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CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Our next item is the Planned Development at 708 Church. As you know, this was a request for continuance from the meeting of March the 24th. And are there any comments, Mr. Wolinski, before we begin?

MR. WOLINSKI: Madam Chair, I think the developers have a presentation for you tonight.

MR. ANDERSON: My name is Tim Anderson, I'm President of Focus Development. And we appreciate the opportunity to take the last two weeks since we asked for the continuance to really look at the project. Our architects, Booth Hansen, Larry Booth specifically, have been working very hard to come up with a design of a reduced height. And we are very excited about the design that's emerged over this concerted effort. And I want to review some of the primary facts about the change from where we were to where we are today.

As you can see, the initial proposal was for 49 stories. We have reduced the height of the building to 38 which represents a 22 percent reduction in height of the building. The actual height measured by feet is about a 20 percent reduction.

The net area has gone down slightly. We've
maintained the area that we need from an economic perspective, but the overall area has gone down slightly and there is a corresponding slight reduction in the FAR. The unit counts have remained the same and the parking ratios have remained the same.

So, I'm going to turn it over now to Larry Booth to walk through the design and have him give an overview.

MR. BOOTH: Well, we wanted to respond to the concerns of the people that have testified here. We also wanted to accomplish the things that we thought were important for Evanston in the long run. And we wanted to stick to our guns on form-based design. We wanted to see the building as a centerpiece that tended to, that would accomplish the unification of Downtown Evanston, to pull it together as a cohesive group of buildings. In other words, to provide a centerpiece for the downtown.

We wanted to maintain the setbacks we talked about at the ground floor so that, which would accomplish not only the scale at the ground floor but the alleviation of wind that would hit the building and come cascading down to the street. And we wanted to
continue the effort to create a capstone building for Downtown Evanston, a signature building for downtown because this is the one place in downtown. This is the center, it will always be the center. So, this is the one opportunity to put a centerpiece in the downtown. So, we wanted to accomplish that.

At the same time, we wanted to respond to obviously the concern about the height. And we wanted the proportion of it to be elegant and noble. And I think we have done those things and we're very proud of this. And let me go through and explain what we have.

This is a picture of Downtown Evanston as it is today with no centerpiece. And you can see it has a number of tall buildings. Now, if we can have the next one? Whomp, there it is. And it becomes, at the Fountain Square location, it becomes the element that pulls the center of downtown together.

And what we have done to accomplish this and maintain the necessary program to make it a financially viable building is to reduce the 11 stories and take the index, extend the building at the more or less a little bit above the midpoint which would index to the existing buildings around it. So, the building becomes wider
from the midpoint down to the base. The base stays the
same, by the way. It's still a four-story base. And
then, the capstone element goes from the midpoint there
up to the point. If we can have the next one please?
This is an existing building from Green Bay
Road and Asbury, and here is the new building here in
the skyline. We still want to maintain the light color
and the reflectivity of it so that it doesn't become,
like some of your posters, a big, dark brick, over-
pressing building on the neighborhood. So, we want to
make it delicate, light and reflective. Next please.
Here we are at Davis Street and Oak. This is
the building as it's seen there. And this is the bank
building here. So, it would extend, obviously it's
going to be, and we want it to be the tallest building
in Evanston, and we want it to be the tallest building
in Evanston for a long, long time like maybe for 1,000
years. If we could have the next one please?
Here is the view from Sherman Avenue. You can
see that this is the bank building. And I don't know
the name of this building. Rotary, okay. And you can
see that the building steps now, it steps from a four-
story base upward to about the midpoint, and then the
capstone element is there. So, it still has a
centerpiece look to it. Next please.

The ground floor, actually we improved the
ground floor, I think, because we extended the, we got
more retail coming around here. We simplified the plan.
This is still the loading dock here. This is the
parking garage entry off of Orrington. This is
Orrington, by the way, Orrington, Church and Sherman.
And then the residential lobby here with elevators that
take you up to the apartments. Next please.

Then, at the roof level of the four-story
base, we still have a roof garden. And you can see the
difference here and let me explain what we did. We
extended the shape of the building so the setback on
Orrington is about 20 feet now instead of 37. And part
of the building goes all the way out to the base.
There's about a 50-foot stretch here of the building
going out flush with the base which, from an
architectural standpoint, has some advantage. It
integrates the base with the whole building.

So, at that point, it won't be as much of an
abrupt step from a four-story base to a single tower.
This side extends in Orrington a little bit, and then
this shape here comes out as more of a triangle, if you will, that sets up a juxtaposition of a rectilinear base here with the upper part plane against it. If we can go to the next one please?

And here is the view on Church Street looking east, the base coming up to the roof garden, a little bit more sculptural quality in terms of how the taller element comes into the base but more or less the same scale relationship of the lower base to the existing context of the buildings. Next please.

Here we are at Orrington this way and Church going this way. Here is the base, the four-story base coming across here, the retail, and then at this point, this one section here, two bays that go all the way up to the midpoint of the upper component. Next please.

Here is Sherman looking south. Again, it really hasn't changed much. The tower, a little bit of the tower now comes out with that triangular form that is still set back though from the face of the base.

Next please.

This is September and March, 9:00 o'clock in the morning. Again, the shadows still fall within the downtown area. Next please.
September and March in the 5:00 p.m. The shadow doesn't reach any of the residential now at all. Before, there was a little bit of shadow that hit the residential. Next please.

And then, June, 9:00 a.m., the tower doesn't, it just, the shadow comes across right here. And next please. At 5:00 p.m., again the shadow just goes a block to the east. I think that's it.

Oh, yes, there's still the Hahn building. We still intend to do exactly what we intended to do before to the Hahn building. So, there is no change there.

