

Upper Harbor Terminal Collaborative Planning Committee Minutes

Regular Meeting

February 12, 2020 - 05:00 PM

NorthPoint Health & Wellness, 5th floor

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

Absent: Tanessa Greene, Phitsavath Nantharath, Gayle Smaller

Staff : Hilary Holmes

Call To Order 5:08pm

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

Committee Co-Chair Willis add new business. Add agenda item - time to plan for next meeting for 2/26 agenda, 15 minutes. Motion passed.

3. Acceptance of minutes of [Jan 22, 2020](#).

Per Committee add note that no local media was kicked out of the meeting. Motion to accept minutes as amended. Motion passed. Two abstentions (Rude, Jamin Maguire). Committee comment that Committee specifically asked for First Ave for their proforma page 3, 3rd paragraph of meeting minutes and note that it is still being requested. Motion to add to agenda as old business. Motion passed.

Committee comment a lot of info provided it seems like we're catching up. Would like to get more than 1 day ahead of the meeting. Should request today that agenda items should be discussed sooner than they have been. Note in the minutes would like to get the information sooner and sooner working notification of putting together agenda for the meeting. Friday is ideal. We know you are pulling together a lot of info and we appreciate it. Committee Co-Chair Smith stated received a lot of phone calls between the Committee and City so there has been a lot of input into the agenda. I have heard from a lot of you. Lot of moving pieces to get to this agenda. I got from you that we wanted to work and get something done. Agenda reflects that and things I've asked for. Want to point out we should discuss agenda for next time, a lot of work went into this one.

Discussion

4. Update on Equitable and Resilient Inclusive Development Matrix (Joy Marsh Stephens)

[UHT Equitable and Resilient Development Decision Matrix.pdf](#)

[Update on UHT Equitable and Resilient Inclusive Development Matrix.pdf](#)

[CPC Matrix Feedback Reconciliation.pdf](#)

Committee Co-Chair Smith introduced. Going to talk about the matrix - updated with a lot of input from the Committee. A lot of behind the scenes work going on. We asked for what recommendations the CPC has made so far. Important to point that out. A lot to still make. Confirmed alignment and parkway alignment. Feedback asked for that to be brought attention and why - no longer pursuing hospitality. What was our recommendation?

Shauen Pearce, Mayor's Office - point of clarification in recommendation column as you discussed consternation about hospitality coming forward. People felt wasn't best use for site. Committee comment that discussion is different than a recommendation. Brandon Champeau, United Properties, when Thor was part of team that was driving hospitality, had an interested partner. In July, August there was negative discussion about a hotel, not high-quality jobs encouraging more non-North Minneapolis people coming in. From my perspective took it as not being a preferred use. We can put it back on table. Committee question - what would vision would look like for jobs in general, Dayna and the venue, what United Properties is visualizing for your team. Committee comment questions is whether or not boutique hotel might be appropriate. If we are going to make this a destination. You're right some of those are lower wage jobs. However Minneapolis is moving toward \$15 minimum wage. As it relates to jobs it's probably within the matrix. It ignores a couple things want to discuss when appropriate. Living wage jobs with a goal of hiring within priority area. Comment to say it's a low priority, don't want to say it's off the table - with the venue and jobs North Minneapolis might want a restaurant or small hotel. Committee question if we are discussing the matrix or the recommendations. Committee Chair Smith answered look at recommendations because the matrix will help us make these recommendations. Motion made to for the status under hospitality to be changed to say low priority and that it is still in discussion. Motion passed.

Committee comment there is conversation about ownership. Needs to be broad conversation about ownership of buildings in this recommendation don't see ownership of land, venue.

Committee Co-Chair Smith addressed the fixed and flexible sheet - fixed flexible lists what the parameters are and what is flexible – where we have room to make recommendations, wanted to make sure we had this before we go into the matrix.

Committee comment suggesting documents that are standing working documents as we start to make decisions and solidify recommendations, to have this sheet and the recommendation points at every meeting.

