

Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission

November 5, 2009, Room 317 City Hall

Staff: Brian Schaffer

Planning Supervisor: Jack Byers

Date of Appeal: November 19, 2009

ITEM SUMMARY

Description: Local Designation of the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District, Wards 5 & 7

Action: Adopt report and its attachments as findings of fact and approve the local designation of the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District to the Zoning & Planning Committee of the City Council with the following conditions:

1. The Minneapolis Warehouse District includes the 254 resources evaluated and listed in the designation study. These resources include the properties identified in the map and listed in Attachment B of the staff report.
2. The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties will be used to evaluate alterations in the district, as they have during interim protection, until such time as local design guidelines are adopted.

TRANSCRIPTION

Chair Larsen: We have our one presentation item, the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District designation, wards 5 and 7, and Brian is here to ... I guess Jack is going to make a couple opening remarks.

Staff Byers: Chair Larsen and Commissioners, I would like to just make a couple of quick comments first to remind you about why we are here tonight and the importance of the item before you. We're here tonight in response to challenges that the staff and the Commission have seen in the last year for some insensitive additions to warehouse buildings. And also to some proposed demolitions in both the local and the national register district. As we're all aware there's been quite a great deal of investment in this area in this city in the last couple of decades and that investment is because of the historic fabric of the district. So we want to make sure that those economic investments, vis-à-vis the built form of that district, are protected and that they continue to generate economic development in the coming decades. This is also a response to some opportunities that are coming up in the district over the next decade or so. As you know, the Twins ballpark, Target Field, will be opening next spring, there's also plans underway and have been for a number of years to build an intermodal train station adjacent to the ballpark. As you know there are much needed improvements to the public realm in the district, many of the sidewalks and streets need repair, they need to be more accessible and as you know as well the district was not a place historically where people lived, but it is a place where people live and

work today so there is a need to incorporate new changes as well. And to set the tone for infill development.

Now there's two pieces of the project, as you know. The first is the designation study and the second is the design guidelines. What we're here to do tonight is to talk about the designation and that's really about the history of the district. It's about why this particular place in Minneapolis is important, why it was important, and why it's important to protect this place and create sensible policy going forward. So tonight's presentation is really about what happened in this place from 1865 to 1930. What we'll take up next month and in January is the design guidelines. That's really for 2010 going forward, and those guidelines will set the policy for how we regulate new proposals and changes to the district going forward.

I'd like to make a couple of important acknowledgements. First I'd like to acknowledge Rolf Anderson. Rolf wrote the 1989 nomination for the National Register of Historic Places and his research has really been critical in doing updated research because he established the important properties and the boundaries for the district. It's really been a much easier project because of the very challenging work that Rolf did at that time. I also want to thank our colleagues at the State Historic Preservation Office led by Brita Bloomberg. They've reviewed the designation, they've given positive comments and feedback and they've been a touchstone for us in the process. I also want to acknowledge the City Planning Commission, particularly the Chair, David Motzenbecker, and also Ted Tucker who is the chair of the Planning Commission's Committee of the Whole. The Planning Commission also reviewed the designation and gave positive comments. They were very helpful in giving us feedback along the way. As I mentioned we'll take up the design guidelines in January but we knew from the start of this designation process that it would be important to begin that conversation while the designation would be underway. Traditionally, as you know, we would wait until after the designation before we would even start to talk about guidelines, but we've tried to do them simultaneously to get that conversation going. And to that end, at your request, we convened a technical advisory group and I want to acknowledge those folks. Mike Koup from the State Historic Preservation Office, Charlene Roise from Hess, Roise Associates, Phillip Koski from Leonard Parker, David Frank and Jennifer Walden from the North Loop Neighborhood Association, John Stark from Perkins and Will, Bob Carlson from the Minneapolis Public Works Department, Denita Lemmon representing the Commission and then our own staff team as well. This group met several times over the summer to talk about what the critical pieces of the district are and set the tone and initial draft for going forward with those guidelines. I want to take a moment to talk about the CPED staff team. We've had great leadership from the Executive Director Mike Christenson and from the Planning Director Barb Sporlein. I expect Mike will be here later on tonight. He had a meeting first and Barb Sporlein is in San Francisco representing the city at a ULI meeting. I also want to acknowledge Beth Elliott who is our downtown planner and Binoy Panicker who is a planner. Both Beth and Binoy are from our community planning section and they've provided help and support throughout. And also Beth Grossen who is from CPED's business development team. She's been an integral part of the team. As you know, Brian Schaffer has done the lion's share of the work. He's not only managed the project but also done, he's been the principal investigator and done that updated research of Rolf's National Register nomination and so there's two very different sets of technical skills and he's done a very fine job of pulling them

together and bringing them forward. And also I want to recognize Diana Armstrong who's had to endure a lot of notices, a lot of paper, a lot of packets, and a lot of different pieces of information coming in from different directions.

We've also been working hard, particularly in the last couple of months, to really make sure that we have collaboration and cooperation from key stakeholders and partners and to that end I want to recognize that the Hennepin County staff and commissioners have been particularly helpful in the last couple of weeks. On Tuesday afternoon the Hennepin County Board Chair asked that the HPC and CPED would write a letter to just acknowledge that there will be an intermodal station built in the district and that we will cooperate going forward with the guidelines. To that end I've drafted a letter for you and I think it's appropriate to take that up in the new business section. We'll do that after item 2.

So lastly I want to thank all of you for your leadership and your guidance. It was not an easy decision for you last January to nominate the district, but I think it was the right one, I think it was an important one, and I want to say lastly that I think we are very well prepared tonight. But as I got ready to walk across the street from my office I recognized that there was one last thing that we should have done and that was to make sure we gave each of you a shopping cart to move your paperwork around. I'm sorry we didn't do that, so I'll turn it over to Brian.

Chair Larsen: Great, thank you, Jack.

Staff Schaffer: Good afternoon. Ever since about a year ago you guys have given me a hard time about PowerPoint so be prepared for PowerPoint tonight. Just to get started, I want to give you a brief overview of what we'll talk about. I know we've spoken about this designation before back October 6, but I still want to give a brief history. I will try to be brief and recognize the fact that there are people here who would probably like to testify and have more deliberation. So with that, if we can hop on over to the PowerPoint. Just quickly we'll go over the background, talk about designation criteria, historic context, we'll talk about what are the physical features of historic context, an evaluation of resources, run through how it is consistent with the plans, some comments that we've received and then end with our recommendation.

So back on January 13, 2009, this commission sat here in the Council Chambers and approved the nomination and directed the Planning Director to commence a designation study of the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District, the National District. To give you just a reminder of what we're dealing with, the National District is everything that you see in the red boundary on this map. The blue crosshatching is the local existing North Loop Warehouse Historic District, and the green is the overlap with St. Anthony Falls Historic District. That overlap is something that we've worked through and it's something that's common with historic districts especially when they're tied to kind of the development of a downtown and commercial activity.

So just to kind of set the table and talk about the designation and criteria really quick. The Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District, staff found that it met three of the seven designation criteria. Again, you only have to meet one criterion to be locally designated, this met three. The first one, is the property is associated with significant events of that period that exemplify broad

patterns of cultural, political, economic, or social history. Criterion four, the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type, style, or method of construction. Criterion six, the property exemplifies the works of master builders, engineers, designers, artists, craftsmen or architects. These are important just as we go through I'll try to remind you as we talk about the historic context but I wanted to say these up front just to help you understand why this area is significant as we talk about the history.

The warehouse district kind of developed around a small location and really kind of started out as an auxiliary area to what would be the downtown core which was the Bridge Square Area, identified on this map as the little red square, it's on the corner where Hennepin and Nicollet intersect. The area really was just a small auxiliary commercial area. Two to three story frame structures; bars, taverns, hotels, restaurants. As the area grew and kind of changed, the dynamic changed a little bit. The area in kind of a larger view is in the circle there in blue. This area, again, was auxiliary to the commercial area of downtown. And really it had it's predominance as downtown grew kind of towards the east, that commercial auxiliary area kind of fell to the side, it was too far of a distance for the businessmen to really become connected to that area. And as that happened, it also became a place for the working men of the district, as the warehouse district took off. So it's prominence, while it may not actually be truly part of what we consider the original, what we consider modern day warehousing, it really was the nest egg and what really grew this warehouse district. Some of the buildings that are intact from that time include the Pacific Block which is located on Washington and the intersection of 3rd Ave N and the Lowry & Morrison Block, called a block but it's a building, it's the name of the structure.

