

## Upper Harbor Terminal Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #14

### Meeting Minutes

12.17.2020 (6:00-8:00pm)

Online Zoom Call

### Introduction/ Updates (Robin and Kate)

Robin started the meeting by thanking everyone for coming, and by giving an overview of the goal of the meeting: to listen to a presentation and provide recommendations as a CAC to the City of Minneapolis' Collaborative Planning Committee (UHT CPC), City, and developers while their public comment period is open.

Kate welcomed folks into the virtual room and reminded folks of the online meeting expectations (i.e. CAC members renaming themselves to show they are on the CAC, one conversation in the chat box, etc.). Kate acknowledged that CAC Meeting #13 (Sept 15 CAC meeting discussing systemic racism and the park project/system) was especially challenging, and apologized; she mentioned that the previous meeting would not be debriefed during this Meeting #14, because it deserves its own time and space, rather than being addressed in a few minutes at the beginning of a meeting. Kate also mentioned that the City' public comment period is time sensitive and she wanted to make sure that the CAC could still do their work. She reminded the CAC the goal is to formalize recommendations written up based on previous discussions, and this is a time for the CAC to edit, add, change, and remove recommendations.

- (CAC Member) Asked for clarification about what made the previous meeting difficult.
- (Project Staff) Conversations about systemic racism generated a lot of friction and tension.
- (CAC Member) Thanked her for the clarification, for naming systemic racism as the tension point.

### City Collaborative Planning Committee (CPC) Co-Chair Overview of Development

Markella Smith, the Co-Chair of the CPC and Executive Director at McKinley Community Neighborhood Organization, gave an overview of the [DRAFT "Upper Harbor Terminal Coordinated Development Plan"](#), which is open for public comment from December 5, 2020 through January 15, 2021.

*[Staff Note: Link to more information about the CPC Community Engagement Plan/Process and upcoming events: <http://upperharbormpls.com/community-engagement/> Project Staff put a few links into the chat, including the [CAC #14 Agenda](#), [Development Overview presentation](#), and [Draft Potential Recommendations](#) [Staff Note: These are the draft recommendations from the MPRB CAC to the City CPC, NOT the draft development plan created by the CPC].*

Markella started the presentation by voicing that she felt good about the process, and where the recommendations have ended up, reminding the CAC that there have been a lot of voices heard throughout this process, and that the work doesn't just end with this project and its process. Markella gave an overview of the CPC's role, and identified the project values and objectives *[Staff Note: Slide 2 of the Development Overview presentation]*. Markella went over how community benefits are built into the project/development through Ground Lease payments, which will go into a dedicated Fund to help

combat gentrification and displacement for Northsiders. She explained that a Community Entity will help direct those available funds. Markella explained that the CPC has had input on various aspects of the plan, including the RFP process by which the Community Entity will be selected. She explained the CPC wanted to ensure there was community representation on the selection committee, so that folks with vested interest in North Minneapolis are represented and making the decisions for the northside. She explained that the Community Entity will co-own the venue land with First Ave which will also help provide revenue streams into the community. She explained the venue was planned for be 7,000-10,000 seat capacity and that it would be available for events; the final design process for the music venue is planned for Spring 2021.

Markella went over the first phase for development, highlighting the inclusion of mixed income affordable housing. She explained that as part of the CPC process, they were working really hard for the developers to include 30% AMI, and that as a result of their feedback 60% of the housing developed will be at 50% AMI or less. Proud that percentage was included, believe mixed income housing is important because the median income in North Minneapolis is below the Minnesota average, and they didn't want to create concentrated areas of poverty (with solely low-income properties). Markella said the City is confident it will be able to meet its affordable housing goals, but the timing may vary with when funding is available. Markella explained that the CPC also hoped that through the development/ housing/ creation of jobs this project would encourage former residents to move back to where they were displaced from.

- (CAC Member *in chat*) 30-50% AMI is approximately \$30,000-50,000/year.
- (Public *in chat*) Elders and disabled and those who are economically struggling are also important and those who have been hit hardest by foreclosures and Life...
- (CAC Member *in chat*) 35% of Camden is Black, 35% of Camden is making less than \$35,000 ([Attached a link to MNCompass](#) which reports the demographic breakdown for the Camden Neighborhood based on previous Census Data).

