



# Task 2 Final Report

## The Riverfront Revitalization Organization Study

July 2006

### **Bacon & Associates**

2912 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South \* Minneapolis, MN 55406  
Phone: 612.724.8459 \* Fax: 612.729.4326

# Riverfront Revitalization Study: Task 2 Report

## Background

With the help of a grant from the McKnight Foundation, the City of Minneapolis hired Bacon & Associates to help the city examine how it can enhance its organizational capacity so riverfront revitalization efforts can be completed more effectively. This report briefly summarizes the second stage of this study, Task 2.

The original purpose of Task 2 was to assess the City of Minneapolis' civic and political readiness for exploring possible organizational models that would strengthen organizational capacity and support riverfront revitalization efforts. However, some key issues raised in Task 1—the lack of a clear leader or champion among elected officials; the perception of no shared vision for the riverfront; and an uncertainty about whether riverfront revitalization was even a high priority—caused key players to take a different trajectory. They decided first to determine if, and where, the primary governmental jurisdictions could improve coordination, and, second, to discover whether riverfront was a high priority for these stakeholders, and third, to determine their readiness for possible organizational change.

The revised objectives of Task 2 thus became to:

- Assess the level of commitment to riverfront revitalization efforts among the primary governmental jurisdictions;
- Determine the willingness of each entity to cooperate on such efforts; and
- See whether there is an appetite among these groups and elected officials for changes in organizational structure in order better support riverfront revitalization.

## Approach

Working in collaboration with leaders of the Minneapolis' Community Planning and Economic Development Department and the Core Group<sup>1</sup>, Carolyn Bacon and Cathy Tilsen of Bacon & Associates designed a series of action-oriented meetings. These included a half-day summit that focused on identifying near-term priorities for the riverfront and opportunities for improved coordination across jurisdictional lines. These meetings also reviewed the business, strategic planning, and budget processes used by each relevant entity. By developing a shared high-level understanding of how and when each entity does its long range, annual, and budget planning, they would thus be able to better coordinate their efforts around shared interests.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Core Group is a small group of representatives primarily from the Riverfront Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The Core Group consists of: Ann Calvert, Carrie Flack, Pam Miner and Barbara Sporlein, Community Planning and Economic Development, City of Minneapolis; Jon Oyanagi, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board; Andrew Gillett, Hennepin County; John Crippen, St. Anthony Falls Heritage Board/Mills City Museum; David Kelliher, Minnesota Historical Society; and Chuck Sullivan and Matt Massman, Above the Falls Citizen Advisory Committee. Lois Eberhart of the Public Works Department and Daniel Kalmon of the Mississippi Watershed Management Organization joined the Core Group during Task 2.

## Action Steps and Results

The first meeting, held on April 3, 2006, involved CPED management. Its objective was to understand, clarify, and coordinate CPED's own priorities around riverfront projects

The next meeting, held a month later on May 3, involved senior management from CPED, Minneapolis Public Works Department, and the Park Board. These leaders met to examine and discuss methods and areas to improve coordination on riverfront revitalization efforts. This meeting resulted in general goodwill and an agreement to 1) look at the business and budgetary processes of the primary governmental jurisdictions, and 2) identify opportunities to improve coordination among these processes. This group also agreed to sponsor a multi-jurisdictional summit, in which key players would assess their broadly appetite for organizational change, and identify shared riverfront priorities.

The third meeting, held on May 18, involved finance, budget, and business planning managers from CPED, MPRB, Public Works, and MHS/SAFHBO. This meeting focused on the planning and budget processes for riverfront projects and activities, particularly capital improvement projects. The information from this meeting was gathered into two matrices; one that involves the planning cycles, the other captures capital improvement project planning (See Appendices A and B).

