I. Call to Order

Board Chair Nick Cichowicz called the board meeting to order at 5:48 p.m.

II. Consideration of the Agenda

McNeill moved and Jones seconded a motion to approve the February 16, 2016 board meeting agenda. Cichowicz called for discussion. The motion passed.

III. Introductions

Other Board Members in attendance were:

- Dan Collison
- Kevin Frazell
- Laurie Jones
- Pamela McCrea
- Matt McNeill, Treasurer
- Carletta Sweet, Secretary
- Joseph Tamburino, Vice Chair

Staff members Joan Bennett and Christie Rock-Hantge were also present.

Guests in attendance included:

- Tom Bartz, Carlyle Condominiums
- Marc Berg, Friends of the Downtown Minneapolis Bike Center
- John Croman, KARE 11
- Kate Grutzmacher, FS Residential
- Denise Holt, Park Avenue Lofts
- Tom Jollie, PadillaCRT
- Cynthia Kria, Humboldt Lofts
- Randy Manthey, Carlyle Condominiums
- David McMillen, Emanuel Housing
- Tom Novak, American Trio Lofts
- Andy Sagvold, Council on Crime and Justice
- Amy Sweasy, Metropolitan Lofts
- Doug Verdier, RiverWest Condominiums
- Nick Wallace, Emanuel Housing
- Dale White, RiverWest Condominiums
- Conrad Zbikowski, The Towers Condominiums
IV. Public Comment

Cichowicz opened up the meeting for public comment. Nick Wallace, a case manager from Emanuel Housing (http://www.cermahrhoades.com/emanuel.html) located at 818 South 3rd Street, shared how tailgating has affected their tenants and staff. Completed in 2013, EH is a 101-unit sober, supportive, permanent, singles housing program that experienced a full season of tailgating on all four sides of the building the last year the Metrodome was opened. As a consequence, on game day they had to double the number of onsite staff to deal with issues related to intoxicated tailgaters trying to gain access to the building, public urination and litter. Wallace indicated that they would be amenable to having the lot across the street from EH be designated as a family-friendly, i.e., alcohol free, lot. It would be the only family friendly lot in Downtown East. The only other family friendly lots are in Elliot Park.

V. Consideration of the Consent Agenda

McCrea moved and Jones seconded a motion to approve the Consent Agenda that included the board meeting minutes from January 19, 2016; the Finance Coordinator’s staff report for January 2016 (Invoice 013); and the Outreach and Engagement Coordinator’s staff report for January 2016 (Invoice 013). Cichowicz called for discussion. The motion passed.

VI. Financial Report

Rock-Hantge reported there was nothing unusual regarding the January financials. She prepared them using a draft / unapproved budget based on 2015 actuals since the FY2016 Budget has not been reviewed by the board. She did, however, share it with both Cichowicz and McNeill. In addition, Rock-Hantge posted a simple income and expense report to the Board Members Only page on the Web site. The NRP fund balance remains the same as January.

McCrea reminded the Board she has yet to see all the project contracts entered into last year and whether the contractors are fulfilling the terms of their contract. Rock-Hantge agreed to prepare the appropriate documentation.

Sweet moved and Frazell seconded a motion to receive and file the financial report. Cichowicz called for discussion. The motion passed.

VII. Community Development Presentations

A. Friends of the Downtown Minneapolis Bicycle Center. Marc Berg, founder of the FDMBC, thanked the Board for inviting him and encouraged it to join him in championing the idea of establishing one or several downtown bicycle centers to meeting the civic goal of increasing bicycle transportation.

Using a slide presentation he gave a couple weeks ago at the 2016 Winter Cycling Congress (http://wintercyclingcongress2016.org/speakers/) as well as to other groups, Berg noted that in Minneapolis we take pride in being a bike-friendly city and, understandably, good things go along with that, i.e., a healthier population, a cleaner environment, more economically vibrant, and a place where people want to live. Discussions have been held regarding what’s going to happen in Minneapolis overall and downtown in particular because there’s going to be an increase in the residential population as well as in jobs. As such, there are several reasons why FDMBC want to encourage more people to bike rather
than drive single occupant vehicles. Mass transit and car pooling are good, but another way to come into downtown for jobs and other reasons is by bike. However, biking to work can be challenging, e.g., what to do about the need to change attire for work; where to store your bike so it doesn’t get vandalized or stolen; what if there’s a repair issue. Moreover, most work places do not offer locker rooms or shower facilities for people to change from workout attire to business clothes.