As the district, the reason really the district took off and grew as a warehouse district and not just another commercial area downtown was really based on the railroad expansion. In 1867 the first bridge really to connect this area across the river was built. It crossed over Nicollet Island, intersected right around 3rd St N and kind of snaked it's way to 4th Ave N. It was operated by St. Paul Pacific Railroad, now currently known as Burlington Northern Sante Fe Railroad commonly referred to in the designation study as Great Northern which is really what it was called during the period of significance. Over that period of time, from about 1867, from that first railroad, to about 1900 we saw all of a sudden about six railroad industries, six rail yards kind of sprout out around the warehouse district which really talks about the importance of the interconnected between the warehouse industry and the importance of the railroads in that development. What you see here is a map trying to explain the relationship of these railroad yards next to the development of the warehouse district. A couple of the prominent ones you can see is the Minneapolis St. Paul, Sault Ste. Marie which in this pink. The Northern Pacific railroad was located here, the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha railroad is right there. The Great Northern railroad and then the Minneapolis railroad shared the 4th Ave rail corridor, which I'll talk more in depth about later. And then the Chicago Great Western Union railroad. These railroads really were the lifeblood of the warehouse district. Without the development of the railroad industry and their inclusion in this area, warehousing wouldn't have taken place. It was the connection between the cheapness of getting goods to Minneapolis, via the railroads, preferential rates systems, and the distribution to the northwest. That connection really did fuel the growth that we'll see here in the Warehouse District. These maps really don't show you a whole lot except for the change in infrastructure. This was a Sanborn map, a fire insurance map

from 1885 to 1889, showing kind of the importance of how this area changed. If you look on the map you can see again this is 3rd Ave N. There's a railroad coming from across Nicollet Island leading down the 4th Ave rail corridor. This is the Northern Pacific rail yard and you can actually see the platting of the original street grade that kind of gave weight to new railroads. As this area grew, by 1912 you can see that the railroad infrastructure significantly increased. You can also see the change in the structures. This area up here where the Northern Pacific rail yard is, that north part of Washington Ave was really residential area, it was single family homes and duplexes and really just row homes that really lined that area. It was a residential area until the commercial growth industry fueled by the railroads kind of moved into that space. In this map you can kind of see that transition occurring, and then finally a map that really ends in 1952 showing that final transition showing how that area grew from single family homes and an auxiliary to the downtown to this larger warehouse footprint and the development. You can see the development of the railroad line tracks, how that intensifies and really kind of ties back to the rise and fall of this warehouse district.

One particular example of how the railroads were really well interconnected and really related to the growth of the Warehouse District is kind of the 4th Ave rail corridor. This rail corridor, again, located, it's the Great Northern rail corridor that came across Nicollet Island and kind of ran southwest through the district. Up until 1890 that railroad, those rail yard and active railroad tracks crossed Washington Ave, 3rd St, 4th St, and 5th St at-grade. There was no bridging like there is now. The grade wasn't the way it is now, it was really at grade crossing, the rail yards pretty much filled up the streets as you can see from this map there were numerous lines going across which really made meetings and connections to that northern part of the district along Washington and 3rd St pretty impossible. There was a lawsuit that was actually filed in 1886 between the City of Minneapolis and Minneapolis and St. Louis railroads. The Great Northern railroad company, and actually Thomas Lowry was involved in some aspects of it. Thomas Lowry representing the streetcars, kind of gives you an idea of the connection issues. Really that lawsuit was filed in 1886 and in 1890 was settled. The settlement gave way to a whole different transformation of this space, so this map kind of shows what it looked like pre-settlement, per 1890. After 1890 this map shows, it's from 1912, but it really shows the intensification of this space. Some of the key parts of that lawsuit was a lowering of the grade of the rail yards and that through railroad corridor that went through for the Great Northern Minneapolis St. Louis. That lowering of the grade resulting in One, the ability to reconnect back to the grid and back to Washington Ave on 3rd St, allowing streetcars to go over Washington Ave. It created the bridge at Washington Ave, the bridging at 3rd, 4th, and 5th Streets north. It created the grade on the site where the Great Northern and the Minneapolis St. Louis railroads are today. The actual rail yard was a lowered grade from the natural grade and then the actual through corridor where the trains operated was again even lower. That grade separation still exists. The bridging also caused some manipulation in the landscape especially along 5th Ave N. The bridge abutments that come across from 3rd and 4th where the viaducts were created needed that transition, that run down, for the bridge abutments, for the road to come back down from the arching over the bridge. So you see actually at the intersections of 5th Avenue N and 3rd St N and 5th Ave and 4th and actually 5th Ave and 5th, a higher grade elevation there, and you can kind of see that change which is a result of that. Part of the lawsuit actually increased the number of through tracks, the number of tracks that came through that area. It increased up to six operateable tracks. There were additional

tracks also required, extensions of the bridges on 1st Street and 2nd Street which were previously bridges. The third and final piece of that was actually the creation of Traffic Street which was located here. Traffic Street was originally an alley. As part of the grade separation and the bridging that occurred, access needed to be granted or increased access to the railroads needed to be granted and so that alley became a street and that's why it doesn't really fit with the rest of the grid in Minneapolis. So again those railroads really helped to facilitate the growth outside of this small section of the Warehouse District and facilitated one along 1st Street N. It later, which I'll talk about in a little bit, along Washington Ave N and again really along 3rd Street N and 1st Avenue N we saw the rise in a kind of wholesale warehousing, dry goods, produce goods.

Moving into the agricultural implement industry. Really the rise of that industry was purely tied to the integration of the railroad tracks. In 1867 right when the railroad tracks first moved into the area there were only two agricultural implement dealers in the area on Washington Avenue. By 1908 with the rise and increase in rail, Minneapolis became the largest distribution point in the world for agricultural implement dealers. So over a 40 year period we went from two to the largest point, pretty significant. By 1915 as compared to other industries in Minneapolis, this became the largest industry, greater than the flour and grain trade that existed at that time, which really is what Minneapolis was known for. So it really talks about how important it was. This map I have to show you, those points represent each an account of one implement dealer in the Warehouse District. And it's just one account from back in 1916. This map was used actually to get the 6th District Federal Reserve Bank to move to Minneapolis when they were looking to site that location, which is ironic because the new Federal Reserve resulted in the demolition of a few historic resources in this district. But this again just show these accounts for one period of time of one of the many firms. The railroads really allowed Minneapolis to kind of feed the whole Northwest accessing not only Wisconsin and Iowa, North Dakota and South Dakota and all of greater Minnesota, but also accessing Montana, Idaho, the railroad tracks extended all the way to the east coast and all the way to the west coast up to Canada, and really all this brought Minneapolis together with all these different trade routes.

Growing that implement idea and how that implement area grew, an indication of that was Implement Row which is kind of given it's name anecdotally and then formalized by a publication back in the 1890s talking about this area along 1st Street N and 3rd Ave N, kind of an L shaped space on the map it's hatch marked here. This really was where all the agricultural implements were located. At one time all these dealers, citations and books have noticed that a person could come, travel by train to this site from North Dakota or Montana, a dealer comes in and looks at all the different manufacturers, all the different goods they could at one time just walking down the street in one day's time, stay at the hotels in the Warehouse District and then take the trains home the next day and have done all their shopping needs from one period of time. And this is really evidenced in a lot of different building styles that are in that area. This will show two of the largest ones, Lindsay Brothers which is located on the corner of 4th Ave and 1st St N, that actually was the longest operating warehouse agricultural implement dealer actually operating up until the mid 1980s. It was built in 1895. The Champion Building which is now the Creamette Building is now housing and is another example of this implement row and some of these agricultural implement dealers.

