

DRAFT REPORT
LOWER HILL COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS' MEETING
NOVEMBER 4, 2019

At the October 18, 2019 meeting of **Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh's ("URA")** Board of Directors, Hill District Community Stakeholders submitted and read aloud a letter which addressed their concerns about the Term Sheet for Blocks A, B and E of the Lower Hill Site. Responding to these concerns, URA Board members formally requested that URA staff:

1. Identify requests made in the letter;
2. Identify the entities, agencies, and/or parties, including the URA, with the authority to address the requests;
3. Form a working group with Stakeholders to create an action plan, and;
4. Present to the Board an initial action plan and report on the proceedings of working group meeting(s) within 30 days.

In response, a Hill District Community Stakeholders' meeting was coordinated by URA staff, the **Hill District Community Development Corporation (the "Hill CDC")**, the City of Pittsburgh, the **Sports and Exhibition Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County ("SEA")**, and other community stakeholders. The first meeting was held October 29, 2019 and is summarized in a separate report.

The report on the second meeting, held November 4, 2019 at the Ebenezer Baptist Church, is broken down into sections which reflect one or more of the 17 requests made in the Community Stakeholders' letter. It generally follows the chronology of the meeting; however, some discussions are arranged to optimize clarity and may not follow the exact course of proceedings. Participants who spoke are identified and their comments summarized, rather than quoted verbatim.

PLEASE NOTE: *This report is subject to review and may be updated through **Monday, November 18, 2019**. Statements attributed to any party may modified upon the written request of that party. These and all other requests to update or change the report must be submitted in writing to Daniel Grantham via e-mail (at dgrantham@ura.org) by November 18, 2019. As requested by its members, the finalized version of the notes will be provided to the URA Board on Tuesday, November 19, 2019.*

LOWER HILL COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS' MEETING
NOVEMBER 4, 2019
LOCATION: EBENEZER BAPTIST CHURCH, PITTSBURGH, PA

ATTENDEES: Kat Baklcrania; Ardie Bankton; Knowledge Build-Hudson; Glenn Burtch; Margaret Burtch; Dr. Vincent Campbell; Lisa Coleman; Clarence Curry; Robert Damewood; Maya Fewes; David Geiger; Thomas Graham; Daniel Grantham; Glenn Grayson, Jr.; Glenn Grayson, Sr.; Dr. Rhonda Hall; Carol Hardeman; Cleophus Harris; Franklin Harris; Kimberly O. Hassan; Michelle Heideman; Victoria Jennings; Harry Johnson III, Neshia Johnson; Majestic Lane; Rhonda Lockett; Tracey McCants Lewis; M.D. MacMillan; Dave K. McNutt; Marimba Milliones; Delvina Morrow; Ron Perkins, Rif Qureshi; Jessica Smith Perry; Richard Taylor; L. Wagner; Beverly Walker; Diamonte Walker; Lee Walls; Deidra Washington; Felicity Williams; Daniel Wood

I. OPENING DISCUSSION

- *Marimba Milliones, President & CEO, Hill District Community Development Corporation (“Hill CDC”)* – The latest Term Sheet for the Lower Hill Development site is the third or fourth iteration negotiated. When Term Sheet negotiations occur, a powerful moment opens in which the community can intercede. If **Pittsburgh Arena Real Estate Redevelopment, LC (“PAR”)**, the Pittsburgh Penguins’ development arm, can negotiate for greater public investment, the community should leverage this moment to also negotiate benefits for itself. Hill CDC representatives plan to attend the **Sports and Exhibition of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County’s (“SEA”)** meeting on November 14, 2019.
- *Diamonte Walker, Deputy Director, URA* – The sun has set on the URA’s negotiation of the Lower Hill Site Term Sheet. A revised Term Sheet that addresses the asks in the letter and the URA Board of Director’s five Term Sheet contingencies was received today, November 4, 2019.
- *Milliones* – So was the Term Sheet signed today? At the URA Board’s October 18 meeting? Or will it be signed by SEA at their Board meeting on November 14? If SEA adopts this Term Sheet, is it now its official?
 - *Walker* – Once URA’s Board of Directors voted to authorize the execution of the Term Sheet on October 18, it was effectively signed. On that date, Community Stakeholders submitted a letter with 17 requests to URA’s Board. The Community Stakeholders asked the Board to adopt these 17 requests with the Term Sheet. Compelled by the letter, the Board authorized the execution of the Term Sheet with five contingencies to begin to address the requests made in the letter. One of these contingencies was a directive to URA staff to form a working group with Hill District Community Stakeholders. This group is to begin work on an action plan.
- *Robert Damewood, Staff Attorney, Regional Housing Legal Services* – Would it be possible to get a redlined copy of the Term Sheet so we can see what was initially proposed vs. what ultimately was adopted?
 - *Jessica Smith Perry, Director, Housing Opportunity Fund, URA* – If you go through the current Term Sheet, you can see the changes made in response to the URA Board’s five contingencies. Outside of incorporating these contingencies, no further changes were authorized.