Task 2 culminated in a half-day summit, which was held on June 8. The objectives of the summit were: 1) to ascertain the key players' level of commitment to riverfront revitalization and organizational change, and 2) to identify actions that can strengthen cooperation across jurisdictions. Participants included Mayor Rybak, elected officials from the City Council, Minneapolis Park Board, Hennepin County, and the Minnesota state legislature; senior and mid-level managers and project managers from CPED, Public Works, Park Board, MHS/SAFHB, Hennepin County, and MWMO; and core group members. There were three concurrent discussion groups. Group 1 explored whether a shared vision for the future of the riverfront exists and if one does not, whether one should be created, and how to do that. Group 2 discussed possible near-term priorities for the riverfront, and Group 3 looked at improving coordination. Each group produced a list of recommended action steps. The third group endorsed an interim structure to improve riverfront coordination that includes a Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force and a Riverfront Senior Management Steering Task Force. For a full report on the summit and its outcomes, please see Appendix C.

Other materials that were developed during Task 2 to summarize the entities currently involved in riverfront revitalization, including existing and previous coordination entities, are included in Appendix D.

## Next Steps

Moving forward requires the establishment of a interim organization structure whose purpose is to provide input and: 1) guide the next phases of the Riverfront Organization Study, including appointment of a Blue Ribbon Task Force and the review of that Task Force's eventual recommendation; 2) identify and coordinate near-term project priorities; and 3) identify a *working* vision to guide revitalization during this interim period. This interim structure will consist of a Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force and Riverfront Senior Management Steering Task Force. They will be supported by both the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Core Group.

Elected boards are being asked to endorse the interim organization structure and appoint membership on the Policy Oversight Task Force.

In the meantime, work is currently underway to frame, charter, and launch the interim structure, the Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force, and the Riverfront Senior Management Steering Task Force. The Senior Management Task Force is scheduled to hold its first meeting in mid-August. Its initial tasks will include: 1) reaching agreement on near-term priorities that cross jurisdictional lines; 2) recommending these to the Policy Oversight group; and 3) preparing for the Blue Ribbon Task Force. The intent is to hold the first Task 3 workshop by late fall.

## APPENDIX A

### EXISTING RIVERFRONT CIPs

Draft 9/8/06

<u>Entity, source &amp; project</u>	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011 or beyond	<u>Total</u>
<b>CPED -- partial list</b>							
TI -- Mill District public imp.	\$400,000						\$400,000
Land -- Guthrie site env. rem.	\$75,000						\$75,000
Rev. -- Upper Harbor Term. redev.	\$30,000						\$30,000
Dev. Acct. -- SAFHB cont.	\$31,000	\$31,000	\$31,000	\$31,000			\$124,000
<b>Public Works</b>							
Net Debt - 18th Ave. NE bikeway	\$300,000			\$375,000	\$375,000		\$1,050,000
Other -- 18th Ave NE bikeway				\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000		\$3,500,000
Net Debt -- Midtown over River			\$50,000	\$200,000			\$250,000
Other -- Midtown over River				\$2,900,000			\$2,900,000
Net Debt - ATF Ph. I WRR trail					\$200,000		\$200,000
Net Debt - Lowry Bridge						\$300,000	\$300,000
Net Debt -- UHT redevelopment						\$200,000	\$200,000
<b>Park Board</b>							
Net Debt -							\$0
Miss. Lower Gorge Reg'l Park:							
Reg'l parks funding – bike trail			\$600,000		\$650,000		\$1,250,000
TEA-21 Match			\$1,000,000				\$1,000,000
Above the Falls Reg'l Park:							
Reg'l parks funding	\$641,000		\$1,000,000				\$1,641,000
MWMO Match	\$574,000						\$574,000
Reg'l parks - ATF Ph. I WRR trail			\$919,000				\$919,000
Central Riverfront Reg'l Park:							
Reg'l parks funding - BF Nelson			\$600,000				\$600,000
EPA & SAFHB Match - BF Nel.	\$270,000						\$270,000
Reg'l parks - Central Riv lighting					\$650,000		\$650,000
SAFHB contribution	\$31,000						\$31,000
Minnehaha Falls Reg'l Park:							
Reg'l parks funding			\$966,000				\$966,000
Also see MWMO section							

Note: Figure shown for 2007 and beyond are tentative and reflect requests/visions that may not yet be approved.

