

Upper Harbor Terminal Redevelopment Community Engagement Presentation and Discussion (following Councilman Cunningham's update report)

September 8, 2018

Prepared by Ann Calvert

Meeting held at: North Regional Library, 1315 Lowry Ave. N.

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

Presentation

Presentation found [here](#).

Presentation speakers:

Slides 1 – 6: Background information on site and earlier engagement	Ann Calvert, City of Minneapolis
Slides 7 – 10: Introduction of overall concept plan	D'Angelos Svenkeson, THOR Companies
Slides 11 --- 27: Community Performing Arts Center	Dayna Frank, First Avenue
Slides 28 – 35: Other Phase 1 development components	D'Angelos Svenkeson, THOR Companies
Slides 36 – 45: Park components & other questions	Kate Lamers, MPRB

Large Group Q&A/Discussion/Input:

1. What is the context for this development, specifically what will be the impact if the river locks and dams are removed?

A: The discussions about lock and dam removal has focused on the Lower St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam and Lock and Dam #1 (Ford). The Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam at St. Anthony Falls would not be removed, so the river pool in which the UHT is located will not change.
2. Are the traffic impacts being considered?

A: Yes, some initial traffic analysis has already started, and the full traffic study will occur as part of the environmental review after concept plan approval.

3. Is the CPAC large enough?

A: First Avenue feels good about the proposed design and the flexibility it allows.

4. Is the area next to the parkway big enough? I'm wondering about when the Phase 3 parkway will be built. What if it turns out that a parkway through there is not needed or should be in a different location?

A: It's helpful to be able to look at the planning and design of the parks and adjacent development together. There needs to be at least one north-south road, and we don't want two parallel roads.

From a practical point of view, there might be enough funds to extend the trails along the river down through Phase 3, but there won't be enough funds to build the parkway, so there will be time to refine that as the process moves forward.

5. Is there any brownfield contamination that needs to be cleaned up?

A: From the testing done so far, it appears that the site is fairly clean (although we can't preclude surprises).

6. I'm concerned that Phase 3 will never get built. What assurances are there that it will be?

A: Yes, that portion of the site will be redeveloped; it's just not yet known when and for what uses. The City will retain ownership until it's time for redevelopment to start and it definitely wants to see it redeveloped.

The timing could be near-term if the community is interested in the types of development for which there's already a market, or it could be reserved for other uses that could be possible if the market changes over time.

7. Thanks for making an investment in North Minneapolis. How will the \$15 million in State funds and \$16 million in local funds be used?

A: Those funds (and the local investment may actually be larger) will go to the basic public investments needed for Phase 1 – streets and utilities, Phase 1 park and we hope to have enough funds to work with MnDOT to make the Dowling Bridge over the freeway a better access point to the site.

8. Are you open to increasing the size of the 2.3 acre park? In looking at size, please also provide comparisons to other riverfront parks, such as Father Hennepin.

A: Yes, the park size is open to input and discussion.

9. Will the development use union labor?

A: THOR uses union labor. The City's policy is that all laborers for public work must be paid "Prevailing Wages" -- which effectively means that either they are union or will earn the same amounts. *Prevailing Wages also are required for any private development on land that is sold for less than fair market value or that receives other subsidies.*

10. I have concerns about access. There should be more housing in Phase 1 and more affordable units. Could that be achieved by having taller buildings?

A: There will be additional housing in Phase 2, and the goal is to have 30% of the total units be affordable. The input about how much of the housing should be affordable has been mixed – some want more affordable units and others want more market choices.

11. Who (demographically) is providing that input, and which voices get listened to?

A: Have attempted to track demographics of those who are providing input, but not always possible given when/where input was provided and what information people are willing to share.

12. How is transit being planned for? Could there be a transit hub to serve the site?

A: There have been initial discussions with Metro Transit about their providing additional transit service to the site, but that won't be possible unless there will be enough bus riders to create the demand. Transit hubs usually go where more than one high-frequency lines converge, so that would need even more demand.

13. This area has historically been industrial and an example of environmental injustice. The residents have fought hard to get it cleaned up. The Green Zone designation has anti-displacement and equity as over-riding priorities, so the project needs to do things differently and provide more affordable housing. There should be at least 40% affordable. The developers have been doing things differently so far -- Would they be willing to sign community benefits agreements?

A: Yes, the CPAC will sign a community benefits agreement. THOR and United Properties noted that there needs to be clarity as to what benefits would be expected, but they also are willing to sign an agreement.

