

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
121 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois
Regular Meeting
March 9, 2021

MINUTES

I. ROLL CALL OF COMMISSIONERS

Chairman Jorge Perez called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and then undertook a roll call to establish the presence of a quorum.

Present

Jorge Perez, Chairman
Shirley Newsome, Vice Chairman
Gwendolyn Butler, Secretary
Robert Buford
Adela Cepeda
Maurice Cox
Dwight Curtis
Eileen Rhodes
Chris Wheat

Late

Leslie Davis
Cornelius Griggs
Latasha Thomas

Not Present

Marc Brooks

In response to the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency, prior to the meeting, the Chairman determined that an in-person meeting was not prudent or practical, and thus issued “Emergency Rules Governing the Conduct of Remote Public Commission Meetings and Provisions for Remote Public Participation” to conduct the meeting remotely on Zoom. The meeting was available to be viewed by the public via live stream through the CDC website.

The CDC provided an opportunity for members of the public to submit written comments, up to twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting, through the CDC website. Members of the public wishing to speak on a matter were also given an opportunity to register in advance, also up to 24 hours before the meeting. No members of the public provided written comments or registered to speak at the meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 10TH MEETING

Motioned by Butler, seconded by Cepeda. Approved 10-0. Yeas: Newsome, Butler, Buford, Cepeda, Cox, Curtis, Rhodes, Thomas, Wheat, Perez, Abstain/Not Present: Brooks, Davis, Griggs.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. PULASKI CORRIDOR TIF REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA (WARD 26)

Request authority to acquire the property located at 4000 to 4008 W North Avenue and 1616 to 1638 N Pulaski Road collectively known as the Pioneer Bank Properties in the Pulaski Corridor Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment Project Area.

Michael Parella

Alderman Maldonado (26th Ward) gave a statement in support of the agenda item.

Motioned by Butler, seconded by Cox. Approved: Approved 12-0. Yeas: Newsome, Butler, Buford, Cepeda, Cox, Curtis, Davis, Griggs, Rhodes, Thomas, Wheat. Perez. Abstain/Not Present: Brooks.

21-CDC-1

B. PULASKI CORRIDOR TIF REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA (WARD 26)

Request authority to advertise and issue a Request For Proposals for the purchase and redevelopment of the property located at 4000 to 4008 W North Avenue and 1616 to 1638 N Pulaski Road collectively known as the Pioneer Bank Properties in the Pulaski Corridor Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment Project Area.

Michael Parella

Alderman Maldonado (26th Ward) gave a statement in support of the agenda item.

Motioned by Cepeda, seconded by Butler. Approved: Approved 12-0. Yeas: Newsome, Butler, Buford, Cepeda, Cox, Curtis, Davis, Griggs, Rhodes, Thomas, Wheat. Perez. Abstain/Not Present: Brooks

21-CDC-2

C. 47th/KING TIF REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA (WARD 3)

Request authority to advertise and issue a Request For Proposals for the redevelopment of the property located at 5021 South Wabash Avenue in the 47th and King Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment Project Area.

Patrick Brutus

Motioned by Butler seconded by Griggs. Approved: Approved 11-0. Yeas: Newsome, Butler, Buford, Cepeda, Cox, Curtis, Davis, Griggs, Thomas, Wheat. Perez. Abstain/Not Present: Brooks, Rhodes

21-CDC-3

D. LAWRENCE/KEDZI TIF REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA (WARD 33)

Request authority for the Department of Housing to negotiate a redevelopment agreement with ROOTS Development, LLC for redevelopment of the property located at 3557 W Lawrence Avenue in the Lawrence/Kedzie Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment Project Area, and to recommend to the City Council of the City of Chicago the designation of ROOTS Development, LLC as Developer.

James O'Connell

Alderman Rodriguez (33rd Ward) gave a statement in support of the agenda item.

Motioned by Butler seconded by Griggs. Approved: Approved 11-0. Yeas: Newsome, Butler, Buford, Cepeda, Cox, Davis, Griggs, Thomas, Wheat. Perez. Abstain/Not Present: Brooks, Curtis, Rhodes

21-CDC-4

E. CENTRAL WEST TIF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA (WARD 27)

Request authority for the Department of Housing to negotiate a redevelopment agreement with WHP-II D., LLC for redevelopment of the property located at 223-257 N Damen and 1951-59 W Lake in the Central West Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment Project Area, and to recommend to the City Council of the City of Chicago the designation of WHP-II D., LLC as Developer.

James O'Connell

Motioned by Newsome, seconded by Wheat. Approved: Approved 10-0. Yeas: Newsome, Butler, Buford, Cepeda, Cox, Davis, Griggs, Thomas, Wheat. Perez. Abstain/Not Present: Brooks, Curtis, Rhodes

21-CDC-5

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Cox, seconded by Cepeda. Voice vote, all yeas.
Meeting adjourned at 3:32PM.

1
2
3 MEETING
4 OF THE
5 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
6
7
8
9

10 Zoom Video Teleconference
11

12 Tuesday, March 9, 2021
13 1:00 o'clock p.m.
14

15 JORGE PEREZ, Chairman
16 SHIRLEY NEWSOME, Vice Chair
17 GWENDOLYN BUTLER, Secretary
18 MARC B. BROOKS
19 ROBERT BUFORD
20 ADELA CEPEDA
21 MAURICE COX
22 DWIGHT CURTIS
23 LESLIE DAVIS
24 CORNELIUS GRIGGS
EILEEN RHODES
LATASHA THOMAS
CHRIS WHEAT

Reported by: Nick D. Bowen

1 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Well, good afternoon,
2 everyone, and welcome to the March 9th regular
3 meeting of the Community Development Commission.

4 I'm Jorge Perez, chairman of the
5 CDC. I'm the host of today's virtual meeting.

6 Due to the COVID-19 public health
7 emergency, an in-person meeting would not have been
8 practical and/or prudent today. Therefore, in
9 accordance with the Commission's emergency rules,
10 this meeting is being held virtually on Zoom and
11 can be viewed live via the Commission's website.

12 A court reporter is present today to
13 record the proceeding.

14 Commissioners, you've all had -- you
15 all have been designated as panelists, which means
16 that you will be able to control your microphone.
17 Now, please remember to place your microphone on
18 mute unless you need to speak. If you want to be
19 recognized by the chair, please activate the raise-
20 your-hand feature, and you will be called in order.

21 The agenda for this meeting was
22 posted on March 4th both online and at the CDC
23 website and physically in City Hall.

24 So I'll now begin with a call of the

1 roll.

2 Commissioners, when your name is
3 called, please turn your microphone on and respond
4 by saying present and please also indicate that you
5 can hear me okay.

6 Vice Chair Newsome.

7 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Present. And I can
8 hear you just fine.

9 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Secretary Butler.

10 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Present. I can hear
11 you quite well.

12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Brooks.

13 (No response.)

14 Commissioner Buford.

15 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Present. And I can
16 hear you quite well. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cepeda.

18 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Present. And I can
19 hear you fine. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cox.

21 COMMISSIONER COX: Present. And I could hear
22 you.

23 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Curtis.

24 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Present. And I can

1 hear you.

2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Davis.

3 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Present. Present. And
4 I can hear you.

5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you.

6 Commissioner Griggs.

7 (No response.)

8 Commissioner Rhodes.

9 COMMISSIONER RHODES: I'm present. I hear
10 you.

11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Thomas.

12 (No response.)

13 Commissioner Wheat.

14 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Present. And I can hear
15 you.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. And I'm also here.
17 We have a quorum.

18 Commissioners, the first item on our
19 agenda requests the approval of the minutes from
20 our previous meeting held on November 10th, 2020.
21 Seems like a long time ago.

22 Commissioners, you've had an
23 opportunity to review the minutes, and if there's
24 no corrections, I'm looking for a motion to

1 approve.

2 Do I have a motion?

3 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: So move. Commissioner
4 Butler.

5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Commissioner
6 Butler.

7 Do I have a second?

8 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Second. Commissioner
9 Cepeda.

10 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Commissioner
11 Cepeda.

12 Now, in accordance with the Open
13 Meetings Act, all votes are to be conducted by roll
14 call so that each member's vote on each issue can
15 be identified and recorded. So I'm going to call
16 the roll.

17 Vice Chair Newsome.

18 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: And request that we
21 add the year 2020 behind the month and date in the
22 minutes.

23 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. Secretary Butler.

24 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Buford.
 2 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Yes.
 3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cepeda.
 4 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Yes.
 5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cox.
 6 COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.
 7 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Curtis.
 8 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Yes.
 9 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Davis.
 10 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes.
 11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Griggs -- I'm
 12 sorry.
 13 Commissioner Rhodes.
 14 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Yes.
 15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat.
 16 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Yes.
 17 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. And Commissioner
 18 Perez votes yes. The minutes are approved.
 19 Let's see. Okay. Now, the public
 20 was given an opportunity to provide written
 21 comments up to 24 hours prior to the start of
 22 this meeting through the CDC email address
 23 cdc@cityofchicago.org. There were no written
 24 comments in the CDC mailbox for this meeting.

1 And we don't have any public
 2 comment, Robert?
 3 MR. MCKENNA: No.
 4 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. We have none. Let's
 5 keep moving.
 6 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Commissioner Perez,
 7 just as a point of order, I just received a message
 8 from Commissioner Thomas, and she is looking for
 9 the login. I just sent it to her, and she should
 10 be logging in shortly.
 11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Excellent. Thank you very
 12 much, Secretary Butler.
 13 Okay. So our first item of new
 14 business is the Department of Planning and
 15 Development is seeking authority to acquire
 16 property located at 4000 to 4008 West North Avenue
 17 and 1616 to 1638 North Pulaski Road, collectively
 18 known as the Pioneer Bank properties, in the
 19 Pulaski Corridor Tax Increment Financing
 20 Redevelopment Project Area.
 21 Michael Parella will present the
 22 staff presentation on behalf of the Department of
 23 Planning and Development.
 24 So if you're ready to go, Mike.

1 Michael.
 2 MR. PARELLA: I am. Let me bring up the
 3 presentation.
 4 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: You can begin.
 5 MR. PARELLA: All right. Can everyone see it
 6 okay?
 7 MR. MCKENNA: We can see it, yep.
 8 MR. PARELLA: Great.
 9 Good afternoon, Chairman and members
 10 of the Commission.
 11 For the record, my name is Michael
 12 Parella, and I'm a project manager with the
 13 Department of Planning and Development.
 14 Today I am bringing forward two
 15 resolutions that together are one part in the
 16 larger INVEST South/West initiative championed by
 17 Mayor Lightfoot and our Commissioner -- DPD
 18 Commissioner Maurice Cox.
 19 As you likely already know, the
 20 INVEST South/West initiative is an effort to
 21 harness resources of multiple City departments,
 22 corporate partners, and community organizations
 23 towards revitalization of twelve commercial
 24 corridors in ten community areas in Chicago's West

1 and South Sides. The focus of this initiative is
 2 the reactivation of neighborhood cores that have
 3 historically served as focal points for community --
 4 pedestrian activity, shopping, services,
 5 transportation, and quality of life.
 6 I think -- I hope at least that
 7 yesterday as well you saw the announcement of the
 8 three winning RFP respondents from the initial
 9 round of the RFP -- INVEST South/West RFP program
 10 in Auburn-Gresham, Englewood, and Austin, which
 11 really show the promise of this INVEST South/West
 12 initiative.
 13 To that end, the resolutions that
 14 will be presented here today request approval for
 15 the City to acquire acquisition authority and to
 16 solicit a request for proposal for 4000 to 4008
 17 West North Avenue and 1616 to 1638 North Pulaski
 18 Road, collectively known as the Pioneer Bank
 19 properties, which will be the signature INVEST
 20 South/West RFP project for the North Avenue INVEST
 21 South/West corridor.
 22 Here's a map of the North Avenue --
 23 North Avenue INVEST South/West corridor. It runs
 24 approximately 1.5 miles along North Avenue from

1 Kedzie to the east to about Lowell Avenue to the
2 west. The corridor is entirely within the Pulaski
3 Corridor TIF redevelopment area. Unlike other
4 corridors, the City does not own a large amount of
5 vacant property here. Highlighted in yellow is the
6 location of the Pioneer Bank properties.

7 The Pioneer Bank properties consist
8 of ten privately owned parcels in total located at
9 the northwest corner of Pulaski Road and North
10 Avenue in Humboldt Park, the community. Two of the
11 parcels are improved with buildings and eight are
12 vacant. All the properties are located in the 26th
13 Ward with Roberto Maldonado being the alderman.

14 The Pioneer Bank site itself
15 consists of three main components. The sites are
16 here highlighted in red.

17 Two vacant buildings at the
18 northwest corner of North and Pulaski. One is the
19 vacant Pioneer Bank building itself, which is a
20 five-story, approximately 50,000 square foot
21 building. Immediately to the west is the Pioneer
22 Bank annex building, a two-story, approximately
23 8,000 square foot building. Collectively they're
24 zoned B2-5, and they're within the Pulaski Corridor

1 TIF.

2 The eight vacant parcels located
3 immediately to the north of the Pioneer Bank
4 building on Pulaski Road contain approximately
5 32,500 square feet or about three-quarters of an
6 acre of land. Those sites are vacant, zoned B3-1,
7 and are not in the Pulaski Corridor TIF.

8 The Pioneer Bank itself -- or the
9 Pioneer Bank building was formerly the home of
10 Pioneer Bank and later Banco Popular. The site has
11 been vacant since 2008 when Banco Popular moved
12 across the street.

13 The building itself was built in
14 1925 when the neighborhood was growing rapidly.
15 Residents and commercial leaders desired a bank
16 that signified permanence, prosperity, and
17 strength. Those same aspirations were the ones
18 that the community members were looking for when
19 they were trying to establish themselves and put
20 down roots in the neighborhood. And the bank's
21 architecture reflects those values. It features
22 Greco-Roman columns along the facade on the east
23 and south side, sculptured panels on the outside
24 depicting scenes of industrial labor, a soaring

1 three-story banking hall featuring ionic columns,
2 coffered ceilings, and terrazzo floors as well as
3 office spaces on the top two floors, the fourth and
4 fifth floor. You see on the middle right there the
5 bank lobby space.

6 And in 2012, the bank was designated
7 a Chicago landmark in recognition of all these
8 beautiful, you know, timeless and really priceless
9 features.

10 The current owners of this bank --
11 these bank properties and the vacant properties to
12 the north purchased the -- it all in 2015. And
13 since that time they have been unable to redevelop
14 the property. As a result, a valuable community
15 asset has been unused and neglected for over 13
16 years.

17 Through discussions with the
18 community and DPD, we believe the bank's
19 revitalization will transform the neighborhood and
20 its redevelopment will reflect the values and
21 priorities of the INVEST South/West initiative.

22 In order to achieve this, DPD
23 initially approached the owners of Pulaski
24 Investments, LLC, which own the property, in August

1 to gauge their interest in allowing DPD to RFP the
2 properties. They were open to that, and we had
3 a meeting with them in November once it was
4 solidified this was a site that we wanted to take a
5 look at. And over the next several months, the
6 owners and DPD negotiated the terms of an agreement
7 to RFP the site.

8 On February 2nd, the City and
9 Pulaski Investments, LLC, who are the current
10 owners, reached an agreement and signed a letter of
11 intent allowing DPD to RFP the properties. The
12 City has no plans to purchase the Pioneer Bank
13 properties from the owners, rather the intent is to
14 have the winning RFP respondent reach a deal with
15 the owners to purchase the private property --
16 property in a private transaction. However, in
17 order to facilitate the RFP, we're requesting
18 acquisition authority especially if the
19 negotiations should break down. That way the DPD
20 will have the authority and the ability to
21 facilitate the redevelopment of this property.

22 And on February 23rd, DPD sent
23 notice to the owners that they were planning to
24 obtain acquisition authority for the properties.

1 The owners have no objection to this cause.
 2 Therefore, given the desire for the
 3 community and DPD to see the site redeveloped, the
 4 length of time which the property has sat vacant,
 5 again, 13 years, and the vital need to bring
 6 economic development to the North Avenue corridor,
 7 DPD requests that the Community Development
 8 Commission approve the acquisition authority for
 9 the Pioneer Bank properties.

10 Alderman Maldonado supports this
 11 initiative and has provided a letter of support
 12 dated February 24th.

13 It's my understanding that you would
 14 read the motion now, or I can continue on with my
 15 presentation.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Well, Commissioners, what we
 17 were going to do is because the first two items
 18 actually are a combination, it's both for the
 19 request for the acqui- -- authority for the
 20 acquisition of the property, and the other side of
 21 this is the actual RFP to this.

22 So what we're going to do is call
 23 for a vote -- a motion on the acquisition
 24 authority. And then Michael's going to finish up

1 on the actual RFP process.

2 So at this point, Commissioners,
 3 do you have any questions on the acquisition to
 4 Michael?

5 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Yes. I'm sorry. I
 6 don't -- this is Commissioner Curtis. I'm sorry.
 7 I don't fully understand the approval process that
 8 we're going through here.

9 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Curtis, if
 10 that was you, if you can speak directly into the
 11 microphone. We couldn't hear that. It sounded
 12 like you're under water.

13 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Can you hear me now?
 14 Any better?

15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Go for it.

16 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Okay. I'm sorry. I
 17 don't fully understand the process we're going
 18 through here. Talking about the price we're paying
 19 for -- I guess that's the RFP process. Can you
 20 help me understand the process a little bit more?

21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Michael --

22 MR. PARELLA: Do you want me to take that?

23 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yeah.

24 MR. PARELLA: Okay. So there are two agenda

1 items for the same piece of property.

2 So the first agenda item is for the
 3 authority to acquire the property, and so that's
 4 what we would be voting on right now.

5 And then the next vote would be for
 6 issuing an RFP for the property.

7 So there are two different agenda
 8 items for the same property.

9 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Okay. But to acquire
 10 the property, we don't have a price, we don't know
 11 what the structure of the arrangements by DPD.

12 MR. PARELLA: Right. It's just for the
 13 authority to do it. It's not a given that we
 14 actually would acquire it. It's just the authority
 15 to be able to acquire it at this point.

16 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: At any price?

17 MR. PARELLA: No, not at any price.

18 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: No.

19 MR. PARELLA: The City is currently acquiring
 20 an appraisal for the property to guide any -- guide
 21 the -- both the RFP respondents and to have it for
 22 backup if negotiations are needed with the
 23 developer as part of the acquisition authority.

24 But, again, our preference is for

1 this site to be purchased by a third party, the
 2 winner of -- or the winner -- the chosen party from
 3 the RFP process who would then make a deal with the
 4 private owner.

5 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: I'm sorry. So there is
 6 no structure to be included to the approval to
 7 acquire the property? There's no guidelines?
 8 There's no -- we're just saying yes, that we do
 9 approve the acquisition of the property? There's
 10 no --

11 MR. PARELLA: No. We don't --

12 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: -- structure?

13 MR. PARELLA: Again, I don't think we want
 14 to acquire the property. We're just -- we're just
 15 requesting the authority to do so in the event that
 16 it is necessary.

17 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Under what guidelines?
 18 The approval to do so within what constraints,
 19 within what guidelines?

20 MR. PARELLA: Only in so much that it
 21 supports the redevelopment of the site and we have
 22 a developer at the table who will spend the money
 23 to redevelop it and turn it into the uses that the
 24 City and the community support as part of the

1 INVEST South/West RFP program.
 2 COMMISSIONER COX: And, Mr. Chair, if I might
 3 add a comment. This is Commissioner Cox.
 4 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes, Commissioner.
 5 COMMISSIONER COX: So this process was the
 6 exact same process this body went through in the
 7 first round of RFPs for the Laramie State Bank,
 8 which -- on Chicago Avenue. The City also did not
 9 own that property. But much like the Pioneer Bank,
 10 we had a willing seller who would allow the City to
 11 market the property, RFP the property, and the
 12 owner agreed that we could have acquisition
 13 authority.

14 But what our -- what that process
 15 has led to is the winning RFP developer and the
 16 seller sitting down to have a property transaction
 17 between those two parties at the Laramie -- at the
 18 Laramie State Bank.

19 So the process worked. We didn't
 20 have to actually acquire the Laramie State Bank,
 21 and nor is it anticipated that we would have to
 22 acquire the Pioneer Bank. But just the fact that
 23 we -- it's our -- the backup plan so that they know
 24 that something can happen.

1 But if I understand correctly, if
 2 we were to move forward, this body would again be
 3 consulted with what exactly -- because we -- I
 4 haven't lived through that experience. I'm not
 5 sure how that triggered -- what gets triggered
 6 that would come to this body again before that
 7 transaction would be completed. But I just wanted
 8 to reference that we found ourself in a very
 9 similar situation last year with the Laramie Bank.

10 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you, Commissioner.

11 So can I confirm that it would come
 12 back to this body before the actual acquisition?

13 COMMISSIONER COX: Well, that I would like to
 14 have an opinion on because I haven't actually gone
 15 through one of those transactions before.

16 I don't know, Robert -- Bob McKenna,
 17 if you are able to ask or if there's legal counsel
 18 present.

19 MR. MCKENNA: Well, we would still have to
 20 get an RFP. The deal structure, if we're doing a
 21 redevelopment agreement, that would still have to
 22 be approved. So we -- again, as you said, we have
 23 done this before where we've -- we sought the
 24 ability to acquire so that we can be in the

1 conversation and then start that conversation
 2 between the current owners and the prospective
 3 developers through the RFP process.

4 We don't have -- we don't -- we're
 5 not reserving money to acquire this property right
 6 now. That's correct, Commissioner, right?

7 COMMISSIONER COX: That is correct.

8 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. So it -- it just -- it
 9 allows us to actually get into the conversation
 10 with some standing.

11 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes, Vice Chair Newsome.

13 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: This is Latasha Thomas.

14 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: I'm sorry, Commissioner
 15 Thomas.

16 Please let the record reflect that
 17 Commissioner Thomas has joined the meeting.

18 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, I have a
 19 question.

20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: And I think I asked the
 22 same question on the last deal. So maybe the
 23 answers -- I don't remember it as we speak.

24 If it turns out that the winner of

1 the RFP and the current owner cannot come to an
 2 agreement and the City has -- the City has
 3 acquisition authority, if the City decided to go
 4 ahead and acquire the building, will they come back
 5 to this Commission for additional authority?

6 COMMISSIONER COX: That's a very relevant
 7 question, and that's one reason why I asked does
 8 the CDC have legal counsel, because I can't answer
 9 that question.

10 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: So this is Commissioner
 11 Butler. And I recall this conversation -- this
 12 question being raised over the time four years I've
 13 been on the Commission. Unless my recollection has
 14 failed me, I do not believe that for purposes of
 15 the acquisition, once it's approved by this body,
 16 whenever that is approved that the department is
 17 not obligated to come back to the -- to this body
 18 for any additional authorizations. I believe
 19 that's been at least the precedent, and certainly
 20 the chair and the vice chair have much more -- much
 21 longer tenure than I have on this Commission, and
 22 so perhaps they would weigh in. But I do believe
 23 that, in fact, the acquisition authority that we
 24 approve, whenever we approve it, is the acquisition

1 authority and allows the department to move forward
2 with its plans in a way that -- with some certainty.