Implement Row's success was its own demise a little bit, as there was not enough land for all these implement dealers to be located along the railroad tracks. So right around 1890-1900 these industries started looking elsewhere for land and access. That fueled some of the growth you see on the corners of what is now Park and 3rd Street. American Trio Lofts which was a commonly known old implement dealer that had access to the railroad lines which was a key to this industry. Also you'll see that there was some growth outside of Minneapolis proper. Some of it is south Minneapolis, some of it in St. Louis Park, as people were struggling to find access to these lands. The introduction of the Minneapolis St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie line commonly known as the Soo Line which runs along Washington Avenue in between Washington Ave and 2nd Street highlighted in this kind of bluish purple, really facilitated new lane growth. That came in about 1900 when they were still looking for land so now there was new land and extra rail yards that allowed for new growth. At the same time Great Northern Railroads created two access points and two spur lines which are here in yellow and ran between Washington Ave and 3rd St N, parallel in between the block and also along 3rd St N and 4th St N. Those spur lines also allowed for further access to the rail and allowed for more growth for the agricultural implement dealers and also other manufacturers and other industries that were looking for the same things that agricultural dealers were which was access to the railroads and develop the land.

Some examples of those buildings again are the Deere Webber building located on Washington Ave and then the Parlin & Orendorff Plow building which commonly is known as Holten Printing located on Washington Ave as well. So again, as that growth moved out the wholesaling industry which is another subsection of this warehousing group really focused their attention and growth along 1st Ave N. They did not necessarily really need direct rail access as the agricultural implement dealers. As you move through that area, though, you see this kind of concentration of growth that wasn't necessarily tied to railroad expansion but facilitated by that same access to goods and that kind of growth and it really occurs along 1st Ave N primarily, also along 2nd Ave N what is now where the 394 kind of on-ramps are to downtown and the tad ramps are. That was actually the produce area which is the produce exchange area of Minneapolis and the original farmer's market or the second iteration of the farmer's market was. And it all ties back to this larger wholesaling industry. One part of it was the dry goods which is really famous by like Butler Brothers and Wyman Partridge, but also the produce industry which was kind of less well known in our warehouse district just because a lot of that had been demolished prior to moving forward with the designation.

So that wholesaling industry growth, just to talk about the rise of that as well, by 1870 was about \$1 million in trade so it was pretty impressive especially in that regard. But as it grew, and you can see here that transition, and by 1900 it was \$200 million in trade so in 30 years it had grown 200 times it's size and by 1919 it had reached a billion dollars in trade. Again, talking about that access created by the railroads to the Northwest, access created for the need of these industries, really facilitated this growth. Some buildings which kind of personified that are the McDonald Brothers building, this one is located on 1st Ave N, it was built in 1900 and then the Butler Brothers Building which was built in 1906, one of the more famous buildings. It's individually registered on the National Register of Historic Places and also locally designated. It was a kind of, it marked a period of growth in the warehousing area and really said that this is supreme in

warehousing in the nation. Butler Brothers was a national company and decided to locate their store here because of the access granted here to the rest of the markets.

One of the other growth, a lot of the growth in the district also occurred from manufacturing. A couple examples of that include the Ford Motor Company. That is located on 5th Ave N and 5th St. They actually built Model T cars there for about 5 years until they realized they couldn't, the vertical assembly floor wasn't something that worked out too well. They eventually weren't able to get more land from Minneapolis so they moved to St. Paul, hence the Ford plant over in Highland Park. Then also the Northern Bag Company, commonly known as Tower Lofts over at 700 Washington, made bags, they actually made the burlap and canvas bags that were made for all the flour and grain.

Also not only were there manufacturing, but a lot of this kind of support industries in the district including offices and stores, services and hotels, taverns. A couple of examples, one is this hotel located on 1st St N on kind of that older part of the warehouse district and then also as the district grew not every building was a warehousing building. The Stearn Building was built in 1904, it is a two-story building with offices on the top. It still exists today as an Army surplus store. Again, it wasn't necessarily used for warehousing or manufacturing but was auxiliary to the rest of this area and was important.

So I'll quickly talk about the physical features of the district and just kind of touch on why is this history in context translated into the built form that we see today. To start, this map is a little convoluted, I'm not going to spend a whole lot of time on it but I wanted to let you know that the introduction of the railroads not only changed not only the face of how buildings looked and where they were located in the district or the grades they were located at, it also determined how they designed the exterior of those buildings. Along with what you know is commonly known as the existing North Loop Warehouse District in part of downtown we have really square blocks. Everything is accessed by alleys in the back. Those alleys really allowed for the freight transportation transfer of goods and other items that weren't really front door type activities. As the railroads built in and people built around the railroads that freight access was granted along the rear of those properties. A good example is 1st St N which lined the Chicago St. Paul and Minneapolis Omaha railroads; 3rd Ave which lined the Minneapolis St. Louis railroads and the Great Northern railroads; and then you can see also the spur corridors, they are highlighted in red on this map. By having those railroads as their locations it was really tough for trucks, carriages, to actually transfer goods through those freight spaces. That was dedicated purely for rail access, so other goods that came in or left these warehousing or manufacturing businesses other than by freight car needed another way to get access to those goods. You can carry them out of side doors, which is what they did, but a lot of times you see loading docks constructed to do that. That loading dock, and that physical feature of this historic district, and the canopies that covered those really tie back to this interconnection to the railroads and the warehousing industry and how it not only shaped location and location decisions of these industries and businesses but also really the physical shape of these buildings.

Just to talk about some of those physical features, and then I'll move on to how those buildings work out. One is the Great Northern and Minneapolis & St. Louis rail corridor and rail yard as it

exist today. Parking lots where the grade still exists. We do a fairly thorough job of evaluating that in the designation studies but I won't dive into the detail of that. Also the rail corridor to the right, on the right side of the images, runs from really the edge of the bridge on the Mississippi all through the district. The width of that rail corridor has changed but that grade separation still exists and activity still exists and kind of mirrors a lot of the input of some of the plans the city and county do in their intermodal station or is now calling the transportation interchange on this site. You'll see the Northstar platforms are in the rail corridor and I think November 16 we'll see active connections with passenger trains again. The Great Northern spur lines, I mentioned these before, again this picture on the left is the corridor between 3rd and 4th St, or Washington Ave and 3rd St. You can see all that's preserved, that space is preserved, the activity of these buildings that can be seen in the back of these buildings how some of them have built in loading docks and others have other features that are equipped to that freight access. And then between 3rd and 4th St, this picture is taken on 5th Ave N – there is actually still railroad lines sitting in the street. Just the fact that the city hasn't gotten to reconstructing all the streets in the district, which is good for preservation and the access to some of these lines is still there. Streets and alleys again, the street materials, the street widths, all these are very important in stating the character for the district.

So the evolution of buildings. This is one of those pieces that leads back to that criterion 4 and 6 of why these areas meet the criteria for designation. And really the architecture, not only is it unique architecture in its own right but it really is a kind of catalogue of the architectural styles and types of modern commercial development from 1865-1930. I think the last building was constructed in 1926. The first was that still exists in the district was from 1865. You really see every different set up and style design, some of the best architects in Minneapolis are represented here. Again, this is an older part of the warehouse district, some of the beginning growth. A lot of these buildings aren't the original buildings that were built in the 1860s. These buildings are logged, the Pacific Block I showed you was 1865 and the Lowry Morrison was 1867, but the rest really date to the 1870s and 1880s and while they're newer than what was originally built they weren't due to the fact that it was already platted area it was already a developed area, there was commercial activity when new construction occurred either because there was a fire or just new needs on buildings, the buildings really retained that footprint. So they are narrow, they still are relatively 2-3 stories, some of them are 4 stories, and they kind of have a different character than you'd find in the rest of the district. As you move through and move down 1st Ave in the north side you can kind of see the district evolving and changing and development not only in the style of the buildings which kind of demarcates the period when it was built, in the 1890 vs 1900 but also in size and scale in some of those relationship just as technology has increased moving from semi-mill construction to more of a modern concrete type construction. That is even more seen on Washington Ave where you see some of the most modern buildings built in the late 20s. They don't have as much decoration, they're not as ornate facades but they also have a different type of construction type which is really important when cataloging commercial growth in the district.