Joy Marsh Stephens provided an update on the matrix, which was last presented in October. The purpose of the matrix is to help CPC, not as an evaluation tool, but to help provide guidance back to City and development team, grounded in values that are in the Concept Plan. Economic inclusion was added as a value. Values are about why we're doing this work, why it's important. Objectives and success measures - how we do the work. How do we accomplish those values that are set forth. The matrix centers racial equity, resiliency and sustainability are embedded throughout. Provides alignment through Concept Plan, CPC talked about that you don't want to have this work not tied to the Green Zone or anti-displacement, this ties to national best practices. Committee comment curious to know how Northern Green Zone group effort and recommendations coming from that body are embedded into our work to date. Ms. Marsh Stephens responded that the last column – Northern Green Zone is cited and work on Environmental Justice had feedback from the City's sustainability team generally to shape those success measures. Committee member Titus noted that she and Committee Co-Chair Willis sit on the Northern Green Zone. Co-Chair Willis requested to add as new business to meet and collaborate with the Green Zone committee on issues we want addressed with the Green Zone. Co-Chair Willis asked what Green Zone committee Ms. Marsh Stephens met with. Ms. Marsh Stephens replied that did not say we met with, we looked at resolution and had contact with Kim Havey and Kelly Muellman in Sustainability Office to flesh out success measures in the matrix. We have not had a meeting with the Northern Green Zone Task Force. Lots of voices participated in this. Also want to offer an update to the matrix. Feedback was vetted we met with the City Attorney, shared with Councilmember and Mayor's Office to be clear on the updates we're providing. Conversation at past CPC to have on clarity on what we can and can't do, so we had internal vetting, to make sure what we're putting in front of you we can do. Regarding values prioritization, while racial equity and environmental justice is the 2nd priority, it is embedded

throughout. Next is economic inclusion because that was added after the Concept Plan. Feedback from various sources is mapped identified where you can find it in the matrix. Items in yellow need internal vetting, probably can add but need more detail. This group will have to resolve if add detail and add it in. The green – high level feedback that might be in matrix already. Blue – is feedback that we can add, and the matrix is updated to reflect that. Orange – these items are programmatic but beyond purpose of matrix. Broader things, including CPC members at agenda setting. Grey is solution orientated and get into how we do they work not why.

Committee comment we are gathering info so we can have discussion and make decisions. Said going forward not going to receive info without weighing in. Need working time to be able to work through some of these docs. Back on 12/11 we received UHT What We Heard. Ms. Marsh Stephens confirmed yes that is one of the sources of these updates. Committee comment that at 1/22 meeting we received overview of UH Coordinated Plan contents, what we're actually finally supposed to present, I would suggest to us we take these documents and use them as anchors and revisit our values, constantly repeated, formalize as foundational anything we have to present in Coordinated Plan. As we make decisions in the Coordinated Plan that we represent this. Have said over and over need to know what City's plan is for North Minneapolis- affordable housing is critical but on 48 acres not able to solve housing crisis for the community. The matrix should be a foundational tool – these are things we need to clarify in order to effectively use this tool, could be at the next meeting, as we're going through design day that we already have in place. In order for matrix to be whole we need to clarify these points. Also for us to consider should we include these? We need to get that figured out. City in general are working on getting us a plan for the north side so we know what else is happening on the north side. Committee comment that salmon colored is what's beyond the matrix. There was an introduction of a First Ave staff member of color, the diversity of development team is beyond scope of matrix, there is inability to bring POC in leadership on development team. Page 6 evaluation measurement accountability should be explicit – don't know how that would be outside of the matrix, that makes me question. Committee comment look at 1d. it is probably nuanced. Salmon is from City's point of view. As we use matrix for decision making how do we see best practice taking this and being effective, do things counteract. Ms. Marsh Stephens responded there is definitely a lot in there regarding success measures. This is a tool for this group to make advisory recommendations back to the city. I don't have a solid answer but would collaborate on that.