Entity, source & project	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011 or beyond	Total
<b>MWMO</b>							
Grain Belt shoreline	\$450,000						\$450,000
Mississippi River Gorge	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$500,000	\$60,000			\$1,160,000
North Mississippi Reg. Park		\$500,000	\$60,000	\$400,000			\$960,000
Upper River Master Plan	\$775,000		\$2,100,000	\$2,250,000	\$3,600,000	\$3,600,000	\$12,325,000
West River Parkway		\$400,000	\$400,000	\$350,000			\$1,150,000
Lowry Avenue	\$75,000						\$75,000
<b>Hennepin County</b>							
Source? - Reconst. Wash. Ave., Henn. to 5th					\$500,000	\$5,500,000	\$6,000,000
Source? - Reconst. Wash. Ave., Plymouth to 16th					\$230,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,530,000
Prov. -- Reconst. Marshall St., 1st Ave NE to Lowry							\$10,700,000
Prov. -- Fed. & State? Lowry Bridge funding requests							\$24,800,000
SAFHB contribution	\$31,000						
<b>MHS/SAFHB</b>							
SAFHB contribution	\$31,000						\$31,000

Note: Figure shown for 2007 and beyond are tentative and reflect requests/visions that may not yet be approved.

**APPENDIX B**  
**CIP and Planning Cycles of**  
**Public Works, CPED, MPRB, Hennepin County, and MHS/SAFHB**

Long range planning cycles	Five year planning cycles	Annual budget and priorities planning
<p><u>Public Works:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20-30 year or 30-40 year transportation (roads) planning cycles.</li> <li>• 10-year comprehensive transportation action plan; coordinates as needed with MNDOT and Hennepin County.</li> </ul> <p><u>MPRB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Driven by regional Master Plans, some 10 years, others 30-40 years out. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Central River projects were part of Master Plan.</li> <li>○ <i>Above the Falls Master Plan</i> is current driver, a plan for 40 years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>CPED</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carves out areas within city's long-term comprehensive plan in small area plans, 10 + years out.</li> <li>• Redevelopment plans also lay out longer-term visions, and TI plans outline long-term costs.</li> </ul> <p><u>Hennepin County</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seven plus years long-range transportation plans targeting specific corridors.</li> </ul> <p><u>MHS/SAFHB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MHS: develops a 5-10 year strategic plan.</li> <li>• SAFHB: initial 15-year interpretative plan; will be creating new 15-year plan.</li> </ul> <p><u>MWMO</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required by statute to update plan at least every 10 years; next cycle is in 2007.</li> <li>• Process generally takes 9-12 months</li> <li>• Board has 120 days to adopt new plan.</li> <li>• Existing plan contains 10-year vision for a CIP.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Public Works:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five-year planning process with yearly process to adjust and adapt for changes</li> <li>• Five-year vision with Council approving funding for one year.</li> <li>• Business planning informed by City's goals and objectives and citizens' concerns.</li> <li>• Uses guiding principles of safety, preservation, and expansion as framework for priorities within each business line's five-year plan.</li> </ul> <p><u>MPRB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six-year plans (three bienniums) for regional parks and watersheds, funded by regional park and LCMR funding.</li> <li>• Priorities within five-year plans influenced by specific funding sources and funding cycles.</li> </ul> <p><u>CPED</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive plan update every 5-10 years.</li> <li>• Every four years City Council sets goals and priorities; adjusts priorities and plans accordingly.</li> </ul> <p><u>Hennepin County</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5-year CIP-like planning process, primarily within Community Works on County facilities.</li> <li>• Priorities set within the process, based on recommendations from the Capital Budget Task Force (CBTA).</li> <li>• Commissioners have final say about priorities.</li> </ul> <p><u>MHS/SAFHB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MHS: Reviews and updates strategic plan about every five years.</li> </ul> <p><u>MWMO</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds strategic planning meeting every 3 years with the Board. Uses info to scope the RFP for planning services for updated plan.</li> <li>• Proposing to change 10-year CIP vision to 5 year CIP with annual updates.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Public Works</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nov-Dec: Identifies and modifies priorities for upcoming year; develops annual work plan.</li> <li>• Jan-Feb: Works with City Finance Dept and the State to determine key funding sources; presents annual work plan to City Council Executive Committee.</li> <li>• Follows City budget process.</li> </ul> <p><u>MPRB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follows City CIP budget process for neighborhood parks, but not regional riverfront parks.</li> <li>• Depending on specific funding streams and cycles will do two-year priority setting, e.g., Met Council Regional and Open Space, state legislature capital bonding sessions.</li> </ul> <p><u>CPED</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begins annual business planning process and budget process in April.</li> <li>• Coordinates business planning priorities with citywide budget process and submits budget requests to Mayor in May.</li> <li>• Also can appropriate funds any time during year.</li> </ul> <p><u>Hennepin County</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual budget process that begins in February with recommendations to Commissioners in September, adoption of budget in December.</li> </ul> <p><u>MHS/SAFHB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MHS: Tied to state capital bonding cycles (even years) and the operating budget in the odd years.</li> <li>• Both MHS and SAFHB develop annual operating budgets.</li> <li>• Adhere to different fiscal years from the City (July to June)</li> </ul> <p><u>MWMO</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develops annual workplan along with annual financial and activity reports.</li> <li>• Implements priorities through annual workplan and budget process.</li> <li>• Board may redirect funds as new needs emerge.</li> </ul>