Moving on to resource evaluation and really talking about why and how we evaluated each of the resources and the district itself is really looking at the historic context set forth in the preservation plan and in the ordinance again where we looked at the three criteria that this district meets. The preservation plan identifies seven, I believe, contexts for local designation and how those contexts are important to the heritage of Minneapolis. This warehouse district is

identified as meeting the context of commerce which is part of the business industry context of the preservation plan, and also the architecture. So as we develop, we look at each in this district as a collection of that significance and that context, we also look at these individual buildings through that lens as well and start to evaluate all those resources for their integrity. And not integrity as commonly used but again integrity as relates to preservation which includes location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

Throughout all the evaluation we found that there were 254 total resources within the district. A hundred and thirty three of those (tape gap). The non-contributing resources are one of two types: one they were built outside the period of significance so they were done outside of the 1865-1930 period, so there is nothing earlier than 1865, so it's really 1930 and on; and then also they were modified so as not to convey their significance. So if a building was originally 4-5 stories and they chopped off 5 of the stories due to a fire or in some cases they put metal screens in front of these buildings, it really inhibits the ability of these resources to convey their significance. Also if the site once contained a building and now the site is a vacant lot, it's considered a non-contributing site. Throughout that evaluation it came down to defining a boundary based on all that. And the boundary is shown here on the map and identified in the staff report and also in the designation study. It contains, it matches the boundary of the 1989 National Register of Historic Places Warehouse Historic District. We evaluated again all these different resources and through a varied and complex lens show and discuss a lot more in the designation study. That evaluation again leads to this: there are four sites that were left that were in the local warehouse district that are not included in this national historic district. I can get in to those details later on if you would like.

So consistency with the adopted plans, to start out with the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth developed over the last couple of years finally was fully adopted by the City Council in 2009, Policy 8.1 of that says preserve, maintain, and designate district, landmarks, and historic resources which serve as reminders of the city's architecture, history, and culture. This does, by this action today, to designate the properties. It also implements implementation step 8.1.4 which states designate resources that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places that have no local protection, which is the warehouse historic district. It also is consistent with the Downtown East North Loop master Plan. This is a plan that was developed and adopted by the City Council in 2003. It was really developed around the Hiawatha Light-Rail lines moving into, and the development of that space, and also that future idea of this intermodal station, multimodal station, that would be connecting future rail lines and connections at the corners of 5th Ave N and really 4th Ave rail corridor. It's identified on the map from this district. The planning calls for the development of a multimodal station in the cut, which is really the 4th Ave N rail corridor and the Great Northern, or 4th Ave N rail corridor and the Great Northern rail corridor and the rail yards that are adjacent to that. So again, the designation would allow for the development to occur in this area. It is consistent with the Warehouse Action Plan which was adopted by the City Council in 2000 and that plan again calls for the local designation of the National Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District. It's also consistent with the Minneapolis Preservation Plan as I alluded to earlier and the quote below is also included in the staff report. I won't read it to you but really identifies how this area is important and that this district was actually called out in the Preservation Plan as being context for designation.

So moving on to reviews and comments. The City Planning Commission reviewed the designation study in September 2009. They found it was consistent with adopted plans and policies, which I have addressed now. There's a copy of that memo included in that report that you have been given. The State Historic Preservation Office also reviewed the designation. This is required by our ordinance and state law that the State Historic Preservation Office review that, and they found that it meets local designation criteria 1, 4, and 6, and I won't really dive into more of that but the letter that they wrote for the City is also included in your staff reports.

Just to kind of discuss the process that we've gone through to develop this, we've gone through numerous amounts of meetings and discussion on the warehouse district and just to show you this is also included in your report it really talks about since December the kind of communication and action that we've been doing in formal meetings where the warehouse designation has been on the agenda at meetings. We've had a lot of informal meetings with lots of stakeholders, but these are actually places where notices were given to meetings, they were on public agendas that were granted and handed out. Also I just kind of wanted to regroup and talk about all the other processes and pieces that were done, the actual physical notice that we usually send, the legal notices for meetings, the nomination hearing was January 13. That notice was sent out in December 28, 2008, so all the property owners in the district and within 350-feet of the district, so not only the properties within this but adjacent. The HPC walking tour and business meeting which occurred on October 6 included information on the process and date of this meeting, today, November 5, in that notice and that was sent out September 18, so property owners have had opportunity to know of this designation since they received that notice. And then finally the notice we sent out for this actual meeting, the legal notice, was sent out October 19, 2009. All that is commensurate with our preservation ordinance and the timelines set forth in our ordinance. I also want to discuss that this is an exterior designation. It hasn't, maybe wasn't very clear in the designation study, we only talked about the exterior of structures, but it is only an exterior designation so it will not affect the interior changes of the interior of properties except for the fact that if they wanted to change the exterior of the building – so replacement of windows or the blocking of windows would be considered an exterior change. Again, this talks about the review and the process that goes with that.

So before we move on, I kind of skipped another section of comments that you may have seen. You see there is a section in your staff reports with comments, one from Preserve Minneapolis who wrote a favorable letter supporting the designation. Also in your packets, a kind of addendum packet for today, you'll see letters from the National Trust for Historic Preservation supporting the local designation; a letter from the US Department of Interior, the National Park Service supporting the local designation; a letter from 2010 Partners, a local organization, asking to work together on the development of the design guidelines especially as it affects the rail yard section which we'll probably discuss later in the memo for the second item on your agenda; and then you'll also see a letter from Rick Bronson who identified some corrections and changes. Also appreciate getting corrections and changes, and these happened to be fairly minor in detail – the corrections he called out were in regard to the names of some of the architects, staff used abbreviations, first initial middle initial and last name in most cases and he was able to supply the full names. Some of the transcription errors when you go from an old building permit to a

record and a database to records on print, so we can make these changes and it's not a concern. He also helped identify new architects for some of the new buildings that we hadn't spent a whole lot of time researching these non-contributing buildings because they were built outside the period of significance. So we appreciate that help as well.

Moving on to the staff recommendation, we recommend that the HPC adopt the report included with all the attachments as Findings of Fact and submit those to the City Planning Commission with a recommendation to approve the district. We state that there's two conditions and it's not really conditions as much as two points that we want to identify. One, that the Minneapolis Historic District includes 254 resources evaluated and listed in the designation study, but those 254 resources don't always associate with one property identification number or one legal description of property. So there's roughly 250 properties, which just speaks to kind of the volume and webbing of the way resources and districts and property lines line up. That's not uncommon, actually the National Park Service in their bulletins in their development of district actually state that rarely do historic districts follow all parcel boundaries completely. So this doesn't, this is nothing unusual. Also as Jack alluded to, we're looking at doing the design guidelines back in January, bringing that back to the Commission for adoption in January 2010 and to an HPC business meeting in December 2009. So in that period of time the Secretary of Interior Standards for the treatment of historic properties will be used to evaluate alterations, just as they have been in the interim protection period. Again this isn't something that's unusual. The last two, and most of our designations but the last two in particular, the design guidelines haven't even been started until the designation has been fully approved and gone through the process. Again, that's nothing unusual, it's just part of the process we go under. There's a draft resolution, again, with a designation approval. It isn't necessarily the only thing that you can do. There's a draft resolution that the Commission can take up and we can discuss that after the testimony and after the Public Hearing.

So with that I think I'll open it up to questions.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, Brian. Thank you for all your work. This has been a long time coming and a lot of work on your part as well as the staff's, so thank you for your intensive efforts. So we'll open up to questions from the Commissioners and after that we'll open up the Public Hearing for comments. Questions from the Commissioners? Commissioner Kelley.

Commissioner Kelley: I wanted to echo my thanks that the Chair mentioned as well. We've covered a lot of questions in our previous meetings and in the walking tour. I had just one that I had forgotten to ask before and it's about non-contributing properties. Is non-contributing forever, or is it occasionally reversible.

Staff Schaffer: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Kelley, thank you, that's a great question. That actually is reversible. You will notice from the 1989 designation there were a few buildings that were considered non-contributing at the time. It happened to be that those buildings were also identified in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District as overlap and kind of the power of what local preservation and local regulatory review can actually provide. Those buildings had metal screens on them, they were obscured for numerous reasons and very insensitive modifications.

That screening has been removed from buildings, they've been rehabilitated, restored back to actually showing their integrity, show their significance. They have the integrity of design and the rest of the levels of integrity that we need to make the decision that they are contributing. There's a few buildings within the district now that have been obscured by that, by alterations that were obscured at the time of the designation in 1989 as well, the National Register listing. And so a property can become contributing again, especially if it's a building or a site or a resource that has that ability to make that flip.