Berg noted that he began thinking about these challenges a few years ago and pondered having a facility in the core of downtown that offers biking commuters everything they need to comfortably transition from a biking commuter to a working pedestrian in downtown. In his research, he discovered:

- City of Minneapolis has a recognized policy goal of being a bike-friendly city, a national leader in bike infrastructure and programming, and to increase mode share from 3-4% to 15% by 2020 (http://www.minneapolismn.gov/bicycles/WCMS1P-135610).

- Attitudes towards bicycling study by Jennifer Dill and Nathan McNeil of Portland State University (http://web.pdx.edu/~jdill/Types_of_Cyclists_PSUWorkingPaper.pdf). Displaying pie charts, 1/3 of the population would never bicycle for transportation, i.e., “No Way No How” types; those who are currently bicycling fall into approximately 8% of the two pie slices are the “Enthused and Confident” or “Strong and Fearless” type; and nearly 2/3 are “Interested but Concerned” type.

According to a study by the Mid-Atlantic Universities Transportation Center (http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/47000/47100/47120/VT-2009-05.pdf), “Trip-end facilities at work are significant determinants of cycling to work. Compared to individuals without any bicycle facilities at work, commuters with cyclist showers, clothes lockers, and bike parking at work are associated with a 4.860 greater likelihood to commute by bike.”

- Bike centers exist in other cities across the country, including Chicago, St. Louis, Seattle, Santa Monica, and Long Beach (http://bikeandpark.com/bike-centers).

- There are similar, smaller facilities in Minneapolis at the University of Minnesota, Target Commons, and the Midtown Greenway. Berg then showed a video of the first major end-of-trip facility for cyclists and pedestrians at the King George Bus Station in Brisbane, Australia (http://www.cycle2city.com.au/).

The proposed location for the DMBC is Renaissance Square at 5th Street and Nicollet Mall. The outreach and engagement efforts the group has undertaken include starting a Facebook group, and posting on Hoodstarter (https://www.hoodstarter.com/ideas/252).

Next steps include convincing the City to follow through with conducting a formal feasibility study, site analysis, services to be offered, what the owner/operator business model should be, and how to pay for it. Berg’s analysis of other bike centers throughout North America concluded that none are completely self supporting and most obtained some sort of operating subsidy, e.g., Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) grants from the federal government.

The City passed a resolution on October 23, 2013 to establish a bike center in downtown Minneapolis by 2016. Berg also noted that Hennepin County set a goal in its 2040 Plan to
work with partners to establish a bike center.

Berg concluded by clarifying he is asking the DMNA Board to support (1) the Bicycle Advisory Committee’s resolution calling upon the City of Minneapolis to fund a feasibility study; and (2) Hennepin County 2040 Bicycle Transportation Plan’s strategy 2.4.d to work with partners in establishing a downtown Minneapolis bike center. He will draft the language and forward to Bennett for consideration at the March 21st, Board meeting.

To become engaged in the Friends of the Downtown Minneapolis Bicycle Center, join the Facebook group at https://www.facebook.com/groups/470827752995023/, and to view Mark Berg’s 02-16-16 presentation.

VIII. Third Ward Update

Council Member Frey reported on the following items:

- The City Council recently approved the sale of 800 Washington Avenue to Mortenson, as well as the redevelopment contract. Mortenson will construct a mixed-use project that includes a hotel, restaurant, and space for the American Academy of Neurology.
- Fundraising for Downtown East Commons is coming along. An operations and maintenance plan is being work on. The annual operations and maintenance budget is estimated to be $11.6 million.
- The Nicollet Mall reconstruction project is progressing. Plans for installing concrete pavers have been eliminated due to cost. The contractor will use designed and textured poured concrete instead. The poured concrete will still allow for storm water to penetrate as oppose to run-off.

Frey then responded to questions from the audience. Randy Manthey advised him the Land Use Committee has a strong interest in extending the skyway system into the Mill District. At this point, there are restrictions to doing so, because the Mill District is part of the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. The committee is planning to meet with city planner Beth Elliot to discuss options.

Frey thanked the Livability Committee and the Minnesota Vikings for working out the details on the Tailgating Agreement. He recognized that there are challenges with the new stadium being located in a new residential area.

Conrad Zbikowski inquired as to whether the City is planning to include any new crime and safety initiatives and/or expand the Safe Zone during the reconstruction of Hennepin Avenue. Frey stated that the City is working to gain access to private security camera footage to complement the existing surveillance camera system.