## APPENDIX C

### ***Riverfront Revitalization Organization Study*** **June 8 Summit Summary and Next Steps**

#### **Participants:**

Chuck Ballentine; Britta Bloomberg, Ann Calvert; Mike Christenson; John Crippen; Carrie Flack; Michael Fox; Andrew Gillett; Jon Gurban; Council Member Diane Hofstede; Richard Johnson; Dan Kalmon; Steve Kotke; State Representative Dan Larson, Tom Leighton; Cara Letofsky; State Representative Diane Loeffler; State Representative Joe Mullery; MPRB Commissioner Jon Olson; Council Member Paul Ostrow; Jon Oyanagi; Rhonda Rae; Judd Rietkerk; Elizabeth Ryan; Mayor R.T. Rybak; Lee Sheehy; Doug Snyder; Chuck Sullivan; MPRB Commissioner Scott Vreeland; Jon Wertjes; Pierre Willette

Facilitators: Carolyn Bacon, Roxanne Hart, and Cathy Tilsen of Bacon & Associates

#### **Summit Summary**

Mike Christensen of CPED and Jon Gurban of MPRB kicked off the summit with a warm welcome. Then, Ann Calvert presented both a look back at the shared successes of the Central Riverfront and an update of the current Riverfront Organization Study.

The group broke into three discussion groups to help gauge the level of commitment to riverfront revitalization and organizational change, with the hope of identifying actions that can strengthen cooperation across jurisdictions. Each group presented their recommendations for moving forward. The full group enthusiastically endorsed these results and actions steps:

#### **Discussion Group #1: A Vision for the Riverfront**

This group's charge was exploring whether a shared vision for the Minneapolis riverfront exists. If so, how can it be communicated to engender support? If not, is one necessary, and if so how should one be created?

The group agreed that:

- There are a lot of plans, goals, and "little visions" from various entities but no unified vision for riverfront revitalization and what the river could mean for the future of Minneapolis.
- There could be value in having a shared vision as long as it is compelling and concise, creates buy-in and energies across communities and agencies, underpins the historical significance of the river, and informs land use decisions at a high level.

To create a vision the group suggested:

- Convene a multi-stakeholder group that includes elected officials from the various entities, extensive community representation, Above the Falls representation, businesses (e.g., Chamber of Commerce), and environmental groups.
- Ensure that the process allows for multiple voices from the communities who have a stake in riverfront revitalization.
- Bring together all the "little visions," and find the common threads or compatible components. Raise up and focus on these compatible elements without creating a vision per se.