Committee comment don't want to wait go back to 2nd page values priorities. When I read these, placed our priorities in our survey. As I look at these 6 all are important, do not see targeted economic development for African American community. If redevelopment is to serve its need in community in underinvested, redlined, marginalized politically economically socially, then we have to talk about economic development so that the condition improves, has to target first African American community and other residents of North Minneapolis but needs to emphasize it was race that was the basis of the underinvestment, suffer from economic inclusion, have highest rate of poverty 2nd in country, if values don't talk about improving economic for families and individuals in our values it's missing something. Not sure I have ability to articulate. Needs to be at top of our priorities. Racial equity and justice don't say anything about economic equality. Committee comments that it is on there. It is on the first page. Committee comment we should spend time on this. This is a working document we need time to review it quietly make contrasts and comparisons. None of this is final until we say it is. Will spend time at meeting after we actually read through it. She just presented it today.

Committee question can I ask structural question. How do these 3 documents relate to each other - can we collapse into one instead of going back & forth. Committee comment as I understood it, paper with colors is stuff we gave to Joy feedback on the big matrix, presentation with colors is presentation to focus on, pulls out things we need to discuss. Committee comment this is what matters this is our tool to help make decisions, this matrix is the end all be all,

everything else is feeder into or input out, our document to update or change. Committee comment hard enough to come do this work and have to go back & forth between documents. Not blaming or shaming anyone. It's difficult to follow, there's a better way of informing - respect to staff they're working as hard as we are and with other jobs to do in the City at some point someone called for a Project Manager to do this kind of thing for us. For clarity and simplification to track this has to be documented. A lot of stuff to pull together better start trying to respond. Simply saying it's a lot for work in a short time it has got to be simplified. Committee comment that this all refers back, yes it's a lot of papers. Committee comment that community ownership was main topic we wanted to talk about do we want to go through the green sheet, if we can do it quickly and efficiently. If we have discussion on clarifying helps Joy update them can use it at next meeting. Committee comment that it's only 6 items. More concerned with having discussion on the other items. Can we set this up as homework. Ms. Marsh Stephens responded send it to me or Nick Campbell our contact info is on last slide, can also provide where those pieces of info came from. Last few pages in the matrix are a foundational document. Committee made point around ownership there are sections within last section of the document, speaks to ownership space for CPC to provide. Two sections there already. Section e. Section g. Sidebar adding a question in Section f that can also speak to that. That part will continue to evolve as prep for the 22nd. For example how the music venue will look, information based on what Dayna provided at last meeting. Committee Co-Chair Smith reiterated that we will all work on this and everyone will email Joy.

Mayor Frey joined the meeting. Asked if it was alright if he addresses group briefly. Thank you to both of our chairs for exceptional work, came here tonight to say thank you, for the work that you have done around creating true excellence and a visionary project here in North Minneapolis. Any time you make a move that sees substantial change and push for a true vision that brings community in, it's difficult and controversial at times there's pushback and I appreciate each and every one of you willing to wade into the messiness. You are discussing very complex decisions and the end result will be really beautiful. I've been doing my part at the Legislature, you've been doing your part. I had the opportunity to discuss the value of this project and the work you're doing. It matters. To North Minneapolis and will matter for many generations to come. From bottom of my heart thank you.

5. Community Performing Arts Center Ownership Discussion and Recommendation (Shauen Pearce, Erik Hansen)

[2-12-20 UHT CPC - CPAC Ownership Options.pdf](#)

