Upper Harbor Terminal
Agenda

1. Agenda Overview and clarifications
2. Ongoing Community Art Project
3. CAC options regarding officers, subcommittees, and participation in process
4. Powerline Discussion
5. Green Gentrification presentation
6. Green Gentrification small group discussion
7. CAC discussion of engagement
8. Public Comment Period
9. Adjourn
Introductions
Overhead Utilities/ Powerline Discussion
Overhead Utilities/Powerline Discussion

What we know:

- Current Xcel transmission lines bisect the site and must be moved for any development (rough appx. $5 - $7 million)
- Lines cross river overhead; 1 pole needed by river in any scenario
- Xcel charges for engineering studies; there is cost to fully understand options
- Full burial along the railroad tracks *may* be possible, but would be very expensive (rough appx. $5-$8 million additional costs)
- Full burial along the river is likely possible but would be very expensive
- City will tentatively pay to move overhead lines to new overhead location, but does not have funds to move lines underground
- City plans to move first connection pole by the river to the south to minimize impacts to public space

Current question:

- MPRB could study, and possibly bury, a short segment of lines over park land. Both study, and possible burial, have costs.
Overhead Utilities/Powerline Discussion

Example of monopoles

Example of overhead/underground transition poles
Overhead Utilities/Powerline Discussion

- **Option 1: Maintain overhead line over parkway**
  - Requires 1 (likely monopole) near river and 1 back near tracks, 2 poles total
  - Xcel will limit the height of what can go under the lines, but not the use
  - Future uses could be impacted. A restaurant (for example) may have issues with a location under power lines.

- **Option 2: Bury line under parkway**
  - Requires 2 transition poles near the river and 2 back near the railroad tracks, 4 poles total. Poles may need to be fenced and are more visually obtrusive than the monopoles.
  - Costs additional funds (rough appx $10 - $30K) for study to determine if feasible. May not be feasible.
  - Costs additional funds to bury (rough appx $1.5+ million) would reduce MPRB construction budget of appx $7.75m. Cost cannot be fully determined without paying for the additional study to compare the two options.
  - There are limits to what can go over a buried line; would limit buildings, footings, and stormwater management. Lines in the ground are encased in concrete.

*Is the impact to park budget worth exploring burial of the lines in this short segment?*
Green Gentrification
**What is Green Gentrification?**

**Various definitions:**
*Cleaning up pollution or providing green amenities increases local property values and attracts wealthier residents.* . .

*Urban greening projects that make areas more livable and attractive and dramatically alters housing opportunities and communities.* . .

*Appropriation of environmental justice movement successes to serve high end redevelopment.* . .

**Why there is risk**

- Urban areas in general
- New park and other investments
- Linear parks that link to other places
- New connections to previously isolated areas
Recent examples of Green Gentrification

High Line and Chicago 606

• Both are signature park investments on former obsolete industrial infrastructure

• Both are designed as regional attractions that draw visitors from well beyond their adjacent neighborhoods.

• Both projects connect adjacent neighborhoods together
Research also shows that investment in parks can lead to substantially increased property values and housing prices. Between 2003 and 2011, property values near the High Line in New York City increased 103 percent, despite the deep recession, and $2 billion had been invested in related development. Housing prices along a portion of the 606 Trail in Chicago rose 48 percent from 2013 (when construction began) to 2016.
Addressing Green Gentrification

11th Street Bridge Project

• Park development is linked with anti-gentrification efforts in the surrounding areas
• Physical, cultural, environmental and economic health
• Workforce development and economic opportunities
• Leveraging park land to support efforts beyond the park boundaries
• Outcome still unknown
Addressing Green Gentrification

MPRB is prepared to participate in a broader view toward district transformation.

- Magnitude of Above the Falls and UHT success is dependent on transformation of surrounding industrial district.
- Positive change for existing community members is key to mission.
- MPRB does not have the answer to gentrification, but believes that a district-wide approach would be most successful.
- MPRB is not the right agency to lead, but is ready to participate as a partner at the table.
Addressing Green Gentrification

Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA)

• Preservation of existing affordable housing
• Creation of new affordable housing
• Tenant protections
• Asset building
Opportunities at Upper Harbor Terminal for MPRB

• Creating accessible quality parks and green spaces
• Support of the right kind of development and land uses
• Designing the right park
• Programming the right park
• Creating opportunities for community members through the park
Green Gentrification
Exercise #1
Exercise #1
Design Balance

Concept: “Just green enough” vs. A destination park

One idea being tested to mitigate green gentrification are parks that are “just green enough” or parks that satisfy residents’ needs but are generally not designed to draw from outside a certain area.

The Slow Park Movement also encourages developing a park more slowly to avoid abrupt changes to the neighborhood identity.

But given the lack of riverfront park on the Northside, we don’t want to underserve the community members.

Is this a worthwhile consideration to address green gentrification concerns?

What is a good balance and design approach?

Exercise (20 minutes)
- Continuum statement and questions

Report out (5 minutes)
One idea being tested to mitigate green gentrification are parks that are “just green enough” or parks that satisfy residents needs but are generally not a significantly larger draw. But given the lack of riverfront park on the Northside, we don’t want to underserve the community members.

What is a good approach and balance? What should we keep in mind? Place a dot on the spectrum where you think this balance should fall. Add notes to your dot to tell us why you chose that location.

100%  50/50  100%

Just Green Enough

A park might aim to serve residents, but not necessarily be a draw for people outside the neighborhood. The Slow Park movement attempts to introduce physical changes more slowly, so that a neighborhood can maintain it’s history, identity, and character. Do you think this approach could affectively help combat gentrification?

A Destination Park

We have also heard that people want “a big park”, “a bad ass park” and “a park that is just as good as everyone else’s”. Should this be a goal now? Do you think this approach has a greater risk of contributing to gentrification?

What could be benefits of a park that is “just green enough”?

What benefits does a destination park have?

What are the risks?

What are the risks?

What might this type of park look and feel like?

What might be included in a destination park?
Green Gentrification

Exercise #2
Exercise #2

Northside Park: Local/Regional/National

Concept: Building a park with the Northside, by the Northside, and for the Northside.

Exercise (25 minutes) Three part question.

• Question: What are the right types of physical improvements (are these familiar amenities or are these new exciting types of amenities) to ensure the park is by and for the northside?

• Question: Give us ideas about activation and programming to ensure the park is by and for the northside?

• Question: How can working and learning skills at the park build opportunities and connections for Northside community members?

Report out (5 minutes)
The park at the Upper Harbor Terminal will serve local residents, is also within a regional park (Above the Falls Regional Park), and a national park (Minnesota National River and Recreation Area). We often hear that this park must be a Northside Park at every level; embraced by the Northside residents, and clear to visitors that they are on the Northside. Help us brainstorm more specific ideas on what will make this a Northside park at every level.

The right design involves more than just incorporating community art and expression. What park amenities will attract Northside community members to the park? What will build ownership in the park?

Is it familiar and well used park amenities such as basketball in a new setting on the river? Is it something new and different that is lacking from the other Northside parks? Some of both?

Bringing people to the site with targeted programming, events, markets, and other activation methods can build ownership. How can a robust activation plan provide opportunities for community members, and establish park identity and ownership? Build on some of the previous ideas to help us form partnerships and a plan.

Employment may be a critical component of providing opportunities and establishing connections to the park. Provide ideas of how the park and build skills and careers at all levels.
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

(10 Minutes)
ADJOURN

THANKS!