint venture between C.A. Ventures and K. Giles, LLC. Our proposal was to renovate these buildings into 450 historic apartments with retail on the first floor in accordance with National Park District, National Park Service guidelines. And completion of this corner would have anchored the south end of State Street, an important economic engine in the city of Chicago. Our team spent the rest of 2017 working with architects, contractors, consultants, and [inaudible] community on the project, and our [inaudible] was scheduled to be presented to the 2017 [inaudible], and its approving closing was scheduled in mid-2018 and completion three years ago. However, right before the planning commission meeting, Chief Judge Ruben Castillo sent a letter to the mayor opposing the project, threatening to stand in the way of all improvements. The judges had engaged a security consultant, which suggested the only way to preserve the security was to [inaudible] historical [inaudible]. We didn't know then that it effectively ended our project. As we had a year of work and nearly a million dollars invested in the proposed project, we continued to communicate Judge Castillo [inaudible] creative solutions to address these concerns and revise our proposal in the spring of 2018. Some of the security exclusions included some of the 15 criteria identified today. Sophisticated screening and 24-hour security of the building and Quincy Court with a direct tie-in to Dirksen security. Elimination of all outdoor spaces [inaudible] Dirksen. The [inaudible] windows facing vertically, tilting to the east away from [inaudible] Dirksen. Installing [inaudible] all elevations facing the Dirksen. And after presenting this to the judges, a 40-page proposal, we heard nothing. No response. No dialogue. No discussion. Nothing. As mentioned, a decision had been made to block this development, and there was no dialogue and no compromise. Quickly, regarding economics, our team was proposing to pay \$10 million for the buildings. So with the 52, we're talking at \$62 million of taxpayer money expended to demolish these buildings. Moreover the opportunity cost to the City of Chicago would be significant including the project was anchored to the south end of State Street, and important economic [inaudible] city, the sales taxes from the retail we were to create. A loss of a \$200 million development, adding to the city's sorely needed tax space, and of course, renovating these historic architectural treasures. which enriches lives and preserves a deep architectural history of one of the greatest architectural cities in the world. This is a waste and a bad decision. I can respect –

[Charlie Webb]

Keith [inaudible].

[Keith Giles]

I'm almost done.

[Charlie Webb]

All right. Sorry.

[Keith Giles]

I swear. I do respect and understand the importance of preserving the security of our judges and the court system in this country [inaudible] in today's world. However, eliminating these buildings and creating a large, empty plaza with a couple of security guards does not in the end secure it. The costs far exceed the benefits. This will be a mistake that happens and will forever be regretted by those who care about historic preservation, State Street, and the city of Chicago. I hope this process identifies today and results in some sort of a compromise solution, which results in the buildings standing [inaudible]. Thank you for your time.

[Charlie Webb]

Okay, Michelle. Is Michelle here? Okay. Elizabeth? Okay. The next speaker after that is Rod Johnson.

[Inaudible]

[Charlie Webb]

Okay. Malachy McCarthy?

[Charlie Webb]

All right. Matt Chavez?

[Carla Mykytiuk]

Malachy McCarthy, I believe, is on Zoom.

[Charlie Webb]

Okay. So if we're moving to Zoom, you need to [inaudible].

[Carla Mykytiuk]

You're right. [inaudible] [laughter] I've got a very marked up sheet here. Just doing my public duty now. [laughter]

[Charlie Webb]

So, just so that you know, when you're on Zoom and we ask you to speak, I am going to allow you to talk. You have to activate your microphone, so it will take a moment, and I won't start the timer until we hear you speak.

Okay, sorry. You are [inaudible]. okay. Thank you.

Yep, whenever you're ready.

[Matt Chavez]

Oh, yeah.

Good evening everybody. My name is Matt Chavez. I am Director of Research and Special

Projects Preservation in Chicago. There is surely going to be much more said tonight about protecting the Century and Consumers buildings, how their demolition would be a mistake [inaudible] short of retention, restoration, and rehabilitation is really [inaudible] acceptable. So I'm sure [inaudible] will certainly need a theme for the comments tonight, but I'm here to hear from everybody else on this. So I kind of just want to spend my time talking a little more about why these buildings matter so much here in Chicago, for those who love her.

