

Upper Harbor Terminal Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #5

Meeting Minutes

11.18.19

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) General Meeting:

Kate introduces meeting agenda. Two items for the CAC to vote on include: determining CAC officers, and decisions about Powerlines. Meeting discussion is about Green Gentrification and impact on park development.

Vice Chair Discussion:

- CAC Chair: Does the CAC want to have a vice chair. Several people that have expressed interest in being the vice chair; position is open to any CAC member interested. Role as chair is to meet a week prior to each CAC meeting with Kate to discuss the agenda, catch up on team, work, and have a deep discussion from a systems point of view. I ask questions, challenge things, and learn more about the project so I can best represent the CAC. Vice chair would step in if Robin is unavailable. If committee wants more of a role, define that role.
- CAC Member: Vice Chair could do a task that Chair delegates, such as emailing the CAC, etc.
- CAC Member: Vice Chair should attend each pre-meeting, not just fill in for Chair, and have similar access as Chair.
- CAC Chair: Request volunteers to be Vice Chair.
- Brandon Burbach: Live in Webber Camden and have been interested in project for years. Involved in WCNO and 2020 plan. Very active on committee, ask many questions, offer input to staff and Chair. Willing to help step in when Robin is not available.
- Mysnikol Miller: Live in North Mpls, Folwell for 7 years. Lot of work has been advocacy, and striving to empower voices in community. Haven't been aware of this project as long and think it's important that everyone is included and represented at the table. Work from home for Folwell Neighborhood and have a flexible schedule. Work with Robin and have a good rapport and are respectful of each other. Don't always agree but can get work done and would be a good match. Can help bring unseen and unheard voices to the project.

CAC Elects Mysnikol Miller to be Vice Chair

CAC Meeting Minutes Discussion:

Kate asks the committee if they want a CAC representative to take notes or review notes to make sure that the CAC minutes are accurate. Kate reaffirms that anyone can write to staff and express a

concern with the minutes, but that typically CAC's do not approve of minutes. If CAC feels this step is not necessary, staff will continue to take notes.

- CAC Chair: Do we feel like we need a CAC member to document and take notes or are you comfortable with staff being the ones to take notes?
- CAC Member: I haven't had experience. I put forth that if anyone feels like their voice isn't reflected in notes, just submit to staff. Anyone at table can take notes from their perspective and submit to staff. Can help add to material and perspective. If we assign someone, it is still biased and they will still miss someone.
- CAC Member: This issue came up at the City CPC meetings; people at City level meetings feel that notes don't always reflect community input. Idea came from conversation with Mayors office – suggested taking their own notes.
- CAC Member: When we broke into small groups before, staff took notes and read them back. If we felt like they were wrong, we let them know.
- CAC Members: Is it our feedback, or community member feedback? When people ask about community members, I don't think of us.
- CAC Chair: When we are in small groups, its all of use. CAC and public participate together.
- CAC Member: Does anyone actually have a concern? If it's not a concern, are we trying to correct a problem that does not exist? This is a problem for other committees and a different group of people, but is it a problem for ours?
- CAC Chair: I see no issue, but wanted to ask if it is?
- CAC Member: Two meetings ago I was looking and minutes and felt there was an issue.
- Kate: CAC Members can always express concerns to staff and get notes corrected. Question is if the CAC wants an extra process before the notes are posted online.
- CAC Member: When we break into small groups, elect a community member to take notes if they want to. Then it's not our bias, community takes notes and submits to staff.
- CAC Chair: Community members may not want to do that; they may just want to provide input.
- CAC Member: It was just a solution to a problem that we don't have.
- CAC Chair: the reasons why this came up is that someone complained. So at this point, do we need documentation outside of what staff does. Do we trust staff or does one of us need to assist? I suggest that we ask for volunteers in breakout sections, and if no one wants to do it, we can just rely on staff.
- CAC Member: Can we just see notes before they are done? We have an obligation to look at, if it's not a lot of work. If not one provides input, they are good.
- CAC Member: People can identify themselves during breakout sessions.
- CAC Member: Have we approved minutes from last time.
- Kate: No because we have not had time to get them out. There were a lot of questions that it's taking a lot of time to track down.

- CAC Member: It would be desirable if the minutes could be disseminated more quickly, and if the people taking notes (staff) could identify themselves during breakout sessions.
- Kate: Staff will try to have minutes before each meeting. Usually we try to have them out within a week but it isn't always possible.
- CAC Chair: How about Alexis and Ben (volunteers) take notes, and staff will try to have meeting notes out as soon as possible.

Motion passes all in favor.

CAC Discussion regarding CAC emails among members:

- CAC Member: Is there an official way to have discussion amongst CAC members that is within the guidelines for discussion besides group email, which isn't allowed due to open meeting laws? There are times that that would be useful.
- Kate: Technically unless communications are public, we would be running afoul of open meeting laws. This isn't our law, this is what we have been told by our legal council for appointed bodies. I had sent out the email list. You are welcome to email other CAC members or the entire group, what we have been told is that ongoing email discussion where topics that are being discussed that go back and forth is a serial discussion, and technically goes outside of open meeting laws. So, any format that we were to set up online, unless we are able to make it completely public, and we have talked to our IT Department and we don't currently have a way to do this. It's not that you can't email each other, it's just that you can't get into a heavy project discussion and keep it going and going. The discussion must be public.
- CAC Member: Can CAC can make a Facebook page that is public.
- Kate: Staff cannot create this Facebook page, but if someone else wants to they can.
- CAC Member: I have a really a hard time when an email goes out from you and we can't respond to all. Sometimes I am not sure if I am replying to everyone. I would like a way for all of us to communicate with each other.
- CAC Member: I (Alexis) will create a Facebook page.
- CAC Chair: Is everyone okay with having a Facebook page?

