

# Upper Harbor Terminal Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #4

## Meeting Minutes

10.22.19

### Community Advisory Committee (CAC) General Meeting:

Kate acknowledged some concern and confusion about the City and MPRB processes and the differences between the two. Kate reviewed the general history of the project which included past attempts by the City and Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) to agree on a park boundary. The collaborative process between the MPRB, the City of Minneapolis, and the developer was established to help determine the boundary based on an understanding of the potential for development. A park boundary was established when the City of Minneapolis approved the concept plan in March, 2019. Having two separate, but linked processes was intended to allow both the City and MPRB to conduct engagement processes that meet their respective needs and standards.

The CAC then deliberated on draft CAC recommendations documented in the form of a memorandum to the City of Minneapolis Collaborative Planning Committee (CPC). (*Draft recommendations included as Attachment A to the meeting notes.*) The recommendations were developed from the notes from the previous meeting by MPRB staff to capture CAC preferences into recommendations. The CAC recommendations, once finalized, will be given to the CPC prior to their October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2019 meeting. The City plans to ask the CPC for a recommendation on the park boundary and layout questions at that October 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Discussion as follows:

- CAC Chair: Reviewed first recommendation identifying Alternate B (consolidated park at Dowling without the music venue embedded in the park) as the preferred layout. Recommended no discussion, vote held until end.
- CAC Chair: Reviewed second recommendation identifying the parkway layout between private redevelopment and the river as preferred.
- CAC Chair: Reviewed third recommendation requesting additional City process to consider an alternative to the large music venue. Opened for discussion.
- CAC Chair: Absent CAC member had requested consideration of a bandshell. Additional discussion included a more open event space for events, festivals, weddings, etc that give Northsiders reasons to come and also support Northsiders. Requested that the city that an alternate option to the large music venue be considered because the large structure impacts the park.

- CAC Member: Is the idea of an open event space in addition to the large music venue? And in addition to the idea of a bandshell?
- CAC Chair: The idea of an open event space expands on Michelle's idea of a bandshell and adds more thought on how we can make it accessible to the community and invite them to come over. It depends on where the City is at with the venue. My understanding is that it's not etched in stone. If we want to make an impact, this is a good way to be involved and see what really benefits community members.
- CAC Member: So does this mean laying down a concrete slab and keeping the structures or adding some structure?
- CAC Chair: There could be options to do those things; the concept is how can we engage people around this multi-use space. What is looks like is something we all could discuss.
- Kate clarified: "Music venue, as proposed with a capacity of 7,000 – 10,000, is set. A lot is not yet determined including design. Also, we don't know yet how things will play out. It's not 100% designed or 100% funded and there are still a lot of questions about what will happen. But it's not on the table for debate, or even if parts of it are, it's not on the Park Board's table because it is the City and developers project. What I saw in the notes and from talking to people after the meeting, is that CAC members have concerns about the large music venue. People specifically asked, can we do a bandshell instead? The answer is no, because the music venue is not on park board land so we don't have the option of replacing it. MPRB could do a bandshell in addition to the large music venue. That idea may not make sense – to have both, but that is something we can talk more about with park design. What I was trying to do was find a way for people to have a constructive outlet for their concerns. If the CAC recommends a bandshell instead of a large music venue that is outside of the CAC purview. Instead of saying what should be done instead, because we have not had a process to compare ideas and we don't want to jump to conclusions, the CAC could express to the City their openness to exploring alternatives – including on park land. Should the City want to explore this, they know the CAC and MPRB is willing to partner. The recommendation articulates the examples that came up during discussion, but I tried to write it so that it stays within the CAC charge."
- CAC Member: As I listen to the third recommendation, it seems like we are describing Alternative A where the performance facility is more integrated into the site. I'm trying to figure out how this contradicts or fits into the options we already have. I don't understand what Option C is. What is the difference with what is proposed? A multi-use space sounds more like Alternative A where performance is in the park and flows with park.
- CAC Chair: They are different because the current music venue is not necessarily open to the public.
- CAC Member: Wouldn't that be up to First Avenue
- Max from The Musicant Group clarified: I was at the table and wanted to try to clarify. All the ideas that people are sharing about vendors, food, markets etc. are things that our team

will be exploring in the park. What Michelle was trying to convey was that the City should develop an Option C that does not have a signature performance venue on it. It wasn't about any activities on park land – it was about creating an alternative without the large venue. All of the ideas you are discussing are still on the table and we will talk over as part of our process. But what is in front of you is a request to the City to develop a new option without the large venue. Kate: This recommendation was taken from the notes and other discussions. If you, as a CAC, feel it does not represent your discussion or wishes, it's before you now for that discussion.

