

Upper Harbor Terminal Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #2

Meeting Minutes

08.15.19

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Procedures: Q/A

See Slides 1 – 4 of the UHT CAC #3 PowerPoint presentation

1. Question: Specifically, what would be the product of our committee? Is it a document or what?
 - a. There will be several products created throughout the process, but the final product will be a park concept plan for the Upper Harbor Terminal and a recommendation of the first phase of improvements. Since the entire plan won't be constructed at one time, MPRB needs to know how to prioritize the current construction budget. Throughout the process, the CAC will establish guiding principles for the project to guide the concept plan, a program model, which is a collection of activities, experiences, and relationships that should happen on site, and more. Each early product is a step towards the final concept plan. The concept plan may include recommendations about developing the park, programming, operations, etc. At the end of the project, a majority of the CAC members will create a recommendation by a majority vote or by consensus. We will discuss examples from other CAC's what type of products and outcomes there can be at the next meeting, CAC #3.

2. Question: If we are having a discussion and can't come to consensus would we vote immediately or at the next meeting?
 - a. Either scenario is possible. There are other decisions you will provide feedback on and the vote might not come until a future meeting. The chair will decide when a vote will occur.

3. Question: Can we have a more quantitative way to determine consensus, this seems to vague?
 - a. This is something that we can determine if it is needed depending on how the first opportunity to vote on something goes. We won't know how this will go until we try it with this group.

4. Statement: Not defining consensus now seems like it might be a problem in the future.
 - b. This can be part of the group discussion at CAC #3.

Proposed Changes to the Concept Plan

See Slides 5 - 7 of the UHT CAC #3 PowerPoint presentation

1. Question: Is 1B industrial?
 - a. The exact type of development in this area is not yet explored, but it won't be heavy industry if it becomes industrial.

2. Question: Does shifting the music venue result in a loss of green space?
 - a. No, it doesn't. The amount of green space has not changed with this change in the concept plan.

3. Question: Could the relics move moved?
 - a. No, they cannot, but it is important to know that the relics are not a fixed element in the site. They may stay or may go depending on how the concept plan shapes up. If the relics stay, the team will work to find good uses for them.

4. Question: If the Park Board is now responsible for the relics, does this now expand the amount of money that the project gets?
 - a. There are no plans to change the split of the state bond funding for the project (City is using \$9 million and MPRB is using \$6 million). Each agency needs to provide a local match for the state bond funding. MPRB's regional park funds are determined by a number of factors and we cannot allocate additional funds to this project for a larger match. We are hoping that the consolidation of the park into one larger area will allow us to do more creative designs with the park. We also hope that this park could bring more excitement and thus possible funding streams through third party sources.

5. Question: The original concept is around 19 acres. Does the new proposal change that or will it decrease the acreage of land?
 - a. The park acreage (19.5) will not be reduced in this new proposal; it could grow slightly. The park needs adequate space for the natural components within the park, such as shoreline restoration, to accommodate pedestrian and car circulation.

6. Question: Why is the music venue moving?
 - a. We don't know the exact circumstances that led to these changes but there were probably a number of reasons that converged to suggest the concept shift. The City and MPRB have heard a number of concerns about having any private development (including the music venue) between the parkway and the river. We have also heard concerns about the development feeling like it was dominated by private development. In addition there were likely some logistical concerns becoming more apparent, such as

- maneuvering on such a tight site, visibility along the river, etc. We believe that these changes will result in a better more usable park.
7. Question: Can we be provided the paper trail for this discussion and determination on the change of the concept plan?
 - a. It is likely that there isn't an exact paper trail on when this decision was made. It was likely an aggregate of many meetings and discussions, so we don't have a linear paper trail regarding this issue at this time. MPRB has stated that we have always been open to considering necessary shifts to the concept and an alternative park boundary. When the City asked us about this change, we felt it was a better layout for all the reasons we've discussed today. We wanted to bring it forward for your review, comments, and questions today.
 8. Will moving the music venue eat into development projects or is it taking away from development at all?
 - a. Not necessarily because the acreage balance stays the same. However, as development moves around it may change what types of development can go where and therefore impact what can happen overall.
 9. Question: What is the process to decide if the relics stay and where does the CAC fit into that process?
 - a. It is Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board's (MPRB) and our consultants' job to make all options on the table clear and to provide the CAC with the possibilities and trade offs for all decisions. Staff will put in the CAC's hands the information and tools to make informed recommendations. In terms of when and how the CAC will weigh in on if the relics stay or go, there won't be a single decision-making point. There will likely be a series of smaller recommendations leading up to a recommendation of what might be included in the final concept plan. The final recommendation may be to keep some of the relics but remove ones that are difficult to reuse in any meaningful way.
 10. Question: If MPRB needs to analyze the relics, should we just wait until you've done that to meet again?
 - a. We aren't prepared yet to really dive into the relics because it's only been in the last week that we knew they were likely to come back onto park land. However, the City has done a lot of study of the relics that our consultant team can examine. In the meantime, there are a lot of other aspects of the project to cover.

11. Question/Statement: I am concerned that this concept shift gives the music venue a clear piece of land and MPRB gets stuck dealing with the relics. Was that the motive for the changes?
 - a. We don't believe that was a rationale for the changes. MPRB staff is most concerned with the long-term layout of the land and setting the park up for ongoing success. We had a lot of concerns about the narrow strips of riverfront land that were in the previously approved concept. Working with the relics does add some immediate cost and complications; however, we still believe that consolidating the park land is better.

12. Question: What will happen to the business operating north of Dowling Avenue? Will they have to sell their land for this project to be developed?
 - a. The entire UHT is being managed by a company who has several contracts with individual companies for space on the UHT site. None of these companies own any land on this site; all have short term leases and know that the redevelopment is coming. Most of the companies are storage large materials or conducting industrial operations and will not remain once the project begins.

13. Who owns the UHT land?
 - a. The city owns all 48 acres of land, but it has almost always been intended that there would be public land on the site and public green space. Once we have a park concept (part of the Coordinated Plan defined by the City) there will be a legal land transaction between the city and MPRB.

Public Comment:

1. Question: How are you going to manage the 7 to 10 thousand people who might be on the site to use the music venue.
 - a. We are working with the City to determine this, particularly how loading and transportation will occur and may impact circulation and the park areas.

2. Question/Statement: There is some dependency on activating nodes and their location on the development. Locations need to be close to the music venue for them to be successful if they are related to the music venue. We also must consider what is the tradeoff of economic development for this change in the concept plan?

3. Question/Statement: The Natural Park Service is a resource for the CAC if needed. If we can help with something we will. We have written a letter with a position on this project to the City.
 - a. Follow up: MPRB will email this letter to the CAC or others as requested.