Those environments are a deep, rich, architectural history. The city of Chicago has been a hub of innovation, creation, and inspiration for people in cities all over the world for countless years. One of our most important and revolutionary contributions is the development of the Chicago School of Architecture and the advent of the skyscraper, commonly attributed to architect William Le Baron Jenney, whose firm, Jenney, Mundie, and Jensen would eventually go on to be responsible for the Consumers Building. The creation of the skyscraper is an incredible moment in the history of engineering, architecture, and belongs solely to Chicago. From this, the strength of the Chicago School grew, changing the Chicago skyline forever along with countless skylines across the world. The Century and Consumers Buildings are an essential part of the significant legacy, and they were built at the tail end of the Chicago School, with both buildings representing the potential [inaudible] architectural movement while showing just how hard that architecture of Chicago had advanced over the course of decades. The building [inaudible] historical [inaudible] Chicago's [inaudible] architectural world stage and should be treated as such. The architects behind those buildings [inaudible] Jenney, Mundie, and Jensen are some of the most important designers of buildings in Chicago's history. [inaudible] in particular are responsible for an astounding percentage of Chicago's most beautiful structures downtown includes but are not even closely limited to Arquette, [inaudible] Building, the old Quality Building, [inaudible] including our own city hall. [inaudible] many of our cities, Chicago's old buildings [inaudible] quality including Landmark protection, that will preserve and maintain them for good because we know that they [inaudible] story of Chicago, and these two buildings should be [inaudible]. The Century and Consumers Buildings go beyond [inaudible] architecture. I and many other Chicagoans [inaudible] masters of their craft during this era. And in the same way that we wouldn't strip paintings off the wall of the Art Institute and toss them in the trash, we cannot possibly entertain the idea of relegating these buildings to a landfill burial. So what happens to these structures will be indicative of how much we value our state and [inaudible] environment. We are one of the great architecture capitals of the world, and that's why there is no other choice but to keep the Century and Consumers buildings standing. Thank you very much.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Matt. So we are going to transition to people who will be commenting via Zoom. I will read out the first three names in the order that we'll hear from them. The first is Adam, Adam Natenshon, followed by Holly Seidler, and then after Holly will be Malachy McCarthy. And there's a few more after that, and I will read names as we get through it. Okay. So, we're ready

for Adam.

[Carla Mykytiuk]

I have Adam speaking. He is now on the line.

[Adam Natenshon]

Hello. Can you hear me?

[Charlie Webb]

Yeah. Very well, go ahead.

[Adam Natenshon]

Excellent. Thank you. My name is Adam Natenshon. I'm the Director of Operations for Preservation Chicago, and I appreciate the opportunity to address this body and these important buildings. Preservation Chicago strongly opposes the demolition of the Century and Consumers Buildings. We strongly encourage their protection, their renovation, and their adaptation to reuse. These are great buildings, by great architects, on one of Chicago's greatest streets. This is more than just my opinion. Their landmark eligible status has been definitively proven by the City of Chicago's Landmark Division. Over the past 20 years, nearly every other early Chicago skyscraper in the Loop has been recognized for their irreplaceable – for the irreplaceable treasures that they are and fully and lovingly restored. The Century and Consumers Buildings are among the only notable exceptions.

Chicagoans love their city, and they love these buildings, but the interest in seeing these buildings saved extends nationally and internationally. Our change.org petition generated over 23,000 signatures. The B1M documentary video has been viewed over 925,000 times. The unprecedented level of support is truly remarkable. Every one of these people is counting on us here today to make the right decision. There's so much more at stake here than just these two terracotta skyscrapers. Chicago's early – Chicago's skyscrapers are currently under consideration for UNESCO World Heritage Site designation, and if they are to be demolished, it would jeopardize this eligibility. The value in heritage tourism is worth tens of millions of dollars, and the cultural prestige to Chicago is priceless. It would be a tragic loss for the city of Chicago and the United States.

So do these precious buildings need to be demolished? Fortunately, the answer is no. These early Chicago skyscrapers are highly endangered today due to the assumption that adaptive reuse and security are mutually exclusive. But the Chicago Collaborative Archive Center Plan proves this would be a faulty assumption. In fact, adaptive reuse and security in this circumstance are highly compatible. This archive center plan is brilliant and viable, and it's a win-win alternative that would accommodate all stakeholder requirements. The details of the Archive Center Plan have been widely reported in the press. They've been shared at length in

meetings with the GSA. It's a solid plan. It has strong stakeholders – stakeholders have significant capacity, and they're highly motivated to proceed. The Archive Center Plan was specifically designed to address security issues. Upon reviewing the security requirements detailed in the Section 106 Notice of Intent, it would appear that the Archive Center Reuse Plan meets or exceeds these requirements. This bears repeating. It appears that the Archive Center Reuse Plan meets or exceeds the security requirements indicated in the Section 106 Notice of Intent. I urge you to move to embrace the Chicago Archive Center Adaptive Reuse Plan and to work to resolve this issue in a way that allows all stakeholders to benefit. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Adam. Okay. Next on Zoom, we have Holly. Holly will be followed by Malachy McCarthy and then Kandalyn Hahn after Malachy.

[Holly Seidler]

Hello. Can you hear me?

[Charlie Webb]

Yes, very well. Go ahead, Molly – or Holly, excuse me.

[Holly Seidler]

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Holly Seidler. I am a member of the Franciscan Central Archive and board member of the Chicago Collaborative Archive Center, CCAC. The historic value of these buildings has been made through landmark proceedings, press, change.org petition, B1M video, Preservation Chicago, and many others. These buildings are a part of Chicago's architectural legacy. Ludwig Mies van der Rohe designed the Federal Center, including the Dirksen Courthouse, with the built environment in mind. These included the Century and Consumers Buildings built by his predecessors. These buildings are in desperate need of repair. They've only had the bare minimum temporary repairs over the past two decades. Recommendations have been given to address the water migration and perform long-lasting repairs. These appear to have been ignored. True stabilization should be a priority, especially to the exterior, roof, windows, and terra cotta.