- CAC Member: Max did a good job of summarizing. Emphasize smaller bandshell or flexible event space.
- CAC Chair: Recommendation #3 does suggest no large music venue. That is in front of you; a recommendation to the city to change their plans.
- CAC Chair: With all due respect, is that likely to happen?
- Max: We don't know, but you can recommend it.
- Kate: My understanding is that right now the venue is not up for discussion. What I heard from people is that they are looking for a place to express concerns. This recommendation is a way the CAC can do that.
- CAC Member: Recommendation #3 encapsulates this idea and I support #3. This also captures the idea that the structure really impacts the park. A smaller bandshell could change everything. I think that is covered in this recommendation. Unless we can only say thumbs up and down, we should express what we think. What if they decide not to build the venue? That would really impact the park. Basically, I am supporting the recommendation.
- CAC Member: Something else was said that is very valid. We are not going to gain park land in any case. So, what we are really talking about is what we are willing to give up. From my perspective, we are here to defend park board land and sovereignty. We should be careful about being pulled into helping development that wants to eat up park land. We shouldn't give anything. We will set a bad precedent. I am concerned with putting down cement for a market because it will increase and aid development and take away from green space. We need to be careful we aren't coerced into aiding and abetting development that doesn't help the community we want to support.
- CAC Member: Kate and others brought this up. Interest in looking at smaller options for the venue is due to impact on park space, but the recommendation does not say that.
- Kate: Can add those reasons to the recommendations. Some of those supporting thoughts are captured in the considerations which are thoughts, questions, details behind the recommendations. CAC can move items from the list of considerations to the actual recommendations. The intention was that the entire memo, including considerations, would be sent to the City's Collaborative Planning Committee (CPC).
- CAC Member: Is the proposal to explore an Option C?

- Kate: Exploring an Option C is not the park boards decision; the city will make that decision because the City owns the land and the City is in charge of private redevelopment. The first two recommendations are on the table and the CAC is invited to provide input on Alternate A or B. The reason the third recommendation exists is because people were looking to make suggestions that didn't have a home in Alternate A or B. We were trying to give the CAC a place to make your opinions known so the CPC knows what you are thinking. What happens next we don't know.
- CAC Chair: We can vote on A and B because that is main topic. For the third recommendation, are there a couple of CAC members who want to adjust the wording to note how this will affect the river and the park?
- CAC Member: Is the acreage of park land the same in each Alternate?
- Kate: Yes, the acreage is the same, the layout is different.

Votes on recommendation for the Memorandum:

- CAC Chair: Can I get a motion for a vote to recommend Alternate B? Then we will vote on the recommendation.
- CAC Member: I move that Alternate B be noted as the preferred alternate
- CAC Member: I second.
- CAC Member: Since most people said they like Alternate B it will likely go forward, but do we want to say why we like it?
- CAC Member: If Alternate B incorporates the structures, does that have different financial impacts on MPRB? Or is it the same?
- CAC Chair: This discussion was had at the last meeting so we are really just summarizing what was discussed.
- CAC Member: When we sat down we weren't given the pros and cons or tradeoffs. Do we have any more information? Will MPRB go broke because of the structures. MPRB Response: There are always unknowns early in a planning process and we have to make decisions based on the best information we have. The structures were not previously on park land and so MPRB has not studied in detail. We cannot know the full extent of costs and implications with the structures without going through a process that will take years. However, we have experience working with historic and industrial areas and believe that we will have more options if the park includes the structures, rather than a music venue that is not owned, operated, or controlled by MPRB. There are definitely costs and complications to the structures but there are also unknowns and risks associated with the venue. The goal of the last discussion was to have the CAC members share their thoughts and opinions.
- CAC Member: I would add to the motion that MPRB, in recommending Alternate B, would reserve the right to approach the City for money to deal with the structures.
- CAC Member: No matter what, it will be public money – correct?