3 MR. HASTINGS: Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: It's my understanding too
5 that it seldom comes to that point where they have
6 to acquire it. It becomes a different process in
7 which that is undertaken.

8 COMMISSIONER COX: Mr. Chairman, I also see
9 Managing Deputy Chip Hastings is in the meeting.
10 He might have something to add to this.

11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. Commissioner Cox,
12 just a second. Let me just recognize Commissioner
13 Brooks has come into the meeting.

14 Chip, did you want to ...

15 MR. HASTINGS: Yeah. Please. So I caught
16 the tail end. I'm not sure which Commissioner made
17 the point. But she's absolutely correct that the
18 authority that we are seeking today allows us to do
19 our due diligence and negotiate with a potential
20 seller and not necessarily return to CDC. It sets
21 in motion an entire process if we're unable to
22 reach agreement or if we're unable to reach
23 agreement with the private party. So I believe --
24 we can check with and confirm with counsel, but I

1 believe the statement made by the previous
2 Commissioner is absolutely correct.

3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. Commissioner Wheat,
4 you had your hand up?

5 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6 I guess I'm -- thank you, Chip and Commissioner
7 Cox, for the clarification. I guess then to go
8 down that route of discussion, can you talk more --
9 can the department provide more information about
10 the viability of potential projects, and knowing
11 that we're asking you to look into a crystal ball
12 either from an intent or probability standpoint,
13 what's the likelihood that the department would
14 actually acquire the property on its own?

15 COMMISSIONER COX: You know, again, Michael
16 Parella has been in conversation with the alderman
17 and the current property owners who have failed to
18 redevelop the property. And so they were very
19 willing to allow the City to market the property on
20 their behalf through the INVEST South/West efforts.

21 So the challenge is that without the
22 acquisition authority, the City has no standing.
23 We have no standing. This is a transaction between
24 two private individuals. But yet we are marketing

1 their property. So we have to have -- in order to
2 have standing to be able to market the property, we
3 also have to be in a position to acquire it. But
4 that is obviously not our intention. And if the
5 past is any indication in other instances where
6 this body gave the City acquisition authority, it
7 has never led to the City purchasing it.

8 And I'm not -- you know, my tenure
9 is only a year and a half, but there have been a
10 number of projects that were larger and probably
11 more complex than this where acquisition authority
12 was enough to move the two private players into a
13 negotiation for sale.

14 And, again, I have to assume that we
15 will be successful. And if the first round of RFPs
16 are any indication, you know, that was -- I think
17 that was granted -- that authority was granted for
18 Laramie Bank in August, and eight months later we
19 now have a private developer party who is going to
20 purchase that building from a private seller. So
21 that is the expectation. But I understand that
22 there's a kind of leap here when you're giving us
23 authority to purchase it when we really don't want
24 to purchase it.

1 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you, Commissioner.

2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Right, it's just the way
3 this is set up.

4 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: This is Commissioner
5 Curtis.

6 Can you explain to me what the next
7 step would be should the City decide to acquire the
8 property? What would be the next approval process
9 or next step in the authorization? Is that City
10 Council?

11 COMMISSIONER COX: So if the chair would
12 allow Chip Hastings to answer that question, I
13 think he --

14 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER COX: -- can talk about that.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Mr. Hastings, go ahead.

17 MR. HASTING: I'm still having trouble
18 hearing Commissioner Curtis a little bit.

19 COMMISSIONER COX: I think he's actually
20 moved the mic to his mouth. You know, hold the
21 cord and move it to your mouth.

22 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: I was just wondering
23 what the next step is in terms of the approval
24 process if that becomes necessary.

1 MR. HASTINGS: In terms of -- in terms of the
2 acquisition?

3 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Yes.

4 MR. HASTINGS: So Mike can speak to the order
5 of events. However, if we decide to move forward
6 with the acquisition authority, we'd have to go
7 through a legislative process just like we do with
8 any other financial incentive or acquisition. It
9 would have to go to City Council. It would have to
10 go to committee, housing and real estate committee.
11 And it would have to be approved by the full City
12 Council body.

13 MR. PARELLA: Thanks, Chip.

14 And I would add the intention,
15 again, to reiterate, is not to acquire the
16 property, and it would only be done, I think, in
17 the instance where there was a developer at the
18 table who was, you know, fully financed, who had
19 the support of the department and the community,
20 and we would do this in concert with a
21 redevelopment agreement with them to redevelop the
22 property so that we are never in a situation where
23 we are buying this property and holding it for any
24 period of time, because that is not a scenario the

1 City wants to be party to.

2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Correct. If banks don't
3 want to hold on to property, the City doesn't want
4 to hold on to property either. So it actually
5 would extend the process even more to put it out to
6 bid and wait further if you acquire it first.

7 I think a really good example over
8 the last few years was the post office. For those
9 of you who were on the Commission back then, we did
10 the exact same thing. And the next day the owner
11 finally appeared -- or the next couple days, and
12 then we found out that he had passed away. But
13 then they came to an agreement, and we see the post
14 office now. It's moving right along. So there was
15 never an acquisition of the post office.

16 But with that, if anybody has any
17 questions --

18 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Actually, Commissioner
19 Perez -- this is Commissioner Butler. Actually my
20 hand's been up for a while. I just don't think you
21 saw it.

22 But my comment earlier was just a
23 follow-on to provide clarification on the question
24 that had been raised by Commissioner Curtis.

1 So my question is what is the -- do
2 we have any statistics on any recent property sales
3 in this area of a similar type in terms of what the
4 price, you know, per square foot or acre, you know,
5 where these properties have traded in this submarket?
6 Does the department have any statistics?

7 MR. PARELLA: We're currently acquiring an
8 appraisal for this property. So we have a -- we
9 will have a licensed appraiser -- we have currently
10 taking a look at the site and providing that
11 reference point for us. And until that time, you
12 know, I don't have information about comparable
13 sales of this size and scope.

14 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Okay. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Buford.

16 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Yeah. I would -- as
17 you get into the discussion of next steps, what if
18 everything fails and the seller doesn't go along
19 with the sale?

20 MR. PARELLA: Again, I think that is the --
21 that is the role of the acquisition authority. The
22 acquisition authority is what would compel the
23 seller through, you know, a legal process to --

24 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Right.

1 MR. PARELLA: -- come to the table.

2 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: So what -- so in the
3 discussions you've had to date, what indication do
4 you have that they would agree to the sale?

5 MR. PARELLA: Well, they have signed a letter
6 of intent. In the letter of intent, they've agreed
7 to allow us to market the property -- allow DPD to
8 market the property through the RFP process. And
9 they've agreed to work with a third party, you
10 know, in an open and honest way to sell the
11 property to them; so basically have good faith
12 negotiations.

13 And, you know -- so right now we
14 have a -- you know, an LOI signed by the current
15 owners and by the department stating to those
16 facts.

17 What assurances I can provide beyond
18 that are limited. But, again, we do have a signed
19 document that states as much, that they're, you
20 know, willing to have the site be RFP'd and they're
21 willing to enter into good faith negotiations to
22 come to a price.

23 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: So -- okay. So there
24 is no val- -- there's no appraisal yet, there's no

1 agreed upon value. There's basically a best
2 efforts in terms of your marketing efforts. And
3 the seller then has agreed to something without
4 knowing the price basically.

5 MR. PARELLA: I mean -- well, the seller has
6 the price in mind. I think the department would be
7 hesitant to put any number on -- you know, we don't
8 want to -- we don't want to tip the negotiations
9 one way or the other. It's up to the winning RFP
10 respondent and the private owner to come to an
11 agreement. And we will facilitate that.

12 However, should negotiations break
13 down, we can compel the seller to the table via the
14 acquisition authority.

15 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: And the seller realizes
16 this compel aspect of the process?

17 MR. PARELLA: Yes. Yes. They were noticed
18 prior to this meeting, and I spoke with them on the
19 phone and via email, and to that -- to the actions
20 that we're taking here today, and they provided no
21 objections and verbal consent to this proceeding
22 and to the acquisition authority.

23 COMMISSIONER COX: I will -- I will offer --
24 this is Commissioner Cox -- that this is a very

1 worthwhile conversation that we're having because
2 increasingly as we move to revitalize corridors
3 throughout the city where the City does not own
4 land, we are going to have to work through a
5 willing seller who effectively is allowing us,
6 after maybe years of not being able to attract
7 investors, to market the property for them. And
8 I know, you know, this gets -- this issue only
9 becomes more compounded when we move to the North
10 and the Northwest Side of the city where almost all
11 of the sites that we're looking at that have been
12 underdeveloped are in private hands. And so we
13 would like to be able to RFP those sites as well
14 and to offer that service.

15 But -- so this is probably not the
16 last time that this body is going to be asked to
17 give acquisition authority with a lot -- with not
18 much assurance of the outcome.

19 So if there are things that you
20 think the department should be thinking about that
21 would give everyone a level of comfort, then, you
22 know, that would be a good outcome. I mean, you
23 know, that would be a good outcome of discussion.
24 But I can understand and sense from the

1 conversation that, you know, we're taking a leap of
2 faith here, and it's more of a strategy than it is
3 an intention. But it would be important to
4 understand, you know, what level is reasonably
5 assumed that this body would feel -- that would
6 make this body feel comfortable voting in favor of
7 this. Once again, I don't know if it's, you know --
8 yeah, I don't know. But I know that this is not
9 the last time that this body will be asked to
10 deliberate on this type of acqui- -- this type of
11 issue.

12 COMMISSIONER BROOKS: Commissioner Cox --

13 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Brooks, you
14 have your hand up?

15 COMMISSIONER BROOKS: Yeah. Commissioner
16 Cox, if I could add on to that. I think any
17 information that we could receive showing that
18 willingness of the buyer and seller. You
19 referenced an LOI. I don't know if that LOI was
20 sent to us in our packet. But seeing documents
21 like that, I think, would help sway our decision.

22 So if in the future and if now, as
23 relates to the items we are, you know, voting on
24 today, if we could substantiate that willingness by

1 having -- by including those kind of documents, I
2 think that would help in our decision.

3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat, you had
4 your hand up? Go ahead.

5 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Yes. But I don't know,
6 Commissioner Cox, if you were going to respond to
7 Commissioner Brooks.

8 COMMISSIONER COX: No, no. I mean, I think
9 that's an excellent point. I didn't know that the
10 letter was not in the packet. And I --

11 COMMISSIONER BROOKS: It very well could have
12 been maybe. I didn't get a chance to scrub it,
13 but it --

14 COMMISSIONER COX: No, I don't think it was.
15 Michael, it wasn't shared.

16 MR. PARELLA: I did not -- I did not share
17 it. It's an oversight in this regard. But I'm not
18 sure -- at the time I didn't know -- because it was
19 a legal transaction between two -- us and the
20 private developer, I wasn't sure it was appropriate.

21 COMMISSIONER COX: So I think you could
22 certainly --

23 MR. PARELLA: I can certainly share it with --

24 COMMISSIONER BROOKS: Yeah, it would be

1 helpful.

2 COMMISSIONER COX: As we assume in direct
3 testimony, very often, you know, an alderman or an
4 applicant would come and testify in front of the
5 Commission. That's also something that we could --
6 you know, if they are willing to testify in first
7 person, that's also something else that could help
8 our deliberations.

9 COMMISSIONER BROOKS: Yeah. I think that too
10 would be beneficial. Again, we're used to that,
11 you know, being on -- physically on hand and seeing
12 that testimony. So in place of that if we could
13 make sure we allow some of that to happen in this
14 virtual setting, that too would be helpful.

15 COMMISSIONER COX: Agreed.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat.

17 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 To your question, Commissioner Cox,
19 I think -- I definitely agree with Commissioner
20 Brooks in terms of, you know, essentially
21 information from the counter-party and whatever
22 level of detail that could be provided.

23 I think also -- you know, I'm sure
24 everyone's, you know, familiar with INVEST

1 South/West, but we also know that it's a
2 neighborhood-by-neighborhood approach.

3 And so, you know, to the
4 articulation of kind of what is the vision or --
5 essentially what is the policy goal that's being
6 envisioned there. Because, you know, candidly
7 there's an argument even outside of the RFP process
8 that there may be value in the acqui- -- and in the
9 Commission recommending acquisition authority, you
10 know, that the City should buy it, and that there
11 is value with respect to that. And I think it's
12 okay for the Commission to essentially go down that
13 path a little bit and say even -- even -- because
14 even great deals fall apart, and that there would
15 be value in the City continuing to have that
16 leverage regardless, frankly, as a result of the
17 RFP. And that even kind of with that, that it
18 still should be a recommendation from this
19 Commission.

20 So I appreciate you, one, kind of,
21 you know, articulating that this will not be --
22 this is not our first rodeo with respect to this
23 type of transaction, and it will not be our last.

24 And also, you know, with thoughts on

1 other things that you and staff can provide, I
2 think the more -- you know, more robust --
3 essentially because there is an element of a leap
4 of faith here, I think would be -- would be helpful
5 in terms of just appreciating the level of
6 transparency that there frankly already is right
7 now between the department and the counter-party
8 and the department and stakeholders in the
9 community. You know, we know like -- you know,
10 obviously the alderman has been involved. There
11 have been other stakeholders involved in that as
12 well. So I think the more information that can be
13 provided there the better.

14 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Newsome,
16 Secretary Butler had her hand up before.

17 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Mr. Chair --

18 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Yeah. This is -- just
19 really quickly to Commissioner Cox's question. I
20 would like -- I would like to suggest that the
21 department consider providing, even despite the
22 fact that there -- that this particular parcel has
23 not been appraised, I think going forward adding
24 some, you know, commentary within the body of

1 the -- of the, you know, information that's
2 presented in conjunction with these types of
3 transactions regarding kind of land values and
4 where things have traded would provide some
5 insights as to what the potential kind of financial
6 exposure might be to the City to the extent the
7 City ended up for whatever reason exercising its
8 right to acquire the property pursuant to the
9 approvals that have been given.

10 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Vice Chair Newsome. Vice
13 Chair Newsome.

14 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: I -- thank you,
15 Mr. Chairman.

16 I'd like to make a statement here.
17 And first of all, Commissioner Butler was correct
18 in that we have entertained this type of
19 transaction several times before. Well, numerous
20 times during my tenure. And what I have found to
21 be the case is that once the City has had some
22 communication with the actual owners of the
23 property, there has generally been a willingness to
24 negotiate with the potential owners of the property

1 in accordance with the RFPs that have been issued
2 by the City.

3 I can recall only one case where the
4 transaction did not go through. I don't remember
5 all of the details. But I -- what we have
6 discovered is once the City has brought to the
7 attention of all that a property has been neglected
8 over the years and has not been maintained and has
9 caused revitalization or redevelopment to be
10 stagnant, then generally they come through with
11 agreeing to the particular negotiation that's
12 presented.

13 It is not my belief personally that
14 everything old is antique and every old building is
15 or should be a landmark. And I am on record
16 everywhere as making that statement, but I really
17 and truly appreciate the fact that now both
18 community and the City are looking at some of our
19 older institutional buildings as the catalyst for
20 revitalization for these particular corridors.
21 Because if you will note over the years, the
22 buildings have been fairly substantial as far as
23 their longevity, and they for the most part
24 represent architectural integrity. And so I'm

1 happy to see that they are being used as part of
2 the revitalization of these major corridors.
3 That said, I would like to also
4 point out that one of the things that the City can
5 use as leverage, if you want to call it that, is
6 the fact that these properties exist in our
7 communities on our major corridors in disrepair for
8 multiple and many, many years, and that there needs
9 to be some action taken earlier on with regard to
10 approaching the owners of these properties so that
11 either they sell them or they do something to
12 maintain them so that they do not take down the
13 value of the remaining properties on those
14 corridors or become an eyesore on the corridors,
15 which would also prevent in some cases further
16 revitalization or redevelopment of these corridors.

17 All of that said, I think if, in
18 fact, these owners of these properties are
19 approached and respected in the approach, I have
20 found that they generally are amenable to
21 negotiating with anybody practically who would
22 agree to take the property off their hands. I
23 didn't get the background as it relates to why
24 the initial owner did not move forward with

1 revitalization or rehabilitation of these
2 properties. I don't know if it was because,
3 you know, once they acquired the property, the
4 investment was not something that they could do for
5 financial reasons or if they just no longer were
6 interested or if initially they didn't have a plan
7 but were just speculators buying up properties at a
8 time when they thought some revitalization would
9 take place.

10 That's a long scenario. But that's
11 the point I'd like to raise.

12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Vice Chair
13 Newsome.

14 Commissioner Thomas. Commissioner
15 Thomas.

16 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Okay. Here I am.
17 Thank you.

18 I think there are two things I'm
19 missing. One is I thought earlier on I heard the
20 statement that the reason why that the City asked
21 for acquisition authority is so that they have
22 authority to market the property. And so if that's
23 correct, then I'm wondering if there are other ways
24 that we could have some other agreement where we

1 can have the authority to market the property.

2 Then the other thing I heard, and
3 kind of heard it from Commissioner Newsome, is
4 where actually -- the City actually holds the
5 acquisition authority as weight on the other two
6 parties to really negotiate an agreement. And if
7 that is the case, then it would be -- it would be
8 nice to have some idea, as Commissioner Butler
9 speaks, to have some idea of what the liability
10 could be for the City of Chicago to purchase the
11 property. Not saying that they shouldn't purchase
12 it, but what would the liability be because that's
13 something that this Commission should be
14 considering.

15 COMMISSIONER COX: I mean, that -- Mr. Chair,
16 there obviously is some need for some historical
17 context that I am unable to provide. But I do know
18 that -- and, you know, I don't know if -- the
19 theater -- what is it? -- the North -- the North --
20 the theater, is it called the North Theater?

21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Uptown. Uptown Theater.

22 COMMISSIONER COX: Uptown Theater.

23 Uptown Theater, in my understanding,
24 and perhaps Chip or someone with a longer memory

1 here can talk about that particular project,
 2 which stalled but had hundreds of thousands of
 3 maintenance dollars needed to keep it mothballed.
 4 And I'm not quite sure whose responsibility it was.
 5 But -- and I also don't know how that property was
 6 played out, whether the City did not have
 7 acquisition authority in that case. But a little
 8 bit of a historical context would be useful to the
 9 conversation.

10 Can you provide that, Chip?

11 MR. HASTINGS: Sure. So a couple quick
 12 points.

13 Commissioner Thomas raised a couple
 14 of good points I want to address as well, and then
 15 I'll circle back to both the Congress Theater and
 16 Uptown Theater.

17 In terms of -- I think the
 18 Commissioner mentioned this. Commissioner Cox
 19 mentioned this as well. Part of the reason -- part
 20 of the motivation and part of the reason for doing
 21 it this way is it offers a legitimacy to the
 22 process on both sides of the table in terms of the
 23 current property owner and potential developers.
 24 It's our backup plan. I think Mike has stated

1 repeatedly it's a backup plan.

2 I think moving forward, it might
 3 be a good idea if we do an acquisition process
 4 overview perhaps at the beginning of the next
 5 meeting. I think it would be really helpful for us
 6 as a department to dive into the details in terms
 7 of our acquisition process. It is painful. It is
 8 elongated. It's not something any of us choose to
 9 want or to hope to choose some day to experience.

10 And I think one thing that we
 11 haven't touched on that is important is that a
 12 large part of this is it provides legitimacy to
 13 the overall process, but it also provides some
 14 semblance of motivation to the buyer's side, the
 15 development team who will be investing upwards of
 16 several hundred thousand dollars, million dollars,
 17 whatever the case may be, in due diligence and
 18 predevelopment costs. They know there's a backup
 19 plan. Whether we utilize it or not, they are
 20 likely to have a more solid, well-rounded
 21 development pool, a pool of potential developers
 22 with this as sort of a backstop.

23 The other thing is in terms of the
 24 acquisition itself, we have to go out and get an

1 appraisal. The subject of the land value has come
 2 up a couple times. This is a very unique property.
 3 It's not in good condition. From a commercial
 4 perspective, there aren't a whole lot of comps, if
 5 any. And we can always do a back-of-envelope
 6 inhouse. But for a property like this, it's
 7 challenging to get at because it's very unique.

8 And there's just not a lot of comps out there.

9 So I want to -- I wanted to touch on
 10 a couple of those questions because they've came up
 11 a few times.

12 And then in terms of just theaters
 13 and older buildings in general, it's always in our
 14 best interest and I think the community's best
 15 interest, the City's best interest to have a backup
 16 plan.

17 The Commissioner mentioned the -- I
 18 think it was the Uptown Theater, you know, which
 19 has been -- in similar circumstances gone
 20 undeveloped for many years, and it's our best
 21 interest to have the ability to step in and acquire
 22 to try to facilitate a deal.

23 I think based on some of our
 24 experiences over the past five or ten years, it's

1 really, unfortunately, come into focus. So that's
 2 part of the reason why you're seeing more of this
 3 approach layered into the RFP process so that we
 4 get some of these older buildings, some of these
 5 buildings with unique challenges back on the tax
 6 rolls, back into an active use.

7 So there's a -- I realize there's a
 8 lot of moving parts, but I would suggest a couple
 9 things before I take up too much more of your time.

10 Moving forward, I would suggest to
 11 the chair, and maybe Bob and I can talk about this
 12 after the meeting, doing a brief overview of the
 13 acquisition process so that every time it comes up,
 14 hopefully we can refer back to that and answer some
 15 of your questions before we propose again next time
 16 around. I think hopefully that would be helpful.
 17 I'm hoping of doing that. And then we'll also
 18 include in the future RFPs, because, again, this
 19 won't be the last one, any LOIs, any contact that
 20 we've had with the existing seller, and we'll make
 21 sure that they're present to speak to the issues
 22 that we've raised -- that you've raised so that you
 23 know that we're representing their position
 24 accurately.

1 I think those three things would
2 go a long way towards sort of addressing some of
3 the questions that have come up repeatedly today
4 frankly. So hopefully that will help.

5 MR. MCKENNA: Chip, if I may. I've been
6 hesitating to talk about this too much because of
7 my role as the secretary. But I did want to point
8 out that while this action is under the CDC's
9 purview of using -- of reviewing acquisition
10 authority within a redevelopment area, the next
11 authority is also the use of TIF proceeds for
12 private development projects.

13 So while we're asking for
14 acquisition authority at this point, we're not
15 asking for TIF proceeds to acquire the property.
16 So even though we would have the supposed authority
17 to acquire the property, we wouldn't have the means
18 to acquire the property unless it came from a
19 private source or that this body would be reviewing
20 it again if TIF funds are used.

21 So I just wanted to point that out,
22 that -- you know, that the authority to acquire and
23 the means to acquire are two separate items, and
24 CDC has authority over both of those.

1 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yeah. And, Robert, I'm
2 glad you brought that up. And, Chip, I think I
3 definitely concur with your recommendation of doing
4 that overview so that you do walk us all through it
5 so there's a clear understanding of that from our
6 perspective as well, so ...