Demolition to these buildings is a disservice to the history of Chicago architecture, loss to the downtown economy, and future positive endeavors. It will remove Chicago's nomination of early Chicago skyscrapers to become a UNESCO World Heritage Center. This is a very significant loss to the city for tourism, who bring money and interest into the city, and is internationally recognized. The CCAC has an option that would preserve the historic nature of these buildings, stabilize them, and bring them back into positive use and meet the security needs for the GSA and the feds. We have had communications with the GSA and feds and asked to be formally part of this process. Security is of the highest concern to the CCAC, whose collections are irreplaceable. We are committed to work with the GSA to find the best possible security for the

site. The Section 106 process and the National Register of Historic Places indicate that historic properties are to be listed. The Century and Consumers Buildings are part of the retail loop historic district and listed with an orange rating with the Chicago Historic Resources survey and were under a review for landmarking, meeting at least two criteria, and noted integrity, but that process was put on hold.

Will the GSA be in consultation with the State Historic Preservation offices to evaluate if these meetings meet the NRHP eligibility by seeking formal determination of eligibility from the keeper of the National Register? Has the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation been notified and invited into this process? Both should occur. These buildings are worth saving, and there are options to do so. These CCAC would welcome other interested parties to come together for discussion. Please reach out to us or Preservation Chicago. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Holly. Then we'll go to Malachy, then Kandalyn, and then Christopher Allison. So, is Malachy ready to go?

[Carla Mykytiuk]

I have asked – yep, here he is.

[Charlie Webb]

All right. We can hear you. Go ahead, Malachy.

[Malachy McCarthy]

My name is Malachy McCarthy. I am the retired Province Archivist for the Claretian Missionary Archives located at Monroe and Wells, and I am also the coordinator for the ARCC, which is the Archival Resources Catholic Collections. And the importance of the Chicago Collaborative Archive Center is that it really merges historic buildings with historic collections. It's really a unique opportunity and an innovative approach to provide a collaborative archive facility in the heart of the Loop. The critical nature of this institution would be that it is in the South Loop campus, which is the home to Roosevelt University, Columbia College, DePaul's downtown campus, and the Chicago campus of the University of Notre Dame, and less than a mile away is the University of Chicago and Loyola downtown campuses. More importantly, it is a block away from the Harold Washington Library, and the special collections have been really the center of Chicago collections over the past 10 years.

Now what is an archive? People don't know what an archive is. Archives have unique materials of many formats, whether they be paper, images, film, objects, art work, that really documents the life of a people. It's kind of the ingredients you make to prepare a cake. It is only from archives that history can be written. This is a perfect use, to put this facility at a multiplicity of archives in the two buildings that are on -- the two large buildings that are under consideration

today. The other thing about -- the unique thing about an archive is that there are not a lot of people associated with the archives. It's a very limited staff, and the security would be very important. The ideal approach is the fact that the back half of these buildings that front the Dirksen building could be used for storage, and that would be of the windows can be taken out, and that would be advantageous not only for the federal government but for the preservation of these collections. One of the things we've emphasized in our discussions with the federal government is the fact that it is actually important that these collections have security as well. So what we are really impressing upon you is the fact that this is a great opportunity to create an innovative approach to use these buildings creatively and create another cultural institution in downtown Chicago. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Malachy. Okay. So the next speaker will be Kandalyn. I'm sorry if I'm not pronouncing your first name correctly, Hahn, followed by Christopher Allison. The next speaker's last name is Fahey, F-A-H-E-Y, but Kandalyn, are you ready to go?

[Carla Mykytiuk]

She will be in a moment.

[Kandalyn Hahn]

Can you hear me?

[Charlie Webb]

Yeah, we can hear you.

[Kandalyn Hahn]

Great. And you got my name perfect. I give you a gold star for that, thank you. So, for the record, my name is Kandalyn Hahn. I'm with the Chicago Department of Planning and Development. And I wanted to just share a brief statement today. Historic Preservation Division staff of the Chicago Department of Planning and Development look forward to participating in Section 106 review for the buildings at 202 through 220 South State and Chicago's Loop. The buildings at 202 and 220 South State Street are architecturally and historically significant. We also understand that there are specific security issues of concern regarding the U.S. Courthouse Building located west of these buildings, which need to be addressed.

We wanted to provide the following input for your consideration. One idea we have is to look at the comparables of other large-scale cities with dense urban environments where federal court buildings are in close proximity. Our second idea is regarding viable adaptive use. We would hope that this group of buildings could be looked at not only as a whole but individually. We look forward to continued dialogue during this process and finding a solution that respects the needs of all stakeholders, recognizing the economic development, historic, and security

considerations. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you. Thank you, Kandalyn. So then we will go to Christopher Allison and then Etha [phonetic] Fahey and then Christopher Cody.