IX. Community Development Presentations continued

B. Council on Crime & Justice. Andy Sagvold, who has been Council for Crime and Justice’s president for 8 months (http://www.crimeandjustice.org/), advised this is his third time working with the CCJ over the past 13 years and he will briefly discuss victimization issues in Downtown East and Downtown West.

CCJ is a private, non-profit agency that has been a leader in the field of criminal and social
justice and the only organization in Minnesota that purposefully advocates for both victims of crime as well as individuals who have been accused of crime. Since 1957, the CCJ has been working to promote a safe and thriving community by addressing both victimization and individuals returning to the community following incarceration.

Regarding victimization, the CCJ has been focused on research, demonstration direct service programs, and advocacy.

An example of a research project is they have started one that will be looking at the Metro Transit Police Department and racial disparities in fare collection and enforcement. Generally, when they conduct research projects looking at racial disparities in the system, the key is to come up with recommendations on how those disparities can be addressed and policies that will make it possible.

An example of advocacy is a couple of legislative sessions ago they were able to work with other organizations on the initiative Ban the Box where the question of whether you’ve been arrested or convicted of a crime has been legally removed from every job application in Minnesota (http://mn.gov/mdhr/employers/banbox_faq_privemp.html).

The direct service programs are focused on providing parenting education in the prison for fathers who will be returning to the communities and addressing victimization issues with crisis intervention, advocacy and financial support.

Sagvold provided some statistical data about criminal activity in Downtown East and West between 2005 to 2010 and 2010 to 2015. Crime peaked in 2010, but has been decreasing due in part to the work of the Minneapolis DID, the Minneapolis Police Department’s CCP/Safe program and the SafeZone. He indicated that identify theft is the fastest growing type of crime.

Thereafter, the Board inquired as to how he envisioned the DMNA working with the CCJ. He suggested the DMNA spread the word and possibly provide funding to expand programming. Jones suggested that Sagvold work with the Livability Committee on outreach and engagement strategies and that he might be a good presenter for the annual meeting. Sagvold indicated that he attended the 2015 annual meeting and had a resource table at the event.

X. Downtown East Branding Update

Dan Collison introduced Tom Jollie from PadillaCRT who gave an update on the East Downtown Council’s Branding Initiative. Jollie began by providing an overview of the outreach and engagement process that culminated in a vision statement, brand purpose and three brand pillars. He explained the brand framework and the overall purpose of the branding initiative, which is to develop a name that properly identifies and positions the area in a desirable way; is true to the brand platform; compliments other potential community elements (the park); has community support; and is somewhat intuitive. Phase III objectives include providing a plan for usage and implementation. Jollie went on to review the current roster of possible names for the East Downtown Business District which included the following:

- Downtown East
- East Downtown
Collison and Jollie concluded the presentation by responding to questions from the Board and audience. Tamburino inquired as to why the Mill District was not an option. Collison explained that the East Downtown Council is trying to recognize the characteristics of both neighborhoods it represents, which include Elliot Park and Downtown East (of which the Mill District is a subset). Amy Sweasy asked about who will make the final decision. Collison stated that he hopes that the name naturally rises to the top as a result of an extensive outreach and engagement process, and that the East Downtown Council Board would rubber stamp it. Conrad Zbikowski asked whether the name of the Downtown East Commons would stay the same, or change to the new district name. Collison stated that the park name will most likely stay as is. A few people from the audience offered their preferences and suggested a handful of additional names. Collison stated that he would send out an email to poll the Board members on their top three names.

View the East Downtown Naming Concepts Presentation 02-16-16

XI. Livability Committee Report

Tamburino provide an update on the draft Tailgating Agreement with the Minnesota Vikings. Displaying a map he showed the current tailgating zone based on the 1980 agreement and the proposed tailgating zone as of February 15, 2016, which includes the American Red Cross lot north of Washington Avenue and new lots in Elliot Park (several of which are family friendly or no alcohol). Residents in the Mill District would prefer to keep the zone south of Washington Avenue.
Tamburino also reviewed details of the old tailgating agreement, which allowed tailgating for 6 hours before a game and 3 hours after. Discussion has been held about reducing the hours to 5 and 2 and noted the proposed new agreement would allow alcohol in all of the Downtown East lots. He stressed the need to build a good relationship with the Vikings and City officials and then entertained questions and comments from the Board and audience.

