

# Northern Green Zone Task Force

Meeting Notes

February 13, 2019

5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

Farview Park Recreation Center, 621 N 29th Ave, Minneapolis

*Meeting facilitated by James Trice and Sam Grant (Public Policy Project), and Kelly Muellman (City of Minneapolis).*

## Attendees

**Task Force Members:** Linnae Nelson-Seys, Lars Morris, Roxanne O'Brien, Michael Chaney, Catherine Fleming, Vanessa Willis, Jim Voll, Markeeta Keyes, and Anita Urvina Davis

**Facilitators/Staff:** James Trice, Sam Grant, Kelly Muellman, and Kennedy Kruchoski

**Guests:** Alexis Pennie, Council Member Jeremiah Ellison, Michelle Shaw, Hassan Bouchareb, Nick Theisen, G.L. Yantos, and Mira Klein

## Agenda

- 5:00-5:30 Arrive, settle in, get food
- 5:30-5:45 Introductions & Review Group Norms
- 5:45-6:00 Updates
- *NMAC Lead and Asthma decree dollars decision*
  - *Upper Harbor Terminal*
- 6:00-7:00 Draft Criteria for Development in the Green Zones
1. *Negative List: What isn't working?*
  2. *Positive List: Flip each "what isn't working" to its opposite*
  3. *Compare Positive list with 12 Green Zone goals – what's missing?*
  4. *Approve as set of development criteria in the Northern Green Zone*
- 7:00-7:20 Activity: "How the City Works" scenario game
- 7:20-7:30 Wrap-Up/Adjourn
- *Evaluation: How is the Task Force going so far?*
  - *What issues do we need to discuss as a group?*

## Introductions

Facilitators James Trice and Sam Grant called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. After members and guests introduced themselves, facilitators walked through the previously established group norms.

## Updates

Before updates were provided, Kelly Muellman was asked to clarify the goals of the Northern Green Zone Task Force. According to the Northern Green Zone Task Force enabling resolution:

*"The Task Force will develop an action-oriented Work Plan specific to the Northside Green Zone, which includes the neighborhoods of Hawthorne, McKinley, and Near North, and portions of Bottineau, Sheridan and Marshall Terrace closest to the Mississippi River. The Work Plan shall identify actions that*

*promote health and economic well-being using environmentally-beneficial strategies. The Task Force will meet approximately monthly to develop, implement and evaluate the Northside Green Zone Work Plan. Task Force members will be responsible for attending meetings, reviewing materials between meetings, and making a recommendation to City Council no later than Quarter 3, 2019.”*

An activity facilitated during the January 9, 2019 meeting was intended to identify the topic areas that Task Force members are most interested in working on. Working groups will potentially be created around those top priorities to determine specific projects, programs, or policy changes. This action-oriented group is intended to operationalize the goals and values of the Green Zones.

### **Northern Metals Advisory Committee Update**

James Trice provided an update about the Northern Metals Advisory Committee (NMAC) meeting. The NMAC recommended a plan and adopted principals regarding how the mitigation money from Northern Metals will be spent. NMAC recommended that:

- 50% in providing services and 50% in participation incentives and benefits to families
- 1/3 for lead poisoning and 2/3 for asthma since less resources are currently available for asthma.
- no consent decree funding will be used to pay for city staff time.
- Actions
  - Asthma outreach/education - \$92,000
    - Service delivery \$32,000, participation incentives \$60,000
  - Asthma mitigation - \$308,400
    - Service delivery \$121,320, asthma trigger mitigation products \$187,080
  - Lead poisoning prevention education - \$75,000
    - Service delivery \$60,000, participation incentives \$15,000
  - Blood lead testing - \$124,600
    - Service delivery \$84,000, participation incentives \$40,600
  - Total settlement funds - \$600,000
  - Health Department in-kind - \$184,200
    - Ongoing asthma and lead efforts and evaluation of use of the settlement funding

Northern Metals is moving its shredder to Becker, MN. Northern Metals will continue to lease the land and collect recyclable materials at the Minneapolis site.