Shauen Pearce - at the last CPC you started to discuss ownership options, we agreed to come back and do a deep dive. Last meeting we talked about 2 components – 1 about community benefits, will be deeper part of the 22nd meeting, today talking about ownership, of land and venue. Focusing on 2 scenarios, you were presented with three. One – 100% ownership by First Avenue, you all said that's not what we're talking about. Other are very similar. First will go through option 1 and option 2 then go through the rest of option 1 & 2, and there is a continuum. In both scenarios the City of Minneapolis on behalf of this project is pursuing a \$20m bonding request, part of request is that the City has sufficient control of the land. In both scenarios the City would sell the land to First Avenue, the City then would have a 62.5 yr ground lease on that land and would have complete authority over the operator, in both scenarios that's true. In both scenarios as is the case with bonding you are required to produce a match, in both scenarios First Avenue is going to produce the \$20m match. In both scenarios there is conversation about and commitment to community entity & involvement. Committee question – City is leasee City is renting and First Avenue owns it or the other way around. Ms. Pearce responded there are 2 parts. 1st part is architects think they will produce building with acceptable life of 50 yrs, requirement is we have control for 125% useable life of building, the

125% is 62.5 yrs. We understand from bond counsel that control can be in form of ground lease that City will hold for 62.5 yrs.

Erik Hansen, City of Minneapolis - in scenarios you're seeing the land would be owned by entity not the City. City is going for \$20m. The developer, First Avenue, has to bring \$20m. There are a lot of requirements for that funding. The City would build the facility, the operational facility would be leased to the City, like Orchestra Hall, MacPhail, the Guthrie, the City is responsible to deliver the government program for 62.5 yrs. The City is on the hook to control for 62.5 yrs and have an operator – the City does not operate music venues, in this case First Avenue would be the operator. What First Avenue has proposed is community ownership on the bottom that is a mix of First Avenue & a community entity or straight up community entity, the City would control for 62.5 years, then it expires then the lease structure collapses.

Committee comment - 2 things confused about \$20m bond is it only for venue. For the actual structure, not the infrastructure. What would be wrong or the reason why we don't just lease the land to First Avenue and then at the end of 62.5 yrs. What concerns me when you get to the bottom line which is community ownership - if we don't have money, I'm not ready to put money into a music venue, don't know who in the community is, maybe investors ready to do that but if we want diversity in that community ownership there really needs to be some options put forth, something to do with leasing the land that has to do with money. Is the data private - I get that, Can we have an independent expert to look at proforma say it works. Committee question – what is your initial question? Committee member response could the City just lease the land to First Avenue. Mr. Hansen responded once we own property we own and operate it forever. City on hook in future for all the capital costs past the 62.5 years, when Target Center had to be rehabbed that's on the taxpayers, the City had to go find the money. Have been getting clear signals from elected leaders on this, that they prefer the sandwich (ownership/lease) model, and easier to raise the funds. Councilmember Cunningham responded that the Committee member wants to know what City Council would/would not approve, would not approve because the responsibility to pay. Need to make sure we can afford capital improvement cost, Council does not want taxpayers to be responsible for the maintenance of this building.

Committee comment help me understand who is owning the land during the 62.5 yr period. Ms. Pearce responded in both models the land is sold to an entity. 1 entity option First Avenue created entity with a shared board CDC or community investment trust that could become owners, 2nd option to get it over to community right away. Committee comment someone suggested that a neighborhood organization would do that, no disrespect but don't think they could take it on in good faith. Committee question about what would this community entity be? Ms. Pearce move to conversation about what's different and how the Community entity shows up between option 1 & 2. Those could go back & forth – start on left over to right, during 62.5 yrs as long as City is ok with that. First Avenue has asked for some time to convene conversations about what does that entity look like. Challenging part of getting to Coordinated Plan is creating tangible steps to get here, so when we go to City Council there's a path and not just a TBD. Committee comment part of the question is what this group's responsibilities and benefits would be. Committee comment 6b parcel with the HUB keep bringing up ownership, this community ownership could be same, there has to be an organization. Eventually they could be running the HUB, as we talk we need to figure out their scope.

Ms. Pearce - Dayna is here and able to say more what it takes to get it done, what does it take First Avenue to run a facility now. Councilmember Cunningham why First Avenue and not the City, the City cannot start an organization. City cannot lead process to establish. First Avenue has offered to support. Audience member commented the City has started a few. Committee comment that the state has. Mr. Hansen responded there is state law that prohibits City from starting entities. City as an entity is not allowed to start entities, don't have all the details about those entities. Committee comment that the City owns the convention center.