Chair Larsen: I assume you are talking about buildings that were built within the period of significance, not a site that is vacant isn't going to become, isn't going to change from a non-contributing to a contributing property.

Staff Schaffer: Yes, Chair Larsen, thank you. Only things that were built or designed with the period of significance. Not everything that was in the district is actually a building that was designed, importantly a site, there is one contributing site which is the rail yards area, the Great Northern Minneapolis rail yards area and a lot of that significance has to do with the design of lowering that grade and that was a design that occurred, the buildings don't exist today but the design is important and significant so that would be a contributing resource but again, if it was a vacant site that doesn't have any of that significance left and has been evaluated that way in the designation study, it wouldn't likely come back as a contributing property.

Chair Larsen: Any other questions? Commissioner Crippen.

Commissioner Crippen: Forgive me if I missed this earlier, I was wondering if you could just give the briefest of background on how we got to the point of having a smaller local district that was different than the National District. Why wasn't the original local larger?

Staff Schaffer: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Crippen, that's another great question. It helps me out in things I may have glossed over in my presentation, which sometimes happens. The local district was designated in 1978 and again it was really focused on the wholesale industries of the warehousing group. And really that's why it's focus is looking really at 1st Ave N and a chunk of Washington and between 3rd and 2nd St. The National Register listing occurred in 1989, that study took place over the late years of the 1980s, so 1985-87, 88 and went through a very vetted process to get on the listing on the National Register. That was looking not only at the wholesaling part of the warehousing industry which was already locally designated but also the agricultural implement industry. The connection with the railroads was articulated in the local district during 1978 but really identified in a greater detail in the 1989 designation. So opening up that kind of lens really expanded the physical boundary not only in the number of resources and the importance of the district but that research matriculated at that point and has to do with a lot of different reasons. One, a willing person to do that designation study, one that occurred back in 1978 and one that occurred in 1989 and all the hard work that went into those and also the availability of that information. As you know in the 80s and 70s it was a lot harder to do a lot of the research that is a little bit easier now with electronic information.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Morse Kahn.

Commissioner Morse Kahn: Thank you so much for your work. I found a question rising just towards the end that what we're really designating are the exteriors of the buildings. My mind goes back to the spectacular interior architectural detail from the Metropolitan Building which we still mourn for loss. And a recent example I believe in the Whittier district of a house by well-known architects where the owners were quickly selling off the fine architectural interior detail. If we needed it, do we have an emergency response plan for renovation of a building which we know contains fine examples of the architectural detail?

Staff Schaffer: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Morse Kahn, yes and no. A lot of these again were warehousing buildings, hence their name, so a lot of their interiors were kind of secondary to their structure or their engineering style. They didn't really possess sometimes an amazing interior decorations. The Wyman Partridge Building had an really amazing inlay of a mosaic in the floor and some other buildings still have some of those resources. We have 500 N 3rd which is the Greene DeLaitte Grocery Warehouse building which is part of the reason we're here today, and that was really important because of an engineering type and changing from kind of the wood and semi-mill construction where the exterior was brick and really supported a lot of that load bearing capacity along with some of these interior pieces to using a reinforced concrete and the work of CAP Turner and others to really change the way we design buildings and kind of move that through. We haven't gone through and researched the interior of these buildings to a very high extent just because they've seen a whole lot of change. A lot of these buildings have gone through rehabilitations. Some very insensitive over the years that have been brought back. Some very sensitive from the beginning. And in that process a lot of the interior features have been lost. The exterior features are more prominent and easier to actually gain access to. If there was a known individual property that had an interior element that was important to its identity that stood alone from the district's identity which is more of this collection of development, this broad patterns and the work of the architects, kind of like 500 N 3rd which merited individual evaluation which is still occurring for its own individual designation because of its structural and engineering style, we can look back and evaluate that as we go forward. So if information comes out that says yes this property was another really amazing engineering feat, had a resource that stood on its own for individual designation, then that could come back to this commission and go through a nomination and designation process. But at this time, staff didn't prepare the work or do the evaluation for the interior designation as a district.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Anderson: You and I talked about the Thresher Building and the Tri-American Building which, now I'm glad you mention them in your report. I realize this is an area designation, not an industrial agricultural or railroad, schools, identification, whatever, but I'm glad you mentioned those two buildings because they are extraordinary buildings and they certainly fit the criteria of this designation.

Staff Schaffer: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Anderson, those are actually individually designated landmarks within the City of Minneapolis, so they are protected resources.

Chair Larsen: Alright, any additional questions before we open up the Public Hearing? Seeing none, I think moving forward here I just want to welcome all of you and invite you to come up if you have something to say and ask that you speak clearly into the microphone. If there is a sign in sheet out in the hallway, even if you haven't signed in yet but do end up making a comment that you sign in, you clearly state your name for the record as we will be transcribing this and ask that you state your address for the record as well. We ask that you focus your comments on the history and design of the properties in the area rather than what will come next as Mr. Byers mentioned we will be addressing that in our design guidelines if we do indeed adopt the district, and that will be coming up on December 5. I understand that Commissioner McLaughlin is interested in making remarks focused on the intermodal station so we will entertain that first before we open it up to other public comments.

Commissioner McLaughlin: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm Peter McLaughlin, Hennepin County Commissioner and Chair of the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority. In that regard, I want to invite everybody to the celebration at the junction of Northstar and Hiawatha on the 14th of November, a week from Saturday. We're going to have the railroads up and operating. Secondly, if I might just take two seconds, Richard Moe was mentioned and his tenure as Chair at the National Trust for Historic Preservation. I just want to commend him publicly in front of this body. He provided inspiration and encouragement to me and to Hennepin County to do the work that we've been doing with others out at Fort Snelling. We had some early conversations with him and he gave us some direction and gave us some support along the way and it's one of the main reasons why we've made progress, we've actually reversed the deterioration of those historic buildings on the bluff, the upper bluff at Fort Snelling. And finally I just thought the context here today of the discussions go back always in politics. I used to run in to people who worked at Minneapolis Moline and the discussion of the implement dealers, I'd run in to folks who had worked there and it was always quite the history that they could tell of the region and the state.

I'm here today and just want to talk briefly, if I could. I'm going to kind of break your rule Mr. Chairman, a little bit talking about where we're going. I just want to provide a little bit of context. I'm very appreciative of the progress that's been made. This transportation interchange is a very big deal and I want to thank the staff at the City, good work from the County people, and the 2010 Partnership and others, the neighborhood organization in trying to come together on something that's actually going to work for now and in the future. I think there's been great progress made and the designation of this rail yard sub area I think is very important to this endeavor in which we are engaged. So I just want to do a quick run through if I could just to provide some context to the members of the HPC so that you know what is being discussed in and around this district that you are on the verge of creating here today. So, this is talking about a transportation interchange where these many lines are coming together. It's going to serve the whole state, it's going to support the region, and these are the various transit lines that are either up and operating, being built, or being planned right now in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. And then we want to make sure that this connects to the City. This is again an important coming together of transportation pieces here in the City of Minneapolis. I just want to run through the elements here. We have, you can see the ballpark, that's 5th St that the train line is running down. We have Hiawatha up and operating as an LRT line, Central Corridor will come in on the same

line on 5th St. That's scheduled to open in 2014. We just designated the route for Southwest, it will come in there as well and Bottineau from the Northwest will come in here as well. So four LRT lines coming to this point adjacent to the historic district. We have commuter and intercity rail, we have Northstar opening on the 16th of November. We have Northern Lights Express, the line to Duluth, the Midwest High Speed Rail which goes to Chicago. We're planning a dual hub, one in St. Paul and one here, two stops in the Twin Cities and then the Red Rock corridor from Hastings through St. Paul to Minneapolis. We have the Cedar Lake bicycle trail which is under, we've constructed it under the ballpark and there are negotiations going on now that will allow it to be built all the way to the river and you'll be able to get to Carver County without crossing a street. It's quite an achievement and it is a part of the transportation hub that we're creating here as part of the interchange.

There are three major garages and transit hubs within walking distance of the hub, the interchange, and are part of the interchange. These are major transportation, sources of transportation in all directions from this spot. We have the parking facilities that we're all familiar with and we have the skyway connections which are an integral part of the Minneapolis Transportation System, connections to the entertainment district, the waste energy plant nearby which is now connected to the district heating system – so we have a grand convergence at this location immediately adjacent to the historic district on the 5th St side and including some of the parcels in the rail yard section are in fact a part of the historic district as well as the Ford building.

