

**Environmental Assessment
Social and Economic Analysis
Technical Memorandum
Appendix I**

Federal Actions In and Adjacent to Jackson Park:
Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Amendment and Transportation
Improvements
Jackson Park, City of Chicago, Illinois

August 2020

National Park Service
Federal Highway Administration

Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Applicable Regulations.....	1
3.0	Existing Conditions	1
3.1	Population and Housing Characteristics.....	1
3.1.1	Race and Ethnicity.....	2
3.1.2	Age	4
3.1.3	Education	4
3.1.4	Income and Poverty	5
3.1.5	Labor Force and Employment.....	6
3.1.6	Housing	6
3.1.7	Population and Housing Trends.....	7
3.1.8	Potential Environmental Justice Areas in Project Study Area	9
3.2	Public Facilities	11
3.2.1	Schools	11
3.2.2	Religious Institutions.....	14
3.2.3	Hospitals and Medical Institutions.....	15
3.2.4	Fire Protection	16
3.2.5	Police.....	16
3.2.6	Parks and Public Spaces	16
3.2.7	Public Transportation.....	18
3.3	Community Organizations.....	18
3.3.1	South Shore Neighborhood	18
3.3.2	Woodlawn Neighborhood.....	18
3.3.3	Hyde Park Neighborhood.....	19
3.4	Land Use, Zoning, and Grants.....	19
3.4.1	South Shore Neighborhood	19
3.4.2	Woodlawn Neighborhood.....	20
3.4.3	Hyde Park Neighborhood.....	22
4.0	Impact Analysis	22
4.1	Alternative A: No Action.....	23
4.1.1	Direct Impacts	23

4.1.2	Indirect Impacts of City Actions	23
4.1.3	Cumulative Impacts	23
4.1.4	Mitigation.....	23
4.1.5	Environmental Justice	23
4.2	Alternative B: NPS Action (FHWA No Build)	23
4.2.1	Direct Impacts	23
4.2.2	Indirect Impacts of City Actions	24
4.2.3	Cumulative impacts	42
4.2.4	Mitigation.....	42
4.2.5	Environmental Justice	43
4.3	Alternative C: NPS + FHWA Action (Preferred Alternative)	43
4.3.1	Direct Impacts	44
4.3.2	Indirect Impacts of City Actions	45
4.3.3	Cumulative Impacts	46
4.3.4	Mitigation.....	46
4.3.5	Environmental Justice	46
5.0	References.....	47

List of Tables

Table 1: Project Study Area Population	2
Table 2: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (2013-2017).....	3
Table 3: Age Distribution	4
Table 4: Educational Attainment	4
Table 5: 2017 Poverty Guidelines	5
Table 6: Median Household Income.....	5
Table 7: Persons below the Poverty Line.....	5
Table 8: Labor Force and Unemployment	6
Table 9: Housing Distribution	6
Table 10: Population Change, 2010 to 2018.....	7
Table 11: Projected Population, through 2050.....	8
Table 12: Projected Number of Households, through 2050.....	8
Table 13: South Shore, Woodlawn, and Hyde Park Environmental Justice Areas, by Census Tracts.....	10
Table 14: Schools/Educational Facilities within the Project Study Area.....	12
Table 15: Religious Institutions.....	14
Table 16: Hospitals and Medical Institutions.....	15
Table 17: Fire Stations.....	16
Table 18: Parks and Public Spaces	17
Table 19: Estimated Total Construction Expenditures	27
Table 20: Estimated Jobs Creation during the Obama Presidential Center’s Six-year Startup Phase	27
Table 21: Estimated Non-Labor Expenses during the Obama Presidential Center’s Six-year Startup Phase	28
Table 22: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Construction Only, State of Illinois	29
Table 23: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Construction and Start-up Phases, State of Illinois.....	29
Table 24: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Construction Only, Cook County....	30
Table 25: Estimated Direct, Indirect, and Induced Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Construction and Start-up Phases, Cook County.....	30
Table 26: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Start-up Only, South Side of Chicago	31
Table 27: Estimated Annual Labor during the Obama Presidential Center’s Operational Phase.....	31
Table 28: Estimated Annual Non-Labor Expenditures during the Obama Presidential Center’s Operational Phase.....	32
Table 29: Estimated Annual Labor during the Obama Presidential Center’s Operational Phase.....	33
Table 30: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Operation Phase, State of Illinois...	33
Table 31: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Visitor Attendance, State of Illinois	34
Table 32: Estimated Direct, Indirect, and Induced Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Operation Phase, Cook County	35
Table 33: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Visitor Attendance, Cook County...	36
Table 34: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Operation Phase, South Side of Chicago.....	36

Table 35: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Visitor Attendance, South Side of Chicago.....	37
Table 36: Estimated OPC Construction and Start-up Phase State and Local Taxes (Indirect and Induced Tax Impacts), by Tax Type	37
Table 37: Estimated OPC Annual Operating Phase State and Local Taxes (Indirect and Induced Tax Impacts from Operations and Direct Taxes from Visitor Spending)	38
Table 38: Annual Visitor-Generated State and Local Taxes, Operations Phase	38
Table 39: Obama Foundation Disruption Minimization Measures during OPC Construction.....	41
Table 40: Estimated Transportation Improvements Expenditures and Labor during Construction	44
Table 41: CDOT Disruption Minimization Efforts during Transportation Improvements.....	45

Attachments

Project Location Map Inset	Attachment I-1
Project Study Area and Surrounding Neighborhoods.....	Attachment I-2
South Shore Community Facilities	Attachment I-3
Woodlawn Community Facilities	Attachment I-4
Hyde Park Community Facilities	Attachment I-5
Transit Network	Attachment I-6
South Shore Neighborhood Current Land Use Map	Attachment I-7a
South Shore Neighborhood Current Zoning Map	Attachment I-7b
Woodlawn Neighborhood Current Land Use Map	Attachment I-8a
Woodlawn Neighborhood Current Zoning Map	Attachment I-8b
Woodlawn Community Development – Review of Previous Plans	Attachment I-8c
Hyde Park Neighborhood Current Land Use Map	Attachment I-9a
Hyde Park Neighborhood Current Zoning Map	Attachment I-9b

1.0 Introduction

This technical memorandum documents the existing conditions and potential impacts associated with Social and Economic issues as part of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Federal Actions in and adjacent to Jackson Park (Federal Actions) and alternatives. Sections 1, 2, and 3 of this technical memorandum describe population and housing characteristics, public facilities, community organizations, and land use. Section 4 describes impacts to these conditions arising from proposed Federal Actions, Cook County, Illinois.

2.0 Applicable Regulations

Several laws, acts, and regulations have shaped the consideration of impacts to the natural and human environment resulting from Federal Actions or federally funded activities, most notably, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. §4321 *et seq.* Executive Order (EO) 12898 addresses Environmental Justice in minority and low-income populations. This Social and Economic Analysis is completed to provide documentation that these requirements are fulfilled.

3.0 Existing Conditions

In Chicago, the South Shore, Woodlawn, and Hyde Park neighborhoods are highly developed and include residential, commercial, recreational, transportation, and public and private institutional land uses.

The South Shore neighborhood is just south of Jackson Park. Neighborhood limits are defined as south of 67th Street, roughly east of the Metra railroad, north of South Chicago Avenue and 79th Street, and west of Lake Michigan. The Woodlawn neighborhood includes the southern portion of Jackson Park between 67th Street and generally 60th Street. Neighborhood limits are defined as south of 60th Street, east of Martin Luther King Drive, north of 67th Street, and west of Lake Michigan. The neighborhood also includes a small section south of 67th Street, north of South Chicago Avenue and west of Cottage Grove Avenue. The Hyde Park neighborhood includes the northern portion of Jackson Park, including the Museum of Science and Industry. Neighborhood limits are defined as south of Hyde Park Boulevard, east of Cottage Grove Avenue, north of 60th Street, and west of Lake Michigan. Attachment I-1 shows a Project Map and Attachment I-2 shows the limits of these neighborhoods in relation to the project study area.

The following sections will provide information on various community characteristics of these neighborhood areas.

3.1 Population and Housing Characteristics

The total population within the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods is presented in Table 1, which includes a comparison to the total population of the City of Chicago.

Table 1: Project Study Area Population

Community	2010 US Census Bureau	2015 ACS	2016 ACS	2017 ACS
South Shore	49,767	49,155	48,552	48,479
Woodlawn	25,983	26,446	26,024	25,207
Hyde Park	25,681	26,893	26,573	26,827
Total Population	101,431	102,494	101,149	100,513
Total Population - City of Chicago	2,695,598	2,717,534	2,714,017	2,722,586

Sources: US Census Bureau, 5 Year Estimates, ACS 2011-2015, 2012-2016, 2013-2017 (US Census Bureau 2019b); US Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census (US Census Bureau 2019a)

As shown above, population in the three neighborhoods in the project study area totals over 100,500 residents. Nearly half of the residents live in South Shore. Woodlawn and Hyde Park share the remaining residents with 25,207 and 26,827 residents, respectively. Population values for each neighborhood were established by combining data from individual Census Tracts within each neighborhood boundary.

3.1.1 Race and Ethnicity

The racial and ethnic breakdown of the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods is presented in Table 2 below.

The predominant racial groups in the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods are black/African American at 74.0 percent of the total population and white at 17.7 percent. The number of people of Hispanic origin is less than the City of Chicago, at 3.6 percent and 29.0 percent respectively. Overall, populations are less diverse in comparison to the City as a whole.

Table 2: Racial and Ethnicity Characteristics (2013-2017)

Ethnicity	South Shore Population	Percentage of South Shore Population	Woodlawn Population	Percentage of Woodlawn Population	Hyde Park Population	Percentage of Hyde Park Population	Project Study Area Total	Percentage of Project Study Area Population	City of Chicago	Percentage of City Population
White	1,566	3.2%	2,465	9.8%	13,773	51.3%	17,804	17.7%	1,337,911	49.1%
Black/African American	45,828	94.5%	21,073	83.5%	7,513	28.0%	74,414	74.0%	830,626	30.5%
Asian	141	0.3%	855	3.4%	3,570	13.3%	4,566	4.5%	169,485	6.2%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	131	0.3%	49	0.2%	85	0.3%	265	0.3%	7,723	0.3%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	841	0.1%
Other Race	175	0.4%	243	1.0%	744	2.8%	1,162	1.2%	304,527	11.2%
Bi-Racial	638	1.3%	522	2.1%	1,142	4.3%	2,302	2.3%	71,500	2.6%
TOTAL POPULATION	48,479	100%	25,207	100%	26,827	100%	100,513	100%	2,722,586	100%
Hispanic Origin (of Any Race) ¹	575	1.2%	780	3.1%	2,246	8.4%	3,601	3.6%	789,713	29.0%
TOTAL MINORITY POPULATION²	47,122	97.2%	23,054	91.5%	14,374	53.6%	84,550	84.1%	1,832,264	67.3%

US Census Bureau, 5-Year Estimates (US Census 2019)

¹As described in the FHWA Order 6640.23A, Hispanic or Latino populations are classified as a minority group, regardless of race. Consistent with US Census data, Hispanic or Latino origins are considered as ethnicity data and a separate designation from race data.

²Minority population means a population that is identified or recognized by the U.S. Census Bureau as Hispanic, African-American or Black, Asian and Pacific Islander, or American Indian.

3.1.2 Age

Data on ages of population are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Age Distribution

Community	Total Population	% <18	% 18-64	% 65 +	Median Age ¹
South Shore	48,479	27.9	68.5	3.6	36.8
Woodlawn	25,207	27.4	69.4	3.1	34.3
Hyde Park	26,827	16.2	80.3	3.5	32.9
Total Project Study Area	100,513	25.3	71.2	3.4	N/A
City of Chicago	2,722,586	21.5	66.8	11.7	34.1

Source: US Census Bureau, 5-Year Estimates (US Census Bureau 2019b)

¹Median age was derived as a weighted average of the individual census block data for each neighborhood. The median age for the City of Chicago was directly provided by the 2013-2017 American Community Survey.

The South Shore neighborhood has the largest population of children (under the age of 18) at 27.9 percent, which is slightly higher than the City of Chicago's percentage of 21.5 percent. The Hyde Park neighborhood has the largest proportion of persons between the ages of 18 and 64, with 80.3 percent of the population in this age range. The South Shore neighborhood has the largest percentage of senior citizens in the three neighborhoods, with 3.6 percent of persons 65 years of age or older, which is still substantially less than the 11.7 percent of persons in that age group in the City of Chicago. The median age of each neighborhood is similar for all three neighborhoods with an age of 36.8 for the South Shore neighborhood, 34.3 for the Woodlawn neighborhood, and 32.9 for the Hyde Park neighborhood.

3.1.3 Education

Data on the educational attainment of population are presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Educational Attainment

Community	High School Graduate (Includes Equivalency)	High School Graduate (Includes Equivalency) Percentage	Bachelor's Degree or Higher for Persons 25+	Bachelor's Degree or Higher for Persons 25+ Percentage
South Shore	9,230	19.0%	4,364	9.0%
Woodlawn	4,028	16.0%	2,401	9.5%
Hyde Park	2,231	8.3%	4,301	16.0%
Total Project Study Area	15,489	15.4%	11,066	11.0%
Total Population - City of Chicago	496,355	48.3%	413,937	22.3%

Source: US Census Bureau, 5-Year Estimates (US Census Bureau 2019b)

Of the three neighborhoods, Hyde Park has the greatest number of people with a bachelor's degree or higher for people 25 years of age or older, accounting for 16.0 percent of the neighborhood's population. The South Shore and Woodlawn neighborhoods have a greater number of people with only a high school graduate degree accounting for 19.0 percent and 16.0 percent respectively. The percent of people in the project study area with educational degrees is lower than that of the City of Chicago.

3.1.4 Income and Poverty

Income statistics for the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods were collected from the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year (2013-2017) estimates and are presented in this section. Table 5 below presents the federal poverty guidelines for 2017.

Table 5: 2017 Poverty Guidelines

Household Type	Income
1 Person Household	\$12,140
2 Person Household	\$16,460
3 Person Household	\$20,780
4 Person Household	\$25,100

Source: US Department of Health and Human Services 2018

Tables 6 and 7 below summarize the median incomes and number and percentage of people below the poverty line in the City of Chicago and the neighborhoods within and surrounding the project study area.

Table 6: Median Household Income

Area	2010 Median Household Income	2017 Median Household Income
South Shore	\$28,766	\$24,859
Woodlawn	\$28,890	\$28,351
Hyde Park	\$46,190	\$55,323
City of Chicago	\$46,877	\$52,497

Source: US Census Bureau, 5-Year Estimates (US Census Bureau 2019)

Note: Median household Income figures were derived as weighted averages of the individual census block data for each neighborhood. The median household income for the City of Chicago was directly provided by the 2013-2017 ACS.