So, the base, just to reiterate, the base has not changed. It's still a four-story base relating to the lower buildings. Now, instead of a single shape, it has some complexity to it. It has a lower section and then an upper section. You can argue on that whether it's a tower, I wouldn't quite call it a tower. I wouldn't necessarily call it a box. We don't want to put a box in the middle of Downtown Evanston. You have some boxes already. We wanted to do something that had a little architecture to it. So, thank you very much.

MR. FRIEDLAND: Good evening. For the record, my name is Steve Friedland, attorney representing
petitioner. We can certainly take any questions you have to Larry, but what I wanted to just address at the end or a couple of items, one, somewhat of a question of procedural process with you. We assume that with this new design which we're pleased you let us present to you tonight, we would expect that you'd want to hear from the general public and get some more public comments. So, we wanted to get a sense for just timing on that with you.

In addition, while our intent tonight is really to present this plan that we've worked on for the last couple of weeks, we certainly understand there's other issues that were discussed with you at the last meeting. I think our purpose tonight was really to present the design. We understand that other issues such as our public benefits are something that we intend to address with you. But in this interim period from the last public meeting to this meeting, we do understand that the City has hired a real estate consultant to review the TIF request we have made for the Hahn building and to generally review the sort of financial analysis of the project.

And I think it would probably be more
efficient to have the conversations with respect to
public benefits with you getting the benefit of your
consultant in that regard. You know, I think we
continue to believe that when your consultant looks at
this, the public benefits that we're providing and that
we've stated that we're willing to provide for the
project will be sufficient for the site development
allowances that we're requesting and certainly
appropriate and acceptable to the City.

So, that really concludes our presentation.

Again, you're certainly welcome to ask Larry questions
with respect to the design, but we also want to discuss
those other issues as well, the process.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right. Before there are any
questions from the Council members, my thought was that
if we heard the presentation tonight, we're certainly
going to have time to digest this new presentation, this
new concept, and that we would, I know our next meeting
is on the 24th -- 28th. 28th, but we do have other
items at that time and I was wondering if the Committee
would consider a special meeting between now and then
that we could discuss -- you want to do it on the 28th?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: No, we won't get the
materials from Marty Stern until the end of April. It doesn't do us any good.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: To have until after the, before it goes to the Economic Development Committee.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Right.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: And the public should have that information.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. All right. Alderman Rainey?

ALDERMAN RAINNEY: Well, Madam Chairman, I would very much like to have the special meeting, but only if we could do something really special at that meeting, and that is have the committee discuss the project which is something we really haven't had an opportunity to do in depth. And only if by the time we have that meeting we will have had some financial advice and analysis from the consultant.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, because I'm sure that there will be a lot of public interest as well, I'm wondering if we could have a meeting before just to take public comments, because I'm sure there's going to be quite a number of people who'll want to speak.
ALDERMAN RAINEY: Well, then, would you suggest we sign up for public comment?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: No, no. I'm trying to figure out -- well, probably, at the rate we're going.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: I have no idea.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: But I'm trying to figure out how we can get it all done.

ALDERMAN HANSEN: Chairman Holmes? Chairman Holmes?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Hansen?

ALDERMAN HANSEN: You know, just in case some out in the public didn't hear, we've asked, based on some, the numbers that John Kennedy presented last time, the Council asked for our staff to look into the numbers and into the economic feasibility of this project. And we have been told by staff that that analysis is not going to be complete by April 30th. And I think what Alderman Bernstein and Alderman Wynne were trying to say was that we want the public to have the opportunity to look at that economic analysis as well and comment on it. So, that's why we're talking about another public hearing.

And so, I think, I don't see how we can do
this before April 30th because we're just, if we have a
public hearing before then, the public is going to want
to comment again and we're never going to get to a
discussion.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: We're going to want to
comment.

ALDERMAN HANSEN: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Absolutely. Well, maybe we
can comment, at the same time the public. Alderman
Wynne?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Alderman Hansen said more or
less what I was going to say, Alderman Holmes. My
question to the staff is do we know when, approximately
when Mr. Stern is going to get the information back to
us.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We think -- Judy can address
that, yes.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I didn't get this
information.

MS. AIELLO: Yes. We have not presented the
information, or we have not received the financial
information yet.
ALDERMAN WYNNE: From?

MS. AIELLO: From the revised plan from the development team. It's our intent to get it to, hopefully we'll get it from them this week, get it to Mr. Stern this week. And then the plan would be to have his analysis to be in a rather complete state to present to the EDC on April 30th, and then report back to the Planning & Development Committee at your next meeting or your first meeting in May.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I didn't get this information.

MS. AIELLO: I'm sorry.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: But I think the critical thing is we should have the public get the information when Economic Development gets it so they have an opportunity to digest it so we're not repeating ourselves. More or less what Alderman Hansen said. So, perhaps the next time we can discuss it as P&D is at the first meeting in May. When?

MS. AIELLO: Which would be May 12th.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: May 12th, okay.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: May 12th.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: So, that gives people about
12 days to look over the material.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right. And we'll make a
special meeting after that if we need it.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Right. Well, I guess that
was my other question was to Mr. Wolinski is do we know
how, at this point, how heavy the agenda will be two
meetings from now?

MR. WOLINSKI: I can, I don't know that I can
give you a firm answer. I know that our meeting on the
28th we will be having the ENH Cancer Care Center
addition that is a recommendation from the Zoning Board.
I imagine that will take some time. We also have the
Solar Panel issue on the 28th of April. And there's
also some Zoning Board, there's a Zoning Board denial
and then there's a Zoning Board recommendation on
parking variances also. And I'm also assuming that
we're going to have the 1603 Orrington. Judy, is that
going to be for the 28th, you think?