7 So seeing no more questions -- I saw
8 someone had a hand up, and then he put it down.

9 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: That was me, Curtis. I
10 thought that --

11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Curtis, speak
12 directly into the mic.

13 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Yes. That was me.

14 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: I can't hear you. Do you
15 want to write it into chat?

16 I don't know. Did anybody get that?
17 I didn't get the -- I didn't hear anything.

18 Commissioner Curtis, one more --
19 once more. Do you want to give it a shot?

20 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Yes. I had raised my
21 hand, but Bob answered my question. And really
22 that was per- -- that was a perfect explanation,
23 just what's the next step and just making sure we
24 didn't give unconstrained approval authorization.

1 That's all I was looking for. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Got it.

3 All right, Commissioners, if there's
4 no other questions, I'm going to call the item up
5 to a vote.

6 So the resolution before us requests
7 authority for the Department of Planning and
8 Development to acquire the property located at 4000
9 to 4008 West North Avenue and at 1616 to 1638 North
10 Pulaski Road, collectively known as the Pioneer
11 Bank properties, in the Pulaski Corridor Tax
12 Increment Financing Redevelopment Project Area.

13 Do I have a motion?

14 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: So moved. Commissioner
15 Butler.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: So moved by Commissioner
17 Butler. Thank you.

18 Do I have a second?

19 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Second. Commissioner
20 Thomas.

21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you. Commissioner
22 Thomas is the second.

23 I'm going to call the roll. Please
24 signify your support or objection by saying yea or

1 nay.

2 Vice Chair Newsome.

3 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Secretary Butler.

5 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Brooks.

7 COMMISSIONER BROOKS: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Buford.

9 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cepeda.

11 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cox.

13 COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Curtis.

15 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Davis.

17 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Rhodes.

19 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Thomas.

21 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat.

23 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: And Commissioner Perez votes

1 yes.

2 The item -- motion passes.

3 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Commissioner Griggs is
4 on the call as well, and I vote yes.

5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes. Please let the record
6 reflect that Commissioner Griggs has joined the
7 meeting. Hello, Cornelius.

8 Our second item of new business is a
9 request for the Department of Planning and
10 Development for authority to advertise and issue
11 a request for proposal for the purchase and
12 redevelopment of the property located at 4000 to
13 4008 North Avenue and 1616 to 1638 North Pulaski
14 Road.

15 Again, Michael Parella will present
16 the staff report on behalf of the Department of
17 Planning and Development.

18 Michael, when you're ready, you have
19 the floor.

20 MR. PARELLA: Sir, I am. Let's move forward.
21 Okay. So shown here highlighted in red is the
22 North and Pulaski intersection, and highlighted in
23 red, of course, is the Pioneer Bank properties, the
24 Pioneer Bank building and the vacant site.

1 The RFP process is intended to serve
2 as a catalytic investment bringing new life and
3 vitality to the North and Pulaski intersection.
4 The RFP process is locally driven
5 and based on the goals of inclusion, community
6 wealth building, and design excellence. The RFP
7 is intended to show a vision of what a potential
8 redevelopment will look like in hopes that it will
9 inspire action by private developers in the
10 community to deliver on that vision and deliver a
11 transformative change to not just the site, but
12 hopefully inspire action to this entire
13 neighborhood.

14 At the end of January, through the
15 assistance of the Chicago Central Area Committee,
16 DPD engaged the services of several pro bono
17 consultants, including BKL, Focus, Avison Young,
18 Wight, and McGuire Iglesias and Associates, to help
19 create a vision for the site.

20 That specific vision is being shaped
21 through active engagement with the alderman and
22 community stakeholders which DPD brought back to
23 the table back in June of 2020 to help both
24 identify an RFP site and determine what uses,

1 programming, and massing would most closely fit the
2 community's priorities and goals.

3 To date, the community has met
4 regularly since June. Together we have identified
5 the Pioneer Bank properties as a preferred RFP site
6 and determined a community priority list. Since
7 early February, after the consultants were engaged,
8 DPD and community stakeholders have met twice to
9 refine that vision into a potential redevelopment
10 framework for the RFP. These discussions are still
11 ongoing, and it is the expectation of the
12 department and the community that further
13 engagements are needed. The goal is to finalize a
14 preferred vision for the site by the end of March.

15 Among the items that are a priority
16 for the community and the alderman are as follows:

17 Within the Pioneer Bank itself, a
18 Latino cultural hub, a nonprofit office center, a
19 business development center, community space, with
20 a limited amount of retail.

21 Within the vacant site, the
22 community desires a 100 percent affordable housing
23 complex where we maximize the total number of units
24 that we could put on the site to combat the

1 negative effects of gentrification that are
2 happening in and around the Humboldt Park
3 neighborhood.

4 We also discussed the idea of a
5 plaza to bring street life engagement to that area
6 of the city and to have some retail component to
7 that site.

8 Here you'll see three initial
9 concepts for the Pioneer Bank properties that were
10 developed by the consultants in consultation with
11 the -- with the community. These models were shown
12 to a community meeting on March 2nd. And, of
13 course, they are three initial concepts. You know,
14 all attempts to maximize the available community
15 space within the Pioneer Bank building and the
16 amount of affordable housing space on the vacant
17 parcels. In each proposal you see about 50 to 60
18 units.

19 A community plaza is also included
20 in options 1 and 3.

21 As I said, these options are going
22 to be refined through further community meetings in
23 the month of March. And those meetings have been
24 productive. And I would just like to say that

1 there's nothing that would lead me to believe that
2 that will not be the case. I think by the end of
3 March we'll have one or two more meetings where
4 the -- with the community stakeholders and with the
5 community at large to determine what a preferred
6 option will be.

7 At that point the developers -- or,
8 sorry, the consultants will work to refine that
9 option 1 vision into renderings and massings and
10 street level views that will, again, inspire action
11 by the private development community to deliver on
12 the promises of the RFP.

13 Therefore, you know, with the
14 community's consent, the department's goal is to
15 issue the RFP in mid April. We believe this RFP
16 will be transformative in catalyzing investment in
17 the North Avenue corridor, particularly around the
18 intersection of North and Pulaski, while
19 strengthening and enhancing existing community and
20 cultural assets and also bringing much needed
21 affordable housing to the community.

22 Alderman Maldonado has provided a
23 letter of support for this RFP, and it's dated on
24 February 24th.

1 And, therefore, we ask the
2 Commission to approve the advertisement and
3 issuance of a request for proposal for the Pioneer
4 Bank properties.

5 And I'll take any questions.
6 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Michael.
7 Commissioners, any questions?
8 Commissioner Rhodes.

9 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Michael, I don't know
10 if I missed it in your presentation. But do you
11 have an amount of money that you're offering in the
12 RFP from -- you know, going back to the earlier
13 points, are you offering City subsidy as part of
14 the RFP, or is that still being determined?

15 MR. PARELLA: No. There will be a subsidy --
16 or there will be a gap -- as part of the RFP
17 process we will identify a gap in funding between
18 what -- the project. And it's the expectation that
19 the City will provide resources to fill that gap,
20 including TIF dollars. What that gap is is totally
21 dependent on what the preferred vision is, and we
22 will not know the outcome of that until we have
23 that vision.

24 COMMISSIONER RHODES: So essentially when --

1 if TIF dollars are allocated, then this will come
2 back -- the deal will come back before the body so
3 we'll have some level of closure?

4 MR. PARELLA: Absolutely.

5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Good question. Good
6 question.

7 Commissioners, any other questions?
8 (No response.)

9 Now, Michael, Chip, and Commissioner
10 Cox, just as a -- so just to reiterate, there's
11 going to be, again, a normal cycle of these RFPs
12 going out, that's correct, right? So it's every
13 three months that they're going out?

14 COMMISSIONER COX: Yeah, every three months
15 for as long as Mayor Lightfoot is in office.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Gotcha.

17 COMMISSIONER COX: And I -- it does -- I feel
18 almost remiss with maybe not framing -- framing
19 this with a presentation of the work that this body
20 has already enabled because it came to a wonderful
21 crescendo yesterday when Mayor Lightfoot was able
22 to award the first three RFPs for a total
23 investment of \$67 million in the three
24 neighborhoods that you approved -- approved of this

1 process back in August.

2 And the talent that stepped forward
3 was probably one of the most diverse set of
4 development talent that Chicago has really ever
5 seen operating in neighborhoods. And it all
6 started with this body giving us the authority to
7 engage in this process.

8 So maybe this -- maybe in a future
9 presentation would be just how the process played
10 out in the first round, because I think it would
11 give you nothing but confidence about the second
12 and the third and the fourth rounds.

13 So let's put that, again, as a
14 future agenda item so that you can see that the
15 process appears to be working exquisitely.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Individuals excited about
17 the process that's --

18 COMMISSIONER COX: And I will -- I will
19 forward to you --

20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Really quickly, if I can,
21 Alderman Maldonado is on. We can give him an
22 opportunity to speak. You can do so.

23 There we go. How's this?

24 Can you all hear me?

1 MR. MCKENNA: Who is speaking now?
 2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: This is Jorge. My Boost
 3 mobile went out on me.
 4 MR. MCKENNA: Oh, okay. I believe that he's
 5 left the meeting.
 6 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay.
 7 COMMISSIONER COX: Would you like to call him
 8 back into the meeting?
 9 MR. MCKENNA: Sorry. Okay. He -- okay.
 10 I got some -- I got some wrong information, or at
 11 least I interpreted it the wrong way. I thought
 12 that through our list of people here that we would
 13 know that. But he -- it's -- he's not here now.
 14 And he probably wasn't here, so ...
 15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. Let's move on.
 16 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Sorry about that.
 17 COMMISSIONER COX: I'm going to call him.
 18 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioners, any other
 19 questions? Sorry about my technical difficulties.
 20 It is a year into the pandemic, and we're not
 21 perfect at this stuff.
 22 Commissioners, if there's no other
 23 questions, I'm going to call the item up for a
 24 vote.

1 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Mr. Chairman.
 2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Is Commissioner Cox calling
 3 Alderman Maldonado?
 4 MR. MCKENNA: I don't think so. I think he
 5 received a call.
 6 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay.
 7 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Mr. Chair.
 8 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Vice Chair Newsome, yes.
 9 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: We have a letter of
 10 support from the alderman, so I believe that will
 11 stand.
 12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: That's correct. I'm glad
 13 you mentioned that, yes. Thank you.
 14 Commissioner Cox.
 15 MR. MCKENNA: Do you want to come back to
 16 him?
 17 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cox. I believe
 18 you're on mute, Commissioner.
 19 COMMISSIONER COX: Unmute. I'm sorry. I'm
 20 sorry. I'm having a little bit of technology --
 21 can you hear me now?
 22 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes.
 23 COMMISSIONER COX: I just spoke to the
 24 alderman, who said he'd be happy to testify if

1 Robert could send him a link and he will join the
 2 meeting.
 3 MR. MCKENNA: Kamal, is that something you
 4 can do?
 5 MR. KAMAL: Yes. If you can email me
 6 alderman's email address. I don't have it in
 7 there.
 8 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. I'll do that.
 9 MR. KAMAL: Okay.
 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.
 11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: This is like live TV from
 12 the '50s. All I need is a cigarette, then ...
 13 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: No.
 14 COMMISSIONER BROOKS: Mr. Chairman.
 15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes, Commissioner.
 16 COMMISSIONER BROOKS: I do apologize. After
 17 this next vote on this matter, I will need to jump.
 18 I have, unfortunately, a physical therapy
 19 appointment I cannot miss. So I will be jumping
 20 off after this next vote. Just wanted to give you
 21 a heads up.
 22 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Commissioner.
 23 Vice Chair Newsome.
 24 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: I think -- I did not

1 raise my hand, sir. We were waiting for the
 2 alderman, and I was curious as to whether we were
 3 going to go on to the next item and then come back
 4 to it. But I assume we're waiting.
 5 MR. MCKENNA: Why don't we go to the next
 6 item?
 7 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: That's a strong microphone.
 8 All right.
 9 If that's the case, we'll go to the
 10 next item.
 11 MR. PARELLA: As a point of order, I'm not
 12 sure that I can be available if we have to come
 13 back to this. I don't know if I'm needed or not.
 14 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat --
 15 MR. MCKENNA: I guess the question is do we
 16 need his testimony?
 17 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: We do have -- we do not. We
 18 do want to move things forward.
 19 Was that Commissioner Wheat who says
 20 we need to move on.
 21 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: No. I think it was
 22 staff. I think it was Mike from --
 23 MR. PARELLA: Yes, that was me. Yeah, sorry,
 24 that was Michael Parella. Yeah. I would not be

1 available if we had to move to another item in
2 order to hear the vote on this item, unfortunately,
3 due to a conflict.

4 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. That's fine. We can
5 move -- we can move --

6 MR. McKENNA: I'm look- -- I'm somewhat
7 limited at looking what I'm up to when I'm on the
8 computer.

9 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yeah. Let's do this. Let's
10 move on then. We'll go to our third item of
11 business.

12 Thank you, Michael.

13 The Department of Planning and
14 Development seeks authority to advertise and issue
15 a request for proposals for the redevelopment of
16 property located at 5021 South Wabash Avenue in the
17 47th and King Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment
18 Project Area.

19 Mr. Patrick Brutus will present
20 the staff report on behalf of the Department of
21 Planning and Development.

22 Mr. Brutus, give me a second here.

23 Commissioner Cox, was that you?

24 COMMISSIONER COX: I just -- I told him you

1 were moving on to the next item, and he -- he'll
2 join the call as soon as the link is sent to him.

3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER COX: So he'll come in later.

5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay.

6 MR. BRUTUS: Can you all hear me? Can you
7 all hear me fine?

8 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes.

9 MR. BRUTUS: Okay. Thank you. All right.

10 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: The floor's yours.

11 MR. BRUTUS: Thank you, Commissioner.

12 Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and
13 members of the Commission.

14 For the record, my name is Patrick
15 Brutus with the Department of Planning and
16 Development.

17 The resolution before you seeks
18 authorization for the department to advertise and
19 issue a request for proposals for the property
20 located at 5021 South Wabash Avenue.

21 The subject site of the RFP is the
22 site of a former ward Streets and Sanitation field
23 office and is in the 3rd Ward. The building is
24 1500 square feet in size and sits on two lots that

1 total 11,795 square feet and with a fair market
2 value of \$90,000 established by an appraisal dated
3 December 31st, 2020.

4 Additionally, the site, which is
5 located in the Grand Boulevard community area, is
6 zoned RT-4, residential two-flat, townhouse, and
7 multi-unit district, and lies within the boundaries
8 of the 47th/King TIF Redevelopment Area.

9 As part of the department's overall
10 mission in the INVEST South/West initiative, it
11 remains extremely important that we understand the
12 characteristics and features that make these
13 communities unique, where redevelopment
14 opportunities present themselves, and when and
15 where to capitalize on them.

16 DPD is seeking an adaptive reuse of
17 this site that will bring a commercial, retail,
18 institutional, not-for-profit, and/or office use
19 that will add to the 51st Street commercial
20 corridor. Despite the current zoning of
21 residential, the department will not entertain
22 responses that propose residential or religious
23 uses.

24 This property has been vacant for

1 over ten years, underutilized, and an eyesore as it
2 has fallen into serious disrepair. In the past,
3 the alderman and community have referenced this
4 property as a site of concern and have long desired
5 to see something be done to redevelop this site.
6 The outreach and ongoing conversation with Alderman
7 Dowell and her office indicates that she is
8 supportive of this site being redeveloped and has
9 provided a letter in support of this RFP.

10 Furthermore, DPD has communicated
11 with the 51st Street Business Association, who
12 serves as the lead community-based organization in
13 this part of the Grand Boulevard/Bronzeville
14 neighborhood, functioning as a single point-of-
15 service organization providing consultation
16 services to businesses, entrepreneurs, and
17 community focused groups. The 51st Street Business
18 Association also is the sole service provider for
19 SSA 52 in the City's special service area program.
20 They also have provided a letter of support for
21 this RFP.

22 In the 51st Street commercial
23 corridor, there are currently over 30 active
24 businesses operating within this retail corridor, a

1 special service area, and recent commercial
 2 activities that further increase the viability of
 3 this corridor. With the redevelopment of this site
 4 as a commercial project, the goal is that it would
 5 result in another business venture that will be
 6 able to thrive and build on the business success
 7 and stability that is currently happening on 51st
 8 Street.

9 The redevelopment of this property
 10 will yield the following public benefits:

11 Revitalization of an underutilized
 12 real estate asset;

13 Adaptive reuse into a commercial/
 14 retail enterprise;

15 New business added to the 51st
 16 Street commercial district and stabilization of the
 17 retail corridor;

18 Temporary construction jobs and
 19 permanent jobs created as a result;

20 And preservation of an orange-rated
 21 building.

22 The development timeline for this
 23 RFP is as follows:

24 We are scheduled to release the RFP

1 March 30th of this year. We will hold a prebid
 2 conference on April 14th. We will have a site
 3 visit for this site on April 21st. And responses
 4 will be due on June 30th, 2021.

5 The Department of Planning and
 6 Development formally requests authorization to
 7 advertise and issue a request for proposals to
 8 market the sale of the subject site at 5021 South
 9 Wabash Avenue in the 47th and King TIF
 10 Redevelopment Area.

11 I will now answer any questions that
 12 the Commission have. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Mr. Brutus.

14 Commissioners, any questions?

15 Commissioner Rhodes.

16 MR. MCKENNA: She's on mute.

17 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Rhodes.

18 COMMISSIONER RHODES: How many parking spaces
 19 are there, Patrick? I'm just concerned the
 20 proximity to residential, and you're not
 21 entertaining residential. So I'm just wondering
 22 can you -- you may have said it, but I just didn't
 23 understand it.

24 MR. BRUTUS: Yeah. Well, we did not indicate

1 how many parking spaces are included with this
 2 site, Commissioner Rhodes. As you -- as you can
 3 see, the aerial here provides a detailed picture
 4 of the location. It sits on two lots. The entire
 5 back of the property is asphalted, and so
 6 conceivably, depending on, you know, the adherence
 7 to the landscape and municipal code, I don't know
 8 how many parking spaces could be delivered as a
 9 result, but I would presume plenty.

10 You're right to indicate that that
 11 may be an issue given that it is zoned residential
 12 and in close proximity to the adjacent buildings
 13 who are at the north end of this site residential
 14 as the rest of the block goes down Wabash.

15 However, in close consultation with
 16 the alderman and her office, with our zoning
 17 department, we have agreed to not seek residential
 18 uses for this property. And so the parking
 19 standards will indicate -- will be based on a
 20 commercial zoning if, in fact, the developer seeks
 21 that designation.

22 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Yeah. I'm just -- I'm
 23 just anticipating that the neighbors are going to
 24 be concerned -- that if it's a busy commercial

1 spot, the neighbors are going to be concerned. And
 2 if it's a commercial spot, like how do they get
 3 access? So you're probably more likely to get a
 4 nonprofit like you said or an office-type use than
 5 a commercial use.

6 MR. BRUTUS: Yeah. We're seeking all
 7 those uses, and we'll be open to all those
 8 considerations.

9 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Right. Okay. Thanks,
 10 Patrick.

11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Newsome.

12 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: I guess my only
 13 comment is this is another example of buildings
 14 that have been allowed to disintegrate into
 15 disrepair for numerous years. And this being a
 16 City of Chicago building, I guess my question is
 17 why has it been left in this state for that number
 18 of years?

19 MR. BRUTUS: That's a very good question,
 20 Commissioner Newsome. I don't have the exact
 21 concrete answer. All I can speak is to where we
 22 are today. And under the stewardship and vision of
 23 our current commissioner, Commissioner Cox, who
 24 sits amongst you all today, the plan is to actively

1 market the sites of many of our City inventory such
 2 as this property, fire stations, schools for
 3 adaptive reuse so we can get them back into
 4 productive uses for the community as part of either
 5 the INVEST South/West program or part of the
 6 overall goal to redevelop in our South and West
 7 Side communities.

8 COMMISSIONER COX: And, Mr. Chair, I'd be
 9 happy -- thank you for raising that point, because,
 10 once again, what we are trying to do, as Patrick
 11 said, is every three months we are trying to RFP
 12 properties across the city that have long
 13 languished with no investment, they're boarded up,
 14 and there's been no coordinated effort to get them
 15 out into the private market. And so we decided to
 16 take that on.

17 Some of them involve a lot of
 18 visioning and bringing the community on board like
 19 the Pioneer Bank project you saw. Others simply we
 20 don't do the visioning. We just put together the
 21 development scenario -- I mean, the development
 22 parameters, and we market it.

23 And this was actually done on behalf
 24 of the alderman who has received random interest

1 from time to time but no coordinated effort. And
 2 so she asked us if we would RFP this on her behalf.
 3 And, again, I think we have built
 4 now an infrastructure that has two full-time staff
 5 members that all they do is RF- -- put together
 6 RFPs for properties primarily in the West and South
 7 Sides to address some of the issues that were
 8 brought up by Member Newsome earlier about why
 9 these signature projects are often -- signature
 10 buildings are often left to languish as if no one
 11 cared.

12 Well, we care, and we are going to
 13 get them out the door and hopefully find the
 14 correct investor to bring them back into their
 15 intended and new uses.

16 So just a little bit of context for
 17 why you're seeing so many of these RFPs, because
 18 that's -- because we're committed to doing them
 19 every three months.

20 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Well, may I just ask
 21 that we take -- well, if we can give special
 22 attention particularly to these types of buildings
 23 that are located on residential streets, because
 24 they do impact not only the appearance of that

1 particular block, but also they impact things such
 2 as the insurance that these property owners are
 3 able to obtain, et cetera. So there are any number
 4 of issues that are problematic in our communities
 5 because buildings are allowed to just go vacant
 6 forever.

7 COMMISSIONER COX: Hm-hmm. Point extremely
 8 well taken.

9 MR. BRUTUS: Yep. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat.

11 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 Patrick, in your comments, you
 13 mentioned in terms of historical designation that
 14 the building is rated orange. For the historical
 15 designation neophytes in the meeting, what
 16 limitations, if any, does that status -- maybe,
 17 one, tell us what that means, and then secondly
 18 what limitations, if any, does that provide with
 19 respect to reuse of the property, parcels there?

20 MR. BRUTUS: Well, the main -- yeah. Thank
 21 you, Commissioner, for your question.

22 The main two considerations that an
 23 orange-rated building in this context provides us
 24 is one that it's registered and listed on the

1 Chicago Historical Survey. So that's number one.
 2 This property was constructed in the 1920s, and so
 3 it has historical significance.

4 And number two, it does -- in a way
 5 is protected slightly from demolition. And so
 6 before a property that's orange rated is
 7 demolished, it has to be notified to DOB. You
 8 know, there are safeguards in place so that a
 9 demolition order cannot be completed without either
 10 the department acknowledging such and seeing if
 11 there's a way to preserve it or if there's a
 12 suitable development or a project. And I think it
 13 also has to potentially go before the Landmarks
 14 Commission before demolition. Not too sure about
 15 the last one. But there are safeguards in place
 16 that protect orange-rated buildings from immediate
 17 demolition. So those are the main two.