Table 7: Persons below the Poverty Line

Area	Number of Persons Below the Poverty Line	Percent of Population Below the Poverty Line
South Shore	18,429	38.8
Woodlawn	9,061	38.0
Hyde Park	5,633	23.2
Total Project Study Area	33,123	34.6
City of Chicago	550,432	20.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 5-Year Estimates (US Census Bureau 2019b)

Of the three neighborhoods, Hyde Park has the highest median household income and exceeds that of the City of Chicago. Within the project study area, 38.8 percent of people in the South Shore neighborhood and 38.0 percent of people in the Woodlawn neighborhood live below the poverty line, exceeding the overall percentage of people below the poverty line in the City of Chicago by 18.2 percent and 17.4 percent respectively. For purposes of this report, if the percentage of people below the poverty line within a neighborhood is at least 10 percentage points greater than the City of Chicago average, it is considered a low-income population of concern. Thus, the South Shore and Woodlawn neighborhoods qualify as low-income populations of concern.

3.1.5 Labor Force and Employment

Table 8: Labor Force and Unemployment

Labor Force, ACS	South Shore	Woodlawn	Hyde Park	City of Chicago	Illinois
Labor Force Participation Rate	57.9%	51.5%	61.6%	66.4%	65.3%
Out of Labor Force	42.1%	48.5%	38.4%	33.6%	34.7%
Percent unemployed	14.1%	17.5%	6.7%	9.9%	7.4%

Source: US Census Bureau, 5-Year Estimates (US Census Bureau 2019b)

As shown in Table 8, the labor force participation rates (persons in the labor force divided by population 16 years and older) in each of the neighborhoods in the project study area fall below those of the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois. Unemployment rates for the South Shore and Woodlawn neighborhoods for the 2013-2017 period were considerably higher than the City of Chicago and Illinois, while that of Hyde Park was below.

3.1.6 Housing

Housing statistics were collected from the ACS 5-year (2013-2017) estimates and are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Housing Distribution

Community	Total Occupied Housing Units	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied	Total Vacancies	Median House Value	Median Gross Rent
South Shore	21,420	21.0%	79.0%	6,346	\$184,142	\$877
Woodlawn	10,481	23.5%	76.5%	2,987	\$154,752	\$938
Hyde Park	12,602	36.3%	63.7%	1,673	\$272,758	\$1,109
Total Project Study Area	44,503	25.9%	74.1%	11,006	N/A	N/A
City of Chicago	1,046,789	44.6%	55.4%	153,516	\$234,500	\$1,029

Source: US Census Bureau, 5-Year Estimates (US Census Bureau 2019b)

Note: Median house value and median gross rent were derived as a weighted average of the individual census block data for each neighborhood. The median house value and median gross rent for the City of Chicago were provided by the 2013-2017 ACS.

Within the study area and surrounding neighborhoods, the percentage of home ownership ranges from 21.0 percent to 36.3 percent, with 21.0 percent home ownership in the South Shore neighborhood, 23.5 percent in the Woodlawn neighborhood, and 36.3 percent in the Hyde Park neighborhood. Overall fewer people in the project study area own homes than in the City of Chicago as a whole (25.9 percent compared to 44.6 percent). Median housing values in the South Shore and Woodlawn neighborhoods (\$184,142 and \$154,752, respectively) also fall below the City of Chicago median (\$234,500), while the median house value in the Hyde Park neighborhood (\$272,758) is approximately \$38,000 higher. Renter occupied housing accounts for 79.0 percent of housing in the South Shore neighborhood, 76.5 percent in the Woodlawn neighborhood, and 63.7 percent in the Hyde Park neighborhood. The number of renters in all three neighborhoods exceeds the citywide percentage of 55.4 percent. Median rental rates for the South Shore and Woodlawn neighborhoods (\$877 and \$938, respectively) are lower than the City of Chicago median rate (\$1,029), while the median rental rate in the Hyde Park neighborhood (\$1,109) is higher.

3.1.7 Population and Housing Trends

Recent population trends in the project study area's neighborhoods have been varied. In its *Woodlawn Community Area Economic Analysis* commissioned by the Network of Woodlawn, AECOM found strong population growth in the Woodlawn Neighborhood (2019). From 2010 to 2018, Woodlawn saw an increase of 2,941 residents (13.7 percent growth). This represented 28.3 percent of the growth the City of Chicago as a whole experienced. Growth was more moderate in Hyde Park, which had a 3.6 percent increase in population (931 residents). The largest neighborhood in the project study area, South Shore, experienced a 1.5 percent decline in its population over the 8-year study period. The project study area as a whole saw a 3.3 percent rise in population, substantially stronger than the 0.4 percent population growth of the City of Chicago during the same time period. Table 10 presents the population change in the neighborhoods within the project study area.

Table 10: Population Change, 2010 to 2018

Community	2010	2018	Change	% Change
South Shore Neighborhood ¹	49,090	48,374	-716	-1.5%
Woodlawn Neighborhood ¹	21,403	24,344	2,941	13.7%
Hyde Park Neighborhood ¹	25,878	26,809	931	3.6%
Total Project Study Area/Surrounding Neighborhoods	96,371	99,527	3,156	3.3%
City of Chicago ²	2,695,598	2,705,994	10,396	0.4%

¹ Source: AECOM 2019

² Source: US Census Bureau, 5-Year Estimates (US Census 2019)

The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) developed population forecasts at the neighborhood level through 2050. The projections assume the development of Obama Presidential Center (OPC), along with other anticipated projects (On to 2050 Socioeconomic Forecast). The population projections also incorporate CMAP's assumptions regarding infill development, vacant land, area desirability, and recent trends. CMAP's projections are presented in Table 11 below.

Table 11: Projected Population, through 2050

Community	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	Total Change (2015-2050)
South Shore	50,476	51,204	52,055	53,164	54,467	55,792	56,242	56,242	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	1.4%	1.7%	2.1%	2.5%	2.4%	0.8%	0.0%	11.4%
Woodlawn	22,760	23,533	24,108	24,869	25,886	26,806	27,950	28,210	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	3.4%	2.4%	3.2%	4.1%	3.6%	4.3%	0.9%	23.9%
Hyde Park	23,962	26,064	26,213	26,367	26,542	26,542	26,542	26,542	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	8.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%
Total Project Study Area	97,198	100,801	102,376	104,400	106,895	109,140	110,733	110,994	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	3.7%	1.6%	2.0%	2.4%	2.1%	1.5%	0.2%	14.2%
City of Chicago (thousands)	2,666.5	2,779.1	2,848.8	2,917.2	2,984.4	3,036.1	3,082.7	3,113.5	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	4.2%	2.5%	2.4%	2.3%	1.7%	1.5%	1.0%	16.8%

Source: CMPA 2018a

As shown in Table 11 above, the neighborhoods in the project study area are forecast to experience approximately a 14.2 percent increase in population between 2015 and 2050. Woodlawn is expected to have the fastest growing population, with a 23.9 percent growth between 2015 and 2050. Hyde Park is anticipated to grow 10.8 percent by 2050. The growth rates projected for South Shore and Hyde Park, as well as that for the combined study area, are below that of the City of Chicago as a whole. Only Woodlawn is projected to have growth that outpaces the City.

CMAQ also developed household forecasts at the neighborhood level through 2050. These projections are presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Projected Number of Households, through 2050

Community	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050	Total Change (2015-2050)
South Shore	23,701	24,162	24,765	25,491	26,255	26,953	27,176	27,182	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	1.9%	2.5%	2.9%	3.0%	2.7%	0.8%	0.0%	14.7%
Woodlawn	9,723	10,162	10,529	10,981	11,532	11,988	12,560	12,695	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	4.5%	3.6%	4.3%	5.0%	4.0%	4.8%	1.1%	30.6%
Hyde Park	13,204	14,579	14,704	14,744	14,779	14,668	14,581	14,586	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	10.4%	0.9%	0.3%	0.2%	-0.8%	-0.6%	0.0%	10.5%
Project Study Area	46,628	48,902	49,998	51,215	52,566	53,610	54,317	54,463	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	4.9%	2.2%	2.4%	2.6%	2.0%	1.3%	0.3%	16.8%
City of Chicago (thousands)	1,072.0	1,133.0	1,169.6	1,200.1	1,227.8	1,245.5	1,262.2	1,275.5	n/a
5-year % Change	n/a	5.7%	3.2%	2.6%	2.3%	1.4%	1.3%	1.1%	19.0%

Source: CMAP 2018a

As expected, household counts in the neighborhoods in the project study area are forecast to experience growth at a similar rate to the population. While multiple households can and do share housing units, over time, the growth in households would occupy an increasing number of housing units driving down vacancy rates. By 2050, the total number of households in the project study area is expected to have

increased by 16.8 percent over the 2015 level, slightly lower than the growth rate projected for the City of Chicago as a whole.

The nationwide foreclosure crisis that began in 2007/8 affected all neighborhoods in the City of Chicago, but some were more impacted than others. In the city as a whole, between 2008 and 2018, average assessed property values fell by 23.7 percent. In South Shore, average property values fell by a similar amount (25.9 percent) but appeared to be stabilizing based on data from the last four years of this 10-year period. Specifically, between 2014 and 2018, while citywide values continued to decline by 1.4 percent, South Shore values declined by only 0.6 percent. With the exception of its farther northwest corner, the neighborhood has a low supply of vacant land and publicly owned vacant lots and buildings, which may limit opportunities for new development on vacant land and redevelopment of existing buildings. In the Woodlawn neighborhood, average assessed values for property fell by 27.9 percent during this same 10-year period (2008-2018) but grew by 0.5 percent between 2014 and 2018. In Hyde Park, average assessed values fell by 16.0 percent between 2008 and 2018 (less than the citywide average of 23.7 percent) and declined only 0.5 percent between 2014 and 2018 (compared to 1.4 percent during this 4-year period citywide).

3.1.8 Potential Environmental Justice Areas in Project Study Area

EO 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations,” requires agencies to analyze the environmental effects of a proposed action on minority and low-income communities. The purpose of the EO is to direct Federal agencies to address disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.

A minority population exists where the percentage of minorities in an affected area either exceeds 50 percent or is meaningfully greater than in the general population of the larger surrounding area. The term “minority population” includes persons who identify themselves as black or African American, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Native American or Alaskan Native, or Hispanic or Latino. Race refers to Census respondents’ self-identification of racial background. Hispanic or Latino origin refers to ethnicity and language, not race, and may include persons whose heritage is Puerto Rican, Cuban, Mexican, and Central or South American. As shown in Table 2 previously, each of the three neighborhoods have minority populations that exceed 50 percent.

Low-income populations can be identified using the Bureau of the Census’ statistical poverty threshold, which is based on income and family size. The Census Bureau defines a “poverty area” as a Census tract where 20 percent or more of the residents have incomes below the poverty threshold (Bureau of the Census 1995). The Census poverty level refers to income levels that are considered too low to meet essential living requirements, based on family size, age of householder,¹ and the number of children under

¹ The householder refers to the person (or one of the people) in whose name the housing unit is owned or rented (maintained) or, if there is no such person, any adult member, excluding roomers, boarders, or paid employees. If the house is owned or rented jointly by a married couple, the householder may be either the husband or the wife. The person designated as the householder is the “reference person” to whom the relationship of all other household members, if any, is recorded.

18 years old (US Census Bureau, 2019c). The criteria for determining poverty level are applied nationally (except for Alaska and Hawaii), without regard to the local cost of living. In 2017, the poverty threshold for a family of four related persons with two children under age 18 was \$25,100, as shown previously in Table 5. The South Shore neighborhood and Woodlawn neighborhood also qualify as low-income populations of concern as the percentages of the population below the poverty level in those neighborhoods are at least 10 percentage points greater than the City of Chicago average.

For the Environmental Justice analysis, the Census tracts within the South Shore, Woodlawn, and Hyde Park neighborhoods were analyzed. Each of the tracts in the South Shore and Woodlawn neighborhoods were found to meet the criteria of an Environmental Justice Area. Within the Hyde Park neighborhood, all tracts but Tract 4111 meet the Environmental Justice Area criteria. A summary of the minority and low-income populations is presented in Table 13 below.

Table 13: South Shore, Woodlawn, and Hyde Park Environmental Justice Areas, by Census Tracts

Area	Percent of Minority Population ¹	Percent of Population Below the Poverty Line ²	Environmental Justice Area? ³
South Shore	n/a	n/a	n/a
Tract 4201.02	97.6%	38.0%	Yes
Tract 4301.01	98.5%	26.8%	Yes
Tract 4302	96.5%	34.1%	Yes
Tract 4303	99.7%	61.6%	Yes
Tract 4304	97.8%	51.4%	Yes
Tract 4305	98.1%	52.4%	Yes
Tract 4306	94.7%	26.6%	Yes
Tract 4307	94.3%	46.9%	Yes
Tract 4308	95.7%	20.9%	Yes
Tract 4309	98.9%	35.3%	Yes
Tract 4312	98.9%	27.0%	Yes
Tract 4312.01	96.7%	39.5%	Yes
Tract 4313.02	99.5%	43.4%	Yes
Tract 4314	93.6%	40.7%	Yes
Tract 8439 ⁴	99.2%	29.0%	Yes
Tract 8342	95.8%	33.1%	Yes
<i>Neighborhood total</i>	97.1%	38.5%	Yes
Woodlawn	n/a	n/a	n/a
Tract 4201	95.1%	35.0%	Yes
Tract 4202	76.5%	37.0%	Yes
Tract 4203	64.4%	36.1%	Yes
Tract 4204	77.3%	45.9%	Yes
Tract 4205	100.0%	27.6%	Yes
Tract 4206	97.0%	51.6%	Yes
Tract 4207	96.2%	58.4%	Yes
Tract 4208	97.0%	27.4%	Yes
Tract 4212	100.0%	39.5%	Yes
Tract 8344	97.7%	28.9%	Yes
Tract 8439 ⁴	95.8%	33.1%	Yes
<i>Neighborhood total</i>	91.5%	37.9%	Yes

Area	Percent of Minority Population ¹	Percent of Population Below the Poverty Line ²	Environmental Justice Area? ³
Hyde Park	n/a	n/a	n/a
Tract 4101	70.0%	22.9%	Yes
Tract 4102	59.3%	24.6%	Yes
Tract 4105	58.8%	32.6%	Yes
Tract 4106	55.1%	35.5%	Yes
Tract 4107	47.0%	27.5%	Yes
Tract 4108	62.2%	22.1%	Yes
Tract 4109	53.1%	22.0%	Yes
Tract 4110	54.8%	10.6%	Yes
Tract 4111	28.6%	10.0%	No
Tract 4112	40.5%	24.7%	Yes
Tract 8362	44.0%	28.9%	Yes
Tract 8363	66.9%	22.4%	Yes
<i>Neighborhood total</i>	53.6%	23.2%	Yes

Source: US Census Bureau, 5-Year Estimates (US Census 2019b)

¹Non-white and/or Hispanic or Latino.