No disagreement by CAC Members.

Powerline Discussion:

Kate provides background on the powerlines at the Upper Harbor Terminal site and the possible configurations of the powerlines that exist. (See the attached exhibit of configurations and notes provided to the CAC before the meeting and relevant slides in the meeting presentation.) There is a

tremendous amount of background on why the powerline options exist, but not a lot of options for MPRB or the CAC.

Kate describes the limitations and options for the powerlines as described in the powerline memo.

We do have an option to take MPRB money and put the lines underground for the short segment through MPRB land, but unfortunately this is a very limited option. It would reduce our budget and we don't know how much. We know it would likely be in the tens of thousands to study the options.

A study would be needed in order to determine if it is feasible to put any portion of the lines underground. This study must be conducted by Xcel and paid for by MPRB. MPRB does not know what the cost for such a study and doing the study does not guarantee that putting the lines underground is possible. MPRB does not know the cost for putting any portion of the lines underground but expect it to cost in the millions of dollars.

The price of steel fluxes quite a bit because of trade, tariffs and other construction going on, but the price won't necessarily stay that way, so even if they quote us a price it could be when we are ready to do the work it's more expensive. There are a lot of unknowns.

The main question here is: Do we feel it's worth investing money in the study to explore whether or not we want to bury the lines? Because if we invest in the study it also means that if it comes back at 1 million or 2 million dollars, it's worth spending that much of the construction budget to do that and do you feel that having the lines buried there is really an improvement over having them overhead?

Questions/Discussion on powerlines:

- CAC Member: Will the domes would interfere with the lines if buried?
 - Kate: Possibly, but it depends on which kind of metal is used, the issues is that it can potentially degrade metal. It might have interference with overhead elevators, and we may need to remove some of those, but the issue with the railroad tracks is that we can't move those.
- CAC Member: What are all the disadvantages of having the lines above ground?
 - Kate: It really depends on how people feel, there is a visual disadvantage and there is a lot of different information out there about the impacts of large powerlines. There are also a lot of concerns about environmental justice, I don't know if there is anything that clearly says one way or the other the actual impacts. If they are underground, they are still there, and they might actually be closer than if they are overhead. To the best of our knowledge it's mostly a visual character.
- CAC Member: Could you shift the line to the north?

- Kate: You really can't, because you can't have an acute angle, because the pull on the polls is very different. That would also result in a longer run of lines, more cost, and more power lines on park land.
- CAC Member: Is the question before us whether we should do the study?
 - Kate: Yes, but if you feel like it's worth funding the study then I would assume that you feel like it would possibly be worth diverting those construction dollars to burying those lines, not knowing what those construction dollars will be. Unfortunately, that is the best information we can give you at this time.
- CAC Member: For aesthetic purposes in Webber, it's always a good idea to bury them.
- CAC Member: Is the environmental injustice any different in terms of moving them from where they are now as opposed to moving them up by the railroad above ground in terms of impact to people in the park or for people in the neighborhood across the street/freeway?
 - Kate: Not as far as we know. I mean generally we have heard from community members, and we would like to impact the public space as little as possible. It would be possible to run these poles through the park space overhead. Generally, what we have heard during previous engagement, nobody liked the poles in park spaces. For most park uses it doesn't limit much, but we just want to get them as far away from people as possible. We don't have any evidence that this is a hazard, in some degree they are still generally in the same area (if you move them to the rail area) so any hazards with the poles are similar.
- CAC Chair: If the poles move from where they are (in the middle of the park) over to along the railroad tracks, there is a lot of other stuff there. Stuff that is generally bad like utilities, railroad tracks, other poles, etc. So it's not like they would be in the way and we would have a full open park. I think that is important – we don't have to have them in the park. The issue is moving them below ground is expensive and we have to take that money out of the park budget. I think above ground seems practical. Is burying the lines common practice and would that be safe? Is that what the study would tell us?
 - Kate: If they study this and found that could be done safely then that would be an option. With these types of large transmission lines, it's not particularly common. It does get done in places, but if you look at a lot of the parks along the river, they have these transmission lines going through them because it is so cost prohibitive to bury them.
- CAC Member: I'll give my background. I work with Xcel Energy a lot I work for an overhead power contractor. For something that short with everything that is going on over there more than likely it's going to cost an absurd amount of money to put them underground. If you're looking at reliability wise for that short span, if a tree falls anywhere else on that line it's going to off power, so that one short span is not going to make a big difference in terms of reliability, if it did make a difference Xcel would pay for it. Realistically that entire span across the river is going to have to be overhead anyway which means you're going to have

to put one or two structures, and when you look at those structures, these are big ugly structures, you'd take up just as much space. If Xcel would pay for it, I'd be all for it.

