

# Upper Harbor Terminal Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #3

## Meeting Minutes

09-23-2019

MPRB HQ, 2117 West River Road North

### Overview of Agenda and Project Updates

Introduction by the CAC Chair:

1. The Upper Harbor Terminal project is a unique process because there are three entities involved: developers, the Park Board, and the City of Minneapolis.
2. CAC Chair attended a large core team meeting with all entities and members of the City's Collaborative Planning Committee (CPC) prior to the CAC meeting. CAC Chair feels that there needs to be a relationship between all entities involved in this project.
3. In the future, the CAC Chair will engage more with MPRB staff in order to have better communication about the CAC's role.
4. The main goal of the project is to provide Northsiders with access to the river. CAC members need to represent the interests of the community members and give a voice to those members who provide them input.
5. Question: Can the CAC elect officers such as a vice president and secretary?
  - a. Since MPRB project manager is absent, this topic can be discussed at the next meeting.

### Presentation of Project Process by John Slack, Perkins + Will

See Slides 1-20 of the UHT CAC #3 PowerPoint presentation

6. Question: You compared this process to a feedback loop, could you explain what you mean by that?
  - a. We figure out what our designs are going to look like through the decisions that the CAC inform. We also collect input from the broader neighborhood on the concepts, which informs what concepts move forward to the CAC. And so on. The designs continually inform themselves based on feedback.

7. Question: Could you also explain the difference between the program model and programming?
  - a. A program model is a plan for activities and uses of the design spaces; how it's operated and what it will look like. While programming are the events themselves, the literal activities [ex. the program model is an athletic field, while the schedule for the athletic field is the programming]
  
8. Question: You say we're making an informed decision, but how much weight do those decisions carry?
  - a. Your feedback will be reflected through the designs. The CAC will ultimately recommend a concept to the Board of Commissioners, then there will be a 45 day public comment period until approval by the Board of Commissioners.
  
9. Project Team Comments: Our first task is looking at the previous data we've collected and distilling out the key comments about parks and open space. From then all, all community engagement will be added to the distilled information including informing the stakeholders.
  - a. We really want to show recommendation that reflect all input given. CAC will go to the community and bring the reflection making modification, calculating and assessment of new data.
  
10. We've collected around 1,300 comments which we will perform an analysis on. Most importantly we are going to be showing our work, showing how recommendations are brought about by community engagement. Through our data analysis we hope to identify the gaps in the concepts we design, gaps in engagement, etc. then we can come back with modifications to fill those identified gaps.
  
11. Question: Will the raw data be available also?
  - a. Yes, the data will be available in both the raw and analyzed form
  
12. Question: Could you give more information about how the process looks like with us leading the engagement?
  - a. The Park Board has a Community Engagement plan. The data that they currently have for what the community wants for this space is from a different project several years ago. Their engagement strategies will agree with this Park Board plan and how the engagement will look specifically is part of this iterative process. No decisions will be made without engagement in place.
  - b. It's a community driven process. The role of the CAC is to listen to the community, document that engagement and let the community know what's going on in the project, as well as devoting some additional time to attending events, getting the word out, leading those conversations, etc. The CAC will identify new unique

strategies to engage that the CAC will approve [ex: If you are missing youth input then focus on engagement to focus on youth]

13. Question: Are there any restrictions on us because this is a regional park project?

- a. We will talk in the next meetings more about that. This area gets regional funding but is also supposed to serve as a neighborhood park as well as the broader region. There are additional considerations like transportation to make in this process. We are still in the analysis state, we won't be sure what engagement for this project will look like until we take the feedback we already have and turn it into something digestible so we can move forward from there. We are focused right now on the position of the music venue and the road network onsite to forward onto the City process. *(Note: there are some restrictions on what Metropolitan Council will approve for funding within regional parks that can be found in the Met Council 2040 Plan: <https://metrocouncil.org/METC/files/40/40d78518-295b-474e-a26c-e85f62b9e706.pdf>*  
*In general, Met Council encourages passive recreation and natural areas, and does not fund athletic fields, court sports, or other active uses. However it is important to note that the should community members wish to include uses that are not currently allowed by Met Council, MPRB can explore strategies for separate funding, etc.)*

14. Question: Approximately how many parking spaces fit in an acre?

- a. I do not know on top of my head we will get back to you.

## Presentation of Park Layout Discussion by John Slack, Perkins + Will

See Slides 21-34 of the UHT CAC #3 PowerPoint presentation

### *Park Layout Small Group Discussion*

Exercise 1: Small group discussion to recommend a layout on the relationship of the entertainment venue and the park.

Exercise 2: Small group discussion to recommend a layout for the northern parkway (road) alignment along the river or along the railroad tracks. General discussion on private development and public space interface.

