

Excerpted transcript of comments by Mr. Jack McCullough at Comp Plan Public Hearing, July 8, 2010

“Finally, Jim O’Halloran mentioned the issue about community support and I make two points on that. Number one, community support is not one of the criteria in front of you; community outreach is. I’m a little surprised by Jim’s comments because the amendment that’s in front of you was in front of you in virtually identical form a year ago and received comments from many in the community. The Roosevelt Development Group actually decided to pull the amendment a year ago in order to create the opportunity for additional dialogue with various stakeholders in the neighborhood which is just what occurred in the last year and in a good part of the year prior to that. So as you will hear from commenters tonight there has been nearly two years of discussion about the issues associated with this and we have detailed that in the application.”

Excerpt from RDG Comp Plan amendment application; response to Item 6 in Required Questionnaire

6. Is there public support for this proposed text amendments (i.e. have you conducted community meetings, etc.)?

Response: “The applicant has conducted the following monthly meetings with the Roosevelt community to discuss the proposed changes in the neighborhood:

- July 17, 2008
- August 26, 2008
- October 25, 2008
- December 15, 2008
- January 5, 2009
- January 21, 2009
- February 17, 2009
- April 20, 2009

Attendance at each meeting ranged from 25 to 40 people, with about 80 people attending the October 25, 2008 meeting. The applicant has also been in frequent contact with the Chair of the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association’s Land Use Committee. Scoping meetings related to the EIS have also been conducted.”

Observation and Commentary by the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association:

1. The list of meetings in the Application did, as we recall, take place. These were arranged by a professional communications company hired by RDG and served to generally familiarize the community with the type of redevelopment contemplated by RDG. Details of their plans were very scarce in all of these meetings, in particular any reference to building heights. Most of the meetings were very contentious, with community members pressing for information which the

developer would not disclose. Through the entire series of meetings, virtually no support for RDG's plans was established, leading one DPD staffer to refer this effort as a (failed) "charm offensive." In hindsight, it appears that the meetings were conducted primarily for the purpose of listing them on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment application form.

2. During the entire series of meetings listed above, there was scant reference, and no discussion whatsoever, of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan by the Roosevelt Development Group. The Community became aware of RDG's 2009 Comp Plan Amendment only after it was published. No text was shared, no discussion ensued about how the 2009 Comp Plan amendment would have impacted the Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan. Had the RDG not voluntarily withdrawn their 2009 application, it would have been invalid for lack of genuine community outreach. For RDG's 2010 Comp Plan amendment as well, there has also been absolutely no specific discussion with the Community as required by the Comp Plan Application.
3. Please note the dates of these meetings listed above. All of them occurred before submittal of the Applicant's 2009 Comprehensive Plan Amendment, and none of them occurred in the past year. This would appear to contradict Mr. McCullough's statement (above) about "additional dialogue with various stakeholders in the neighborhood which is just what occurred in the last year".
4. There has been no outreach of any kind between RDG and the Community between the date of an EIS scoping meeting on June 9, 2009 and a phone call by Ed Hewson of RDG to Jim O'Halloran of the RNA on May 25, 2010, nearly one year later. This fact contradicts the representation in the RDG's 2010 Comp Plan application (above) that "the applicant has been in frequent contact with the Chair of the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association's Land Use Committee" (Jim O'Halloran). In the May 25 phone call Mr. Hewson confirmed, but only when asked, that a 2010 Comp Plan amendment had been filed. That filing date was May 7, 2010, more than two weeks earlier. For the second year in a row, RDG provided the Community with no advance information pertaining to its Comp Plan amendments. This is not outreach; this is deceit.

The intent of the Comp Plan application process is clear; that applicants must demonstrate genuine outreach (if not actual support) in the neighborhoods affected by their proposal. Changes in the Comp Plan cause changes in Neighborhood Plans; these must be discussed between applicants and the affected communities. No such discussion has occurred between the Roosevelt Development Group and the Roosevelt Community, at any time, in either the 2009 or 2010 Comp Plan amendment cycles.

For the applicant to so egregiously misrepresent a series of fruitless community meetings as a genuine discussion of the effects of their Comprehensive Plan amendment is a serious affront not only to the Roosevelt neighborhood, but to City Council as well. For these reasons and more, the 2010 RDG Comprehensive Plan amendment must not be admitted to the policy docket.