

STADIUM IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE  
**DESIGN SUBCOMMITTEE**

Friday August 24, 2012

1-3 p.m.

315 City Hall

**Meeting Minutes**

**Subcommittee members present:** *Chair:* Tom Fisher. *Members:* Sandra Colvin Roy, Tom Meyer, Kevin Reich, Craig Taylor, Jesse Winkler. **Members excused:** Tim Baylor, R.T. Rybak

**Other Implementation Committee members present:** Diane Hofstede, Peggy Lucas

**Guests:** Jeff Anderson, Lester Bagley, (Mn Vikings), Nick Koch (HGA), Varun Kharbanda (Timeshare Systems Inc.)

**Staff/consultants present:** Johnnie Burns, Peter Brown, Hilary Dvorak, Beth Elliott, Chuck Lutz, Jennifer O'Rourke, Brendon Slotterback, Sally Westby, Jason Wittenberg.

**1.0 Call to order** – the meeting was called to order at 1:07 p.m. by chair Tom Fisher. Those present introduced themselves.

**2.0 Update** – Chuck Lutz noted that subcommittee members Tim Baylor and R.T. Rybak were unable to attend the meeting. Jennifer O'Rourke, chief of staff to Mayor Rybak, is attending for him.

The Stadium Implementation Committee (IC) has been divided into three subcommittees each of which will meet prior the next IC meeting on Monday 9/17.

**3.0 Design Subcommittee Draft Work Plan** – Chair Tom Fisher reviewed the draft work plan (appendix A).

**3.1 Purpose** – As the document indicates, the purpose of the subcommittee is to ensure the ‘highest quality design for the stadium exterior, plaza and related structures’. One product of the subcommittee’s work will be a Design Vision and Principles for the stadium development that will be transmitted to the Minnesota Sports Facility Authority’s (MSFA) selected architect. The Design Vision and Principles will then be used as a guide by the subcommittee and full IC in reviewing the architect’s design proposals.

**3.2 Reports to/advises** – The design subcommittee will make recommendations to the IC on design issues related to the \$975 million project authorized by the legislature within the “red line” of stadium jurisdiction (see map - appendix B).

In response to a question from Sandra Colvin Roy, Chuck Lutz said that the “red line” refers to the stadium district as defined in the stadium legislation. This is the area in which the bulk of the stadium funding will be spent. However, the line is porous. The design principles and vision could relate to the larger area as well (see appendix B). Colvin Roy requested that the references to the “red line” be deleted from the work plan. Staff will make this change in the document. Tom Meyer suggested that visual representations be included with the principles in the future.

In response to a question from Jesse Winkler, Lutz said that budget details related to parking and infrastructure had not yet been determined.

Craig Taylor asked about the architect selection process and how design review would work. Lutz said that the design subcommittee would want to meet with the architects during the design process so there were no major surprises when the schematic design (SD) was presented next year.

**3.3 Products/deliverables** – Once the schematic design of the stadium is completed, the Design Subcommittee will make a recommendation regarding the design to the Implementation Committee (IC). This recommendation is the technical product of the subcommittee’s work. The work plan is geared towards this deliverable. In turn, the IC will make a recommendation to the City Council, which will forward its recommendation to the MSFA. Although the major work of the design subcommittee will end at Schematic Design (March, 2013), the subcommittee could continue to meet afterwards.

Public presentations by stadium architect finalists are scheduled for Thurs Sept. 6 @5 p.m. at the Metrodome. IC members will receive an invitation. The architect selection is scheduled for Sept. 14 and will be made by the MSFA.

In response to a question from Johnnie Burns, Lutz said the Construction Manager (CM) has not yet been selected. The CM will not have a lead role in design.

**3.4 Calendar and Meeting Time** – The subcommittee has a relatively short time frame (through March 2013) in which to complete its work. It was agreed the subcommittee would meet monthly on the:

**4<sup>th</sup> Friday of each month**  
**1 – 3 p.m.**  
**in either Room 315 or the Mayor’s Conference Room**  
**City Hall.**

Sally Westby will update the calendars of subcommittee members with the subcommittee meeting dates through the end of the year.