## Small Group Discussion on Recommendations:

### Table 1: Alternative A

#### *Table 1 Alternative A Pros:*

1. Like the access from Dowling to the music venue
2. Like that the shoreline will act as a sound buffer for the music venue
3. Breaking up of space may be preferred by the public that would be using the site because of the proximity of affordable housing developments; breaking up the park spaces will allow for everyone to be close to a park space
4. The breaking up of the park space may also provide additional opportunities for programming if there are different intentions for amenities in the different parcels
5. Breaking up of park space may encourage those who aren't using the music venue to move in and out of different park spaces.

#### *Table 1 Alternative A Cons:*

1. Dislike that this feels more music venue focused than park focused
2. Dislike the music venue being central to the site because it breaks up the park spaces and makes the overall park space feel smaller

#### *Table 1 Alternative A Questions:*

1. Would the venue would be fenced because of the size of the proposed venue; this would not be preferred as it would prevent people from flowing through the park space.
2. Would the venue would be open when it's not being used for ticketed events, how can the space be further activated? If the venue is going to be at the center of this site there should be additional outward facing amenities (concessions, etc.) These amenities could be implemented through building out space or integrating main level concessions.
3. What will parking will look like for a venue of this size, there will still need to be significant parking for families who won't use the space unless there is parking, and access for seniors.

#### *Table 1 Alternative A Recommendations:*

1. REGARDLESS OF IF IT IS BEING USED FOR A CONCERT OR NOT THE SPACE SHOULD STILL FUNCTION WITHOUT THE LARGE SCALE EVENTS.
2. Would like to see pedestrian bridges to connect the space
3. Like the parkland along the river, it would help connect some of the space that is currently in the system
4. Idea of docks as a functional space; question about the possibility of floating docks to get kids on the River
5. Overall, the River should be the focus of the park design, engaging with the river and providing access.

## Table 1: Alternative B

### *Table 1 Alternative B Pros:*

1. Like the idea of a bigger park space that is not separated because it has a more continuous feel to it

### *Table 1 Alternative B Questions:*

1. Will people in the park spaces would still be able to hear the music from the venue
2. What will the orientation of the music venue will be, call for sound studies depending on the orientation of the space.
3. What the space would look like, is it true industrial space or not? Would this industrial space make the park land feel broken up still? How will people walk through and flow through the space. Whatever is adjacent to the park property should allow for flow through the space and have a cohesive feel.

### *Table 1 Alternative B Recommendations:*

1. Put a gathering space outside of the venue so that people in the park spaces could listen to the music for free
2. Alternative to concept B would be to move the venue farther South

## Table 1: Road Alignment

### *Table 1 Road Alignment Recommendations:*

3. Like the road between the parkland and the River:
  - a. Similar to West River Parkway, follows the model of how things are generally done within the system, has consistency.
  - b. Would provide more equitable access to the river front
  - c. Would allow pedestrians to use the space without watching cars

### *Table 1 Road Alignment Comments and considerations:*

1. Private service road—this road would allow for buses (that need to access the music venue) to come down 33<sup>rd</sup>, which would take traffic off of Dowling
  - a. Would need a traffic study because those coming of 94 still need to use Broadway or Dowling
  - b. This does simplify traffic in the area which would help the public
2. Transfer building (looks like a mushroom; 3.5 Acres) which could be a development or programming opportunity if that space is incorporated
3. Would need to make changes to 26<sup>th</sup> and Dowling for improvements for bike access as this is a large residential and commuter area

4. NEED bus routes coming through here
5. Regardless of road configuration should have foot bridges or other enhanced crossing elements to aid movement of pedestrians across busy streets

## Table 2: Alternative A

### *Table 2 Alternative A Pros:*

1. Like the idea of different spaces – family space, dog space, conscious of different spaces.
2. Agree that community should have accessibility to the park. Prefer Alt A: the break model of how a family friendly park operates is a culture norm. Accessibility is important but spread out the activities for people and for parking.

## Table 2: Alternative B

### *Table 2 Alternative B Pros:*

1. Like the continue flow of the park 8 acres of the green space
2. Community should have accessibility to the park. Like the whole spot (referring to Alt. B) No division in order to do that go around the space for picnic, can be a dog park, people can easily get around and can preserve history.
3. I want to see walking, breathing space Alt. B, and the community to connect to the River to each other in a gathering space.
4. Consolidated park seems attractive but looking through community outreach lens, concert venue is being moved, not to give more space to the park, but in case of the state bond.
5. Like park width and open feeling – am just generalizing. The river needs to be open to the public. I want my kids to experience that.