Dayna Frank, First Avenue - Idea came up because of questions about who will receive the ticket fee, who will hold a CBA, how will it be culturally relevant, idea of organization or community entity holding ownership, that's what I view as 3 main buckets: receptor of funds, holder of CBA, and being community voice in operations and design. Ms. Pearce asked what it takes. How does First Avenue exist, what does it take. What do you know, what a community entity would be taking on. Ms. Frank responded could be as much or as little as entity determines. Conversation is exciting because it's your input. I'm not the right person to talk about this entity - we can help fund it, entity could hold fee ownership and receives checks could be onsite walking around and helping food vendors. Committee question can you be more specific on how First Avenue would support that entity. Ms. Frank responded by providing initial infrastructure, support legal or convening the right parties who can determine the path forward, supporting the bonding effort, that money would go towards the building that this CE would own, supporting infrastructure to get it off the ground, philanthropic effort.

Mr. Champeau stated to add to Dayna's idea is that Othello Meadow's 75N business model CDC, his group owns the Highlander they don't own all the land in Omaha - he's a partner in some of the housing, he's not the controlling partner, his company is also responsible for all the programming of the project, they hire all the vendors, as other developers come in other land attached to project they are filter to make sure community's goals are being met. Could go all way from being partner in project, to getting annual ground lease check from developer, to property manager, doesn't have to all happen at once, could be phased approaches that this could take. Development team interested in helping see this type of organization get started and get business model in place to put in multi-year phased approach. Developer not in control, community led, don't know how that happens.

Committee comment right now in our community we don't have a CDC. Takes a while to get one up and running. ADC has been around a long time, NDC. We don't have one, if you don't know status, we have one healthy non-profit that is a multi-cultural organization, the rest are struggling because they get very little overhead costs funded- this is a problem that our nonprofits suffered for over 50 yrs. These are facts. Dayna will all due respect you need to know where we got the start. We need to have something for rest of the project we need operating entities, with knowledge, skill and ability, depending on CBA to get something out of it and I'm not very trusting of that. Have some options you can investigate you know who your partners will invest in so does United Properties. So have some options we can talk about, and over time how controlling interest goes to people who look like us.

Ms. Pearce - early questions in the discussion what the community entity might have to take on – can range from holding company that can receive check, can be group that is dealing with day to day aspects, that can take care of the vendors, what we heard from Committee is be specific who we're talking about. Sounds like if there's even a community entity that would be in the position to be a fee title owner – that's really the question before you today. Which of the 2 models would you recommend to City Council and Mayor that ownership starts with - a combined model – some of you can be on a joint board, or is it let's figure out how to get the CDC going and then get there. Those are the 2 options we're really asking and the components you're raising.

Ms. Pearce getting to heart of it – I want the CPC to really think about this – TBD option. Black and North side starting from disadvantage because entity doesn't exist and don't know how to sustain it and First Avenue entity that could help them decide it. A lot of well-intentioned where people throw money at us and once they falter and doesn't work out and people go on doing business how they do it. If community entity didn't ever show up does it mean First Avenue gave away the land, is it really an option since we know there isn't an entity that exist? Are you comfortable making this decision?

Committee response state of MN in very unique situation. African American condition in state is not the complete story of African Americans. Reason we're here is disenfranchised history of disinvestment rate worst of economic disparities of any other state, know for a fact is that African American capable of running organizations, and we have an opportunity to have a seat at the table and create something that works for us. Ms. Pearce to your question we're not at a place to decide 1 or 2 - everything presented, discussion points, also bring in partner so we can effectively run organization. Info gathering day and spend time evaluating the 2 options that we research. Thank you to city for giving us what we ask and giving us two options we can work on.