## **Discussion Group #2: Riverfront Near-term Priorities**

After a robust discussion, the group recommended moving forward on the following four near-term priority areas:

- Phase 1 of *Above the Falls* Plan. This includes West River Road, Sheridan Veterans Park, trails, Plymouth to BN railroad bridge (both sides), etc.
- Lowry Avenue Bridge
- Upper Harbor Terminal
- Ensure the quality of storm runoff and outfalls and the quality of natural habitat and water within all projects.

Primary factors in moving the priorities forward:

- CPED should make the *Above the Falls* Plan part of the City's comprehensive plan.
- Policy makers should make these priorities their priority, even if it isn't always popular.
- Policy makers should come together across jurisdictions to work out differences around these priorities and their issues, e.g., land acquisition, staffing limitations.
- Figure out ways to both respond to market opportunities while also not being beholden to only market driven redevelopment decisions.
- Set-up inter-jurisdictional process/system/structure to create long-term commitment and to share in the benefits and risks.

## **Discussion Group#3: Improving Coordination/Organization Structure**

This group endorsed an interim structure to improve riverfront coordination that has two primary components: a Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force and a Riverfront Senior Management Steering Task Force.

- Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force: will be comprised of elected officials from the City, MPRB, Hennepin County, MWMO and MHS. The Policy Oversight Task Force will be the decision making body and provide direction to the senior staff of the agencies involved. Initial work will include responding to the results of each Summit discussion group and appointing a Blue Ribbon Task Force. (The Blue Ribbon Task Force—a public-private group consisting of representatives from elected bodies, businesses, nonprofits, and civic and community arenas— will recommend a long-term organization design for strengthening riverfront coordination and revitalization results.) In addition, another high priority for the Policy Oversight Task Force will be to develop a communication strategy for interested stakeholder groups, such as the Minneapolis Delegation of State Legislators, University of Minnesota, DNR, etc. Furthermore, the discussion group expressed a strong sense of urgency for this Policy Task Force to be convened as soon as possible and meet, at least initially, quite frequently.
- Riverfront Senior Management Steering Task Force: will consist of senior leadership from key riverfront organizations (e.g., CPED, MPRB, Public Works, Hennepin County, MHS, MWMO). Primary responsibilities will include reenergizing, supporting, and ensuring staff participation in the TAC, making recommendations to policy makers about priorities, key issues, etc., and providing leadership and direction on decisions made by the Policy Oversight Task Force. In addition, this Task Force would be the sponsors of the Riverfront Organization Study.

## Recommended Next Steps

As informed by the June 8 summit, it's recommended that an interim organizational structure be established to provide input and guidance to: a) the next phases of the Riverfront Organization Study, including appointment of the Blue Ribbon Task Force and review of its eventual recommendation; b) identify and coordinate near-term project priorities; and c) identify a working vision to guide revitalization in the interim.

For the overall continued success of the Riverfront Organization Study, and thus, of each Task Force, coordination of key relationships and feedback loops will be essential:

- The Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force will respond to policy issues and recommendations presented to it by the Senior Management Task Force. Primary issues include potential shared riverfront priorities, short-term budget recommendations, and appointment of Blue Ribbon Task Force members.
- The Riverfront Senior Management Steering Task Force's roles and relationships will include preparing and presenting recommendations to the Policy Oversight Task Force and leading implementation of policy decisions and priorities; reviewing TAC and Core Group recommendations to the Policy Oversight Task Force; sponsoring the Study process and responding to recommendations made by the Core Group; and assuring active staff participation in the TAC.
- The Core Group has worked in collaboration with the consultants to drive the Riverfront Organization Study. It will continue to be the hands-on working group to plan and direct the Study process in concert with the consultants, the interim task forces and the TAC. This means that, in part, the Core Group will inform the issues and priorities for review and consideration by the Senior Management Task Force. (The Core Group is a small group of representatives from the TAC and AFCAC that crosses jurisdictional boundaries.)
- The Riverfront Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will help both the Core Group and the Senior Management Steering Task Force frame key issues and activities for consideration by the Policy Oversight Task Force. Furthermore, the TAC will continue to coordinate activities and will complete staff work in support of both Task Forces.