[Carla Mykytiuk]

I am not seeing a Christopher Allison on Zoom. Unless you're on the phone. And even then, [inaudible] I have lost the call. So we're going to skip Christopher Allison.

[Charlie Webb]

Okay. Okay. Etha Fahey.

[Etha Fahey]

Hi. Can you hear me?

[Charlie Webb]

Yeah. And then, by the way, thank you very much for putting the phonetic spelling of your name in the chat. That was very helpful.

[Etha Fahey]

It's phonetic if you know Irish, but I know how it goes. All right. Hi, my name is Etha Fahey. I am a life-long Chicagoan, and I'm mad. And I'm mad because the federal government is reanimating the corpse of urban renewal to demolish two historically significant buildings in downtown Chicago at the behest of well-connected individuals over big security concerns. This is an embarrassment and demonstrates that we have apparently learned nothing from the past 75 years of failed urban policy. Everyone involved should be ashamed. If the security concerns are valid, then tearing down these buildings won't solve this problem. The world is full of skyscrapers, and tearing down them will only open up sidelines to other buildings. Does the federal government plan on tearing down the entire Loop? If the answer is no, then the security concerns are clearly a farce, and the buildings should remain standing. If the answer is yes, then it's clear that the Loop is not an appropriate place for the federal complex in the first place, and the solution should be relocating to a place that suits such a hysterical mindset. I'm sure there is no shortage of suburbs with similar views in the urban form who would be happy to host the federal government. I would encourage anyone who claims the Century and Consumers buildings make their block of State Street more [inaudible] to look in a mirror. Is the federal government and individuals acting on behalf of the federal government, which has allowed these architectural masterpieces to waste away as the area around them has boomed. Tearing down these buildings to replace them with a parking lot or whatever would not only further this failure but would make it permanent. The good news is that as long as these buildings are standing, it's not too late to reverse the past two decades of mismanagement at the hands of the

federal government and preserve these treasures of [inaudible] and national heritage and, in fact, international heritage as I've learned that it's like up for UNESCO Heritage Site. And if we tear down these buildings, future generations will look at these vacant lots where they once stood as a testament to our failure, to the federal government's failure, and the federal government's failure of Chicagoans, architectural appreciators, and the entire history of human culture. I yield the rest of my time. Thank you very much.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Etha. Okay. The last person we currently have signed up on Zoom is Christopher Cody and then if Christopher Allison is out there somewhere we will go back to Christopher -- Christopher Allison, excuse me. Christopher Cody, if you're ready to go, we're ready for you.

[Christopher Cody]

Thank you very much. My name is Christopher Cody, and I'm associate general counsel with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The National Trust would like to express our support for the comments offered by all of the previous speakers including our long-time partners, Preservation Chicago and Landmarks Illinois. It is notable that we support all previous speakers' comments, and the GSA should note that every single speaker so far this evening has spoken in favor of preserving these buildings with no one advocating for its demolition. That is a very clear, unanimous comment from the public that we hope that you hear. The National Trust joins in advocating for the preservation of these important, very important, historically significant buildings.

We're encouraged by the statements made tonight by the GSA that their preservation will be considered, and we urge the GSA to explore all possible avenues to achieve the adaptive reuse proposal outlined in Alternative B. We look forward to hopefully working together with the GSA to achieve that outcome. To delve into further detail, the National Trust questions the exclusion of residential uses from any potential adaptive reuse, especially given the current extreme demand for housing. We would like to better understand why residential uses are impossible, and we also encourage the GSA to develop a version of Alternative B that would permit a residential use perhaps with additional security measures. We also would like to specifically echo earlier comments and express our sincere concern for the safety of everyone working at the Dirksen Courthouse. The National Trust has a deep respect for the people who work at Dirksen Courthouse and for the work that they do, and their safety is of paramount concern. However, as we previously pointed out, the Courthouse is surrounded by private property that has enumerable sightlines to the courthouse and that have no security requirements imposed upon them. The National Trust wonders how eliminating the limited number of sightlines from the historic buildings in question and making those buildings comply with the proposed security measures would meaningfully make the courthouse safer given its context. We urge the GSA to explore other more comprehensive solutions to better achieve the important objective of safety for the Federal Courthouse and its employees and especially solutions internal to the

Courthouse Building. Again, the National Trust would like to express our support for all of the previous comments made unanimously in favor of the preservation of these historic buildings. We very much look forward to continuing to participate in this Section 106 consultation going forward. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Christopher. So that is the end of the speakers we have signed up to speak. And just one note I want to make before we open it up to anyone else who would like to speak. There was a representative from the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation on Zoom, and they just notified [inaudible] that they'd like it to be known that the advisory council has not been officially notified by GSA of the [inaudible] taking. That is an accurate statement. The GSA will be officially notifying ACHAP Advisory Council very shortly. There's a mic –

[Regina Nally]

[inaudible] invited to consultation yet.