- CAC Member: Yes, however MPRB noted at the start of the meeting that they would define a boundary and the responsibilities associated with the land would also be defined.
- CAC Member: That was my concern is that the City or First Avenue was foisting responsibility for the relics onto MPRB. They didn't want to put up with paying for what has to happen – so where does the money come from.
- Kate: I can add that text, but whether you vote or not we can always approach the City for money.
- CAC Chair: There can be more discussion about that as this project progresses. We still need to vote on A or B. We will vote on B if there are no other additions.
- CAC Member: We can note that we are making these recommendations based on the information we have today. Not that we can take it back, but we leave that door open so that if we find some thing big, we can revisit this recommendation.
- CAC Chair: Can I get a second on that amendment?
- CAC Member: Second.
- CAC Chair: All in favor?

Motion passes unanimously.

- CAC Chair: Alternate B will be the recommended plan. Along with that, can we approve the recommendations themselves, along with the considerations listed? This is based off of the information we had when we discussed at the last meeting? Can I get a motion to move the first recommendation associated with Alternate B?
- CAC Member: We should add that we don't know the impact of structures on park land and associated cost.
- CAC Member: Recommend Alt Map B so that it's very clear.
- CAC Chair: Item 2, can I get a recommendation on the parkway location.
- CAC Member: yes, I move this recommendation keeping the parkway between the development and the river.

Motion passes unanimously.

- CAC Chair: Item 3, can I get a motion.
- CAC Member: I move the third item recommending that the City engage in a larger process to consider an alternative without the large music venue.

Motion passes, one vote against.

- CAC Member: I would recommend that we have no position at this time. Since we don't know what they are going to be doing, why would we give up something? They could change and we've already given a go and then they take that and us it. I suggest we table it.

- CAC Chair: We already passed it so it's actually too late to table it.
- Kate: I would clarify that the intention is expressing your interest in studying something and being part of a conversation. There is no conclusion identified.
- CAC Member: Should we review the list of considerations. I have some things we should add.
- CAC Chair: yes.
- CAC Member: I really appreciate people bringing up the noise issue. I think most are good, but wanted to add on that we should consider transit. MnDOT is doing a reconstruction on I94 and is not looking at doing transit. Since parking is an issue on this site and transit will be important, we need to insert it into the conversation.
- CAC Chair: I thought MnDOT was not clear on what their project will include?
- CAC Member: That is true, but we know that transit on this corridor will not be part of it. So, if we are talking about parking for people who cannot access the site, we need to talk about transit for people who cannot access the site.
- CAC Member: I have asked MetroTransit about this site and they essentially punt and won't provide transit until there are people who need to use it.
- CAC Chair: That is a future conversation because we don't yet know what the amenities will be or how many people will be on site.
- Kate: The recommendations are for the CPC to decide on A or B. There are a lot of future needs and wishes that will be discussed and developed regardless of where the layout lands.
- CAC Member: Are you suggesting that we articulate the need for transit and to further study it as the project develops?
- CAC Member: Yes. And the undergrounding of the powerlines is also in our purview because it impacts our project and public space.
- CAC Chair: Okay, we will add those two items.
- CAC Member: Prioritize placing utility lines underground.
- CAC Chair: Will that transit discussion come later?
- Max: Yes, we will look at with activities and experiences. How people get to this site is really important, so we will look at it along with the design team and others.
- CAC Chair: Okay, let's move forward with that recommendation and those additions.
- Kate: I will add those items to the recommendation for the CPC. I also suggest we postpone the discussion on CAC officers until the next meeting. There are people who are interested who are not here.
- CAC Chair: Let's table this. We did not discuss this at the last meeting because Kate wasn't here. We can make sure folks know it's on the agenda for the next meeting.

Agenda item tabled.

