

Upper Harbor Terminal Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #12

Meeting Minutes

08.27.20

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) General Meeting:

Introduction/ Updates (Kate)

Prior to the meeting, MPRB encouraged participants to review a packet that outlines the information, considerations, and questions to be discussed.

Link to pre-meeting packet:

http://upperharbormpls.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/2020-08-27_DiscussionPacket-CURRENT.pdf

After a brief introduction MPRB staff split participant into three breakout rooms.

Staff and consultants each presented the key points around each topic before discussion:

[Meeting Presentation](#)

Group 1 Notes:

Group 1 included CAC Members: Vice Chair Mysnikol Miller, Teqen Zéa-Aida, Tom Dunnwald, Michelle Shaw, Jennifer Webb

Notes are written to show general viewpoints from each CAC member:

CAC Member: I am fed up with this process. This project just keeps getting more and more ridiculous. MPRB is being used as a tool for gentrification and displacement. The park is being used to placate the music venue. This park does not work. Why would we want to create a second place for performances with the venue already there?

CAC Vice Chair: I agree completely. The community is not centered in this process and I don't see the point of this CAC. We are nothing more than a front for the Park Board to say that they have engaged. Nothing has changed since George Floyd died. I am tired of agenda driven meetings.

CAC Member: I also agree. I joined this committee because I was told it was a way to explore an alternative to the First Avenue music venue. I had suggested a bandshell, although it doesn't have to be a bandshell, but that is not being explored. But I didn't want to have this conversation before debriefing from the Dakota presentation.

CAC Member: We should be honest, we are a tool of the developer and of gentrification. I would feel better if MPRB stuck to its goals and values. The mission is not to be used by a developer. We should heal the area and just do restoration.

CAC Vice Chair: What if the development didn't happen right away? There may or may not be money. This is not equity driven. We have an opportunity to say no.

CAC Member: Why would you build a performance area in the park when there is a venue next door. That makes no sense?

Kate: That is partly why we have highlighted this concern and question. We have heard a lot of people ask for a park that supports community events and performances. But we see some real issues with providing them with the current development plan. There is overlap in function with the venue and issues with having more than one event at a time. So we wanted to ask people if this type of 2000 person space had value if we couldn't actually hold many events. We are hearing that 200 person spaces are desired for large family/casual events.

CAC Member: If the park doesn't have money to support programming, why would you propose it. The money from the venue should be going to support park programming.

Kate: There would be a different group, I believe a community led entity, that would determine how any funds generated from the venue fees on ticket sales would be spent. It is possible that some could be spent on programming the park, but it could also be spent on community programming at the venue or a number of other things, including other anti-gentrification efforts.

CAC Member: I absolutely agree about the venue and the process that City has used. We are very constrained by the venue and it's harder to make a space by the river. The venue could be a smaller venue on park space. But I absolutely do not believe we should lose the park space. I think we should take the opportunity to hold public green space on the river. I don't see the purpose of a 2000 person space in the park with the venue next door – maybe more like a 400-500 person space.

CAC Member: Don't invest in this park. We should be investing in other Northside parks.

CAC Member: I don't agree with letting the City take over the park land. We want and need this park on the Northside. People will come here. I don't like the venue either, but I was listening to the last CPC meeting and they were talking about affordable housing and Northside business and cooperative ownership.

CAC Member: If the City screws up, it becomes our issue to deal with in the park.

CAC Member: This conversation is moot unless we can provide a space for Northsiders to come. I think we need to meet with the City's CPC (Collaborative Planning Committee). I've been asking for that for a long time.

CAC Member: The money could be there for a good project, but it is being designated wrong. They are asking for \$20 million to support the venue.

CAC Member: I am 100% against any public funding being used for this project.

CAC Vice Chair: It is very privileged to say that we should build it and people will come. What if it doesn't operate that way? We are used to not having anything so not having a park here isn't a loss. If we can't do it in a meaningful way, we shouldn't do it.

CAC Member: I think we need to make a case for why the park is important. Why the venue and development plans are damaging.

CAC Member: I do not think we should walk away from creating a park. The land there is an eyesore. This park will just become a parking lot for the venue if we don't make sure it's a park.