I just want to give a brief summary here of what's going to happen. On November 16 and every workday thereafter there are going to be 240 train arrivals and departures at this spot. So a week and a half from now, 240 trains are going to arrive and depart from this spot. When Central arrives there will be another 240 on top of that. This is just that Hiawatha and there will be another 240 trains. If you bring in the Northstar it's another 12 so essentially there will be 250 rail operations November 16 and upwards of 500 in the middle of 2014 when Northstar arrives and there'll be some additional changes as well. Southwest and Bottineau won't bring any additional trains because these will be through trains running through from Southwest to Central to Bottineau to Hiawatha, but it will be opening up two additional quadrants of the metropolitan area to transportation. The estimates of 2000 bicycle riders a day, and from my experience down on the Midtown Greenway in the summertime it's a traffic jam now and as we make these connections you get geometric increases in the number of riders. Bus garages, its 2100 bus arrivals and departures at these three facilities that are going to be directly connected as a part of the transportation interchange. So we're talking about 2400 transit arrivals and departures starting on November 16 moving to above 2600 by the time the Central Corridor opens up. Then we have the parking ramps which have an enormous number of spaces as we're well aware.

So what we're trying to do is, number one engage the public. We've participated in the creation with great civic leadership from the neighborhoods, from business communities, with Chuck Leer as our Chair at 2010 Partners. They've been doing studies first in conjunction with the ballpark and then the ballpark and beyond opening day and beyond. Creating a vision for this area. The county is engaged in a couple studies here to start determining just how many tracks we need. How many platforms we need. And trying to figure out what the sequencing would be as it is

built out. We did a workshop at HDR to look at conceptual work. We're not there, this is just to get the basic concepts in place. And we have recently hired a consultant to provide leadership on this project. Ed Hunter who has been involved with the ballpark will be taking the lead. So far there has been \$53 million worth of public and private investment in the public realm, I'm not talking ballpark proper, we're not talking home plate, second base, anything like that, and we're not talking about the train, the basics of the train. We're talking about additional enhancements that create this interchange, this district where we have this transportation convergence that we see as a catalyst for development as well. So you see the ballpark authority, which is essentially money that was made available by the sales tax from the County, the Twins contribution and on top of that you have the Twins direct contribution of \$19 million including the vertical circulation building between Northstar and Hiawatha. Target and the Twins contributed \$9 million to enhance the plaza which is an integral part of the pedestrian realm that we are trying to create. Then we have the County and City contributions. MN DOT and the City on the connections to the ramps and then some Federal stimulus money to help with the bike ramp. Fifty three million dollars that's been invested already to create this district because we want to make it work and we're building it piece by piece.

I just want to show you one little example. This is some simulations that were done through the 2010 partnership. This is what it looks like right now. Kind of grim as you look toward the ballpark there from, is it 3rd or 2nd? 2nd. This is another view, and now we're starting to see things that are being contemplated here that are part of these investments that are being made. A little greening, screening that probably won't come about at this point, some trees, additional trees, better sidewalk, some screening through a fence, a bike, some bike facilities that would be a part of this, and people of course. We're going to populate this. That's what we're looking at though, that's the kind of thing that we're trying to do here in this interchange because it's about not only the facilities and the vertical circulation but it's about horizontal circulation to these various facilities that we have and making the connections to the city. And lighting on top of this, which is probably not going to happen through, we have maintenance questions that are associated with the lights but this is an opportunity that we see to create this interchange. One of two new gigantic regional centers, the other being the Depot in St. Paul, being driven by these transit investments. So we appreciate the work that has been done as we try to create this and work with the staffs at the City and the County we are able to put together here to make sure there was an acknowledgment that this interchange which is an integral part of the City's longterm plan which goes back to some of the railroad history that was here, and we want to build for our railroad future that will be able to work hand in glove with the historic district, which you're about to designate. So again, we thank the staffs and thank the others who have helped to contribute to all this.

Chair Larsen: Thank you very much, we'll be eager partners. Alright, so with that we'll open up to additional public comment. If you wish to come forward speaking for or against, please step forward and state your name and address for the record.

Doug Wardlow: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my name is Doug Wardlow and I'm with Parker Rosen LLC, address is 300 1st Ave N, #200, Mpls 55402. I represent the owners of the properties lying in the railroad's area, subarea as I've heard it called this evening, the properties

generally lying between Washington Ave N on the north or northeast side, and 5th St N on the south or southwest side and along what would be 4th Ave N and to the southeast or east of 4th Ave S.

Chair Larsen: I'm going to stop you for a moment, real quick, Brian can we get the map of the district, the proposed district, up on the screen? Yup, that works.

Doug Wardlow: Fantastic, thank you. So the properties lying between Washington Ave N here on the northeast side and this property I'm outlining here following it all the way down to 5th Ave N including these parcels, this southwest end ... so it's running along what would be 4th Ave N here and to the southeast ...

Chair Larsen: So in the trench?

Doug Wardlow: Oh yes, this is what has been referred to as the cut for the railyards and these are parking lots. On behalf of the owners of these properties I respectfully object to the inclusion of these properties within the historic local warehouse boundaries and to their designation as contributing historic resources. Nothing about these properties has historic significance, much less significance rising to a level warranting designation pursuant to the criteria or otherwise. Any such designation or inclusion would be arbitrary and capricious. Moreover, including these properties within the local historic district boundaries and designating them as contributing resources I believe diminishes the historic preservation process as well as the import of the designation of properties of true historic value. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, is there anybody else that wishes to speak for or against, please step forward.

Chuck Leer: Thank you Mr. Chair, my name is Chuck Leer. I'm here today on behalf of 2010 Partners, a group of public and private stakeholders that is committed to creating a new urban center in the area around the ballpark. As Peter was mentioning, we really are going back to the future here in this area in the railyards and it was interesting to hear Brian's presentation about what was the impetus for growth in this area and what we're seeing today. We've weighed in, 2010 Partners has weighed in, several times on this proposed designation. We started in January and we've submitted a couple other submissions this week as well that came out of a meeting last week of the 2010 Partners membership. I'm not going to repeat what's in that letter other than just basically summarizing it seems that we're moving in the right direction.

What 2010 Partners has always been about is collaboration and communication. It took awhile I think for the communication collaboration to connect but it sounds like we're moving in that direction and in that spirit we're hopeful that we can get to the end. I wouldn't be completely honest with you if I didn't say that we're a little concerned about when designations precede the final guidelines, that we don't know exactly what all of this means at this point. But I think that there's a lot of faith and trust that's going around right now and I think that that's good, that's what collaborations are all about. From what we've seen, it seems to be moving in the right direction but let me just point out one thing as I was listening to the presentation, and I'm

looking at the designation study, one of the things that concerns people like me when we see this, Item #245 is a contributing element and it's the designation of a historic rail track, ok, which may be wonderful except when that comes into potential conflict with the real thing. I mean that's an historic track as Peter was showing, demonstrating there's going to be a lot of new tracks coming into this area as well. I mean I expect there will be some new track or some movement of tracks and how do we resolve that. It seems to me that it's an important thing to address under the guidelines. I'm not talking about a building, we're talking about an areaway, about something that there's sort of a shadow, a memory of what was in the past and then what does that mean relative to what we're trying to do going forward. Those sometimes end up to be tough questions. It's very difficult to develop like what we're trying to do now, we're trying to achieve a world class facility, can we do that?

We had some wonderful images of a new station in Copenhagen that we were going to try to show you, but we'll have to do it at a later time, maybe when the guidelines come through. But these images, and I think the ideas, are soaring and we want the past to be the foundation but the future is probably is going to look like something different and we'd like to be able to marry the two together and create something here which is truly wonderful for our city and our community. So back to #245, one of the ideas that we laid out in the letter was that best practices ought to be what we follow and one of the ideas in the best practices area is testing. Testing the guidelines against what some of the reality might be, and this seems to me has popped out of me as one of the obvious ones that we ought to be looking at.

But we like the staff collaboration that's occurring right now. It seems, again, like everything is moving in the right direction and we too, Mr. Chair, are willing partners as 2010 Partners, and thank you for coming to the table.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Is there anybody else that wishes to speak, please step forward.