²The annual thresholds for the federal poverty level vary with household size and composition. In 2017, the poverty level for a family of four related persons with two children under age 18 was \$25,100 (see Table 5).

³An Environmental Justice area meets one of the following criteria: population is 50 percent or more minority or has 20 percent or more of the population below the poverty level.

⁴Tract 8439 is divided between Woodlawn and South Shore. For the purposes of the EJ analysis, the population in this tract is included in the totals of both neighborhoods.

3.2 Public Facilities

This section provides a summary of the existing public facilities and services within the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods. Maps of these facilities within each of the studied neighborhoods are provided as Attachments I-3 through I-5. Schools, religious institutions, hospitals and medical institutions, police and fire protection, parks and public spaces have been identified; the proposed Federal Actions would not impact these public places and public services.

3.2.1 Schools

There are several public and private educational institutions within the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods. The area includes elementary, middle, and high schools, magnet schools (which specialize in subject areas like math and science or fine arts), and educational community centers or facilities. The largest collegiate institution in the area is the University of Chicago, located mainly in the Hyde Park neighborhood near the Midway Plaisance between Washington Park and Jackson Park. The University is a private institution with approximately 6,300 students and offers more than 100 graduate and professional programs (University of Chicago 2020). University of Chicago campus buildings are shaded in red on Attachments I-4 and I-5. A list of schools and educational facilities is presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Schools/Educational Facilities within the Project Study Area

School Name	Neighborhood	Type	Public/ Private	Street Address	City	State	Zip
Adam Clayton Powell Jr., Paideia Academy	South Shore	Elementary	Public	7511 S South Shore Drive	Chicago	IL	60649
Bouchet Elementary Math and Science School	South Shore	Elementary	Public	7355 S Jeffery Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Camelot Academy of Chicago	South Shore	Varies	Public	7877 S Coles Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Charles Hamilton Houston Alternative High School	South Shore	High School	Public	7843 S Chappel Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Clara Muhammad Elementary School	South Shore	Elementary	Public	7351 S Stony Island Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Excel Academy of South Shore	South Shore	Varies	Public	7530 S South Shore Drive	Chicago	IL	60649
James Madison School	South Shore	Elementary	Public	7433 S Dorchester Avenue	Chicago	IL	60619
Myra Bradwell School	South Shore	Elementary	Public	7736 S Burnham Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Nkrumah International Academy	South Shore	Varies	Private	7415 S East End Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
OKeeffe Elementary School	South Shore	Elementary	Public	6940 S Merrill Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Parkside Elementary Community Academy	South Shore	Elementary	Public	6938 S East End Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Robert A. Black Magnet School	South Shore	Elementary	Public	7133 S Coles Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Saint Brides School	South Shore	Varies	Private	7765 S Coles Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Saint Phillip Neri Catholic School	South Shore	Elementary	Private	2110 E 72nd Street	Chicago	IL	60649
School of Leadership High School	South Shore	High School	Public	7627 S Constance Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
School of Technology High School	South Shore	High School	Public	7529 S Constance Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
South Central Community Services	South Shore	Varies	Private	7550 S Phillips Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
South Shore Fine Arts Academy	South Shore	Elementary	Private	1415 E 70th Street	Chicago	IL	60637
South Shore International College Preparatory High School	South Shore	High School	Public	1955 E 75th Street	Chicago	IL	60649
Andrew Carnegie Public School	Woodlawn	Elementary	Public	1414 E 61st Place	Chicago	IL	60637
Emmett Louis Till Math and Science Academy	Woodlawn	Elementary	Public	6543 S Champlain Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Hyde Park Academy High School	Woodlawn	High School	Public	6220 S Stony Island Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Hyde Park Day School	Woodlawn	Elementary	Private	6254 S Ellis Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637

School Name	Neighborhood	Type	Public/ Private	Street Address	City	State	Zip
James McCosh Elementary School	Woodlawn	Elementary	Public	6543 S Champlain Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
James Wadsworth STEM PreK-8	Woodlawn	Elementary	Public	6650 S Ellis Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
John Fiske Elementary School	Woodlawn	Elementary	Public	6020 S Langley Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Liberty School of Christian Education	Woodlawn	Varies	Private	6207 S University Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Mount Carmel High School	Woodlawn	High School	Private	6410 S Dante Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
The Sonia Shankman Orthogenic School	Woodlawn	Varies	Private	6245 S Ingleside Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Woodlawn Community School	Woodlawn	Elementary	Public	6657 S Kimbark Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Akiba-Schechter Jewish School	Hyde Park	Elementary	Private	5235 S Cornell Avenue	Chicago	IL	60615
Bret Harte Elementary School	Hyde Park	Elementary	Public	1556 E 56th Street	Chicago	IL	60637
Kozminski Community Academy	Hyde Park	Elementary	Public	936 E 54th Street	Chicago	IL	60615
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago	Hyde Park	Varies	Private	1100 E 55th Street	Chicago	IL	60615
Phillips Murray School	Hyde Park	Elementary	Public	5335 S Kenwood Avenue	Chicago	IL	60615
Ray Elementary School	Hyde Park	Elementary	Public	5631 S Kimbark Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
St. Thomas the Apostle Catholic Grade School	Hyde Park	Elementary	Private	5467 S Woodlawn Avenue	Chicago	IL	60615
University of Chicago Laboratory School	Hyde Park	University	Private	1362 E 59th St	Chicago	IL	60637

Note: For school types, Elementary Schools are Kindergarten through Eighth Grade, High Schools are Ninth Grade through Twelfth Grade, and schools with type “Varies” do not observe grade level boundaries for CPS as they provide services not divided by grades.

3.2.2 Religious Institutions

There are a variety of religious institutions throughout the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods. A list of religious institutions is presented in Table 15.

Table 15: Religious Institutions

Name	Neighborhood	Street Address	City	State	Zip
Christian Fellowship Missionary Baptist Church	South Shore	2024 E 73rd Street	Chicago	IL	60649
First Christian Assembly Church	South Shore	2333 E 75th Street	Chicago	IL	60649
Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses	South Shore	1315 E 71st Street	Chicago	IL	60619
Mckenzie Mission	South Shore	2415 E 75th Street	Chicago	IL	60649
Our Lady of Peace Catholic Church	South Shore	7851 S Jeffery Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
St. Bride Roman Catholic Church	South Shore	7811 S Coles Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
St. Phillip Neri Church	South Shore	2110 E 72nd Street	Chicago	IL	60649
Wellspring Christian Ministries	South Shore	2810 E 79th Street	Chicago	IL	60649
Apostolic Church of God	Woodlawn	6320 S Dorchester Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Chicago Theological Seminary	Woodlawn	1407 E 60th Street	Chicago	IL	60637
Christian Temple Baptist Church	Woodlawn	6344 S Kimbark Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Concord Missionary Baptist Church	Woodlawn	6319 S Kimbark Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Cornerstone Baptist Church	Woodlawn	1200 E 62nd Street	Chicago	IL	60637
First Paradise Missionary Baptist	Woodlawn	6736 S Cottage Grove Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
First Presbyterian Church of Chicago	Woodlawn	6400 S Kimbark Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Lincoln Memorial Congregation United Church of Christ	Woodlawn	6454 S Champlain Avenue	Chicago	IL	60638
Martin Temple AME Zion Church	Woodlawn	6930 S Cottage Grove Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Shrine of Christ the King	Woodlawn	6415 S Woodlawn Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Vernon Baptist Church	Woodlawn	6400 S Champlain Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Woodlawn Baptist Church	Woodlawn	6207 S University Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Calvert House	Hyde Park	5735 S University Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Catholic Theological Union	Hyde Park	5416 S Cornell Avenue	Chicago	IL	60615
Congregation Rodfei Zedek	Hyde Park	5200 S Hyde Park Boulevard	Chicago	IL	60615
Devine Word Theologate	Hyde Park	5342 S University Avenue	Chicago	IL	60615
First Unitarian Church of Chicago	Hyde Park	5650 Woodlawn Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637

Name	Neighborhood	Street Address	City	State	Zip
Hyde Park Christian Reformed Church	Hyde Park	5144 S Cornell Avenue	Chicago	IL	60615
Hyde Park Union Church	Hyde Park	5600 S Woodlawn Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
McCormick Theological Seminary	Hyde Park	5460 S University Avenue	Chicago	IL	60615
Priest of Sacred Hearts Sanctuary	Hyde Park	1421 E 53rd Street	Chicago	IL	60615
Rohr Chabad at the University of Chicago	Hyde Park	5700 S Woodlawn Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
The Vineyard Church of Hyde Park	Hyde Park	5333 S Greenwood Avenue	Chicago	IL	60615
United Church of Hyde Park	Hyde Park	1448 E 53rd Street	Chicago	IL	60615
University Church	Hyde Park	5655 S University Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
University of Chicago Hillel	Hyde Park	5715 S Woodlawn Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637
Zygon Center for Religion and Science	Hyde Park	1100 E 55th Street	Chicago	IL	60615

3.2.3 Hospitals and Medical Institutions

Within the three neighborhoods surrounding the project study area, there are several hospitals and medical centers available to residents. A list of hospitals and medical institutions is presented in Table 16.

Table 16: Hospitals and Medical Institutions

Name	Neighborhood	Street Address	City	State	Zip
South Shore Hospital	South Shore	8012 S Crandon Avenue	Chicago	IL	60617
Jackson Park Hospital and Medical Center	South Shore	7531 S Stony Island Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
La Rabida Children's Hospital	Woodlawn	6501 S Promontory Drive	Chicago	IL	60649
University of Chicago Medical Center, including Comer Children's Hospital, Bernard A. Mitchell Hospital, and Center for Care and Discovery	Hyde Park	5841 S Maryland Avenue	Chicago	IL	60637

La Rabida Children's Hospital specializes in treating children with complex medical conditions, disabilities, and those suffering from abuse or trauma. The facility is an integral part of the community and works with patients regardless of their financial circumstance, with 90 percent of their patients being insured through Medicaid (La Rabida 2020). On a broader scale of treatment, the University of Chicago Medical Center is one of the nation's leading academic medical institutions. The Medical Center includes approximately 900 physicians throughout its several locations in the Chicago area. The main campus and School of Medicine are located in Hyde Park (University of Chicago Medical Center 2020).

3.2.4 Fire Protection

The project study area and surrounding neighborhoods are served by the City of Chicago Fire Department. The Fire Department consists of 7 Districts, 24 Battalions, and 99 Engine Companies. The project study area and surrounding neighborhoods include 5 fire stations which are located in District 5. The fire stations and their locations are presented in Table 17.

Table 17: Fire Stations

Fire Station	Neighborhood	Address	City	State	Zip
Station E126	South Shore	7313 S Kingston Avenue	Chicago	IL	60649
Station E72	South Shore	7974 S South Chicago Avenue	Chicago	IL	60617
Station E63	Woodlawn/South Shore	1440 E 67th Street	Chicago	IL	60637
Station E47	Woodlawn/South Shore	432 E Marquette Road	Chicago	IL	60637
Station E60	Hyde Park	1150 E 55th Street	Chicago	IL	60615

3.2.5 Police

Police protection and law enforcement for the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods are provided by the Chicago Police Department. The project study area is located in Police District 3 and includes one police station, located in the Woodlawn neighborhood at 7040 S. Cottage Grove Avenue. In addition, the Chicago Park District's Department of Permit Enforcement works to ensure the safety and security of patrons, employees, and facilities in Chicago's parks. The University of Chicago Police also have a patrol range that stretches from Hyde Park in Woodlawn.

3.2.6 Parks and Public Spaces

In addition to Jackson Park, there are many additional parks, community spaces, gardens, and beaches in the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods. These parks and public spaces are listed in Table 18.

Table 18: Parks and Public Spaces

Park or Public Space	Neighborhood
71st and Crandon Organic Garden	South Shore
Arthur Ash Beach Park	South Shore
Chestnut Playground Park	South Shore
Don Nash Community Center	South Shore
Essex Playlot Park	South Shore
Hasan Playground Park	South Shore
Hodes Park	South Shore
Rainbow Beach	South Shore
Rosenblum Park	South Shore
South Shore Cultural Center Park	South Shore
Tranquil Garden	South Shore
Woodhull Park	South Shore
62nd Street Community Garden	Woodlawn
Arnita Young Boswell Park	Woodlawn
Beehive Park	Woodlawn
Brickyard Garden	Woodlawn
Flying Squirrel Playlot Park	Woodlawn
Harris Park	Woodlawn
Huckleberry Playlot Park	Woodlawn
Mamie Till-Mobely Park	Woodlawn
Moccasin Ranch Playlot Park	Woodlawn
No. 326 Playlot Park	Woodlawn
Prairie Wolf Playlot Park	Woodlawn
Vernon Park Gardens	Woodlawn
Jackson Park	Woodlawn/Hyde Park
Bessie Coleman Park	Hyde Park
Bixler Park	Hyde Park
Burnham Park	Hyde Park
Butternut Playlot Park	Hyde Park
Cornell Park	Hyde Park
Elm Park	Hyde Park
Florence Stout Park	Hyde Park
Harold Washington Park	Hyde Park
Midway Plaisance	Hyde Park
Nichols Park	Hyde Park
Promontory Point (part of Burnham Park)	Hyde Park
Spruce Park	Hyde Park
Sycamore Park	Hyde Park

The neighborhoods of Woodlawn, South Shore, and Hyde Park offer a number of public parks to promote an active lifestyle for all ages. The neighborhoods also include public spaces for community gathering and gardening (Vernon Park Gardens, Brickyard Garden, 62nd Street Community Garden, 71st and Crandon Organic Garden, and Nichols Park Community Garden). With the eastern portion of the neighborhoods bordering Lake Michigan, community residents also enjoy proximity to several public beaches, including Arthur Ashe Beach Park, Rainbow Beach, South Shore Cultural Center Park, 57th Street Beach (in Jackson Park), and 63rd Street Beach (also in Jackson Park).

3.2.7 Public Transportation

Public transportation in the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods is provided by the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) and Metra. CTA buses that operate within the project study area include Routes 2, N5, 6, 10, J14, 15, 26, 28, 55, 59, 63, and 67. Additionally, the CTA Green Line has two stops in Woodlawn. The Metra Electric train line also runs through the area, with three stations in Hyde Park, one in Woodlawn, and five in South Shore. A map of the public transportation facilities available in the project study area and surrounding neighborhoods is provided as Attachment I-6.