#### **4.0 Staff Briefings**

**4.1 Stadium Policy Framework and Planning Context** (appendix C) - Beth Elliott reviewed the extensive planning work that has been done over the past ten years and a number of adopted City plans that relate to the stadium area. The subcommittee will not need to work from scratch in developing its recommendation. The policies outlined in appendix C provide a framework that the subcommittee can use in making its recommendations. Elliott noted that there is an LRT station next to the stadium site so there should be a focus on transit oriented development in the area. She suggested that a great area could be developed around the stadium if good urban design and planning were done.

Elliott reviewed relevant City policies including:

- **Land use** - City policies call for concentrating future office development in the downtown core with mixed-use development in the stadium area.
- **Parking** – the City’s big goal is to phase out surface parking and incorporate above ground parking into mixed-use development.

Colvin Roy noted that this policy could be in conflict with the stadium legislative requirement of 2500 parking stalls near the stadium. Lutz said there are currently 1350 parking spaces in the area; so over 1100 new stalls will need to be provided. Parking structures will be needed.

Diane Hofstede pointed out the potential for parking spillage into neighborhoods such as the Mill District and northeast and southeast Minneapolis that have not been involved in the stadium planning to date.

- **Transportation** – Chicago and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenues as well as 5<sup>th</sup> Street will be primary pedestrian corridors to the stadium and should be enhanced with wider sidewalks and improved streetscaping. It is important that pedestrian connections be comfortable.

City policy calls for not utilizing skyways in the downtown east neighborhood. This could be in conflict with the stadium legislation which calls for 2000 parking spaces connected by tunnel or skyway. If skyways are utilized in the area, design will be very important.

- **Urban Design** – a major issue is how to weave a large structure such as a stadium into the rest of downtown without overwhelming the area.

**4.2 Building Design Elements** (appendix D) – Hilary Dvorak reviewed the City’s regulations regarding building design. The first sentence of the Site Plan Review paragraph outlines what the City wants designers to do in this area

“...promote development that is compatible with nearby properties, neighborhood character... to minimize pedestrian and vehicular conflict, to reinforce public spaces, to promote public safety and to visually enhance development”.

Dvorak reviewed the design elements including:

- **Building Placement** – Typically the City requires buildings to be no more than 8 feet from the front lot line although in the case of the stadium this might be too close. Amenities are required between the building and the sidewalk.
- **Parking** – Parking should not detract from the design.
- **Building Entrances** – should be highlighted and noticeable. Primary entrances are required on all sides of a building.
- **Building walls** – There should be no large blank expanses. Ground level activity is required.

- **Parking Garages** – Vehicles should be screened from view. The goal is for the structure to not look like a parking garage.
- **Access and Circulation** – Minimizing conflicts is important.
- **Landscaping and Screening** – Typically the City requires 20% of a site to be green. The City also has plaza design standards.
- **Additional Standards** – related to shadowing, wind, lighting etc. (see appendix D)

Tom Fisher commented that many of the design elements seem geared towards commercial buildings rather than a facility such as a stadium.

In response, staff said that there is an exception process to allow for different circumstances and creativity. Also, as indicated in the stadium legislation, the Implementation Committee does not need to abide by the City regulations and policies. Staff has presented the regulations/policies so that the subcommittee has a platform from which to review the stadium design. Target Field design principles are also attached (appendix E) for subcommittee review.

Elliott reminded the subcommittee that the City wants to see transit-oriented development in the surrounding neighborhoods and that this development *will* need to comply with the City regulations and policies. Also, as subcommittee members think about the area, it will be important to *not* concentrate on “view sheds” that might not be there in the future.

**4.3 Other documents** – Other documents have been included for the subcommittee use. These are: a report on Best Practices for Development in Stadium areas (appendix F); a report from the Eliot Park neighborhood (appendix G); ideas about sustainability and accessibility (appendices H & I); and a list of issues and questions that will need to be addressed (appendix J).

#### **4.4 Discussion**

Sandy Colvin Roy suggested that staff organize a walking tour of the area. Staff will schedule this for early September.

Tom Meyer expressed interest in hearing from the architects and others regarding what worked and what did not work at Target Field. Nick Koch (HGA) briefly described the 2010 process that was utilized at Target Field.

Peter Brown noted that the role of the 2010 partners was to develop principles to guide the Twins stadium development. Once the Target Field design was completed, the 2010 partners worked on getting ready for opening day. The Vikings Stadium process is different since the City has a major role that it did not have with Target Field.