- CAC Member. Who is responsible for repairs?
 - Kate. Xcel.
- CAC Chair: So, you would say that it wouldn't be a good idea to do that?
- CAC Member: That's my opinion with everything there and how deep you'd have to bury them.
- CAC Member: My thought is you are going to see the power plant, you are going to have towers no matter what solution you build, and these estimates costs are 20% of our park budget. I feel like there are much better things we could do with that 20% that would have our park be a more pleasant and useful space rather than trying to erase an issue that that we just can't erase. I don't know that there is a good solution, at least not with the options that we are presented.
- CAC Member: The city has agreed to move the first pole?
 - Kate: Tentatively the city has agreed to move everything because the city owns the land now, they have agreed to move the line to criss cross the road back by the railroad tracks. Technically there is no legal agreement in place, but yes, assume the City will move the lines but not put them underground.
- CAC Member: Those lines cross partly over the concert venue land. I'd say we keep them overhead and if the concert venue really wants to put them underground, they can fund that.
- CAC Member: Exactly.
- CAC Member: There are no costs MPRB would have to pay to study moving the lines back along the railroad tracks?
 - Kate: The city is funding the general study to move the lines this way.
- CAC Member: Is the cost being shared or is cost being pushed to the park instead of the city?
 - Kate. The City will (tentatively, as noted before) fund the study and cost to move the lines back along the railroad tracks. MPRB only incurs cost if we want to study more options, and further cost if we want to pursue burial.
- CAC Member: Has the developer been engaged with on these discussions?
 - Kate: The discussion about the powerlines, yes the developer has been involved, there are no concerns from their point of view. There is no additional cost coming to the Park Board, it's just that if people wanted to explore the option of pushing it under ground here in this segment, we would pay for it. It's all public funding and it's part of a larger cost negotiation between the City and MPRB. For example, the City is giving MPRB a good deal on the acquiring the land and they are offering to pay to move the lines back out of the way along the railroad tracks. But if MPRB

wants to do more because of the desire to have fewer lines over park land, we will need to pay for it.

- CAC Member: The study would only cover burying this very small segment – correct? Not burial of the entire line on the UHT property?
 - Kate: Correct.
- CAC Member: Who has been the traditional beneficiary of these existing powerlines and if who would be the future beneficiary of these powerlines? Is this getting forced onto the park to eat up our budget as opposed to the city or developer paying for it. I'd be very concerned about little bits and pieces of cost being hoisted onto the public that aren't really benefiting the public.
- CAC Chair: Staff memo shows clarify these lines serve the Northside and Northeast Minneapolis.
 - Kate: These lines serve a huge area. We don't have an option to make them go away – we looked to see if we could put them in the freeway corridor etc. The city has explored ways to try and make the lines go away as much as possible.
- CAC Member: I want the notes to clearly show that I think it's critical that the Park Board make sure that these types of considerations are earlier in the decision making process. I feel that being presented with critical things like this and being told that it's going to cut into the budget; it feels like manipulation. If the discussion was a higher priority sooner and the discussion with Xcel had happened during the getting of the funds it could have been folded in there and we could have had the full thing potentially.
 - Kate: We will do our best to bring things to you so that you have time before these decisions come up.
- CAC Member: I am not talking about before the CAC, I mean before this whole CAC existed. I think for this whole UHT process things have happened in a very unproductive order. I mean this conversation could have happened a lot sooner, like even before we existed, so that it was in the budget to begin with.
 - Kate: The the powerlines were discussed with the state legislators when seeking bonding. The city is not allowed to use the bonding dollars to put the lines underground for redevelopment purposes. There's a whole can of worms that goes with the bonding dollars. The legislators who helped get public infrastructure dollars were very interested in getting rid of the power poles but they saw no mechanisms to do it. So this was something that came up a couple years ago. But we will do our best to get things in front of you as quickly as possible, because we don't like a rushed decision either, but that was kind of where this one was at especially given that the boundary decision was relatively recent.
- CAC Member: Could the all powerlines be buried on the parkland by the river?
 - Kate: In theory they could be, but the MPRB even with all of our budget, does not have the budget to look at that as an option. That would actually take more than the total budget that we have.

- CAC Chair: Can we have a vote? There are three abstentions.
- CAC Member: I'd like to know why people are abstaining.
- CAC Member: Colleen made a really good point and it tempts me to vote yes, but Mysnikol made a really good point that I wish all these decisions were being done more transparently because I think people would really have wanted to advocate for putting the lines underground at this site because the environmental legacy of what we have here with city owned park owned property where people allowed to rent property and dump on it and not do things that are advantageous for water quality so if we could do that today for this site.
- CAC Chair: So what you are saying is that because the City made money on the lines, they should pay for this?
- CAC Member: I'm saying that environmental justice is so critical in our communities and because the city is not taking that seriously from the forefront I'm not going to play the game to sit here on this committee and pretend like I have a say when in reality the decision was made way before me. This is why I abstained on that vote.
- CAC Member: I'd like to change my vote and abstain too.
- CAC Member: Can I make a motion to retake the vote?
- CAC Chair: Before we do that, Kate is there anything you can do to address Mysnikol's and Alexis's comment?
 - Kate: I don't that there is a whole lot more background I can give, because I don't completely know everything. When we first started talking about this process everyone said "what in the world are we going to do with those awful powerlines?" There was a lot of digging by the city attorney about what rights they have or not have. And they consulted with someone with a specialty in understanding what rights they did have. The City does not have the right to require Xcel to move or fund some of the move? No one has ever wanted them there at all.
- CAC Member: Who allowed it in the first place? Is the City making money?
 - Kate: As far as I know the City is not making any money. They allowed them the easement. This situation is really common on river sites; the stuff that was not wanted anywhere else in the city moves out of the way until it gets to the river because it can't move any farther. So, when the Park Board is doing riverfront projects, we find a lot of this type of stuff. Usually they aren't as big as these powerlines. I know that they looked at every option, because everyone preferred them buried, including the city, but the feeling was they can't fund it right now. If they could conceivably fund it, they could bury them. Generally, people wanted them as far away from the public land as possible. In nearly conversations people said get them as far away from the public land and if that is back by the train tracks that's not really a used area. That may be the best you can do.
- CAC member: Can we open this up the public to see if they have questions or comments?
- CAC Chair: Yes.