With the synergy of these significant relationships in mind, the following are recommended next steps that will also harness the sense of urgency expressed by many at the Summit:

1. Elected Boards endorse interim organizational structure concept and appoint membership on the Riverfront Policy Oversight Task Force by late July.
2. Establish Riverfront Senior Management Task Force by end of June.
3. Hold first Riverfront Senior Management Task Force meeting by end of July.
4. Hold first meeting of the Policy Oversight Task Force by mid-August.
5. Policy Oversight Task Force reviews and recommends any changes for 2007 budget priorities by end of August.
6. Policy Oversight Task Force appoints Blue Ribbon Task Force membership and creates communications strategy for other key stakeholder groups by end of September.

7. Blue Ribbon Task Force first identifies a working vision to inform interim activities, and then reviews potential organizational models through the anticipated series of Task 3 workshops.
8. Blue Ribbon Task Force recommends an organizational model to the Policy Oversight Task Force for review, prior to seeking broader input in the Task 4 community outreach phase of the study.

# APPENDIX D

## Riverfront Revitalization Organization Study Organizational Background Materials

RIVERFRONT REVITALIZATION ORGANIZATIONS AND NEEDED ACTIVITIES MATRIX DRAFT 4/28/06		GOVERNMENT										NON-PROFIT/INST.										Input				
		City CPED	City PW	MPRB	SAFHB	HPC	MWMC	County	Met. Comm.	State DEED	State MNDOT	State DNR	Fed MNRRA	Fed Corps	IEA-3	Univ.	GMCVA	FMR	TFL	MCNC	Found.	Priv. Found.	Unb. e.g. AF-CAC	Neigh. groups	Priv. Dev. & Bus. Indiv.	
PLANNING Comprehensive Park Development Public Improvements Interpretive	◆◆◆	◆	◆◆◆	◆	◆	◆	R				R	R	R													
	◆◆◆	◆	◆◆◆	◆	◆	◆	R				R	R	R													
	◆◆	◆	◆◆	◆◆◆	◆	◆	R				R	R	R													
	◆		◆	◆◆◆	◆	◆	R				◆															
LAND ACQUISITION For parks For public improvements For development	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆◆				\$\$\$				\$\$\$							◆								
	◆◆						\$																			
DESIGN/CONSTRUCTION Parks Trails Public Improvements Stormwater imp. Streetscape, "Riverways" Parking Development Housing affordability Special amenities	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
	◆	◆	◆◆	◆			◆				◆															
POLLUTION REMED. For parks For public improvements For development	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆				◆																			
	◆	◆	◆◆				◆																			
HISTORIC Preservation Interpretation - SAF Interpretation - Other	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
OPERATION Parks Public Improvements Attractions	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆				◆																			
	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
PROGRAMMING Parks Other	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆				◆																			
	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
EDUCATION Environmental Historic	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
PROMOTION/MKTG. To developers To port res./tenants To consumers/visitors	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
	◆	◆	◆				◆																			
ADMINISTRATION Community input Transition assistance Fund-raising	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆				◆																			
	◆	◆	◆				◆																			



**Existing and Previous Riverfront Coordination Entities**

	<u>Topical Focus</u>				<u>Geographic Focus</u>			<u>Involved</u>				<u>Goals</u>					<u>Staffed</u>		<u>Meeting Frequency</u>	
	Historic pres. & interpretation	Planning & capital projects	Programming	Promotions	Central riverfront	Entire riverfront	Upper River	Elected officials	Senior staff from member orgs	Staff from member orgs	Reps from bus. neigh. groups, env. orgs, etc.	Prep/coordinate of plan to interpret history	Coordinate activities of member orgs	Promote riverfront district and coordinate events	Coordinate and enhance quality of programming	Inputs/support to the Above the Falls plan	Yes	No	Monthly	Less frequently
<b>St. Anthony Falls Heritage Board</b>	X				X			X		x	X	X					X		Monthly	Less frequently
<b>Riverfront/Heritage Board Tech. Adv. Comm. (TAC)</b>	X	X				X			X			X	X				x		X	
<b>Mill District Coordinating Committee</b>		X			X				X				X				x			X
<b>Minneapolis Riverfront District Promo. &amp; Coord. Board</b>				X	X				X					X					X	
<b>Minneapolis Riverfront District Programming Coord. Comm.</b>			X		X				X					X					X	
<b>Above the Falls Citizens Advisory Committee (AFCAC)</b>		X													X				X	
<b>Riverfront Development Coordination Board (DEFUNCT)</b>		X			X		X											X		