Discussion ensued about how lot owners will deal with trash and public urination. Tamburino said the policy will remain the same as in the 1980 agreement. The City will need to hold the lot owners accountable for violations. McNeill advocated for allowing tailgating on the American Red Cross and MS Society’s lots as tailgating provides a source of revenue for nonprofits.

Sweet moved and McNeill seconded a motion to approve the draft Tailgating Agreement with the Minnesota Vikings with the updated tailgating boundaries as proposed by the Minnesota Vikings incorporating the American Red Cross parking lot. The Board also agreed to tailgating 6 hours before and 3 hours after games with no alcohol restrictions placed on any of the lots within the Downtown East tailgating boundaries. Cichowicz called for discussion. The motion passed.

Thereafter, Livability Committee Chair Amy Sweasy thanked the Board for arriving at a decision on the Tailgating Agreement and then gave a report on other LC items: (1) there will be a presentation regarding the police substation given to the entire Board at the March 21, meeting; (2) at the March LC meeting, there will be a discussion regarding the extension of the DID into Downtown East, as well as the City’s possible repeal of the ordinance that prohibits three or more people from congregating on streets or sidewalks. The ordinance dates back to 1960, and the wording may not hold up to legal scrutiny.

Lastly, Sweasy announced that she is resigning from being the Livability Committee as she was recently appointed to the City’s Planning Commission and both groups meet on the same day.

XII. DMNA Funding Process & Priorities Work Group Update

McNeill advised that as part of the strategic planning process, two work groups were formed: one to work on governance, and one to work on financial resources. Being new to the Board, addressing his role as treasurer and fulfilling his fiduciary responsibilities, he selected himself to work on the latter.

Then he noted there has been a fair amount of mishegoss and misunderstanding about the financial allocations that took place in 2015. There’s been lots of chatter and it’s unhealthy for our organization. The goal is to present a transparent and objective framework for how funds, i.e., taxpayer resources, are allocated and how we hold the organizations they are allocated to accountable and responsible, and how we choose whether to fund those organizations a second time. What he and Jones are proposing is a starting point and is based upon what remaining NRP funds are available.

They believe that in 2016 priority should be given to providing funds to new organizations; organizations that have not received monies from the DMNA in the recent past. Moreover, Jones stated that any organization that received over $2,000 in the past 2 years should not be eligible to receive funds in 2016 and stressed the need for organizations to bring matching funds to the table.
McNeill suggested the Board use an objective 1-page score card to evaluate how sustainable and replicable the program is; the overall impact on the neighborhoods; the number of people that will be touched (250 at a minimum); engagement with other downtown stakeholders; and whether the DMNA will be recognized. Jones stated that the next steps should be to have Bennett start working on a process for identifying and reaching out to potential new partners. They concluded their update by responding to questions and feedback from the Board.

McCrea and Tamburino applauded the work group’s efforts thus far. They agreed with the approach that organizations seeking NRP funds must have matching funds. Jones also stated that requests for funds should come through the Board, as opposed to the Livability Committee. McNeill stated that there should be a focused effort to bring proposals from organizations in the Downtown West neighborhood, since the majority of last year’s funds went to programs or organizations in Downtown East.

XIII. Land Use Committee Report

LUC Chair Randy Manthey reported on the following projects:

A. Legacy Condominiums by Shamrock Development. This residential project is located on the edge of Downtown East at the corner of 13th Avenue South and South 2nd Street west of I-35W. The site is currently occupied by the now empty Cenveo building and a 148-stall surface parking lot and contains approximately 186,121 square feet or 4.273 acres. Shamrock Development recently presented its concept plan to the City’s Committee of the Whole; it received positive feedback and will likely move forward after some building massing fine-tuning and refined landscaping plan is developed.

The 374-unit condominiums will be divided between two connecting towers; one 12-sory and one 14-story with walk-up units facing 13th Avenue South; the COW recommended raising the height of one of the towers. The developer is not proposing to include any commercial use in the project. Floor plans have not been finalized, but they will range in size from approximately 950 to 3,900 square feet. The exterior of the project is proposed to be stone, glass, metal panel, phenolic (wood grain) panel and fiber cement composite panels and will complement both the Bridgewater and Stonebridge projects. The proposed project includes a playground, pet exercise area, pool and spa, bike racks, a community room, game room, green roof, lawn bowling and an exercise room. The proposed project includes three levels of underground parking with a total of 697 parking stalls (8 guest stalls, 14 handicap stalls and 675 residential stalls), which exceeds what is currently allowed. The developer will seek a variance to increase the allowable parking space.