- CAC Member: What I'm hearing right now is that the park board is not ready to invest in this land properly right now.
- CAC Member: And neither is the City.
- CAC Member: I thought that railroad line is dying and is going away?
 - Kate: Probably eventually just because industry is moving off the river, but there is no end date in sight. There are still several businesses using the rail line. Nothing we can count on.
- CAC Member: It takes a lot for a utility to give up their right of ways because once they give it up, they can't do anything with it.
 - Kate: Even if CP Rail no longer needed that railroad there is no guarantee that they would give up the use of it or ROW.
- CAC Member: You had mentioned regarding the conditions of the bond. What are the conditions that is stated that this can't be funded by the bonds? The bonds are millions of dollars of public money – why note?
 - Kate: This gets into how the city is able to use the bond money and I'm not the expert. It has to be for public infrastructure and if they have to move or bury that line so that redevelopment can occur, they cannot apply bond dollars that way. The city and MPRB have local match for those bond dollars and could apply local match, but what the City is seeing is that the overall funding is not adding up because they still have things to do with roads, utilities. Because the MPRB is a public agency we could take that bond money and bury the lines, but the money that it would take to bury the entire line under MPRB land is likely to be more than our entire budget, both local and bond funds. That would be a question too - is there a feeling like if the lines are overhead in park land is the situation really much better if they are underground? Because they are still there – you just don't see them that much. We heard a lot that people wanted them to go away, but that going underground is not that much of an improvement.
- CAC Member: Are these powerlines along the river in South MPLS too?
 - Kate: There are some situations in South MPLS and some transmission lines with city projects where some were buried, but these situations were different because Xcel needed something and so the city had more leverage. These lines are in North and Northeast because these are the industrialized areas of the river historically, so we deal with these problems more in these areas.
- CAC Member: I just wanted to clarify that the lines are in North and Northeast along the river, not in south Minneapolis.
 - Kate: Correct – because North and Northeast are where the riverfront has been industrialized.
- CAC Member: Are these the powerlines that some people say it's dangerous to be under them?

- Kate: I think any powerlines could be considered dangerous in this way.
- CAC Member: So there is some question about the safety. My understanding is that it's worse to have them overhead and not underground. One choice the committee would have is to not vote either way.
- Community Member: Is the CAC voting on whether or not to approve the powerline location or whether or not to approve the MPRB funding a study?
 - Kate: The study.
- CAC Member: What happens if we approve the study? How does the budget change? What disappears.
 - Kate: We can't know everything yet because it depends on how the park gets designed. We would need to get the quote from Xcel. We just know we would be spending budget for this. Our general estimate that it would be in the tens of thousands of dollars.
- CAC Chair: It's going to cost to do the research and additional to bury. Did someone ask why is the park paying for this?
 - Kate: Basically, if the MPRB wants them to go underground we could fund this. It's part of a cost negotiation between the MPRB and City. The City is giving the MPRB a good deal on the land for the park, so the City doesn't feel they have additional funding. If it's important for the public park, we are welcome to spend our own funds for this.
- CAC Chair: Do we want to spend money on research to make them go underground? That is one thing.
- CAC Member: The study would only be funding the undergrounding for this little segment? The rest of line has to be overhead in any scenario.
 - Kate: Yes.
- CAC member: I make a motion that we leave the powerlines above ground and ask the city to pay for the study of putting this small segment underground.
- CAC Member: If you transition underground, you will have two poles at each transition point, and they are very visual obtrusive.
 - Kate: Correct – you get the line underground, but double the amount of poles.
- CAC Member: Is it true that this land was all supposed to be ceded to MPRB?
 - Kate: I have never heard that it was all supposed to be park. A few people have suggested that, but I have never heard anything planned other than a split. At one time MPRB had wanted more park land than is currently shown, but the City had never agreed to that split. This planning process was intended to find a balanced split.
- CAC Member: Does National Park Service (NPS) have an opinion or the power to reorganize the situation? I am loathe to trust Xcel or the City.

- Kate: NPS has no power to reorganize the situation. I think their opinion is to get them to go away as much as possible. If they can't go away, keep them away from the river and minimize them.
- CAC Member: Is the City prepared to vote or is it just on this committee?
 - Kate: City could address stretch along the railroad tracks, but I don't know what City will discuss with the CPC. The City does not currently feel they can find burying that stretch so they may not want to offer an option that isn't really an option. The reason this is coming before you is that technically we could fund the study (and maybe burial) but wanted to ask you if you felt the study and maybe burial has any benefit.
- CAC Member: If we do not vote and put this back on the City, would nothing change?
 - Kate: Someone else would make the decision, but the City is not offering to fund the study. Right now MPRB would not recommend funding the study.
- CAC Member: I would like to clarify that we are not making this decision, we are making a recommendation? If we decide something at this CAC, it might not happen because someone else is making the decision?
 - Kate: If you decide that it is important to study putting this underground, we could spend that money. We could spend that money. If Xcel comes back and asks for more money to study, maybe we want to set a threshold.
- CAC Member: I think it's worth the investment to find out the potential for that particular piece of land. At least we will know the options and have it documented. 5-10 years from now when the costs are higher, we will have already done that study.
- CAC Member: I think it is concerning that we are this far into the meeting and haven't gotten yet to the Green Gentrification topic. That was supposed to be a huge part of our meeting and people want to take part in that discussion. What can we vote on and move on?
- CAC Member: Does putting the powerlines underground, does it increase the value of the land parcel?
 - Kate: I don't know that there has been a study. Since everything just moved, I would imagine everyone is still figuring out what this means to them.
- CAC Member: I suggest we table until we know more about what is going on, or else we don't spend any money on a study. I understand the point of having information early, but don't see why we spend the money on this right now.
- CAC Member: Because there will always be an excuse not to do the best thing for the Northside.
- CAC Member: I make a motion that we table this.
- CAC Member: I make a motion to ask the City to fund the study?
- CAC Chair: It's their property.

