

Upper Harbor Terminal Collaborative Planning Committee Minutes

Regular Meeting
December 2, 2020 - 5:00 pm
Online Meeting

Members Present: 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), Vanessa Willis (Chair), Gayle Smaller, and Princess Titus

Staff : Hilary Holmes

Call To Order

1. Roll Call.

Quorum Present

Committee moved for Zulu-Gillespie and Schroeder to co-chair the meeting in the absence of Co-chair Smith and Co-chair Willis.

English moved. Newman second.

Motion passed 9 yay - 1 nay (Pennie) - 0 abstain

2. Adoption of the agenda.

Action Taken: Adopted.

Lemon moved. Newman second.

Motion passes 10 yay- 0 nay – 0 abstain

3. Acceptance of minutes

[Nov 18, 2020 Upper Harbor Terminal Collaborative Planning Committee](#)

Action Taken: Accepted

Motion passed. 8 yay – 0 nay – 2 abstain

Unfinished Business

4. Continued Discussion on Phase 2 Housing Strategy, Community Entity Process and Community Benefits

[11-18-20 UHT CPC Updated Recommendation Points](#)

[11-14-20 UHT CPC Proposed Community Benefits in Future UHT Agreements](#)

[11-14-20 UHT CPC DRAFT City-Developer Community Benefits-CPAC](#)

[11-14-20 UHT CPC DRAFT City-Developer Community Benefits-Housing Parcels](#)

[11-14-20 UHT CPC DRAFT City-Developer Community Benefits-Jobs Parcels](#)

Action Taken: Continued to meeting of Dec 9, 2020

Brandon Champeau, United Properties, presented some of the changes from the October 28th Draft Coordinated Plan including specific reference to the overall timeline noting the planned buildout for the first phase and the anticipated timing for the second phase, which could change depending on market conditions. Mr. Champeau responded to Committee question on if there are red flags about this plan, by stating that no real red flags but a lot of these projects are going to need a lot of partners and creating momentum.

Mr. Champeau responded to a Committee question regarding the business park Mr. Champeau said that Parcel 5 would be in Phase 1 following the completion of the City infrastructure, and that he anticipates having designs next year to begin marketing to potential tenants. Parcel 4 as shown as food production is shown with extra time to find a tenant, with a projected start in Q3 of 2024, but the development team is hoping they can speed that up.

On the Environmental Review section (page 71 of 12-2-20 Draft Coordinated Plan) Mr. Champeau responded to a question on when studies for noise and pollution would be completed, by stating that the noise study is underway right now. There was a preliminary study completed in 2018, and there will be public process for this

Committee question if the Committee can get environmental studies. Erik Hansen, City of Minneapolis, noted that all of the environmental reports and studies for the site are on the Upper Harbor project website under the Resources tab and that includes initial noise studies as well.

Hilary Holmes, City of Minneapolis, noted that Hilary Dvorak, City of Minneapolis CPED, previously updated the Committee on the environmental review process (the Alternative Urban Areawide Review "AUAR") and will come back to the Committee or another online conversation to discuss the future AUAR process and the planned engagement for that. Ms. Holmes also noted that there will be an AUAR page added to the project website.

Committee comment that the Above the Falls committee also wants information about how the traffic impacts of the venue at Washington Avenue and doesn't think all of these issues were addressed as part of the Coordinated Plan. JoAnna Hicks, Element/City of Minneapolis project management consultant) noted that the Public Works team is working through designs now on 33rd Ave N and the new parkway, and will be rolling that out through their public process in 2021, with a planned Council approval of the concept plans of the infrastructure in late summer following the approval of the AUAR.

Committee comment to have some faith in the City and their plan to address traffic as part of the study.

Committee comment wanted to note that the historic reviews (Page 72 of 12-2-20 UHT CPC Draft Coordinated Plan) should reflect that in order to accomplish the goals the Committee

wants to accomplish, that there needs to be a reflection that the historic context was disinvestment and redlining. Committee comment that this was reflected on page 8 (of 12-2-20 UHT CPC Draft Coordinated Plan) Historical and Social Context.

Ms. Hicks noted that many of the existing structures will be on park board land.

Regarding the Community Entity Selection process (Pages 73-77 of 12-2-20 UHT CPC Draft Coordinated Plan) Mr. Champeau noted that he has received some ideas on the RFQ document and will start working on the document in January, with the goal of having the RFQ ready to go public after the Coordinated Plan process.

Ms. Hicks walked through the proposed selection process and noted a timeline will be added to the Updated Draft Plan for this.

Committee comment to make sure the selection process is more inclusive. Mr. Champeau responded and referred to Page 74 regarding the proposed selection and also responded in the affirmative to a question on the proposed task force to work on economic inclusion after the UHT CPC sunsets (and noted page 87 of the Draft Plan)

Committee question about more detail on the profitability/sources of revenue for the venue, in order to understand how the ticket fees relate to the overall profitability. Dayna Frank, First Avenue, noted that the \$3.00 was the maximum and that she could share an anonymous profit & loss statement for a similar venue – those are available but due to competition in the industry so those are anonymous. Ms. Frank noted that there are four general buckets for revenue: promotions (used to be 50/50 between promoter and band, and now it is 90/10 band/promoter and the promoter takes most of the risk), the second is the food and beverage, which is generally the source of profit now and which we have offered to the northside, then there are the ticket fees, and then merchandise/ancillary fees. Committee comment that don't need to see the proprietary information, that that explanation/breakdown was helpful.