3.3 Community Organizations

3.3.1 South Shore Neighborhood

Although the South Shore neighborhood has historically been home to fewer community-based organizations than Hyde Park and Woodlawn, a number of organizations are active in the neighborhood, including the South Shore Chamber, South Shore Planning and Preservation Coalition, South Shore Cultural Center Advisory Council, Southeast Side Block Club Alliance, and the Southeast Chicago Chamber. These organizations work to support and strengthen the commercial corridors along South 71st and 79th Streets and to organize neighborhood watches and improve neighborhood cohesion. The South Shore Cultural Center brings area residents together around arts programming and serves as a neighborhood asset. The South Shore neighborhood also has several active block clubs.

3.3.2 Woodlawn Neighborhood

The Woodlawn neighborhood has a number of community-based organizations working within the area to stabilize existing housing and support new housing development, to organize and coordinate residents and other community stakeholders around common goals, and to address concerns of community safety, future growth, and gentrification.

Network of Woodlawn: The Network of Woodlawn is a community building organization that aims to address community needs. Its primary focus areas are economic and community development, safety, education, and health and human services. Woodlawn residents have identified these focus areas as the basic building blocks of a healthy community. Recently, Network of Woodlawn has coalesced around their 1Woodlawn initiative, a larger planning and community engagement effort focused on developing a comprehensive vision for community growth and vitality. This initiative began in 2015 and is expected to continue over the next several years.

Preservation of Affordable Housing (POAH) Chicago: POAH is a national nonprofit developer, which owns and operates affordable rental apartments in the Chicago area. The organization built and operates several affordable housing developments in the Woodlawn neighborhood and is engaged with the community to support public safety and youth education efforts, neighborhood recreation opportunities, public art, and community gardens and nutrition initiatives.

Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) Coalition: The Obama CBA Coalition is comprised of five active member organizations. The founding members of the Coalition are Kenwood Oakland Community Organization (KOCO) and Southside Together Organizing for Power (STOP). The other three active member organizations are Black Youth Project 100, UChicago for a CBA, and Westside Health Authority. The CBA Coalition also has over 20 ally member organizations, including the Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights.² The CBA Coalition formed in response to concerns about gentrification and displacement of low- and moderate-income households arising from the construction of the OPC.

3.3.3 Hyde Park Neighborhood

Hyde Park is a well-established neighborhood with a strong sense of identity and a large number of active community-based organizations. These organizations include the Coalition for Equitable Community Development focusing on business and community development; the East Hyde Park Committee, Hyde Park Cluster of Interfaith Open Communities, Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference, and South East Chicago Commission addressing larger community issues of safety, equity and vision; the Hyde Park Historical Society, promoting the neighborhood's architectural and historic character; as well as a number of locally-based advocacy and activist groups.

3.4 Land Use, Zoning, and Grants

3.4.1 South Shore Neighborhood

South Shore is a geographically large neighborhood on Chicago's south side. Bordered on the north by Jackson Park and the east by Lake Michigan, South Shore is composed primarily of residential apartments and single-family homes, with commercial uses along major corridors of East 71st, 75th and 79th Streets, as well as Stony Island and Exchange Avenues. Denser residential apartment buildings exist along the north and eastern extents of the neighborhood, adjacent to Jackson Park and the lake, with smaller enclaves of single-family homes interspersed throughout. The Jackson Park Highlands section of the neighborhood, between 67th and 71st Streets east of Jeffrey Avenue, is home to stately historic houses along tree-lined streets and is a Chicago Landmark District. The north and east sections of the neighborhood are served by Metra Electric commuter rail service. Future land use and zoning changes

² The other ally members are: Alliance of the Southeast, Brighton Park Neighborhood Council, Bronzeville Regional Collective, Chicago Jobs Council, Chicago Rehab Network, Chicago Teachers Union, Chicago Women in Trades, Community Renewal Society, Environment, Transportation, Health, and Open Space (ETHOS), Friends of the Parks, Indivisible Southside, Metropolitan Tenants Organization, Reparations at UChicago, Service Employees International Union Healthcare Illinois/Indiana, Showing up for Racial Justice—Chicago, South Side Chicago Democratic Socialists of America, Voorhees Center for Neighborhood and Community Improvement at UIC, Wolfpack, Woodlawn Baptist Church, and Woodlawn East Community And Neighbors.

appear limited, with new development opportunities being limited to infill on vacant residential lots, and potential reinvestment in neighborhood retail corridors if population and market forces stabilize within the area. Both 75th and 79th Streets have limited opportunities for new mixed-use and retail development on vacant lots along the corridors. See attached land use and zoning maps included as Attachment I-7a and I-7b.

Since 2016 the City of Chicago – through its Department of Planning and Development and then through a now-separate Department of Housing – has provided a total of \$493,000 in grants to South Shore neighborhood homeowners to repair and maintain their properties, assisted aspiring South Shore homeowners to purchase homes with \$173,000 in total grants, and supported renters through \$1.4 million in rental assistance to maintain housing affordability. The City has also invested \$2.3 million in Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds to develop 13 affordable housing units in South Shore.

More recently, the City selected South Shore as one of 10 neighborhoods for targeted public investment as part of the INVEST South/West initiative—a new initiative to bring more than \$750 million in public funding over the next three years to Chicago’s historically disinvested South and West sides. The public funding will support projects focused on restoring the vitality of key neighborhood commercial corridors, improving transportation, refreshing streetscapes, and building affordable housing. The goal of the initiative is to re-activate neighborhood cores that have historically served as focal points for pedestrian activity, shopping, services, transportation, public spaces, and quality-of-life amenities for local residents. INVEST South/West will leverage the City’s committed funding and planning efforts to attract additional investment by corporate and philanthropic sponsors.

3.4.2 Woodlawn Neighborhood

Woodlawn is a diverse neighborhood predominantly residential in character, but with concentrations of retail and denser uses along major streets, and university and institutional uses along its northern extent. Residential areas are composed primarily of multi-unit brick walk-ups with some single-family interspersed throughout; higher density apartment buildings exist along major thoroughfares and in the north and eastern extents of the neighborhood, close to the University of Chicago and Jackson Park. Commercial areas, where still intact, exhibit traditional neighborhood retail character, with storefronts defining the block and apartment units above. Woodlawn is bounded on the north and east by parks – Washington Park, the Midway Plaisance Park, and Jackson Park – and to the south by Oak Woods Cemetery. A substantial amount of vacant land exists along 63rd Street between Martin Luther King Drive and Woodlawn Avenue, with smaller vacant lots interspersed throughout the neighborhood. The City anticipates making zoning changes to accommodate development pressure along Stony Island Avenue. Along commercial corridors, redevelopment is likely to be larger in scale, with mixed-use development prioritized to re-establish the original street wall and provide neighborhood-serving amenities. See attached land use and zoning maps included as Attachment I-8a and I-8b.

Over the past 10 years, several community-driven plans have been developed for the Woodlawn neighborhood. The attached matrix of past plans and studies (Attachment I-8c) provides a breakdown of the various plans developed for Woodlawn and their common goals and objectives.

Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) Quality of Life Plan *Woodlawn: Rebuilding the Village* (LISC 2005): In 2005, the Chicago office of the LISC, a national community development support organization, was engaged by the neighborhood to develop a quality of life plan to address concerns around housing, commercial and retail opportunities, open space and recreational amenities, public safety, youth engagement, and local social service programming and support.

1Woodlawn: The 1Woodlawn initiative, launched in 2015 by the Network of Woodlawn, aims to develop a comprehensive strategy for managing growth, development, and community needs within the neighborhood. 1Woodlawn has engaged several local planning firms to survey existing conditions both in land use and in development and community demographics (Gensler 2016), undertake a robust community engagement agenda (SOM 2017), and explore ways of organizing existing efforts and stakeholders around areas of mutual concern (AECOM 2014). Network of Woodlawn, through this 1Woodlawn initiative, aims to articulate a bold vision for future growth and development within the neighborhood.

Other Studies: The City of Chicago, the Cook County Land Bank Authority, and Network of Woodlawn have commissioned studies that provide land use guidance for future development in the neighborhood. The City of Chicago commissioned two studies (AECOM 2014; Goodman Williams Group, Gingko, and CR&M Commercial Realty 2015) for the 63rd Street corridor, primarily focusing on opportunities for transit-oriented and open space development. The Cook County Land Bank Authority commissioned a study aimed at redevelopment of a former bank building it owns at the southwest corner of 63rd Street and Cottage Grove Avenue. Both of these undertakings provide recommendations for redeveloping commercial property along the corridor in a way that promotes mixed-use and mixed-income development. In 2018, the Network of Woodlawn published a study that measures the risk of gentrification and displacement in the neighborhood and puts forth recommendations for mitigating these effects (Smith, Lane, and Butler 2018).

Since the late 1960s, Woodlawn has experienced considerable disinvestment and continues to be challenged by higher rates of residential and commercial vacancy than other Chicago neighborhoods. As of 2017, an estimated 2,987 housing units in Woodlawn – or 22.2 percent of all housing units – were vacant, and substantial stretches of former traditional neighborhood retail along 63rd Street and Cottage Grove Avenues were demolished in the 1980s due to vacancy and abandonment. Since 2016, however, development pressures along the lakefront and from Hyde Park and the University of Chicago directly to the north, have spurred investment in Woodlawn, particularly in the neighborhood’s housing stock. While the 2008 economic downturn slowed investment some, in the past 2 years alone, 570 units of market-rate, mixed-income, and affordable housing have been developed in Woodlawn, totaling more than \$112 million in investment. In addition, since 2016 the City of Chicago has provided grant funds to neighborhood homeowners to repair and maintain their properties (\$540,000 in grant funds awarded), assisted aspiring homeowners to purchase homes (\$220,000 awarded), and supported renters through rental assistance to maintain housing affordability (\$547,000 in rental assistance provided).

Over the course of 2019 and into 2020, the Department of Planning and Development developed the *Woodlawn Plan Consolidation Report*, which encapsulates nearly 20 years of planning in Woodlawn (City of Chicago Planning Department 2020). Since LISC Chicago published its “Rebuilding the Neighborhood”

plan in 2005, there have been more than a dozen plans and studies developed for the Woodlawn community by the City of Chicago, nonprofit organizations, neighborhood groups, and others. Consolidating these predominantly community-driven plans into one report provides a roadmap for City officials to work alongside community groups with a vested interest to ensure that future development decisions prioritize sustainable, long-term growth and the needs of the Woodlawn community area. The Woodlawn Plan Consolidation Report (1) identifies where past plans and studies align around common goals, (2) provides an analysis of existing conditions and future trends, and (3) articulates a set of strategies that the City can pursue to achieve some of the goals identified in past plans and studies.

The Woodlawn Plan Consolidation Report is anticipated to be adopted by Chicago Plan Commission in spring 2020, and community engagement work will commence thereafter. Primary work will be related to a community process around the redevelopment of city-owned vacant land and two decommissioned Chicago Public Schools buildings in the Woodlawn neighborhood west of the Metra tracks.

3.4.3 Hyde Park Neighborhood

Hyde Park is a predominantly residential neighborhood hemmed in on three sides by parkland and Lake Michigan: Washington Park to the west, Midway Plaisance Park to the south, Jackson Park and Lake Michigan to the east, and Kenwood to the north. The neighborhood is composed of smaller apartment buildings, brick walk-ups and courtyard apartments, with single-family residential interspersed. The neighborhood is home to many buildings that are of architectural and historical significance. The University of Chicago dominates the south and southwest portion of the neighborhood. Commercial nodes exist on 51st and 53rd Streets and along Lake Park Avenue. Virtually no vacant land exists within the neighborhood boundaries, and future land use and zoning changes are therefore very limited and likely to be influenced by future needs of the University of Chicago. See attached land use and zoning maps included as Attachment I-9a and I-9b.

4.0 Impact Analysis

This impact analysis evaluates the socio-economic effects of Alternative A (No Action Alternative), Alternative B, and Alternative C, which are described in more detail in the EA.

Potential impacts can be direct, indirect, or cumulative. Direct impacts occur as a result of the proposed action, at the same time and place of implementation. Indirect impacts occur as a result of the proposed action, but later in time or farther in distance from the action. Cumulative impacts result from the “incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (federal or nonfederal) or person undertakes such other actions” (40 CFR 1508.7).

The cumulative impacts analysis would assess the synergistic effect of combining the impacts of the Federal Actions, any indirect impacts following the Federal Actions, and the impacts of the past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions that are unrelated to the Federal Actions. Section 5.2.1 of the EA considered certain other projects in, or adjacent to Jackson Park, unrelated to the OPC project track and

field relocation and roadway improvements, but potentially having impacts to the same resources. None of those projects were considered to have impacts to socioeconomic resources.

4.1 Alternative A: No Action

Alternative A assumes that there is no UPARR boundary conversion, the OPC is not constructed, and no roads are closed.

4.1.1 Direct Impacts

There would be no social and economic impacts under Alternative A, because the proposed actions would not occur.

4.1.2 Indirect Impacts of City Actions

As noted in the direct impacts section above, there would be no change to existing social and economic issues; therefore, there would be no indirect impacts to social and economic issues under Alternative A.

4.1.3 Cumulative Impacts

Other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects in Jackson Park, unrelated to the OPC project, would have negligible impacts on the social and economic environment as a whole. Alternative A would not contribute to any cumulative impacts because no Federal action would occur under this alternative.

4.1.4 Mitigation

There would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts associated with Alternative A; therefore, mitigation is not considered.

4.1.5 Environmental Justice

There are no disproportionate or negative impacts to the low-income and minority communities in the project study area associated with Alternative A.

4.2 Alternative B: NPS Action (FHWA No Build)

Alternative B includes National Park Service (NPS) approval of the partial conversion of recreation due to the construction of the OPC and replacement of recreation opportunities on the Midway Plaisance.

4.2.1 Direct Impacts

The NPS's approval of the partial conversion of recreation in Jackson Park under Urban Park and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) does not authorize construction of the OPC. NPS's approval of the proposed action does affect the Midway Plaisance, because conversion approval assumes the City of Chicago makes improvements to the replacement site. The proposed development of recreation opportunities on the Midway Plaisance would have minimal direct socioeconomic impacts on the local community. Temporary impacts would include a slight increase in short-term employment arising from the construction activity

at the proposed replacement recreation site. No impacts are expected to the population level or composition as a result of the action. Likewise, housing is not anticipated to be affected. Public space impacts are expected to be positive and limited to the change in recreation use at the east end of the Midway Plaisance site, improving the recreational amenities of the area. The proposed NPS action would not physically change existing conditions, nor would it geographically divide or isolate the residents or businesses within South Shore, Woodlawn, or Hyde Park. The proposed NPS action would not impact community cohesion.