- CAC Member: Why does this come back on the park? Let's ask the City why it's the park responsibility and define whose cost it is.
- CAC Member: I second the motion to ask the City to pay for the study.
- CAC Member: I don't see any improvement by burying the powerlines. We still have a powerline and will still see it. I get the larger concerns, but I don't think anything we can do with this little segment fixes that. Getting rid of the powerlines is a totally different conversation.
- Kate: My understanding is that the City will not foot the bill. We can ask for that, but the discussion has been had. It would be best for MPRB staff to know if you think it is worth MPRB money to study this. We can always ask someone else to pay for it, but we don't get to decide if they will. WE only get to decide if it's worth it for us to pay for it.
- CAC Member: How can we determine that if you cannot give an answer to what else we will spend the money on? You are only talking about one cost and how can we answer that if we don't know what everything else will cost?
 - Kate: It is the decision we have, and this is common with planning processes. Early on we have to determine what is important to invest in; we can't know what the outcome will be. I am hearing from some people that this isn't worth studying. We can't know where we will be a year from now, we can't know what we would have bought instead, but we still can't wait to move this study forward.
- CAC Member: Let's vote and ask the City and get them on record, and be ready for a vote when this comes back to us.
- CAC Chair: Do we want them to move the line from the middle of the park? Will the City pay for that?
 - Kate: City is moving lines to the proposed overhead location and the choice for MPRB is only whether it is worth studying to bury the lines in the segment where they cross the park land.
- CAC Member: City will not put the lines through development area because they cannot develop the land if they do. They are moving the lines to clear the space for development, not because they care about the park. I second the motion to ask the city to pay to study putting this short segment of lines underground.
- CAC Chair held a vote that was unanimously approved.

Green Gentrification:

Since the last time this CAC met, the MPRB, design team and others involved in this project have thought we ought to have a bigger broader conversation about gentrification. We all understand the value that this park will bring to North MPLS, but the thought was maybe we should think more broadly about the effects of building a park.

Perkins + Will presented on Green Gentrification:

- CAC Member: Can you say how close properties were to the parks that rose in value?
- Public Comment: Very close, like right next door.
- Consultant: I am not sure exactly but I would say like half a mile. If you think of other projects like the Grand Rounds in South Minneapolis; what does that have on property values and what impact might it have here?

Perkins + Will presented the first exercise: Exercise is for both CAC members and public to talk about a park that is potentially “just green enough” verses a park that is a “destination park”. “Just green enough” is a park that is designed to a specific level of investment and improvements that make it usable and feasible for the local residents verses a park that is a “destination park” which is designed with bigger bells and whistles or different types of amenities that don’t currently exist in North Minneapolis. We have heard both sides of the story depending on who you are talking to out in the community.

One of the potential movements related to just green enough is called “slow park movement”, which is to develop a park more slowly to avoid abrupt changes to neighborhood identity. One conversation we could have around this is phasing.

Opposite to that is that we have also heard that people want something spectacular here, that perhaps this wants to be a world class park, that draws people from a broader cross section of the city, if not nationally, than regionally. What might each type of park look and feel like.

These are the two balancing acts we want people to talk about.

Green Gentrification Discussion

- CAC Member: Could we to save time could we do this as a group?
- A: Yes, and we will document the discussion as people talk.
- Public Comment: Do you have example locally of already existing parks for each of these categories?

- A: This a design approach and philosophy question. On either end there is still going to be a park and it's going to get designed. Some of those questions are worked in there. The idea of "just green enough" the idea that we don't try to draw people in.
- Public Comment: Is Boom Island just green enough and Gold Medal a destination? Is Farview just green enough? Is Commons a destination park? I am just wondering if there are examples.
- Kate: We can say that our regional park system tends to draw people in from the outside. The neighborhood parks tend to serve the neighborhoods. But There is not an exact right answer here. You may say that a lot of the things you might put here are going to be a destination no matter what because there is no existing park here in the first place and it has the river. Even if you put in a really simple park. You may say that we should change more slowly and work our way up over time. You might say that Minnehaha falls is a destination because it draws people from all over, but that you still want that level of design. This is the kind of discussion we want to have. This is a values discussion verses getting stuck on things. We need to have the values discussion first.
- There is also a question about timing? Some of the examples John pointed out are that there are protections that are being put in place with the park development. If you feel like some of those needed protections aren't in place, then maybe we need to start slower until those happen. Exactly what those are is a different discussion. This is a messy topic, we are open to a messy discussion.
- CAC Member: The conversation around Green Gentrification needs to also focus on protections on affordable housing. It feels problematic to me for the community to ask for a lower quality of park when the conversation should be how do we make sure affordable housing is included in this. I know that this is the City and there is only so much the Park Board can do.
- CAC Member: Again this goes back to my comment regarding the electrical lines. We are putting the cart before the horse. Property taxes are already going up close to 20% in north Minneapolis just because this project is underway and it's going to fall on to renters. It doesn't even exist yet and it's already becoming a financial burden. We can have this conversation, but I just want to put this out there that I feel like we are pretending to have a conversation, because the gentrification process is already started. Unless we are going to stop what we are doing here and start advocating for rent control -this conversation is a show.
- CAC Chair: Gentrification is an issue that is going to be. This project is happening and so we want to have our footprint of North MPLS in this park. Something that I see is having Juneteenth there or putting activities there draw black people, or Latino or people of color there, May Day anything that we can put there. We put our foot print there so when other people come out see that this is north MPLS. As far as the gentrification of taxes or rent, we can't do anything about that because this is the park side and that is the city. We can talk

