Upper Harbor Terminal Collaborative Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting
January 22, 2020 - 05:00 PM
UROC - Room 107

Members: Markella Smith (Chair), Vanessa Willis (Chair), Jashan Eison, William "Bill" English, Tanessa Greene, Britt Howell, Mary Jamin Maguire, Channon Lemon, Melissa Newman, Alexis Pennie, Grace Rude, and Princess Titus (Quorum - 9)

Absent: Gayle Smaller, Phitsavath Nantharath

Staff: Hilary Holmes

Call To Order

1. Roll Call.
2. Adoption of the agenda.

Presentation

4. Community Performing Arts Center: Dayna Frank, First Avenue (6:20pm) - UPDATED TIME 5:20PM

Dayna Frank, First Avenue Productions, introduced team. Reviewed questions for discussion about venue. Regarding ownership options would propose ownership option 1 – most feasible and sustainable, with First Avenue (FA) taking the risk. Vesting the underlying ownership over time and in year 5-7 FA would commit in Community Benefit Agreement to transfer ownership over to the Community Entity (CE).

Committee comment about the several models- there are reasons we should be nervous about land trust. Favorite option is City maintains ownership of land, leases under whatever terms. Problem we have is we’ve not seen any real exiting models that are working today that will help us. Like the idea of a Community Development Corporation (CDC) that comes later- some exist today, but none that African Americans control. There is time to get that done. Want to see models what FA means by community ownership, what we want out of community ownership, what would that look like and by time we get to year 7 what kind of infrastructure needs to be in place, assume that this doesn’t mean the CE takes over operations. Will the City will build it and the City will own it?

Ms. Frank asked how does everyone feel about the City owning it? Committee comment that Ms. Frank is saying that she doesn’t want to own it, that we need to come up with a better idea. Ms. Frank commented that is a good discussion do you want the City to own it.

Committee question about more detail about the CDC, would CDC own half or a portion of the venue. Ms. Frank stated that it would be a joint venture – 51%/49% or 50%/50% until such a time that CE is fully operational and would vest ownership of it. Committee comment that the CDC is going to have to have some backing. Ms. Frank stated FAP would help fundraise, and the CDC would be a land holder, not responsible for operations, which would all be in a use agreement. The CE would hold FA accountable that FA is meeting the CBA, ticket fees, goals. FA wouldn’t be here if didn’t feel comfortable that we could follow through.
Committee question about other models. Ms. Fran replied Target Center, Xcel Energy Center, Palace Theater, CHS Field, Guthrie Theater. Committee question if these are for profit or nonprofit.

Committee comment that this is a strong commitment, how does FA feel about getting it off the ground? Ms. Frank responded we feel good that we are beating all of our metrics with the Palace Theater. FA is in its 50th year of running as a business. Committee comment that what is different here is the real estate and community involvement. Ms. Frank replied that is why FA is here saying we want to do this with the CE that can hold us accountable. Acknowledging that we can’t do this on our own. Who is it that can help us with that? Question is who is that body who we can move forward with? Committee comment that they like the idea of community ownership and partnership can still have a piece of the land, you spoke to a CBA and would like to see that. The extension of that agreement would allow CE or organization in the long run to reap the benefits of the parcel of land that has minimal restrictions from the City. The same group or organization could put housing on site. Ms. Frank asked for confirmation on what Committee member meant on having a piece of the parcel. Committee member responded that could potentially have a portion for the community gifted with minimal restrictions and that would be a way we have ownership. Brandon Champeau, United Properties, added that the community would receive the economic benefits, if you’re a partner you have say and control over what’s happening there idea is to create a CE that receives economic benefits that has land ownership.