[Charlie Webb]

Excuse me, Regina. [inaudible] have been notified but have not been officially invited yet.

[Regina Nally]

We did have a signup just now for the --

[Charlie Webb]

On Zoom.

[Regina Nally]

Yeah. A Zoom signup to speak in the formal comment period.

[Charlie Webb]

Okay. Lena Reynolds just asked to speak via Zoom. Lena, go ahead, and then after Lena speaks, I'll ask anyone else in the room who would like to speak to simply just raise their hand. Go ahead, Lena, if you're ready.

[Carla Mykytiuk]

I asked her to speak, and it looks like she disappeared.

[Charlie Webb]

Oh.

[Lena Reynolds]

Can you hear me?

[Carla Mykytiuk]

Yeah.

[Lena Reynolds]

There you are.

[Carla Mykytiuk]

Yeah.

[Lena Reynolds]

Thank you. Hello. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Lena Greer-Reynolds, and I'm a fourth-generation Chicagoan and historian. But I'm out here for the past --

[Unknown Speaker]

Hi, Jane. Sorry. I'm just getting out of this feckled [phonetic] hearing, so...

[Lena Reynolds]

I'm sorry?

[Charlie Webb]

Okay. Go ahead, Lena. I think one of our speakers, one of our recent speakers, did not go back on mute again.

[Lena Reynolds]

Okay. Great. So, I am here because I care about the future of this city and our planet. And the Century and Consumers Buildings have been part of the fabric of Chicago's Loop for generations, but their value goes far beyond nostalgia. We're in the midst of a climate crisis that calls us to reduce waste and reduce emissions in every way we can. My generation and the next care deeply about doing as much as we can for a livable planet, and saving these buildings will help to reduce energy waste and carbon emissions while making our city more resilient for the future. The two biggest sources of carbon emissions in the Midwest are energy and transportation. These buildings represent a massive investment in energy, materials, labor, shipping, and construction that was already spent years ago. So while the financial costs to tear them down and build a plaza today may seem small, the environmental cost is large. We'd be throwing perfectly good masonry work, beams, hardware, and other materials in the dump, wasting the energy expended to create them in the first place, while fueling massive cranes and dump trucks to burn more fuel today. The energy and materials needed to renovate these buildings would not come close to the amount wasted in demolition. Even worse, demolishing buildings shifts the future potential of new tenants to others in the area, incentivizing more

sprawl and more brand-new construction that pulls new materials out of the ground, disrupting forests and other habitats.

Transportation is even more important here. Dense, walkable, bikeable, and transit-oriented communities are the most effective and equitable way to reduce transportation emissions. Chicago's Loop is a rare example of density in the Midwest, and it is that density that frees people from having to drive everywhere for every little thing. So I don't know what the future of these buildings would be. Someday perhaps residential, commercial future, office, or storage [inaudible]. Any usage will draw people who will have the option to walk, bike, or take the CTA instead of driving. These buildings contribute to the surrounding streetscape as well, creating a complete street façade that feels inviting to visitors and residents alike. By tearing holes in the fabric of the Loop, you reduce both the form and function of its architectural assets, hurting the surrounding businesses and municipal tax base as well. The two biggest impacts of climate change on the Midwest are likely to be flooding and heat, and a new concrete plaza will exacerbate both, fueling stormwater runoff, and cranking up the urban heat island effect. Eliminating the shade provided by these buildings will also make the summer heat worse for Loop pedestrians and surrounding buildings. And if the premise here is that any tall buildings near the Courthouse is a risk, then every tall building in the Loop could be on the chopping block next. The climate impacts could be enormous. We should improve the security of these buildings, find a better option for use, and not waste our cultural heritage for a short-term lack of creativity. The next generations will thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Lena. Is there anyone else here in person who would like to speak? Go ahead, sir, and then, I saw your hand, you can go ahead [inaudible].

[Dan Pontarelli]

Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Sure.

[Dan Pontarelli]

My name is Dan Pontarelli. I'm a local Chicago developer and real estate person who's been connected to the industry for a lifetime, most of my adult life, and I agree with everything that everyone prior to me has said, and I believe all those comments are valid. And one blanket statement is this: All buildings are built to be occupied in some way, shape, or form by people. So when you have alternative uses, and you try to do a study about alternative uses, they all have to do with people. So somehow people are always going to be involved. So I don't know how you have any alternative uses with not allowing people to occupy the building. The only thing that I can think of, for a land use perspective, is to have all occupants be people that work

for some form of federal or state government that has security clearances, and you could have housing for them, if the demand so exists, but other than that, I don't see the exercise of going through alternative uses unless there's more flexibility. It just doesn't – you know, there's – like even the storage use, people are going to be going in and out. So how do you have any alternative use for this property other than demolishing it, you know. You've got 52 million to contribute to an alternative use with some flexibility to address the security. Otherwise, you might as well just demolish it. Why go through all this three-year process if there's no flexibility. It's just – it's a waste of energy. So in all buildings and every building that's built across the world, it all houses people to have a roof over them in some fit way, shape, or form, no matter what the function, retail, commercial, residential. So that's basically it. I mean I just – that's my comment.