MS. AIELLO: Correct. Correct.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Some of that is probably
going to spill over.

MR. WOLINSKI: Yes. So, certainly the meeting
on the 28th is pretty full at this point. And I imagine
some of that will spill over to the 12th.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I'd say that we should be looking at a special meeting sometime in May.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. All right. Alderman Jean-Baptiste?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Well, I agree with everything that's been said. But meanwhile, we have an hour, and I would think that not everyone really responds to this kind of project from an economic kind of standpoint. So, those who are here today who wish to make comments, I think we should hear them as opposed to, you know, adjourning at this point.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Rainey? I don't think we were, I certainly wasn't suggesting that we adjourn.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Rainey?

ALDERMAN RAINNEY: What is the time line?

Again, I don't have any fear in discussing this project. And I don't know if there is some effort to delay discussion of this project, but I think we ought to move forward. When are you suggesting as Chair, after Economic Development gets this project, should this
Committee meet in a special meeting?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, I have a suggestion that we have a special meeting between now and the 30th that we can maybe take public comment. But I certainly do appreciate what Alderman Hansen and the rest of you have said about having the public have the financial information that we will have, so if you want to wait for that. But I know that there is going to be a lot of people who'll want to speak, and so I wanted to make sure that we had enough time and ample time. So, that was my suggestion for the special meeting there.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: But when do you foresee the people who are actually going to vote on this project getting an opportunity to discuss it?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: It doesn't look like we're going to have an opportunity to discuss it until after we receive all of the information which will be April. We will have to wait until the Economic Development Committee gets it.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Is there any reason we can't discuss this, have the special meeting the first week in May?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: No, not at all.
ALDERMAN RAINEY: Is there any reason why we can't set that right now?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: There is no reason why and we would want to -- well, we will have the information. If we have the information back by April 30th and if we wanted to meet --

ALDERMAN RAINEY: We'll have it before then because the Committee meets on the 30th. So, we'll have to have it in our hands, you know --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's not what the memo said.

MS. AIELLO: I can't guarantee because we have not seen it yet. So, I can't guarantee that, you know, staff will have had a chance because we also want Kane McKenna to look at it so I've got to, you know, we've got to organize two consultants. So, I mean we hope we could have it to you as we typically do the Friday before the Wednesday meeting. But I can't guarantee it.

And I don't want to rush our analysis.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I don't want the Committee to meet and we don't have the information. And that was my whole thought on that. Alderman Wollin, Wynne, and then Bernstein.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I was just going to, excuse me, I have a cold. I was just going to suggest that then all the aldermen should attend the Economic Development Committee meeting as opposed to just the Economic Development Committee.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: That's a good point.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's a good idea.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: That's an excellent idea.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's a very good idea.

And we could get the information at the same time.

Okay.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: And it would be important for the public to show up. We rarely have an audience to the Economic Development.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: And what is the date of that meeting?

MS. AIELLO: 30th.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: It is the 30th, okay. On Wednesday the 30th. 7:30? Is it 7:30, Alderman Jean-Baptiste? 7:30?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Is that, all the aldermen have that? Yes, we would. We should have. Okay,
Alderman Wynne, do you have other comments?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: No, other than I think that if we have a special meeting between April 30th and the first Council meeting in May, I think we need to leave the public a week to look through the material in order to --

ALDERMAN RAINEY: They're not going to have a week to look at it.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: No, no. I meant, Alderman Rainey, I think if we wanted to have a discussion before the first meeting in May which I'm happy to do, I think we still need to give the people who have spent a lot of time analyzing this a fair opportunity so that we don't feel as though we have people asking for additional meetings. I think we do have to wait for the consultant, otherwise, maybe we can open it up to the floor to people tonight to make a quick assessment, but you know, I think the arguments before were based on public benefits and economic analysis. And that's what I want to see.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Wollin?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: No.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Bernstein?
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I would like Ken to get up here and explain the policy with respect to not going back to the Plan Commission because it's a lesser included project, if it's, you know, non-material change. But to the extent that we don't send it back to the Plan Commission, I would like the benefit of their wisdom and I'd like to invite them to come up here at least with respect to the design and, you know, there wasn't a unanimous, it was a 4 to 3 but it was a difficult vote by the Plan Commissioners. And those that voted in favor, three of the four had criticisms and concerns about the development.

So, I'd like the benefit of their wisdom concurrent with ours. And this is not going to be a quick thing. And I'm not afraid to discuss anything, Alderman Rainey, but you know, I think that the reason for which there probably wasn't discussion about the last time is in deference to the developer, I think it would have failed the first time through. So, they have an opportunity to come in here and to try to sell it and to try to come in and provide for a different kind of a physical plan and some meaningful financials and benefits to the City. And you know, as long as it
takes, you know, hopefully we'll get the job done
efficiently and effectively.

But I would like the Plan Commissioners up
here to the extent that they want to come. I see a
couple of them back there.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: When are you talking
about?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I'm saying at our
Planning & Development meeting. And it's probably going
to be at the special Planning & Development meeting.
And you know, we can go until we're done. You know, we
don't have a problem staying until all hours, so I have
no problems with that.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: That's a proposal,
right?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes, I just want to --

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: For Ken to talk about
the project and then we can put it on the table.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes. If Ken is
consistent with what my understanding of our law is,
then that's what I would propose.
MR. COX: The question has been raised not only by you at this moment, Alderman Bernstein, but by members of the public that given the fact that the developer has come back with a design that is, you know, substantially different than what was originally proposed, the question was raised why does this not go back to Plan Commission and essentially start the process over.