- *Damewood* – Is the SEA Board going to do an up/down vote or will the Term Sheet be subject to additional changes?
 - *Walker* - That would be at the SEA Board’s discretion. This is a triparty negotiation between the URA, PAR and SEA, but I want to reiterate that the sun has set on URA’s Term Sheet negotiations. That is not to say that the community shouldn’t exercise their rights. Rather, attempting to relitigate the Term Sheet is no longer constructive.
- *Milliones* – Given the lack of opportunities the community was given to provide input, the Hill CDC believes there was an extreme, egregious lack of transparency surrounding the negotiation of this Term Sheet. Further, when URA’s Board voted on October 18, we did not feel that our requests were fully considered. I think some folks came to tonight’s meeting thinking that negotiations were reopened, but that is not the case nor is it our goal. Rather, we want to get a side agreement executed in tandem with the Term Sheet. We ask that this agreement be in place prior to SEA’s November 14 vote. We hope that this agreement can facilitate more direct lines of communication between the Community Stakeholders, public agencies/authorities, and Lower Hill developers. This agreement should help facilitate the community’s ability to inform Lower Hill development benefits without having to go from agency to agency. We also know that consistently negative public relations will upset the development process. We are here to negotiate, not to obstruct the process. That said, if we cannot achieve our goals at tables such as this, we will be forced to pursue other means.
- *Carol Hardeman* – I know the Term Sheet was fast-tracked and the community did the best it could. For the sake of Hill District Residents and our ownership of this process, I have a few questions:
 1. Will we be able to give additional input?
 2. Can we get a timeline of key dates on which the community can provide additional input?
 3. Can we get funding for home stabilization projects and other community needs?

As I mentioned last week, the group assembled tonight is not representative of the entire community. This process is 60 years in the making and means a great deal to all involved. If PAR wants to do this right, they should take the time to do so. No Hill District resident left behind.

 - *Tracey McCants Lewis, Deputy General Counsel and Director of Human Resources, Pittsburgh Penguins* – That is why we are here.
 - *Walker* – That is why we are here. The Term Sheet is not a last stage but a starting point. URA staff is here so we can identify the tools needed to help ensure the development is favorable to the community.
- *Walker* – Prior to tonight’s meeting, staff compiled a grid which isolates each of 17 requests made in the Community Stakeholders’ letter. The grid identifies the lead agency/agencies, the URA Board’s actual or possible response, and PAR’s written response to each request. We completed this grid and coordinated tonight’s meeting in support of the Board’s request for an action plan through which broadly supported community items can be identified and acted upon.
- *Felicity Williams, Programs/Policy Manager & Special Assistant to the President and CEO, Hill CDC*– We missed an opportunity for a city-wide community-informed model for negotiations of development-based community benefit agreements. Any time there is a request for community land, there should be processes in place to negotiate benefit packages well before the execution of Term Sheets. The process should be in place the next time PAR moves on the take-down (i.e. initiate development on) of other Lower Hill parcels.