Markella also went through the second phase of the development which will include a community hub, more housing, light industry and commercial space. Markella explained that the community hub is meant to be geared toward health and wellness. They want to create a space where community services are available, programming, etc. She went over the housing parcels, noting that there is still room to determine what those look like, with a mind toward a range of affordability options. She explained that there would be a parking structure, and that the light industry would include things like indoor food growing, rooftop agriculture, etc.

Markella also went over a few aspects of the transportation plan for this area; which will eventually include a new parkway, continuous sidewalks and trail connection parallel to Dowling Avenue from Lyndale to the new parkway at UHT. They are seeking support from MNDOT for a bike/ped bridge but even without a bridge there will be enhanced connections. The parkway will not likely connect all the way until after phase I. Everything was designed to accommodate traffic, the presence of utilities, and minimize the impact on the parkland. Future phases will have parkway connections up and down the river.

Markella outlined the major benefits the CPC sees in this plan including: creation of a public park and connection improvements, revenue generation through Ground Leases and ticket sales, opportunities for community businesses, creation of affordable mixed income housing, and jobs creation.

Markella went through the next steps for the draft plan, explaining that the comment period ends on January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021 and that the plan will hopefully be in front of the City Council in February 2021, with the vision to begin implementation in December 2022 with Phase I infrastructure and park construction (dependent on funding and other variables). Phase 2 construction is envisioned to being in 2025, with additional feedback beforehand on elements that still need more detail.

### Question and Answer Period

During this time, John Slack (Perkins & Will) read through the questions received in the chat box. *Staff Note: the chat box was incredibly active during this meeting; chat feedback is placed with the appropriate topic/conversation wherever possible.*

- (CAC Member *in chat*) If you don't know how much they plan to make each year at the venue, how can you determine how much of a benefit to the community is a \$3 ticket fee?
- (CPC) Do not have an exact answer
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Can we ask for a MINIMUM of the ticket sales? (Ex. \$3 per ticket or \$1M annually, whichever is greater)
- (CPC) Will take that into consideration, will bring it up at the next meeting.
- (CAC Member) Who's deciding the ticket price? Dayna Frank? [*Staff Note: Dayna Frank is the owner and CEO at First Avenue & 7<sup>th</sup> St. Entry*] Or are the City of Minneapolis and Dayna agreeing on a price?
- (CPC) Not sure how that amount came to be.
- (CAC Member) Push as a community member that the community gets to decide what the ticket price is, because at the end of the day that is determining the value of the space/people the price and revenue are affecting.
- (CPC) Encouraged folks to submit this feedback through the online survey that is open for the public comment period.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Dayna is not going to average the ticket sales per venue because the costs are all different based on size, age, debt, service, etc. The \$3 fee is based on what people will pay, not community need!
  
- (CAC Members *in chat*) A couple of questions about public transit plans for the area
- (CPC) Not a transportation expert. Explained that yes there are plans to connect public transit to this space; focus of the City is on public transit, bikes and walking. Want to create a space where there's room for all of that to flow seamlessly. Encouraged folks to tune into the City led meetings so that they can provide the technical feedback she doesn't have the expertise of.
  
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Expressed that the CPC and the community has a right to know the expected financial projections for the music venue considering the \$12.5 Million dollars in public funds going into the project. What percentage of the total profits is the \$750k to \$1M that's being offered to the community?