Kate: I am concerned that we may not know what will happen with development. The market is definitely uncertain and so plans could change but those changes might not be figured out years from now. And it's really common to have to plan parks where we have to live with whatever development is our neighbor and we don't know how it will change. What if we plan two alternative versions of the park based on whether some major development pieces, like the venue, go forward or not? Like we are hearing some clear desire to have a community performance area in the park, but maybe it doesn't make sense with the venue there. If we developed two alternative versions, does it help you get your message out that there can still be music on the river? Do you want to say that Option A is an ideal park, but we would have to do Option B based on some of the development unknowns? Then we would know what to do if things changed, even if it happens a year after the park is built. We can build in flexibility.

CAC Member: I have to leave but I think we need to work on this more. I also think we should talk about giving the land back to the Dakota.

CAC Member: I am 100% against this project and the use of any public dollars via our park board going towards any part of it. I am deeply concerned about further displacement as well as the possible loss of First Avenue to these predatory developers. I believe First Ave is in way over their heads and are being sold a pipe dream.

CAC Vice Chair: I am never going to give up on equity and justice. We need to work differently. This is backwards. If the Northside people were your priority you would have solved the transportation barrier at the forefront. There are access issues – those should have been considered first. The Indigenous perspective should have been considered first. It doesn't make sense to invest in the park without the infrastructure to create access for the Northside.

We need time and space to create a more powerful statement from the CAC. There is a way we can all get what we want. We can have both park and equity. My main issues are the venue and commercial spaces and access to the park. This process is set up to fail and to pit people against each other. The venue is a perfect example.

Priti: Project for Public Space is supporting MPRB and working on ways to make this park very much of a Northside Park and accessible. We can further develop those ideas with you.

Kate: Is the issue that you do not want a park or the issue that you do not feel this park can work with the development that is being planned?

CAC Vice Chair: The former. And there needs to be an actual plan for connecting people to the park. A strategy that builds incrementally. We should leverage the money that has been allocated in a more meaningful way so that the park is more accessible. This process has been set up to fail and pits people against each other. The venue is a classic example. There is a way that that we can all have what we want – a park and access for the Northside. What is the access planned right now?

Kate: Public Works is using the rest of the 2018 State Bond Funds (that is not being allocated for park) to improve access along Dowling Ave. The plan is also to provide access at 33rd to the south although we don't know if the parkway will connect all the way through the UHT site. Dowling Ave will have bikeway and sidewalks and general improvements, but the problem is that it isn't a very wide right-of-way. So the City can only do so much within that right-of-way – they can provide the pathways but they are somewhat packed into a tight corridor. They are asking for MnDOT to help them by construction a separate bike ped bridge that would give them more space to make it a better experience. Everyone wants a bus stop but we likely need to create demand for that in order to Met Council to support it. So we have suggested that MPRB provide a shuttle to support programming at the park. It could pick up in neighborhood locations. We support capping a portion of the freeway with a lid in master plans, but that is a huge state, if not federal, government project. MnDOT is exploring lids, and discussed on at this upper river, but their first priority is where the neighborhood is really on both sides of the freeway. Right now we have industrial land on one side.

CAC Vice Chair: Equity cannot be at the forefront when transportation is an after thought.

CAC Member: I could definitely get behind making a statement to the City and to the MPRB Commissioners. We should ask the Commissioners to help us put pressure on the City.

CAC Member: I absolutely want a park. The Northside residents need and deserve this green space.

CAC Member: I think we should leverage the economic situation right now to push for change. I think we should have the public space and make it clear why the venue is an issue. We can provide a statement that people want to endorse. Our best plan is to address the misguided plans by the City. We need to be explicit about what is wrong with development plans and what has to change.

Kate: You could also set up a subcommittee of the CAC to further detail this out.

CAC Vice Chair: I thought we couldn't meet outside of the CAC?

Kate: You just shouldn't have a quorum if you are discussing official CAC business but smaller groups can definitely meet and bring recommendations back to the larger group.

CAC Vice Chair: If we want to have the Commissioners support us, we need people to support them.

Kate: It's very hard to tell where general sentiment is at since Covid. Keep in mind that the City has a committee that is meeting weekly now so they are really immersed in the details of the development. My understanding is that they are mostly supportive of the Draft Coordinated Plan that is about to be released publicly. You may put this statement out there and it may go nowhere. We could be back at this same place in a couple of months and have to make decisions about the park and the development plan and any uncertainty will still be there.