Committee comment that right now we have an operating entity, which has put forth terms and conditions today. We’ve been given several models worth looking at. Concern is do not have a model throughout this whole development that talks about operations. How does all that fit in within the operating entity? Operating entity needs to make money. Out of all models which ones can the City guarantee will be approved? How will operating entity interface with the City? Need to understand that City Council believes they can advance into implementation and execution? We don’t have a viable black owned CDC – how do we get it started, operate it? By time we get to City by June will we have plan in place, so CDC can come into existence? We need money to back it. Ms. Frank asked do you have ideas who should be leading this. Community ownership option 1 feel the most comfortable with. FA to take on operating liability. Committee comment that FA can get cash. Ms. Frank asked who should be the people to help plan it? Committee comment that there are people outside the room with business skills, access to financial institutions who can advise us to the kind of people to recommend to this committee. There needs to be a small working group. Committee comment that if CPC members know of people to share their names so we can start planning this.

Committee question that FA team is identified, how many are African American and local? Ms. Frank introduced Mohammed Lawal of LSE Architects, Mr. Lawal introduced himself to the Committee. Ms. Frank asked who else should be on the team. Committee comment that there should also be people of color is positions of power, not just a part of the team. Is there a board? Is your team diverse to operate and lead that are a part of the team – management and leadership that represents FA. Where is the proforma that says this is profitable? Part of this process need to see how you’re going to make it work. Ms. Frank responded that the City has seen this, there is confidential economic information, the feasibility study, competition.

Committee member said not asking for proprietary information just need to know if it floats. Ms. Frank stated that Minneapolis is the only city of it size without outdoor amphitheater every other market has this. It is a unique opportunity. And will be able to funnel economic benefits back into North Minneapolis. Could be incredibly profit for North Minneapolis.

Committee comment on the sandwich lease model - how to balance having a community organization involved but shouldn’t rest everything on that. Even if we create, can it be representative of community. Needs to be a role of balancing public ownership in that too.
General nonprofit or CDC doesn’t have accountability. That’s a bigger part of community ownership, not just to create it. Ms. Frank responded we want to form that board of governance. Email me. Want to populate it with community voices, the other element is a CBA. Suggesting McKinley neighborhood association hold it. Proposing. That would have some of the responsibility you’re proposing. Committee member interested in being on that committee. Committee member said table that - we need to define skills, ability. We need some criteria. FA is a corporate entity. So many Fortune 500 companies in region, so few have African Americans on their board of directors. Those at this table ought to be on FA board. An entity ought to have diversity on their board of directors.

Committee member noted page 16 of presentation talks about $3 per ticket fee and putting it towards priorities that we’ve identified. If that’s the amount we’re talking about we can’t help out that many people. Regarding the proformas if it fails we have no investment in the community.

Committee member asked when do we get to talk about design and noise issues? Ms. Frank responded at the 2/22 CPC design day. Haven’t wanted to talk about design without knowing what it is. Reason we said 7,000 capacity is that is the number we feel comfortable guaranteeing this would work. The more capacity the more economic benefits. It’s a matter of priorities. If it’s only 7,000 that minimizes impact. Committee comment that we need to look at other impacts. That’s why we need to look at the range. Committee member addresses the Committee – what do we do with this information? What are the next steps? Make sure we want some of these things part of the Coordinated Plan. Who does the CBA, all that needs to be looked at. Ms. Frank responded that the next steps on the CBA are what organization is willing and able. The City cannot do a CBA – who is the entity that can hold it? Then work with the community group and the City on what should be in the redevelopment agreement. Form a community board of directors, get job description for board members. Committee comment don’t know if FA can be responsible for the process and accountability.

5. HUB Strategies: Othello Meadows, 75 North (6:50pm) - UPDATED TIME 6:00PM

Othello Meadows, of 75North, presented on the Highlander project in Omaha, NE that was developed by 75North and lessons learned. Committee member paused Mr. Meadow’s presentation to ask about media taking photos. Committee Co-chair Willis said media introduced at beginning that were going to audio record beginning of meeting did not know there was other media in room. Other media introduced themselves. Chair asked for respect. MinnPost reporter taking photos and MPR photographer said they can take photos. Erik Hansen, City of Minneapolis said they can take photos. Committee comment that it is disruptive to lean in between people at table to take photos across table of committee members. Committee asked to not take photos if can’t be respectful. MPR photographer left the meeting. No local media were asked to leave the meeting.