Committee comment that there might be opportunities for local businesses or community entity to shuttle customers to and from the site and venue.

Discussion regarding the Mapping Community Benefits document and Committee comment that this should be in the Coordinated Plan.

Committee comment/question that negotiating a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) is complicated and need to make sure that it is being negotiated by individuals who have expertise (like the economic inclusion task force). Mr. Champeau responded that he is not expecting that the neighborhood organization would be negotiating this agreement, but that the recommendation is that United Properties negotiate a PLA and that would be included in the CBA as a way to stress its importance – as a way to achieve the BIPOC participation goals. Mr. Champeau noted that he is hoping to set a new standard with the PLA.

Committee comment that what we do not control is the constitutional membership of the McKinley neighborhood and we want to make sure that we have representation.

Committee comment to note that the City of Minneapolis partner with the City Assessor, Hennepin County and the State to create tax limitations for all of North Minneapolis similar to Proposition 13 in California and to stand behind the words of development without displacement. This still does not feel specific to the plan on UHT.

Regarding housing strategy Committee comment on Page 81 – under 1A and 7A please clarify that these are not solidified yet in the first sentence, and what affordability levels are for the remaining 1B and 6A. Mr. Champeau responded that the goal is mixed income townhomes, and they can explore limited equity opportunities and some with unrestricted. Note that should be clarified on the chart on page 82.

Committee comment on the townhomes, that the Committee had early discussions about affordable home ownership and had some mixed feelings about commercial land trusts and Urban Homeworks. Committee member noted they have asked for information for how many households of color those organizations have worked with, but the preliminary information is that they had sold more than 50% of homes to white homeowners. Committee question if there are other ways to look at affordable homeownership without those two options. Ms. Holmes mentioned that the City is looking at a new perpetual affordability option.

Next Steps:

Committee comment that there are many parts of this plan that need to be finalized.

Committee question on how to address the following points after we go to the community for comment:

- a. Equity Matrix (how will we achieve these goals?) In looking at the summary of the community benefits agreements. How does language in the documents get to “achievement”? Ms. Holmes noted that the community benefits coming out of the matrix is tied to the strategies on 12-2-20 Draft Plan pages 22-33.
- b. Park and public space: Style guides for buildings as well. Proximity to corner, human scale design on the park, and aesthetics of how the buildings are designed. Ms. Holmes noted that each building will go through a separate design review process including the Planning Commission process.

Committee comment that before the Draft Plan goes out to the community, to make sure to explain all of the acronyms in the Plan – maybe through a glossary.

Committee question on remaining Committee meetings. Ms. Holmes noted that there are no meeting dates scheduled for December and January other than the Committee meeting on January 27th to receive the public comments and Final Draft Plan. Ms. Holmes also noted that the Committee could decide to meet during the public comment period as a check in.

Motion to propose to add a meeting on 12/9 to finalize the unfinished business.

Committee comment to address potential additional meeting dates.

Zulu-Gillespie moved. Newman second.

Motion passed 7 yay – 0 nay – 2 abstain

Committee comment to make sure that any meeting on ADOS preference is addressed. Mr. Hansen noted he has an update. Committee comment that we keep adding Indigenous people in the mix; they didn't ask us to do that and it feels presumptuous of us to do that and they have no interest in being part of the language. Committee member would like to understand how that is reflected in the definition of community. Committee comment responded that due to the site's proximity to Spirit island and the historical settlement, it is important that we reflect that importance of the indigenous culture.

New Business

5. 12-2-20 Updated Draft Coordinated Plan

[12-2-20 UHT CPC Updated Draft Coordinated Plan](#)

Action Taken: Continued to meeting of Dec 9, 2020

Reports

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

Action Taken: No action taken

a. Disparity study: City is asking UROC to brainstorm around how to frame a disparity study that would allow the City to be more innovative with respect to targeting the benefits of this project for ADOS residents.

b. The meeting with City Attorneys and the Public Policy Project is planned for next week and then will discuss a time for the City attorney to come meet with this Committee.

c. Mr. Hansen noted he has a meeting scheduled with a professor at the University of Minnesota to scope out a study that would look at impacts of this project would create impacts on North Minneapolis and will be able to report more next week.

d. Follow up on the request to understand all of the development that is all along the river; Mr. Hansen has all of the land use applications across all of the years, and some are major developments and is looking at how to synthesize all of that information.

7. Draft Coordinated Plan Outreach & Engagement Update (Hilary Holmes, Rattana Sengsoulichanh, City of Minneapolis)

[12-2-2020 UHT CPC Update on Draft Coord. Plan Outreach & Engagement.pdf](#)

[UHT Coordinated Plan Engagement Plan 10.21.20.pdf](#)

Action Taken: No action taken

Committee question on what methods were decided to reach to the community for public comment and if there are some things that Committee members can share on social media platforms on engagement. Ms. Holmes gave an overview of the community engagement timeline and highlighted the means for outreach

- Project website is being updated to have a coordinated plan page.
- 2 min video about project and plan
- Project flyer about the plan
- Direct postcard mailing by neighborhoods (North Mpls and select NE neighborhoods)
- Targeted online ads
- Gov delivery emails
- Print ads
- Online ads through social media
- Media presser and press release

Adjournment 7:58pm

Notice:

To join the meeting as a member of the public: Call in Number +1 612-276-6670 Conference ID: 285 177 029#

This meeting may involve the remote participation by members, either by telephone or other electronic means, due to the local public health emergency (novel coronavirus pandemic), pursuant to the provisions of MN Statutes Section 13D.021

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: Dec 9, 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.