The practice and also the dictates of the City Code state that so long as the amended project does not ask for greater zoning relief than was initially included in the public notice and the Plan Commission meetings, it's unnecessary to go back to Plan Commission. If a developer were to come in and request greater zoning relief, that would be a different story. However, here, again I have not seen a complete list of the information provided but I've been assured and from what I did see tonight that there is less zoning relief requested here. So, it's essentially included already in the original notice.

As far as your point as to inviting members of other committees or other commissions particularly Planning coming in, I in now way want to cut off debate
but I would just point out that the Plan Commission, although it has a different makeup now than it did at the time it originally took its vote, has originally issued a recommendation to this body. However, members of the Commission are always, as ever, eligible to come to any public meeting and speak their minds regarding the project.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Bernstein?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes. I'm not looking for them to vote. We've got the recommendations and we've got transcripts. What I'm looking for is wisdom to the extent they can provide some to us. We have had a precedent where we've had meetings combine with the Plan Commissioners. And you know, I don't see a problem with that.

They're not going to be up here voting. They're going to be up here asking questions maybe at a different level than the community would be because, you know, they are the people in whom we're supposed to have confidence to make the decisions with regard to the analysis of our Zoning Ordinance and plans relative to it. So, I don't see a problem with that. I mean, does anybody have a problem with bringing them up here?
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Steve?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: May I?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Jean-Baptiste.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Ken is not the person who will make that decision.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: No, no. We are. I'm not talking about Ken.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. But Ken is still up there. You're still talking to him, right?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Ken, I'm done with you unless somebody else has questions for you.

MR. COX: I'm happy to take a seat.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: He was the threshold issue.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: You dealt with him around --

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: That's all, right.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: You know, whether this should --

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Now I'm arguing for my proposal to invite the Plan Commissioners.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes, but that's not
what's on the table right now though.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Okay, what is?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What we have on the table is public participation in this process. We have talked about the next scheduled meeting where we can begin to weigh in and participate. We will meet on April 30th at the Economic Development Committee meeting where we will have a chance to discuss issues that are relevant to the project and relevant to Economic Development, the TIF request, et cetera, et cetera.

When we have our special meeting, the Plan Commissioners can intervene to the extent that they want to intervene, you know, to come and make public comments. But they have issued Minority Reports, they have issued Majority Reports. They have made statements regarding whether or not the project meets the standards or not.

So, I don't want to see us make a special request to enlarge the discussion to include members of the Commission. Apparently, their weighing in on the discussion have led the developer to think through some different approaches. And so, it's before us now, we have to be able to get the opportunity to consider the
question, debate it, and move forward, and with the benefit of what's already been said and with the benefit of the new economic analysis, Marty Stern's review of that, public comments that have accumulated.

And so, I don't see the need for us to set a special process by which we invite the Plan Commission to come back, there are about eight or nine members of that Plan Commission, to come and weigh in. They've already weighted in and we've already read, you know, their views on it. If they want to participate at public comment, then they should, you know, to the extent that that's allowed, they come and do that. But I don't see -- our responsibility as the P&D Committee is to make the analysis, make the recommendation to Council. It's in our court now. And I think we ought to go ahead and do what we have to do in light of what we have before us and not enlarge the process.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Bernstein?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes. It is in fact in our court, and when something comes to this court, I want as much information as I can possibly get. Now, several of the Plan Commissioners had specific recommendations with respect to the physical structure
of that building, the former building, okay? I don't know, you know, looking at the rendering and looking at this thing whether or not those things have been addressed. Chances are, with my inability and my lack of ability, I'm not going to know even if I look at it whether their particular concerns have been addressed.

So, to the extent that they're willing, it's not going to be anything tremendously formal. And if it takes us until the following P&D meeting and Council to make the vote, you know, I don't know what we're going to be discussing. Obviously, none of us is ever shy about discussing anything from this floor, all right. But I think that we should be armed with Marty Stern's analysis which hopefully will include an analysis of what the Evanston Coalition has provided along with their numbers.

They're going to come back and hopefully negotiate something about the public benefit. And depending on what the numbers say, they're either going to say that we can or we can't. Or it's even worse now than it was before. I don't know what they're going to say. But I don't want to preclude ourselves from anything.
You know, height has never concerned me, all right. 49 stories may be too tall but I'm never concerned about height as height per se height. But I am concerned about the analysis that was meaningful to me among those three of the four Commissioners that actually affirmatively voted for this project. They had concerns. And that's all I wanted to address. They're not going to get it back; it's ours. But to the extent that they're our experts, I'd like to call them in like we're calling in Marty Stern.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Hansen and then Alderman Rainey. But then I just have a question and I'll have to depend upon those of you who have been here much longer than I. Is that a normal, have we done that before? Do we go back and ask a Commission once that they've put it here?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: No.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I mean, I just don't want us doing anything different, not under my Chair, that we've not done before.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: May I make myself clear? The Plan Commission is not going to vote on this again.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I understand that.
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Their time is gone. Unless the applicant wants to go back through the process which I'm guessing they don't. The Plan Commission's time is over, but they still have lived with this thing for nine months, and theoretically, they are the experts who will look at this with a different eye than I.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Point of procedure. Listen, we had an hour for public comments. If we as the P&D want to consider inclusion of members of the Plan Commission in our discussions, we can make that decision after we have incorporated or taken advantage of the fact that the public is here. Have them participate and we can make a decision.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, we have some other aldermen that would like to speak.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: That's fine. I'm just saying that --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: So, let me do that first and then we can see if we want to vote on that. Alderman Hansen?