18 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: All right. I saw lots
 19 of head nodding from Vice Chair Newsome. So I'm
 20 going to -- I think you have a second there.

21 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: No. I am in agreement
 22 with what Patrick was saying.

23 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Yeah. Although, it

1 kind of -- well, I'm in agreement with what Patrick
 2 said.
 3 MR. BRUTUS: Thank you, Commissioner.
 4 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Is there any other questions?
 5 (No response.)
 6 If not, I'm going to call the item
 7 up for a vote.
 8 So the resolution before us requests
 9 authority for the Department of Planning and
 10 Development to advertise and to issue a request for
 11 proposals for the redevelopment of the property
 12 located at 5021 South Wabash Avenue in the 47th and
 13 King Tax Increment Financing Redevelopment Project
 14 Area.
 15 Do I have a motion?
 16 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: So moved.
 17 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: So moved.
 18 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: By? I didn't get whoever
 19 else. It was like a tie.
 20 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Cepeda and someone
 21 else.
 22 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thomas.
 23 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. So moved by
 24 Commissioner Cepeda and Commissioner Thomas.

1 Do I have a second?
 2 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Second.
 3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Second by Commissioner
 4 Buford.
 5 I'm going to call the item up for a
 6 vote.
 7 Vice Chair Newsome.
 8 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Yes.
 9 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Secretary Butler.
 10 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Yes.
 11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Brooks.
 12 (No response.)
 13 Commissioner Buford.
 14 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Yes.
 15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cepeda.
 16 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Yes.
 17 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cox.
 18 COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.
 19 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Curtis.
 20 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Yes.
 21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Davis.
 22 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes.
 23 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Griggs.
 24 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Rhodes.
 2 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Yes.
 3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Thomas.
 4 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.
 5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat.
 6 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Yes.
 7 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: And Commissioner Perez votes
 8 yes.
 9 The motion passes.
 10 Before we go on to the next item --
 11 MR. BRUTUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Mr. Brutus.
 13 MR. HASTINGS: Mr. Chairman.
 14 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Who's got their hand up?
 15 MR. HASTINGS: Chip Hastings.
 16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. Go ahead, Chip.
 17 MR. HASTINGS: I apologize for interrupting.
 18 My -- I can't -- it looks like Alderman Maldonado
 19 has joined us, but he's waiting to be elevated to a
 20 panelist.
 21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Say it one more time. I
 22 didn't hear that.
 23 MR. HASTINGS: It looks like Alderman
 24 Maldonado has joined us, but he needs to be

1 elevated to a panelist.
 2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. There he is. So,
 3 Commissioners, we're going to move back to the
 4 first -- the second item now that Commissioner
 5 Maldonado has joined us. Commissioner, welcome.
 6 Sorry. Alderman Maldonado. Thank you very much
 7 for joining us.
 8 Alderman Maldonado, we were talking
 9 about the project, the old Pioneer Bank project.
 10 So if you wanted to speak to that, the floor is
 11 yours, sir.
 12 ALDERMAN MALDONADO: Thank you so very much.
 13 Well, you know, I am very excited
 14 that the Pioneer Bank, the old Pioneer Bank has
 15 become the anchor development for the North Avenue
 16 corridor. And I'm very grateful to Commissioner
 17 Cox and his team for trying to move as fast as
 18 possible on making this project a reality.
 19 The concept that we have worked out
 20 with the stakeholders of the community is to make
 21 sure that the Pioneer Bank will become an anchor
 22 with a Latino concept, re- -- a redevelopment
 23 concept that would be completely and essentially
 24 Latino.

1 And one of the major contenders for
2 and as a possible anchor tenant is the Latino
3 Theater Company, that it is the home to 106
4 Latino-owned theater companies from all over the
5 city. In the event that -- and I'm sure that it
6 will happen, but it will become the home for this
7 great institution. That's going to set the tone,
8 in my judgment, for the rest of the redevelopment
9 on the North Avenue corridor.

10 So I'm more than willing to take any
11 questions that any of your members may have.

12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Alderman
13 Maldonado.

14 Vice Chair Newsome, did you have
15 your hand up?

16 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: No, sir, I do not.

17 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: It's up. Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: I'm sorry.

19 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. That's fine.

20 COMMISSIONER COX: You know, I don't have a
21 question. But given that it was the alderman who
22 brought the current owners to the table and
23 actually negotiated their participation in this
24 RFP, he might want to speak to that because there

1 was some question about, you know, are they going
2 to operate in good faith. Because we're being
3 given -- this body has the authority to give the
4 City acquisition authority. Of course, that is not
5 the intent for the City to buy it. But as it was
6 described, it does give us standing.

7 And so I think the body would simply
8 like more context to this -- to this current owner
9 who has held on to this property. You've known
10 them now, and you were the one that was able to
11 bring them to the table. So if you'd like to give
12 some context, I think that would be helpful to this
13 body.

14 ALDERMAN MALDONADO: Sure. It will be my
15 pleasure.

16 Well, I've known this family for --
17 since I became alderman in 2009. And, in fact,
18 soon thereafter, it became part of my ward, because
19 when I became alderman, that area was not part of
20 the 26th Ward. In the last remap, it did become
21 part of the 26th Ward.

22 And originally what they wanted to
23 do when they acquired that property -- and mind
24 you, they were the ones who developed the bank just

1 east of that location and the Walgreens that is in
2 that little minimall or strip mall.

3 So what they wanted to do at Pioneer
4 was not an independent living development for
5 seniors, but -- the name --

6 COMMISSIONER COX: Is it assisted living?

7 ALDERMAN MALDONADO: Supportive. No.

8 Supportive, which is that step before a senior
9 becomes nursing home bound. So it's that phase
10 in between independent living, assisted living,
11 supportive living, and then nursing home.

12 And so -- but when they seek the
13 certificate of need through the state, they were
14 denied because at that time they were not issuing
15 any further certificate of needs for that type of
16 development because Medicaid was already in deep,
17 deep financial trouble. And there was no -- there
18 was no sign that they were going to come out of it.
19 And still they have not come out of that situation,
20 so ...

21 And so over the years, we did
22 explore several other options. But I always wanted
23 to make sure that the land just north of the old
24 bank would be a massive affordable housing

1 development for working families.

2 And so as you know, there is always
3 a lot of takers when it comes to market rate
4 development, but there are not a lot of takers when
5 it comes to affordable housing because maybe they
6 don't understand the market or they simply are
7 gentrifiers and they just want to maximize their
8 profits according to my perception.

9 And so that was the -- and because
10 of that, the property sat there for many years up
11 until now. And I know that -- I think -- so I
12 think, you know, there is also some change in the
13 helm of the family running the business from the
14 original founder, the dad, and now the offsprings,
15 and they are very reputable. I have never had any
16 bad experience with them. Everything that they
17 have ever said to me or committed to do they have
18 done so. So I have nothing but good things to say
19 about them to their integrity.

20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: All right. Commissioners,
21 any other questions to Alderman Maldonado?

22 (No response.)

23 Okay. If not, thank you very much,
24 Alderman. Appreciate you taking the time to join

1 us this afternoon.

2 ALDERMAN MALDONADO: My pleasure, President

3 Perez. And you look very distinguished with your

4 beard.

5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you. Appreciate that.

6 Okay. Commissioners, the

7 resolution -- I'm going to call the item up for a

8 vote.

9 The resolution before us requests

10 authority for the Department of Planning and

11 Development to advertise and issue a request for

12 proposals for the purchase and redevelopment of the

13 property located at 4000 to 4008 West North Avenue

14 and 1616 to 1638 North Pulaski Road.

15 Do I have a motion?

16 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: So moved. Commissioner

17 Butler.

18 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you. First move,

19 Commissioner Butler.

20 Do I have a second?

21 COMMISSIONER COX: Second by Commissioner

22 Cox.

23 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Commissioner Cox.

24 I'll now call the item up via the

1 roll. Signify by saying yes, yea, or nay.

2 Vice Chair Newsome.

3 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Secretary Butler.

5 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Brooks.

7 (No response.)

8 Commissioner Buford.

9 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cepeda.

11 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cox.

13 COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Curtis.

15 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Davis.

17 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Griggs.

19 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Rhodes.

21 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Thomas.

23 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat.

1 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: And Commissioner Perez votes

3 yes.

4 And the motion passes.

5 Okay. We're now going to go to item

6 4 on the agenda.

7 MR. O'CONNELL: All right. That's me.

8 Metropolitan --

9 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Let me do the intro, yeah.

10 So this item of new business is

11 the Department of Housing seeking authority to

12 negotiate a redevelopment agreement with Roots

13 Development, LLC for the redevelopment of the

14 property located at 3557 West Lawrence Avenue in

15 the Lawrence/Kedzie TIF Redevelopment Area, and

16 to recommend to the City Council of the City of

17 Chicago the designation of Roots Development, LLC

18 as developer.

19 James O'Connell will present the

20 staff report on behalf of the Department of

21 Planning and Development.

22 All right. The floor is yours.

23 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Mr. Chair -- Mr. Chair,

24 actually before -- sorry. Before we begin, I think

1 the alderman was on the call earlier to speak to

2 the event and then had to hop off. So if she does

3 want to speak to the item, so we should probably

4 notify her that this is up.

5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you for that.

6 COMMISSIONER COX: Is Robert going to reach

7 out to her?

8 MR. O'CONNELL: I don't think the alderman

9 was planning on speaking. She wanted to be

10 available in case called upon for questions. But

11 I don't know.

12 Bob, are you going to reach out to

13 her?

14 MR. MCKENNA: Yeah. Sorry. I was on mute.

15 But, yeah, so I'll reach out to her.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. Can you double dutch

17 in when you find out, please?

18 MR. MCKENNA: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Great.

20 MR. O'CONNELL: Everyone can see my slide, my

21 title slide?

22 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes. Thanks. Go ahead.

23 MR. O'CONNELL: So good afternoon, Chairman,

24 members of the Commission.

1 For the record, my name is Jim
2 O'Connell, and I'm an underwriter and project
3 manager with the Department of Housing.

4 I am here today with Metropolitan
5 Apartments located at 3557 West Lawrence in Albany
6 Park within the Lawrence/Kedzie TIF. It's in the
7 33rd Ward with Alderman Rodriguez-Sanchez. And I'm
8 requesting a TIF developer designation as well as
9 2,500,000 in TIF financing approval prior to
10 Council introduction on March 24th.

11 I do want to point out one thing.
12 The agenda and resolution incorrectly interchanged
13 the developer name with the future owner entity
14 name, but an updated resolution has since been
15 submitted. So my apologies for that.

16 The next slide. Okay. So before we
17 begin, here is the aerial map showing the project
18 on Central Park and Lawrence. The next street
19 immediately to the east is Bernard. East of
20 Bernard and out of frame is Kimball where the Brown
21 Line terminates. So it's fairly close to transit.

22 And this is a southeast view of the
23 site. It sat vacant for some time, and its prior
24 use was a gas station.

1 So this is a six-story new
2 construction project which was awarded 9 percent
3 federal tax credits by Housing in our 2019 funding
4 round. The project has a lot of merit, mostly due
5 to a pretty healthy skew in affordability, both in
6 depth and width, but also the ground floor daycare
7 use, which I'll explain in a minute. It'll have 42
8 affordable units for families earning between 30
9 and 60 percent AMI and 8 units of market rate.
10 MAUI subsidies from the trust fund would support 16
11 units, which enables targeting of households at 30
12 percent AMI and potentially even 15 percent.

13 So the story of Albany Park is one
14 around gentrification. While incomes are
15 increasing, the population is actually falling, and
16 there's evidence it's due to de-conversion of two-
17 and three-flats into single-family homes. Of the
18 50 units, 33 will be two-bedroom, and as a response
19 to community requests, they've incorporated 5
20 three-bedroom units with the goal being to keep
21 families -- to give families large enough spaces to
22 remain in the neighborhood. And all of this
23 affordability is in place for 40 years.

24 But what's really interesting to

1 note is the ground floor commercial space with
2 Concordia. They have a memorandum of understanding
3 in place for a 15-year lease with the provision
4 that they provide childcare services to low-income
5 residents and nearby families. The project will
6 only charge Concordia a dollar a year for the
7 ground floor space, which then allows Concordia to
8 charge low to no tuition to the families.

9 So, again, this came in through our
10 2019 QAP round. The developers have a fairly
11 robust community engagement, and they meet with the
12 alderman and her staff monthly. They've either
13 been presenting to or working with Communities
14 United, the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless,
15 the CHA for their waiting list, and obviously
16 Concordia, and all are supportive of this project.

17 So let me know if you have any
18 questions about the financing. It's a fairly
19 straightforward capital stack. The source is on
20 the left and use is on the right. What's pretty
21 noteworthy is actually their \$5.4 million private
22 loan at 25 percent of total development cost and
23 TIF only being 11 percent with a 2.5 million, it's
24 fairly well leveraged with the 9 percent LIHTC

1 equity. And operating costs are also right in
2 range at 7,400 per year per unit.

3 Then to continue with the financing.
4 So given the 42 affordable units, that places the
5 TIF-eligible expenses for this project at roughly
6 7.1 million, which exceeds the ask of 2.5, and MBE
7 expenditures at 4.6 million and WBE expenditures at
8 1.1 million.

9 And finally, these are two
10 renderings of the project. One is looking south --
11 with the southeast rendering, and one is southwest.
12 There's -- as feedback from community groups,
13 they've incorporated art which will change on the
14 blank walls of the building throughout -- I'm not
15 sure how often, but that was a response to kind of
16 liven up the space.

17 But, yeah, that's it for now. Let
18 me know if you have any questions.

19 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioners, any questions?

20 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: I have one question.

21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Curtis has his
22 hand up.

23 Commissioner Curtis, try one more
24 time.

1 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Can't hear him.
 2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: We can't hear you,
 3 Commissioner Curtis. You need to speak into the
 4 microphone, into the phone.
 5 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: I'm having trouble here
 6 with my ...
 7 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: He's having problems.
 8 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: I feel like a deejay from
 9 the '80s.
 10 Can't hear you, Commissioner Curtis.
 11 We're going to have to come back to you.
 12 Commissioner -- Vice Chair Newsome.
 13 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Mr. Chairman, my
 14 question to Jim is which Clark Construction Company
 15 is the GC?
 16 MR. O'CONNELL: That's correct. Clark
 17 Construction is the GC on this.
 18 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Which Clark
 19 Construction? Is this Michael Clark Construction
 20 or --
 21 MR. O'CONNELL: I am not sure. But it's the
 22 Clark, the -- you know, Wolf Point.
 23 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: It's the big one.
 24 MR. O'CONNELL: The big one. The big one.

1 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yeah.
 2 MR. O'CONNELL: What's interesting to note
 3 about this project and the next one I'll present
 4 is both were originally supposed to be with
 5 Skender's modular factory, yeah. So Clark was
 6 chosen ultimately in lieu of Skender.
 7 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Okay. Thank you.
 8 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Can I ask a question on
 9 that? I'll probably ask it again for the next one
 10 too, is that is there an opportunity because -- I
 11 brought this up earlier. Clark is a \$4 billion
 12 national general contractor. This is a relatively
 13 small project to what they typically do. Obviously,
 14 from the standpoint of minority/women business
 15 involvement, is there an opportunity still at the
 16 prime GC level for that for this project?
 17 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.
 18 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Because I think there's a
 19 good bandwidth of GCs who are minority who have
 20 done projects in this ballpark. And it just
 21 strikes me that Clark, you know ...
 22 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Right.
 23 MR. O'CONNELL: Absolutely. And actually
 24 that was a question within the department as well.

1 And unbeknownst to me, this is not Clark's first
 2 affordable housing project. They are active in
 3 affordable housing throughout the U.S. and actually
 4 in Illinois as well. This is just the first time
 5 in the city.
 6 But they do have an apprenticeship
 7 program. They actually got on a community call
 8 with Communities United and they explained -- they
 9 have a program called HIRE 360. And so they use
 10 local resources that are directly connected with
 11 the neighborhoods. But ultimately -- ultimately a
 12 lot of the construction is union. So what it looks
 13 like is more of an apprenticeship to get locals
 14 into the unions and become -- and become
 15 contractors on the projects.
 16 But Scott Henry is on the call. He
 17 may have a little better -- might be better to --
 18 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: James, if I could.
 19 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.
 20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: And that's nice. But I'm
 21 talking about at the prime general contractor
 22 level, not the job seeker from the neighborhood who
 23 wants to work on the project. So if he's on the
 24 line, if he wants to speak to it.

1 MR. O'CONNELL: Yeah. Scott Henry or Aaron
 2 Weisner, are you able to speak to that?
 3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: If you're on, just state
 4 your name when you're on.
 5 MR. O'CONNELL: If they're having technical
 6 difficulties, I can get an answer and work with Bob
 7 to forward it to the Commission if that's
 8 acceptable.
 9 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. Commissioner Curtis,
 10 do you want to give it another shot?
 11 MR. O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. You paused there
 12 for a second.
 13 MR. MCKENNA: Chairman, you may have froze.
 14 You may still be frozen.
 15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yeah, my monitor went out.
 16 Can you guys hear me now?
 17 MR. MCKENNA: Yes.
 18 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
 19 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. I'm sorry,
 20 Commissioner Curtis, were you answering a
 21 question -- or asking a question?
 22 (No response.)
 23 All right. If not, Commissioners,
 24 any other questions?

1 Vice Chair Newsome.
 2 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: No.
 3 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Commissioner Wheat. Can
 4 I hop in?
 5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes, please.
 6 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 7 A question for staff and maybe the
 8 alderman as well. Can you just talk more about the
 9 community engagement process for this particular
 10 development, the discussions with Communities
 11 United, et cetera?
 12 MR. O'CONNELL: So I -- they came in with
 13 Communities United, the developer. I don't have
 14 a strong background on their -- how close their
 15 partnership is to be honest. All I know is the
 16 meetings have taken place and that they've noted.
 17 ALDERMAN RODRIGUEZ-SANCHEZ: This is Alderman
 18 Rodriguez-Sanchez here, 33rd Ward.
 19 Yes, the developer started the
 20 process with Communities United. And since I was
 21 elected and after being in office, we have had a
 22 lot of community conversations about this project.
 23 It has the support of the community.
 24 The developers have been always very

1 collaborative and have made a lot of changes to the
 2 project in order for the community to be able to
 3 accept it and to get on board with the project. So
 4 it definitely has the support of community. And
 5 it's a much needed development in our neighborhood.
 6 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Thank you, Alderman.
 7 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Alderman
 8 Rodriguez.
 9 ALDERMAN RODRIGUEZ-SANCHEZ: I believe that
 10 one of the developers is on the line but is having
 11 problems with their mic. So if there is a
 12 different way for them to be able to answer
 13 questions. It seems like he's not being able to
 14 use his mic to speak.
 15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Vice Chair Newsome, you had
 16 a question?
 17 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: I'm trying to recall.
 18 I believe the agreement or covenant with the
 19 developer was for 15 years at \$1 per year for the
 20 use of the ground level space for the childcare
 21 center?
 22 MR. O'CONNELL: That's correct, yes.
 23 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Okay. That is
 24 officially memorialized?

1 MR. O'CONNELL: They have a memorandum of
 2 understanding.
 3 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Okay. And is there
 4 any anticipated other useage of the space after
 5 that 15-year period has expired?
 6 MR. O'CONNELL: I do not know that, no.
 7 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Thank you.
 8 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: And, again, James, you said
 9 you were going to find out if there's still prime
 10 level opportunity in addition to Clark as the
 11 general contractor on this?
 12 MR. O'CONNELL: I'll get -- I'll get a better
 13 answer around their HIRE 360 program. And then I
 14 will get an answer regarding post year 15 for the
 15 ground floor commercial.
 16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. I wasn't asking about
 17 the HIRE 360. I was asking more in terms of Clark
 18 Construction as -- again, just to reiterate,
 19 there's minority general contractors who can do
 20 work in this ballpark. Clark Construction being a
 21 \$4 billion a year national behemoth really kind of
 22 crowds out opportunities at the prime level. I'm
 23 just asking if there's an opportunity for -- at the
 24 prime level opportunity where Clark can team up

1 with somebody. Obviously, there's subcontracting
 2 opportunities. And I'm not mentioning that as
 3 well. But just kind of want to reiterate at the
 4 very high level.
 5 MR. O'CONNELL: Makes sense. On the GC
 6 level, I gotcha. Okay. Thank you. Sorry about
 7 that.
 8 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I'd like to second, you
 9 know, what Jorge just mentioned regarding making
 10 sure that -- you know, as I speak to aldermen
 11 locally in the communities in which I work in, I
 12 always encourage them to make sure that projects
 13 are better being done local in the community for as
 14 much as possible they're utilizing contractors,
 15 especially at the prime level, that have the
 16 capacity to perform on a project like this.
 17 Because those are the -- those are the folks -- you
 18 know, the Old Veteran Constructions of the world
 19 and some of the other contractors that are out
 20 there who work in these same communities that will
 21 provide opportunities for growing businesses as
 22 well.
 23 So I get it. It's a great project.
 24 It's going to be great for the community. But

1 Clark is a \$4 billion monster who does, you know,
 2 Wolf Point Towers downtown, hundred-million-dollar
 3 projects, you know, and firms, you know, who are,
 4 you know, hundred-million-dollar-a-year firms don't
 5 get those same opportunities. So a project like
 6 this provides a lot of opportunity for a growing
 7 prime contractor who can perform on a project like
 8 this. And I think, you know, our body has to hold
 9 it accountable. The City has to ask those
 10 questions as well. Hey, Clark, why can't you go
 11 get a minority partner? and make sure that they
 12 have an opportunity to gain that same level of
 13 experience that Clark has had.

14 I know Clark well. I used to work
 15 for them out in Washington, D.C. So they -- you
 16 know, they are a very large contractor. And this
 17 right -- this one right here strikes me as odd that
 18 Clark would be the contractor on a project of this
 19 size.

20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Very well said, Commissioner
 21 Griggs.

22 ALDERMAN RODRIGUEZ-SANCHEZ: This is Alderman
 23 Rodriguez-Sanchez again. I asked the developer to
 24 jump on the line through the phone because he's

1 clearly having issues with the computer. So I
 2 would love to hear from them about the contracting
 3 part of this. As you probably know, the
 4 contracting situation changed. So I didn't
 5 completely know about Clark. So I would love to
 6 have a little bit of a clarification about that.
 7 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I also think there's
 8 always an opportunity for our body to, you know, to
 9 make sure that there -- that minority firms that
 10 are out there that can perform and that developers
 11 know about them. And it really starts, you know,
 12 with folks like Jim at your level and your
 13 department and the folks who work alongside of you,
 14 you know, making sure that -- when these developers
 15 come in, they don't always know and sometimes they
 16 just go with the horse that they've always been
 17 told or that they know about. So they never know
 18 about a Bolo Construction or they don't know about
 19 an OVC Construction. They don't know about these
 20 organizations that perform great work right here in
 21 the City of Chicago.

22 So it's up to you, it's up to us to
 23 make sure that they are positioned to have the same
 24 opportunities that Clark -- a job like this, in my

1 mind, should not be one that goes to a Clark
 2 Construction.