Committee comment get the history and get how things have felt in the past there is a lot of mistrust we need to move forward maybe I am too optimistic but I really believe we have a chance to do things the right way and do something positive for the community – while things have happened this really is a chance to do something in our interest, we need to be intentional about entities coming to the table need to know their intentions. Committee question the City would need to know entity for both options by transaction date? Mr. Hansen responded yes because entity will lease facility back to the City of Minneapolis. Committee comment I think this could be entity that can, doesn't mean it can't be done but need to be really clear on what do you need for an organizational capacity - not ready to make this decision today. Committee comment want to extend the table and said last week want to be a part of that, this is opportunity to build and go forward if you want to be part of it as well and see what it looks like, focus on what the TBD means, important but so many aspects at play, in order to focus on that I don't think that should be our hang up. \$3 ticket fee TBD for the greatness to come, doesn't have to be identified for what are you going to use money for now.

Ms. Pearce - Emphasize what you heard from Mayor Frey. We're in a very unique moment in the City, the state, grants gone out to small, number of nonprofit and for-profit businesses I get calls from on a regular basis something very different about those scenarios then here, I spent 6 years fighting against the City, aware of the challenges. This is the first time I've seen in our region and our state, first time we have unwavering support for significant investment in North Minneapolis for current North Minneapolis residents in way that will be generational, significant and affirming, from City, County, MPRB, state and development team. It's typical in development to see 1 or 2 of those, can't think of an example where we have development team offering we'll give the infrastructure because that's the failure point for most of these groups, City saying make sure we can. Last year hosted City's first black business week, while there still not trust encourage us to rest on hope that we're all hearing and the specificity and rigor that you're demanding. Don't lose sight, the burning of black wall street those communities existed outside of a country that said they couldn't exist, if they could do it in those times when it was not even possible to walk into bank and get a loan to everyone's points this is time to fight for what you want and create what you want and hold the City to task to be creators with you and please bring the hope and pivot from the fight, creation takes less energy and provides way more.

Committee comment what's it about if we fail to remember our history we will fail to do us right. I have never given up on the creativity of black people I don't mean leaving out white and Asian people that live in our community I'm saying we're the majority of the population. History tells me to be suspect to look at it with a cynical eye and challenge conventional thinking and she's right I praise Councilmember Cunningham making sure this effort got started he didn't have to. Usually developers and Council don't do that. It's given a freshman Councilmember will make a few errors, praising City staff, there's more than 3 Councilmembers - trust me also some Councilmembers on Council that don't want this project to happen and sooner or later they're going to get called out. Need to make sure they don't run over to the state and take the bonding out - they are part of the disinvestment, tell you everything that's going on in the politics, community can't operate if don't know the facts. Dayna god bless you you're trying there are community leaders that have great ideas look for those options that we can have, we need a CDC. I know people ready to do that with strong finance background. There's \$10m sitting in

mezzanine fund supposedly for real estate development put aside by Itasca Northside economic development group that could be used as part of this development if we so choose we have to be very careful. Ms. Pearce stated to be clear about what we heard bring back items from matrix and foundational items and prepared to dive into other components of community ownership at the 22nd meeting. That way it can integrate into rest of ownership discussion – how ownership can be connected – all the other components we were talking about are important to discuss.

Committee consensus to stay until 7:30pm.

CPC 2/22 Design Day Agenda, Format, Outcomes

[UHT CPC 2-22 Design Day agenda.pdf](#)

[Upper Harbor Redevelopment Fixed & Flexible Components.pdf](#)

[UHT CPC 2-12-20 Public Works Infrastructure Primer.pdf](#)

Committee CO-chair Smith introduced discussion of 2/22 design day. Clarifying point how to follow up on ownership models? Ms. Pearce responded be part of 2/22 are there specific ways CPC want to follow up and tell us. Committee question is there a deadline? Ms. Pearce responded sooner the better the clarity is that the legislative session has started. Yes the bonding bill has to be introduced or Legislature has started drafting any - ownership is important for it to go forward. JoAnna Hicks, project management consultant, stated Mr. Hansen said there could be scenario that starts with option 1 and move to option 2 in future. Committee comment decision has to be made when and that we have time to talk about it. Agenda items should be discussion, questions not more presentation. What decisions have to be made when is it critical. Committee Co-Chair Smith responded that the design day will be different than a CPC meeting. Ms. Pearce stated if we can be mindful ideally ownership of music venue, should be decided 2/22.