- *Walker* – For transparency’s sake, let me remind everyone that my understanding of this process is a result of my life-long residency in the Hill District and my position at the URA. When I was appointed to serve as URA’s Interim Executive Director, I was informed that the **Community Collaboration and Implementation Plan’s (the “CCIP”)** Executive Management Committee had been briefed on the Term Sheet. I was also advised that the CCIP shared information on the Term Sheet with the Greater Hill community. Obviously, this did not occur. We need to make sure governance structures are in place to prevent similar miscommunications in the future.
- *Hardeman* – What is the CCIP and why aren’t more Hill District residents on the **CCIP Executive Management Committee (the “EMC”)**?
 - *Milliones* – The CCIP EMC is comprised of CCIP members, conveners and chairs. The Committee’s job is to implement the public benefits outlined in the CCIP agreement. I am on the Committee and can say with certainty that the EMC first knew about the Term 10 days before URA’s Board met on October 10. This is a major breakdown in transparency, and we should have been notified sooner by the public agencies responsible. Additionally, why are we talking about the CCIP EMC as a negative? The power is not with the EMC – public agencies and government control the purse. I do not want there to be any confusion over who gave PAR its tax abatement. It was not the EMC.
 - *Glenn Grayson, Sr.* – I think there needs to be separate, “not in front of company,” conversation about the EMC.
 - *Lee Walls* – Agreed; we need a “family meeting” with the Hill CDC so that those who want to learn more about the CCIP/EMC may do so.

II. REQUEST #1

Remove the commercially reasonable standard for commitments by PAR.

- *Walker* – URA was a lead on this request. Responding to this request on October 18, URA’s Board of Directors directed URA’s legal team to remove “commercially reasonable/feasible” language in places where this language was inappropriate or did not make sense. The finalized, executable version of the Term Sheet reflects the removal of such language.
- *Williams* – By asking for the removal of this language, what we really wanted was the removal of a legal standing. This legal standing could have had future implications if the associated language was maintained in the Term Sheet. If this language was retained, PAR could argue in court that delivering on some/all the community benefits is commercially unfeasible/unreasonable. Removing this language limits PAR’s ability to litigate itself out of delivering community benefits.

III. REQUEST #2

Pursue affordability for 30% of the units at or below 50% AMI for Blocks A & B for a term that matches any loan terms; or Pursue affordability for 20% of all Lower Hill housing units (not just Blocks A & B) at 50% AMI or below for a term that matches any loan terms.

- *Walker* – The URA Board committed to longer periods of affordability but opted not to tie affordability to loan terms. Had the Board done so, prepayment of the loan by the lender could bring a premature end to affordability. Instead, the Board committed to assist Intergen, PAR’s

partner on Block A and B residential developments, to secure **Project Based Vouchers (“PBVs”)** from the **Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh (the “HACP”)**. If HACP issues Intergen the PBVs, affordability will be locked in for a period of 20 years. Jessica Smith Perry is with us tonight and is the brightest housing mind on our team. She and we will do whatever is necessary to help Intergen get the PBVs from HACP.

- *Williams* – What about the PBVs locks in affordability for 20 years? What prevents the developer from pulling out of providing affordable units?
 - *Smith Perry* – PBVs tether subsidies to specific units for a 20-year period. The URA could also record a longer deed restriction. That is what I will be focused on until deeper affordability is achieved.
- *Richard Taylor* – Are longer PBV terms of 25 to 40 years something the URA Board is willing to negotiate?
 - *Walker* – This request will go into the Action Plan.
- *Hardeman* – The Hill District needs its own **Housing Opportunity Fund (“HOF”)**. The community should not have to wait for Lower Hill developments to see benefits. The entire Hill District is in desperate need of such assistance.
 - *Walker* – For the record, I’m not talking about an either/or situation here. We need not limit our affordability conversation to the Lower Hill. Given the neighborhood’s unique set of needs and its history, the citywide HOF may not be enough for the Hill District. So long as I am here, I am talking about a Hill District HOF. Let’s put some thoughts around this.
 - *Hardeman/Others* – Yes!
 - *Smith Perry* – I want to elaborate on this offer. As the Director of the citywide HOF, I am here because of my affordable housing expertise. Other neighborhoods have had similar programs we can use as models, such as programs stemming from Larimer’s CHOICE Neighborhood grant. There are opportunities and different financing options outside of a CHOICE Neighborhood grant to create something specific for the Hill.
- *Dr. Rhonda Hall* – Where is the investment in people? Why aren’t we looking for solutions that would negate the need for housing subsidies. I do not want to see my neighborhood become dependent on housing subsidies. That is not to say they aren’t needed; I just don’t want the Hill District to be at the mercy of subsidies for the rest of its existence.
 - *Milliones* – We got out of shackles 150 years ago, survived Jim Crow, Black Codes, and continue to face institutional racism that oppresses and disenfranchises our community. This is in part why housing subsidies are necessary. I know that sometimes we do not like to face that reality.
- *Hardeman* – Echoing Rhonda’s comment, we need to explore cooperative working – not learning to work for others.
 - *Tracey McCants Lewis, PAR* – That is part of it. We will be working with everyone to develop the Catapult space.
 - *Hardeman* – There is a wider community to consider, such as Centre Ave businessowners.
 - *Walker* – To be clear, we are talking about Catapult because it is in the Term Sheet. The URA must do a better job at making sure that project benefits are permeating the whole neighborhood.