David Frank: Good afternoon, I'm David Frank I work for a real estate company, Schaffer Richardson, I'm the president of the North Loop Neighborhood Association, I proudly serve on the steering committee of 2010 Partners, but I'm here tonight as myself, as a guy who thinks about this district a lot as I know you do. I want to commend you and especially your staff for what I know has been a lot of work. On the topic of back to the future, when Warren Buffet invests \$35 billion in railroads, right, it's not just the past it is clearly the future and I know it's not on the point for tonight until a little bit later but I just need to say when people who know that I pay attention to this stuff say is this a good thing? My answer is always it depends entirely on what the guidelines say. Ok. So you have a lot of say so, not especially right now, but in the future, about what those guidelines say, so we have our hopes high and we'll look forward to working with you on that. Thank you very much.

Chair Larsen: We take that very seriously as well. Anybody else, please step forward. Seeing none, I'm going to close the public hearing. Commissioners, comments, questions?

Commissioner Crippen: Question for Brian if I could. I don't think we've talked very much about the former railyards that, along 2nd St N on that map, that aren't included. They're not on

the National Register district. We've talked a lot about the cut and one of the public comments was saying whether or not that should be included. Why is the former railyard on the cut that's now a parking lot included in the district but not the stuff along 2nd St N, what's the difference between those two?

Staff Schaffer: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Crippen, great question. Two real differences in that. One, what has happened on that site and really the ability of a resource when we talk about evaluating their integrity. It is not only important as a significant part of the district but how has it conveyed that significance. That area, the property that you're discussing really bounded by 4th Ave N and 8th Ave N and 1st and 2nd Streets was the, is the old Pacific Railroad railyards. Actually the bridge that accesses that space still exists, it's been infilled certainly, but it still exists and is actually a contributing resource and was identified that in the National designation. The reason why a resource like this doesn't include it now is that it doesn't have the ability to convey that significance. It was below grade, it had a significant grade change at the time. That feature is lost. Its design really is lost, all that's left is this megablock design that has no other aspect of importance. When you move into the railyards there's a real key development there – there's really this man involvement in 1890 when the lawsuit was settled between the railroads and the city and that significant grade change and how that all really facilitated the rest of the growth and interconnecting this and is really evident with that grade change. And that grade change is still there today, it's still a significant feature. It's really the significant design element of that site. The buildings, the railyards, the ones that are there, are all really good features but they don't exist at this time. And the reason why it's a contributing site and not a noncontributing site is really based on the fact that it has its integrity of design based on the lower of the grade and that connection with the significance of the district and the railroads and the warehousing connection. The site that you referenced, the Pacific railroad site, doesn't possess that.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Mack.

Commissioner Mack: Maybe I could expand on that a little bit, could you describe the edges of the district that are, what, why is it doing that?

Staff Schaffer: It really has to do with, I guess I can start at 12 o'clock and go around in a circle if we will or just talk about some of the main pieces. The reason why it cuts out this location right here, again, is that none of that integrity of those resources, was no longer intact. When the district was evaluated in 1989, that was the case. Today, that is also the case. As you go around the district there's other locations that really, do you want me to go through the whole boundary evaluation process or would you want just that particular ... because I could, I don't want to bore you or monopolize everyone's time ...

Commissioner Mack: Could we start with the area in dispute, I can't point because, well I can point but it doesn't do any good, but the area that we're discussing just with John's question down between, where the railyards are. What's included, what isn't included, what are the edges there like and maybe you could even refer some buildings so that we have a better sense of what is there.

Staff Byers: While Brian is lining that up, I just want to reiterate that the boundaries that are there are the same boundaries as the National Register district, so we haven't proposed different boundaries from that district.

Staff Schaffer: Hopefully the aerial photo of this helps a little bit, it's still kind of grainy. But what's really included in this site, there's a jogging of that site and that was actually done in '89 and that was when the construction of those tad ramps were there and it really lost the features. That really was the actually street wall along 3rd Ave N that existed at one point. Those are all buildings, all lost, that's why it jogs back. That was lost due to that construction. The actual features in that site, again, all about the elevation change, all about the grade change and all the importance that comes to the significance and the interconnectedness really manifested itself physically in that format. So again, it follows and includes the properties that really front 3rd Ave N with the exception of where the garage C ramp is located. It follows 5th Ave or 5th St, and goes over the bridge and includes that edge of the bridge down 5th Ave N and includes those resources as well.

Staff Byers: So let me take a crack at it if I could too. To reiterate what Brian has said is that the, I think that often when it's a knee jerk reaction that we all have and we all deal with through every item but the tendency is to think of preservation as just about buildings but what we have in the warehouse district is a total environment and in today's terms what it is more often referred to as a cultural landscape. So it's the buildings, the railyards, the alleys, the loading docks, and it is the grade change as well. So just to put a point on what Brian has stated in his presentation is that when that bridge was built over the river and rail access was made to, frankly this half of the city, this half of the continent, what evolved was generators of the built form which later on resulted in buildings but that really came from the pattern of rail lines and there was a number of different railyards that were important but this one that is down at the rapid park site was the critical one. And that one became critical because as the rails evolved that one also evolved at grade, but those at grade rail lines that ran across north 3rd St and north 4th St and 5th St and so on, they prevented the expansion of the streetcar lines. And the streetcar lines that Thomas Lowry was building was really critical to the internal residential and commercial fabric of the rest of the city. So there was this conflict between regional economic growth and local development at the same time. So Thomas Lowry and others sued the City and there was a settlement between the city and the railroads and that settlement called for that major railyard there at the rapid park site, for the grade to be lowered so that the commercial rail lines (tape gap).

The reason that that site is contributing is not because there are any buildings left, the buildings that were on that site were incidental. They were really only just one story buildings that were transfer sites between trains and spur rail lines and trucks. So it's not the buildings that were on that site that were important. What's important is that court settlement and the fact that that entire area was excavated and pulled down 20 or 30 feet so that these lines could all interact together, and that's what's left. The buildings aren't left, but it's actually that grade separation which is left and that's what conveys the significance and integrity of the district.

Chair Larsen: Does that answer your question?

Commissioner Mack: Can you trace the grade for me?

Staff Schaffer: From the point of that settlement for the sake of what we define as the railyards really it is the Washington Ave space, obviously north Washington was also part of the excavation and the grade change but really when the railroad came through, you know I'm going to see if I can trace it here ... so it came through 1st and 2nd St, they were always bridged and had a different elevation, Washington again throughout the streetcar really operated on Washington Ave and then later on 5th St N. But the grade separation would have occurred just north of the Washington Ave N bridge running, if we're running along the northwest edge, really along which would be the railroad tracks as they exist, you can see the grade change and where it would have been, kind of very similar to what it is now on the back side of those buildings that front Washington and 3rd there you can actually see where the curb, that one building is actually a spur line coming off. And as you start to rise up, travel south towards 3rd St you see that grade change come up again, so you can see that there was some excavation and then some inversion of that to bring that soil back up to allow for that bridging. So that follows pretty much that line across over, down, this is where we consider railyards. Everything really that you see on the north side of 4th Ave N corridor occurred after the grade separation so it's really separation to explain where that definition of line ended just because everything's integrated into that new grade. The more effective and visual distinction is along the south barrier and you can see that more with the Traffic Zone building which is the old Minneapolis Moline building, kind of at that 3rd Ave N level and the traffic street as it starts to slope down to the site. The Union Plaza two buildings which are located behind the Traffic Zone building here, those two buildings were built after the grade changes so you can see that their doors and their elevations of the main floor are different. In pictorial evidence if you found pictures from the period of significance and just after, you can see the bridging and how that occurred. You can still see the bridge across the side of, on this side of the street here on 3rd Ave N. The facilities you see here along, which is the cold storage building, Minnekada, along with the Crane building, Bag Company and a few other buildings, you can see that front façade built up at higher level and then the backside really dropping off at the grade. Hopefully that answers, it's tough to try and trace it here but I will do a little bit of backtracking or forward tracking I guess to show you kind of just another visual reference to that.