Ms. Hicks stated we have not anticipated that much further conversation by the 22nd. Will walk through what we were planning on talking about also meeting on 2/26 is very open as far as what needs to be discussed. Design day 9:00a-2:00p. Orientation and talk about outcomes - trying to be consistent, trying to work through recommendations, these were tied to discussion guide at back of matrix, can adjust, but trying to use consistently moving forward. Goal of meeting some presentation, as much discussion, questions, feedback as possible. This is the result of many months of taking feedback and having developer share options. There will be short 3 slide update on the park, design not ready until March, update on where MPRB is in process, then site planning. Next step is to talk about mobility and connectivity questions that are part of the equity framework - streetscape stormwater, prioritization of southern half of site – road and connections to 33rd Ave. Primer is in your meeting packet. Development team presentation they are working through – they are going to come with 3 conceptual scenarios with themes focused not just on real estate but also outcomes. They have looked at almost 3 alternatives for each parcel, there are a lot of options. We'll be talking about 5 key questions /things looking at primarily, for CPC to provide feedback on: the HUB do we pursue large centralized, or smaller & discrete has impact on how rest of development works and fits together. Options presented from developer and feedback on that. 2nd piece is housing character – what is appropriate size & design for river parcels, and Dowling parcels 6 & 7 - they have different characters. How people feel about density/intensity moving forward, affordability, development team strategy accurately reflecting outcomes we're looking for. Jobs parcels that are specific to the river – tradeoffs between high level job creation and quick timing vs. looking for specific industries they have impact on timing and design of the building. Feedback will help move those forward. Get recommendations out of there to allow developer team to see if scenarios are reflective of what you want to see or if we're seeing a push for another scenario.

Committee comment hoping for more context than we've had in the past. To see what it would look like we've been looking at things in isolation. Ms. Hicks responded that there will not be full renderings. Committee question what does this mean – what are the tradeoffs? Ms. Hicks responded having scenarios vs individual parcels. Committee comment you keep asking if utility hub should be one large facility dispersed throughout the site what elements will go into it. Question doesn't make any sense. Ms. Hicks responded you will be hearing different types of uses giving multiple options. Committee comment this was all generated before this. Committee comment go back to December materials, we didn't get to talk about that if you go back. Ms. Hicks stated I am optimistic that you will be happy that there will be more info on the 22nd. Committee question will Othello's information be incorporated? Mr. Champeau responded yes, a similar type of facility will be one of the options.

Committee comment what's in Hub at this point we need to think long term – what's going to be at the end of this development after these years, what's going to be there. Number of housing units - seems there's going to be a lot of people there's going to be some needs there. Social services, medical clinic, is Northpoint interested in having satellite there? Don't need to get on bus to go to it. Hub gives you a unique opportunity to survey again. Some options for what you can put into the Hub, and questions about who operates that Hub, without any clue about who's going to be that operating entity. Got a lot of work to do. Three organizations in this town who are internationally known for design capabilities – U of M, MCAD. Skilled people there who can talk to community and understand how they see design and how it makes things more functional and also embed the culture into the design of the facilities. Even looking for more out of design than business as usual. Tap into resources they are already there. Consult the CPC.