ALDERMAN HANSEN: In deference to what Alderman Bernstein is asking for, I don't think any of
us have ever said no, so to speak, to an alderman asking
and wanting some more advice and consultation on an
issue, this issue or any other issue. And with that
being said, you know, I think if we extend the concern
to the Plan Commission of what Alderman Bernstein is
asking for and invite them to come comment as opposed to
having them all sit in the front row and ask them what
they think, you know, and the other thing I do want to
say is there are some Plan Commissioners here and one of
them had raised their hand and I think it was maybe in
comment to what Alderman Bernstein is asking. And I
would ask if the Chair would recognize the Commissioner
so maybe she could speak as to what she wanted to say.

In addition, before that, in terms of public
comment, again I just, I have the benefit of sitting
over here so I can hear some comments from the public
without going up there, and I think some of them are
feeling that at least at this point what they've heard
tonight, at least what I'm hearing, there might not be
any additional public comment in the sense that I don't
think their feelings have changed on this project. So,
I mean, that doesn't mean to say that they won't all get
up there again, but at the same time I really think they
should all have the information. You know, to do public
comment tonight, I think, would just be rehashing it
after we get this stuff.

So, if we could ask Commissioner Burrus to
comment to Alderman Bernstein's request?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Let me recognize Alderman
Rainey. I'm going to ask you if you just want to wait
until I get to finish with the aldermen. Alderman
Rainey, Alderman Moran, Alderman Bernstein, Alderman
Wynne. And then we'll get to you.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: We have a Minority Report
and a Majority Report.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: From the Plan Commission.

It would be my suggestion to cut to the chase and direct
the developer to address matters that have changed or
have not changed in relation to those two critiques and
find out from the developer how those concerns have been
addressed, and then allow for perhaps a rebuttal by
those Plan Commission members who made those suggestions
if they choose. We can't make them do it. If they want
to say, oh, no, you're wrong, you didn't meet that
criteria that we set forth.
But I'd like to hear how those issues have been addressed. I mean, we know how one is addressed: height.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Major concern: height. We know how that was addressed. We don't have to hear any more about that. But there are other issues.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, and I think that they did address that by saying that they've been working on the height thing for the last couple of things and they will come back with the rest of the information at the next meeting. I believe that's what I heard. Alderman Moran?

ALDERMAN MORAN: That, if there were some direction or even a generalized invitation to have the Plan Commission back, that would be a unique event in my 17 years of doing this. And I'm very uncomfortable doing it. You know, the notion, either whether it be by fiat or invitation with the implication that the invitation had better be responded to affirmatively, I think is not consistent with how our government operates.

I don't think it's correct. I mean, these
people who are in the Plan Commission, all of them put
in a huge amount of time. They serve the City. They do
provide a significance assistance to us, but I don't
think it's the City Council's prerogative to really
summon the Plan Commission to come here and either say
yes or no or we agree or we don't agree or this is our
take on the latest and so on and so forth.

I don't think that they have an obligation to
come here and be grilled by people including us. I
think that's out of line. They're citizen volunteers.

Now, having said all of that, if people who
are members of the Plan Commission want to come here and
provide commentary because it's their desire to say
something to us about this, they're entitled to do it.
They're entitled to do it as citizens and they should
feel free to do it. I would never tell somebody to not
come here and provide commentary that they feel is
important to this process.

But I don't think that we should summon the
Plan Commission. I don't even want to invite the Plan
Commission particularly in a way where, you know, we
reach a point here where eight or nine people are
sitting here in the front row so that we can, you know,
ask them questions, demand answers, to have them act as
our experts. They do act in an expert function, but
when they take a vote and they provide reports, it is
our responsibility, and I think the idea of bringing
them here and putting them on the spot and somehow
transferring responsibility for either the discussion,
the deliberation or the vote I think is unfair to them.
If they want to come here and talk about it, they can.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Wynne?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Well, Alderman Moran, I think
that mischaracterized what Alderman Bernstein was
saying. And in fact, Alderman Holmes, we have had a
history because I've been on the P&D Commission, you
asked the question, I've been on the P&D for 11 years,
and I don't remember exactly the project, Jim Wolinski
might remember, but Larry Widmayer was chair of the Plan
Commission at the time, and if Larry was here, he'll
remember it. And he came and did provide additional
commentary during our discussion of a major project, and
I'm sorry, I don't remember but I'll call Larry tomorrow
and find out which one it was, in answer to questions
that we had as a P&D Committee to a project that the
Plan Commission had voted in favor of. And it was very
clear that the P&D Committee was not agreeing with them. And Larry Widmayer, who was chair of the Plan Commission, sat in on our meetings and we actually have a representative, we're supposed to have a representative of the Plan Commission at every one of these meetings to provide clarification to us of what their discussion is. And I can think, Larry Widmayer actually prepared remarks on several occasions and I am sorry that my brain is stuck that I can't remember when it was.

So, it isn't unprecedented. It happened frequently. And actually it happened any number of times informally because we always had a Plan Commission liaison who we would turn to occasionally and say, is this what you all were talking about? Or provide us with clarification on what went on during your meeting on this point.

So, I think that because the project is being presented to us as changed, not materially enough to send back to the Plan Commission but clearly changed, I mean they are telling us it's changed, that we should ask any Plan Commission members who wants to provide comment to comment. I agree with Alderman Rainey that
they had a critique and analysis and they should, if
that's the form they want to bring it to us, then that's
what they should do. But you know, no one is asking
them or demanding that they come. So, I would very much
like the benefit of their analysis.

Now, could I just change the subject and ask a
question of this design while we have them here?
Because I'd like to know what the lighted part up at the
top of the building is. Is it -- I mean, is that
dwelling units?

