



Date of Comment	Comment	Response
1/24/2013	How does these new design alternatives reconnect the Iberville Development to the surrounding neighborhood	
1/24/2013	I was wondering why you have to remove any buildings if it's already on the site. In other words, you have these -- these spaces that you're calling green space, why can't you just leave the buildings that's already there. There's housing there.	
1/24/2013	I want to know which alternatives are now obsolete.	<p>I think we do want to respond the best that we can at this point in time.</p> <p>I think first of all, a question was asked which alternatives are obsolete.</p> <p>We're still considering all alternatives.</p> <p>We are recommending number 11, the last one that is a mix of preservation and new construction.</p>
1/24/2013	<p>Okay. I'm Mike [Last name Omitted] with 31 Hands of Iberville. We made it clear for a long time that we were one of the development to be improved. But the basic structure stay the same. And we still hold this position. We will hold this position till the very end. But first of all, since there are going to be changes, I have some proposals.</p> <p>One hopefully, one, I propose that the persons in charge of the redevelopment of Iberville neighborhood erect a stone memorial in the neighborhood that honors the hundreds of Iberville residents who gave up their homes, their ... and their way of life in order to pave the way for the implementation and the completion of this redevelopment.</p> <p>Secondly, I urge everybody who is interested, excuse me, I have a question.</p> <p>The second is one of the residents asked me why have the planners reneged on their earlier pledge to use a phased in approach to the demolition of existing buildings and the replacement with new homes. That is a question one of the residents didn't feel comfortable raising the question. Who knows for obvious reasons.</p> <p>And then finally, I encourage everyone who wants to know a little more about the history of redevelopment and public housing, including all the way up to Iberville and this move to get rid of Iberville, to read a book published by the University of Minnesota press called "Driven from New Orleans" by Jay ...</p> <p>That's out in host of the yufrtsd and that will give you some good incited on the last 20 years. Thank you.</p>	<p>With regard to the phased demolition, we haven't made any decisions that demolition yet. But what we do have funding lined up for is a phase development of the site. And it only as Andrew talked about, only the first step in that is three</p> <p>In reference to the memorial or monument, I really want to make it clear that one of the requirements of the CNI award is that every resident who lives on the site now, and is in good standing, of course fshgs but every resident that's on the site now has an absolute right to return to a public housing unit on the site. So there are now about 360 families, households, they are guaranteed a unit on the site as a condition of us even participating in the grant.</p>
1/24/2013	There were more than a hundred families purged in 2008, 2009 on pick I house charges to get them out. And because of the three-month wait after Katrina, hundreds of other families that lived in Iberville, since we didn't have a great deal of resources were never able to come back. As to the idea that everybody is just not true. It's only the most fortunate, strongest people found a way to come back. A lot of people couldn't and they would have loved to.	