The Musicant Group Presentation on engagement information gathered to date (found as a separate document on the project website):

- Public Question: Where the request for proposal fits into this—United Properties, what was the relationship between engagement and early phase, any developer involvement?
  - A. The developer was involved in most engagement in 2017 and 2018.
- CAC Member: Engagement in partnership with city, what comments are related to park versus developers? (ie. Music)
  - A. Park Board staff went through to find comments that were pulled out about the park
  - A. Tried to keep it park related as well, there was a specific survey question about the music venue itself, this wouldn't be coded for as music, music was about music in park space itself
- CAC Member: Graph that shows split between local area resident comments and broader comments?
  - A. Could do it, but decided because 78% is large we didn't exclude the 22%
- CAC Member: Trends, boating strong throughout, soccer is strong at first, then didn't talk about it with concept plan, concept makes people limit their visions in response to what they see
  - A. This is exactly why we need CAC members, we don't have that kind of analysis, we need help interpreting what this actually means (what topics diminishing could mean)
- CAC Survey particular, both north and northeast, what percentage is north versus northeast?
  - A. Project Staff—can look at it any way
  - A. 300 of the survey comments of the 700 total survey comments came from those 3 zipcodes, also true that 78% of TOTAL comments (from survey and events) comes from these 3 zipcodes.

Small Group Work:

## Exercise: *Themes and Principles*

Explore themes + principles to guide the development of the program model and design

### Instructions

20 Minutes

- Break into 3-4 Groups
- Brainstorm, record, discuss and rank **'meta' themes and principles** for The Park @ UHT
- Finalize and prioritize themes/principles on post-it-notes and place on board

33

## Examples: *Themes and Principles*

Interaction with the river

Creating dynamic spaces that can be programmed to accommodate multiple uses

Natural Spaces for people to use

Access to food

Local community use and ownership

Embracing and blurring the river edge

Recognize historic inequities around UHT and the Mississippi River

Considering and mitigating 'Green Gentrification'

Pursue environmental justice

Creating connections

Active and vibrant space

Space for youth and families

Gathering

Music

34

## Team 1

Group 1 wrote down themes/principles/ideas both individually and as a team and then grouped them into broader categories. The Grouping below represents the grouping of the comments by Team 1. **The names of the groupings were given by TMG.**

### *Grouping #1: Programming + Access to the River*

- Environmental Education
- Free Programming day/night
- Restore connections to + interactions with the river
- Access to the River
- Access to the Mississippi River
- Education and teaching about the river and the land

### *Grouping #2: Spaces for all Families + activities for youth*

- Family + Youth Space
- Community Gathering Space
- Teens Hammocking
- Gathering space for family/community. Events, Cultural
- Structured Areas for specific activities. Example: Fishing, Soccer
- Gathering Spaces for groups. I.e. Minnehaha Park
- Family and Youth Space
- Cool Playgrounds

### *Grouping #3: The use of 'natural' space + connections*

- Green Spaces
- Natural Space for Physical Activity
- Trails
- Walking + Runnings
- Access to the river for use
- Connections to bike and walk from neighborhood, other parks
- Bicycle trails and pedestrian paths

### *Grouping #4: Equity + ownership + belonging*

- Equity for all users
- Connection between park access + affordable housing
- Address green gentrification
- No Overpolicing + criminalization

*Grouping #5: Environmental Justice*

- Indigenous land reparations
- Environmental justice
- Environmental justice
- Environmental justice

*Grouping # 6: Active and Vibrant Space*

- Active and Vibrant Space

*Grouping #7: Commercial Activity and Affordability*

- Paid amenities should emphasize affordability for as many visitors as possible
- Access to food
- Opportunities for economic empowerment
- Vendors be POC, immigrants, preferably northsiders

*Team 1 Themes (TMG Interpretation):*

- 1. Programming and Access to the River**
- 2. Spaces for families and activities for youth**
- 3. Use of natural space + connections**
- 4. Equity, ownership and belonging**
- 5. Environmental Justice**
- 6. Active and Vibrant Space**
- 7. Affordable commercial activity**