General response: CAC should push back on the City and ask MPRB Commissioners to resist developing a park with current development plans.

Group 2 Notes:

Group 1 included CAC Members: Chair Robin Lewis, Eva Bailey, Brandon Burbach, Aric Arneson, Adam Cameron

Notes are written to show responses to each question:

Topic 1: Park event/gathering space and music venue event/gathering space

Question 1.1: Are the considerations listed above the right considerations when assessing the size and function of an event area in the park?

Question 1.2: If the music venue was available for community events for up to 40 days per year as planned by the City/First Avenue, is there still value for the Park Board to offer an additional space for performance events? If so, how can the two spaces be planned so that they complement each other, rather than duplicate offerings?

Question 1.3: The majority of the event space in the park concepts is provided by a large lawn that can also support field sports, picnics, casual activities, and more. Would a larger, open gathering space (such as the lawn shown in Concept C) still have value for the park users regardless of event use? Or would this space be better devoted to multiple smaller spaces, more natural areas, or other park amenities?

CAC Member: My understanding is that the Venue would have a lot of non-ticketed/low-cost ticketed time available, is that still assumed? 40 isn't that many - it doesn't seem like there would be a few events per year, not that many conflicts, not a major issue.

- a. John: Outdoor venue so it's april to june through november. Best case, 6 mo/yr, 1/yr at night

CAC Member: Park doesn't need to have a major performance venue for un-ticketed or low-cost ticketed events. If MPRB doesn't have a margin to do a lot more events, then there's plenty being offered by the larger venue. The park should then be for 50-100 people, vs a competing amphitheater. Seems redundant

- a. John: Timing of the building of the private venue being built - maybe a temporary stage could be provided by the Park Board in the interim.

CAC Member: 200 seems minimal and 2000 seems excessive. Is there a middle ground?

- a. John: Middle ground could be a potential with the larger field - larger events in the parks now are 1000 or less. Planning for 1000 people is probably realistic.

CAC Member: My concern, not to cannibalize the venue, want local residents to have a sizable park. The venue events may not be a big factor for local residents

CAC Member: What's the difference for booking the venues - there would be booking through First Ave?

- a. John: First Ave is the operator for the 30-40 paid events per year. The other community events will run through First Ave. Park Board doesn't actually run many programs

CAC Member: Movie in the park is a really valuable and should be accommodate by a park event space

CAC Member: We don't have a say in how many events for the community will be held, that's determined by the state?

- a. John: It's the agreement between the city and the developer. We could recommend that no more than 40 events are held.

CAC Member: Those are good considerations, noise is the main thing. It's tough to imagine how loud it would be when just looking at the plans. It would effect the character of the park space.

- a. John: Noise mitigation will likely be blocked by some of the differing levels. The domes may provide noise mitigation while they are here, but they may be removed.

CAC Member: If the Park Board is having venue on the smaller space, could the park Board hold their event simultaneously? Would have to schedule around the venue anyways. (Agreement from two other CAC Members - doesn't make a lot of sense to have two outdoor performance spaces at the same time)

Flexibility of the space is key - so the lawn option is very useful. No formal structural music venue, but flexible open lawn. Aim for 250-1000 multi-functional.

CAC Chair: Clarifying question on the community based events in the venue. The timing of the park space - skeptical because the community events could get not the best time slots. What would then be left over for the community. Would Juneteenth not be there? Need more information about the terms and conditions - they are profit motivated. If we want to do Juneteenth by the river, there should be an outside event outside where barbeque, wedding. Skeptical about what the park developer wants.

- a. John: CAC could make a recommendation. Recommend limiting events at the venue to 35 per year.

CAC Member: Only 21 weeks in the season - that's only 42 weekend days every year. That's going to be tight. Maybe we want maximum 30.

- a. John: Could suggest 2 paid events per week. 3 days left for other potential programming in a park venue.

CAC Member: What about recommending that they include Juneteenth? (Agreement)

CAC Chair: Should also think about Northside - also Cinco de Mayo etc.

- a. John - there could be free flow between park and venue during the community events at the venue

General group consensus on topic 1: Flexibility of the space is key - so the lawn option is very useful. No formal structural music venue, but flexible open lawn. Aim for 250-1000 multi-functional.