Colvin Roy suggested that something like the 2010 partners be considered for the Vikings stadium. Lutz agreed that the Stadium Implementation Committee might eventually evolve into a 2010 type group. **Staff will provide the 2020 web link to the subcommittee members.**

In response to a question from Tom Meyer, Lester Bagley said that the Stadium legislation dictates a collaborative relationship between the City, the MSFA and the Vikings. The Vikings share the same vision and goals as the City. The Vikings want a first class facility that fits into the neighborhood. There will need to be a balance of public and private interests. The project will need to work for both the public and for Vikings' fans. The Vikings are committed to collaboration.

**5.0 Draft Vision and Principles** (appendix K) – Tom Fisher lead a discussion of the draft vision and principles that he and David Wilson put together based on the discussion at the 8/6/12 Stadium Implementation Committee.

**5.1 Vision** – Fisher commented that the statement as written talked about spurring “high density” development, which should be modified to say mixed-use development.

Colvin Roy presented a revised draft for consideration:

“A world class” urban football stadium, designed as an integral part of a world class place with great public amenities, that attracts fans, neighbors and visitors to be in active in the district 365 days a year”.

Tom Meyer said the stadium should be designed for a northern climate. Diane Hofstede suggested that connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods, the U of M and the River be included in the vision statement. It was agreed that the vision statement should be a general in nature.

**Staff will modify the vision statement based on Colvin Roy’s draft and subcommittee member comments.**

The other subcommittees will also be developing vision statements and principles. Eventually the work of all three subcommittees will be combined into one single document.

**5.2 Principles** – Discussion ensued regarding the draft principles:

**Image** – It was suggested that the context in which the building is being built (e.g. northern climate) is important and is related to the aesthetic of the building. The building should look as though it belongs in Minnesota.

Fisher thought that being “contextual” could be in conflict with being “iconic”. Colvin Roy noted the difficulty of knowing if something is iconic until after it is built. Kevin Reich commented that an iconic building is one that stands out and relates to what it stands for.

**Building Scale** – discussion ensued regarding how to keep a large building from feeling so big that it created barriers. Tom Meyer said that it was important to be clear regarding the meaning of “massing”. The latter could be a confusing concept to a design team.

**Exterior Shell** – Beth Elliot suggested that the transparency of the building was important. Reich suggested that the right kind of exterior could be important in shaping the context for future development. Tom Meyer said that more than transparency was involved in making a building both an “inside” and “outside” facility. For example, walls could move in and out. Colvin Roy noted that a building façade could be broken up with grade changes.

Lutz reported that the stadium in Indianapolis while beautiful was so big it dominated the landscape. Reich said that the Rose Bowl stadium appears small even though it holds 100,000 people.

The Metrodome is built in a bowl so part of it is underground. It is Lutz’s assumption that the new stadium will be partly underground although this has not been confirmed. Brown suggested that a principle be considered that relates to keeping the building low.

Elliott suggested inclusion of a principle related to the plaza. Colvin Roy spoke to the importance of thinking about what people will “do” in a plaza rather than how the plaza would look. Meyer pointed out that plazas could often be windswept and uninviting. What is around a plaza is very important.

In response to a question from Meyer, Lutz said that it had not been determined what activities would and would not occur in the plaza on game day but that tailgating would most likely **not** occur there. Jeff Anderson said the plaza could be smaller than the existing one and perhaps used to host games for children. The Mayor has suggested food carts in the plaza area.

**Subcommittee members agreed to review the principles on their own time and send revisions to Chuck Lutz by Friday 8/30/12. The following subcommittee members agreed to work on specific principles**

- **Tom Fisher – Image, Exterior Shell, Site plan, open space**
- **Tom Fisher & Tom Meyer – Building Scale; add a “development” principle**
- **Sandy Colvin Roy & Kevin Reich - Transportation, Sustainability and Parking**
- **Jesse Winkler and Craig Taylor - Commerce**

The goal is for the revised principles to be presented to the Implementation Committee on 9/17/12.

**6.0 Adjourn** – 3 p.m.

**7.0 Next subcommittee meeting - Friday September 28 @ 1 p.m. City Hall – room to be determined.**