### **Upper Harbor Terminal Update**

Catherine Fleming and Michael Chaney provided an update about the Upper Harbor Terminal concept plan. Currently the Eco-Harbor Co-Creation team, a coalition of community residents and organizations, is organizing against the current concept plan for the Upper Harbor Terminal due to the privatization of public land, the lack of community involvement in the decision-making process, the lack of an environmental impact assessment, and the fact that it does not follow the guiding principles of the Minneapolis Green Zones or Promise Zones. The Co-creation team is asking City Council for a Co-

Creation process, where local residents are heavily involved in the decision-making process so that the plan ends up benefitting the surrounding community instead of outside interests. As of right now, most of the nearby residents seem to not have been engaged, or haven't heard of the Upper Harbor Terminal.

Michelle Shaw noted that the Minneapolis Community Environmental Advisory Commission has written a letter to City Council opposing the current concept plan. Other groups, including the National Parks Service and the Sierra Club have also come out in opposition of the plan.

Council Member Jeremiah Ellison (Ward 5) gave a brief description of the amendments that he will be proposing to the Upper Harbor Terminal concept plan. One of these amendments will be to remove the hotel from the hospitality goal within the concept plan, allowing the community to dictate what the hospitality aspect of the plan will look like.

James recommended that individuals read the current proposed concept plan and come to a personal position on the topic, so that the group can discuss its position at the next meeting and make recommendations accordingly.

### **Draft Criteria for Development in the Green Zones**

City staff and leadership are currently unsure how to apply the Green Zone priorities to development in the Green Zone. The Task Force has been asked to identify what it means for development to align with the Green Zone goals, by coming up with a list of criteria that can be referenced when developments are being considered within the Northern Green Zone. This is an opportunity to decide how to hold the City accountable for when these criteria are not met, and to provide specific requirements that prevent individual interpretation of the Green Zone priorities. These criteria would be most effective if it were eventually adopted by City Council as an ordinance or policy.

Kelly asked attendees to consider what isn't working and then use that list to identify what requirements should be included in the list of criteria. Task Force members brainstormed the following list of what they consider to be negative or not working in the current development process.

- RFP process: Not broad enough, there is usually only one applicant, and priority seems to be repeatedly given to the same organizations.
- Developers lead all projects.
- Community engagement isn't working. The process seems out of order, and happens too late to make any difference. No real effort or resources are delegated to community engagement. Once input is received, there are no actions taken. The community doesn't hold any real power, and any attempt at engagement is just for show. Community requests/input/vision is binding.
- Environmental or Social/Economic or Transportation impact studies aren't done until a concept plan has been passed, which is too late in the process.
- Brownfields mitigation only happens after projects have been identified and approved.
- There is a lack of City Council transparency. Council members only deal with issues in their own wards: some members aren't speaking up about things that are happening in Council Member

Cunningham's ward, since it's his territory. There seems to be a system of hedging bets rather than fighting for what is right and beneficial to Minneapolis residents.

- City funded research is considered the only "valid" research that can be referenced, and seems to be missing data. There isn't transparency about what is being collected.
- Developers lack transparency. Feasibility studies aren't required from large developers. Expertise in the topic areas covered by a concept plan don't seem to be required either. These large developers are not held to the same standards as someone who is pursuing a smaller scale business endeavor.
- The City's 5-year plan (CIP – Capital Improvement Projects) and budget limit what changes can be made once approved. Large developers already have the upper hand and seem to influence the plan. There is very little community engagement in this process: if it happens, it is after the fact.
- Seems that the City is dismantling the groups that have the opportunity to provide feedback: neighborhood organizations, etc.
- There is missing expertise from City Staff.
- City staff has picked up the UHT and run with it. There is lack of communication within the City, and a lack of accountability in this process. Overly protective unions.
- Residents of North Minneapolis have been isolated from the river through development decisions, and have experienced the most negative environmental health impacts due to industrialization.
- There has been a lack of analysis of gentrification impacts of development.
- Benefits of developments don't go to nearby residents.
- Everything comes down to incentives. The only way that changes is if this is called out. All benefits and incentives right now go to developers.
- Public land has been going to existing relationships, rich communities, etc.
- No alignment with the Climate Action Plan goals.