There is interest from the CAC to develop a recommendation that paid events do not exceed 30-35 events per year (vs the potential 40) and that the venue community events must include Juneteenth.

Topic 1: Adjacent development impacts to the park

Question 1: The park board could potentially have indoor space in the first floor of the Parcel 1B which is directly north of the main park area. There is potentially cost savings in sharing a building, rather than having a separate park building. There is enough space to accommodate any likely park needs, such as a lobby, public multipurpose room(s) and restrooms, public kitchen for general use, events, and classes, staff office and storage, as well as potential space for a partner. Having multiple partners with overlapping spaces can expand hours that the building is open to the public. Some of the indoor park spaces, such as reservable rooms, might also serve nearby residents. Do you feel that sharing Parcel 1B could be a good idea? Would your views change if the nature of the residential units changed? What if affordability changed?

CAC Member: Do we know what our financial constraints are? Operating costs, but what about a capital investment?

- a. John: 7.75 million dollars needs to build "phase 1" - that includes site work, built infrastructure, anything the CAC identifies as priorities. When concepts were presented we presented full vision with a phase 1 concept. The rental of this space might not need to come out of that - might go into yearly costs for operations. To build a building, that would come out of the 7 million.

CAC Member: Those amenities (kitchen, community room) are great if there's affordable housing. My views would likely change if it is market rate housing.

- a. They have only talked about affordable housing here. Thank you for those points.

CAC Member: If we did occupy this space, would that take away from the space those residents would have?

- a. I don't think so, example of Bryan Cole Center in Cedar Riverside. Park board spaces may not normally be built into a building like this - having PB as the partner might actually add value to the building for residents. Or a 5 year lease and then that would have to be figured out. (Post meeting clarification – the intention is not have some public facing use on that ground floor to MPRB space wouldn't take a way from residential units. It could also be a business such as a restaurant, or a non-profit organization. MPRB is one possible occupant if there is interest from community members)

CAC Chair: BC Center helps the residents there but also financially responsible. Could be a trial run to be in the building and test things like operating a kitchen, many don't have such advanced buildings, community center, group fitness, senior center - would be a great benefit to the residents. Could test having a restaurant there, could be Black-owned, women-owned. Then in phase II there is greater understanding of how to develop their own park building. Nice gateway from Dowling into the park.

CAC Member: Who would own the building?

- a. John: United properties. They aren't the affordable housing developer, so there will be a lease, but in lieu of the timing of the building, we could create a temporary building for Phase I.

CAC Member: Would the park pay rent to them?

- a. John - What that rent is at this time is unknown, maybe rent is negligible? Maybe minority-owned business and they split the rent. (Post meeting clarification – the ownership structure could be set up so MPRB rents some ground floor space or could have ownership through a vertical plat or other means)

CAC Member: [in summary] Vote on the space is that we want to see the space utilized, as long as the resident use isn't negatively impacted.

Question 2: With the music venue on parcel 3 there will be sound from the venue during shows – similar to being near other outdoor performance areas. The venue will need to comply with sound requirements established by applicable government regulations and any direction set by the environmental review (Alternative Urban Areawide Review, AUAR). There also may be people queuing outside of the venue before shows.

We have heard both concerns about sound from events and people queuing in the park but also that both offer opportunities. Some people have suggested that park users might listen to concerts, or that markets could serve people in line for shows. Do you have any recommendations about what park features and designs should be near the venue? Should these features be prioritized in the first phase(s) of construction if the venue development is delayed?

CAC Member: The queue is concerning - 7-10 thousand people. Figure how to corral the cue away from the park. Cue shouldn't be a consideration that influences the park. When they have their events it shouldn't disrupt the park- that's not our vision.

- a. CAC could make a recommendation that cuing for the venue shifts South vs North.
- b. Let's say you take an Uber and get dropped off, maybe you hang out instead of standing in line. Tricky to stop people from hanging out in the park before the event. Likely going to get spillover.

CAC Chair: Clarification of what queuing would mean. They have a big plaza area and area across the street at UMN, it shouldn't go down Dowling or into the park space, even though people are walking - it's traveling to the place that gets clogged up. They should have to deal with that. People who are at the park shouldn't have to deal with that.