- *Dr. Hall* – Please make sure the action plan includes something regarding education. We have a plethora of universities, the Community College of Allegheny County, and other programs that could help Hill District residents earn a livable wage.
 - *Walker* – I will include this in the action plan. Thank you to the stakeholders who wrote that they wanted “white collar jobs.” There are programs like BankWorks that could provide Hill District residents with a livable wage. \$18.00 per hour straight out of High School is nothing to sneeze at.

IV. REQUEST #3

Given the fact that the community was not engaged in determining the public benefits, PAR should make a sum-certain financial deposit to an account housed at the Hill District Federal Credit Union and administered by the Hill District Growth Fund Advisory Committee, unless or until the Greater Hill District Reinvestment Fund is established. This amount should be negotiated between PAR, the City, the URA, and the Hill District Community, and at minimum should be in excess of the scope of work to rehabilitate Ammons Recreation Center.

- *Milliones* – We want money invested into the **Hill District Federal Credit Union (the “Hill FCU”)**. The original Term Sheet identified commitments to and from the City and URA, but no such commitment from PAR are stated. We want monies sourced from PAR for the rehabilitation of the Ammons Center to be controlled in a manner similar to the Hill District Growth Fund. The URA is not the lead on responding to this request and so we look to PAR for a commitment.
 - *McCants Lewis* – We met with the Hill FCU to discuss ways in which money can be contributed to the Hill CDC.
- *The Honorable Daniel Lavelle, Councilman, District 6* – The intent behind this ask was to get Credit Unions to become depositors for the City. There are some challenges with Federal Credit Unions’ point of entry for dealing with the City.
- *Grayson, Sr.* – This Sunday, I noticed parking at PPG Paints Arena was \$37.00 per car. I think we need to look at parking as source for this kind of funding.
 - *Williams* – Such funding could be housed in an account that is dispersible to Hill District residents, community organizations and nonprofits. Can we get 4 dollars a car? Can you take that back that back to PAR?
 - *McCants Lewis* – I will take that back to Kevin Acklin. Keep in mind that PAR went to the Hill FCU because of the request made in the letter. We made a good faith effort to respond in kind, so I do not understand why changes are being proposed at this juncture.
 - *Glenn Grayson, Jr.* – For fairness, if we ask for something, we cannot as a community go back and change our minds. PAR is making the effort to do what we asked of them.

V. REQUEST #4

Transferring control of 50% of the “Owner Payment” to PAR prevents the URA and City from using those funds to provide matching commitments, guarantees, and leverage for investments into the broader neighborhood. In addition, the agreement states that PAR will not seek additional public funding for infrastructure, so long as the SEA and the URA use commercially reasonable efforts to assist PAR and any affiliates in securing funding from federal, state, nonprofit, and foundation sources, which is public money. This provision requires that the public pay twice for infrastructure investments. As such, we

*request that you do not amend the portion of the **Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance (the “LERTA”)** that positions the project for such a large amount of future public funding*