Once the list of what isn't working in the process was identified, the group discussed how these negative items can be converted to positive items that can be translated into criteria for development in the Green Zone. The list of those items is as follows:

- Comprehensive request for proposals, with no geographic limit. Many RFPs are only released to a local newspaper. Multiple proposals should be required. The community should be involved in creating the RFPs. Questions in the RFP should also address how the proposed project meets outcomes. Applicants should be required to specify how their project vision aligns with the Green Zone and community's vision and goals, and how it carries ecological value. The community should participate in the evaluation of proposals, and it should be an ongoing process.
- Land should be leased to developers as opposed to sold.
- Developers should be required to bring forward a cooperative and collective ownership model or succession plan, showing how the project will transfer ownership to the community. The City

needs to be intentional in letting the community know when developers apply for public funds such as TIF and others.

- Ongoing community engagement and community-led decision making.
  - Adequately resource community engagement.
  - Address concerns of impacted community, and let these lead to real solutions.
  - Power-sharing. Cooperative ownership/partners in design.
- Community development plan (not developers)
  - Community-driven/authored RFPs.
  - Ongoing engagement with community.
- Require an explanation of how community input impacts and is built into plans and output.
- Environmental impact and other studies:
  - Environmental and other (social and equity, economic/wealth building, transportation, gentrification, etc.) impact studies will be required before a plan is voted on.
  - Should be required of developers to come with an impact assessment for their plans as they propose them.
  - Developers are responsible for these studies, and they can't be waived by City Council.
- Find resources to clean land regardless of whether there is a project or development planned.
- Hold public hearing on concept plans.
- Value federal, community, state, and international research throughout the decision-making process.
- Community gets first right-of-refusal of sale.
- The term "Community" referenced throughout this list will be defined at a later date.
- Eco district protocol.
- Historically we can look to the NRP process: taking ideas from neighborhood residents.
- Do community engagement before, during and after any RFPs go out. Any development must be reviewed and approved by the Green Zone task force, especially if the project is receiving City dollars.
- "Community led and community fed"
- Challenge the leaders and developers to say what they believe aligns with the Green Zone goals. Create list of questions for City Council and staff: what is their vision? How does that vision align with and meet the Green Zone goals?
- Community benefits agreements that result in legal ramifications or consequences need to be enforced. Language to hold developers and the City accountable.
- Leasing, not selling land to developers.

In the interest of time, City staff will use this list to create the list of criteria and present it as a draft to City Council, with the understanding that it will be voted on by the Task Force at its next meeting. This draft will be sent out to Task Force members before being presented to City Council.

## **Announcements**

- Sunday, February 17<sup>th</sup> 2-4 p.m. at Plymouth Christian Youth Center (PCYC), the Eco-Harbor Co-Creation team is hosting an Upper Harbor Terminal Co-Creation 101 Informational Event. Learn more at [ecoharbor.org](http://ecoharbor.org)
- The Economic Development and Regulatory Services Committee of the City Council will be voting on the Upper Harbor Terminal concept plan at their meeting on Tuesday, February 19<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 p.m. The Eco-Harbor Co-Creation team is hosting a rally prior to the meeting to protest the concept plan at 12:30 p.m., outside Minneapolis City Hall room 317.
- Please read the Upper Harbor Terminal concept plan before the next meeting.
- **Next meeting: Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at Bottineau Recreation Center, 2000 Second St. NE, Minneapolis**

## **Adjourn**

James Trice adjourned the meeting at 7:29 p.m.