- (CPC) Cannot answer that question, Dayna could provide a more technical answer, this is a question to bring to the CPC/City led meetings as a whole.
  - (Public in chat) How long does the 300 livable wage jobs last? What's a livable wage?
  - (CPC) Assume that those jobs will last the life of the project as a whole, don't have a list of what these jobs will be.
  - (Public) Thinking about how a livable wage will be determined, wonder how many people will be successful. What is considered a livable wage and for how long? Is there such a thing?
  - (CPC) Think that the idea of "livable wage" will continue to fluctuate over the lifetime of the project, so didn't want to write an exact number, did want to use specific language to say livable wage, which in her opinion is AT LEAST minimum wage.
- 
- (CAC Member *in chat*) If the community benefits never show up (ex. jobs, housing, revenue from ticket sales), who can the community hold accountable? Is it whoever holds the Community Benefits Agreement (CBA)? Asked for clarification about McKinley Community holding the Community Benefits Agreement.
  - (CPC) Explained that McKinley Community Neighborhood Org (McKinley Community) is not for sure going to hold the agreement, they have offered to hold it until there is another community entity in place, since they are already an established organization in the neighborhood. McKinley Community is prepared to hold developers accountable and expect the community to hold the developers accountable as well. She doesn't envision that McKinley Community will hold the CBA long term unless the community expresses that's what they want. McKinley Community isn't taking this lightly, they're working to make sure there is capacity and legal help present to hold the developers accountable.
  - (CAC Member) Asked for clarification about the RFP process.
  - (CPC) Explained that it will take time for a selection committee to be formed following the CPC, and then additional time to select a community entity. There needs to be an entity in place to hold the agreement before it passes on to another organization, otherwise there will be no accountability for months.
  - (CPC) Additional accountability built in—the venue itself will have joint ownership, which is designed to ensure that the benefits are coming back into the community. In the interim, until there is an entity chosen by a selection committee through an RFP process, McKinley is stepping in to make sure there is accountability from the get-go.
- 
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Have been following both groups (CPC and CAC), concerned about creating the park because of the fact that there is no public transit plan yet. So, whom would actually be making a decision about transportation since it isn't in the works yet?
  - (CPC) Would be a question for the City, don't have an answer.
  - (Public) Could turn the railroad into some sort of public transit route. Railroad is on stolen land, used by major polluters (ex. Northern Metals). Think that land should at least be cleaned up.
  - (CPC) Will take note of that, agree that's something that needs to be addressed. Reiterated the importance of the public comment period. Explained that she would bring the questions/feedback back to the CPC, but that she doesn't represent the City, Developers, or

transit groups and doesn't have the technical information people are asking about. Explained that this development won't solve all problems, but that it's a start. Explained that Northsiders haven't benefitted from previous developments so now they want to make sure there is a vested interest in this project so that it's beneficial for all.

- (Public *in chat*) Great points about the railroad!
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Agreed. GAF, Northern Metals, and Continental Cement need to be moved off the river!
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Yes, they all need to go, agreed.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) There needs to be an Environmental Impact Statement for GAF before any housing is done.
  
- (CAC Member *in chat*) is it not TRUE that public dollars are in effect going towards a bailout package for First Ave? Are they not on the verge of collapse? Aware that direct action initiatives have been set up to save the club?
- (CPC) Don't have an answer to that; recognize that there is contention about having a music venue here in the first place, not going to respond to question, can bring it to First Ave.
- (Public) This is not just a question for First Ave, it's a question for everyone backing this development.
- (CPC) No idea of the current financial situation of First Ave.
- (Public) Expressed that that's a problem.
- (CAC Chair) Had to interject to restore a point of order.
- (CPC) First Avenue's financial situation has not been the focus of discussion of the project. Discussion has been about the future facing, multi-year development and how to partner on this project.
- (CAC Members *in chat*) Some discussion of the fact that it's public knowledge that First Ave has been struggling financially (has been in the news, asking for federal bailout).
- (CAC Members *in chat*) Expressed that it was a problem that the CAC felt like it knew more about First Ave's financial situation than the presenters. Said it was because this CAC has been questioning everything.
- (Public *in chat*) Like Dayna but struggling with how the land continues to be developed.
- (*in chat*) Agreement between other CAC Members and members of the public.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Need to remember that this is a small city and many folks have multi-level information sources.
- (*in chat*) Agreement.
  
- (CAC Member *in chat*) CAC members should attend the CPC meetings. There was one 2 day ago and most of these questions were answered and images showing how everything would be done and transportation was discussed too. It was a well-produced presentation.

## Public Comment Period

- (Public) Have worked with MPRB on Community Engagement work for this project, have also worked as a designer on the preliminary designs for the amphitheater. Explained that the design

process for the amphitheater was halted when COVID hit, still haven't heard any updates. Have seen the Save our Stages legislation; First Ave is asking for government bailout (in addition to many other businesses right now), haven't seen an operating revenue for performances since March. Expressed that this parcel is being developed because right now it's operating at a loss. Explained that United Properties/First Ave were the only group to put together a proposal, so the City was not able to choose between multiple options. Think one plan is problematic, would have liked to see more diversity.