[Charlie Webb]

Okay. Thank you, Dan.

[Brian Evans]

My name is Brian Evans. I'm a Chicagoan, and [inaudible] the definition of a slumlord is a property owner who does not properly or ethically manage their property. Landlords have a responsibility to maintain safe and healthy conditions. End quote. Under this definition, how is the GSA not a slumlord? The sure fact that the feds eminent domain these properties and then put nothing into them for maintenance and upkeep is exactly the behavior of a slumlord. The property had tenants when the federal government took the buildings over in 2007. The provisional plan was the good and respectful use of the buildings for what they originally were and still are, offices. But [inaudible] backed away from that plan, and instead of doing the wise thing and placing the buildings on public market, they let them sit with zero care or regard. Then came 2017 Adaptive Reuse Plan to [inaudible] two specimen of classic Chicago School of Architecture is [inaudible] micro studio and one bedroom apartments. This great plan was then [inaudible] for security reasons. Security then overly broad [inaudible] the federal government [inaudible] gives them carte blanche without any rhyme, reason, or responsibility for their action. The demolition of the – if the demolition of the Consumers and Century Building was truly [inaudible] – then why didn't the feds or the GSA respond when there was a real threat against the Dirksen Courthouse? In 2004, the FBI arrested and brought here the man who was trying to procure materials to build a truck bomb to use on Dirksen. Security was a priority. Why did the government not try to close Dearborn, Jackson, Adams, or more to vehicles. Instead, [inaudible] that hasn't happened in the 62 years that both Dirksen and the subject property on State had coexisted to fear monger the public in support of a completely unnecessary deep insurrection of Chicago's historic urban environment. We noted that seven years after GSA commandeered the building, it became uninhabited "due to life safety reasons." This is solely the fault of GSA. Tonight, Judge Pallmeyer said there is a "lack of significant federal funds for maintenance." [inaudible] congressionally appropriate \$52 million for maintenance. Had you been doing proper maintenance and upkeep on these historic buildings, they would not become uninhabitable. It's

an unfunny joke [inaudible] maintenance that GSA performs on these buildings is the removal of two and a half [inaudible]. Hopefully, GSA isn't lying when they say the removed pieces will be cataloged and stored. Historic buildings like this will never be built again. Their design, quality, and specialty craftsmanship are one of those long ago retired trades. Terra cotta, at least in the form and scope, was made by artisans in and around Chicago, have been featured on some of Chicago's most iconic landmarks. To go through [inaudible] senseless demolition of two [inaudible] oldest and most ornamental buildings is unfathomable in this day and age. If \$52 million is spent to remove these buildings, this will be remembered as a crime against Chicago's global reputation for renowned architecture. Thank you.

[Inaudible]

[Charlie Webb]

And then we have a few people on Zoom we will turn to next. Go ahead.

[Wendall Edgars]

Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Wendall Edgars, President and CEO of Chicago [inaudible]. We're a company that's been around and working on State Street since 1997 while awaiting for that, that the street is now, since 1997. Otherwise, like everyone here, [inaudible] the loss of these buildings over time [inaudible] GSA. I don't have a lot to say. I'm going to [inaudible]. But I did want to. I did think it's important that we ask Senator Durbin to come to one of these meetings and explain to us why he approved \$52 million to tear down these buildings. I think that's really important for us to know as citizens of this country and as the senator for us. I'd also like to ask the GSA, as I understand it, you used to have a program. Maybe you still do. I'm hoping that you do. Downtowns across the country always had federal properties. For the last 30 years the GSA had a program called the Good Neighbor Program, and the idea was that they recognized that they were part of the fabric of the city and how the city functions, and therefore, they had resources where they had an ability to participate with the community in making the downtown a stronger place and not quite so much like an island within the downtown. So if we could get something, some kind of response to the status of the [inaudible] program, I think that would be really, really helpful. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you.

Is there anyone else in the room who hasn't spoken and would like to speak? Okay. Yes, sir. Go ahead. And then we will go as a – by the way, if people want to speak a second time, that's fine. I just want to exhaust the list of people who haven't spoken yet before we -- okay [inaudible].

[Jacob Rodgers]

All right. Hi everybody. First time commenting at a public meeting, but I found out about this on

the way home from work. As someone who is an office worker in downtown Chicago, it's very important to me that downtown stays vibrant, there's lots of people and things to do. When we run into a situation where buildings are – we want to tear them down or want to get rid of them – I think that's a really concept. It's a bad idea. There are empty lots all over this city, you know, in the south, west sides, even downtown. I live across the street from the big hole [inaudible]. If we demolish these buildings, they're going to be vacant for a very long time. They're going to take away from our downtown, take away from our tax revenue, and just make the place look nice, you know. It's a nice building. It's a nice sub. A nice place to be. It makes downtown a nicer place to be. I think I'll just keep it short, but I did want to say something to Adam and this floor for keeping the buildings as they are. All right, thanks, guys.