### *Table 2 Alternative B Cons:*

1. Concerned about the process issues around the relics

### *Table 2 Alternative B Considerations:*

1. Would like to keep access to the Northside without gentrification. Possibly more park space.
2. Like the idea of keeping part of the relics (structures). Could be cool to save.
3. Recommend using the relics at least half to cut a half to do a bandshell

### *Table 2 Questions*

1. Where will the back of the building will face?

2. Will all music venue customers come off of Dowling Ave? That will lead to high traffic.

*Table 2: Recommendations*

1. Alternative B is preferred but it needs to be a strong park that can include a bandshell.
  - a. Should also include:
    - i. Bridge at 34<sup>th</sup>
    - ii. Accessibility
    - iii. Private road
    - iv. Ways to address congestion at Dowling Ave
2. Create an Alternative 3 – Bandshell instead of a music venue.
  - a. Music venue is not currently fully public (is a hybrid model); explore a bandshell that could be fully public.
  - b. Have a family day have a space for youth to have a venue to show their talents
  - c. We need to have a process together to create an option; not assume a venue
  - d. John Anfinson has great ideas and knows a lot about the Mississippi River. Should consider his ideas and form a different concept.
3. Study further the following considerations related to park development:
  - a. Alternative A had some benefits which should be considered during design:
    - i. Like the access from Dowling to the music venue
    - ii. Like that the shoreline will act as a sound buffer for the music venue
    - iii. Breaking up of space may be preferred by the public that would be using the site because of the proximity of affordable housing developments; breaking up the park spaces will allow for everyone to be close to a park space
    - iv. The breaking up of the park space may also provide additional opportunities for programming if there are different intentions for amenities in the different parcels
    - v. Breaking up of park space may encourage those who aren't using the music venue to move in and out of different park spaces.
4. River should be the focus of the park design, engaging with the river and providing access.
5. Docks could be a functional space; floating docks could get kids on the River
6. Will people in the park spaces would still be able to hear the music from the venue
7. What the space would look like, is it true industrial space or not? Would this industrial space make the park land feel broken up still? How will people walk through and flow through the space. Whatever is adjacent to the park property should allow for flow through the space and have a cohesive feel.

8. Put a gathering space outside of the venue so that people in the park spaces could listen to the music while in the park.

## CAC Discussion

1. Comment: Have a larger park for all ages and different users. The type of users will depend on the concept.
2. Question: What are you asking for us to choose?
  - a. Ultimately, to define the boundary of the park.
3. Comment: The choice is Alternate B versus Alternate A. But why shift? It is not to provide better access but because they have issues with state bonding if the venue is in the middle of the park.
4. Comment: This is the City's process.
5. Comment: MPRB needs to email the meeting minutes summary for review by CAC members. The CAC needs to approve the minutes. There should be time at the next meeting to discuss and approve the recommendations.
6. Comment: Our group did not get far enough to discuss the road alignment.
7. Comment: The CAC needs to approve meeting agendas in advance of meetings.
8. Comment: We should consider spaces for users of a wide variety of demographics (age, race, etc.). It would be nice to be able to provide somewhat distinct spaces for those different users.
9. Comment: The music venue was shifted in Concept B because if the venue didn't get funding, there would be a large gap in the spaces. Can we approve the official language of the meeting minutes? Motion to approve or modify the meeting minutes at the next meeting. (Motion passes). **Staff has created the 2019-10-22 CAC Memo to CPC based on these meeting notes which is listed as a separate document. Memo to be reviewed by CAC members before the meeting and finalized at the 2019-10-22 CAC Meeting #4.**
10. Comment by CAC Chair: I want to make sure that we are all on the same page here, I don't want our meetings to get re-directed so we waste time of talking about things that might not matter. I want to make sure that we get aligned with the CPC and continue on having constructive discussions.
11. Comment: It seems like time is of the essence here. Is it possible for us as CAC members to take ownership of this process by having less reliance on staff? I would like to see Robin take on her Chair role in its entirety. If the discussions are not facilitated properly we lose that opportunity. If we're going to move this process through in a timely manner we should assign roles and responsibilities

12. Comment by CAC Chair: Kate needs to be involved in this process, I will talk to her and make sure that the first order of business at the next meeting is to establish roles and potential subcommittee development.
13. Invitation by Tom Dunnwald: If anyone would like the opportunity to see this project site from the on the River, I have a friend who can take a group out on their pontoon for a boat ride.
14. Comment: It's great to be able to see the current conditions and the history of the space that we're working in. And we also saw more Southward down the river, and saw the difference that cleaning up the bank made to the appearance of the river, there was more open space and more light.

#### Public Comment:

1. I support the ownership this CAC is taking on, and the creation of distinct roles. I've been to several CAC meetings in the past for different projects, having distinct roles could allow for more conversation facilitated about concrete ideas.
2. Here's an update, Northern Metal Recycling decided to permanently shut down their shredder as of yesterday. They admitted to falsifying their records.

Adjourn (7:57 pm)