MR. BOOTH: It's a halo.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Is that true? Be
literal.

MR. BOOTH: No, the top of all buildings
generally have mechanical equipment and chimneys and
fans and all kinds of contraptions.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: So, is that just a shield to
the mechanicals?

MR. BOOTH: It's the shield for that. And it
will be made from glass and it will have at night a soft
light behind it. So, it might not be as strong as the
Hancock but it would be just a soft little glow in the
sky.
ALDERMAN WYNNE: I hope not as light as the building just south of the Sears Tower either.

MR. BOOTH: Oh, no, it won't look like pork chops.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: No. No.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Bernstein --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: No, I have one more question though.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I'm sorry.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: So, when we're looking at that, how tall is that lighted band?

MR. BOOTH: The lighted band I think is 24 feet.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Okay. And dwelling units start below that?

MR. BOOTH: Right. Because there is an elevator over it about 17 feet generally. So, you've got, we want to hide that because they tend to, what we don't want to do is have a bunch of junk in the profile of the building. So, we want to keep the elevator penthouse and chimneys and everything else that's kind of a clutter below that level.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Was that lighted band on your
last model?

MR. BOOTH: Yes, it was.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: It was?

MR. BOOTH: We always had that idea.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: So tall you couldn't see it.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Yes. You said it. Okay.

I'm finished, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Bernstein?

MR. BOOTH: It's a light, I mean, poetically, you could say that Evanston has a lighthouse, this is another one. I'm sure all my friends over there will appreciate that.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I don't know that that's an analogy you want to make.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: When the light comes up to that lighthouse, we're all in big trouble. I think that Alderman Rainey understood my analysis and my request. I'm certainly not going to summons the Plan Commissioners here for demand performance, command performance. But I do, I think Alderman Rainey took it perfectly well, to the extent that those three want to come in and comment, and I think it's a great idea that the developers come in and tell us how they have
addressed the issues raised by the Plan Commissioners if
in fact they have.

But this is, to me, the 11 years I've been on
this side of the dais and the 15 years I was on the
other side of the dais, I've never seen a written
Minority Report. So, this is new ground. And you're
talking about the potentially tallest building in the
City of Evanston, if Mr. Booth gets his way ever, and
it's a 4 to 3 vote of the Plan Commission, and 3 of the
four that voted for it have questions. So, I think to
the extent that there is some time to change precedent,
this is it.

We're not bound by anything up here. I'm not
summoning them to here but I do want to hear their
concerns. I don't want to have them go through it
again. They don't want to go through it again. But I
think Alderman Rainey took that in my point particularly
well.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Tisdahl?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Thank you. I'd very much
like to hear from the Plan Commission and I've never
summoned anyone, and I don't think this Plan Commission
is particularly likely to feel that they've been
summoned. But it's an interesting concept. At any rate, I would very much appreciate hearing from them and I don't mind doing unique things. I just would not want them to be limited to three minutes for their comments in whatever form we choose.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, you know, I'm a stickler for rules so we'll have to see about that, Alderman Tisdahl.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: So, we if could have special rules for the Plan Commission, I would appreciate it, Alderman Holmes.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I would like to ask a question about the amount of retail space. You increased it and by how much? And is it comparable to the -- and is it more or less than the current amount of retail space?

MR. ANDERSON: The retail space was increased to 18,720. It wasn't a major increase. It was, I think we were 17,900 before.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: But still less than the current space?

MR. ANDERSON: Well, the current space is
20,000, so it's about 13,000 square feet less roughly.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Moran?

ALDERMAN MORAN: I'll stick with what I said before.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: You stick with what you said before, okay. Alderman Wynne?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I have one other quick question. Maybe I don't understand because I've been out of town, but at this point, this is what you're presenting as the changed project with no other change in the public benefits?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's going to be addressed later.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Well, that's what I don't understand. So, right now, this is your changed project with the list of public benefits that you have presented with the taller version?

MR. FRIEDLAND: What we're presenting tonight is design, is the new design of the project. With respect to public benefits, our feeling is that it's sort of most efficient to deal with that once you have your consultant's material. So, that's the purpose for
which we understand you've hired the consultant, to give
you some guidance in that respect because frankly we get
the sense that there is some skepticism with respect to
some of the financial information we've given you with
respect to our public benefits such as LEED
certifications going to cost this project $3.5 to $4
million, and the fact that we've requested TIF
assistance for the Hahn building but we also have told
you that that is in addition to a significant subsidy
the project is providing for the Hahn building, and the
sense we've gotten from some of the questions is that
you have some skepticism about that.
So, part --
ALDERMAN WYNNE: At this point though, you
aren't changing your public benefits? You're just
waiting for us to hear back from our consultant on them?
MR. FRIEDLAND: That's correct.
ALDERMAN WYNNE: Okay, that's fine.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: And so, we would expect an
answer, I would assume, from them about other questions
then because public benefits wasn't the only question
that was posed to them at the meeting of the 24th, that
they would come back to us at the next meeting, you
know, with some answers in addition to what Alderman
Rainey said tonight. Okay, can we hear now from -- you
want to come forward?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm Colleen Burrus, I'm
on the Plan Commission, part of the Minority Group. But
I wanted to address what Steve had said about the three
Commissioners that were on the Majority and had some
concerns.

I've been concerned all along about the
developer saying that this plan that they've brought
before you has been recommended approval by the Plan
Commission. That is not true. What was recommended by
the majority had specific conditions that only with
those conditions including underground parking,
including office space, I believe absolute designed LEED
certification. So, the majority of Plan Commissioners
did not approve this plan that is before you. And I
think you need to be really clear about that.