- *Walker* – URA’s Board declined to amend the Term Sheet to reflect this request. Pending the LERTA’s approval by the City of Pittsburgh’s **Three Taxing Bodies (the “3TBs”)** – the City, the County and Pittsburgh Public Schools – PAR will retain, 50% of the estimated value of property taxes it would have paid to the 3TBs for on-site infrastructure spending. In exchange, PAR agreed to not request funds for infrastructure from the City or URA so long as the LERTA is in place. The City and URA still agreed to provide future assistance if PAR needs federal/state government, non-profit or foundation-sourced funds for infrastructure down the road. The URA Board will provide oversight by monitoring the status of PAR’s infrastructure projects, particularly during future disposition/takedown processes.

The remaining 50% of money not paid to the 3TBs in the form of property taxes will be used to capitalize **the Greater Hill Reinvestment Fund (the “GHRF”)**. The current estimated tax value of the completed Lower Hill Development project is \$80 million. This estimate is conservative and may exceed \$80 million. The 50/50 split would grow if the actual value of the completed Lower Hill Development does exceed \$80 million.

- *Williams* – Thanks for clarifying. The remaining concern is that the URA is still on the hook to assist PAR in pursuing additional taxpayer dollars. PAR already has the LERTA funds for infrastructure. As it currently stands, PAR gets to keep \$40 million. Why would PAR need anything in addition to this?
 - *Walker* – We can get the explanation to you. URA’s Board declined to enact this request. Still, the Board will require PAR to meet certain infrastructure milestones before the URA will provide such assistance.
 - *David Geiger, Government Affairs Officer, URA* – The only place in the Term Sheet in which commercially reasonable/feasible language was maintained relates to PAR pursuing such funds in the future.
- *McCants Lewis* – I want to highlight the uniqueness of PAR’s LERTA is unique. Developers party to LERTAs typically retain 100% of LERTA-derived funds. PAR agreed to spit LERTA-derived funds with the Hill District.

VI. REQUEST #5

In addition, any realization of PAR’s efforts to capitalize the 50% of the annual owner payment for the benefit of the Greater Hill District Reinvestment Fund should either be housed in an account at the Hill District Federal Credit Union and administered by the Hill District Growth Fund Advisory Committee.

- *Walker* – The URA Board is awaiting feedback from the CCIP EMC on the draft GHRF guidelines and is currently in a **request for proposal (“RFP”)** process to contract with a GHRF Trustee. We believe the Hill FCU should respond to this RFP.
- *McCants Lewis* – We are pursuing capitalization of the GHRF. We too our awaiting the CCIP EMC’s response to the draft GHRF guidelines.
- *Walls* – Whatever governance structure is put in place, we need to ensure that we have a broad-based committee with clear and defined points of contact.

- *Williams* – We planned to have those conversations back in September, but discussion of the Term Sheet consumed our attentions.
 - *Grayson, Jr.* – This should be a part of our “family meeting.”
- *Milliones* – We would never make decisions about the GHRF without first engaging the community. We were responsible for generating the lawsuit that resulted in the \$40 million capitalization of the GHRF.
- *Walls* – How does the community participate in the GHRF if there is a trustee in place?
 - *Walker* – A trustee is a legal requirement. The GHRF will be subject to audits. If a dime is not accounted for or incorrectly spent, we face serious problems. The trustee ensures checks and balances and will be instrumental in producing the annual GHRF report. There is an opportunity here to discuss increased levels of transparency and to move beyond community input. We should switch our focus to discussion of power sharing.
- *Milliones* – Is PAR going to advance this money? How do we sign-off on the Term Sheet if we do not know where the GHRF capitalization is coming from?
 - *McCants Lewis* – We are working on monetizing the GHRF. Kevin Acklin has more information.
 - *Cmn. Lavelle* – PAR will attempt to leverage the future market value of the completed Lower Hill Development to frontload the GHRF’s capitalization. Banks will be willing to provide capital if PAR can prove what the overall value of the development will be.
 - *Walker* – I have heard the current estimates on the value of the completed Lower Hill Development are conservative. Regardless, PAR’s commitment to capitalizing the GHRF is real and mutually agreed upon. The Board said that PAR shall capitalize the GHRF, not that they should, could or may capitalize it.
- *Cleophus Harris* – To me, the bottom line is this: do or don’t we get 50% for the GHRF. No disrespect to Marimba, but we have been debating the Term Sheet and just holding up the inevitable. Maybe it’s time we accept the gets we’ve been given and move on.
 - *Milliones* – I’m just not wired that way. I believe we can reasonably ask for more given what PAR is getting.
 - *Cmn. Lavelle* – Keep in mind that PAR is already in possession of the land. PAR recognized the uncertainty surrounding the 50/50 split. PAR said they would like to hold on to their 50%, bank roll it, and put it into on-site infrastructure. In exchange, PAR wanted to ensure the remaining 50% that will capitalize the GHRF be made available as quickly as possible.