3 MR. HENRY: This is --

4 ALDERMAN RODRIGUEZ-SANCHEZ: Yes.

5 MR. O'CONNELL: Hold on, Scott.

6 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Hold on for a second. Real
 7 quick. Commissioner Griggs, I think you hit the
 8 nail on the head. I think a couple years ago, for
 9 those of you who were -- Commissioners who were
 10 with us, I think the theme is that we don't want to
 11 hear the excuse, We couldn't find any, because that
 12 was said here actually by a minority developer
 13 oddly enough. But I think it's -- especially over
 14 the last, you know, several months, the fact of not
 15 being able to find a minority GC is kind of too
 16 late.

17 But, Alderman Rodriguez, you said
 18 you wanted to say something, or did someone from
 19 Clark want to speak?

20 MR. HENRY: Scott Henry is on the line from
 21 the developer. Can you hear me?

22 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes, Mr. Henry, go ahead.

23 MR. HENRY: We're with Roots ALB, Limited
 24 Partnership. That's the name of the entity that's

1 the subject to this transaction. Really the
 2 underlying developer is Celadon Holdings.

3 It's not a case at all that we just
 4 couldn't find anybody or did not -- didn't have
 5 time or -- it was -- it was more of a situation
 6 with Clark Construction pulling out of the modular
 7 market. This -- if there's -- this is a very long
 8 story. I will try and make this as concise --

9 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Scott, I'm going to
 10 jump in. It wasn't Clark that pulled out of the
 11 modular market. It was Skender that pulled out,
 12 right?

13 MR. HENRY: If you would please let me
 14 finish.

15 Yes. We had initially presented
 16 this transaction to be a modular mid-rise building
 17 with Skender. And we had gone way down the line
 18 with them, even purchased the property in the
 19 spirit of getting to the finish line and closing as
 20 quickly as possible and delivering these modular
 21 units as quickly as possible because of the
 22 tremendous need for affordable housing.

23 So we had gone out there, used our
 24 own capital to buy the property and raced towards a

1 closing as quickly as possible. When we got the
 2 very surprising news back in September that Skender
 3 decided to pull out of the market, we were heavily
 4 invested at that point. We had an investor that
 5 was counting on a closing by a date certain event.
 6 We did not have time to go back and do an
 7 exhaustive canvass of a new contractor market. We
 8 had to go with somebody that we knew very, very
 9 well with a team that we had known and used --
 10 worked with extensively in the past so that we
 11 could pivot and get the team up to speed and still
 12 maintain our closing deadline that we promised the
 13 City.

14 It did not pan out the way we had
 15 hoped. We made the best out of a very, very
 16 difficult situation. Had we start over or if we --
 17 you know, Skender wasn't in the picture, we would
 18 have definitely worked with an MBE general
 19 contracting firm. Our last 9 percent transaction
 20 was with Brown & Momen in West Pullman. We have a
 21 95 percent MBE participation. We care very, very
 22 much about these issues.

23 This particular situation was just
 24 very unfortunate, and we had to make lemonade out

1 of lemons.

2 I assure you we have emphasized to
 3 Clark that the subcontractor team that ends up
 4 working on this project must be well represented
 5 with MBE and WBE firms. If you know anything about
 6 Celadon, check our record, we are very, very
 7 committed to this. This is just a very unique
 8 situation.

9 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I'm going to, again --
 10 I'm usually pretty quiet on these calls, but on
 11 these -- on issues like this, because I'm from the
 12 West Side of Chicago, and, you know, I have a
 13 responsibility, you know, to my community on these
 14 calls, you know, to hold folks accountable. And I
 15 hear you, and everything you just said is exactly
 16 why we shouldn't, you know, be doing that. I get
 17 it you got a relationship with Clark. But you also
 18 have a relation with Brown & Momen. And I know
 19 Ernest Brown very well. And I wonder if he got
 20 that phone call or that opportunity to be engaged
 21 like you have a comfort level with Clark. It's
 22 important that that happens, you know, across the
 23 city, which is why -- the reason why the Mayor's
 24 office initiated the INVEST South/West program to

1 try to create, you know, opportunities for folks in
 2 those communities and folks of -- and people of
 3 color.

4 So I hear you, but I think that
 5 maybe Brown & Momen should have got that same phone
 6 call, and maybe he should have been the contractor
 7 that you brought before this body and not Clark. I
 8 get your deal fell apart, and that really sounds
 9 like an internal issue. But to bring it before the
 10 body and ask us to approve the amount of funds that
 11 needs to be approved to move this deal forward, I
 12 think there should have been a more concerted
 13 effort to have a minority involved from the
 14 beginning even with Skender and their modular
 15 piece.

16 MR. HENRY: Well, it's easy to say. You
 17 really don't understand what we were up against.
 18 We did make lots of calls with the limited time
 19 that we had. We did receive bids from other
 20 contractors that were all \$3 million higher than
 21 Clark's bid. You know, it's -- it was a very
 22 difficult situation. We feel as the developer of
 23 record that we made the right call.

24 COMMISSIONER COX: Chair Perez, I had my hand

1 up. I don't know if you could see it.

2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: I can't see it. Go ahead,
 3 Commissioner.

4 COMMISSIONER COX: Well, I mean, I think the
 5 points that the Commissioners are making are indeed
 6 the very substance of Mayor Lightfoot's INVEST
 7 South/West initiative. Because she knows of the
 8 GMAs and the Bolos out there, and criteria for
 9 selecting developers, architects, contractors of
 10 INVEST South/West is -- it's in writing, it's in
 11 the criteria so that we build that local community
 12 wealth. So it's not by chance that those \$67
 13 million of work were all given to minority
 14 contractors. And so that really should be the
 15 model, and I am -- you know, I'm obviously very
 16 concerned as we move into Latino communities such
 17 as Back of the Yards or in Maldonado's district
 18 that the -- we need a pipeline of developers and
 19 contractors who look like the communities they are
 20 seeking to build in.

21 And so I know I have reached out in
 22 the past to your network and HACIA to make sure
 23 that these upcoming RFPs, like the one we just saw,
 24 the one with Pioneer Bank, has a robust, you know,

1 circulation in the black and Latino community.
2 So this one, you know, is -- this
3 was -- this development project was done before my
4 time. And it sounds like it has a very complicated
5 history.

6 I would not want to lose sight of
7 the fact that it is in Alderman Rodriguez-Sanchez's
8 ward, that it is 100 percent affordable. I am
9 extremely proud to support this project. But I
10 also understand that I can't rewrite the past, but
11 I can certainly determine the future, and that is
12 what we intend to do with the INVEST South/West
13 portfolio of projects.

14 So the point that was made by
15 Commissioner Griggs is -- stands, still stands.
16 And I hope that people see and Chicago will see a
17 very different approach on projects like this under
18 this administration.

19 MR. HENRY: I'm sorry. But I can't help but
20 respond to that. It pains me to be labeled that
21 way when we have such a strong track record in this
22 regard. This is a unique situation.

23 In regards to Back of the Yards, you
24 will see a proposal from Celadon Holdings for the

1 New City RFP. The entire development team is --
2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Hold on. Let's not cross
3 the scenes like in Ghostbusters. That's a totally
4 different issue. We're not talking about that one,
5 Mr. Henry.

6 COMMISSIONER COX: No. And to the Chair, I
7 said -- to the Chair, what I thought I said was I
8 don't want to lose sight that this is a project
9 that is 100 percent affordable and it's in a Latino
10 ward, it deserves our support. So that was what I
11 was trying to say.

12 Notwithstanding as I can't rewrite
13 the past and the challenges that this particular
14 project saw, but what I can do is make sure that in
15 the future you will see a lot of the issues that
16 are being raised by the Commissioners addressed in
17 the portfolio of INVEST South/West. That's all I
18 meant to say.

19 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thanks, Commissioner Cox.
20 Vice Chair Newsome, you had your
21 hand up?

22 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: No. I'm good. I'm
23 good.

24 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. Commissioner Thomas.

1 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thank you.
2 I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that
3 Commissioner Griggs for bringing this up. It's
4 something that either I or some of the other
5 Commissioners do think of. And I thought,
6 Mr. Chairman, that you -- you made a statement as
7 to how there may be opportunities to the -- to
8 partner with a minority, try to have a partnership.
9 And so instead of just going on and on about what
10 happened, how can we improve this situation now?
11 Is there an opportunity to do that?

12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: That's a very good point,
13 Commissioner Thomas. Yeah.

14 COMMISSIONER COX: Sure there is.

15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: I would say this, Mr. Henry.
16 But the stage that we're at here, it's very
17 interesting in that I guess we've become
18 accustomed -- I know Commissioner Griggs has as
19 well -- that we've heard the lines before, Couldn't
20 find any, didn't know where to look. But also
21 we're familiar with the, We didn't have time.

22 And typically what happens is when
23 bids go out in a short time period, of course
24 they're going to come out very high. That's not a

1 good faith effort. And if you want an outline free
2 of charge of a good faith effort, just talk to the
3 folks over at the City's Department of Procurement
4 Services. They have a very robust good faith
5 efforts outline that they give to large GCs -- I
6 know Clark gets it as well -- in terms of what
7 constitutes a good faith effort, and developers are
8 starting to use it as well.

9 And so there's an opportunity there
10 to really do that good faith effort that's very
11 respectful of the community because we're talking
12 about millions of dollars here, the TIF dollars.
13 Yes, for affordable housing. We understand that.
14 Not arguing that. Clearly it's needed. But we're
15 missing an opportunity to really impact the lives
16 of minority/women businesses with that money at the
17 prime GC level because those are the limits --
18 actually those are the barriers that we just talked
19 about that I just mentioned that historically
20 prevented firms from growing to get to hopefully
21 one day a Clark Construction size. We don't have
22 those firms. And the reason why we don't have
23 those firms is because the culture is, I go with
24 who I'm comfortable with because that's the way I

1 did it for a long, long time ago. We've heard the
2 phrase, We've got a great track record, too.

3 Commissioner Rhodes.

4 COMMISSIONER RHODES: I would just -- I mean,
5 I obviously echo what you're saying, Jorge and
6 Cornelius. I guess I was a little disappointed
7 that they have only met the MBE/WBE hiring
8 criteria, the 26 percent at a minimum. If you
9 aren't willing to joint venture and have another GC
10 prime, you know, in a community that should have
11 that, at a minimum you should be pushing yourself a
12 lot more aggressively to get a higher level of
13 MBE/WBE participation in the subcontracting level.

14 MR. O'CONNELL: I should note that that
15 template just says that if they reach the minimum,
16 that that's the minimum dollar that they -- would
17 go to MBE and WBE. They very likely will exceed
18 that. Or could exceed that. Sorry.

19 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Well, I would just urge
20 you to make that something that -- if nothing else
21 is accomplished today that that would be something
22 that they would be -- that it would be expected
23 that they exceed that.

24 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Very good point,

1 Commissioner Rhodes.

2 Commissioner Wheat.

3 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4 I think, if memory serves and to the
5 point of the Chair and other Commissioners, you
6 know, this is not our first discussion around
7 issues of MBE/WBE. And if I recall, this feels
8 very familiar to a discussion we had probably in
9 the fall, late fall of 2019, maybe the winter of
10 2019 when we were still meeting in person as
11 humans. And I do think that one of the -- one of
12 the questions and one of the realities is that this
13 is a tough call to make for this body in this
14 meeting given kind of the nature of the discussion
15 because the only option to respond is to vote no.

16 And, you know, as Commissioner Cox
17 has stated and others, as someone who lives, you
18 know, I think, less than a mile from this project,
19 you know, you don't get opportunities that often
20 to support projects that are very focused on
21 affordability and also focused on other issues in
22 the community such as childcare.

23 But one of the things we had talked
24 about, you know, a year, year and a half ago was,

1 you know, a separate session with staff to go
2 through, you know, essentially kind of -- you know,
3 the pieces that happen before things get to the
4 body both in terms of the recommendations and
5 considerations of staff was providing back to
6 developers and starting to make it clear that, you
7 know, at least this body was going to continue to
8 increase scrutiny with respect to those issues.

9 And so I'm going to vote yes on this
10 matter. I think the signal to staff is that at
11 some point that you may not get as many yeses. And
12 so I think it's a note, you know, that that needs
13 to be taken into consideration and that the --
14 a tremendous benefit of projects are going to start
15 getting weight with some of the other components of
16 those projects over time, which means that you will
17 not necessarily be guaranteed a favorable outcome
18 from this body or from me.

19 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thanks, Commissioner Wheat.

20 Commissioner Cepeda.

21 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Right. What I wanted
22 to say is well, if this is creating this kind of
23 discomfort, and no one has been more concerned
24 about this issue over the years than me, that --

1 and somebody made the point, and I couldn't see who
2 it was, that it really starts right there in the
3 department. It's like those calls -- it's like
4 that's where it is. By the time it comes out and
5 there's a list of who they might mail the
6 information to, that subcontractor has no leverage
7 whatsoever. It's just who the contractor knows and
8 wants to include. And it's not really a good way
9 to even run that business of minority participation.

10 But if this is so upsetting, maybe
11 it's correct to vote no. I mean, when is the
12 message going to get there? Vote no and start
13 it -- bid it out again and put it out so that --
14 you know, through the chamber and all the different
15 chambers, and let's get some minorities to bid on
16 it. Because if they know enough about it, they
17 will. There are -- somebody -- someone made the
18 point there are some very good minority contractors
19 that are getting to the point. I mean, I just say
20 it's not enough to be constantly, you know, talking
21 about it. You got to take a position at some point
22 and say no if this isn't the way we want to
23 participate in this.

24 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: This is Commissioner

1 Davis.
 2 I would agree with that sentiment.
 3 I've been on the Commission for quite a long time,
 4 and I know that we've had these kinds of
 5 conversations and we have given these kinds of
 6 requests and mandates and those kinds of things.
 7 And I have not seen them really be taken as
 8 seriously as I'd like to see them taken.

9 And I would agree at this point that
 10 I think this is one way to make sure that it's
 11 understood that we're really serious about how we
 12 look at these particular deals.

13 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Very good point.

14 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Could I just ask for
 15 the council- -- councilwoman's reaction to this
 16 discussion? I mean, this is a hundred percent
 17 affordable housing with very low cost childcare.
 18 I'm just -- you know, if the councilwoman has any
 19 remarks she'd like to share with us at this time, I
 20 think it's probably appropriate.

21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Sure. Alderman.

22 ALDERMAN RODRIGUEZ-SANCHEZ: Yeah. I had
 23 my -- I had hand up to intervene in the
 24 conversation.

1 I really appreciate this
 2 conversation, and as you all know, I've only been
 3 in this seat for a year and a half, and this is my
 4 first development that I'm working on. And it's a
 5 much needed development in our community. We are
 6 desperately in need of affordable housing for our
 7 people. We've lost so many people from the Latinx
 8 community in our neighborhoods because they can't
 9 afford to live here anymore. And I appreciate the
 10 conversation.

11 And I absolutely agree that we need
 12 to be very aggressive in terms of the contracting
 13 work and making sure that our people are
 14 represented and are benefiting and are being able
 15 to grow.

16 In this particular case, what I can
 17 say about working with Celadon is that they have
 18 been really open to working with community the
 19 whole time, and they have -- the process has been
 20 grueling. It's been really, really hard to get to
 21 this point. And I do understand the importance of
 22 making a point.

23 I would hate to see this work
 24 delayed because my community desperately needs it.

1 We are getting gentrified so quickly. And putting --
 2 putting another constraint on the project being
 3 able to move forward would negatively impact our
 4 community and what we are trying to do.

5 Celadon has other projects in the
 6 community that we are trying to push forward, and I
 7 am very committed to making sure that I work with
 8 the developer so that next time we know that there
 9 is going to be important representation from
 10 minority communities in development. And I am very
 11 committed to making sure that the subcontracting
 12 in this project is definitely going to go to
 13 minorities. I would really appreciate a vote in
 14 favor of this project.

15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Griggs.

16 Thank you, Alderman Rodriguez-Sanchez.

17 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yeah. I just wanted to
 18 circle back -- you know, there's been some great
 19 comments. I want to circle back to Commissioner
 20 Cox's comment of -- you know, at the end of the
 21 day, we want to support something that's great for
 22 the community, right? The project in itself is
 23 going to bring hundred percent affordable housing
 24 and a new daycare facility to that community.

1 But we can't -- to my other
 2 Commissioners, as I mentioned earlier as we started
 3 this conversation, we can't overlook the fact that
 4 this has constantly come before us. I've been on
 5 this Commission now going into my fourth year, and
 6 this has been a constant conversation under the
 7 previous administration, now under a new
 8 administration.

9 What I did hear from Commissioner
 10 Cox was a commitment, you know, from his seat as
 11 the Commissioner of Planning to make sure that
 12 he is focused on ensuring that minority and
 13 disadvantaged businesses are participating.

14 And to the point I made earlier, it
 15 has to start in the departments. By the time it
 16 get to this Commission and to this body, there's
 17 nothing much we can really do other than all agree
 18 to vote no and delay it. Right? Which then takes
 19 away resources from those communities.

20 So I am confident in Commissioner
 21 Cox and his department that they are going to make
 22 sure that before it gets to us that we have -- that
 23 they have vetted it and made sure that folks of
 24 color are participating especially in communities

1 of color. Because I tell you my organization and
 2 organizations like mine don't get an opportunity to
 3 participate on projects on the North Shore and in
 4 downtown Chicago. So the only places I can
 5 participate and my counterparts can participate are
 6 on the South and West Sides of Chicago.

7 So it pains me to see that Clark
 8 Construction will get an opportunity that could
 9 have went to one of my counterparts. Right? An
 10 opportunity could have helped Bolo grow his
 11 business, OVC grow their business, Brown & Momen
 12 grow their business and not the \$4 billion giant
 13 sitting down there on Jefferson Street.

14 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Commissioner
 15 Griggs.

16 Vice Chair Newsome.

17 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: You've got your hand up.

19 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: No, I don't.

20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes, you do. Shows up on
 21 this side.

22 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Okay. Well, then ...

23 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Secretary Butler, you had
 24 your hand up as well?

1 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: I decided I would
 2 withhold my comment.

3 COMMISSIONER COX: Chair, I know -- I mean,
 4 obviously I think we should be moving. I mean,
 5 this is good -- this is the right place to be
 6 having this conversation. There's no question.
 7 But this body, much like my first year and a half,
 8 has been playing cleanup for things that were
 9 conceived of before the Lightfoot administration
 10 came into being. And so I can't take any
 11 responsibility for how these deals were structured
 12 and -- but I can take responsibility for the
 13 future. And if yesterday's announcement of the
 14 first round of, you know, INVEST South/West is any
 15 indication, we are in perfect alignment with this
 16 body. So I will certainly do my part.

17 And I'm sitting here, you know,
 18 wishing that Commissioner Novara was listening to
 19 this conversation because this is a housing deal
 20 fundamentally, and I know her values too. And so I
 21 think your -- you -- your points of view are in
 22 perfect alignment with this administration. And
 23 when we get -- when we clear the deck of all these
 24 projects that are residue -- you know, all be they

1 extraordinary projects, as we said, 100 percent
 2 affordable, daycare, but they were not conceived by
 3 this administration. And I hope -- I hope that we
 4 will be bringing you things that are very much in
 5 line with the values that we've heard here.

6 I really don't want to penalize this
 7 particular project for the errors and missteps
 8 because I know this community is sorely in need of
 9 it. And as the alderman said, they're being
 10 gentrified out of their community as we speak.

11 And so I don't want to do a symbolic
 12 protest. I want to get work done and assure you
 13 all that the values that you are speaking are going
 14 to be the values that you will see time and time
 15 again before this body in the future.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: With that, Commissioners, if
 17 there's no other questions or comments, I'm going
 18 to call the item up for a vote.

19 (No response.)

20 Okay. So the resolution before us
 21 requests authority for the Department of Housing to
 22 negotiate a redevelopment agreement with Roots
 23 Development, LLC for the redevelopment of the
 24 property located at 3357 West Lawrence Avenue in

1 the Lawrence/Kedzie TIF Redevelopment Project Area,
 2 and to recommend to the City Council of the City of
 3 Chicago the designation of Roots Development, LLC
 4 as the developer.

5 Do I have a motion?

6 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: So move.

7 COMMISSIONER COX: So move.

8 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Please state your name.

9 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: So move. Commissioner
 10 Butler.

11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Commissioner
 12 Butler.

13 Do I have a second?

14 COMMISSIONER COX: Second.

15 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Second Commissioner who?

17 COMMISSIONER COX: I heard two. I'm going to
 18 defer, let someone else second.

19 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: It's Commissioner
 20 Griggs. I second.

21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Commissioner
 22 Griggs, for the second.

23 And I'll call the roll call. Please
 24 signify your support or not by saying yea or nay.

1 Vice Chair Newsome.
 2 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Yes.
 3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Secretary Butler.
 4 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Yes.
 5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Brooks.
 6 (No response.)
 7 Commissioner Buford.
 8 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Yes.
 9 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cepeda.
 10 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Okay. Yes.
 11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cox.
 12 COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.
 13 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Davis.
 14 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: With res- --
 15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: I'm sorry. Commissioner
 16 Curtis. Commissioner Curtis.
 17 (No response.)
 18 Commissioner Davis.
 19 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: With reservation, yes.
 20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Got it.
 21 Commissioner Griggs.
 22 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yes.
 23 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Rhodes.
 24 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Thomas.
 2 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Reservations, but yes.
 3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat.
 4 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Yes.
 5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Perez votes
 6 yes.
 7 Thank you, Commissioners. The
 8 motion is carried.
 9 MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 10 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Our final item of new
 11 business, the Department of Housing is seeking
 12 authority to negotiate a redevelopment agreement
 13 with WMH-I, LLC for the redevelopment of the
 14 property located at 223 through 257 North Damen
 15 Avenue and 1951 through 59 West Lake Street in
 16 the Central West TIF Redevelopment Area, and to
 17 recommend to the City Council of the City of
 18 Chicago the designation of WMH-I, LLC as the
 19 developer.
 20 James O'Connell, again, will present
 21 on behalf of the Department of Housing.
 22 Mr. O'Connell, when you're ready,
 23 please proceed.
 24 MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you. Can you see --

1 can you see my screen?
 2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yes.
 3 MR. O'CONNELL: I just do want to note before
 4 I begin the Department of Housing is currently,
 5 under the leadership of Commissioner Novara,
 6 finalizing a racial equity investment analysis, and
 7 I think the -- I don't have the final language, but
 8 the ultimate goal is how do we incorporate that
 9 into our QAP funding round every two years when we
 10 select these processes. So if you have any
 11 commentary you'd like me to pass along, I'd be
 12 happy to do so.
 13 Okay. So for the record, my name is
 14 Jim O'Connell with the Department of Housing.
 15 This is Westhaven Park IID located
 16 at 145 North Damen in the Near West Side community
 17 area, 27th Ward with Walter Burnett, Jr. as
 18 alderman.
 19 I'm requesting a TIF developer
 20 designation as well \$10 million in TIF financing
 21 approval prior to tentative bond inducement in
 22 April and full Council introduction in May.
 23 Similar to the situation with
 24 Metropolitan Apartments, the agenda and resolution

1 incorrectly interchanged the developer name with
 2 the future owner entity name, but an updated
 3 resolution has since been submitted. Again, my
 4 apologies for that.
 5 Here is an aerial map showing its
 6 location at the southeast corner of Lake and Damen
 7 directly across the street from the new Damen Green
 8 Line station, which I believe is almost built or
 9 will be built.
 10 Here's the project parcel from the
 11 southeast. The site is currently vacant.
 12 So Westhaven is the seventh and
 13 final affordable phase of the CHA Henry Horner
 14 Homes redevelopment. CHA is actually under consent
 15 decree with legal obligation to return a certain
 16 amount of public housing units, and this will
 17 fulfill that as well as close out the HOPE VI
 18 funding source. What's most exciting is this is
 19 the first CHA Plan for Transformation site to be
 20 demolished and the first to go through these
 21 substantial changes and to finish. So it's a huge
 22 milestone for CHA and the Department of Housing.
 23 This 12-story, 96-unit new
 24 construction building will include mixed-income

1 households and over 4,000 square feet of commercial
 2 space. There will be 82 one-bedroom units, 14
 3 two-bedroom units, with 5 at 50 percent AMI, 55 at
 4 60 percent AMI, 3 at 80 percent AMI, and 33 market
 5 rate. And the affordability period will last for
 6 40 years.