Date of Comment	Comment	Response
1/24/2013	<p>I'm a little distressed that there wasn't a process at very beginning and you need to do it at next hearing where we can submit comments and line up, and that way residents can have the preference to go first. You're caretakers at the front, they didn't know. So it needs to happen.</p> <p>You know, your assessment of the fact that public housing turned out a certain way while here in New Orleans, our city was empty and then you took advantage of the disaster to lock people out of their big four housing develop jts. So that needs to be said, not to say it is to rewrite history. It's offensive. And that's what's happened with our schools. That's what's happened with our hospitals. That's what happened with everything.</p> <p>On number 11, why have the green spaces? As I understand and by the way, I am a participating party in this process through the admit ee to reopen Charity hospital, that state first that was there at one of the meetings said that if you just renovate the buildings, you're not running a foul of the cemetery that lies beneath it. Why can't you just leave current buildings where they are and then if you're going to clear something out, well, you have the Winn-Dixie site that's already clear. You don't need to clear anything out.</p> <p>Also, if you aring to have off site development, all that off site development needs to be constructed before you tear down Iberville, because if you're scattering the current population outside of the area, they're going to be less likely to return. So the off site development should be preserved. I mean, there were 80 houses moved from lower mid-city. Those could actually be utilized if they were built and put the roofs back on.</p> <p>And there's a lot of vacant space in the Lafitte corridor and other places that people could live very closely. We don't need to be scattering people on the Westbank and elsewhere. We want people back in the center of town and should be the original residents.</p> <p>This programmatic agreement, that is just, you know, there's a lot of scariness to this. Ask the residents that live near lower mid city with the VA hospitals. They have to deal with pile drivers and messed up cracked walls in their homes. And this also for current residents of tremor a and current residents of the area. You need to be mindful of what agreements are. And these vibration impacts, because you need assurance that your property's going to get fixed.</p> <p>Whether you're a renter or an owner, you need to be able to stay on top of it.</p> <p>Finally, I just say we have deadlines. Well, the deadlines should be subordinate to the population that's here and that was here at the time of Katrina. We want our original residents back and we want them back now and we need to be able to invite people back and use the money to subsidize their return, because there are still more than 100,000 people that are displaced because they can't come back because of high rent.</p> <p>That's all I've got to say. I'm just disturbed that these sketches take out the development and proposals to put nice things on the edges. Going to actually isolate people more.</p> <p>I don't care what the refinance ears think. It has to be restoration, building back better than we were before means getting the original people back.</p>	<p>I just want to respond to just a couple of the things. Those are excellent comments. Comments on the things that I have control over on won't otherwise. I think it's important for everybody to know how our options are limited with when we found that there were bear I can't say on the site. We have basically three options, or anybody. That has nothing to do with us. But if someone finds a burial on their property, they have three options. One is to leave it alone and continue if you're living on that property to do it, but not disturb anything around the bodies or the bodies or the bolts. Two is to stop using the land, basically, take off whatever you have on the land, keep it green space and then you're fine. The third one Andrew talked about, which is moving the bodies, which would be digging them up, testing them, reburying them on another location.</p> <p>We analyzed the first option of digging, disturbing bodies and moving them, rejected that immediately.</p> <p>The first option of continuing the existing use also has certain risk to it, because the buildings as they are are not habitable. The buildings as they are need significant work and will require disturbing the ground beneath them and around them. The law is not clear about --</p> <p>SHPO said they would work with us if we wanted to do that. Ultimately on anything we want to do here, we have to find money to do. And we have to borrow money to do this and essentially there is nobody who is going to lend HANO or the developer the money to dig up bones and without knowing exactly what the ramifications are.</p> <p>So we thought Alternative 11, which is what we're seeking comment on, any other options that a green space was the best alternative and most usable alternative.</p> <p>We're not doing anything where the bodies are. And what we're doing is taking option 2, accept for the couple of buildings, one on basin and one, the existing building on Marais, which we can as nonresidential buildings keeping them and incorporate rating them into the site plan. That's what option 11 is. But in terms of it doesn't do anything disturbing the land where the bodies are. And lastly, the other thing I wanted to clear up, you mentioned that the possibility of damages to buildings from construction disruption. The programmatic agreement that we discussed will contain language that anything that happens as a result of our, of the development on the site will be repaired and there will be protocols to make sure that damage hatches, but in the unlikely event that it does, those homes, walls will be fixed.</p>