about that, but the thing is we are curators of this park. I'm concerned about people coming from St. Anthony and the Falls coming here and suddenly Northsiders are not coming here. We want to get them here. How do we get them here? Through attractions. Getting the park we want. Getting activities that include us here. Make it historical for Indigenous community members. Why can't those ideas be an attraction. Farview Park is a Northside Park and Northsiders use it.

- CAC Member: But that is a community based park – it is in a community. If we build infrastructure, if we build a bandshell, more than what First Avenue is potentially going to build, that is going to bring the people you don't want to come.
- CAC Chair: That's not true, we put artists there from the Northside. We can't stop people from coming.
- CAC Member: Yeah, but what we are being asked here is to either be tricked into assisting gentrification or take a stand against it.
- CAC Chair: What is the stance? What do you stand on.
- CAC Member: That is why I sent out scenic Hudson and what they did in Kingston. I would advocate just green enough, which is not any less, that is still beautiful, but that is just creating a beautiful clean, green space without bells and whistles... which we don't know if the community is... two minutes ago we just talked about are kids going to even come across the street and come here?
- CAC Chair: That's what we have to do - we have to get them across the street because a lot people don't know it exists.
- CAC Member: If you build it, they will come. It happened in North Loop and all these other places. They can say they are concerned about Green Gentrification but no they are not! If we are concerned about that, we could go incrementally, or slowly, bringing it back to green, planting native grasses, cleaning it up, taking down the relics or leaving a few select ones Because if we do any more that is just going to be to the benefit of United Properties. We are just benefiting those who basically forced us into this place in the first place.
- CAC Member: I wish we could say destination park, but the problem is the City who is controlling what is going on around us, has no genuine goal of combating gentrification. This is a real estate development project, they started by engaging a private development team well before there was a community process. It's not a community development process.. The city promises anti-displacement plan, but they haven't presented one, and I don't think they have any idea what they are doing about that. It's a developer driven project. Given that, in a better project we could be addressing all of these other concerns holistically.
- CAC Member: We still don't know if the land is toxic.
- CAC Member: A destination park is not an option because the City is not going to do that. I am very hesitant to say that we should be able to build a great park when we don't have any anti-gentrification strategies in place by the players who actually have power over that.

- CAC Member: Northeast has a connection to the river but North has a freeway. A linear park is what is going to make it a North park in the first place – people can get there and come back. That's what RiverFirst does, or should do, although it's outside of just this project. That's well beyond this parcel. Like what you said about Farview, the local parks have a park building where you are doing things for kids. Not a bandshell, just focused on kids. We talk about just green enough but maybe we are actually talking about just local enough. We can't necessarily move where our money is spent, but we could say money could be better spent to open the river up to the neighborhood in the north.
- CAC Member: With First Avenues project, it's already going to be a destination. Maybe we spend our money creating access to the park for North Mpls residents. Access is most important with the highway there; it's a divider. It may be outside of the park boundary. I'm way on the making it just green enough and creating a connection to the park.
- CAC Member: So like a bridge over the freeway?
- CAC Member: Yes
- CAC Member: Everyone may not be aware, but at 26th Avenue North there is going to be a park and the end which will help open Farview to the river. It's similar to what we are trying to do here.
- CAC Member: It will still be a vehicle heavy route.
- CAC Member: And they said they are not going to put any bus stops there, right?
- CAC Member: I hear what you are saying about bringing kids down on this piece. Our kids have parks, why are we trying to pull kids away from their neighborhood parks? I don't think we need to be pulling our kids away from their neighborhood parks. We are doing everything in our community (Folwell Park) to build our neighborhood park up and make it more accessible for kids who can walk there and live there rather than send them across the highway for programming. If anything, offering programming over there is going to deplete what is happening right in our neighborhood.
- CAC Member: In my mind if we don't pull the Northside to the river it will remain North Loop.
- CAC Member: But if we go with just green enough and also not make it a destination space, it's a net zero.
- CAC Member: I say we put bee hives there.
- CAC Member: I'm with that!
- CAC Member: Are you saying we should make it a destination?
- CAC Member: No, I am saying make it just green enough. Get rid of the relics, maybe keep a couple, allow the land to heal itself for a period of time, put bee hives over there, put art work over, just make it a green space that people can go to, but it's not about profiting or a promotional item, it's simply just calm quiet space on the river that people can go to. It's not going to take away from communities, it's not going to be something people can all

show off put in a brochure, it's not going to take away from the Northside communities, take away from our kids or local programming.

- CAC Member: And hopefully it will heal the river.
- CAC Member: Yes
- CAC Member: Boom island doesn't have any formal programming it's just green space that people can come and utilize?
- Kate: Its not heavily programed there are some events and rent it out. I don't think MPRB heavily programs it.
- CAC Member: There are a lot of events there (Boom Island). I wanted to say that not pulling from the Northside; the parks are always going to have kids there because kids can't drive and this is a walkable space,. To go to the river is an experience nothing like going to a neighborhood park, and I would hope people from the Northside, children or youth will go to the river and see this river. Because people can literally live half a mile from the river and never experience the river. Hopefully it's attractive enough for people to go outside their comfort zone because we have to jump that barrier of 94. We have to figure out a way to get them over there.
- CAC Member: We can get them over there by, instead of taking their money and building a bunch if infrastructure, take and invest in the parks that are already here. Develop programs at the neighborhood parks. They do go to wilderness areas from the neighborhood parks sometimes. There isn't even transportation for them to get there to UHT.
- CAC Member: At two meetings ago, people said they would never allow their kids to go there alone, across 94, in the first place.
- CAC Member: I'm curious what folks from the northside have to say.
- Public Comment: One, gentrification is a policy issue whether kids go to the park or not. I'm going to advocate that you try and separate those. Whether kids go to the park or not, what you do on that land and the gentrification issue are two different things. It is going to be destination because if you have 7-10 thousand seat amphitheater people are going to come there and see it as a destination. The bigger question for me as a Northsider, who lives by Wirth, how do we claim this space as ours? That is really important. How do we, as a community, advocate for these gentrification policy issues that need to happen in order to make sure that gentrification isn't a result of the development as a whole. Development is going to push gentrification just because of the nature of real estate development. The question is: if you do just green enough, and development is slower, do you have time to think about that and work on policies and strategies that combat gentrification? If you go slower does that buy you more time to think about and push those thing because they are policy drivers?. I don't know what the experience at the park should be. I think that is a really important thing to think about, is how the park reflects the Northside and who we are and who we want, what are aspirations are. How does it connect, how does it heal? All

those items should be on the table that we should be talking about, along with other strategies about combating gentrification.

- CAC Member: Do you find that a lot of residents of Northside utilize Theo Wirth?
- Public Comment: I do not see a number of Northside residents. More now than I used to, but my big pet peeve is that I want to go the park and BBQ and hang out. I don't want to hike or go to the sauna at the trailhead. So how will you program the park and the reality is - if you go to the park and you don't see a lot of people who are different you don't think it is for you. All of these are in the mix of how you get to whatever happens here. So that needs to be part of the whole process along with those other pieces of gentrification. Because there is going to be enormous pressure on the green space because of the development around it. For me that is the big question, where is the deeper discussion about where is the 21st century park like in North MPLS. That could be different than the 21st century park in South MPLS. What does that look like as part of a major development in our community even though we are disconnected from it? That is going to be a big part of this challenge to get people to think that it is ours because it's geographically North MPLS, but culturally it is not. We don't think about going to the Upper Harbor.
- Public Comment: Each park has it's own individual identity – individually and collectively. If we go through a slow process, it will allow us to see how everything else around it gets built. Don't put so much into it up front and build up the people who are already in place so they can stay. We can address the historic issue about where did this land come from, address the Native American's and how they used this land and the river so that people know that piece and bring back life to the river. In regards the gentrification I sit on the CPC and we are pushing the issue to put a cap on for property tax owners who are currently living and have been here for an extended period of time, and put out projections for 5-10-20-30 years within a 5 mile radius of the park. We want to have development but not displacement.
- Public Comment: I live on the Northside. Commenting on your last statement on gentrification, I look at the Anacostia project and that transition happened 20 years before the park came. So its about the cause and effect and I don't think we should assume that if we built a destination park that gentrification will occur; it could be the other way around. But separating gentrification, if that's going to happen, figure out how to make the Northside benefit from it. I think we need a two-pronged approach, if gentrification is going to happen we need to make sure that Northsiders benefit from it. It's easy to say we going to be gentrified, so we are going to be displaced, but I think there needs to be a separation. If we are going to be displaced, and I live in one of those homes that is probably going to be out of my price range soon, I want a place to go to. In the case of Anacostia, Washington DC they made sure there were places for people to move to and actually a better place in many cases. You could buy a town home for 15K dollars because no one wanted to live there, but they gave people in Anacostia the option to moving to Prince Georges County where you doubled your money in 5 years. There is going to be fluidity here. I don't think we should be

subjected to (1) displacement, but you need to give us places to move to. I know things are going to change, but you need to create a clear path for us to move up and out. The other is I don't think we should continue to keep thinking that having a nice place to live means we are going to gentrify.

- CAC Member: I have this theory: it's called the placeholder theory. Black and brown bodies in this country have been placeholders. Our job is to live in undesirable places to keep the infrastructure intact, to keep the water flowing, to keep the electricity going, so that when the gentry needs that space, the investment is not quite as high as it would be had it been abandoned. So, yes, they will move us to the next undesirable place to be a placeholder there, and the cycle continues and continues. Eric, is my neighbor and my brother, but I'm going to have to disagree with you about the idea of having some place to go because that has always been the narrative. That has always been the story and we as black and brown bodies have always been the victim in that narrative, every single time. I understand what you are saying logically. We should be able to live in nicer spaces and not be displaced. We should, but we live in a capitalistic society and in capitalism what happens is is when the desirability goes up the cost goes up and when the cost goes up, the haves that have it move their way in before the cost is out of control. And the people who don't have it get put out. And they build their wealth as it continues to climb so they can do that again, and its generational. If you watch white people and I'm just saying this as a specific how things move. Right now, we got all these condominiums downtown, why is that? Because right now all these white people who raised their kids out in the suburbs they need somewhere for their kids to go live.
- CAC Member: But it is also because of the stadiums.
- CAC Member: So that is the pattern, they move their kids in here, their kids push us out, they raise their kids here in the city, when their kids come of age what happens they push us back in and they let their kids go out and buy suburban homes and this goes back and forth and we are simply placeholders. They put us in the less desirable places. Because they will tolerate us when they are not raising kids, they'll just keep to themselves when they don't have to worry about us snatching their poor little babies. But when they have a generation of people who are raising kids they will push us out so that they have a safe space for their kids to be raised. And our kids are at the end of that stick every time.
- CAC Member: As a point of order I agree with everyone on the gentrification issue but I don't know that we are going to be able to address this. The closest I think we are going to come to is to make this the most effective Northside park we could make, so we could either make it grand or make it simple. I think in our framework if we are going to do this I think we are going to have to decide simple or destination. I vote simple.
- CAC Chair: Anyone else have a comment on the simple? We have to wrap up soon. Paul's comments were right on in my mind. The motive should be to get black and brown people into this park without pulling programming away and enjoy the same amenities. People can come from outside and can come enjoy those same amenities.

- Public Comment: I just want to say we don't want to move. This is our community and we shouldn't have to move.
- CAC Member: How much gentrification is there, as long as the industry is still in this whole area? How does that effect any of this?
- CAC Member: Well Northeast would be your example. In Northeast we have most of the industrial spaces left in the Twin Cities in the two wards in NE. I think it's like 60% of all the industrial space left. So if it's desirable, people will move in there. People will adjust. I think you are talking about specific gravel pits, etc. In terms of industrial I don't know if that is going to be the issue.
- CAC Member: It's pretty toxic.
- Public Comment: I think we need to remember that this is the Mississippi River. You can't go fishing or boating or sit by the river at Farview park. So there is something about bringing the kids or schools down to this park that would be great.
- CAC Member: I don't know how many people have been to the Rondo community center and what they have there as far as what Paul is talking about, reflecting the culture, but I'd like to propose something like that in that space there. So maybe looking for further instances of that and also looking at what Melissa and Mynikol said about partnerships. I don't know how you can do this without providing bussing, but having that Northside partnership with this park and other neighborhood parks so there are different services provided. I don't know how that would look, but somehow being able to do that would be good.
- Public Comment: I think to conclude with what I was saying, I agree completely with Paul and Mynikol. We want to stay, but in order to stay we have to break that cycle, and in order to break that cycle we need to share in the prosperity so we can stay and that is all I'm saying. Make sure we have both things going on at the same time.
- Public Comment: I just want to say we have people we want those who have left to come back. Make the park as grand as you can to attract people who have left.
- CAC Chair: Do you remember when Juneteenth was moved to North Mississippi - it decreased a lot. It wasn't a good situation. There were a lot of police, traffic was bad, people had to walk a long way, and all that. Let's say we brought Juneteenth to the river. I would purposely come from the Southside to come to this event as a black person because it is Juneteenth. So things like that which would draw people. I know that busses may be limited but black people do have cars. We don't want to exclude people but there are ways around that. I thought that was something that the city was trying to do. You talked about them going down 94 when they do the development. Was that something they were going to do when they start doing Dowling? Add a bus line or no?
- CAC Member: From my understanding the city is in conversations with both MnDOT and Metro Transit because (1) MnDOT will be doing a timely expansion on 94 and the study has said that this is a needed site for public transit. MnDOT has not said that they were willing

to do that, so it begs the question who are building this for? Because what they are willing to do is build a MnPass lane on that stretch which will get people from downtown to the suburban location faster. They are willing to do that, and willing to talk about parking at this site for people at the hotels and the concert. So they are definitely talking about bringing people in who do not live in the community. Teqen had a point about children walking down Dowling avenue and crossing the highway and the 94 entrance for example to get to the site is Ludacris. For example more than likely you are going to want people to stay in their own neighborhood parks, but at the same time figure out how we get to this destination. I know Paul, for example with MN Design Center, has been talking about a lid over the highway and I know some people feel that could be a good thing, but could also be another contributor to what we are talking about here.

- CAC Member: I think we are at risk of creating a beautiful private paradise for United Properties (*agreement from several CAC members*) and that is it. As it is right now, no thing is in the service of any one who currently lives anywhere near this site. So going slow, even if that slows down the whole process, that is good. That gives the Northside time to elect people who aren't part of family empires that are actually going to do something for you.
- CAC Chair: Okay, so just green enough then. What next?
- Kate: Some of the things we planned to talk about in the second discussion we did already touch on. Obviously, we need to continue this discussion, and to some degree as a group we would still need to define what just green enough and destination park is. S I think this is not something that we won't force a choice. If we start down the path and decide that is too minimal, that is still yet to be determined. I feel like this was an important conversation that we wanted to have with people.
- CAC Member: What was the second topic?
- Kate: The second topic was asking how does this park have that Northside stamp on every level? How do we activate it, programing or the need to be very deliberate on how we activate it and how we take some responsibility for helping people get there and not competing with neighborhood parks? This was all stuff we would like to continue and get into.
- Chair: Lets close the meeting.
- CAC Member: Can I just request that the agendas be less ambitious? We never finish up. We just need to be a little more realistic.

Meeting adjourned