[Charlie Webb]

If you wouldn't mind, can you state your name?

[Jacob Rodgers]

Oh, I'm sorry. I forgot to. My name is Jacob Rodgers, R-O-D-G-E-R-S. I signed in a little late, so it should be on there somewhere.

[Charlie Webb]

No problem. Thanks Jacob.

[Jacob Rodgers]

Great. Thanks [inaudible].

[Charlie Webb]

Okay. We're going to pop back over to Zoom because there's some people who have been waiting there. So three people I've got. The first is Arathi Gowda. And then we'll go to Laura Lavernia from the Advisory Council, and then Adam Natenshon. So, Arathi, if I'm pronouncing your name correctly, if you're ready to go.

[Arathi Gowda]

[Inaudible]

[Charlie Webb]

All righty.

[Arathi Gowda]

[Inaudible]

[Charlie Webb]

Oh, no. [inaudible].

[Arathi Gowda]

Okay. Can everyone hear me?

[Charlie Webb]

Yes, go ahead.

[Arathi Gowda]

Wonderful. Thank you, everyone. I'm Arathi Gowda, a principal at Zimmer, Gunsul, Frasca architects, and also representing AIA Chicago and AIA Illinois. That's the American Institute of Architects, whereas I serve as the VP of Advocacy on their Board of Directors. We respectfully submit the following letter of support for the preservation of the Century and Consumer buildings to the Chicago and GSA community. This is on behalf of AIA Chicago and AIA Illinois membership, two chapters of the American Institute of Architects. Our mission is to build on our shared architectural legacy by advocating for the architectural profession and partnering with communities. These are two significant buildings, as you've heard from many of the commentators today, built in 1915 by Holabird & Roche and 1913 by Jenney, Mundie, and Jensen. The buildings represent significant contributions to the Chicago School of Architecture, and we stand with the community calling for adaptive reuse and revitalization to both of these high rises in lieu of demolition. The design concerns from the federal complex and the judges are valid, but we strongly believe that a design team will be able to address them during the revitalization process. At the same time, respecting the existing urban fabric of the State Street corridor versus essentially putting a tooth out on the State Street corridor. Recent success with adaptive reuse in the city have been, I think, wide-standing for many projects that have been vacant for several years. They include the Chicago Athletic Association, Cook County Hospital, old post office in the Reliance Building. It's usually successful, and they demonstrate that the long, dormant buildings with unique challenges can yield financial and cultural rewards. As many commentators have mentioned today, buildings that have more than 100 years of legacy simply cannot be rebuilt today with the same manner of craftsmanship. In fact, we don't even have those materials anymore due to cost [inaudible] and actually the way we have been treating the Earth's resources. The preservation of our buildings is also vital to a sustainable future for all Chicagoans. We are very heartened to see and hear some of the young people mentioning that again today, as we've heard many times during these public comment processes.

This fall, as we focus on Chicago's newly released Climate Action Plan and the Mayor's Decarbonization Task work together, they have advised us to prioritize adaptive reuse. Why are they doing that? Because buildings account for approximately 40% of global carbon emissions. In some estimates, when we talk about the transportation and embodied carbon that are used to make buildings, it's up to 50% of global carbon emissions. When we look at carbon emissions up to 2030, these critical years when we must bend the carbon curve down, and let's not

remember that we're having a global international climate summit as we speak today, we can be too late. We can miss that target. In the next eight years, 75% of emissions that are used for buildings are going to come from embodied carbon, embodied in the bricks, terra cotta, steel, and concrete of these buildings. We must emphasize the undeniable value of preservation in face of all of these factors. As Chicagoans, it's our strong belief we should not ignore our architectural legacy. Instead, we should harness the talents of our design community to resolve these concerns while preserving the richness of our urban fabric. AIA Chicago and AIA Illinois look forward to working with the city, Preservation Chicago, Landmarks Illinois, and GSA on this important issue. Please feel free to reach out to us if we can assist you as you continue the public comment process. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you. So, next, we'll turn to Laura Lavernia from the Advisory Council. Laura, go ahead. Whenever you're ready.

[Laura Lavernia]

Hello. Can you hear me?

[Charlie Webb]

Yeah.

[Laura Lavernia]

Hi. Good afternoon or good evening. Thank you so much for hosting this meeting. I would just like to say that the Advisory Council is the official federal organization that oversees the 106 process. While we haven't been formally invited, because I do believe that GSA hasn't actually begun the 106 process, I'm a little bit confused on this small technical detail. I think the letter said that you'd be starting 106 at the same time as the public scoping process for NEPA. I'm just not sure, though, today's comments have said that you will be commencing 106 shortly by communicating to and initiating the process with the State Historic Preservation office. I would just like to say that the Advisory Council is here, that we have been kept apprised of everything that's going on, and if any consulting party would like to copy the ACHP on their communications, please feel free to do so. My name is Laura Lavernia. I am a program analyst and GSA liaison for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Thank you. I yield the rest of my time.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Laura. And yeah, the GSA will be formally initiating the Section 106 process very shortly. I mean, to put it down, probably December. [inaudible] will be sending out letters to officially initiate the 106 process. Okay. So, Adam, on Zoom, if you're ready to go, we'll hear from you. I will see if anyone else in person would like to give comments, and then we have one more speaker after Adam that would like to speak [inaudible].