- (Public) How will noise and congestion from the music venue affect residents and park users? When will the size of the venue be discussed? 10,000 attendees seem excessive.
- (CPC) Environmental studies still need to be done, including looking at noise/sound pollution. Encourage folks to put they want to see a different size of venue, into the public comment. Don't know when the design of the venue is going to be discussed.
- (CAC Members *in chat*) Expressed disbelief that the studies hadn't been done yet. States that the Coordinated Development Plan shouldn't be passed until the environmental studies have been completed.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Expressed belief that nobody cares about the shoreline overlay
- (CAC Member *in chat*) The Environmental Review/AUAR will be completed after and once the City's Coordinated Plan is approved. Wish the City Committee would take the shoreline overlay and Critical Area seriously.

Markella had to leave at this point, and no longer was responding to questions, but she left her contact information in the chat so that folks could get ahold of her.

- (Public) What will the total mix of affordable, mixed income and market rate housing be? Will this project follow the DNR height rules? Would hope so, much of this area is in the Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area (MRCCA)
- (CAC Member *in chat*) The draft coordinated plan states that they will be seeking exceptions from DNR riverfront height rules.
- (CAC Member) Asked for clarification about the agenda and public comment period, seemed like Project Staff were trying to end the public comment period after Markella left, wanted to make sure the public comment period wasn't contingent on her being there.
- (CAC Chair) Clarified yes, the public comment period will continue without Markella.
- (CAC Member) Want to make sure that all questions people are getting an answer, how will that happen?
- (Project Staff) Will make sure that all the questions will get passed onto the City.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Expressed concern about questions getting lost.
- (Public) Expressed that it feels like history is repeating itself where the process isn't beneficial for the community it's supposed to serve. Feels like this moment isn't being used to do anything more than business as usual. This is the last portion of undeveloped riverfront in the city, should advocate for more from goals. Processes feel out of order, nothing has been done to help repair

the land and water before developing it, already packaging and selling the land, doesn't feel like folks are learning from history.

*Staff Note: This public comment lead to a robust discussion in the chat box happening in tandem to the discussion of draft recommendations. That conversation is documented below.*

- (Public *in chat*) The history of real estate development in BIPOC communities is the government asking BIPOC communities to trust them. History has shown that they never deliver and here we are again being asked to trust the powers that be that they are going to deliver these benefits. Right now, the representatives representing the project cannot even tell us if the entities involved are financially viable enough to provide the benefits.
- (CAC Members *in chat*) Agreement, well stated.
- (Public *in chat*) No-one is talking about the value of the 12.5 million in bonding that is going to support the venue. If First Avenue had to go out and borrow it or get it from investors the total amount of the loan or investment would be a range 20-40million. This is how wealth gets built for the white community as they "help" our community
- (Public *in chat*) If 1st Ave does get public funding what are they required to provide the community?
- (Public *in chat*) Legally speaking? I appreciate the insight provided above.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Wait, First Ave doesn't have to match the \$12.5 million they got from the state?
- (Public *in chat*) I'm not sure if they have to match or not. I'm asking if they do get public funding, what are they required to provide in return.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Gotcha. it's referred to minimum improvements required.
- (Public *in chat*) And the Venue I remember reading that they would only activate the venue for 50-60 days a year leaving the rest of the space open for community use for 300 or so days a year. So, they could share bathroom facilities, concession stands etc. But that was in Schematic Design.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) 50-60 days a year immediately adjacent to the public park .... further recall that it has been noted the five acres will not - as say Bayfront in Duluth be open the other 300 days... the venue may be opened for public events, but not in use it is a 5 acre impediment to people coming and going
- (Project Consultant *in chat*) My understanding is that they DO have to match the \$12.5 grant
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Thanks! That was my understanding. However, I haven't seen it written down how that process would move forward.
- (Public *in chat*) What are they (1st Ave) require to provide for 12.5 million in public funds then.
- (Project Consultant *in chat*) I assume it is in the development agreement with the City
- (Public *in chat*) That is my understanding also that they have to match it. Regarding what they are required to do for the community. The bonding bill does not specify that.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) can we see development terms agreement sheets for this project?
- (Project Consultant *in chat*) Assume those would be part of public records.
- (CAC Members *in chat*) Expressed frustration with advisory committees and process.

## CAC Discussion on recommendations on development interaction with park

At this point, both Project Staff and Project Consultants were taking notes directly in the recommendation document, more general feedback and expansive conversation is captured here.

The CAC Chair started the discussion, explaining to everyone that these recommendations have come from notes compiled from previous discussions. These recommendations will be presented to the City at the end of January. The point of tonight's conversation is to read over the recommendations, discuss them, talk about additions, and come up with solid recommendations they can agree on.