- a. Any features near the venue? Supporting the overflow could look like having a market. Could look like natural areas.

CAC Member: Everyone who comes to visit the City should be welcome. Someone coming to picnic in the park and then go to a venue - should figure out how to make that part of the experience. If there's trails or fields or playgrounds, have those not conflict with people that are in proximity to the concert site. Have it be a relationship and not a feud - there's a bit of a feud mentality...have a co-existing space. If there are issues down the road, can address then.

CAC Chair: Afraid of gentrification. Northside venue - who are invited as a destination park. Is that going to stop the local people from coming to the park. White people, rich people. Want to see black people around.

CAC Member: I don't really go to the park - I hope I would be welcome at the park.

CAC Member: Great point about not having it be a destination park - if there's a creative way with the landscaping to shepherd people around the park. Having bike trails conflict with cues is the worst, have landscaping shepherd people away from the trails.

CAC Member: The domes are close to the venue - to recreate something there (basketball court or other) it would be difficult for park goers to have a basketball game there if there's a concert going on. A creative design to naturally guide people out of conflict of the park. Not have queuing.

General group consensus - we want to see the space in the development utilized as a park building, as long as the resident use isn't negatively impacted. If the units are not dedicated to be affordable, then there is less interest to add amenities like a kitchen, community space etc.

Interest in a CAC recommended that the City make the lines flow south away from the park. If there's trails or fields or playgrounds on the venue side, have those not conflict with people that are in proximity to the concert site, whether to wait in line or extend their experience otherwise. Have it be a relationship and not a feud between park and venue, but still maintain local park users as the main audience of park features (not attracting venue attendees). Use creative design/landscaping to guide venue traffic out of conflict with park use.

Question 3: Any further thoughts on positive park and development interface or how the park design might vary based on development parcels?

CAC Member: concept alternative B w/ food terrace. Is that design what's being considered

- a. John - The variations between the concepts. Bringing people to the park and the river vs bringing people to meet the river right away

CAC Member: servicing that community (600 units) with sport courts would be useful. Create some kind of destination to draw people across 94 from the Northside. It's not necessarily readily accessible, pull in with walking paths, pavilion, sports activities. Initially you will serve whatever else gets built in phase I, phase II. It's not just passers by.

CAC Chair: Something that says hey- we're here. Maybe having a shuttle from nearby parks.

- a. John - explains Dowling planning process. Direct people straight to the river.

CAC Member: We really can pull people from the northside over to the river is the big goal and excited to hear about Dowling improvements for walking. When that comes up, the Washington Ave going north, that's a major entrance point for 1/3 of north Minneapolis. They'll probably come over from 42nd. Simple bike path and lighting on Washington will make a big difference to make it welcoming from the North. Washington Ave is just as important as Dowling. The people designing it don't know the neighborhood access. The City needs to know.

- a. John. We will let you know about opportunities to weigh in on city street design process

General group consensus - Liked Parking Option B best, and they want to have parking be on the same side as the park. Then kids/families you don't have to cross traffic to get into the park.

Affirmed that yes, it is important to keep public parking at the park open for park users, and not allow venue users to occupy park spaces.

CAC members want to know about opportunities to weigh in on the city street design process for Dowling and Washington N (future access point from neighborhood).

Topic 3: Access and Parking for Park Users

Question 3.1: Previously the CAC listed some concerns to the City's CPC Committee regarding congestion. Do you feel that maintaining vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access along Dowling Avenue to the park needs to be a priority of an Event Management Plan? Do you have any other recommendations to the City's Committee regarding the importance of access to the park?

Do you have any recommendations to the Park Board and City regarding parkway closures for events?

Question 3.2: Do you prefer one of the parking layouts shown? Which one best balances community use and space required? Does the amount of parking offered based on assumptions about park use make sense?

Question 3.3: Is it important to keep public parking at the park open for park users, and not allow venue users to occupy park spaces? If so, likely a mechanism of control or monitoring would need to be put in place during large shows. Any advice on doing so in a way that is friendly to park users.

CAC Member: Clarify - Where is this on the bigger map? You have to come in on Dowling and then go south?

CAC Member: I like the parking being on the same side as the park. Then kids/families you don't have to cross traffic to get into the park. Safer and more friendly. May be able to push the parkway a little further west.