Staff Byers: So while Brian's finding that slide, to address your question and mark a couple of buildings, the four corners of that site, if you will, would be on the northwest, the security warehouse, which is right at the rail track and Washington Ave N. Down on the southwest is the Ford Center, then on the southeast is the Minnekata Storage Building and then on the northeast is the Union Station building and actually dé-jà vu which is up on Washington. So everything that's in the center was dropped down after that lawsuit or settlement.

Staff Schaffer: So, again, this is that Sanborn map we showed earlier. The intersection at Washington Ave at grade and you can kind of see the really, difference in the existing structures at the time. This is 1885-1889. You don't see much here that really dates to that period of significance or date to what we were talking about in that building. You see mostly residential structures, you see some commercial structures that line the backside of the Minneapolis St.

Louis railroad lines. Those buildings are now where that garage C is located and then you can see the cold storage and the Minnekata buildings here. And then as you go forward you can see how that manifests itself differently in new construction.

Chair Larsen: Does that answer your question? Ok, Commissioner?

Commissioner Elliott: Just a quick question, what happens to the handful of properties on the very south edge of our current local district that will no longer be in the National District or will no longer be in the district at all?

Staff Schaffer: As part of this process, those would no longer be under the local designation. Those are four parcels that are currently vacant sites. At the time of the local designation in 1978 they were vacant sites. The 1989 designation looked through those and their evaluation of that was that there was nothing there and that's why the boundaries as Commissioner Crippen and Commissioner Mack indicated, why are they jagged, it's really related to the significance of the features that were there at the time and how you connect those features and draw boundaries. Those boundaries were drawn and the boundaries that are proposed for the Minneapolis Historic District were all based on evaluation processes used for the National Register designation process. Not the one that was done in 1989 but the actual process laid out by the National Park Service to create boundaries. Those parcels would actually no longer be designated.

Chair Larsen: Alright, any other questions, comments? Commissioner Kelley?

Commissioner Kelley: I had a question, but you answered it and I think I'm going to take a chance and say I'm ready to move that we adopt staff findings and designate this historic district.

Commissioner Crippen: I'll second that.

Chair Larsen: Alright, with that I think that staff has prepared, if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Schaffer, to help us out a little bit you have some suggested language that might be helpful?

Staff Schaffer: Chair Larsen, thanks for the reminder of that. We did prepare a draft resolution for you today to do more than just move staff recommendation and the clerk will hand those out to you. I'll put one on the cam here for everyone to see. I'll read it out loud, and knowing us it is wordy.

Staff Byers: Unlike the typical Certificate of Appropriateness it is important because we're doing a designation to actually have a resolution with formal language.

Staff Schaffer: I'm just going to read it for the record. Resolution of the Heritage Preservation Commission of the City of Minneapolis

Resolved by the Heritage Preservation Commission of the City of Minneapolis

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis Warehouse District is a 30-block area located immediately west of the downtown core and south of the Mississippi River and contains a total 254 individual historic resources

on a total of 285 public and private properties, all of which are included in the Planning Director's report; and

WHEREAS, the boundaries for the district were determined by the highest concentration of warehouse buildings, the buildings of associated industries and historic infrastructure such as rail corridors, streets, and alleys; and

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis Warehouse District was nominated for local designation by the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission on January 13, 2009, and a designation study was undertaken by the Community Planning and Economic Development Department of the City of Minneapolis and is included in the Planning Director's report; and

WHEREAS, the local designation of the Minneapolis Warehouse District to encompass the boundaries of the existing district listed on the National Register of Historic Places was directed by the Minneapolis City Council when they adopted the *Warehouse Action Plan* in 2000; and

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis Warehouse District local designation will include all of the properties and historic resources within the current National Register of Historic Places Minneapolis Warehouse District; and

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis Warehouse District meets the contexts of commerce and architecture as identified in the Minneapolis Preservation Plan adopted by the City Council in 1991; and

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis Warehouse District meets Local Designation Criterion One: the property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history; Local Designation Criterion Four: the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style or method of construction; and Local Designation Criterion Six: the property exemplifies works of master builders, engineers, designers, artists, craftsmen, or architects; and

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis Warehouse District designation is consistent with City Council adopted plans and the policies they contain including *The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth (2009)*, the *Downtown East North Loop Master Plan (2003)*, and the *Warehouse Action Plan (2000)*; and

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis Warehouse District local designation has been reviewed and favorably commented upon by the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office and the City Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Director's report, along with the written comments and oral testimony given at the designation public hearing on November 5, 2009, has been considered and will be forwarded to the City Council;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission recommends to the Minneapolis City Council that the Minneapolis Warehouse District shall be designated as a Local Historic District.

Adopted by the Heritage Preservation Commission of the City of Minneapolis this 5th day of November 2009.

Staff Byers: Mr. Chair and Commissioner Kelley, this is submitted for your consideration and its really up to the commission whether you choose to use it and if you choose to modify it or not.

Commissioner Kelley: May I alter my motion to adopt this resolution as written.

Chair Larsen: Ok, so there's a motion on the floor to adopt the resolution as prepared by staff for the Minneapolis Warehouse District.

Commissioner Anderson: I'll second the motion.

Chair Larsen: Alright, Commissioner Anderson, second by Commissioner Anderson. Are there comments on the motion? Commissioner Crippen.

Commissioner Crippen: In the spirit of matching the diligence of the staff with the designation study and what have you, I might suggest a couple quick changes. Fix the spelling of the fourth clause on Whereas, and substitute semi-colons for commas on the sixth clause for ease of readability so you can get the 3 criterion separated. Those are my suggestions.

(conversation unclear)

Chair Larsen: Alright, that is acceptable to the motioner and the seconder?

Commissioner Kelley: Yes.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Anderson?

Commissioner Anderson: Yes

Chair Larsen: Alright, any comments on the motion? Alright, I'll make a comment. I think it's important before we take a vote just to take a quick step back. We've been looking at this for a long time and clearly the City has as well. I'm pleased and I hope the commissioners are as well, that we're taking that final step that was intended a long time ago and I think it's important to consider that we are embarking on a new era in terms of integration of rail and other modes of transportation just as it was, there was some conflict back when this area was growing and I think that we'll continue to see new growth. Me, personally, I'm excited by that opportunity and I think one of the hopes that I have is it creates this designation really does preserve and allow for new development in an area such that we can 5, 10, 15, 20 years from now recall that this is still the Minneapolis Warehouse District. It will have many new buildings, it will have many new features, but at the same time when you walk down the street you'll know why, the whys and the wherefors of why it was there. I think if you take examples and learn from the past, if you consider the areas south of 1st and north of Washington on the southeast side of Hennepin where many buildings were clear cut and demolished there is no sense of past and history. And that has changed the city forever. I think in a negative way. So I think this opportunity to preserve the heritage of the city moreso than just in the buildings but in the landscape and the cultural features will be important for years to come. So I'm eager to support this nomination.\

Commissioner Anderson: I would like to thank Commissioner McLaughlin for tying the future into our discussion here today and I'm going to vote for this motion.

Chair Larsen: Alright, any other comments? Commissioner Crippen.

Commissioner Crippen: This one perhaps more relevant, I'm interested in the public comments that were along the lines of the proof in the pudding here will be in the design guidelines and I appreciate the staff recommending a month or so ago that they get delayed because they weren't quite right and they get them right. I'm really intrigued by, I think we can set some new groundbreaking roles here by thinking about urban cultural landscapes in new ways and designing things such that we can preserve the landscape while still allowing growth, so I think that's an exciting thing and an exciting challenge for us coming up next.

Chair Larsen: Alright, any further discussion?. Seeing none, we'll call the roll.

Clerk: Commissioner Morse Kahn?

Commissioner Morse Kahn: Aye.

Clerk: Elliott?

Commissioner Elliott: Aye.

Clerk: Anderson?

Commissioner Anderson: Aye.

Clerk: Crippen?

Commissioner Crippen: Aye.

Clerk: Larsen?

Chair Larsen: Aye.

Clerk: Lemmon?

Commissioner Lemmon: Aye.

Clerk: Mack?

Commissioner Mack: Aye.

Clerk: Kelley?

Commissioner Kelley: Aye.

Chair Larsen: That motion carries. Congratulations Commissioners, staff, members of the public and I think Commissioner Crippen put it well. If we look to cities around the world, they

have been struggling with development and the history and the future for longer than we have and they seem to have managed it quite well. I'm confident we can do the same.