[Adam Natenshon]

Hi there. Adam Natenshon, Preservation Chicago. I appreciate the opportunity to complete my comments. I'd run out of time during my earlier opportunity. Upon reviewing the security requirements detailed in the Section 106 Notice of Intent, it would appear that the Archive Center Reuse Plan meets or exceeds the requirements. As long as the Chicago Archive Center Plan is viable, the demolition of these buildings cannot be considered a legitimate option for consideration per the federally mandated Section 106 process. The GSA is solely responsible for the building's current deteriorated condition prior to the GSA taking ownership through eminent domain in 2005. Both buildings were in reasonably good condition with many tenants. The GSA promised restoration and reuse but allowed significant deferred maintenance, vacancy, neglect, and deterioration over the past years. The GSA should be required to immediately correct the documented maintenance and to ensure that there's no further deterioration. Demolition by neglect is prohibited by law in Chicago. Regarding funding, there are ample funds available to restore these buildings. We've landed astronauts on the moon. We can add two little words or renovation to the language in the \$52 million earmark. It's true that Century and Consumers have suffered from deferred maintenance under the stewardship of the GSA, but the \$52 million federal earmark could be used instead for restoration. It's hard to know what the true restoration cost would be, but to offer some perspective, Lane Tech was recently restored inside and out. Lane Tech is the largest school in Chicago at over 600,000 square feet. This is more than double the combined square footage of Century and Consumers. They replaced 6,000 feet of masonry parapets, restored or placed 15,000 pieces of terracotta, installed 2,500 new windows, and replaced the roof. Total cost, \$52 million. Chicago is a city that innovated the skyscraper and that reversed the direction of the Chicago River. We can do this. I urge you to move forward and embrace the Archive Center Adaptive Reuse Plan and to work together to resolve this issue in a way that allows all stakeholders to benefit. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Adam. Is there anyone in the room who would like to speak? Okay. Seeing no one. Carla, do we have anyone on Zoom who has indicated they would like to speak?

[Carla Mykytiuk]

I do see one hand up, and that is Malachy McCarthy. I'm not sure if the hand is indicating he'd like to talk a second time. If there are others who would like to speak, please raise your hand. He would like to go again. Your microphone should be open.

[Malachy McCarthy]

This is Malachy McCarthy again. I'm with the Chicago Collaborative Archive Center. I wanted to follow up my comments with the fact of the need for the Chicago Collaborative Archive Center. Right now, within the archival and research world, Catholic women's religious orders are closing at an unbelievable rate. The collections which really laid the foundation of many urban areas in

their work with the poor and ethnic groups in building hospitals, schools, orphanages, and other charitable institutions, and these collections have nowhere to go, and that is one of our primary focuses in the Chicago Collaborative Archive concept. But the other thing is we like to open it up to other archives that need a home. The critical thing about Collaborative Archives is with shared resources and professional interaction, you can better the service of these collections. You can make them much more intelligible by pooling resources. You get lower costs for cloud storage. You can have common contact management systems and a whole bevy of other professional services. So I would strongly urge the GSA to consider the collaborative archive project because it really not only enhances these institutions but it really creates a scholarly hub in downtown Chicago right in the heart of the South Loop campus. Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you, Malachy.

[Carla Mykytiuk]

I did not see any additional hands up.

[Charlie Webb]

Okay. We don't see any additional hands up on Zoom. Final check of the room here. I don't see any hands in the room. So here's what we'll do. Basically end the meeting because we have no more speakers. Can you go to the last slide, Carla?

[Carla Mykytiuk]

Yes.

[Charlie Webb]

So I want to go over a couple things, namely the – just once again remind everybody the short-term and long-term schedule before people start heading out. So, again, comments due by December 12th, Monday the 12th. They can be e-mailed to statestreet@gsa.gov. They can be sent by regular mail to Joe at the address there, 230 South Dearborn Street, Suite 3600, Chicago, 60604. And then you can see the broader process. Again, you know, the draft EIS will be available in spring for public review and comment. All agency and public comments on that document will be incorporated to address [inaudible], final EIS in the fall of 2023, followed by the Record of Decision early in 2024. So we have no more presentation. We have no more people interested in speaking. So we can [inaudible] end the meeting, but the panel will be here until 7:00, so about another hour. If someone comes running in at 6:55, we are here to take their comment. But since we have no speakers, it's essentially temporarily to end the meeting. Anybody is welcome to stay, but that'll – unless somebody shows up to speak again, that'll end tonight's meeting. Thank you.

[Unidentified Speaker/Speakers]

Thank you.

[Charlie Webb]

Thank you.

###