4.2.2 Indirect Impacts of City Actions

The indirect impacts are primarily related to the development of the OPC in Jackson Park. These OPC-related indirect impacts will be discussed in detail. The evaluation of the overall economic impact, including direct, indirect, and induced effects, of the construction and operation of the OPC and the ongoing operations of The Obama Foundation was adopted from an analysis commissioned by The Chicago Community Trust.³

4.2.2.1 Methodology for Economic Impact Analysis of OPC

The *Economic Impact Assessment* (Deloitte Consulting LLP 2016) was completed using the IMPLAN Group's IMPLAN accounting software and state data files. The USDA Forest Service, working with the University of Minnesota, originally developed the IMPLAN model in 1976 to support the analysis of socioeconomic impacts as required by the National Forest Management Act. In 1988, the IMPLAN model was made available to non-Forest Service users. Use of the model has expanded over the years, and it is now widely used by economists as a tool to understand the extremely complex interactions among the various parts of an economy. IMPLAN's regional and national input-output models have been used for years. The data files are compiled from a wide variety of sources including the US Bureau of Economic Analysis, the US Bureau of Labor, and the US Census Bureau. The model is based on a national input-output dollar flow table called the Social Accounting Matrix (SAM), which measures the purchasing relationships between industry and household sectors and between government, industry, and household sectors. IMPLAN's economic multipliers capture the influence of a project's construction, its operation, and the subsequent rounds of economic activity. The use of the IMPLAN model allows the economic impacts associated with the construction and operation of the OPC to be evaluated objectively using a standardized approach based on reliable data and methodology developed by economists over time.

IMPLAN provides three measures of local economic impact:

³ The Chicago Community Trust is a community foundation dedicated to improving the region through strategic grant making, civic engagement and inspiring philanthropy (The Chicago Community Trust 2020; The Chicago Community Trust 2019). The Trust works in partnership with numerous Chicago entities and initiatives to improve Chicago for the community. Its current strategic focus is the racial and ethnic wealth gap. The Trust is a public charity and the largest community foundation in the Chicago region, with \$3.2 billion in assets. . . The Community Trust commissioned Deloitte Consulting LLP to evaluate the impacts of the OPC. Deloitte published its analysis in a report titled *Economic Impact Assessment* (Deloitte Consulting LLP 2016).

- **Employment:** Employment reflects changes in employment attributable to the development of a project. IMPLAN jobs estimates are measured in twelve-month periods but include both full- and part-time employment (IMPLAN Group 2020).⁴
- **Income:** Income includes the total increase in payroll for industries supported by the project, including wages and salaries of workers, self-employed individuals, and income received by private business owners.
- **Output:** Output measures economic activity: the total increase in production for industries supported by the project, interpreted as the total increase in sales value or gross local product that is realized by a study region.

IMPLAN results, in terms of employment, income, and output, are provided across three categories:

- **Direct Impacts:** Direct impacts include the direct employment, construction spending, infrastructure improvements, property taxes payments, and other spending that occur during the development, construction, and operation of a project.
- **Indirect Impacts:** Indirect impacts include business-to-business purchases arising from local spending on goods and services.
- **Induced Impacts:** Induced impacts encompass the jobs and economic impacts that arise from the expenditures of household income generated by the direct and indirect impacts (spending by workers in the first two categories).

Together, the above impacts form the total economic impacts calculated by IMPLAN. Impacts were calculated for the following study regions: State of Illinois, Cook County, and Chicago's South Side.

The economic impact study analyzed the economic impacts from the OPC construction and future operations for four components: construction, operations, programming, and visitor expenditures. Study results are provided as follows:

- construction phase—construction and start-up;⁵
- operations phase—operations, programming, and visitor spending (based on 760,000 visitors per year); and
- visitor spending—scenarios based on 625,000 and 760,000 visitors per year.

The study also evaluated the potential state and local fiscal impacts associated with the construction and operations of the OPC on the State of Illinois and local governments.

Model Assumptions

As with any economic impact modeling efforts, the results depend on various assumptions and, as such, have limitations that should be considered. The economic analysis of the OPC was completed in October 2016, based on preliminary budgets provided by the Obama Foundation. The study for the OPC notes that

⁴ A job lasting 3 months would be reported as 0.25 jobs.

⁵ The start-up period includes an anticipated six-year period during which administrative activities occur in advance of the operation of the OPC. The construction period is expected to overlap somewhat with the start-up period.

the estimates are also subject to changes in “economic and business conditions, demographic and technology changes, existing and future government regulations and tax policies, the ability and resources of the project, and other relevant factors” (Obama 2016). The economic impact study assumes construction would occur between 2018 and 2021, with the first full year of operations in 2022. With the construction occurring later than originally estimated, shifting economic conditions between 2014⁶ and the OPC’s actual construction timeline have the potential to affect the realized impacts. However, the IMPLAN multipliers experience only small shifts over time. As a result, if the modeling were completed with updated figures, any changes are expected to be insignificant. Therefore, the results of the economic impact analysis continue to be accurate and reliable.

The majority of information related to the OPC’s construction, operations, programming, and visitor expenditures was derived from the Obama Foundation staff, presidential centers, comparable institutions, third party data providers, and Deloitte analyses and estimates. Construction costs were developed from the Obama Foundation’s preliminary budget and schedule. Costs during the construction and start-up phase are assumed to be mostly net new to Cook County and the State of Illinois. In forecasting the impact for each study region, only the estimated spending that would be expected to occur in the study region was considered. The analysis for Chicago’s South Side addresses start-up costs only.

Impacts also include spending by visitors to the OPC during the operations phase. Visitors are defined as those who go to the OPC and purchase tickets to the museum. The study estimated the range of annual visitors to be between 625,000 and 760,000, as described in Section 4.2.2.2. The economic impact study assumes 760,000 visitors annually when addressing impacts during the operations phase (Obama 2016). Estimated visitor expenditures were developed from third-party data providers and considered both onsite and offsite expenditures. Onsite spending includes expenditures for tickets, gift shop items, and food and beverage purchases. Offsite spending includes travel costs, such as lodging and transportation, as well as additional food and beverage purchases and retail spending.

Operation-related impacts were evaluated for each of the three study regions. Operations includes both payroll expenses for employees and non-payroll expenses. These expenses begin during the start-up period, which is modeled with construction, and continue through the annual operations of the OPC. Estimates of staffing needs were derived from public reports and other presidential centers. Non-payroll expenses were estimated by the Obama Foundation and benchmarked against other presidential centers, adjusting for the differences in the use and size of facilities. Total headcount figures for OPC employees were entered into the IMPLAN model, which then identified the appropriate income levels in the calculations of economic impacts.

⁶ The IMPLAN model used in 2016 to estimate the impact of the OPC relied on 2014 economic data, as data lags by a full calendar year.

4.2.2.2 Impacts from OPC Construction and Start-up

Total Expenditures

As part of the study, an analysis of expected construction and start-up expenditures was done. The expenditures are assumed to be mostly net new⁷ to Cook County and the State of Illinois. For each study region, assumptions were made to estimate the level of spending expected to occur. Total costs are projected to be approximately \$402.0 million. Of this total, 82 percent (\$328.5 million) is anticipated to be spent within Illinois. Sixty-four percent (\$258.1 million) is expected to be spent within Cook County. Table 19 below summarizes construction spending.

Table 19: Estimated Total Construction Expenditures

Category	Total	Illinois	Cook County
Construction (hard costs) ¹	\$291,386,361	88%	66%
Services (soft costs)	\$ 41,290,903	54%	49%
Other (including contingency)	\$ 69,278,589	74%	67%
Total Costs	\$401,955,853	82%	64%

Source: Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016

¹Hard costs can be broken down into 50 percent labor and 50 percent materials/spend. The labor portion is projected to be 100 percent within Cook County.

Expected labor requirements during the OPC's anticipated six-year start-up activities were also evaluated. Although the timeline has been extended, the labor requirements provide a baseline level of anticipated economic activity. As shown below in Table 20, an estimated 1,528 12-month jobs would be created during the OPC's start-up. Ninety percent of these jobs (1,375 jobs) are expected to be in Illinois, with 1,224 jobs in Cook County. The South Side would anticipate seeing 657 jobs generated during the OPC's startup.

Table 20: Estimated Jobs Creation during the Obama Presidential Center's Six-year Startup Phase

Category	12-month Jobs	Percentage
State of Illinois	1,375	90%
Cook County	1,224	80%
South Side	657	43%
Start-up Labor (includes out of state jobs)	1,528	100%

Source: Calculated from Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016.

The mix of residents employed during the OPC's construction would ultimately depend on the number and qualifications of job applicants from the project study area. However, the OPC's construction manager (Lakeside Alliance [LA]) has committed to ensuring that at least 50 percent of the worker hours during construction are performed by City of Chicago residents. Additionally, the construction manager has opened a South Side Resource Center to promote job opportunities associated with the OPC construction. Apprenticeship training programs are also planned for the Woodlawn and South Shore neighborhoods, among others (The Obama Foundation 2018).

⁷ Net new expenditures represent spending that would not have occurred in the area without the OPC.

Non-labor expenses budgeted for the OPC's start-up efforts were also evaluated. These non-labor expenses are expected to be approximately \$69.2 million. Non-labor expenses include the following cost categories: National Archives and Records Administration facility expenses⁸, corporate and administrative, public engagement, communications, digital, development, and contingency/miscellaneous. Eighty percent (\$55.0 million) of the expenses are anticipated to be spent in the State of Illinois. Cook County is forecast to receive 70 percent (\$48.4 million) in spending, with the South Side receiving 34 percent (\$23.4 million). Table 21 summarizes the anticipated non-labor expenditures by geography.

Table 21: Estimated Non-Labor Expenses during the Obama Presidential Center's Six-year Startup Phase

Category	Expenditures	Percentage
State of Illinois	\$55,053,321	80%
Cook County	\$48,429,492	70%
South Side	\$23,401,871	34%
Start-up Labor (includes out of state jobs)	\$69,166,475	100%

Source: Calculated from Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016

Effects on the State of Illinois

Within the State of Illinois, the direct impacts of the OPC include 2,017 jobs, which would provide income of \$123.9 million. Output⁹ associated with the direct expenditures of the OPC is expected to total \$305.5 million. Indirect effects, reflecting business to business spending, are projected to generate 673 jobs and \$41.1 million in income in Illinois during the OPC's construction. These effects are also anticipated to contribute \$115.9 million in output to the state's economy. Induced effects from household spending are expected to generate an additional 992 jobs, income of \$49.6 million, and output of \$148.2 million to Illinois' economy during the OPC's construction phase.

In total, 3,682 jobs, with an associated total income of \$214.6 million, are forecast to be created in Illinois through the construction of the OPC. Additionally, \$569.6 million in output is expected to be added to the state's economy. The results of the IMPLAN analysis of economic impacts to the State of Illinois during the OPC's construction are shown in Table 22 below.

⁸ National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) activities were anticipated to be located in the Chicago suburbs and then on-site at the time of the 2016 study; however, current plans do not call for material NARA activities on-site.

⁹ Output includes employment compensation, other proprietary income, other property type income, intermediate expenditures, and taxes.

Table 22: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Construction Only, State of Illinois

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$)*
Direct Effect	2,017	\$123.9 million	\$305.5 million
Indirect Effect	673	\$41.1 million	\$115.9 million
Induced Effect	992	\$49.6 million	\$148.2 million
Total Effects	3,682	\$214.6 million	\$569.6 million

Source: Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016

*Output includes employment compensation, other proprietary income, other property type income, intermediate expenditures, and taxes.

The economic impact analysis evaluated the labor and expenditures associated with the OPC's start-up activities (see Table 20 and Table 21). Total employment impacts during the construction and start-up phase are anticipated to include roughly 6,500 full- and part-time jobs within the State of Illinois. Combined direct, indirect, and induced impacts to income during the construction and start-up phase are projected to be \$356 million statewide. Statewide, output impacts are modeled to be \$883 million. Table 23 summarizes the forecasted impacts to the economy of the State of Illinois during the OPC's construction and start-up phases.

Table 23: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Construction and Start-up Phases, State of Illinois

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$)
Total Impacts	6,493	\$356 million	\$883 million

Source: (Obama 2016)

*Excludes construction costs

Effects on Cook County's Local Economy

In Cook County, the direct impacts of the OPC's construction include 1,569 jobs which would provide income of \$109.8 million. Output associated with the direct expenditures of the OPC are expected to total \$242.8 million. Indirect effects from business to business spending are projected to generate 439 jobs and \$29.5 million in income in Cook County during the OPC's construction. These effects are also anticipated to contribute \$72.7 million in output to the county's economy. Induced effects, which arise from household spending, are expected to generate an additional 675 jobs, income of \$35.9 million, and output of \$100.0 million to Cook County's economy during the OPC's construction phase.

In total, 2,683 jobs, with an associated total income of \$175.3 million, are forecasted to be created in Cook County through the construction of the OPC. Additionally, \$415.0 million in output is expected to be added to the county's economy. The results of the IMPLAN analysis of economic impacts to Cook County during the OPC's construction are shown in Table 24 below.

Table 24: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Construction Only, Cook County

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$)
Direct Effect	1,569	\$109.8 million	\$242.8 million
Indirect Effect	439	\$29.5 million	\$72.7 million
Induced Effect	675	\$35.9 million	\$100.0 million
Total Impacts	2,683	\$175.3 million	\$415.0 million

Source: (Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016)

As part of the economic impact analysis the direct, indirect, and induced economic impacts associated with the OPC's construction and start-up phases were also estimated for Cook County, Illinois. These impacts are presented below in Table 25.

Table 25: Estimated Direct, Indirect, and Induced Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Construction and Start-up Phases, Cook County

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$)
Direct Impacts	3,059	\$186 million	\$378 million
Indirect Impacts	749	\$49 million	\$129 million
Induced Impacts	1,137	\$60 million	\$168 million
Total Impacts	4,945	\$295 million	\$675 million

Source: Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016

Note: Figures may not sum to total shown because of rounding.

Countywide, the OPC is expected to generate 3,059 direct jobs during the Center's construction and start-up. Jobs are measured in twelve-month periods,¹⁰ but include both full- and part-time employment. Income associated with those jobs is estimated to be \$186 million, with output totaling \$378 million.

Indirect impacts, those that arise from business-to-business spending, are expected to generate 749 full- and part-time jobs in Cook County during the construction and start-up phase. Income associated with these jobs is forecast to be \$49 million. Output, which would contribute to Cook County's gross local product, is anticipated to be \$129 million.

Induced effects measure the additional economic activity that arises from household spending associated with direct and indirect impacts. The induced impacts on Cook County from construction and start-up are anticipated to include 1,137 full- and part-time jobs, \$60 million in income, and \$168 million in output.

