

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Estenson, Rhonda Pownell, Jim Pokorney, Tim Geary, Mike Berthelsen, Pete Sandberg, Scott Richardson, Jay Jasnoch, Christopher Sawyer, and Neil Lutsky

MEMBERS ABSENT: Erica Zweifel and Tracy Davis

ALSO PRESENT: EDA Board Member's Steve Engler, Victor Summa, and Marty Benson, Mark Koegler, Jim McMenimen, Economic Development Manager Jody Gunderson, Community Development Director Brian O'Connell and other interested persons

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m.

I) **Introduction**

Jeff McMenimen provided an introduction to the meeting and reviewed the agenda. He briefly discussed a number of handouts including information on design trends prepared by ProLogis, the PowerPoint prepared by Design Workshop summarizing the market analysis activities to date and accompanying memorandums prepared by Design Workshop. Jeff mentioned that the starting point for the initial project charrette activities was the list of target uses prepared by Design Workshop. The full market analysis is expected to be complete in early to mid January.

Per the initial market findings, Northfield can expect to absorb approximately 2 million square feet of industrial land in the next 20 years. This equates to a total of approximately 200 acres of land. Mike Berthelsen asked what assumptions went into the absorption rate. Jeff McMenimen responded that absorption assumptions will be clearly documented in the final market analysis report. Jay Jasnoch commented that it would be interesting to see what Northfield's absorption has been over the past 10 years. The group had a brief discussion of floor area ratios (FAR) and Northfield's growth projections. Brian O'Connell then provided a brief commentary on Northfield's Development Code and the floating zone and mentioned that the master planning process is expected to help inform future land use regulations.

II) **Charrette Update and Review/Discussion**

McMenimen reviewed the charrette format including the project sites tour, the post tour meeting, the afternoon work session and an overview of the concepts that prepared during day one and presented at the late afternoon pin-up session. Two concepts were prepared for each site. He then provided an overview of day two of the charrette including the morning steering committee discussion, and the concepts that were prepared and discussed at the late afternoon pin-up session. The session featured three concepts for the north site and one for the south site. Jeff then reviewed a meeting handout that included common themes that were recorded from comments by the steering committee and general public. The group then had a brief discussion about agriculture as a holding use or long-term use on the north site.

Based upon comments by several of the steering committee members, the group discussed phasing – specifically, how to allow for flexibility by individual phases of the project while retaining flexibility for the mix of uses on the entire north parcel. The relationship between phasing and infrastructure was noted. The group wondered if zones would have well defined uses or if they would be flexible. It was

noted that some of the initial concepts have more of a center and might lend themselves to a more radial implementation pattern rather than blocks of land. The committee also commented on how the north site would be integrated into the Northfield community. Members wondered if people working in the industrial park would go downtown and whether or not people from other areas of the community would go to the new industrial park area. It was agreed that HKGi would prepare graphics for the next meeting that would show the industrial park site in the context of the larger community in order to examine connections throughout Northfield.

In a continuation of the phasing discussion, it was suggested that consideration be given to using “units” rather than “phases”. Phases may have too close of a connotation to actual periods of time and a sequential progression pattern. It was generally agreed that it is important to tie down the Cedar Avenue extension through the north site as early in the process as possible.

It was noted that Concept “C” lends itself to a potential phasing scenario that starts with the mixed use node and spirals out into other land uses. The concept depicts a pattern of “fingers” of uses rather than “blocks” of uses. Regarding potential future users, it was suggested that the project team collaborate with Jody to examine all of the companies that have contacted Northfield in the past 5 to 10 years and determine where they might hypothetically locate in the new north industrial area in accordance with each of the concepts.

Jeff McMenimen reminded the group that the concepts at this point are very preliminary and that the task for the project team over the next two or three months is to refine the concepts, add appropriate detail to each and prepare them for subsequent steering committee review and review by the public at an open house.

III) **Ideas**

Mark Koegler suggested that the remaining minutes of the meeting be used to generate a list of reactions and ideas that resulted from the charrette. Steering committee members noted the following:

- Consideration should be given to establishing an eco-industrial park – something with a “wow factor”.
- What will make the new industrial park part of Northfield?
- How will the new industrial park be different from parks in other communities?
- Can Northfield’s unique community qualities be used to create a unique industrial park?
- Northfield doesn’t want or need a “cookie cutter” pattern of industrial uses.
- How does Northfield compete?
- Northfield should emphasize its unique attributes including two noted college campuses – can the industrial park have a campus organization – quads? – carry the campus idea to the industrial setting.
- Are there examples of cities that have implemented their eco-industrial visions?
- Can Northfield develop a self conscious, healthy workplace campus? Can this be a goal that is reflected in the infrastructure of the place?

After a review of the schedule, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.