Date of Comment	Comment	Response
1/24/2013	<p>What if I don't find a desent house in 3 months will I get more time or will I be on the street. If you don't do right by the people remember the Lord don't Sleep.</p>	<p>No, absolutely not. We would never do that. That's part of the legal requirement of the grant form. That's a minimum. That means HANO cannot make you leave until that 90 days. So that's what that means. It doesn't mean that we're going to kick you off the property. That's not at all what it means. So we do have relocation consultants on site right now that are working with every single family. And so if you haven't had a chance to meet with yours yet, then I would come give me your name and we'll make sure that you talk with her, because we have a lot of resources available and they help people find [housing]. They have realtors that can help you find apartments. We're looking at all our other developments to see what units are available. Come give me your name and I'll make sure they contact you.</p>
1/24/2013	<p>I just have a question concerning every single plan that was shown. They all show reduction in density. The excuse we can't keep the existing buildings and renovate them because we lose density, every plan loses density, too. So I don't understand why you're not showing where you're making that density up. And it also seems odd that you're not really making light of the connection between your project and the CNI, because the slide you showed for the proposed development around Winn-Dixie is just one of many. There's another map, a slide you show where the density is made up throughout nabdz reaching all the way from Orleans to broad to Claiborne and m lchl canal. That's pretty important to all these people here, especially the residents, because they're not going to be able to go back, because the density is not there. So where are they going to go? You should show them that? You should show them that now, because this is the second meeting and you have one left. This should have been shown snchlt tape snchlt show what's being proposed and show where the money in the development is coming from. You claim it's not -- snchlt tape snchlt but all these other outside development firnls that are building the various around it are doing it. And if they're not doing it, then show us what they're doing. That's about it.</p>	<p>Regarding Zoning of the project that was also a concern of Troy ___: The current zoning will change under the new CZO, but for the record, it is RM-3 Multiple-Family Residential District with a maximum height limit of four stories.</p> <p>The proposed CZO calls for HU-RM2 Historic Urban- Multi-Family Residential District for the site. It permits the uses we've programmed and has height restrictions of 40' or 3stories for Townhouses, 48' or 4stories for Multi Family, which alternative eleven meets. We are comfortable that the plan will work with HU-RM2 area requirements for the site, and will confirm this when we meet with CPC staff at the appropriate time in the process.</p> <p>We have met with the city on several occasions throughout this process to confirm that our planning and design directions are compatible with the city's objectives for the site.</p>
1/24/2013	<p>Thank you for letting me speak and interestingly, actually I have exactly the same question as this gentleman has. Also want to point out that I think in terms of getting residents and people that live in the impact area to fill in these commented cards in order to be able to make a comment, you're excluding people that cannot read and write and I think all the circumstances you chase people out of these buildings because they're too embarrassed to let you know, but they still have something they want to say. And I think in terms of density that leaving the historic buildings on, if that's possible, I understand it, will solve some of the dense it see problem. You can renovate those buildings and leave them. But really I want to know how housing dif ease up in the entire impact area and how you're going to address the issue of density. I know I have something else, but you have my comments over there, so I can't remember what it was. If I remember, I'll -- Okay. Let's see. Oh, also, buildings that front the main streets, we'd like to see those buildings stay his stock, his stock brick buildings front the main streets as opposed to dmol *ishing them and putting in some ridiculous building like what we have in B. I think better comments are mainly to do with gentleman asked. If you could answer that question first, that would be wonderful.</p>	<p>Well, if you don't mind, I'll answer the second comment that you made first. If there's anyone that doesn't feel comfortable to fill out a form or to come up and speak, you can personally approach me after the meeting. I will stay behind as long as I need to. We want to accept any comment and every comment possible. So if there's any thought or fear, please feel free to approach me after the meeting or my staff. We will stay here as long as we need to. And in regards to the density, I think Andrew did respond to the question the first time by saying they're addressing or looking at the density issues right now by potentially going up higher. That's the extent of what efficient they've been able to stud eye so far. But the purpose for tonight is take these comments and further evaluate.</p> <p>So if we don't have an answer tonight that satisfies right now we're looking at going no higher than four stories, then we'll potentially have another answer for you at the next meeting.</p>
Date of Comment	Comment	Response