As shown above, the OPC's construction and start-up phases are expected to support nearly 5,000 full- and part-time jobs within Cook County, as the result of direct, indirect, and induced impacts. Total impacts to income during the construction and start-up phase are projected to be an increase of \$295 million statewide. Countywide, the total economic impact associated with output is anticipated to be an increase of approximately \$675 million.

¹⁰ A job lasting 3 months would be reported as 0.25 jobs.

Effects on the South Side of Chicago

The economic impact analysis evaluated the expected impacts of the start-up costs of the OPC on the South Side of Chicago.¹¹ Construction costs were not evaluated for the South Side because of limitation in data availability. During the start-up phase, the OPC is expected to generate a total employment impact of 1,407 jobs in Chicago's South Side. These jobs would come from direct employment by the OPC and Obama Foundation, as well as indirect (business to business spending) and induced (household spending) impacts. Income associated with the projected jobs is forecast to total \$86 million. The economic activity associated with the OPC's start-up activities is anticipated to generate a total output of \$339 million in the South Side. Table 26 below summarizes the estimated total impacts to the South Side associated with the OPC's start-up phase. There may be some adverse impacts from additional fuel consumption and lost productivity associated with traffic delays under Alternative B.

Table 26: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Start-up Only, South Side of Chicago

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$)
Total Impacts ¹	1,407	\$86 million	\$339 million

Source: (Obama 2016)

¹Excludes construction costs

4.2.2.3 Impacts from OPC Operations

Operational Expenditures

In evaluating the potential economic impacts during the operations of the OPC, the Deloitte economic impact study included the effects of three components: operations, programming, and visitor spending. Non-payroll jobs include contracted workers. As shown in Table 27, a total of 195 jobs are anticipated to be directly created by the OPC during annual operations. The majority (90 percent) of these jobs would be in Illinois, with 80 percent in Cook County. Of the total jobs, 85 (43 percent) are anticipated to be filled by South Side residents.

Table 27: Estimated Annual Labor during the Obama Presidential Center's Operational Phase

Category	Payroll Jobs	Non-payroll Jobs¹	Total Jobs	Percentage
State of Illinois	146	31	177	90%
Cook County	130	27	157	80%
South Side	70	15	85	43%
Total Labor	162	34	195	100%

Source: Calculated from Deloitte Development, LLC 2016. ¹An additional \$250,000 annually is forecast for legal fees.

Obama Foundation non-labor expenditures during the operational phase of the OPC are expected to total \$18.6 million annually. Of this total, an estimated \$11.9 million (64 percent) in expenditures are forecast to occur in the State of Illinois, with \$10.5 million (56 percent) occurring in Cook County (see Table 28).

¹¹ Construction-related expenditures were not evaluated for the South Side because of limitation in data availability. The full impact of the OPC's start-up and construction phase would exceed the impacts shown in Table 26, which include only impacts from the OPC's start-up.

Approximately 28 percent (\$5.2 million) of operational, non-labor spending is expected to occur in the South Side.

Table 28: Estimated Annual Non-Labor Expenditures during the Obama Presidential Center's Operational Phase

Category	Non-labor Expenditures (2016\$)	Percentage
State of Illinois	\$11,896,967	64%
Cook County	\$10,460,207	56%
South Side	\$ 5,176,795	28%
Total Expenditures	\$18,630,679	100%

Source: Calculated from Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016.

Expected revenue generated from the restaurant/café, gift shop, and private event space was also included in the IMPLAN modeling. Revenues were calculated based on industry benchmarks, comparable presidential center revenues, and local comparable revenues per square footage. To avoid double counting, restaurant/café and gift shop expenditures were included in IMPLAN inputs for operations as revenue.

Visitor Attendance and Spending

As part of the economic impact analysis, Deloitte evaluated two projections of the total number of visitors. The upper bound estimate was calculated using the capacity constraint of the OPC and the visitor time and an adjusted utilization rate of the space of comparable presidential centers. Based on this approach, the upper bound was found to be 760,000 visitors per year. The lower bound was calculated using estimates from other presidential centers, after adjusting for population, tourism market, and other differences between sites. This approach resulted in an estimate of 625,000 visitors per year to the OPC. The study notes that these estimates represent the steady state, or long-run average, of the OPC. Visitor numbers are expected to be higher in the first years of operation. (Obama 2016).

Visitor spending levels and averages were developed using comparable data from other presidential centers, Deloitte estimates, and Choose Chicago® survey data ("About Choose Chicago"). As shown in Table 29, the economic impact study estimates total annual spending to be between \$138.7 million and \$167.8 million. Approximately 50 percent of this spending (\$63.7 million to \$83.4 million) would be net new spending¹² to the South Side. This represents spending that would not have otherwise taken place in the South Side without the presence of the OPC. Net new spending in Cook County is expected to be approximately 40 percent of total spending (\$55.6 million to \$67.2 million). Net new spending is higher in the South Side than in Cook County or Illinois as a whole because a portion of the spending that is new to the South Side would have otherwise occurred within the broader county or state area.

¹² Net new spending represents spending that would not have occurred in the area without the OPC.

Table 29: Estimated Annual Labor during the Obama Presidential Center's Operational Phase

Case Scenario	Total Visitors	Total Spending	Net New Spending: South Side (Average 50%)	Net New Spending: Cook County (Average 40%)	Net New Spending: State of Illinois (Average 39%)
Upper Bound	760,000	\$167,755,054	\$83,351,379	\$67,155,357	\$64,962,867
Lower Bound	625,000	\$138,711,136	\$63,695,820	\$55,549,966	\$53,722,348
Average	692,500	\$153,233,095	\$73,523,600	\$61,352,662	\$59,342,608

Source: Calculated from Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016.

Effects on the State of Illinois

As with construction and start-up, Deloitte evaluated total statewide impacts during the operations phase of the future OPC. The estimates were calculated using the upper bound of visitor spending, considered the most likely, presented above.

Statewide, annual employment associated with the direct, indirect, and induced impacts of the OPC's operation, programming, and visitor attendance is expected to reach 2,774 full- and part-time employees. Income impacts are forecast to total \$105 million within the State of Illinois. Total annual output statewide is anticipated to be \$266 million.

The results of the IMPLAN analysis of the economic impacts on the State of Illinois are shown below in Table 30.

Table 30: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Operation Phase, State of Illinois

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$)
Total Impacts	2,774	\$105 million	\$266 million

Source: Obama 2016

Note: Totals include impacts from OPC operations and programming, as well as onsite and offsite visitor spending.

The total economic impact to the State of Illinois from the OPC's construction and start-up through the first 10 years of operations is estimated to total \$3.5 billion in output. Of this total, \$883 million in direct, indirect, and induced output is expected during the construction and start-up phase, with \$2.66 billion in output during the initial 10 years of operation. These totals include impacts from operations, programming, and visitor attendance.

As part of the economic impact study, Deloitte modeled the direct, indirect, and induced impacts associated with visitor attendance using IMPLAN. Impacts were evaluated for both the upper and lower bounds of visitor attendance. Within the State of Illinois, the direct impacts of the visitor attendance are forecast to generate between 872 and 1,049 jobs, which would provide income of \$24.3 million to \$29.3 million. Output associated with visitor attendance to the OPC is expected to total \$49.0 million to \$59.4 million.

Indirect effects associated with visitor attendance, which include business to business spending, are projected to generate 111 to 134 jobs in Illinois. These jobs are anticipated to provide \$6.8 million to \$8.2

million in income. Indirect effects are expected to contribute an additional \$19.8 million to \$24.0 million in output to the state's economy.

Induced effects from household spending are expected to generate an additional 187 to 226 jobs. State residents are anticipated to earn \$9.4 million to \$11.3 million in income as the result of the induced effects associated with visitor attendance at the OPC. Within the State of Illinois, output attributable to the OPC's visitor attendance is forecast to be \$28.0 million to \$33.7 million.

In total, 1,169 to 1,409 jobs, with an associated total income of \$40.4 million to \$48.8 million, are forecast to be created in Illinois through the visitor attendance at OPC. Additionally, \$96.8 million to \$117.1 million in output is expected to be added to the state's economy. The results of the IMPLAN analysis of economic impacts to the State of Illinois OPC visitor attendance are shown in Table 31 below.

Table 31: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Visitor Attendance, State of Illinois

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Labor Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$) ¹
Direct Effect	872 to 1,049	\$24.3 million to \$29.3 million	\$49.0 million to \$59.4 million
Indirect Effect	111 to 134	\$6.8 million to \$8.2 million	\$19.8 million to \$24.0 million
Induced Effect	187 to 226	\$9.4 million to \$11.3 million	\$28.0 million to \$33.7 million
Total Effect	1,169 to 1,409	\$40.4 million to \$48.8 million	\$96.8 million to \$117.1 million

Source: Calculated from Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016.

¹Output includes employment compensation, other proprietary income, other property type income, intermediate expenditures, and taxes.

Effects on Cook County's Local Economy

The economic impact study estimated the direct, indirect, and induced economic impacts associated with the OPC's operations, programming, and visitor attendance for Cook County, Illinois. The direct impacts associated with the OPC's operation phase include 1,849 full- and part-time jobs in Cook County. It is estimated that these jobs would support \$64 million in income. The OPC's operations would contribute \$135 million in total direct output to Cook County.

Indirect impacts from business-to-business spending are expected to generate 286 full- and part-time jobs in Cook County from the OPC's operations. Income associated with these jobs is forecast to be \$19 million. Output associated with indirect impacts would contribute an estimated \$52 million to Cook County's gross local product. Induced impacts (from household spending) associated with the OPC's operations are anticipated to include 401 jobs, \$21 million in income, and \$59 million in output.

The OPC's operations phase is expected to support 2,536 full- and part-time jobs annually within Cook County, as the result of direct, indirect, and induced impacts. Total impacts to income during the operations phase are projected to total \$104 million. In Cook County, the total economic impact associated with output is anticipated to be approximately \$246 million.

Table 32 summarizes the direct, indirect, and induced impacts associated with the operation of the OPC. These impacts include operations, programming, and visitor attendance.

Table 32: Estimated Direct, Indirect, and Induced Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Operation Phase, Cook County

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$)
Direct Impacts	1,849	\$ 64 million	\$135 million
Indirect Impacts	286	\$ 19 million	\$ 52 million
Induced Impacts	401	\$ 21 million	\$ 59 million
Total Impacts	2,536	\$104 million	\$246 million

Source: Obama 2016

Note: Totals include impacts from OPC operations and programming, as well as onsite and offsite visitor spending.

The total economic impact to Cook County from the OPC's construction and start-up through the first 10 years of operations to total \$3.14 billion in output. Of this total, \$675 million in direct, indirect, and induced output is expected during the construction and start-up phase, with \$2.46 billion in output during the initial 10 years of operation (Obama 2016). Operational impacts arise from the OPC's operations, programming, and visitor attendance.

Within the Cook County, the direct impacts of attendance at the upper bound are forecast to include between 836 and 1,006 jobs which would provide income of \$27.1 million to \$32.6 million. Output¹³ associated with visitor attendance is expected to total \$50.6 million to \$61.4 million.

Indirect effects, which include business to business spending, are projected to generate 98 to 119 jobs in Cook County from visitor attendance to the OPC. These jobs are anticipated to provide \$6.7 million to \$8.1 million in income. Indirect effects are also expected to contribute \$18.1 million to \$21.9 million in output to the county's economy.

Induced effects from household spending are expected to generate an additional 163 to 197 jobs. County residents are anticipated to earn \$8.7 million to \$10.5 million income as the result of the induced effects associated with visitor attendance at the OPC. Within Cook County, output attributable to attendance is forecast to be \$24.1 million to \$29.0 million.

In total, 1,097 to 1,322 jobs, with an associated total income of \$42.4 million to \$51.3 million, are forecast to be created in Cook County through the visitor attendance at the OPC. Additionally, \$92.8 million to \$112.3 million in output is expected to be added to the county's economy. The results of the IMPLAN analysis of economic impacts to Cook County during the OPC's construction are shown in Table 33 below.

¹³ Output includes employment compensation, other proprietary income, other property type income, intermediate expenditures, and taxes.

Table 33: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Visitor Attendance, Cook County

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Labor Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$) ¹
Direct Effect	836 to 1,006	\$27.1 million to \$32.6 million	\$50.6 million to \$61.4 million
Indirect Effect	98 to 119	\$6.7 million to \$8.1 million	\$18.1 million to \$21.9 million
Induced Effect	163 to 197	\$8.7 million to \$10.5 million	\$24.1 million to \$29.0 million
Total Effect	1,097 to 1,322	\$42.4 million to \$51.3 million	\$92.8 million to \$112.3 million

Source: Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016

¹Output includes employment compensation, other proprietary income, other property type income, intermediate expenditures, and taxes.

Effects on the South Side of Chicago

During the annual operation of the OPC, the South Side is expected to gain a total of 2,175 jobs annually as the result of direct, indirect, and induced impacts arising from the OPC's operations, programming, and visitor attendance. These South Side jobs are expected to generate \$81 million in income annually. South Side output impacts from the OPC annual operations are modeled to be \$177 million. The results of the IMPLAN analyses are shown in Table 34.

Table 34: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Operation Phase, South Side of Chicago

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$)
Total Impacts	2,175	\$81 million	\$177 million

Source: Obama 2016

Note: Totals include impacts from OPC operations and programming, as well as onsite and offsite visitor spending.

The total economic impact from the OPC's construction and start-up through the first 10 years of operations is estimated to total \$2.1 billion in output in the South Side of Chicago. Of this total, \$339 million in direct, indirect, and induced output is expected during the construction and start-up phase, with \$1.77 billion in output during the initial 10 years of operation.

Within the South Side, the direct impacts of attendance at the upper bound to the OPC are forecast to include between 1,093 and 1,313 jobs which would provide income of \$33.2 million to \$39.9 million. Output¹⁴ associated with visitor attendance is expected to total \$56.6 million to \$68.4 million.

Indirect effects associated with visitor attendance are projected to generate 82 to 100 jobs in the South Side. These jobs are anticipated to provide \$5.5 million to \$6.7 million in income. Indirect effects are also expected to contribute \$15.1 million to \$18.3 million in output to the South Side's economy.

Induced effects from visitor attendance are expected to generate an additional 159 to 192 jobs. South Side residents are anticipated to earn \$8.2 million to \$9.8 million in income as the result of the induced

¹⁴ Output includes employment compensation, other proprietary income, other property type income, intermediate expenditures, and taxes.

effects. Within the South Side, output attributable to visitor attendance at the OPC is forecast to be \$23.5 million to \$28.3 million.

In total, 1,335 to 1,604 jobs, with an associated total income of \$46.9 million to \$56.5 million, are forecast to be created in the South Side from the OPC's visitor attendance. Additionally, \$95.2 million to \$114.9 million in output is expected to be added to the area's economy. The results of the IMPLAN analysis of economic impacts to the South Side from visitor attendance at the OPC are shown in Table 35 below.