(CAC Member) Asked a question about why the chat function was disabled for this portion of the conversation, need additional avenues for public to comment, CAC can't always participate in verbal conversation. Without the chat the meeting is narrative.

- (CAC Member) Agreed. Need chat to record thoughts.
- (Project Staff) Reminded folks that there are notes being taken, and there will be meeting minutes that record what happened at the meeting. Expressed that it is difficult to keep folks focused on one conversation often with the chat enabled. Can keep the chat function on if the CAC agrees it's more efficient.
- (CAC Chair) Keep the chat on, document everything that can be documented.
  
- (CAC Member) Feels disappointed, sees that the recommendation to return land to Indigenous Peoples and Tribes wasn't included. Have heard from many folks how important it is to have some of the land, important to start that explicitly through this project.
- (CAC Member) During the time Dakota people have spoken at meetings, feel like have not heard that they explicitly want land back. More open to discussion, multiple ways that "land back" can look in terms of giving space and honoring history and culture.
- (CAC Member) Disagreed. Think she has heard several people say explicitly to give the land back.
- (Project Staff) Interjected to restore a point of order. That is not included on this list of recommendations because it is more park specific (intended for recommendation to the MPRB). This list is what the CAC as a group wants to bring to the City to engage in a bigger policy discussion about the developments. Would save that recommendation for the park discussion and utilize this time tonight to get recommendations to the City.
- (CAC Member) Thanked Kate for the explanation, didn't realize the differences between the what is being sent to the City and what's being recommended to the MPRB.
- (Project Staff) It's a fine line, the recommendations are definitely interconnected. Tonight's conversation is surrounding how the development and park land are interfacing. The 7 recommendations being reviewed tonight are related to the City and development and concerns about the development impact (things the MPRB can affect minimally).
- (CAC Member) So essentially removing it from this piece so that it can be talked more about as a CAC when giving recommendations to the MPRB about what to do with the parkland.
- (Project Staff) Correct.

- (CAC Member) Expressed that he's not sure that the CAC can come up with a list of recommendations that they all agree on, believe that there might have to be multiple recommendations from different schools of thought present on the CAC. Should send at least two different perspective recommendations to the City.
- (Project Staff) There are mechanisms to do something like that, if there is a vote Project Staff can provide that breakdown to show where there is still differing thought. Want to communicate messages and intent as clearly as possible, want to avoid oversimplifying these recommendations.
- (CAC Chair) Would like to spend the rest of the evening looking through the recommendations and adjusting language/wording to make them stronger, make sure they accurately capture everyone's opinions. Reminded folks the recommendations are based on previous conversations they've had.
- (CAC Member) Said that they are having a hard time following the discussion because they are unable to have the recommendations pulled up in front of them.
- (CAC Chair) Read the first recommendation aloud and agreed to slowly read the rest of the recommendations.
- (CAC Member) Concerned about people in the venue taking up public space that is being created "for the north side". Question if Northsiders will be able to utilize the venue and parkland, or if it will be other people coming in from all around the city to use the venue.
- (Project Staff) That was what they were trying to capture through the questions included in this recommendation. Trying to show all the ways the park will be impacted by the development—trying to get the point across (who will live and work in this area, use the venue, operate business, etc.) What are the key questions that need to be addressed to make this feel like a Northside Park? Highly dependent on the ones listed, starting with those.
- (CAC Member) The root concern of these questions is that public dollars will be utilized to fund private enjoyment. CAC should figure out ways to STATE that, explicitly state concerns with development impacting park/park being made private for developments.
- (CAC Member) Asked for clarification, talking about concerns about gentrification of this space?
- (CAC Member) Know that parks, bike lanes, and other green infrastructure lead to gentrification through increase in property values, which can lead to the displacement of the current and longstanding community. Want to get to the root of the questions included, and state that gentrification and displacement is the concern. Say explicitly the community doesn't want the development if it will lead to gentrification and displacement.
- (CAC Member) Think that the questions address this concern.
- (Public *in chat*) Don't think the City/CPC an answer the question. Think the CAC might want to ask for what they want to see, rather than ask questions.
- (CAC Member) Propose that there is an additional question added: "Will public dollars be used for public benefit as opposed to benefiting an all but private development?"
- (CAC Member) Agree with the addition, think it's a good critical question. Don't want to spend the entire meeting wordsmithing but, First Ave is stating they are working at public benefit. Perhaps instead of asking critical questions can take their wording and define it with the CAC's intent, so that public benefit is clarified and there's less room for interpretation.