1/24/2013	Is the Winn-Dixie lot and the RV park, is that adjacent or a continuation of the green way?	
1/24/2013	<p>When you plan or when you're planning to start demolitions and will you -- I mean, when can we expect to see the finalized plans? He said at one point they're going to be demolishing in June and another source say they're going to be no issuing in April. It seems to me there are still a lot of loose ends and we can see, if you have plans in place, first before you start demolition, especially in terms of where to put residents. So when can we expect to see demolitions start?</p>	<p>And that is the deadlines that are associated with the funding that's already been secured to do the develop. On the site, to do these first three blocks. These, that requires people to be, those units to be ready for occupancy by 2014.</p> <p>Backing up from that, in terms of how long it takes to do the necessary demolition and the first three blocks, have the least amount of demolition of anywhere else on the site, the goal would be to start demolition in April, March or April.</p> <p>We're not going to demolish anything without having a plan that meets all the requirements of NEPA 106. We have to go to city council for approval of demolition. There's a lot of procedural steps that we have to go through to make sure we don't lose that funding, because once that funding goes away, it's not going to come back. So we will have to have a plan for that. And a place for everybody who lives in those buildings to go before that happens.</p>
2/4/2013	<p>Submitted Via Email to Shirley Smith: My name is Nick [last name omitted] and I have a question about the Iberville Section 106 review. I was wondering if HANO/the City's Historic Preservation Consultant determined if any of the buildings on the Iberville site are eligible for the National Register of Historic Place? Also, is there any way that you could send that assessment to me or could I stop by OCD to review that assessment? Please let me know. thanks.</p>	
2/8/2013	<p>The Foundation for Historical Louisiana (FHL) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Iberville Redevelopment Project. The Choice Neighborhood Initiative is a wonderful opportunity for New Orleans.</p> <p>CNI includes on-for-one replacement of public housing of the Iberville, with 1/3 – 1/3 – 1/3 mix (public, workforce and market) onsite. With the proposed 300 or so public housing units to be built onsite, the offsite public housing required is approximately 500. The offsite area naturally consists of a mix of workforce and market share housing. However, an additional 1000 units above the 500 public units (approx 500 each of workforce and market) are projected to be artificially inserted into the CNI boundaries. Is there really a need to create over 2400 units – which will change the entire makeup and face of these neighborhoods? Supporting information about these expected offsite units has not been forthcoming, nor does the proposed PA offer sufficient protections for historic resources impacted by future offsite construction. FHL strongly reiterates that much more consideration and careful inclusion of off-site construction and/or rehabilitation needs to be discussed, and well as included in the Programmatic Agreement. Not enough information has been provided, and any discussion concerning off-site housing has been discouraged.</p> <p>The Consult 106 process for the Iberville Redevelopment, while hitting internal checkmarks, has had constant problems including an unreliable flow of information, varying outreach, and lack of transparency.</p> <p>FHL continues to be disappointed in the lack of response after months of repeated requests by</p>	



several consulting parties for alternatives to retain more historic buildings. Instead, as the alternatives progressed, less and less historic buildings were retained. There were at least two meetings where the parties left with the clear impression that alternatives would be presented by the next meeting, yet it never happened. Now we are told we are out of time and must move forward with the existing alternative. Continued requests to retain the buildings over the “found graves” have been completely ignored, even after SHPO reported positive feedback as to the ability to work with the Attorney General to do this. As we learned from the St. Thomas/River Gardens Redevelopment, the renovated historic buildings are the most desirable and more attractive of the project. Once again, FHL formally asks for alternatives that retain more historic buildings, including those over the found graves.

The Foundation for Historical Louisiana is particularly concerned about the effects of vibrations to the very fragile, historic cemeteries in the area. These are unique National Treasures – and the most visited cemeteries in New Orleans.

Prior to any demolition or construction, we ask for:

- Documentation of all tombs and conditions in St. Louis #1 and #2

- Creation of a database of tomb owners

- Notification to all owners of tombs or their designated representatives of the pending construction

- Stabilization of tombs and structures prior to any demolition or construction

- Formation of a representative committee of tomb owners or their designated representatives to participate in the Section 106 process and provide oversight for activities that affect their property

- A process in place to automatically proceed with repairs when the construction is finalized

- Tomb restoration should be executed by historic cemetery artisans who are knowledgeable with tombs of this age and type

- All repairs should be done in compliance with the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Restoration and Rehabilitation

Vibration monitoring and standards should be much more rigorous than that for the VA/UMC construction. Attached is the September 2012 “Current Practices to Address Construction Vibration and Potential Effects to Historic Buildings Adjacent to Transportation Projects” – which should be used as a bare minimum guide. Again, these tombs are extremely delicate, and irreplaceable