VII. REQUEST #6

Leverage the 50% Owner Payment to recapture the over \$200 million in commitments that were made for the CHOICE Implementation Grant, a failed federal application from the City of Pittsburgh to HUD. The grant was intended to transform the Middle Hill District which suffers from generational public disinvestment.

- *Walker* – The CHOICE Implementation Grant refers to an application submitted to the **U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”)** to redevelop Bedford Dwellings and the surrounding Middle Hill area. The submitted application was deemed so technically deficient that HUD declined to review it.

- *Williams* – What we are saying here is that we should leverage PAR’s capitalization of the GHRF to reintroduce a bid for a CHOICE Neighborhood grant.
- *Milliones* – We had the opportunity to get \$30 million for the entire Middle Hill Area, not just Bedford Dwellings. CHOICE deals with people and the built environment. Unfortunately, due to the technical deficiencies of the application, that opportunity passed. We now have \$40 million on the table. This presents an opportunity to invite the previous CHOICE application stakeholders back to discuss a future CHOICE application.
- *Phyllis Ghafoor* – Do we have a sense of how those stakeholders would respond now?
 - *Smith Perry* – I as well as others in this room were at the table during the last CHOICE application process. When we applied for the \$30 million CHOICE grant from HUD, we had to demonstrate buy-in from the community. The application’s technical deficiencies were a result of not meeting this requirement. That is, the community framed its buy-in as though the CHOICE funds were already awarded.
- *Grayson, Jr.* – To clarify, you are proposing using \$30 million of the GHRF out-of-hand to leverage \$200 million we may not even get? That would leave us with only \$10 million in the GHRF. Tonight isn’t the night to decide how to spend/pre-spend the LERTA money.
 - *Walls* – Lets discuss this at the “family meeting.”

VIII. REQUEST #7

In accordance with the principles of the CCIP that call for community ownership, we recommend that PAR cause its affiliates to condo the 1,200 square feet of small business space to Hill District community ownership instead of leasing it to the URA. The URA can serve as a fail-safe.

- *Walker* – URA’s Board of Directors declined to amend the Term Sheet to transfer ownership of the Catapult space to the Hill District community. The URA retains the right to purchase the retail condo after five years at 80% of its then-market value. If/when the URA is ready to purchase the Catapult space, the Board would be amenable to considering community partnerships and joint ownership models. Until then, the URA will be able to lease the Catapult space from PAR for \$1.00 per year for 29 years. If the Board acts on its option to buy, we will share this opportunity with business owners at that time.
 - *Milliones* – I support the private, nonprofit model of ownership. Minority/Women-owned Business Enterprise ownership is important but should not supplant community ownership. We need to get back to this request during our “family meeting.”

IX. REQUEST #8

Instead of language such as “assist,” include clear financial commitments from PAR and their affiliates for the public benefit items mentioned.

- *Walker* – URA’s Board of Directors took its final action to address this request on October 18. One of the five contingencies the Board adopted alongside its authorization to execute the Term Sheet was a directive to URA’s legal team to remove the term “assist” from the document.
- *McCants Lewis* – We are working on all of these project plans, and we will meet with the CCIP to plan the roll-out to the community.

X. REQUEST #9 & 10

In accordance with the principles of the CCIP that call for coordinated community development: Include language that coordinates any development on the Lower Hill site throughout the neighborhood, particularly Centre Avenue infrastructure, commercial project gap financing and parking.