- (CAC Member) Feels like this is a small version of “the yard” downtown, the couple of blocks that the Vikings Stadium has restricted public use of. [Staff Note: it was clarified in chat that he was called about the space that is now called “The Commons”, it will be referred to as such from here on out]. Feels like this will be a 5-acre private site with a park as a front yard. Park is going to be impacted every time the venue is used. Impact compounded even more by how skinny the strip of land is. Could add the question: “is special use going to overwhelm the park?” Don’t know how to avoid this if development is adjacent to parkland.
- (CAC Member) Think instead of asking questions, should ask for what the CAC wants. Unrealistic to call such a narrow site a park if there is going to be private use going on at the same time. Need to say that it will act more like a lawn with the development adjacent.
- (CAC Member) The CAC disapproves of/rejects the private use of public land, don’t know how this gets ASKED through questions, maybe more of a statement saying the CAC rejects that, that would be the use.
- (CAC Member) Like the statement over asking questions, have concerns about how does (or doesn’t) answer the questions.
- (CAC Member) include the fact that there will be private use when people have events in parks, there is no way the venue runs adjacent to the park without burdening it.
- (CAC Member) Recommendation three (3) addresses a lot of the impacts (pedestrian use/congestion, etc.) We can make recommendation one (1) a statement instead of a series of questions. First concern is about gentrification, have to craft a statement that addresses this, how should it be worded?
- (CAC Member) Made a motion that the entire recommendation document is read through so that everyone knows the entirety of what’s included, then the CAC can go back with suggestions and additions. Also, support the idea of statements rather than questions.

Robin (CAC Chair) read through the entirety of the document, which can be found [here](#). After reading through the recommendations, the CAC resumed their discussion about what revisions to make to what they just heard.

- (CAC Member) The CAC needs to be clear that it’s adamant of not signing on to the misuse of public funds, can weave that in throughout, addressing where that needs to be worked on/addressed. For example, thinking about parking, want to make sure that all parking is public regardless of what events are happening at the Venue. Don’t want parking to get taken up by housing development. Would like to say somehow that public parking is reserved for the public not to be used by housing, or even the amphitheater.
- (CAC Member) Housing should be responsible for their own parking. Dedicate all parking to PARK USE.
- (CAC Member) Second and agreed.
- (Project Staff) Expressed that from her understanding, it’s fairly difficult to control parking, either there is paid parking or there isn’t. If the presence of the development means there needs to be paid parking does that affect use of the park? Something to keep in mind.

- (CAC Member) Paid parking will affect use, the focus isn't on paid parking, just don't want parking for park to be back up space for development around it. Development needs to create appropriate parking space for itself.
  - (Public *in chat*) It seems that a suggestion would be to have event parking at other northside parks with buses taking attendees to the event. Don't want to have North Commons, Farview, Folwell, etc burdened by event users, because our neighborhoods need to use their parks.
  - (Public *in chat*) If parking at the park was limited (e.g. 2 hours) that might help.
  - (Public *in chat*) There should be a transit hub at this site because there will not be enough space for anyone to park. And also, First Ave was going to bus people in from a major garage downtown and not take up parking on site, Dayna was aware the site didn't provide enough space for parking from the start.
  - (CAC Members *in chat*) Agreed with needing a transit hub. Appreciated these ideas.
  - (Public *in chat*) Question about where the information about First Ave was coming from, hadn't heard the bus/parking suggestions, agree with idea of transit hub or bussing people in from a different location.
  - (Public *in chat*) Have worked on the design, but expressed the project hit a hard stop when COVID hit.
- 
- (CAC Member) Question about if the park has an operating hours schedule
  - (Project Staff) Beholden to other park system rules, but technically open 24 hours a day to go THROUGH the park.
- 
- (CAC Member) In the rest of the park system, cannot park in parking bays/lots for 24 hours. Can only park during specific times, cannot park overnight. Should have the same restrictions at Upper Harbor Terminal.
  - (Project Staff) That is pretty typical. With park discussion can talk more about how parking should function, can work on those mechanisms.
  - (CAC Member) Around the park system there are some 2-hour parking limits, could that be implemented at UHT? People can buy annual permits, so they pay parking cost upfront instead of fees. Throwing all these options out.
  - (CAC Member) Trust that Project Staff will be able to implement what works, tying it back to the guiding principles that are being reviewed right now. Have done enough on parking function, move on to other elements?
  - (CAC Member) Thinking about how to implement paid parking for low income folks. Could there be sliding scale options or discounts for parking permits potentially?
- 
- (CAC Member) Responding to recommendation 3h: Think there needs to be additional contrast put in. Show what the land could be used for given the space available, and how the land could be affected by the venue. Still so many unknowns, don't know where the money will go or what will happen. Still think it's bizarre the music venue is the City's top bonding requirement. Should say this is what the park could look like, this is what the venue will impact.

