

Upper Harbor Terminal Collaborative Planning Committee Minutes

Adjourned Meeting
September 9, 2020 - 5:00 pm
Online Meeting

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

Members Absent: Markella Smith (Chair), Gayle Smaller, and Princess Titus

Staff : Hilary Holmes

Call To Order

1. Roll Call.

Quorum Present

2. Adoption of the agenda.

Action Taken: Adopted

Discussion

3. Community Ownership Implementation Strategies (Brandon Champeau, United Properties and Devean George, Building Blocks/George Group North)

[09-02-2020 UHT CPC Community Ownership Implementation Strategies](#)

Action Taken: No action taken

Committee question on deadline by which there needs to be a community entity identified. Mr. Champeau responded that the longer the project goes without one identified that leaves a lot more ambiguity.

In response to a Committee member request for information about conflicts of interest and any future community entity, Erik Hansen, City of Minneapolis, responded that the City's ethics attorney wants to ensure that there are no real or perceived financial conflicts of interest as it relates to Committee members' work on the Committee. Mr. Hansen noted that Committee members are on this committee specifically because of their roles and connections within the community, and that members are going to have other roles outside of the Committee. The purpose is to make sure that all members are adhering to the ethics policy and are not actively advocating for a specific entity that may have financial benefit to them individually. The City is recommending that rather than actively recommending a specific entity, a specific competitive process that the developer can utilize. If any Committee members are on another board, they may want to consider filing a conflict of interest form or can always recuse themselves from any specific actions related to that entity. If any Committee members want to make sure that a certain entity is part of this process, then they can resign the Committee and then potentially advocate. Questions are to be directed to Erik.

Committee comment recommending RFP process going forward, that would need to be approved by the Committee. Committee question if there are other models that the team can refer to. Mr. Champeau mentioned a few models though non are directly applicable to UHT. 3CDC is a private philanthropic model in Cincinnati that developed and owns all ground floor space in a neighborhood in the city. The 3CDC model has control of the ground level experience of the area. The organization brings in the businesses in the area, mostly local Cincinnati entrepreneurs and they are able to be more nimble than the private sector. When we first started talking about a community entity involvement, it was to partner with First Avenue for the venue, and it would help program the venue on non-First Avenue event days. When the development team started talking to Deveen George, the Building Blocks CDC was more similar to the Othello Meadows Highlander model in Omaha. Discussion also started about how to create an opportunity to have one cohesive ownership approach to the ground floor retail across multiple properties, overseen by an organization that the community trusts.

Committee request for Mr. Hansen to send the documentation about the conflicts of interest policy to all of the members of the Committee. Committee comment of concern of the limitation of being able to make specific recommendations but limited by making any recommendations for specific community organizations; especially if the developer is the one making recommendations. Mr. Hansen clarified that the team wants recommendations from the Committee members but want to make sure that everyone adheres to the policy.

Committee comment on power in partnerships and that an RFP would be a good way to start looking for the community entity group(s), especially groups that want to partners and work on the site as a whole. Mr. Champeau responded that an Upper Harbor RFP could list out the opportunities and expertise. Committee comment that first need to figure out what skills and experience is needed.

Mr. Champeau noted that the entity could own the commercial property, be a district manager for the public realm and start the process for the Hub. One way is the development team would make that decision using the recommendations laid out by the Committee.

Committee comment that what the project/Committee needs it to figure out an entity that is the overarching entity for the project rather than the Committee having a granular recommendation on the entities – Committee should be looking at making a recommendation that would set in motion accountability measures and what the process is.

Committee comment to establish rigid criteria that gets the best of what we want to do. Criteria could include rigid criteria, encouraging collaboration, some evidence and ability to deliver, and make sure that if Building Blocks encourages some partnerships and collaborations. And Run by and works with following communities, indigenous, black, women and LGBTQ, working class and Northsiders and experience with environmental justice and organizing.

Mr. Hansen noted the team is looking for the Committee to provide some guidance on how to make these choices - when the Coordinated Plan comes out, there will be work to implement the vision identified in the Coordinated Plan, there will be a long runway for opportunities to live, work, and create businesses at UHT. Depending on the specific decisions, the City Council, the MPRB or the developer might make those decisions. Mr. Hansen encouraged the Committee

to provide some guidance around the procurement of the community entities that will last beyond when the Coordinated Plan is approved.

Brief Committee discussion of the role of a community entity: Have the community entity that is in charge of making decisions on the distribution of funds picked with a competitive process and that the funding should go back to the community. The criteria would be: the entity working on this should be from Minneapolis, have cultural competence, knowledge and awareness and track record (ability to deliver). There should be community input into how those funds are spent, from the people that would be impacted, and if that is a place based representative organization (people living in and using that site).

Committee requested more information on the Redevelopment Agreements and what they would entail, and how the Committee could recommend or create a Community Benefits Agreement. Committee staff noted that the Learning Tables team is working on this and any CBA would need to be negotiated with the developer.

Committee comments: It was never defined what community means, as community is defined in many ways by different people. Black people, non-immigrants, have been historically disenfranchised and have the worst socioeconomic disparity in the state and the country, and if the process does not establish a hierarchy of needs, the Northside will end up with gentrification. Those who have been most marginalized are a priority and to make sure the group is specifically saying that we are working to right historic wrongs, and that the Committee should define community and who is prioritized because if not, Black residents will have to fight new members of the community who have more money, more power and more time.

Committee comment that the Committee already identified that focus and success measures in the Matrix.

Committee comment that the group has been talking about community too broadly and that we should all be a changed people and should be listening to the African American community.

Committee comment to use the equity matrix and have a full section of the Coordinated Plan that clearly defines community and defines this as a restorative project- and identify what the mechanisms are to prevent this from going down the wrong path.

Committee comment that current policies reflect the current condition, and Black residents don't want to be lumped into POI, but have reparations for the disparities. Other cities have figured out how to do it, to create reparations for this community in this project.

Committee request for City staff to address these concerns and present something to address it at the next meeting on September 23rd.

4. Engagement and Communications Update (Hilary Holmes, Rattana Sengsoulichanh, City of Minneapolis)

Action Taken: No action taken

5. Meeting Schedule and Topics (JoAnna Hicks, Element. Added to agenda at 9/2 meeting)

[09-09-2020 UHT CPC Meeting Schedule & Draft Coordinated Plan Update](#)

[09-09-20 UHT CPC Recommendation Points for Coordinated Plan](#)

Action Taken: No action taken

Announcements

6. City Update (Erik Hansen, City of Minneapolis)

Action Taken: No action taken

Adjournment 7:45 p.m.

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: Sep 23, 2020

Submit written comments about agenda items to: councilcomment@minneapolismn.gov

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 612-263-6850. Para asistencia 612-673-2700 - Rau kev pab 612-673-2800 - Hadio aad Caawimaad u baahantahay 612-673-3500.