Table 35: Estimated Total Impacts from Obama Presidential Center Visitor Attendance, South Side of Chicago

Impact Type	Employment (Full- and Part-time Jobs)	Labor Income (2016\$)	Output (2016\$) ¹
Direct Effect	1,093 to 1,313	\$33.2 million to \$39.9 million	\$56.6 million to \$68.4 million
Indirect Effect	82 to 100	\$5.5 million to \$6.7 million	\$15.1 million to \$18.3 million
Induced Effect	159 to 192	\$8.2 million to \$9.8 million	\$23.5 million to \$28.3 million
Total Effect	1,335 to 1,604	\$46.9 million to \$56.5 million	\$95.2 million to \$114.9 million

Source: Deloitte Consulting, LLP 2016

¹Output includes employment compensation, other proprietary income, other property type income, intermediate expenditures, and taxes.

4.2.2.4 State and Local Fiscal Impact

The OPC's construction and start-up phase and annual operations phase would have a positive impact on the tax revenues of the State of Illinois and local governments. The indirect and induced effects of tax payments were for the OPC's construction and start-up phase. These payments exclude the direct taxes paid by the Obama Foundation and its employees.

The total state and local taxes during the construction and start-up phase are shown in Table 36 below.

Table 36: Estimated OPC Construction and Start-up Phase State and Local Taxes (Indirect and Induced Tax Impacts), by Tax Type

Tax Type	Amount (2016\$)
Employee Compensation	\$ 215,000
Tax on Production and Imports	\$11,851,000
Household	\$ 3,111,000
Corporations	\$ 1,357,000
Total	\$16,534,000

Source: Obama 2016

As shown above, indirect and induced tax revenues to the State of Illinois and to local governments are forecast to total \$16.5 million. The majority of the revenues (71.6 percent) are associated with taxes on production and imports.

Potential tax revenues were also evaluated for the annual operating phase. These taxes exclude the direct taxes paid by the Obama Foundation and employees but do include the direct taxes generated by visitor expenditures during the annual operating phase. The estimates presented here assume 760,000 visitors annually (Obama 2016). Table 37 summarizes the indirect and induced taxes from the OPC's annual operations and the direct taxes generated by OPC visitors.

*Table 37: Estimated OPC Annual Operating Phase State and Local Taxes
(Indirect and Induced Tax Impacts from Operations and Direct Taxes from Visitor Spending)*

Tax Type	Amount (2016\$)
Employee Compensation	\$ 140,000
Tax on Production and Imports	\$ 8,548,000
Household	\$ 2,054,000
Corporations	\$ 602,000
Total	\$11,344,000

Source: Obama 2016

As shown above, annual tax impacts are forecast to be \$11.3 million in revenues to state and local governments. Taxes on production and imports represent the majority (75 percent) of the taxes expected to be collected annually.

Of the \$11.3 million in total annual revenues, approximately \$8 million is forecasted to be generated by the projected 760,000 visitors to the OPC annually.¹⁵ Variations in the level of visitors would directly affect the total tax revenues received by state and local governments. Table 38 below provides a detailed analysis of visitor-generated tax revenues.

Table 38: Annual Visitor-Generated State and Local Taxes, Operations Phase

Impact Type	Employee Compensation	Tax on Production and Imports	Households	Corporations	Total
Direct Impacts	\$59,000	\$4,439,000	\$ 893,000	\$ 92,000	\$5,482,000
Indirect Impacts	\$15,000	\$ 625,000	\$ 218,000	\$ 91,000	\$ 949,000
Induced Impacts	\$20,000	\$1,201,000	\$ 283,000	\$125,000	\$1,629,000
Total Impacts	\$94,000	\$6,265,000	\$1,394,000	\$308,000	\$8,060,000

Source: Obama 2016

4.2.2.5 Housing

Housing Availability

The growth in jobs associated with the OPC's long-term operations has the potential to impact population and, in turn, housing. As described in Section 3.1.7, CMAP's population projections, which assume the development of the OPC, forecast roughly a 10 percent increase in population in the project study area neighborhoods over the 15-year period from 2015 to 2030 (CMAP 2018a). These additional residents along with currently unemployed or under-employed residents could potentially staff the jobs that would be generated by the OPC's operations, programming, and visitor spending. With more than 11,000 vacant housing units in the South Shore, Woodlawn, and Hyde Park neighborhoods, sufficient housing is available to meet the demands anticipated from the forecasted population growth. Additionally, POAH is involved with two mixed-use and mixed-income developments on the South Side (Obama 2016).

¹⁵ Ibid.

Housing Costs

Housing costs can be influenced by numerous national and local factors. Examples of national factors include the overall economy of the United States, interest rates, and national political issues. Examples of local factors include the University of Chicago's development plans, the local economy, local policies, accessibility to transportation, accessibility to jobs and educational facilities, availability of construction materials and labor, financing, and subsidies, as well as existing vacant housing and additional planned projects in the area. The construction of the OPC and related federal actions are among many factors that may affect affordable housing in the project study area. The issues of gentrification and displacement include but are larger than the OPC, and the conditions/preconditions for gentrification predate the OPC.

Large private or public development projects can accelerate neighborhood change (Smith, Duda, Lee, and Thompson 2016). As noted in the context of the 606 elevated trail project on Chicago's northwest side: "concerns are also growing about the role of public works investments in accelerating housing market change, reducing neighborhood affordability, and potentially displacing long-time residents. A new amenity can attract people living outside the neighborhood, increasing demand for housing, which may lead to rising housing costs. As a result, the existing housing stock would likely be upgraded, and new housing units would be built. Although adding new units to the housing supply may ease some demand pressure, these new units are not likely to be affordable to low- or moderate-income households unless the homes are heavily subsidized."¹⁶ Various studies have been prepared to try to understand the risk of gentrification and impacts to original residents,¹⁷ and additional measures are under consideration by the Chicago Plan Commission for considering these issues more closely for future large projects (City of Chicago Department of Planning 2020).¹⁸

The possibility of gentrification and the impact of the OPC on housing within the project study area have been raised as concerns by a variety of stakeholders and interested parties. As noted previously, the Network of Woodlawn put forth its own plan to grow inclusively, and the CBA Coalition crafted legislation to protect residents from displacement, which was introduced to City Council in July 2019 (Obama Community Benefits Agreement Coalition 2019). Importantly, the City of Chicago owns nearly 25 percent of Woodlawn's vacant land, and approximately 30 percent of the existing housing stock has long-term

¹⁶ *Id.* (internal citations omitted)

¹⁷ For example, a recent study by the Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank evaluated the impact of gentrification on original residents. . . This study was co-authored by a Senior Research Methodologist in the Statistics and Methodology department at the non-partisan research organization NORC at the University of Chicago. The longitudinal Census data that were analyzed came from various cities in the US, including the Chicago area. The purpose of the study was to determine how gentrification affects a broad set of outcomes for original residents. The study found that changes to a neighborhood are driven primarily by in-migration rather than out-migration, despite many original residents choosing to stay. The original adult residents who stay have reduced poverty exposure and higher home values. Children who remained in gentrified areas were found to be more likely to attend and graduate from college. They also benefited from exposure to higher opportunity neighborhoods. Although gentrification increases out-migration modestly, those who move away from the area were not made observably worse. (Brummet and Reed 2019)

¹⁸ For example, the Chicago Plan Commission has proposed requirements to "supplement existing protocols for Planned Development (PD) projects and create a 'Master PD' designation that would apply to projects of a certain size and scope." As proposed, the Master PD designation would be given to private projects larger than 20 acres, 4 million square feet, or 4,000 dwelling units, and to public projects larger than 10 acres, 2.5 million square feet, or 2,500 dwelling units.

affordability guarantees. These characteristics are expected to assist Woodlawn in withstanding potential rising property values without losing substantial existing residents.

In addition, through a currently proposed ordinance, the City of Chicago would make a commitment to Woodlawn to:

- help protect existing residents from displacement;
- create new rental and for-sale housing opportunities that are affordable to households at a range of incomes;
- ensure that existing housing stock offers good quality housing for residents;
- promote housing options to support equitable and inclusive income diversity in Woodlawn; and
- support economic development opportunities (Chicago Department of Planning 2020).

The Obama Foundation has stated its intention to support neighborhood stabilization efforts. These planned efforts include using its “convening power and resources to bring local residents to the table with city and county officials to help create a strategy around vacant land and responsible affordable housing” (Obama Foundation 2019). As will be described in Section 4.2.2.5, the Obama Foundation has also made a commitment to employing local residents, both during construction and during operation, with the goal of allowing those residents to remain in their homes.

4.2.2.6 Additional Considerations

Workforce Diversity

The Obama Foundation has taken steps to ensure that the workforce for construction and operations of the OPC is diverse and inclusive.¹⁹ The Obama Foundation and its construction manager, LA, have committed to ensuring that at least 50 percent of the workers’ hours on the job are performed by City of Chicago residents (Obama Foundation 2019). In addition, LA has committed to maximizing workforce recruitment specifically from the South and West side neighborhoods of Chicago, while also targeting the local impact area nearest the OPC site. This commitment is designed to ensure that residents from areas of historic underinvestment would benefit the most not only from labor opportunities relating to the OPC project, but from long-term careers in the Chicago labor trades, affording them an opportunity for generational wealth creation in their communities. Likewise, per the Obama Foundation’s agreement with Lakeside Alliance, it is anticipated that a minimum of 50 percent of the subcontract spending for the project would be directed to diverse firms, including at least 35 percent with minority business enterprises (MBEs), 10 percent with women business enterprises (WBEs), and no less than 5 percent with businesses owned by veterans, individuals with disabilities, and members of the LGBTQ community.²⁰ Lakeside Alliance would aggressively reach out to the available workforce in the community, by hosting job fairs, maintaining an

¹⁹ See, e.g., Report to the Chicago Plan Commission from the Department of Planning and Development for approval of the Proposed Lake Michigan and Chicago Lakefront Protection Ordinance (Application No. 721) and Planned Development (Application No. 19495) at 20 (May 17, 2018) (“The Foundation is committed to ensuring that the economic activity created by the investment of the Presidential Center will be experienced across the South Side and that the workforce for the construction and operations of the Presidential Center is reflective of the great diversity of the City of Chicago.”).

²⁰ *Id.*

active and visible community presence, and working with trusted partner organizations with credibility in the community, such as Black Contractors United, Black United Fund of Illinois, the Chinese American Service League, the Hispanic American Construction Industry Association, and many others, to advertise job openings and encourage residents to apply for available jobs (Obama Foundation 2019).

Lakeside Alliance would also continue to host career and training opportunity fairs across college campuses; travel across Chicago to meet with local neighborhood groups, sharing information about job opportunities on the OPC project; and support the establishment of apprenticeship training programs in Washington Park, Woodlawn, and South Shore. Moreover, Lakeside Alliance has already opened a South Side Resource Center, allowing residents storefront access to the OPC builders and to learn about subcontractor and workforce opportunities related to the project.²¹ Finally, with respect to the operations of the OPC, the Obama Foundation is committed to exploring workforce development partnerships with local trade and technical schools, universities, and nonprofit organizations, in order to maximize local residents' employment opportunities at the OPC. The Obama Foundation is committed to recruiting diverse candidates whenever possible for highly skilled museum positions in curation, collections, and exhibitions. In so doing, the Obama Foundation hopes to help cultivate a new generation of diverse professionals to run and manage museums across America.

Construction Disruption Minimization Measures

The Obama Foundation has approved a range of measures to minimize disruption to the neighboring communities from the construction activities associated with development of the OPC. In addition, the Obama Foundation would continue its efforts to minimize impacts when construction begins. Table 39 below summarizes some of the steps and commitments the Obama Foundation has made to limit negative impacts related to construction.

Table 39: Obama Foundation Disruption Minimization Measures during OPC Construction

Type	Disruption Minimization Measure
Communication	Plan to communicate construction activities, in general
Communication	Plan to communicate activities with the potential of disrupting traffic or causing noise issues
Communication	Forward-looking two-week schedule posted on project website to provide information on upcoming activities that would potentially impact traffic or noise
Communication	Provide Obama Foundation staff to attend neighbor group meetings to explain and answer questions about construction activities
Noise	Comply with City of Chicago Noise Ordinance, which restricts mechanical equipment operations between 8:00 PM and 8:00 AM within 600 feet of any residential building
Traffic	Utilize Cornell Drive for the majority of construction truck traffic ingress and egress.
Traffic	Provide construction-traffic-only turning lanes from Cornell Drive to the site in order to maintain traffic flow

²¹ *Id.*

Community Cohesion

Community cohesion is not anticipated to be negatively impacted by the OPC. The proposed construction and operations of the OPC would not geographically divide or isolate the residents or businesses within South Shore, Woodlawn, or Hyde Park. Rather, as a presidential center highlighting the first African American president, the OPC is expected to enhance the cultural richness of the neighboring African American communities. The OPC's construction and operation are not anticipated to encroach upon residential property or disrupt access to education and childcare facilities, community centers, or places of worship (see Table 39 and Table 40). As part of the improvements related to the OPC's construction, bicycle and pedestrian access would be enhanced, supporting community cohesion.

Community Resources

The presence of the OPC would necessitate some additional police and fire protection activity. However, overall the OPC is not anticipated to have a substantial impact on public facilities in the project study area. The OPC's construction and operation phases would generate tax revenue that would potentially support the public facilities that may be associated with presence of the OPC.

Recreation

The development of additional recreation opportunities is expected to be positive for those residing near Jackson Park and the east end of Midway Plaisance. From a sociological perspective, this action would have a neutral impact on the community by relocation 4.6 acres of recreational area (from the entire 551.52 acres of Jackson Park) to an available and adjacent replacement area in the Midway Plaisance. This action would not divide or cause isolation to neighborhoods within the project study area. There would be no right-of-way acquisition or relocations of residential or commercial properties.

4.2.3 Cumulative impacts

As discussed above, the direct impacts associated with the NPS action would not physically change existing conditions outside of the Midway Plaisance and the indirect impacts from the development and operation of the OPC would provide increased employment and income in the project area. Moreover, certain other projects in or adjacent to Jackson Park, unrelated to the OPC project, but potentially having impacts to the same resources were considered in Section 5.2.1. of the EA. Most of those other projects would provide slight increases in employment. The impact of the construction and operation of the OPC under Alternative B would create a substantial number of jobs in Cook County. However, the increase in traffic congestion from the closed roads would lead to an adverse economic effect. The economic impacts of the proposed road closures may include additional fuel consumption and lost productivity due to increased congestion and vehicle delays. When considered with the other projects described above, there would be a beneficial cumulative impact to social and economic under Alternative B.