7 Amenities will include a community
 8 room, exercise and yoga room, business center, bike
 9 room, roof deck, and on-site management.

10 So community engagement for this
 11 project is fairly formalized since it's a CHA Plan
 12 for Transformation site. Main community input
 13 takes place via the Horner Working Group whose RFP
 14 Brinshore-Michaels responded to. It's similar to
 15 other CHA redevelopments in that you have standing
 16 meetings with representatives of the former
 17 families, CHA, and the developer. So it's pretty
 18 well known and codified. And there have been
 19 additional community-wide meetings as well. The
 20 last step prior to bond inducement will be Plan
 21 Commission, which will be March 18th.

22 Total development cost for this
 23 project is 41.8 million with 10 million, or 24
 24 percent, coming from TIF. This number's actually

1 decreased due to the 4 percent credit fix in
 2 Washington and the greater LIHTC equity that's now
 3 flowing into the capital stack. CHA has also
 4 increased its loan to 12.2 million in exchange for
 5 more public housing units in the building.

6 The closing out of CHA's HOPE VI
 7 funding is frankly why there's a large public
 8 agency input into the capital stack. With the HOPE
 9 VI funding obligation, CHA units are actually
 10 Section 9 units, and basically, to satisfy HUD, the
 11 units have to remain traditional public housing and
 12 can't receive rental subsidies. So there are no
 13 project based vouchers. So in order to charge so
 14 low of rents, the development simply can't take out
 15 a larger private loan because when rents are low
 16 like this, you can't service a larger loan.

17 We're estimating roughly 10.8
 18 million in TIF-eligible expenses against the 10
 19 million TIF request. It's largely driven by the
 20 fact it's 60 percent -- 66 percent affordable, so a
 21 fair amount of all the construction costs are in
 22 play. MBE and WBE participation will reach a
 23 minimum of 8.7 million and 2 million respectively.

24 And finally is a rendering. Here's

1 an east elevation of the project as if you were
 2 standing outside the new Green Line station on
 3 Damen looking east towards the Loop. It did
 4 originally come in with more of a flat silhouette
 5 or outline, but at the recommendation of DPD, a
 6 more tiered approach was taken to kind of create
 7 a gateway experience as you hop off the L.

8 That concludes my presentation if
 9 there are any questions.

10 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: All right. Commissioners,
 11 do you have any questions?

12 Vice Chair Newsome, you have your
 13 hand up again. Is that on purpose this time or ...

14 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Actually my computer
 15 is showing my hand is lowered. I'm sorry.

16 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Okay. Commissioners --

17 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Now it's gone back to
 18 raise. I don't know what's happening here.

19 MR. KAMAL: Commissioner Newsome, this is
 20 lower. When it's light, it's lower.

21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: All right. Commissioners,
 22 any other questions?

23 (No response.)

24 Seem likes a pretty straightforward

1 project. All right. Not all at once.

2 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: It's fairly
 3 straightforward.

4 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Yeah. We should have put
 5 this one at the beginning.

6 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Hearing no other questions
 8 or comments, Commissioners, I'm going to call the
 9 item up for a vote.

10 So the resolution before us requests
 11 authority for the Department of Housing to
 12 negotiate a redevelopment agreement with WMH-I, LLC
 13 for redevelopment of the property located at 223
 14 through 257 North Damen Avenue and 1951 through 59
 15 West Lake Street in the Central West TIF
 16 Redevelopment Project Area, and to recommend to the
 17 City Council of the City of Chicago the designation
 18 of WMH-I, LLC as developer.

19 Do I have a motion?

20 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: So moved, Mr. Chair.
 21 Vice Chair Newsome.

22 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Vice Chair
 23 Newsome.

24 Do I have a second?

1 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Second.
 2 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Second by -- state your
 3 name.
 4 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Commissioner Wheat.
 5 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat. Thank
 6 you, sir.
 7 All right. I'm going to call the
 8 roll.
 9 Vice Chair Newsome.
 10 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Yes.
 11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Secretary Butler.
 12 COMMISSIONER BUTLER: Yes.
 13 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Brooks.
 14 (No response.)
 15 Commissioner Buford.
 16 COMMISSIONER BUFORD: Yes.
 17 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cepeda.
 18 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Yes.
 19 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Cox.
 20 COMMISSIONER COX: Yes.
 21 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Curtis.
 22 (No response.)
 23 Commissioner Griggs.
 24 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Rhodes.
 2 COMMISSIONER RHODES: Yes.
 3 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Davis. I'm
 4 sorry.
 5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes.
 6 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: I said Commissioner Rhodes.
 7 Commissioner Thomas.
 8 COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.
 9 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Wheat.
 10 COMMISSIONER WHEAT: Yes.
 11 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Commissioner Perez votes
 12 yes.
 13 The motion is carried.
 14 Thank you, Commissioners. We're now
 15 at the end of our agenda. I would like to request
 16 a motion to adjourn.
 17 Do I have a motion?
 18 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Mr. Chairman, before
 19 we adjourn, may I make a comment?
 20 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Sure, Vice Chair Newsome.
 21 COMMISSIONER NEWSOME: Earlier I was somewhat
 22 hesitant. I wanted to apologize to the
 23 Commissioners for causing the excessive discussion
 24 on the prior item. It was not my intent. I was a

1 little concerned as to which Clark Construction
 2 Company we were referring to, and so I raised the
 3 question just for my own personal information, but
 4 not to belabor the meeting. So I do apologize for
 5 the length of this meeting on the record.
 6 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Vice Chair
 7 Newsome.
 8 COMMISSIONER COX: I mean, I might offer just
 9 a comment because I -- to be honest with you, I
 10 continue to really value the rigor and the -- of
 11 the conversation that this particular body has. I
 12 feel like this is exactly what these bodies are
 13 supposed to be doing on behalf of the City.
 14 So I -- you know, my compliments
 15 to you all. It doesn't -- it doesn't inhibit you
 16 from taking action, but the conversations that
 17 we're having are the conversations that we should
 18 be having, and I just -- I just think it's a breath
 19 of fresh air. So I don't think any apologies are
 20 necessary.
 21 I think this is the place to have
 22 these conversations, and it gives us -- helps us --
 23 helps validate what the administration is trying to
 24 do to know that we have a body that is so in sync.

1 This could have been Mayor Lightfoot talking. So
 2 clearly we're doing the work that you've been
 3 charged to do, and I just -- I just appreciate this
 4 body's ability to deliberate and have a robust
 5 conversation and still take action to move the work
 6 forward.
 7 So thank you.
 8 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Thank you, Commissioner Cox.
 9 So with that, I'm still asking do I
 10 have a motion to adjourn?
 11 COMMISSIONER COX: So moved.
 12 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: We have a motion to adjourn
 13 by Commissioner Cox.
 14 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Second.
 15 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Do we have a second?
 16 COMMISSIONER CEPEDA: Cepeda.
 17 CHAIRMAN PEREZ: Cepeda.
 18 All in favor signify by saying aye.
 19 (Chorus of ayes.)
 20 Thank you for your time, Commissioners.
 21 (The proceedings adjourned at
 22 3:32 p.m.)
 23
 24

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Nick D. Bowen, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the proceedings of said hearing as appears from my stenographic notes so taken and transcribed under my direction.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at Chicago, Illinois, this 6th day of April 2021.

Nick D. Bowen
Illinois CSR No. 084-001661

Table with 3 columns: \$, 2, 4. Lists various terms and their corresponding page numbers.

Table with 3 columns: 80, 90s, 82. Lists various terms and their corresponding page numbers.

Table with 3 columns: anticipating, argument, awarded. Lists various terms and their corresponding page numbers.

belabor 132:4 79:11 104:9 116:23
belief 38:13
beneficial 34:10
benefit 112:14
benefiting 115:14
benefits 66:10
Bernard 86:19,20
bid 27:6 104:21 113:13,15
bids 104:19 108:23
big 90:23,24
bike 126:8
billion 91:11 96:21 98:1 118:12
bit 15:20 25:18 35:13 42:8 59:20
7:16 99:6
BKL 51:17
black 106:1
blank 89:14
block 68:14 72:1
board 70:18 95:3
boarded 70:13
Bob 19:16 45:11 47:21 85:12 93:6
bodies 132:12
body 18:6 19:2,6 12:21 15:17 24:6
26:12 31:16 32:5,6,9 36:24 46:19
56:2,19 57:6 79:3,7,13 98:8 99:8
104:7,10 111:13 112:4,7,18 117:16
119:7,16 120:15 132:11,24
body's 133:4
Bolo 99:18 118:10
Bolos 105:8
bond 124:21 126:20
bono 51:16
Boost 58:2
Boulevard 64:5
Boulevard/bronzeville 65:13
bound 80:9
boundaries 64:7
break 13:19 30:12
breath 132:18
bring 8:2 14:5 53:5 64:17 71:14

certificate 80:13,15
cetera 72:3 94:11
CHA 88:15 125:13,14,19,22
126:1,11,15,17 127:3,9
CHA's 127:6
chair 2:19 3:6 5:17 18:2 20:12
21:20 25:11 36:17 37:12 13 40:12
41:15 45:11 49:2 59:7 80:23 70:8
73:19 75:7 78:14 83:2 84:23 90:12
94:1 95:15 104:24 107:6,7,20
111:5 118:16 119:3 122:1 128:12
129:20,21,22 130:9 131:20 132:6
chairman 2:1,4 3:9,12,17,20,23
4,2,5,11,16 5:5,10 19:23 6:1,3,5,7,
9,11,15,17 7:4,11 84:9 14:16 15:9,
15,21 23 12:18 18:4 20:11,12,14,
18,20 22:3,4 8,11 23:3 5,25,2,14,
16 27:2 28:15 32:13 33:3 34:16,17
36:14,15 37:10,11,12,15 40:12
41:21 47:1,11,14 48:2,16,21 49:4,
6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20,22,24 50:5
55:6 56:5,16 57:16 20 58:2,6,15,18
59:1,2,6,8,12,17 22 60:11,14,15,22
61:7,14,17 62:4,9 63:3,5,8,10,12
67:13 17 69:11 72:10,11 74:4,18,
23 75:3,9 11,15,17 19,21,23 76:1,
3,5,7,11,12 13:14 16:21 77:2
78:12 17,19 81:20 82:5,18,23 83:4,
6,10,12,14,16,18,20 22,24 84:2,9
85:5,16 19,22,23 89:19 21 90:2,8,
13,23 91:1,8,18 92:18,20 93:3,9,
13,15,18,19 94:5,6 95:7,15 96:8,16
98:20 100 6:22 105:2 107:2,19,24
108:2,6,12,15 110:24 111:3 112:19
114:13,21 116:15 118:14,18,20,23
120:16 121:8,11,16,21 122:3,5,9,
11,13 15:20,23 123:1,3,5,10 124:2
126:10,16,21 129:4,7,22 130:2,5,
17,17,19,21 131:1,3,6,9,11,18,
20 132:6 133:8,12,15,17
challenge 23:21
challenges 45:5 107:13
challenging 44:7
chamber 113:14
chambers 113:15
championed 8:16
chance 33:12 105:12
change 51:11 81:12 89:13
changed 99:4
characteristics 64:12
charge 88:6,8 109:2 127:13
charged 133:3
chat 47:15
check 22:24 103:6
Chicago 12:7 18:8 41:10 51:15
57:4 69:16 73:1 84:17 88:14 99:21
103:12 106:16 118:6,4 121:3
123:18 129:17
Chicago's 8:24
childcare 88:4 95:20 111:22
114:17
Chip 22:9,14 23:6 25:12 26:13
41:24 42:10 46:5 47:2 56:9 76:15,
16
choose 43:8,9
chorus 133:19
chosen 17:2 91:6
cigarette 60:12
circle 42:15 116:18,19
circulation 106:1
circumstances 44:19
city 2:23 8:21 9:15 10:4 13:8,12
16:19 17:24 18:8,10 21:2,3 23:19,
22 24:6,7 25:7,9 26:9,11 27:1,3
31:3,10 35:10,15 37:6,7,21 38:2,6,
18 39:4 40:20 41:4,10 42:6 53:6
55:13 19 69:16 70:1,12 78:5 79:4,5
84:16 92:5 98:9 99:21 102:13
103:23 107:1 121:2 123:17 129:17
132:13
City's 44:15 65:19 109:3
clarification 23:7 27:23 99:6
Clark 90:14 16:18 19:22 91:5,11,
21 96:10,17,20 24 98:1,10,13,14,
18 99:5,24 100:1,19 101:8,10,
103,17,21 104:7 109:6,21 118:7
132:1
Clark's 92:1 104:21
cleanup 119:8
clear 47:5 112:6 119:23
close 68:12,15 86:21 94:14 125:17
closely 52:1
closing 101:19 102:1,5,12 127:6
closure 56:3
Coalition 88:14
code 68:7
codified 126:18
coffered 12:2
collaborative 95:1
collectively 7:17 9:18 10:23 48:10
color 104:3 117:24 118:1
columns 11:22 12:1
combat 52:24
combination 14:18
comfort 31:21 103:21
comfortable 32:6 109:24
comment 7:2 18:3 27:22 69:13
116:20 119:2 131:19 132:9
commentary 36:24 124:11
comments 6:21 24:12 72:12 116:19
120:17 129:8
commercial 8:23 11:15 44:3
64:17,19 65:22 66:1,4,13,16 68:20,
24 69:2,5 88:1 96:15 128:1
Commission 2:3 8:10 14:8 21:5,
13,21 27:9 34:5 35:9,12 19 41:13
55:2 63:13 67:12 73:14 85:24 93:7
114:3 117:5,16 126:21
Commission's 2:9,11
commissioner 3:7,10,12,14,15,
17,18,20,21,23,24 4:2,3,6,8,9,11,
13,14 5:3,5,8,10,10,18,20,24 6:1,2,3,
4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14,15,16,17,
7:6,8 8:17,18 15:5,6,9,13,16 16:9,
16 17:5,12,17 18:2,3,4,5 19:10,13
20:6,7,11,13,14,17,18,21 21:6,10,
22,8,11,12,16 23:2,3,5,6,15 25:1,4,
11,15,18 19:22 26:3 27:18,19,24
28:14,15 16:24 29:2,23 30:15,23,
24 32:12 13:15 33:3,5,6,7,8,11,14,
21,24 34:2,9,15,16,17 18 19 38:14,
15,17 18 19 37:11,14,17 40:14,16
41:3,8,15,22 42:13,18 44:17 47:9,
11,13,18,20 48:14,16 19,21 49:3,5,
6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,
18,19,20,21,22,23,24 50:3,6 55:8,
9,24 56:9,14,17 57:18 58:7,17
59:1,2,7,9,14,17,18,19,23 60:13,
14,15 16:22 24 61:14,19,21 62:23,
24 63:4,11 67:15,17,18 68:2,22
69:9,11,12,20,23 70:8 71:20 72:7,

10,11,21 73 18:21 23:24 74:3,16,
17,20 22:24 75:2,3,8,10,11,13,14,
15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24
76:1,2,3,4,5,6,7 77:4,5,16 78:16,
18,20 80:6 82:16,19,21,23 83:3,5,
6,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,
19,20,21,22,23,24 84:1,2,23 85:6
89:20,21,23 90:1,3,5,7,10,12,13,18
91:7,22 93:9,20 94:2,3,6 95:6,17,
23 96:3,7 97:8 98:20 99:7 100:7
101:9 103:9 104:24 105:3,4 106:15
107:6,19,22,24 108:1,3,13,14,18
110:3,4,19 111:1,2,3,16 112:19,20,
21 113:24 114:14 116:15,17,19
117:9,11,20 118:14,17,19,22
119:1,3,18 121:6,7,9,11,14,15,16,
17,19,21 122:4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,
13,14,15,16,18,19,21,22,23,24
123:1,2,3,4,5 124:5 128:14,17,19
129:2,6,20 130:1,4,5,10,12,13,15,
16,17,18,19,20,21,23,24 131:1,2,3,
5,6,7,8,9,10,11,18,21 132:8 133:8,
11,13,14,16
Commissioners 2:14 3:2 4:18,22
14:16 15:2 48:3 55:7 56:7 58:18,22
67:14 77:3 81:20 82:6 89:19 93:23
100:9 105:5 107:16 108:5 111:5
117:2 120:16 123:7 128:10,16,21
129:8 131:14,23 133:20
commitment 117:10
committed 71:18 81:17 103:7
116:7,11
committee 26:10 51:15
communicated 65:10
communication 37:22
communities 39:7 64:13 70:7
72:4 88:13 92:8 94:10,13,20 97:11,
20 104:2 105:16,19 116:10 117:19,
24
community 2:3 8:22 24 9:3 10:10
11:18 12:14,18 14:3,7 17:24 26:19
36:9 38:18 51:3,10,22 52:3,6,8,12,
16,19,22 53:11,12,14,19,22 54:4,5,
11,19,21 64:5 65:3,17 70:4,18
77:20 87:19 88:11 89:12 92:7 94:9,
22,23 95:2,4 97:13,24 103:13
105:11 106:1 109:11 110:10
111:22 115:5,8,18,24 116:4,6,22,
24 120:8,10 124:16 126:7,10,12
community's 44:14 52:2 54:14
community-based 65:12
community-wide 126:19

corner 10:9,18 125:6
corporate 8:22
correct 20:6,7 22:17 23:2 27:2
37:17 40:23 56:12 59:12 71:14
90:16 95:22 113:11
corrections 4:24
correctly 19:1
corridor 7:19 9:21,23 10:2,3,24
11:7 14:6 48:11 54:17 64:20 65:23,
24 66:3,17 77:16 78:9
corridors 8:24 10:4 31:2 38:20
39:2,7,14,16
cost 88:22 114:17 126:22
costs 43:18 89:1 127:21
Council 25:10 26:9,12 84:16 86:10
121:2 123:17 124:22 129:17
council- 114:15
councilwoman 114:18
councilwoman's 114:15
counsel 19:17 21:8 22:24
counter-party 34:21 36:7
counterparts 118:5,9
counting 102:5
couple 27:11 42:11,13 44:2,10
45:8 100:8
court 2:12
covenant 95:18
COVID-19 2:6
Cox 3:20,21 6:5,6 8:18 18:2,3,5,
19 13:20 21:6 22:8,11 23:7,15,
25 11,15 19 30:23 24 32:12,16
33:6,8,14,21 34:2,15,18 41:15,22
42:18 49:12,13 56:10,14,17 57:18
58:7,17 59:2,14,17,19,23 62:23,24
63:4 69:23 70:8 72:7 75:17,18
77:7 78:20 80:6 82:21,22,23
83:12 13 85:6 104:24 105:4 107:6,
19 108:14 111:16 117:10,21 119:3
121:7,14,17 122:11,12 130:19,20
132:8 133:8,11,13
Cox's 36:19 116:20
create 51:19 104:1 128:6
created 66:19
creating 112:22
credit 127:1
credits 87:3
crescendo 56:21
criteria 105:8,11 110:8
cross 107:2
crowds 96:22
crystal 23:11
cultural 52:18 54:20
culture 109:23
curious 61:2
current 12:10 13:9 20:2 21:1 23:17
29:14 42:23 64:20 69:23 78:22
79:8
Curtis 3:23,24 6:7,8 15:5,6,9,13,16
16:9,16 17:5,12,17 19:10 25:1,4,5,
18,22 26:3 27:24 47:9,11,13,18,20
49:14,15 75:19 20 83:14,15 89:21,
23 90:3,5,10 93:9,20 122:16
130:21
cycle 56:11
D
D.C. 98:15
dad 81:14
Damen 123:14 124:16 125:6,7
128:3 129:14
date 5:21 29:3 52:3 102:5
dated 14:12 54:23 64:2
Davis 4:2,3 6:10 49:16 17 75:21,
29 82:16,17 113:24 114:1 122:13,
14,18,19 131:3,5
day 27:10 43:9 109:21 116:21
daycare 80:6 116:24 120:2
days 27:11
de-conversion 87:16
deadline 102:12
deal 13:14 17:3 19:20 20:22 44:22
56:2 104:8,11 119:19
deals 35:14 114:12 119:11
December 64:3
decide 25:7 26:5
desires 21:3 70:15 102:3 119:1
decision 31:21 33:2
deck 119:23 126:9
decreased 127:1
decree 125:15
deejay 90:8
deep 80:16,17
defer 121:18
delay 117:18
delayed 115:24
deliberate 32:10 133:4
deliberations 34:8
deliver 51:10 54:11
delivered 68:8
delivering 101:20
demolished 73:7 125:20
demolition 73:5,9,14,17
denied 80:14
department 7:14 22:8 13:21 16
22:1 23:9,13 26:19 28:6 29:15 30:6
31:20 36:7,8,21 43:6 48:7 50:9,16
52:12 62:13 63:20 63:15 19 64:21
67:5 68:17 73:10 74:9 82:10 84:11,
20 86:3 91:24 99:13 109:3 113:3
117:21 120:21 123:11,21 124:4,14
125:22 129:11
department's 54:14 64:9
departments 8:21 117:15
dependent 55:21
depending 68:6
depicting 11:24
depth 87:6
Deputy 22:9
deserves 107:10
design 51:6
designated 2:15 12:6
designation 68:21 72:13,15 84:17
86:8 121:3 113:18 124:20 129:17
desire 14:2
desires 11:15 65:4
desired 52:22

interpreted 58:11
interrupting 76:17
intersection 50:22 51:3 54:18
intervene 114:23
intro 84:9
introduction 86:10 124:22
inventory 70:1
INVEST 8:16 20 9:9,11,19,20,23
 12:21 18:1 23:20 34:24 64:10 70:5
 103:24 105:6,10 106:12 107:17
 119:14
invested 102:4
investing 43:15
investment 40:4 51:2 54:16 56:23
 70:13 124:6
Investments 12:24 13:9
investor 71:14 102:4
investors 31:7
involve 70:17
involved 36:10,11 104:13
involvement 91:15
ionic 12:1
issuance 55:3
issue 5:14 31:8 32:11 50:10 54:15
 62:14 63:19 67:7 68:11 74:10
 82:11 104:9 107:4 112:24
issued 38:1
issues 45:21 71:7 72:4 99:1
 102:22 103:11 107:15 111:7,21
 112:8
issuing 16:6 80:14
item 4:18 7:13 16:2 48:4 50:2,8
 57:14 58:23 61:3,6,10 62:1,2,10
 63:1 74:6 75:5 76:10 77:4 82:7,24
 84:5,10 85:3 120:18 123:10 129:9
 131:24
items 14:17 16:1,8 32:23 46:23
 52:15