The Middle Hill District will need a parking solution that will likely include a structured parking garage.

- *Walker* – Lets recognize that this request is more under the purview of City Planning and the Parking Authority. That said, the URA Board would consider providing financial assistance for a Hill District parking study.
- *Milliones* – The economic impact of the Lower Hill Development should come up into the Middle and Upper Hill District. With that in mind, recent Wylie Ave. infrastructure projects should have been scaled to reach beyond the boundaries of the Lower Hill site.
- *Grayson, Jr.* – With regard to this ask, it was my request that the study be extended to include the entire Centre Ave. Corridor.
 - *Walker* – URA’s Board would be agreeable to considering partially funding a Centre Ave. Corridor parking study. We would still need to secure financing to construct a Centre Ave. parking garage.

XI. REQUEST #11

Commitment to move Zone 2 to a Kirkpatrick Street location or other community-endorsed location. A long-term lease would allow a community-entity/minority-owned business enterprise to partner, own and/or develop the new Zone 2 site.

- *Walker* – The current police station is not a URA asset. The City of Pittsburgh would be the lead on relocating the Zone 2 Station.
- *Damewood* – There are concerns surrounding the optics of relocating the Zone 2 Station to the Lower Hill. We thus asked that for a commitment to relocate the Zone 2 Station to Kirkpatrick St.
 - *Cmn. Lavelle* – We’ve had this dialog and we all agree that the Zone 2 station should be relocated. I understand and hear the concerns about relocating the Station to the Lower Hill site. Currently, there simply isn’t enough money available to relocate the Zone 2 Station. Chief Gillman and others are working to determine what facilities we have that could potentially serve this need in a cost-effective manner. We will get there, but as of now, I cannot provide a timeline for this.
- *Lisa Coleman* –The relocated Zone 2 station needs to be more centrally located within the Hill District. Currently when a Hill District resident calls the police, the police may not even respond. If they do respond, the resident can expect a long response time.
- *Damewood* – Can we get PAR’s commitment that the Zone 2 Station will not be in the Lower Hill?
 - *PAR* – The community will put together a plan which we will review and respond to.
 - *Cmn. Lavelle* – Speaking as your Councilman, there is a movement within the city to create an additional Zone for Pittsburgh’s entertainment districts – the North Shore, Downtown, and Southside Flats. If this movement gathers steam, Zone 2 would essentially remain unchanged. The new Zone’s Station could be somewhere in the Central Business District.
 - *Grayson, Jr.* – Zone 2 decisions need to be made quickly so we can address the needs surrounding the New Granada Theatre.

XII. REQUEST #12

In efforts to not isolate the Middle Hill District commercial corridors from the Lower Hill (such as the Waterfront and 8th Avenue in Homestead) assure extensive collaboration between New Granada Square Programming, Centre Avenue Corridor redevelopment, and the Lower Hill Music Venue and commercial components.

- *Walker* – The URA Board voted to add a requirement that the Block E venue operator coordinates its programming with that of the New Granada’s. Going forward, I believe the Board is amenable to similar opportunities to drive economic activity east of the Crawford Square line.

XIII. REQUEST #13

Ammon Recreation Center is a publicly owned facility. As such, the money for its repairs should come from the City’s capital budget. If Ammons Recreation Center is to be specifically named in the Term Sheet, however, PAR and the City must assure Ammons Recreation updates are done in coordination with key stakeholders, including, but not limited to Macedonia Church and affiliates.

- *Walker* – The URA Board instructed URA’s legal team to add Macedonia as a named organization in paragraph C(ii) of the Term Sheet.
- *McCants Lewis* – To be clear, key stakeholders are not limited to Macedonia.

XIV. REQUEST #14

To strengthen the Hill District ecosystem, Hill District organizations should be considered as partners on Lower Hill initiatives prior to external organizations.