## Existing and Previous Coordination Entities

### St. Anthony Falls Heritage Board

- Established by state legislation in 1988
- 22-member Board composed of **elected reps** of Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB), City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County and Minnesota legislature, plus MPRB and Minnesota Historical Society (MHS) **senior staff** and other non-profit/private/commission reps
- Goal is to prepare and then coordinate implementation of a plan to interpret history of St. Anthony Falls Heritage Zone
- Meets three times per year
- Supported by annual contributions from MPRB, City, Hennepin County and MHS
- No staff of its own; MHS is fiscal agent and provides administrative support; Riverfront TAC provides staff support
- Geographical area: Central riverfront only
- Topical focus: Historic preservation and interpretation

### Riverfront/Heritage Board Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

- Established by City Council as **staff-level** advisory group for central riverfront in 1985 with reps from Minneapolis Planning and Public Works departments, MPRB and Minneapolis Community Development Agency
- An expanded version (that included reps of Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission, State Historic Preservation Office and Hennepin History Museum) was appointed as TAC for St. Anthony Falls Heritage Board work in 1988
- Membership has continued to expand as more governmental entities became involved; list now includes reps of multiple departments/governmental entities involved in riverfront
- Upper River TAC was created about 2000, and two TACs now have merged
- Goal is to coordinate activities of member entities
- Meets monthly, plus work groups meet as needed for particular projects, plans and initiatives
- Member entities assign (or allow) staff to participate
- Geographical focus: Entire riverfront
- Topical focus: Planning and capital projects

### Mill District Coordinating Committee

- Core part of group in existence since 2000
- Initially composed of senior staff and project staff from governmental, non-profit and private developers involved in West Side Milling District work
- Expanded to include all parties involved in Mill district, but now **staff level**
- Goal is to coordinate development activities and strategies
- Meets every other month
- No dedicated staff (although member entities assign or allow staff to participate)
- Geographical focus: Mill District only
- Topical focus: Primarily capital development

### **Minneapolis Riverfront District Promotions and Coordination Board**

- In existence since early 1990s?
- Composed of **staff** reps of governmental, non-profit and private entities that have venue and plan events
- Goal is to promote overall Minneapolis Riverfront District and coordinate events
- Meets monthly
- No dedicated staff (although member entities assign or allow staff to participate)
- Geographical focus: Central riverfront only
- Topical focus: Promotions and events

### **Minneapolis Riverfront District Programming Coordination Committee**

- Created in 2005
- Composed of **staff** reps of governmental, non-profit and private entities that provide programming
- Goal is to coordinate and enhance quality of interpretive and other programming
- No dedicated staff (although member entities assign or allow staff to participate)
- Meets monthly
- Geographical focus: Central riverfront only
- Topical focus: Programming

### **Above the Falls Citizens Advisory Committee (AFCAC)**

- Created in 2001
- Composed of 30 reps from neighborhood organizations, businesses and environmental organizations, with 60 alternates
- Goal is to provide input and support to implementation of *Above the Falls* plan
- No dedicated staff (although member entities assign or allow staff to participate); otherwise, volunteer effort (with tiny administrative budget provided by City)
- Meets monthly
- Geographical focus: Upper River only
- Topical focus: Planning and capital projects

### **Riverfront Development Coordination Board (defunct)**

- Established via a joint powers agreement
- Board composed of **elected reps** of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, City of Minneapolis and Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority
- Existed from 1977 to 1981
- Goal was to undertake joint planning and oversee coordination of activities of member entities
- Had staff
- Geographical area: Central riverfront only
- Topical focus: Capital redevelopment