And I'm sure that Chairman Woods or Vice Chair
Opdycke would be very happy to come before you and talk
about why they put those recommendations or conditions
on their recommended approval. They were very strong
about that even though I still didn't agree with it
going forward. But I'm sure that they would be happy to come and talk to you about that. And I just wanted to follow up because it's been a misrepresentation by this group.

(Applause.)

MR. ANDERSON: I have to address that because I don't think it's, because in our first presentation we stated there were I believe seven conditions specified by the majority of the Commissioners and we stated we agreed with all seven conditions except one, and that was the underground parking. The condition was underground parking so that we could provide office space. So, anyway, I just want to be clear that we were clear about what conditions we were accepting when we presented to this P&D Committee. We did not do any kind of a bait and switch or anything. We were very clear at that meeting.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We're not going to get into a debate. Now that we're not going to do tonight because I don't think we are prepared to do that, at least I know I'm not until we've read all of the information. Alderman Moran?

ALDERMAN MORAN: This is what I fear is going
to happen with this premise of bringing the Plan Commission forward. We have hundreds of pages, every single word transcribed verbatim. And what was said and what was agreed to, and we have a Minority Report and Majority Report, word for word, everything that was said. And I think that we're really looking for big problems by inviting people to come in and provide all kinds of commentary about who said -- we know what they said.

We know exactly what they said. We know exactly what the recommendations are. We know exactly what the objections are. And the Plan Commission in its last meeting, they had to stop because it was so, they were at such antagonistic positions with respect to each other that they couldn't even finish the meeting in good order. And I think to invite them to come back to provide commentary, what did you really mean on page 1438, you know, what do you really think about this stuff, I think you're really, you're getting into very troubled waters. I think it will be an incredible diversion.

I think we have the responsibility to do this now. The Plan Commission doesn't have the
responsibility to do this. Melissa, you didn't disagree
with me. You basically said what I said which was that
if a Plan Commission member wants to come and give
commentary, I said they should. And I'd be happy to
hear them. But I don't think that we need to issue
invitations or mandates to the Plan Commission to come
in here and start talking about what their
recommendations were, how they feel about it now, you
know. We'll never get through it. We'll never get
through it.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Hansen and then
Alderman Jean-Baptiste.

ALDERMAN HANSEN: I'm going to move that we
set aside a special meeting on May 7th which is a week
after Economic Development and that, unless that's a bad
date for somebody, but it's a Wednesday, it's exactly a
week later. And along with my motion, I am asking that
at that meeting we allow 90 minutes for public comment
with a discussion by P&D to follow. That's my motion.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Second.

ALDERMAN MORAN: What date is this?

ALDERMAN HANSEN: May 7th. That's a
Wednesday.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Can people just check their calendars before we vote? Because then we won't have to try for another date. Is that possible? Do we have enough people for the 7th?

ALDERMAN HANSEN: The time doesn't matter to me. I'm just saying that, if you want to do 6:30 that's fine. But it's up to everybody's schedules.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Yes, if you're saying 90 minutes for public comment, then that is 6:30 I would say. Okay? All right. It has been moved and seconded that we hold a special meeting on Wednesday, May 7th, beginning at 6:30 p.m. with 90 minutes set aside for public comment and discussion by the aldermen afterwards. Okay? Just a second.

It's been moved and seconded. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: The Chair votes aye. Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Jean-

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We set the meeting and we conduct the meeting in the way that we've done in
the past.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. That's fine. Okay, Mr. Wolinski?

MR. WOLINSKI: Yes. I think since this is a revised plan, the Site Plan and Appearance Review Committee should also have an opportunity to give the Committee comments prior to your meeting on the 7th. So, we will be inviting the developer's team to present a more fully developed plan hopefully than what we've seen here tonight so we can comment.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: All right. So that the public can understand clearly, that you're invited on April the 30th to the Economic Development Committee along with the rest of us to hear all the financial information. Then the following week, a special meeting beginning at 6:30, and probably then again on the 12th. We'll have it on the agenda for the regular Council meeting at P&D. Okay? Okay. Go ahead.

Would you want to come to the mike and give your --

MS. ANDERSON: My name is Marge Anderson. With having the economics material from the Economic meeting, when might we hear the public benefits portion
of it that the developers would be redressing?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I would assume that they would redress not only the public benefits but the other questions that have been asked of them by the Council and they would have that information hopefully back to us probably by the special meeting. That's what I would assume. We'll confer with staff to make sure that the developers can do that, and that information would be available.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay. And if that's available any earlier --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: It may be available by the 30th, you know, we're just not sure.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay. So, just keep in touch with the City staff on when we might see that?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I would say that that would be the best thing to do, yes.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. All right. Is that it? Okay. Is there any -- well, if you want to. About this particular project or do you want to --

MS. SUMMERS: Well, it would be in any project.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: In any project?

MS. SUMMERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: All right, fine. Do you want to come?

MS. SUMMERS: Thank you. I couldn't come on the date that you set. I'm Renee Summers. I live at 2126 Orrington. I am personally and professionally opposed to the plans for 708 Church.

I decided to live in Evanston with my husband Frank because we thought it was a community in which we could have a voice in decision making. We have been involved in the community in various capacities: Mental Health Board, the Human Relations Commissions, schools, sports and professional advisory committees. As a practicing psychotherapist, my office at 708 Church is in an ideal location for my diverse clientele which consists of children, adolescents, Northwestern University students, adults and Medicare patients.

There is no alternative space in Evanston to see my patients.