4.2.4 Mitigation

There are no direct or indirect adverse impacts to mitigate associated with Alternative B.

4.2.5 Environmental Justice

The Environmental Justice analysis was conducted in accordance with EO 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations.” The analysis involved several steps: defining the study area, identifying minority and low-income populations, identifying any high and adverse human health or environmental impacts, and determining whether any high and adverse impacts would disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations.

As discussed in Section 3.1.8, the study area was defined as Census tracts within the South Shore, Woodlawn, and Hyde Park neighborhoods. Each of the tracts in the South Shore and Woodlawn neighborhoods were analyzed and found to meet the criteria of an Environmental Justice Area. Within the Hyde Park neighborhood, all tracts but Tract 4111 meet the Environmental Justice Area criteria. South Shore has a minority population of 97 percent and a low-income population of 38 percent. Woodlawn has a minority population of 91 percent and low-income of 38 percent. Hyde Park’s minority population is 53 percent and low-income population is 23 percent. Identification of these minority and low-income populations was collected via the US Census Bureau. A summary of the minority and low-income populations is presented above in Table 13.

As described in Section 3.1.1, residents of the project study area are 17.7 percent white; 74.0 percent black; 0.3 percent American Indian and Alaskan native; 4.5 percent Asian and Hawaiian; and 3.6 percent Hispanic. As described in Section 3.1.4, the median family income for the project study areas are: \$24,859 in South Shore; \$28,351 in Woodlawn; and, \$55,323 in Hyde Park. Overall, 33.0 percent of the residents are below the median family income within the project study area. The Poverty Guidelines for a family of four is \$25,100.

For the impacts warranting detailed analysis (recreation, traffic access, cultural resources, and social and economic issues), Alternative B would not result in high and adverse impacts. Therefore, Alternative B would not cause disproportionately high or adverse impacts to the low-income and minority communities in the project study area. Moreover, Alternative B would not take private land or displace any residents.

The proposed action has been the subject of a comprehensive public outreach and involvement program to encourage public involvement by residents in these neighborhoods. The City and the Park District held or participated in over 50 meetings to discuss the OPC campus location, the design and uses of the proposed buildings, proposed roadway changes and proposed park improvements. There were over 6,000 total attendees at these various meetings, which ranged from large gatherings in the hundreds at two different McCormick Place events to a handful of area residents in building-specific discussions. No groups or individuals have been, or will be, excluded from participation in public involvement activities, denied the benefit of the project, or subjected to discrimination in any way on the basis of ethnicity, religion, race, elderly, color, age, sex, national origin, or religion.

4.3 Alternative C: NPS + FHWA Action (Preferred Alternative)

This alternative incorporates impacts associated with Alternative B, in addition to those encountered by improving roadways and bicyclist/pedestrian facilities. The analysis of impacts in this section will only discuss the **additional** impacts associated with Alternative C.

4.3.1 Direct Impacts

While not on the same scale as the impact from the construction and operations of the OPC, there would be a notable public investment in infrastructure related to the roadway improvements. As described in Appendix H, the proposed FHWA action would provide improvements to traffic operations. The proposed roadway and bike/pedestrian improvements would cause temporary impacts to employment and income during the construction period for the numerous projects. In total, the construction projects are estimated to cost \$174 million. Construction would occur in three phases lasting one to two years each. An estimated 166 full-time equivalent construction jobs are anticipated to be generated directly during the projects, with estimated labor expenditures of \$52.6 million. An additional 56 construction management jobs are expected to be created, with expenditures of \$14 million. Table 41 summarizes the direct expenditures and expected labor association with the proposed actions. There may be some positive impacts from decreased fuel consumption and increased productivity associated with reducing traffic delays under Alternative C, compared to Alternative B.

Table 40: Estimated Transportation Improvements Expenditures and Labor during Construction

Job Types	Direct Labor Expenditures during Construction	Direct Labor Jobs during Construction
Construction	\$52,560,000	166 FTE
Construction Management	\$14,000,000	56 FTE
Total	\$66,560,000	222 FTE

Note: FTE=full-time equivalent, or 2,080 hours.

No long-term employment and income impacts are expected to arise from the proposed action. Additionally, no impacts are expected to the population level or demographics as a result of the proposed action. The proposed FHWA action would not geographically divide or isolate the residents or businesses within the South Shore, Woodlawn, or Hyde Park neighborhoods.

The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) is committed to diversity and workforce development to enhance the participation of those economically disadvantaged residents by creating jobs within the community and in particular areas of the community that would be impacted by the transportation improvements. Examples of this include a 50 percent city resident labor requirement, a minimum of 7 percent local labor within the project area with an incentive to hire more (to come as close as possible to the 15 percent goal for local labor) , incentives to hire apprentices from City colleges, and construction contracts with 30 percent MBE, and 7 percent WBE. To this end, contractors are required to describe the approach to diversity and workforce development by submitting a robust Workforce and Outreach Plan that includes:

- A detailed plan coordinating workforce development, apprenticeship, and training opportunities to attract and train a diverse workforce pool for this project.
- Outreach initiatives and community events for recruiting participants and potential hires
- How the contractor will meet commitments for the recruitment of individuals from the project area as identified on the Project Area Map.

- How the contractor's efforts will interface with CDOT's consultant serving as the liaison for recruitment; and
- Examples of each instance (if applicable) of similar plans used in the past and their successes or challenges and lessons learned as they apply to the proposed plans on this Project.²²

The CDOT likewise would be undertaking efforts to minimize construction impacts related to the proposed transportation improvements. CDOT has coordinated with local stakeholders throughout the development of this project. Local stakeholder coordination occurred early during the Phase I design process and would continue towards the end of Phase II design. The main two key stakeholders, the Obama Foundation and City of Chicago Planning Department, have regular coordination meetings with CDOT to discuss pedestrian connectivity, proposed designs, access, and maintenance agreements. These efforts are summarized in Table 40 below.

Table 41: CDOT Disruption Minimization Efforts during Transportation Improvements

Type	Disruption Minimization Measure
Communication	Work with and through other City and State agencies to inform the public of changes in traffic patterns, short- and long-term lane closures, and roadway closures and detour routes
Communication	Work closely with key stakeholders near the project during design and construction to plan for and accommodate unique circumstances
Access	Maintain access to residences and business throughout construction
Access	Utilize temporary access roads, temporary driveways, and local detour routes to ensure access will be maintained at all times
Public Transportation / Bus Stops	Maintain CTA service for bus users throughout the project study area for the duration of construction
Public Transportation / Bus Stops	Consolidate or relocate certain bus stops within the project limits to their permanent locations early during construction
Public Transportation / Bus Stops	Provide temporary bus stops with accessible paths when existing stops are inaccessible due to construction activities
Public Transportation / Bus Stops	Coordinate closely with CTA to provide notice to riders for relocated stops to do detours and general construction activities
Traffic	Proposed utilization of Cornell Drive for the majority of construction truck traffic ingress and egress. The current Maintenance of Traffic Plan provides construction-traffic-only turning lanes from Cornell Drive to the site in order to maintain traffic flow.

4.3.2 Indirect Impacts of City Actions

The indirect adverse impacts to socioeconomic resources would be similar to Alternative B, in addition to the indirect impacts from the transportation improvements under Alternative C. As described in Alternative B, section 5.2.5.3 above, the development of the OPC is an indirect action, relative to the federal action of UPARR conversion. The development of the OPC would include indirect impacts on

²² CDOT 2019

economics, housing, and community cohesion. Alternative C would also include the impacts from the road improvements. Indirect impacts from the proposed transportation improvements of Alternative C would include the jobs and economic impacts that arise from the expenditures of household income generated by the direct and indirect impacts (spending by workers). Therefore, there are no additional adverse indirect impacts under Alternative C.

4.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

As discussed above, the direct impacts associated with the FHWA action would provide increased employment and income, compared to the impacts of Alternative B. Moreover, certain other projects in or adjacent to Jackson Park, unrelated to the OPC project, but potentially having impacts to the same resources were considered in Section 5.2.1 of the EA. Most of those other projects would provide slight increases in employment and would alleviate the traffic congestion impacts of Alternative B. Reduction in traffic delays may lead to a positive impact regarding decreased fuel consumption and increased productivity. The impact of the actions in Alternative C would not be adverse in relation to overall social and economic impacts of the region.

4.3.4 Mitigation

As discussed above, the direct impacts associated with the FHWA action would provide increased employment and income. Moreover, certain other projects in or adjacent to Jackson Park, unrelated to the OPC project, but potentially having impacts to the same resources were considered in Section 5.2.1 of the EA. Most of those other projects would provide slight increases in employment. The cumulative impacts to socioeconomic resources are anticipated to be beneficial under Alternative C.

4.3.5 Environmental Justice

For the impacts warranting detailed analysis (recreation, traffic access, cultural resources, and social and economic issues), Alternative C would not result in high and adverse impacts. Therefore, Alternative C would not cause disproportionately high or adverse impacts to the low-income and minority communities in the project study area.

From a sociological perspective, the proposed action would not divide or cause isolation to neighborhoods within the project study area. There would be no right-of-way acquisition or relocations of residential or commercial properties. The roadway improvements would include rerouting traffic in the area but would overall improve transportation reliability. There would be no adverse impacts to transit services. Existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities would be improved, and new bicycle/pedestrian facilities would be constructed. Section 4.2.2 in this report summarizes the economic and employment impacts of the project and the opportunities they create for the communities of South Shore, Woodlawn, and Hyde Park. Minimal positive employment impacts may arise from construction activities associated with the proposed FHWA action.

5.0 References

AECOM

- 2013 “63rd Street Transit Oriented Development Study.” Chicago: AECOM Technical Services. Accessed July 21, 2020. www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/dcd/rfps/63rd-tod.pdf.
- 2019 “Woodlawn Community Area Economic Analysis.” Accessed July 21, 2020. https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/dcd/supp_info/woodlawn/aecom_woodlawn_04_22_2019.pdf

Brummet, Quentin and David Reed

- 2019 “The Effects of Gentrification on the Well-Being and Opportunity of Original Adults and Children.” Working Papers (WP 19-30). Philadelphia: Philadelphia Federal Reserve. Accessed July 9, 2020. <https://www.philadelphiafed.org/-/media/research-and-data/publications/working-papers/2019/wp19-30.pdf>.

Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT)

- 2019 Jackson Park Mobility Improvements: Instructions and Execution Documents, Book 2. Chicago: Chicago Department of Transportation.

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)

- 2018a On to 2050 County and Local Projections. Accessed July 21, 2020. <https://datahub.cmap.illinois.gov/dataset/2050-forecast-of-population-households-and-employment>.
- 2018b On to 2050 Socioeconomic Forecast Appendix. Accessed July 21, 2020. <https://datahub.cmap.illinois.gov/dataset/2050-forecast-of-population-households-and-employment>.

Chicago Planning Commission

- 2018 Lake Michigan and Chicago Lakefront Protection Ordinance. Accessed July 21, 2020. https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/dcd/supp_info/OPCLPOapplication.pdf.
- 2018 Committee on Zoning, Landmarks, And Building Standards. Accessed July 21, 2020. http://gisapps.chicago.gov/gisimages/zoning_pds/PD1409.pdf.

Choose Chicago

- 2020 “About Choose Chicago.” Accessed July 9, 2020. www.choosechicago.com/about-us/.

Deloitte Consulting LLP

- 2016 “Finalized Assumptions Modeled Inputs” (updated 2019 by The Obama Foundation only to remove non-public personally identifiable information). Accessed July 17, 2020. <https://www.obama.org/wp-content/uploads/finalized-assumptions-modeled-inputs-11-7-19.pdf>.

- Gensler
2016 A Strategy for Revitalization (aka Woodlawn Master Plan).
- Goodman Williams Group, Ginkgo, and CR&M Commercial Realty
2015 “63rd/Cottage Grove Retail Analysis.” Chicago: Goodman Williams Group. Accessed July 21, 2020. www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/dcd/rfps/63rd-cottage-retail.pdf.
- IMPLAN Group
2020 “Employment FAQ.” Accessed April 22, 2020. <https://implanhelp.zendesk.com/hc/en-us/articles/115009510967-Employment-FAQ>.
- La Rabida Children’s Hospital
2020 “About.” Accessed April 22, 2020. <http://larabida.org/about/>.
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)
2005 “Woodlawn: Rebuilding the Village.” Chicago: LISC. Accessed July 21, 2020. www.newcommunities.org/cmadoes/WoodlawnQofL2005.pdf.
- Skidmore, Owens and Merrill (SOM), LLP
2017 “Woodlawn 2025.” Chicago: SOM.
- Smith, Geoff, Sarah Duda, Jin Man Lee, and Michael Thompson
2016 “Measuring the Impact of the 606.” Chicago: Institute for Housing Studies at DePaul University. Accessed July 21, 2020. www.housingstudies.org/releases/measuring-impact-606/.
- Smith, Thurman, Vince Lane, and Mattie Butler
2018 Getting Ahead of Gentrification.
- The Chicago Community Trust
2020 “About.” Accessed April 22, 2020. www.cct.org/about/.
- The Obama Foundation
2018 “Our Commitment to Our Neighbors.” Accessed April 22, 2020. www.obama.org/updates/community-commitments/.
- The Obama Presidential Center and Obama Foundation (Obama)
2016 “Economic Impact Assessment.” Chicago: The Obama Presidential Center and Obama Foundation. Accessed July 21, 2020. www.obama.org/wp-content/uploads/Economic_Impact_Assessment_Report OPC.pdf.
- The University of Chicago
2020 “Admissions & Aid.” Accessed April 22, 2020. www.uchicago.edu/admissions/.
- The University of Chicago Medical Center
2020 “Community Engagement.” Accessed April 22, 2020. www.uchicagomedicine.org/about-us/community.

US Bureau of the Census

- 1995 Statistical Brief: Poverty Areas. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce. Accessed July 9, 2020. https://www.census.gov/prod/1/statbrief/sb95_13.pdf.
- 2019a "2010 Decennial Census." Accessed April 22, 2020. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/decade.html>.
- 2019b "American Community Survey 5-year estimates." Accessed April 22, 2020. <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/advanced>.
- 2019c "Subject Definitions." Accessed April 22, 2020. www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/technical-documentation/subject-definitions.html#householder.

US Department of Health and Human Services

- 2018 "Poverty Guidelines Computation Page." Accessed July 9, 2020. <https://aspe.hhs.gov/computations-2017-annual-update-hhs-poverty-guidelines-48-contiguous-states-and-district-columbia>.

US Office of the Federal Register

- 1994 Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 59 Fed. Reg. 12898 (February 11, 1994). Accessed July 21, 2020. <https://www.archives.gov/files/federal-register/executive-orders/pdf/12898.pdf>