14. I note that the Equitable Development Scorecard sets a goal that 50% of the units be affordable. The design of the project must be welcoming to the community, not just to outsiders.

15. Please also consider alternate ways to get to the site.

Small Group Discussions:

Community Engagement

- Some macro questions people have
- Bigger/larger community engagement process → with city, local government, and community boards
- Community engagement has been dysfunctional.
- Jxta's engagement needs more criteria.
- Larger scale and application for engagement
 - Less divide and conquer
- Longer scale (50+ years not 5)
- Needs community-designed and community-led engagement processes.
- 4:1 ration of time → residents to developers vs. the other way around
 - Letting residents propose an agenda and what they want to talk about
- Not enough time
- What does community mean? Who is community?
- Cover a larger geographical scale and more neighborhoods?
- Holding all entities involved accountable
- Having more neighborhoods/organizations involved in engagement
- Door knocking is key in civic engagement.
- Need more adult voices (from Jxta charts).
- Door knocking should be vetted more (tools made available, questions asked, houses covered, biases).
 - Neighborhood orgs door knock
- Northside needs equitable voices.
- Need to be in contact more with local business owners (use their space, what they want, what they are hearing).
- Process should not be led by one organization or group.
- What is possible? What can be eliminated? What is doable? What is set? What is not?
- Workshop style does not work → people have a lot of questions' not just one table.
- Every single resident should be engaged.
- Let community gather questions and ideas and then let them present back
 - Community needs to talk to each other.
- Need more of an equity based process.
- How are disparities and "being screwed over" working here and not working here?
- City needs a list of criteria
 - Ex. 9 Characteristics of Success included in Request for Qualifications
 - Things have to change

Parks/Public Green Space and Green Development

- More park space = less development revenue.
- Would like to see built in grills.
- Is freeway noise going to affect the “vibe”?
 - Boat traffic noise?
 - Hopefully to be mitigated by future developments
- Pedestrian bridges and Dowling and Lowry
- Park space needs to be bigger than 2-3 acres.
- Would like to see more park in this plan.
- Just green/spark spaces don’t always bring diverse communities.
 - Field space i.e. soccer fields can attract more diverse communities to the river.
- If more park space, what would you take away from?
- More density housing
- Birds are big entertainment factors, more spaces to see birds.

Community Performing Arts Center/Amphitheater and Community Benefits

- Amphitheater moves to its present site because community wanted more of a destination at Lowry. There are no sightlines from river but can listen.
- Capacity of the venue:
 - 4,000 indoor
 - Max. 10,000 with indoor and outdoor space
- For the green space that is open and available to most of the year, how will public safety fit in? How to engage the community about safety strategies at the site.
- Design is getting really good feedback for musical, nationally.
- Community programming after the ticketed season (summer)
- How will community use the space in the winter?
 - Stage fully enclosed for use in the winter time.
- Partnership agreements with community groups
- Facility would be offered at cost. Must figure out who should program the space.
- Ticketing fee supports organizations that don’t have the money.
- Could have the money
- Could a system be developed for an exchange of services?
- How do we make sure that access for community groups is not denied because of access to pay?
- Schedule: projected to be open in 2022.
- Make sure tickets are not an equity issue.
- Access that is not just about public space or fees
- Community innovation hub could provide space for arts organization.
- We did not discuss community benefit agreement.

Housing and Commercial Spaces On-Site, and Job Creation

- Maximize both housing and job creation.
- Let's not categorize this as a North Side development but a city, county, and state development.
- Afraid of too much housing development in North Minneapolis, why do we need housing in this development.
- Can it be looked at as a larger body of work?
- Rental units vs multifamily units. Transportation would have to get involved
 - Why is transportation not at the table?
- Rentals should be multi-family.
- What do the pathways look like to access the site?
- How to make sure safety is in mind when cleaning up the industrial site?
- How can we make sure this project is an international project?
 - If First Avenue is going to bring shows and concerts they might draw in international interests.
- Economic stability, there needs to be economic sustainability.
 - How are the jobs going to be sustainable?
 - The hotel jobs are more service-oriented and management jobs.
- The office spaces should be innovative; are they looking for small businesses in North Minneapolis that could utilize the space?
- This development can bring more problems than we anticipate if we they don't look at housing with the housing. No housing should be on the site?
- Why is Phase 3 blank?
- We need to make sure the community priorities are incorporated into each phase.
- Can the theater wait to be built?
- Are developers really going to sign a community benefits agreement?
- What is the objective of the project? What are they trying to solve?
 - There are not enough jobs or housing to solve any sort of problem, it is just an attraction.