I have worked with the City Development Planner, and with other therapists have canvassed the available spaces and have found them unsafe, difficult...
to access or not zoned for office rental. I have been
at a majority of these community meetings and I have
heard over and over that the community is not in favor
of the plan. The City Council should not act like Dick
Cheney who when asked about the public's overwhelming
opposition to the Iraq war answered. So, an Evanston
that would operate that way is not the Evanston I chose
to live and work in.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We only had three people
that were signed up tonight to speak. And I'm again
suggesting that you wait until you have all of the
information before you speak. But the other two people
that had signed up besides Ms. Summers, and that's why
I'm calling on her, was Mr. Adams and Mr. Ursini?

MR. ADAMS: I'll wait. I'll wait.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Oh, you want to wait until
that? Thank you, I appreciate that. Ms. Rakely? Go
ahead.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You're not supposed to speak
in this Council if you are not a resident of this City.

Is that correct?

MR. ADAMS: Is this not a public meeting?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: It is not public for non-residents.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, excuse me.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: We want to hear every bit of information we can get from every source.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: He is not a resident.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: We want to hear every bit of information --

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Let the Chair respond to that rule.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: It is a public meeting and we would ask anyone to give their address and, you know, state where they're from so there would be no surprises.

MR. ADAMS: I have no problems with that.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Let's not forget why we all moved here.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Because we are open to every --

MS. RAKELY: My name is Barbara Rakely and my comment will follow on Ms. Anderson's. I would like, I think it would be very helpful to put in place some procedural mechanism by which the public is assured of
having access to the developer's revised or not revised
public benefits in advance of the May 7th meeting. It's
going to be very difficult for those of us who plan to
comment during that 90-minute period if we're only
hearing about the public benefits, the revised public
benefits for the first time that night.

And I would really request that a firm
mechanism be put in place so that public benefits are
made available to all of the public without sort of
loosely keeping in touch with staff because I don't know
what that means. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: You know, Ms. Rakely, the
Council is at the same advantage or disadvantage I think
as the public in terms of receiving some of the
information. Hopefully we will be getting all of the
information maybe on the 30th, and that's why we are
inviting you to come on the 30th, there might be some of
that information available then. If not, it may not be
available until the 7th and we would be looking at it
probably at the same time you are. We may get it in our
packets on the 3rd or on the 2nd.

And that's why we are saying if you would call
the City staff, then you'd be able to get it. Other
than that, I mean, I don't know how we can assure you
that you're going to get it in a more timely manner
because it's not in our hands to tell, you know, for the
developer to give it to us because they can get it. I
mean, I just don't know how to address it any other way.

MS. RAKELY: I'm sorry. Maybe I misheard
the developers or maybe I'm just not clear. Are
the developers planning on presenting a revised
public benefits section on the 30th to Economic
Development?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: They may or may not. I
don't know that. Absolutely, it would depend upon the
information.

MS. RAKELY: Oh, that's right. Okay. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Bernstein?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes. I'm really, you
know, frustrated. I don't think we've ever precluded
public commentary, nor will we preclude public
commentary. This Council won't act until we have the
facts and I think that throughout the time, I think
that's been consistent. People may not have approved of
what we've done after hearing the facts or our
interpretation of the facts, but we want to hear
everything we can hear.

Now, I don't know what people are expecting
with respect to the Economic Development. Much of what
they will give us is proprietary information. They
won't even give it to us, they'll give it to our
assistant, Mr. Stern, our consultant. We can't, don't
expect to come and learn what their costs are, you know,
there is going to be a certain analysis and our
consultant will comment on that analysis as he has in
many numerous occasions before.

But you know, what I heard the developer say
is that they're going to wait to see and maybe they're
going to take comfort in what our consultant says and
maybe that will bolster their case with respect to their
inability to provide public benefits. If that's what it
is at the end of the day, we're going to have a decision
to make whether or not they're asking for something for
which they are paying. All right? But please, there is
not going to be any quiet here. The people will be
heard.

You know, and Ms. Rakely, I've gotten a whole
lot of emails from you and hopefully we all respond to
them. Keep emailing, keep calling, and keep being here.
Your voices are being heard.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. If there are no other comments, then move adjournment?
MR. ERNST: Can I make one very brief comment?
I don't know if you need me to go to the mike or not.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Yes, we do. And we need you to state your name.
MR. ERNST: My name is Chris Ernst, 1639 Hinman. I am on the board of the Southeast Evanston Association as well as affiliated with Evanston Coalition for Responsible Development. And my one comment is that if we are going to be limiting public comment at that meeting to 90 minutes, that we give some sort of benefit to groups, to speakers who represent large groups such as the Central Street Neighbors, such as the Downtown Residents Association, such as the Southeast Evanston Association and others. Because they are giving voice to many, many people and they give a lot of thought and they're well-reasoned presentation. And to cut them off at one, two or three minutes I think is doing a disservice.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I appreciate that comment,
and I did try to do that at the last time. We gave them
more --

MR. ERNST: Oh, I'm not saying anything about
that. I just --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I know. But I'm just saying
to you and I'll say to the rest of the public, it
depends on the number of people who want to speak.

Now, if we have 90 people that show up
that want to speak, they're going to get one minute.
So, I'm just, I'm being honest with you. I'm just
trying to be as fair as I can.

MR. ERNST: Okay. I'm just giving you a point
of view from organizations that represent thousands of
people.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: And I hear you. I really do
hear you.

MR. ERNST: Okay. I just want to be heard on
that, okay? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: And I try to do that. But
it all depends on the number of people that speak.

MR. ERNST: And I totally understand that. I
just want to make my point.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay, thank you. Okay.
Move adjournment?

(Moved and seconded.)

(Whereupon, the hearing on the above-titled cause was concluded at 8:15 p.m.)