- *Milliones* – **Partner4Work (“P4W”)** is not based in the Hill District. This request represents our push for the Hill District’s right to self-determination. We want to bolster the Hill District’s existing ecosystem, build its capacity, and ensure that all *community-based* partners can be party to negotiations when necessary. Partnering with P4W conflicts with our community’s ability to regenerate its own economy as P4W is not based in our community. The Hill District disappearing, and we must continue to fight for our community-based organizations.
 - *McCants Lewis* – Can you provide a list of the community organizations and assets you reference? This information would be helpful to align our work with the existing ecosystem.
- *Walker* – URA’s Board should not stipulate who should and should not be partners in this development. We can commit to thoughtful consideration of community input before advancing Board items such as this. URA Staff will continue to attend CCIP EMC meetings to ensure that partnerships are being considered.

XV. REQUEST #15 & 16

Regarding the First Source Hiring, commit to low-level, mid-level, and executive-level placement. Commit to a Community Workforce Agreement to be incorporated within the Project Labor Agreement for all phases of Lower Hill Development.

- *Walker* – The URA Board can help to ensure some amount of visibility on the Workforce Agreement by publishing it on our website, by issuing a board announcement, or by creating a dashboard. *Walker* – The URA plans to hire a Workforce Development Officer so we can align our projects to the workforce needs of the communities impacted. We must be mindful that there are already C-Suite level executives in the Hill District who do not need or want to sit through another program. Again, I think that we need the community’s input to make sure our Workforce Agreement is in alignment.
- *Ron Perkins* – I really want to highlight the workforce needs of Hill District residents. We need to upskill Hill District residents because there is no other way to ensure our community’s future tax base. Without a well-paid workforce, any community benefits we gain now will not matter long-term. Without this investment in our workforce, we also will not be able to attract higher-income households to our neighborhood without causing gentrification and displacement. The higher-income households need to partially come from within.
 - *Taylor* – That is why the affordable housing piece is important.
 - *McCants Lewis* – We are committed to hiring Hill District residents for middle income and high-income jobs.
- *Grayson, Jr.* – Does this include development teams? We need a more open process that encourages black developers to submit project bids. My recommendation is for the development of a process that will encourage more minority-owned businesses to submit responses to bids/RFPs for remaining Lower Hill parcels.
- *Taylor* – There is a preferential use of union-affiliated companies, but the issue remains that blacks have been excluded from organized labor. Unions workers make more money. The idea was to leverage this opportunity to compel more aggressive outreach by unions in our community. If the unions want the benefits of getting this work, they should have to hire members of our community.
 - *Walker* – PAR and Cmn. Lavelle have been working hard to increase diversity within organized labor’s membership. This will not happen overnight. It is a “both and” strategy. If developers are to contract with organized labor, that labor must be reflective of the communities in which they work.

XVI. REQUEST #17

URA and City of Pittsburgh will work with the Hill Community Land Trust (the “Hill CLT”) to transfer ownership of critical, publicly owned, residential and commercial parcels, specifically in the Middle and Upper Hill District, but not excluding the Lower Hill District.

- *Milliones* – The Hill CLT’s acquisition of land currently owned by the URA or City would help to promote longer, more permanent affordability in the Hill District. Like the URA or the City, the Hill CLT would just be holding onto and maintaining the land.
- *Walker* – The URA could help the Hill CLT with acquiring land currently we currently hold. It is unconscionable that the City and URA have allowed land we own in the Hill District to be poorly maintained. We would have to pilot a program to address this request. This pilot program could mirror similar programs in Lawrenceville and Oakland. Be aware that some business owners in the community oppose the Hill CLT’s acquisition of URA/City-owned properties. These business owners are concerned about working within a non-profit to acquire property.

- *Damewood* – We need to think beyond the example of Lawrenceville and Oakland. This could be an opportunity to build relationships with developers and for community members to bring actual equity to the negotiation table. It would be great if we could talk long-term relationships of this type.

XVII. CLOSING

- *Walker* – URA staff will begin to prepare an Action Plan for presentation to the Board of URA. Staff will also produce minutes for tonight's meeting which shall be made available by Tuesday, November 12.
- *Millions* – The Hill CDC and Community Stakeholders will begin to draft a Memorandum of Agreement. The draft of this agreement will be made available to all Community Stakeholders by Wednesday, November 13, ahead of SEA's November 14 Board meeting.