J

James 84:19 92:18 96:8 123:20
January 51:14
Jefferson 118:13
Jim 86:1 90:14 99:12 124:14
job 92:22 99:24
jobs 66:18,19
join 60:1 63:2 81:24
joined 20:17 50:6 76:19,24 77:5
joining 77:7
joint 110:9
Jorge 2:4 58:2 97:9 110:5
Jr 124:17
judgment 78:8
jump 60:17 98:24 101:10
jumping 60:19
June 51:23 52:4 67:4

K

Kamal 60:3,5,9 128:19
Kedzie 10:1
Kimball 86:20
kind 24:22 33:1 35:4,17,20 37:3,5
 41:3 74:1 89:15 96:21 97:3 100:15
 111:14 112:2,22 128:6
kinds 114:4,5,6
King 62:17 67:9 74:13
knew 102:8
knowing 23:10 30:4

L

labeled 106:20
labor 11:24
Lake 123:15 125:6 129:15
land 11:6 31:4 37:3,44:1 80:23
 131:24
landmark 12:7 38:15
Landmarks 73:13
landscape 68:7
language 124:7
languish 71:10
languished 70:13
Laramie 18:7,17,18,20 19:9 24:18
large 10:4 43:12 54:5 87:21 98:16
 109:5 127:7
largely 127:19
larger 8:16 24:10 127:15,16
Latasha 20:13
late 100:16 111:9
Latino 52:18 77:22,24 78:2 105:16
 106:1 107:9
Latino-owned 78:4
Latinx 115:7
Lawrence 84:14 86:5,18 120:24
Lawrence/kedzie 84:15 86:6
 121:1
layered 45:3
lead 54:1 65:12
leaders 11:15
leadership 124:5
leap 24:22 32:1 36:3
lease 88:3
led 18:15 24:7
left 58:5 69:17 71:10 88:20
legal 19:17 21:8 28:23 33:19
 125:15
legislative 26:7
legitimacy 42:21 43:12
lemonade 102:24
lemons 103:1
length 14:4 132:5
letter 13:10 14:11 29:5,6 33:10
 54:23 59:9 65:9,20
level 31:21 32:4 34:22 36:5 54:10
 56:3 91:16 92:22 95:20 96:10,22,
 24 97:4,6,15 98:12 99:12 103:21
 109:17 110:12,13
leverage 35:16 39:5 113:6
leveraged 88:24
liability 41:9,12
licensed 28:9
lies 64:7
lieu 91:6
life 9:5 51:2 53:5
light 128:20
Lightfoot 8:17 56:15,21 119:9
 133:1
Lightfoot's 105:6
LIHTC 88:24 127:2
likelihood 23:13
likes 128:24
limitations 72:16,18
limited 29:18 52:20 62:7 100:23
 104:18
limits 109:17
lines 108:19
link 60:1 63:2
list 52:6 58:12 88:15 113:5
listed 72:24
listening 119:18
live 2:11 60:11 115:9
lived 19:4
liven 89:16
lives 109:15 111:17
living 80:4,6,10,11
LLC 12:24 13:9 84:13,17 120:23
 121:3 123:13,18 129:12,18
loan 88:22 127:4,15,16
lobby 12:5
local 92:10 97:13 105:11
locally 51:4 97:11
locals 92:13
located 7:16 10:8,12 11:2 48:8
 50:12 62:16 63:20 64:5 71:23
 105:22 107:14 110:20 111:13
 112:6 114:10 117:11,21 131:19
 124:14 124:15 129:13
location 10:6 68:4 80:1 125:6
logging 7:10
loggin 7:9
LOI 29:14 32:19
LOIS 45:19
long 4:21 40:10 46:2 56:15 65:4
 70:12 101:7 110:1 114:3
longer 21:21 40:5 41:24
longevity 38:23
look- 62:6
Loop 128:3
lose 106:6 107:8
lost 115:7
lot 31:17 44:4,8 45:8 70:17 81:3,4
 87:4 82:12 94:22 95:1 98:6 107:15
 110:12
lots 63:24 68:4 73:18 104:18
love 99:2,5
low 88:8 114:17 127:14,15
low-income 88:4
Lowell 10:1
lower 128:20
lowered 128:15

M

made 22:16 23:1 95:1 102:15
 104:23 106:14 108:6 113:1,17
 117:14,23
mail 113:5
mailbox 6:24
main 10:15 72:20,22 73:17 126:12
maintain 39:12 102:12
maintained 38:8
maintenance 42:3
major 39:2,7 78:1
make 17:3 32:6 34:13 37:16 45:20
 64:12 77:20 80:23 97:12 98:11
 99:9,23 101:8 102:24 104:18
 105:22 107:14 110:20 111:13
 112:6 114:10 117:11,21 131:19
Makes 97:5
making 38:16 47:23 77:18 97:9
 99:14 105:5 115:13,22 116:7,11
Maldonado 10:13 14:10 54:22
 57:21 59:3 76:18,24 77:5,6,8,12
 78:13 79:14 80:7 81:21 82:2
Maldonado's 105:17
mall 80:2
management 126:9
manager 8:12 86:3
Managing 22:9
mandates 114:6
map 9:22 86:17 125:5
March 2:2,22 52:14 53:12,23 54:3
 67:1 86:10 126:21
market 18:11 23:19 24:2 29:7,8
 31:7 40:22 41:1 64:1 67:8 70:1,15,
 22 81:3,6 87:9 101:7,11 102:3,7
 126:4
marketing 23:24 30:2
massing 52:1
massings 54:9
massive 80:24
matter 60:17 112:10
MAUI 87:10
Maurice 8:18
maximize 52:23 53:14 81:7
Mayor 8:17 56:15,21 105:6 133:1
Mayor's 103:23
MBE 89:6 102:18,21 103:5 110:17
 127:22
MBE/WBE 110:7,13 111:7
Mcguire 51:18
Mckenna 7:3 8:7 19:16,19 20:8
 46:5 58:1,4,9,16 59:4,15 60:3,8,10
 61:5,15 62:6 67:16 85:14,18 93:13,
 17
means 2:15 46:17,23 72:17 112:16
meant 107:18
Medicaid 80:16
meet 88:11
meeting 2:3,5,7,10,21 4:20 6:22,
 24 13:30 17:22 9,13 30:18 43:5
 45:12 50:7 53:12 58:5,8 60:2 72:15
 111:10,14 132:4,5
meetings 5:13 53:22,23 54:3
 94:16 126:16,19
Member 71:8
members 8:9 11:18 63:13 71:5
 78:11 85:24
mission 64:10
missteps 120:7
mixed-income 125:24
mobile 58:3
model 105:15
models 53:11
modular 91:5 101:6,11,16,20
 104:14
Momen 102:20 103:18 104:5
 118:11
money 17:22 20:5 55:11 109:16
monitor 93:15
monster 98:1
month 5:21 53:23
monthly 88:12
months 13:5 24:18 56:13,14 70:11
 71:19 100:14
mothballed 42:3
motion 4:24 5:2 14:14,23 22:21
 48:13 50:2 74:15 76:9 82:15 84:4
 121:5 123:8 129:19 131:13,16,17
 133:10,12
motivation 42:20 43:14
mouth 25:20,21
move 5:3 19:2 22:1 24:12 25:21
 26:5 31:2,9 39:24 50:20 58:15
 61:18,20 62:1,5,10 77:3,17 82:18
 104:11 105:16 116:3 121:6,7,9
 133:5
moved 11:11 25:20 48:14,16
 74:16,17,23 82:16 129:20 133:11
moving 7:5 27:14 43:2 45:8,10
 63:1 119:4
multi-unit 64:7
multiple 8:21 39:8
municipal 68:7
mute 2:18 59:18 67:16 85:14

N

nail 100:8
national 91:12 96:21
nature 111:14
nay 49:1 83:1 121:24
nearby 88:5
necessarily 22:20 112:17
needed 16:22 42:3 52:13 54:20
 61:13 95:5 109:14 115:5
negative 53:1
negatively 116:3
neglected 12:15 38:7
negotiate 22:19 37:24 41:6 84:12
 120:22 123:12 129:12
negotiated 13:6 78:23
negotiating 39:21
negotiation 24:13 38:11
negotiations 13:19 16:22 29:12,
 21 30:8,12
neighborhood 9:2 11:14 20:12 19
 51:13 53:3 65:14 87:22 92:22 95:5
 115:8
neighborhood-by-
neighborhood 35:2
neighborhoods 56:24 57:5 92:11
 115:8
neighbors 68:23 69:1
neophytes 72:15
network 105:22
news 102:2
Newsome 3:6,7 5:17,18,20 20:12
 36:14,15,17 37:11,12,13,14 40:13
 41:3 49:2,3 59:1,7,8,9 60:13,23,24
 69:11,12,20 71:8,20 73:19,21,24
 75:7,8 76:14,16,18 83:2,3 89:20
 90:1,12,13,18 91:7,22 94:1,2
 95:15,17,23 96:3,7 107:20,22
 118:16,17,19,22 122:1,2 128:12,
 14,17,19 129:2,6,20,21,23 130:9,
 10 131:18,20,21 132:7
nice 41:8 92:20
nodding 73:19
nonprofit 52:18 69:4
normal 56:11
north 7:16,17 9:17,20,22,23,24
 10:9,18 11:3 12:12 14:6 31:9
 41:19,20 48:9,10 53:12 53:1 54:17,
 18 68:13 77:15 78:9 80:23 82:13,
 14 118:3 123:14 124:16 129:14
northwest 10:9,18 31:10
not-for-profit 64:18
note 38:21 88:1 91:2 110:14
 112:12 124:3
noted 94:16
noteworthy 88:21
notice 13:23
noticed 30:17
notified 73:7
notify 85:4
Notwithstanding 107:12
Novara 119:18 124:5
November 4:20 13:3
numbers 24:10 30:7 52:23 69:17
 72:3 73:1,4
number's 126:24
numerous 37:19 69:15
nursing 80:9,11

O

O'CONNELL 84:7,19 85:8,20,23
 86:2 90:16,21,24 91:2,17,23 92:19
 93:1,5,11,18 94:12 95:22 96:1,6,12
 97:5 100:5 110:14 123:9,20,22,24
 124:3,14
objection 14:1 48:24
objections 30:21
obligated 21:17
obligation 125:15 127:9
obtain 13:24 72:3
odd 98:17
oddy 100:13
offer 30:23 31:14 132:8
offering 55:11,13
offers 42:21
office 12:3 27:8,14,15 52:18 56:15
 63:23 64:18 65:7 68:16 94:21
 103:24
office-type 69:4
officially 95:24
offsprings 81:14
older 38:19 44:13 45:4
one-site 126:9
one-bedroom 126:2
ongoing 52:11 65:6
online 2:22
open 5:12 13:2 29:10 69:7 115:18
operate 79:2
operating 57:5 65:24 89:1
opinion 19:14
opportunities 64:14 96:22 97:2,
 21 98:5 99:24 104:1 108:7 111:19
Opportunity 4:20 13:3
opportunities 24:10 30:7 52:23 69:17
 72:3 73:1,4
option 54:6,9 111:15
options 53:20,21 80:22
orange 72:14 73:6
orange-rated 66:20 72:23 73:16
order 2:20 7:7 12:22 13:17 24:1
 26:4 61:11 62:2 73:9 95:2 127:13
organization 65:12,15 118:1
organizations 8:22 99:20 118:2
original 81:14
originally 79:22 91:4 128:4
ourselves 19:8
outcome 31:18,22,23 55:22
 112:17
outline 109:1,5 128:5
outreach 65:6
OVC 99:19 118:11
overlook 117:3
oversight 33:17
overview 43:4 45:12 47:4
owned 10:8
owner 17:4 18:12 21:1 27:10 30:10
 39:24 42:23 79:8 86:13 125:2
owners 12:10,23 13:6,10,13,15,23
 14:1 20:2,23 17:23 15:37,22,24
 39:10,18 72:2 78:22

P

p.m. 133:22
packet 32:20 33:10
painful 43:7
pains 106:20 118:7
pan 102:14
pandemic 58:20
panelist 76:20 77:1
panelists 2:15
panels 11:23
parameters 70:22
parcel 36:22 125:10
parcels 10:8,11 11:2 53:17 72:19
Parella 7:21 8:2,5,8,12 15:22,24
 16:12,17,19 17:11,13,20 23:16
 26:13 28:7,20 29:1,5 30:5,17
 33:16,23 50:15,20 55:15 56:4
 61:11,23,24
Park 10:10 53:2 86:6,18 87:13
 124:15
parking 67:18 68:1,8,18
park 8:15 16:23 17:24 38:23 39:1
 42:19,20 43:12 45:2 55:13,16 64:9
 65:13 70:4,5 79:18,19,21 99:3
 119:16
participate 113:23 118:3,5
participating 117:13,24
participation 78:23 102:21
 110:13 113:9 127:22
parties 18:17 41:6
partner 98:11 108:8
partners 8:22
partnership 94:15 100:24 108:8
parts 45:8
party 17:1,2 22:23 24:19 27:1 29:9
 pass 124:11
passed 27:12
passes 50:2 76:9 84:4
past 24:5 44:24 65:2 102:10
 105:22 106:10 107:13
memorandum 88:2 96:1
memorialized 95:24
memory 41:24 111:4
mentioned 42:18,19 44:17 59:13
 72:13 97:9 109:19 117:2
mentioning 97:2
merit 87:4
message 7:7 113:12
met 52:3,8 110:7
Metropolitan 84:8 86:4 124:24
mic 25:20 47:12 95:11,14
Michael 7:21 8:1,11 15:4,21 23:15
 33:15 50:15,18 55:6,9 56:9 61:24
 62:12 90:19
Michael's 14:24
microphone 2:16,17 3:3 15:11
 61:7 90:4
mid 54:15
mid-rise 101:16
middle 12:4
Mike 7:24 26:4 42:24 61:22
mile 111:18
miles 9:24
milestone 125:22
million 43:16 56:23 88:21,23 89:6,
 7,8 104:20 105:13 124:20 126:23
 127:4,18,19,23
millions 109:12
mind 30:6 79:23 100:1
mine 118:2
minimall 80:2
minimum 110:8,11,15,16 127:23
minorities 113:15 116:13
minority 91:19 96:19 98:11 99:9
 100:12,15 104:13 105:13 108:8
 113:9,18 116:10 117:12
minority/women 91:14 109:16
minute 87:7
minutes 4:19,23 5:22 6:18
missed 55:10
missing 40:19 109:15
mission 64:10
missteps 120:7
mixed-income 125:24
mobile 58:3
model 105:15
models 53:11
modular 91:5 101:6,11,16,20
 104:14
Momen 102:20 103:18 104:5
 118:11
money 17:22 20:5 55:11 109:16
monitor 93:15
monster 98:1
month 5:21 53:23
monthly 88:12
months 13:5 24:18 56:13,14 70:11
 71:19 100:14
mothballed 42:3
motion 4:24 5:2 14:14,23 22:21
 48:13 50:2 74:15 76:9 82:15 84:4
 121:5 123:8 129:19 131:13,16,17
 133:10,12
motivation 42:20 43:14
mouth 25:20,21
move 5:3 19:2 22:1 24:12 25:21
 26:5 31:2,9 39:24 50:20 58:15
 61:18,20 62:1,5,10 77:3,17 82:18
 104:11 105:16 116:3 121:6,7,9
 133:5
moved 11:11 25:20 48:14,16
 74:16,17,23 82:16 129:20 133:11
moving 7:5 27:14 43:2 45:8,10
 63:1 119:4
multi-unit 64:7
multiple 8:21 39:8
municipal 68:7
mute 2:18 59:18 67:16 85:14

N

nail 100:8
national 91:12 96:21
nature 111:14
nay 49:1 83:1 121:24
nearby 88:5
necessarily 22:20 112:17
needed 16:22 42:3 52:13 54:20
 61:13 95:5 109:14 115:5
negative 53:1
negatively 116:3
neglected 12:15 38:7
negotiate 2

path 35:13	personal 132:3	119:21
Patrick 62:19 63:14 67:19 69:10 70:10 72:12 73:22 74:1	personally 38:13	policy 35:5
paused 93:11	perspective 44:4 47:6	pool 43:21
paying 15:18	phase 80:9 125:13	Popular 11:10,11
pedestrian 9:4	phone 30:19 90:4 98:24 103:20 104:5	population 87:15
penalize 120:6	phrase 110:2	portfolio 106:13 107:17
people 58:12 104:2 106:16 115:7, 13	physical 60:18	position 24:3 45:23 113:21
per 47:22	physically 2:33 34:11	positioned 99:23
percent 52:22 87:2,9,12 88:22,23, 24 102:19,21 106:8 107:9 110:8 114:16 116:23 120:1 126:3,4,24 127:1,20	picture 68:3 102:17	post 27:8,13,15 98:14
perception 81:8	piece 16:1 104:15	posted 2:22
Peréz 2:1 4:3 9:12 17:20,23 4:2,5, 11 16:5 5:10 19:23 6:1,3,5,7,9,11, 15,17,18 7:4,6,11 8:4 14:16 15:9, 15,21,23 16:18 18:4 20:12,14,20 22:4,11 23:3 25:2,14,16 27:2,19 28:15 32:13 33:3 34:16 36:15 37:10,12 40:12 41:21 47:1,11,14 48:2,16,21 49:4,6,8,10,12,14,16, 18,20,22,24 50:5 55:6 56:5,16 57:16 58:2,6,15,18 59:2,6,8,12, 17,22 60:11,15,22 61:7,14,17 62:4, 9 63:5,8,10 67:13,17 69:11 72:10 74:4,18 23 75:3,9,11,15,17 79:21, 23 76:1,3,5,7,12,14,16,21 77:2 78:12,17,19 81:20 82:3,5,18,23 83:4,6,10,12,14,16,18,20,22,24 84:2,9 85:5,16 87:19 89:19,21 90:2,8,23 91:1,8,18 92:18,20 93:3, 9,15,19 94:5 95:7,15 96:8,16 98:20 100:6 102:10 104:2 105:2 107:2,19,24 108:12,15 110:24 112:19 114:13, 21 116:15 118:14,18,20,23 120:16 121:8,11,16,21 122:3,5,9,11,13,15, 20,23 123:1,3,5,10 124:2 128:10, 16,21 129:4,7,22 130:2,5,11,13,17, 19,21 131:1,3,6,9,11,20 132:6 133:8,12,15,17	Pioneer 7:18 9:18 10:6,7,14,19,21 11:3,8,9,10 13:12 14:9 18:9,22 48:10 50:23,24 52:5,17 53:9,15 55:3 70:19 77:9,14,21 80:3 105:24	potentially 73:13 87:12
perform 97:16 98:7 99:10,20	pipeline 105:18	practical 2:8
period 26:24 96:5 108:23 126:5	pivot 102:11	practically 39:21
permanence 11:16	place 2:17 34:12 40:9 73:8,15 87:23 88:3 94:16 119:5 126:13 132:21	prebid 67:1
permanent 66:19	places 89:4 118:4	precedent 21:19
person 34:7 111:10	plan 18:23 40:6 42:24 43:1,19 44:16 69:24 125:19 126:11,20	predevelopment 43:18
	planning 7:14 23 8:13 13:23 48:7 50:10 84:21 85:9 117:11	preference 16:24
	plans 13:12 22:2	preferred 52:5,14 54:5 55:21
	play 127:22	present 2:12 3:4,7,10,15,18,21,24 4:3,9,14 7:21 19:18 45:21 50:15 62:19 64:14 84:19 91:3 123:20 55:10 56:19 57:9 128:8
	played 42:6 57:9	presentation 7:22 8:3 14:15
	players 24:12	presented 9:14 37:2 38:12 101:15 128:24
	playing 119:8	presenting 88:13
	plaza 53:5,19	preservation 66:20
	pleasure 79:15 82:2	preserve 73:11
	plenty 68:9	President 82:2
	point 7:7 15:2 16:15 22:5,17 28:11 33:9 39:4 40:11 46:7,14,21 54:7 61:11 70:9 72:7 86:11 90:22 98:2 102:4 106:14 108:12 110:24 111:5 112:11 113:1,18,19,21 114:9,13 115:21,22 117:14	presume 68:9
	point-of- 65:14	pretty 87:5 88:20 103:10 126:17 128:24
	points 9:3 42:12,14 55:13 105:5	prevent 39:15
		prevented 109:20
		previous 4:20 23:1 117:7 30:4,6
		priceless 12:8
		primarily 71:6