- a. Have been discussing moving down from usual to 15 mph. 15-20 mph max. Probably less of an issue but good point.

CAC Member: High density of kids drives families to parks. Agree not to have to cross parkway. Did the one-way thing.

CAC Member: Is there an option to move off street parking to other side of the street (park side)

- a. It just means you take up park space. Going to be parallel parking on the parkway, maybe about 60 stalls, those won't be designated for park space, the City will own. Ultimately may be filled by residents. But these off street spaces are meant for park users.

CAC Member: How will they control that?

- a. Sign it and monitor it. They'll have to figure out how.

CAC Member: Parallel parking will be metered?

- a. The existing parkways mostly don't. First come, first serve usually unless in downtown. But that could change.

CAC Chair: I like B with no crossing the street, it has the most space and most familiar, but most traffic conflicts.

- a. Bikes might be going around by the river, but some commuters. It's safer for peds but the conflict is lower.

CAC Member: What happens if you don't find one of the 22 parking spots? How do you turn around?

- a. Would be able to turn around via the development roads. Parallel parking would be on the development side for the venue side.

CAC Member: I like B too.

CAC Member: I like B too but we need to make sure cars have a way to turn around when the spots are full No one wants to drive all the way to 33rd.

CAC Chair: Will they have underground parking for the residences?

- a. Likely not underground because water table, but will be their own parking. The venue won't have that much parking for people coming to the concerts.

CAC Member: Will the businesses use the parallel parking or will it be 2hr enforced?

- a. The businesses 4 and 5 wont use many spaces. Maybe residence visitors. We will note limit parking conflicts.

CAC Member: Will there be a roundabout feature right where Dowling connects to the Parkway? I think this would be a good idea so cars can easily flip around there.

General group consensus: Parking design B is preferred because it is familiar and park users don't have to cross the parkway to get to the park.

It is very important that access and public parking at the park be maintained for park users. Venue attendees should not occupy the park parking when there are events – those spaces should be for the public using the park.

Group 3 Notes:

Group 1 included members of the public and consultants to other agencies on the UHT project

Notes are written to show responses to each question:

Notes are written to show responses to each question:

Topic 1: Park event/gathering space and music venue event/gathering space

Question 1.1: Are the considerations listed above the right considerations when assessing the size and function of an event area in the park?

Question 1.2: If the music venue was available for community events for up to 40 days per year as planned by the City/First Avenue, is there still value for the Park Board to offer an additional space for performance events? If so, how can the two spaces be planned so that they complement each other, rather than duplicate offerings?

Question 1.3: The majority of the event space in the park concepts is provided by a large lawn that can also support field sports, picnics, casual activities, and more. Would a larger, open gathering space (such as the lawn shown in Concept C) still have value for the park users regardless of event use? Or would this space be better devoted to multiple smaller spaces, more natural areas, or other park amenities?

Community Member: Is the venue open air?

- a. Planned to be, envisioned as primarily a summer venue

Community Member: How many large events do the park board hold? What could that number be here?

- a. Hard to tell, frequency dependent on other entities. Budgeting process NOT typically done during planning/design. Nothing set in stone, other entities haven't committed dollars yet. Unique process with more focus on operation and funding

Community Member: Regarding Phasing, is there a sense of 'when' on the larger venue will go forward? What is the process for the first ave community use of the venue?

- a. Venue needs state funding and it depends on the bonding. What we do not know is if the bonding is not passed, do we wait and go another round or a limited facility.

Community Member: Have we looked at other programming that was across the city that could be here as well?

- a. Do events (or this park) pull energy away from neighborhood parks or add energy? There is interest in culturally specific programming opportunities.

Community Member: North Mississippi Regional Park is difficult to navigate - this park has the opportunity to have a center of energy and focus.

Community Member: Whatever the events, provide needed infrastructure such as power and water to make it easy for small scale performers or artists to participate

Topic 2: Adjacent development impacts to the park

Question 1: The park board could potentially have indoor space in the first floor of the Parcel 1B which is directly north of the main park area. There is potentially cost savings in sharing a building, rather than having a separate park building. There is enough space to accommodate any likely park needs, such as a lobby, public multipurpose room(s) and restrooms, public kitchen for general use, events, and classes, staff office and storage, as well as potential space for a partner. Having multiple partners with overlapping spaces can expand hours that the building is open to the public. Some of the indoor park spaces, such as reservable rooms, might also serve nearby residents. Do you feel that sharing Parcel 1B could be a good idea? Would your views change if the nature of the residential units changed? What if affordability changed?