*Team\_2*

- Hyper local public art
- Ability for art on site to adapt
- Park can adapt + change over time. Design for deconstruction
- Relationship of land as it relates to water
- Connection to greater river park system + grand rounds
- Missing link for bike trail/ped access
- Water access
- Make park a unique destination + what makes park unique to this community. [Picture is cut off] record more
- Access to water, relation to water, neighborhood focus

- Connect to greater context
- Multi-Functional Flex-Space
- Adaptable Spaces
- On-going opportunities for public art by northside residents/artists
- Welcoming, open, accessible space for low wealth community and communities of color
- Connections to greater water systems, regional trail systems
- Environmental Justice
- Enhance relationship to river and water access
- Anti-displacement measures

*Team 2 Themes (TMG Interpretation):*

- 1. Public Art**
- 2. Flexible and adaptable spaces**
- 3. Connection to the broader park system**
- 4. Unique + connected to the community**
- 5. Connections to water**

*Team 3\_*

Group # 3 had two written completed boards with themes, principles and ideas.

*Board 1*

- River Access
  - Boat, fishing
- Flexibility + Balance
  - Natural v. developed
  - Multi-generationality
  - Regional v. local
- Playspaces (engage youth?)
- Habitat Restoration
- Public Garden Space
- Uniqueness of Place
- Public Art
- Historic Preservation
  - Dakota People

### *Board 2*

- Natural green space
- Relation to regional v. local (both)
- Balance with gathering spaces
- Flexibility- not set in stone
- River Access
- Boat Launch, Fishing, Dock
- Ages
- Passive natural areas (to play in)
- Playspaces- dynamic to accommodate multiple uses
- Draw in those from N. Side- come in

### *Team 3 Themes (TMG Interpretation):*

1. **River Access**
2. **Space that is flexible + use that is balanced**
3. **Places to play**
4. **The uniqueness of place as connected to the community**
5. **Public Art**
6. **Historic Preservation and recognition**
7. **Natural but interactive space**

### *Questions Written Down*

#### *Clarifying Questions:*

1. **Is physical engagement with the river now/in the future plausible? (pollution, health and overall safety concerns?)**
2. **Why build a beach if you can't swim?**
3. **How will this project impact the MPRB Budget?**
4. **Can the power lines be buried?**
5. **What happened to the MN DOT/I-94 transportation issue?**
6. **Statistically how many comments are needed to get a final answer? (When does engagement no longer add value?)**
7. **Other projects (nationwide) of this scale: How many comments do they get before making a decision?**
8. **When will we know what the city is planning to do with their section of land to take that into account with our own plan?**
9. **Economic modeling: How much tax base is required for this to fund itself (self-sustaining)**

10. How will this project impact the MPRB Budget?
11. Can the power lines be buried?
12. What happened to the MN DOT/I-94 transportation issue?
13. Why build a beach if you can't swim?
14. Is physical engagement with the river now/in the future plausible? (pollution, health and overall safety concerns?)

### Engagement Questions:

1. Do we know how well feedback givers' demographics align with the demographics of the neighborhood nearest UHT? Race, age, income, language, ability.
2. If some of the engagement was done with the city, how were comments related to the park differentiated from those related to the rest of the development?
3. What information is being provided to the public for context when comments/surveys are collected?
4. How are you ensuring equal racial/ethnic representation in the data collection?

### Future Engagement Questions:

1. Everyone wants everything. How do we "narrow" the options? That's the real issue.
2. When I think about spending \$ at a park (food, markets, rentals) how do we ensure that we're hitting price points in line with what the community might have envisioned?
3. I'd like deeper engagement about paid vs. free amenities and what price points would for visitors + vendors alike
4. What's the relationship between UHT and North Mississippi Park? Do people want to have different uses at each park, visit both? Or do they prefer to only visit UHT?
5. Engage the faith community. E.g. space for rented or reserved programming
6. We need to get an idea of how many people will use a large destination park like this.
7. Compare to lake harriet + como + minnehaha
8. How many times per week/month do you visit parks? How would UHT change that?

### Final Group Discussion and Public Comment

1. Public Comment: I appreciate the space to discuss these issues and the nutritious meal and the fact that public participation is a part of this meeting. It is not a part of the City meetings.