- (CAC Member) Heard the public comment earlier about the height of development. Does the CAC feel like it should recommend that the City follow the shoreline overlay? Ask the City to adhere to the set standards/requirements for height as they relate to the shoreline overlay plan?
  - (CAC Member) This is the Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area (MRCCA). There are height limits that extend deeper into the site, more implications than the shoreline. Agree that how the buildings interact with the riverfront is important.
  - (Project Staff) This is covered in the ordinance. Can tie this into the park too; when thinking about habitat and restoration of ecological corridors in conjunction with improvements to address hazards (ex. improving lighting and sightlines) these can be in conflict. Can note that.
  - (Public *in chat*) Believe they vote on the ordinance [to add MRCCA guidelines to Minneapolis ordinance] on Friday (Dec. 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020).
  - (CAC Member *in chat*) Suggest that building heights conform to Shoreland Overlay and Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area ordinance requirements, including building heights.
  - (CAC Member *in chat*) That's correct, the City Council is voting to adopt its MRCCA ordinance this Friday (Dec. 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020)
  - (Public *in chat*) Yes, but the City Council also seem to be VERY open to approving exceptions to the MRCCA requirements.
  - (Public *in chat*) What is the building height limits for Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area ordinance requirements?
  - (CAC Member *in chat*) Building height limits at this site will be 35 in the Shoreland Overlay (closest to the river) and 65 feet in the MRCCA overlay (which covers most of the rest of the site). To get higher heights should require a pretty strict list of requirements to meet and a public hearing
- 
- (CAC Member) Question about what number recommendation height requirements relates to?
  - (CAC Member) Don't know exactly where the recommendation should live. Trust staff to place it where appropriate given all the feedback being collected. Perhaps under recommendation two (2).
- 
- (CAC Member) Asked for clarification about recommendation 3 as a whole. Does the statement mean that the CAC is open to the venue not being there, or that the CAC is open to the venue being a different size?
  - (CAC Member) Think this might be a can of worms. Have heard people say that the venue doesn't belong in this location at all. Could we make the statement stronger? Say to explore alternative options? If there is consensus to say something stronger/more definitive should say that. Could say that the CAC recommends that a 7-10k capacity private venue isn't appropriate at UHT.
  - (CAC Member) Not sure if that's a statement that IS agreed upon as a CAC.
  - (CAC Member) Certainly a private venue of this size ADJACENT to the park doesn't work.
  - (CAC Member) Asked if there was any CAC Members that were pro-music venue that wanted to advocate for the development? Also agree and recognize that not all the CAC members are in agreement that the venue (even at the proposed size) is inappropriate.

- (CAC Member) Can strengthen the negative impacts of the amphitheater in these recommendations. Do overall feel like there is general consensus against the venue as a CAC.
- (CAC Member) Support that.
- (CAC Member) Perhaps the statement could be something that shows engineering a solution to the impact of the venue on parkland is impossible. Without trying to determine other CAC members opinions, can all agree that the CAC doesn't want the venue to negatively impact the park, thereby one must solve the impossible problem. Doesn't force the CAC down the road of saying there shouldn't be ANY venue, just saying no to the use of the park as part of the venue.
- (Public *in chat*) I'm 50/50 on the music venue. I think it could be done well but I do understand the concern.
- (Public *in chat*) There is a strong support on the Northside for a music performance venue, but not necessarily like the First Ave plan. Something like Millennium Park in Chicago amphitheater, which allow it to be used as park space when no performance.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Agree and I would note Bayfront an open public use area -- that seats - on the ground 5000+
- (Public *in chat*) Millennium Park is not in a neighborhood or close to neighborhoods.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Not sure what the point is trying to made about Millennium Park not being in a neighborhood?
- (Public *in chat*) This proposed music venue will be next to housing and very close to residential neighborhoods (that already have high levels of noise due to traffic and industry) - noise studies need to be completed before the venue is approved.
- (Public *in chat*) To get money from the state bonding bill as City did they would have had to say it was for a regional park?
- (Public *in chat*) This park is part of a Regional Park: The Above the Falls Regional Park.
  