The developer’s next steps include refinement of the site plan and demolition of the existing buildings and come back to the LUC meeting for recommendation of letter of support to the Board. The intent is to start construction this spring.

Manthey then responded to questions. Several Board members expressed concern about truck loading and unloading at the main entrance porte-cochère on South 2nd Street, and the failure of the design to activate the street, and the need to have a design charrette.

Manthey advised the developer did not speak to the pricing structure of the units; it’s early in the process but it would be similar to his other projects downtown. McNeill expressed disappointment over the fact that this developer’s price points for 1-bedrooms are typically in
the high $300,000s and we need to be conscious of that fact because affordable home ownership as an option downtown for 20 something’s is not being provided. There’s a lot of data that supports the fact that affordable home ownership is an important conversation to support stronger students and stronger schools.

No action was required by the Board.

B. **Protected Bike Lane on 11th Avenue South.** In 2016, Minneapolis Public Works is planning to install a protected bike lane on 11th Avenue South between South 6th Street and West River Parkway. This is a high-demand corridor for bicycling carrying 1,160 bicyclists per day linking the Hiawatha LRT Trail to Downtown East and the Mississippi River. The City’s Bicycle Master Plan has also identified this segment to include a protected bikeway.

The City’s goal is to create a more comfortable corridor or physical barrier that separates bikes from motor vehicle traffic; a separated facility can attract a wider demographic of riders and the City sees protected bikeways as an important tool to increase bicycling in Minneapolis.

Public Works plans to narrow the existing travel lanes, as well as eliminate parking from the west side of the street. Since street parking in the area is at a huge premium, the LUC recommended that the City preserve parking on both sides of the street north of Washington Avenue due to the high demand for street parking in the Mill District. The project is in its early process; the DMNA was its first stop and the City will be meeting with other businesses and community groups and will return to the Board later in the community engagement process.

The board took no action on this item. For more information on this project, please visit [http://minneapolismn.gov/bicycles/projects/WCMSP-171549](http://minneapolismn.gov/bicycles/projects/WCMSP-171549).

C. **Washington Avenue Bike Lane Improvements.** This is a classic case of government agencies not working together; Hennepin County has rights over some of the streets, the State has rights over some of the streets, and the City has rights over some of the streets. Washington Avenue is a Hennepin County Road and it has a redesign project from Hennepin Avenue to South 5th Avenue with protected bike lanes ([http://www.hennepin.us/residents/transportation/washington-ave-mpls](http://www.hennepin.us/residents/transportation/washington-ave-mpls)); however, there are no plans at this time for protected bike lanes between 5th Avenue South east and I-35W. The Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition has asked the DMNA for support in determining why the HC is not implementing protected bike lanes on Washington Avenue east of 5th Avenue South to I-35W. The LUC agreed to send a letter supporting the concept but would like to have more information.

Jones moved and Frazell seconded a motion to approve the draft letter of support. The motion passed.

D. **Hennepin Avenue Reconstruction.** This is another project early in its 5-year planning process slated for 2020 to reconstruct Hennepin Avenue between Washington Avenue North and North 12th Street from building face to building face; it will be a huge disruption. The goal is to go out into the community to receive feedback. Manthey encouraged board members to attend an informational meeting tomorrow at the Central Public Library on Wednesday, February 17th at 4 p.m. The City will hold a follow-up meeting in April. For more information, visit [http://www.minneapolismn.gov/cip/future/WCMSP-172270](http://www.minneapolismn.gov/cip/future/WCMSP-172270).
E. **205 Park Avenue Survey Results.** The Survey Monkey results are in and Bennett is working with a couple committee members on a draft summary. Great information was received and it is a tool that can be used in the future and another way to reach into the community. There were 303 responses and the results will soon be shared.

F. **Dog Relief in Downtown East Commons.** Manthey reminded the Board it had approved a letter to the City regarding this matter. Bennett has received a response that they now have identified a location for that on the property.

G. **Skyways in Mill District.** Manthey advised they have a meeting with Beth Elliott and Jacob Frey to begin discussions, moving from reactive to proactive.

XIV. **Downtown Partnerships Update**


XV. **Adjournment**

*Being no further business, Sweet moved and Jones seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. Cichowicz called for discussion. The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.*

Signed this _______ day of ________________________, 2016.

_______________________________  ______________________________
Chair                                    Secretary