Presentation resumed. Committee question if University of Omaha has played a role in the public engagement center. Mr. Meadows responded that U of Omaha not involved. Creighton University played a role in center for financial literacy and health and wellness. Committee question on how long this took. Mr. Meadows responded that he started in 2011 to get hold of properties. Tried to start acquisition as 501c3. There was a 2012 deal with the Omaha Housing Authority, 2 years to get through that process and multiple iterations. Closed on the acquisition end of 2014 and broke ground 2015, Highlander project has been up and running since end of 2017.
Committee comment to talk more about the ugly. What are the callouts. You have to be willing to take risks and be wrong. We bet a lot on aquaponics to take 17k of space, but they weren’t ready. Have to have community patience and backers and be honest with being wrong. Financing – we used New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC). Have $7m in equity that the tax credits has generated, and raised the rest through philanthropy. NMTC are a difficult tool to use. Hard explaining it to funders and foundations. People need aspirational things. Committee comment appreciate the finance mechanism. Regarding NMTC what would be a good starting point for us to start a HUB on this site. Mr. Meadows responded if you can get allocation they’re worth the trouble. The hard work is going out and raising the money. Not sure about the Minneapolis philanthropic community. If you want to be impactful or aspirational you can’t support a lot of debt. There is no debt on the building. The goal every year with the building is to break even the goal is not to make money on it. There are some other mechanisms that can help fund the CBO that runs everything and that’s huge win. NMTC and philanthropy will be huge contributors.

Committee comment need to figure out land use and models, seating governance, components/financing. Model or framework that you used what does it look like? Mr. Meadows responded need small nonprofit that is exclusive to seeing this vision through. Purpose Built is in 28 other cities. Premise is you only work in one neighborhood. Important to have only one entity that focuses only on that work. A lot of the people that lead those initiatives come back to that sector from the private sector to leads those initiatives. Need a high functioning team above the politics and above the petty. Focused on getting things done and moving the ball forward.

Unfinished Business

6. 2020 Schedule and Community Engagement update - Hilary Holmes (7:20pm) - UPDATED TIME 6:40PM

1-22-20 UHT CPC Working Draft Engagement Schedule.pdf
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Upper Harbor Terminal Coordinated Plan Overview.pdf

Upper Harbor Terminal - 2020 Milestone Schedule.pdf

Staff presented the draft engagement schedule and draft survey for discussion. Committee question regarding development of the survey – the topics were based on what? Staff responded topics based on same topics Committee and Learning Tables have covered. Committee comment that there are nuances of values we say are important making sure we have understanding of those items – have we asked community if those are priority areas? When you develop a survey can you do a small test of intended respondents? Is there a representative group that could take it initially? Preview it at neighborhood meetings?

Committee comment that the questions are out of context. Without ability for person to look at pros/cons. i.e. page 4, #4. What does it look like, what is the parking. So out of context. Not sure how valuable these are going to be. Committee comment on survey available to take on iPad at Community Connections conference and that maybe in the body of the questions can link back to the Concept Plan, also have open questions. Committee comment what do you want from survey - recognize 2 or 3 things. Concern is it’s long. Vision and context is important. You can tell people to go online and do it and who will respond to it are the activists. Ways in which you can do a survey beyond online. Telephone surveys. Have to have multiple ways of taking a survey or only the usual suspects will. Committee comment to break survey down into topics and then it’s not that long. Committee comment that it needs refining more plain language. Some time for us to
review. Survey is collaborative. If we want true community response need to take the survey to the community so it’s reflective of community we’re trying to hear from. Think about what that might look like, organizations we work with, organizations that are here. People conducting the survey and talking to people about the project. A lot of people don’t know or have been misinformed. Best response would come from more engaged approach. Committee comment what were we trying to accomplish – purpose seems like an addition to Learning Tables. Committee could prioritize. Do we need to ask questions on all 5 areas? Need to give more direction to Hilary. Are there ways we can help spread the word. Break it up in sections. People won’t want to do long survey. We have time, get this done now. Could be engaging with people.