- (CAC Member) Feel pushed into another corner with regard to the environmental impact and lack of ecological studies. Concerned about the park being healthy for people to recreate in. Thinking about accessibility to healthy spaces, and environmental impact. Related to the misuse of public dollars. Need a strong recommendation that says the CAC stands against these things.
- (CAC Member) Not just a misuse of public funds, a misuse of park property (i.e. without owning the land, a private entity can impact the land to the extent that it impacts the value of the land and the usability of a public facility). Feels like a freebie for developers.
- (CAC Member) If in agreement, can say that in the interest of avoiding another situation like with "The Commons", the CAC has these positions.
- (CAC Member) Have to state that in both the interest of avoiding what happened at "The Commons", as well as avoiding harm to the Northside. Don't want that to be misinterpreted as solely the legal structures that lead to what happened with "The Commons", also want it to be about impact. Can raise the point that similar things have happened elsewhere that haven't provided benefit to community and there is the opportunity to learn from those mistakes.
- (CAC Member) Feel apprehensive to trust this process/development since the City has never set a precedent to trust it. Could impart of Dayna that First Ave doesn't need to take on the City's legacy.

- (CAC Member) An environmental impact statement needs to be completed. Suggest that the CAC asks for an Environmental Impact Statement.
- (CAC Member) Second that.
- (CAC Member) Asked for clarification, talking about the AUAR that still needs to be done?
- (CAC Member) No, talking about an extensive environmental impact statement that is done at the state level.
- (CAC Member) Specific to the music venue, or the development in total?
- (CAC Member) Thinking about air quality, soil quality. Could look at the environmental justice mapping tool from EPA, there's data about lead in soils and the health impacts in those areas. Want to be specific about monitoring air and soil quality.
- (CAC Members *in chat*) Talking about lead presence, air quality, carcinogens present needing to be measured.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) The environmental impact statements have got to be completed BEFORE the Coordinated Plan is voted on! It's not okay to put community members lives on the line when no one knows what pollutants are there.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) GFI gives off a horrible odor and we know about the pollution from the recycling plant Northern Metal. That needs to be addressed.
- (CAC Member) Question about the statement "misuse of government funds", what does that statement intend to say? Is there something more specific that could be suggested? Doesn't really specify what the concern is directly, worried it could get lost.
- (CAC Member) Could say something along the lines of avoiding another situation similar to U.S Bank Stadium, where millions of dollars in public funds were used for a private venture. Concerned about the MPRB (public dollars) augmenting a private development by giving the developers a private front lawn. Concerned that this front yard for a luxury development is being sold to community as an opportunity for BIPOC children to access a polluted riverfront. IN essence, feel like the CAC is being cajoled into creating a private lawn cut off from the city (specifically the Northside the CAC is being told this is for). Want to make sure there is strong language to prevent the City from using public dollars to boost private development.
- (CAC Members *in chat*) Agreement. Like the language around using public park funding to "augment" a private development.
- (CAC Chair) Checked in with everyone to see how they would like to proceed forward. Longer meeting to get through the recommendations or come back to it at another meeting?
- (CAC Member) Move that the CAC stops their work for the evening; let staff make the edits based on Meeting #14 feedback, represent the document to the CAC, then come back from another meeting to finalize the document before the end of the public comment period.
- *The motion was seconded and approved.*
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Joined the meeting late. Reading the document, agree with the development related recommendations in the original document. Appreciate the discussion. Agree that staff should clarify the recommendations and help the CAC continue to move forward.
- (CAC Member *in chat*) Asked if the next meeting could be kept shorter, feels like most of the work related to the developments has been done.

There were a few final comments from CAC Members, thanking one another for a productive conversation and Kate went over next steps:

- Project staff will write up questions from the meeting and either respond, or pass to City team to respond as appropriate.
- Project staff will continue revisions of recommendations and send prior to the upcoming meeting. Asked for initial comments from individual members and CAC can finalize in the next meeting.
- Next meeting to follow a similar format and be a continuation of this Dec 17 meeting.
- Staff will post meeting notes etc.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm.