

Upper Harbor Terminal Redevelopment Community Engagement Meeting

August 15, 2018

Prepared by Namuun Bayasgalan and Ann Calvert

Meeting held at: MPRB headquarters, 2117 W. River Road N.

Presentation started: 11:10 am; discussion ended: 1:26 pm

Note: Text in *italics* is supplementary information added to the meeting summary to make it more informational.

Presentation

Presentation found [here](#).

Presentation speakers:

Welcome and introduction:	D'Angelos Svenkeson, THOR Companies
Slides 1 – 8: Background information on site and goals	Ann Calvert, City of Minneapolis
Slides 9 – 15: Background on previous planning, input and master developer selection	Kate Lamers, MPRB
Slides 16 – 22: Summary of 2017 engagement input	Kristen Murray, Dara Crawford & Cameron Downey Juxtaposition Arts
Slides 23 – 29: Introduction of overall concept plan	Brandon Champeau, United Properties
Slides 30 --- 50: Community Performing Arts Center	Dayna Frank, First Avenue
Slides 51 – 58: Other Phase 1 development components	D'Angelos Svenkeson, THOR Companies
Slides 59 – 66: (Park components)	Kate Lamers, MPRB
Slides 67 – 72: Answers to other questions	Ann Calvert, City of Minneapolis

Q&A/Discussion/Input:

1. I have specific questions about housing and AMI (area median income). The Northside needs affordable housing now. Don't do development that will squeeze out the existing residents.

2. Green Zone – What guarantees are there that the values of the Green Zone will be applied to the proposed development?
 - A: The Green Zone resolution didn't set specific outcomes. Discussions are under way with Council Members about appointing a Northside Green Zone Task Force (which will include the members of Environmental Justice Coordinating Council) that will work with the UHT team to achieve the Green Zone goals.
 - A: The development team has started to look at building design and stormwater management options that would achieve the Green Zone goals. The team also is open to considering other options.
3. The Minneapolis 2040 plan is encouraging much more housing density. Is there a market for housing on the UHT site and, if so, does the draft plan include enough density?
 - A: According to a market study completed for the development team, there is a market for housing once the CPAC is under way to change the market. Phase 1 of the draft concept does include housing.
 - A: Phase 1 is focused on getting something done to create a destination and thus a market for site redevelopment. Later phases of development will incorporate more housing (about 600 units).
4. What is the plan and strategy to achieve an inclusive economy for North Minneapolis? What kinds of jobs will be created and can be pursued for Phases 2 and 3? (The creation of jobs should go along with the development piece rather than waiting.) [Policy Link](#) and [Democracy Collaborative](#) are both doing good work that should be considered.
 - A: The development team is aware of both of those organizations, which are working at a very general policy level. The development team has been exploring ways to nurture a pipeline of Northside businesses that could be ready to move to the UHT site once space is available. Those discussions had been under way with Marcus at NEON and are now on pause since he transitioned to another position. The team also is looking into the challenge of how space costs could be lowered to be affordable to community businesses.
5. I'm a nearby residential property owner who is concerned about displacement, but I'm open to the sale of my property.
 - A: There are no residential units on the UHT site that will be displaced by the redevelopment and only a handful of jobs (which may be relocated rather than eliminated). There won't be any actions that will directly displace anyone outside the site. At this point, the focus is on redevelopment of the UHT site itself, and funds are not allocated to expand the site by acquiring additional property.

6. Does the 15.5 acres of park include all of the development phases, or is that area just in Phase 1 and there will be more park space in later phases? Is that amount of park area sufficient?

A: 15.5 acres is for all phases. The *Above the Falls Master Plan Update* showed 20 – 22 acres. The team is seeking input through this engagement process as to whether that amount is sufficient and whether the CPAC open space would be considered another acceptable way to achieve open space/public amenity goals. If the CPAC area is added in, then the total park/open space area is over 20 acres and is comparable to *Above the Falls*.

A: The setback distance along the river in the southern part of site (Phase 3) (between Ordinary High Water and building front) is two to three times more than the minimum requirement and is more than what might appear on the graphics.

7. I have questions about the graphic indicating the CPAC benefits to the Northside (slide 37). How do taxes generated benefit the Northside community?

A: Taxes help pay for the services provided by several different levels of government. Any taxes generated at the UHT site will reduce the amount of taxes that other areas, including the Northside, will need to pay to maintain services.

8. There has been no person to talk to if there is a business owner who is interested in relocating to the UHT. People need more than apartments. The team should reach out to business owners to receive more feedback about what would benefit the North Side. Project Sweetie Pie has been contacted by businesses looking for space and also has a presentation it would like to make about its vision for the site. Phase 1 sounds like the creation of amenities for people who are from outside of North Minneapolis, rather than a plan to benefit the Northside.

A: Most businesses need space in the fairly near future, and thus it's premature to take their time to discuss their space needs when it will be a number of years before any space is available. Once a concept plan is approved, then marketing to specific businesses can proceed.

9. The housing plan should not just be limited to rental apartments -- consider single-family homes, tiny homes and other types of housing that the Northside needs. The City of Minneapolis should own the land as part of a land trust.

A: Lower density single family housing can't support the development costs; multi-family housing is needed. The Phase 2 housing can move more quickly if it can be financed. A land trust can be considered, but the likely owner would be a nonprofit rather than the City.

10. As a North Minneapolis resident, I'm upset that we are not involved enough in the decision-making processes for these developments and agree that the residents should be making the decisions. Housing should be the focus for the development because North Minneapolis residents do suffer from a shortage of housing. Affordability has been a challenge for the residents and will get worse once the duration of existing affordable units expires (e.g., Heritage Homes). The UHT team should think about the needs of a mother making \$10 per hour. How will you make sure that Northside residents will benefit from these developments, especially

housing? Having 20% of the housing be affordable means that the other 80% of the apartments will be occupied by non-Northsiders. Instead, 70% should be affordable.

A: Once the housing is built, it's not legal to pick residents based upon their geographic location, so the development team can't guarantee how many units will be occupied by existing North Minneapolis residents. The question of how long the affordable units will remain affordable can be discussed/negotiated.

A: Staff has heard that some Northside residents can afford market-rate housing, and they are looking for additional choices not currently available in the area. As a result, they're moving from the Northside.

11. Does the plan include enough green space along the river?

A: Staff has heard that everything from 0% of the site to 100% of the site should be park, so there hadn't been a community consensus. The goal of the concept plan is to balance the amount of parkland with the amounts allocated to provide housing and jobs. Now that there's a draft concept plan for the community to review, the question of how much of the site should be park space is up for input.

12. Only 33% of the site will be public land for open park/green space, which does not sound right. Another issue is that the public land is behind private development parcels, which might make it difficult for the public to access the public amenities. How do you see the trail connections working? Note that a "woonerf" design does not work for rollerbladers.

A: There will be continuous bike and pedestrian trails along the riverfront for the entire length of the site to assure that the riverfront is publicly accessible, with the goal of eventually extending those trails both up and downriver to connect into the overall park system. The Dowling Plaza area will be the primary access to these linear riverfront public amenities.

In the southern portion of the site, the parkway will run along the riverfront and the private development will be inland of that parkway. In the northern portion of the site, the plan is to shift the parkway inland for two reasons. That alignment will allow users of the development (e.g., those attending the CPAC or a restaurant in the ground level of the hotel) to have direct access to the riverfront without needing to cross a parkway. In addition, the strip of land at and north of Dowling is narrow, and the parkway will eventually need to swing inland as it connects through parcels to the north.

13. Will the CPAC be owned by the City or privately?

A: If State bond funds are used to finance the CPAC as is currently anticipated, then the City (as the recipient of the State funding) will need to have a long-term real estate interest in the CPAC property. First Avenue will own the land and improvements and lease them to the City for 125% of the useful life of the facility. The City then will lease the CPAC back to First Avenue to operate. That arrangement would be similar to other City projects that received State bond funding. After the City's interest terminates, the CPAC will be privately owned.

A: Regardless of ownership, the CPAC is being designed to be a public/civic asset.

14. Affordable housing could be accomplished on property outside the UHT site. If the zoning for my property right outside the site were changed, then multi-housing could be built there.

A: Given how much needs to be done to redevelop the UHT staff, the focus needs to be on completing that work rather than adding in other property and goals.

15. Is the CPAC for all types of arts? What are examples of some types of artists who might perform there?

A: Yes, the CPAC will be for all types of performing arts; a couple examples of artists if the CPAC were in operation now might be Kendrick Lamar and Adele.

16. What might be the Phase 1 time frame?

A: If the draft concept plan is found to be acceptable with only modest revisions, then it could possibly be approved by the City Council and Park Board by the end of 2018 or first part of 2019. Additional planning and analysis work would then be needed to complete a full Coordinated Plan and negotiate initial business terms for City and Park Board approval. That might take until mid- to late-2019. The next step for the park and public space components would be design and bidding, and construction of those components might start by 2020 or 2021. The timing of the private development components will depend upon how long it takes them to get their detailed approvals and to secure financing.

17. How many residents are anticipated to move in during phase 1?

A: *If the current unit count (140) and unit sizes do not change, it's estimated that about 225 people will move into the Phase 1 mixed-use development.*

18. How can the development draw businesses to the site, without losing them from the core of the Northside?

A: The goal would be to provide locations for existing Northside businesses that either do not already have a satisfactory location or who want to expand to a second location.

19. The surrounding properties between the highway and river should be incorporated into the plan. The development of a hotel seems out of scope and that parcel instead should be used for something else that fits and is appropriate for the surrounding area, not just the current proposed site (UHT).

20. Did you have conversation with West Broadway? The City should be part of that discussion.

A from development team: No; not yet.

A: *Staff discussed the UHT project with West Broadway Business and Area Coalition earlier in the process, and WBC is included in the distribution list that receives all notices about the draft concept plan input opportunities.*

21. 15.5 acres is not enough; the park needs to be bigger. Note that the proposed “relics park” area is less than half the size of the Commons Park. Is there a long-term goal of adding a bridge over I-94? Is it out of equation because it does not have direct connection to the park?

A: The UHT team is trying to determine the appropriate balance between park space and other development goals. Input about what part features/uses are desired would help inform the question of how much space is needed to accommodate those uses. As part of the Dowling Bridge enhancement, consideration will be given to adding a small parallel bridge to add pedestrian capacity. Something larger would need additional consideration (e.g., how it would be designed, where it would connect and how it might be funded) and likely would need to be a future phase.

22. Is swimming and/or boating access being considered? Also, it would be desirable to have areas where there is no light so that special astronomical events could be appreciated.

A: Swimming in the River might raise a safety concern due to the river current and water quality, but access to the river could be considered at the beach area at about 34th Ave. N, at the Dowling Plaza and along the river wall promenade.

23. Could there be a curling club or a swimming pool over the freeway? Does the bridge just have to be bridge or could it be something else?

A: Those ideas could be explored when and if an additional bridge over the freeway is being considered.

24. Will the presentation slides be available online?

A: Yes. There was a slight difference in order between the slides being projected and the printed version. The information is the same.

25. Consider the park improvements on the land bridge over I-35 in Duluth as an example.

26. You mentioned that proposals received from nonprofits are being considered for the Community Innovation Hub. Are those from the Northside?

A: Yes.

27. There should be discussions now with interested businesses.

A: As noted, once a concept plan that identifies the basic land uses is agreed upon, then serious discussions can be held with interested businesses.

28. Answering questions and concerns about housing and job-creation must be part of the initial development process rather than waiting to the end of the process or the phase 3. The project should be innovative and a true public-private partnership.

29. Cleveland and Folwell saw the importance of parks, and the same ethos should apply to the UHT. Prioritize green space, and use the entire site for parks.

30. The UHT site will be considered as a case study for an upcoming Eco-District summit. We must think big and act big.