prime 91:16 92:21 96:9,22,24 97:15 98:7 109:17 110:10	promised 102:12	pulled 101:10,11
prior 6:21 30:18 86:9,23 124:21 126:20 131:24	promises 54:12	pulling 101:6
priorities 12:21 52:2	properties 7:18 9:19 10:6,7,12 12:11 13:2,11,13,24 14:9 28:5 39:6,10,13,18 40:2,7 48:11 50:23 52:5 53:9 55:4 70:12 71:6	Pullman 102:20
priority 52:6,15	property 7:16 10:5 12:14,24 13:15,16,21 14:4,20 16:1,3,6,8,10, 20 17:7,9,14 18:9,11,16 20:5 23:14,17,18,19 24:1,2 25:8 26:16, 22,23 27:3,4 28:2,8 29:7,8,11 31:7 37:8,23,24 38:7 39:22 40:3,22 41:1,11 42:5,23 44:2,6 46:15,17,18 48:8 50:12 62:16 63:19 64:24 65:4 66:9 68:5,18 70:2 72:2,19 73:2,6 74:11 79:9,23 81:10 82:13 84:14 101:18,24 120:24 123:14 129:13	purchase 13:12,15 24:20,23,24 41:10,11 50:11 82:12
private 13:15,16 17:4 22:23 23:24 24:12 19:20 30:13 31:12 33:20 46:12 19:51 9:54 11 70:15 88:21 127:15	pro 51:16	purchased 12:12 17:1 101:18
privately 10:8	probability 23:12	purchase 24:7
pro 51:16	problematic 72:4	purpose 128:13
problems 90:7 95:11	proceed 132:23	pursuant 21:14
proceed 132:23	proceeding 2:13 30:21	purposes 37:8
proceeding 2:13 30:21	proceeds 46:11,15	purview 46:9
proceedings 133:21	process 15:1,7,17,19,20 17:3 18:5,6,14,19 20:3 22:6,21 25:8,24 26:7 27:5 28:23 29:8 30:16 35:7 42:22 43:3,7,13 45:3,13 51:1,4 55:17 57:1,7,9,15,17 94:9,20 115:19	push 116:6
proceeds 46:11,15	processes 124:10	pushing 110:11
process 15:1,7,17,19,20 17:3 18:5,6,14,19 20:3 22:6,21 25:8,24 26:7 27:5 28:23 29:8 30:16 35:7 42:22 43:3,7,13 45:3,13 51:1,4 55:17 57:1,7,9,15,17 94:9,20 115:19	Procurement 109:3	put 11:19 27:5 30:7 47:8 52:24 57:13 70:20 71:5 113:13 129:4
processes 124:10	productive 53:24 70:4	putting 116:1,2
Procurement 109:3	profits 81:8	
productivity 53:24 70:4	program 9:9 18:1 65:19 70:5 92:7, 9 96:13 103:24	<hr/> Q <hr/>
profits 81:8	programming 52:1	QAP 88:10 124:9
program 9:9 18:1 65:19 70:5 92:7, 9 96:13 103:24	project 7:20 8:12 9:20 42:1 48:12 55:18 62:18 66:4 70:19 73:12 74:13 77:9,18 86:2,17 87:2,4 88:5, 16 89:5,10 91:3,13 16 92:2,23 94:22 95:2,3 97:16,23 98:5,7,18 103:4 106:3,9 107:8,14 111:18 116:2,12,14,22 120:7 121:1 125:10 126:11,23 127:13 128:1 129:1,16 127:5,7,11	quality 9:5
promise 9:11	projects 23:10 24:10 46:12 71:9 91:20 92:15 97:12 98:3 106:13,17 111:20 112:14,16 116:5 118:3 119:24 120:1	question 20:19 22 21:7,9,12 25:12 27:23 28:1 34:18 36:19 47:21 56:5, 6 61:15 69:16 19 72:21 78:21 79:1 89:20 90:14 91:8,24 93:21 94:7 95:16 119:6 132:3
		questions 15:3 27:17 44:10 45:15 46:3,7 48:4 55:5 56:7 58:19, 23 67:11,14 74:4 78:11 81:21 85:10 88:18 89:18 19 93:24 95:13 98:10 111:12 120:17 128:9,11,22 129:7
		quick 42:11 100:7
		quickly 36:19 57:20 101:20,21 102:1 116:1
		quiet 103:10
		quorum 4:17
		<hr/> R <hr/>
		raced 101:24
		racial 124:6
		raise 40:11 61:1 128:18
		raise- 2:19

raised 21:12 27:24 42:13 45:22 47:20 107:16 132:2	recorded 5:15	rendering 89:11 127:24
raising 70:9	red 10:16 50:21,23	renderings 54:9 89:10
random 70:24	redevelop 12:13 17:23 23:18 26:21 65:5 70:6	rental 127:12
range 89:2	redeveloped 14:3 65:8	rents 127:14,15
rapidly 11:14	redevelopment 7:20 10:3 12:20 13:21 17:21 19:21 26:21 38:9 39:16 46:10 48:12 50:12 51:8 52:9 62:15,17 64:8,13 66:3,9 67:10 74:11,13 77:22 78:8 82:12 84:12, 13,15 120:22,23 121:1 123:12,13, 16 125:14 129:12,13,16	repeatedly 43:1 46:3
rate 81:3 87:9 126:5	redevelopments 126:15	report 50:16 62:20 84:20
rated 72:14 73:6	refer 45:14	reporter 2:12
re- 77:22	reference 19:8 28:11	represent 38:24
reach 13:14 22:22 85:6,12,15 110:15 127:22	referenced 32:19 65:3	representation 116:9
reached 13:10 105:21	referring 132:2	representatives 126:16
reaction 114:15	refine 52:9 54:8	represented 103:4 115:14
reactivation 9:2	refined 53:22	representing 45:23
read 14:14	reflect 12:20 20:16 50:6	reputable 81:15
ready 7:24 50:18 123:22	reflects 11:21	request 5:20 9:14,16 14:19 50:9, 11 55:3 62:15 63:19 67:7 74:10 82:11 127:19 131:15
real 26:10 66:12 100:6	regard 33:17 39:9 106:22	requesting 13:17 17:15 86:8 124:19
realities 111:12	registered 72:24	requests 4:19 14:7 48:6 67:6 74:8 82:9 87:19 114:6 120:21 129:10
reality 77:18	regular 2:2	res- 122:14
realize 45:7	regularly 52:4	reservation 122:19
realizes 30:15	rehabilitation 40:1	Reservations 123:2
reason 21:7 37:7 40:20 42:19,20 45:2 103:23 109:22	reiterate 26:15 56:10 96:18 97:3	reserving 20:5
reasons 40:5	relation 103:18	residential 64:6,21,22 67:20,21 68:11,13,17 71:23
recall 21:11 38:3 95:17 111:7	relationship 103:17	residents 11:15 88:5
receive 32:17 104:19 127:12	release 66:24	residue 119:24
received 7:7 59:5 70:24	relevant 21:6	resol 86:12,14 120:20 124:24 125:3 129:10
recent 28:2 66:1	religious 64:22	resolutions 8:15 9:13
recognition 12:7	remain 87:22 127:11	resources 8:21 55:19 92:10 117:19
recognize 22:12	remaining 39:13	respect 35:11,22 72:19 112:8
recognized 2:19	remains 64:11	respected 39:19
recollection 21:13	remap 79:20	respectful 109:11
recommend 84:16 121:2 123:17 129:16	remarks 114:19	respond 3:3 33:6 106:20 111:15
recommendation 35:18 47:3 128:5	remember 2:17 20:23 38:4	responded 126:14
recommendations 112:4	remiss 56:18	respondent 13:14 30:10
recommending 35:9		respondents 9:8 16:21
record 2:13 8:11 20:16 38:15 50:5 63:14 86:1 103:6 104:23 106:21 110:2 124:13 132:5		

response 3:13 4:7,12 56:8 74:5 75:12 81:22 83:7 87:18 89:15 93:22 120:19 122:6,17 128:23 130:14,22	116:16	secretary 3:9 5:23 7:12 36:16 46:7 49:4 75:9 83:4 118:23 122:3 130:11
responses 64:22 67:3	Rodriguez-sanchez's 106:7	Section 127:10
responsibility 42:4 103:13 119:11,12	role 28:21 46:7	seek 68:17 80:12
rest 68:14 78:8	roll 3:1 5:13,16 48:23 83:1 121:23 130:8	seeker 92:22
result 12:14 35:16 66:5,19 68:9	rolls 45:6	seeking 7:15 22:18 64:16 69:6 84:11 105:20 123:11
retail 52:20 53:6 64:17 65:24 66:14,17	room 126:8,9	seeks 62:14 63:17 68:20
return 22:20 125:15	rooms 11:20 84:12,17 100:23 120:22 121:3	seldom 22:5
reuse 64:16 66:13 70:3 72:19	roughly 89:5 127:17	select 124:10
review 4:23	round 9:9 18:7 24:15 57:10 87:4 88:10 119:14 124:9	selecting 105:9
reviewing 46:9,19	rounds 67:12	sell 29:10 39:11
revitalization 8:23 12:19 38:9,20 39:2,16 40:1,8 66:11	route 23:8	seller 18:10,16 22:20 24:20 28:18, 23 30:3,5,13,15 31:5 32:18 45:20
revitalize 31:2	RT-4 64:6	semblance 43:14
rewrite 106:10 107:12	rules 2:9	send 60:1
RF- 71:5	run 113:9	senior 80:8
RFP 9:8,9,20 13:1,7,11,14,17 14:21 15:1,19 16:5,21 17:3 18:1, 11,15 19:20 20:3 21:1 29:8 30:9 31:13 35:7,17 45:3 51:1,4 6:24 52:5,10 54:12,15,23 55:12,14,16 63:21 65:9,21 66:23,24 70:11 71:2 78:24 107:1 126:13	running 81:13	seniors 80:5
RFPD 29:20	runs 9:23	sense 31:24 97:5
RFPS 18:7 24:15 35:1 48:18 56:11, 22 71:6,17 105:23		sentiment 114:2
Rhodes 4:8 9:6 13:14 49:18,19 55:8,9 24 67:15,17 18 68:2,22 69:9 76:1,2 83:20,21 110:3,4,19 111:1 122:23,24 131:1,2,6	<hr/> S <hr/>	separate 46:23 112:1
rigor 132:10	safeguards 73:8,15	September 102:2
Road 7:17 9:18 10:9 11:4 48:10 50:14 82:14	sale 24:13 28:19 29:4 67:8	serve 51:1
Robert 7:2 19:16 47:1 60:1 85:6	sales 28:2,3	served 9:3
Roberto 10:13	Sanitation 63:22	serves 65:12 111:4
robust 36:2 88:11 105:24 109:4 133:4	sat 14:4 81:10 86:23	service 31:14 65:15,18,19 66:1 127:16
rodeo 35:22	satisfy 127:10	services 9:4 51:16 65:16 88:4 109:4
Rodriguez 95:8 100:17	scenario 26:24 40:10 70:21	session 112:1
Rodriguez-sanchez 86:7 94:17, 18 95:9 98:22,23 100:4 114:22	scenes 11:24 107:3	set 25:3 57:3 78:7
	scheduled 66:24	sets 22:20
	schools 70:2	setting 34:14
	scope 28:13	seventh 125:12
	Scott 92:16 93:1 100:5,20 101:9 133:4	shaped 51:20
	scrub 33:12	share 33:16,23 114:19
	scrutiny 112:8	shared 33:15
	sculptured 11:23	she'd 114:19
	seat 115:3 117:10	shopping 9:4

Shore 118:3	Skender's 91:5	square 10:20,23 11:5 28:4 63:24 64:1 126:1
short 108:23	skew 87:5	SSA 65:19
shortly 7:10	slide 85:20,21 86:16	stability 66:7
shot 47:19 93:10	slightly 73:5	stabilization 66:16
show 9:11 51:7	small 91:13	stack 88:19 127:3,8
showing 32:17 86:17 125:5 128:15	soaring 11:24	staff 7:22 36:1 50:16 61:22 62:20 71:4 84:20 88:12 94:7 112:1,5,10
shown 50:21 53:11	sole 65:18	stage 108:16
Shows 118:20	solicit 9:16	stagnant 38:10
side 11:23 14:20 31:10 43:14 70:7 103:12 118:21 124:16	solid 43:20	stakeholders 36:8,11 51:22 52:8 54:4 77:20
sides 9:1 42:22 71:7 118:6	solidified 13:4	stalled 42:2
sight 106:6 107:8	sorely 120:8	stand 59:11
sign 80:18	sort 43:22 46:2	standards 68:19
signal 112:10	sought 19:23	standing 20:10 23:22,23 24:2 79:6 128:15 128:2
signature 9:19 71:9	sounded 15:11	standpoint 23:12 91:14
signed 13:10 29:5,14,18	sounds 104:8 106:4	stands 106:15
significance 73:3	source 46:19 88:19 125:18	start 6:21 20:1 102:16 112:14 113:12 117:15
signified 11:16	south 9:1 11:23 62:16 63:20 67:8 70:6 71:6 74:12 89:10 118:6	started 57:6 94:19 117:2
signify 48:24 83:1 121:24 133:18	Southwest 8:16,20 9:9,11,20,21, 23 12:21 18:1 23:20 35:1 64:10, 70:5 103:24 105:7,10 106:12 107:17 119:14	starting 109:8 112:6
silhouette 128:4	southeast 86:22 89:11 125:6,11	starts 99:11 113:2
similar 19:9 28:3 44:19 124:23 126:14	southwest 89:11	state 18:7,18,20 69:17 80:13 93:3 121:8 130:2
simply 70:19 79:7 81:6 127:14	space 12:5 52:19 53:15,16 88:1,7 89:16 95:20 96:4 126:2	stated 42:24 111:17
single-family 87:17	spaces 12:3 67:18 68:1,8 87:21	statement 23:1 37:16 38:16 40:20 108:6
sir 50:20 61:1 77:11 78:16 130:6	speak 2:18 15:10 20:23 26:4 45:21 47:11 57:22 69:21 77:10 78:24 85:1,9 90:3 92:24 93:2 95:14 97:10 100:19 120:10	states 29:19
site 10:14 11:10 13:4,7 14:3 17:1, 21 28:10 29:20 50:24 51:11 19:24 52:5,14 21,24 63:7 63:21,22 64:4, 17 65:4,8 66:3 67:2,3,8 68:2,13 86:23 125:11,19 126:12	speaking 58:1 85:9 120:13	stating 29:15
sites 10:15 11:6 31:11,13 70:1	speaks 41:9	station 86:24 125:8 128:2
sits 63:24 68:4 69:24	special 65:19 66:1 71:21	stations 70:2
sitting 18:16 118:13 119:17	specific 51:20	statistics 28:2,6
situation 19:9 26:22 80:19 99:4 101:5 102:16,23 103:8 104:22 106:22 108:10 124:23	speculators 40:7	status 72:16
six-story 87:1	speed 102:11	step 25:7,9,23 44:21 47:23 80:8 126:20
size 28:13 63:24 98:19 109:21	spend 17:22	stepped 57:2
Skender 91:6 101:11,17 102:2,17 104:14	spirit 101:19	steps 28:17
	spoke 30:18 59:23	stewardship 69:22
	spot 69:1,2	story 87:13 101:8

straightforward 88:19 128:24 129:3	symbolic 120:11	therapy 60:18
strategy 32:2	sync 132:24	thing 27:10 41:2 43:10,23 86:11
street 11:12 53:5 54:10 64:19 65:11,17,22 66:8,16 86:18 118:13 123:15 125:7 129:15	T	things 31:19 36:1 37:4 39:4 40:18 45:9 46:1 61:18 72:1 81:18 111:23 112:3 114:6 119:8 120:4
streets 63:22 71:23	table 17:22 26:18 29:1 30:13 42:22 51:23 78:22 79:11	thinking 31:20
strength 11:17	tail 22:16	Thomas 4:11 7:8 20:11,13,15,17, 18,21 40:14,15,16 42:13 48:19,20, 22 49:20,21 74:16 22:24 76:3,4 83:22,23 107:24 108:1,13 123:1,2 131:7,8
strengthening 54:19	takers 81:3,4	thought 40:8,19 47:10 58:11 107:7 108:5
strikes 91:21 98:17	takes 117:18 126:13	thoughts 35:24
strip 80:2	taking 28:10 30:20 32:1 81:24 132:16	thousand 43:16
strong 61:7 94:14 106:21	talent 57:2,4	thousands 42:2
structure 16:11 17:6,12 19:20	talk 23:8 25:15 42:1 45:11 46:6 94:8 109:2	three-bedroom 87:20
structured 119:11	talked 109:18 111:23	three-floors 87:17
stuff 58:21	talking 15:18 77:8 92:21 107:4 109:11 113:20 133:1	three-quarters 11:15
subcontracting 97:1 110:13 116:11	targeting 87:11	three-story 12:1
subcontractor 103:3 113:6	tax 7:19 45:5 48:11 62:17 74:13 87:3	thrive 66:6
subject 44:1 63:21 67:8 101:1	team 43:15 77:17 96:24 102:9,11 103:3 107:1	tiered 128:6
submarket 28:5	technical 58:19 93:5	TIF 10:3 11:1,7 46:11,15,20 55:20 56:1 64:8 67:9 84:15 86:6,8,9 88:23 109:12 121:1 123:16 124:19, 20 126:24 127:19 129:15
submitted 86:15 125:3	technology 59:20	TIF-ELIGIBLE 89:5 127:18
subsidies 87:10 127:12	template 110:15	time 4:21 12:13 14:4 21:12 26:24 28:11 31:16 32:9 33:18 40:8 45:9, 13 15 71:1 76:21 80:14 81:24 86:23 89:24 92:4 101:5 102:6 104:18 106:4 108:21,23 110:1 112:16 113:4 114:3,19 115:19 116:8 117:15 120:14 128:13 133:20
subsidy 55:13,15	Temporary 66:18	timeless 12:8
substance 105:6	ten 8:24 10:8 44:24 65:1	timeline 66:22
substantial 38:22 125:21	tenant 78:2	times 37:19,20 44:2,11
substantiate 32:24	tentative 124:21	tip 30:8
success 66:6	tenure 21:21 24:8 37:20	title 85:21
successful 24:15	terminates 86:21	today 2:8,12 8:14 9:14 22:18 30:20 32:24 46:3 69:22,24 86:4 110:21
suggest 36:20 45:8,10	terms 13:6 25:23 26:1 28:3 30:2 34:20 36:5 42:17,22 43:6,23 44:12 72:13 96:17 109:6 112:4 115:12	today's 2:5
suitable 73:12	terrazzo 12:2	
support 14:11 17:24 26:19 48:24 54:23 59:10 65:9,20 87:10 94:23 95:4 106:9 107:10 111:20 116:21 121:24	testify 34:4,6 59:24	
supportive 65:8 80:7,8,11 88:16	testimony 34:3,12 61:16	
supports 14:10 17:21	theater 41:19,20,21,22,23 42:15, 16 44:18 78:3,4	
supposed 46:16 91:4 132:13	theaters 44:12	
surprising 102:2	theme 100:10	
Survey 73:1		
sway 32:21		

told 62:24 99:17	typically 91:13 108:22	usage 96:4
tone 78:7	U	utilize 43:19
top 12:3	U.S. 92:3	utilizing 97:14
total 10:8 52:23 56:22 64:1 88:22 126:22	ultimate 124:8	V
totally 55:20 107:3	ultimately 91:6 92:11	vacant 10:5,12,17,19 11:2,6,11 12:11 14:4 50:24 52:21 53:16 64:24 72:5 86:23 125:11
touch 44:9	unable 12:13 22:21,22 41:17	val- 29:24
touches 43:11	unbeknownst 92:1	validate 132:23
tough 111:13	unconstrained 47:24	valuable 12:14
Towers 98:2	underdeveloped 31:12	values 11:21 12:20 37:3 119:20 120:5,13,14
townhouse 64:6	underlying 101:2	venture 66:5 110:9
track 106:21 110:2	understand 15:7,17,20 19:1 24:21 31:24 32:4 64:11 67:23 81:6 104:17 106:10 109:13 115:21	verbal 30:21
traded 28:5 37:4	understanding 14:13 22:4 41:23 47:5 88:2 96:2	Veteran 97:18
traditional 127:11	understood 114:11	vetted 117:23
transaction 13:16 18:16 19:7 23:23 33:19 35:23 37:19 38:4 101:1,16 102:19	undertaken 22:7	VI 125:17 127:6,9
transactions 19:15 37:3	underutilized 65:1 66:11	viability 23:10 66:2
transform 12:19	underwriter 86:2	vice 3:6 5:17 20:12 21:20 37:12 40:12 49:2 59:8 60:23 73:19 75:7 78:14 83:2 90:12 94:1 95:15 107:20 118:16 122:1 128:12 129:21,22 130:9 131:20 132:6
Transformation 125:19 126:12	underwrote 44:20	view 86:22 119:21
transformative 51:11 54:16	unfortunate 102:24	viewed 2:11
transit 86:21	union 92:12	views 54:10
transparency 36:6	unions 92:14	virtual 2:5 34:14
transportation 9:5	unique 44:2,7 45:5 64:13 103:7 106:22	virtually 2:10
tremendous 101:22 112:14	unit 89:2	vision 35:4 51:7,10,19,20 52:9,14 54:9 55:21,23 69:22
triggered 19:5	United 88:14 92:8 94:11,13,20	visioning 70:18,20
trouble 25:17 80:17 90:5	units 52:23 53:18 87:8,9,11,18,20 89:4 101:21 125:16 126:2,3 127:5, 9,10,11	visit 67:3
trust 87:10	Unlike 10:3	vital 14:5
tuition 88:8	Unmute 59:19	vitality 51:3
turn 3:3 17:23	unused 12:15	vote 5:14 14:23 16:5 48:5 50:4 58:24 60:17,20 62:2 74:7 75:6 82:8 111:15 112:9 113:11,12 116:13 117:18 120:18 129:9
turns 20:24	upcoming 105:23	voting 16:4 32:6,23
TV 60:11	updated 86:14 125:2	
twelve 8:23	upsetting 113:10	
two- 87:16	Uptown 41:21,22,23 42:16 44:18	
two-bedroom 87:18 126:3	upwards 43:15	
two-flat 64:6	urge 110:19	
two-story 10:22		
type 28:3 32:10 35:23 37:18 80:15		
types 37:2 71:22		

vouchers 127:13	winning 9:8 13:14 18:15 30:9	Z
W	winter 111:9	
Wabash 62:16 63:20 67:9 68:14 74:12	with 119:18	zoned 10:24 11:6 64:6 68:11
wait 27:6	withhold 119:2	zoning 64:20 68:16,20
waiting 61:1,4 76:19 88:15	WMH- 123:13,18 129:12,18	Zoom 2:10
Walgreens 80:1	Wolf 90:22 98:2	
walk 47:4	wonderful 56:20	
walls 89:14	wondering 25:22 40:23 67:21	
Walter 124:17	work 29:9 31:4 54:8 56:19 92:23 93:6 96:20 97:11,20 98:14 99:13, 20 105:13 115:13,23 116:7 120:12 133:2,5	
wanted 13:4 19:7 44:9 46:21 60:20 77:10 79:22 80:3,22 85:9 100:18 112:21 116:17 131:22	working 57:15 81:1 88:13 103:4 115:4,17,18 126:13	
ward 10:13 63:22,23 79:18,20,21 86:7 94:18 106:8 107:10 124:17	world 97:18	
Washington 98:15 127:2	Washington 31:1	
water 15:12	write 47:15	
ways 40:23	writing 105:10	
WBE 89:7 103:5 110:17 127:22	written 6:20,23	
wealth 51:6 105:12	wrong 58:10,11	
website 2:11,23	Y	
weigh 21:22	Yards 105:17 106:23	
weight 41:5 112:15	yea 48:24 83:1 121:24	
Weisner 93:2	year 5:21 19:9 24:9 58:20 67:1 88:6 89:2 95:19 96:14,21 111:24 115:3 117:5 119:7	
well-rounded 43:20	years 12:16 14:5 21:12 27:8 31:6 38:8,21 39:8 44:20,24 65:1 69:15, 18 80:21 81:10 87:23 95:19 100:8 112:24 124:9 126:6	
west 7:16 8:24 9:17 10:2,21 48:9 70:6 71:6 82:13 84:14 86:5 102:20 102:12 118:6 120:24 123:15,16, 124:16 129:15	yellow 10:5	
Westhaven 124:15 125:12	yeses 112:11	
whatsoever 113:7	yesterday 9:7 56:21	
Wheat 4:13,14 6:15,16 23:3,5 33:3,5 34:16,17 49:22,23 61:14,19, 21 72:10,11 73:18,23 76:5,6 83:24 84:1,23 94:3,6 95:6 111:2,3 112:19 123:3,4 130:1,4,5 131:9,10	yesterday's 119:13	
width 87:6	yield 66:10	