Committee comment on the social media aspect - influencers, help drive people to some events. Wish City was in position to tell North Minneapolis its plan for North Minneapolis. So many things this project will not address and not having City commitment for future of North Minneapolis is missing part of this conversation. Without City saying there is plan it rings hollow, many immediate needs we are not addressing. Committee comment to be Clear on schedule more about February. Echo comments about survey needing context. Page 5 #9 land ownership missing land trust and coop models. Committee comment the issue is the community. Allow us to do the work. Before you bring in community. Committee comment regarding the survey & schedule - important to have space for additional things. Additional opportunities for youth.

Committee comment what was asked for is to help lead the process. Don’t go into remaining meanings before we decide how it will flow. Need time to work through the Coordinated Plan. Ask to change process so we can have input. We don’t control engagement. Need to talk about those two items. Request of City and staff and Chairs how we want to construct format of next meetings. Not trying to blow up the process. Maybe we don’t schedule entire meetings for being recipients of info. Time to do the work. Where/when do we have time to discuss Othello’s information. Need working time for the next meeting.

Committee comment this kind of thing is new and messy. Doesn’t have to be as messy going forward. Meetings have been prescribed for us. Always resistance and pushback. Same in terms of other issues meetings need to be constructed so we have time to sit down and raise questions to get things answered. We know we’ve been meeting a lot. if you are having to try to have a dialogue. Handicapped to lead a messy process. What do we need to happen on the 22nd and put out what you need from us on the 22nd. Committee comment that important for time to work together. Community engagement is also important.

Committee comment that didn’t feel like we addressed issue of media going forward. Important that there’s a respect between the media and this group regardless. Any media left in the room you are in room with people of color at the table. There is a distrust. Want to be a part of repairing it come to table respectfully. Should have a discussion. Want to have respectful relationship with media want it to be reported fairly. History of why we don’t trust media in general. This is a conversation for everybody. Committee comment that we appreciate we have addressed media prior. We asked in the beginning for respect and said that media is here. Ask they don’t take pictures if they disrupt meeting and get disrespectful. Committee comment read the bottom of our agenda. You notice the media is all white. Very little diversity in news media in this town the trust factor is real, need to understand it be sympathetic.

Announcements

Staff updates (6:10pm) - UPDATED TIME 5:10PM

Shauen Pearce stated that it is against City policy to pay boards and commissions. Due to an anonymous donor stipends will be coming to Committee members via a third party.
New business. Committee comment on committee member’s questions about City’s economic plan for North Minneapolis, needs to be summarized so the burden isn’t on Upper Harbor to solve it all. Need models of an operating entity to operate various aspects of the development. We don’t have that. Enhance community engagement and address disparities. Any housing rebuilt to give opportunity to any black people to have priority to come back into the community to live. Committee comment on an article about Bloomington $15m approved for affordable housing. Is that something we can do. The Port Authority has workforce covenants. Leadership and board representation. Another model to examine.

Adjournment 7:36pm

Notice: A portion of this meeting may be closed to the public pursuant to MN Statutes Section 13D.03 or 13D.05

Next Upper Harbor Terminal Collaborative Planning Committee meeting Date: Feb 12, 2020

For reasonable accommodations or alternative formats please contact the Community Planning & Economic Development at 612-673-5070 or e-mail hilary.holmes@minneapolismn.gov. People who are deaf or hard of hearing can use a relay service to call 311 at 612-673-3000. TTY users call 612-673-2157 or 612-673-2626. Para asistencia 612-673-2700 - Rau kev pab 612-673-2800 - Hadii aad Caawimaad u baahantahay 612-673-3500.