Committee question about the scenarios. Ms. Hicks responded there will be 3 specific scenarios – we will give you before the meeting a table that summarizes the Concept Plan and 3 scenarios and also parcel by parcel. Committee comment as we think about each development has to be ongoing community ownership or involvement going forward. Committee comment exciting to be in position to make some of these decisions. What is method you will use to make sure we have the info we need to get to recommendations and outcomes? Bottom line is we are to produce some outcomes and what is your timeline for us to get there. The process really. The conversation we have is key and whatever you are recommending should be well thought out so we have some order, structure. Ms. Hicks responded share what we're thinking about process to get feedback. Recommendations are in the document. Idea is you would hear presentation and work through recommendations as you're going and have facilitated conversation about the questions. Intention is for example- character of parcel 1 we will walk through what it would look like across these scenarios. Committee comment it should be more allowing us to do the work ahead of time so when we come on Saturday we know what we're looking over- questions vs presentation.

Discussion followed about meeting packet and how to get information to Committee. Agreed upon electronic distribution of information by noon Tuesday 2/18, printed copies to be available for pick up at UROC no later than 5pm Tuesday 2/18.

Recommendation regarding feedback to Joy on the matrix send feedback to Joy by Friday at 5pm could collect feedback in Britt's format word doc that has what everyone says and you could all discuss it.

Committee Co-Chair Willis asked Committee if the Committee wanted any more details about Green Zone. Committee comment that in Concept Plan and other document states CPC will work w Green Zone. Really unfortunate all these things written down in plan that we're not adhering to. Ms. Pearce stated knowing at that time Green Zone had not decided on their work, it is embedded in the matrix. If Committee members feel there are items from the Milan Pact are missing send it to Hilary or Joy. Committee comment can someone put out a document on what

the hell is the Green Zone - what are we talking about, who is it and what are their principles? First I heard of it. Committee member Princess Haley responded I can send out something about the Green Zone resolution, Miss Vanessa sits with me. Will send to Hilary to send out to everyone.

Committee comment keep line of sight to Coordinated Plan, revisit the timeline and check in on plan to finalize Coordinated Plan. Committee comment clarify need to understand what is going to be required to satisfy those components that we're populating and making decisions so that the plan can actually be written. Ms. Pearce - bring forward plan to finalize Coordinated Plan and items needed to finalize Coordinated Plan. Committee comment – also the timeline.

Committee comment to revisit community engagement on 2/26. Committee Co-chair Smith noted Hilary tried to put on this agenda but I told her no- we wanted time to work. Comment to discuss what's important after 2/22 there will be more room for engagement.

Committee question has there been projection for what can be done with displacement, rent control, property values. Councilmember Cunningham responded no not yet, the City is having a rent stabilization study done and need data to be able to do that. There are preference and right to return policies we are working on and there has been exploration of capturing entertainment tax that's revenue from music venue into to anti- displacement measures. Committee question will that also include TIF on the project. Will that info also include how TIF is working on this project and how it's being used? Committee comment on a property tax cap and being grandfathered in. Councilmember Cunningham responded that we are looking into it. Ms. Pearce stated this has been captured on list along with the City's plan for North Minneapolis. Councilmember Cunningham commented you will continue to use foundational docs as narrow down decisions.

Committee comment already doing this as part of discussion, now can clearly point out where community ownership can be executed in project and what varying levels of ownership could be getting into detail of implementation plan. Need another meeting- Othello could give CDC 101? How he formed 75North? Committee Co-Chair Smith noted need to prioritize if we can get the info to go into the 22nd, can help with deep dive discussion we could have. Matrix and community ownership for the 26th.

Committee comment new business. Commend these people - staff compiled. Asked communications staff be here for a purpose. Want a press release dropped about tonight - what happened, what we did, what we want to do and expect. Tired of people spinning that, would like it to go to the mainstream press, community and black press. Telling our own story. For those who are not African Americans in this meeting long been mistrust of the press, mistrust is real it's historic. I've been to the heads of Star Tribune on lack of coverage of African Americans. Nothing to do with the CPC I'm informing people in the community and our allies who come to these meetings and understand why this trust is earned. Press do not call me a community activist again don't minimize me. Committee Co-Chair Willis noted those are his words not this committees' words. Motion to have a press release, motion passed.

Adjournment 7:51pm

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 26, 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.