Question 2: With the music venue on parcel 3 there will be sound from the venue during shows – similar to being near other outdoor performance areas. The venue will need to comply with sound requirements established by applicable government regulations and any direction set by the environmental review (Alternative Urban Areawide Review, AUAR). There also may be people queuing outside of the venue before shows.

We have heard both concerns about sound from events and people queuing in the park but also that both offer opportunities. Some people have suggested that park users might listen to concerts, or that markets could serve people in line for shows. Do you have any recommendations about what park features and designs should be near the venue? Should these features be prioritized in the first phase(s) of construction if the venue development is delayed?

Community Member: Accommodate park spaces for more everyday use rather than larger, less frequently used destination events

Community member: Could be a great way to enrich the lives of those who live in the affordable housing in particular as proximity to parks is so important for everyone, esp those with lower income

Community member: Desire for space for programming, workshops, educational opportunities all seasons

Juxtaposition Arts team: The opportunity to tie in with this more substantial indoor space could be a real win win for residents the broader community to allow more to happen

Community member: Affordable gathering and meeting spaces where you can bring and or make food is at a premium in North Minneapolis. More multipurpose space is needed for non profits and community groups - grad ceremonies, birthday parties, meetings, etc. The park would benefit from having something on the first floor to host events (Kristn echos). Year round use

Juxtaposition Arts team: no one is living there now, whoever first lives there will define what "the community" means so it is really important that the first housing in particular is affordable and supports people/culture that is most likely to be supportive of existing people/culture in North Minneapolis

Community member: Want to make sure you can see the river at many places through out it and that the private development and any naturalized planting areas do not totally get in the way / connection (ann calvert)

Community member: MPRB does habitat so well, but sometimes they miss the connectivity. We want beauty and function (nature and social), noise sequestration via trees and vegetation

Community member: some benefits for being able to hear the music without paying ticket prices outside the venue. Make sure venue doesnt feel so securitized and privatized when an event is happening - let the public who did not pay for a ticket enjoy.

Community member: there is a premium where residents and families of north minneapolis feel a sense of safety and can accommodate recreation - want to make sure that having the concerts there does not crowd out resident/family enjoyment

Community member: allow for vendors - whether there is a venue or not. Juneteenth supported a lot of small scale entrepreneurship when it was on Glendale by surrounding neighbors (Shawn)

Community member: Allowing for folks that do catering on the side (micro businesses) who are from North Minneapolis

Topic 3: Access and Parking for Park Users

Question 3.1: Previously the CAC listed some concerns to the City's CPC Committee regarding congestion. Do you feel that maintaining vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access along Dowling Avenue to the park needs to be a priority of an Event Management Plan? Do you have any other recommendations to the City's Committee regarding the importance of access to the park?

Do you have any recommendations to the Park Board and City regarding parkway closures for events?

Question 3.2: Do you prefer one of the parking layouts shown? Which one best balances community use and space required? Does the amount of parking offered based on assumptions about park use make sense?

Question 3.3: Is it important to keep public parking at the park open for park users, and not allow venue users to occupy park spaces? If so, likely a mechanism of control or monitoring would need to be put in place during large shows. Any advice on doing so in a way that is friendly to park users.

Community Member: Parking not as much of a challenge if large events have strong support.

Community Member: in case you missed it, "This summer it was a struggle with the timing, and you can't just go in and take over a park," says Johnson. "So my thing is, why isn't the plan being put into effect for kids to come into facilities for the winter? ... You can't practice basketball in the wintertime outside here. That's just not going to happen." <http://www.citypages.com/news/north-minneapolis-youth-coaches-frustrated-by-closed-rec-centers/572198611?fbclid=IwAR1iZEYIEpQmyHB5Shl0wemNpXDUMbCc7fbF94uyc1j9Y62dyQajRxmyrjI>

Community Member: I definitely agree that parking or lack of parking is anxiety producing

End of document