Upper Harbor Terminal Redevelopment

Summary of RFQ Submission Community Input through November 3, 2016

Draft 11/22/2016

Sources

November 3 community input open house -- 65 people signed in (but many didn’t)

Staff estimates about 80 people attended who weren’t staff, development team reps, media or elected officials.

Online survey responses through November 13 – 210 people

Comments from online survey through November 13 and community input meeting are shown (with similar comments grouped). Similar input that was received four or more times is highlighted. However, note that participants may have included similar comments on multiple boards and/or in online survey, thus impacting total counts.

Question 1

Having reviewed the information about the development submission, do you think the City and Park Board should select this team and enter into a planning process with them for the Upper Harbor Terminal?

Yes -- 89% (13 at meeting and 189 from survey)

No -- 5% (0 at meeting and 11 from survey)

Maybe -- 6% (4 at meeting and 10 from survey)

Comments from online survey (through November 13) and community input meeting related to Question 1:

- Impressed with concept, especially amphitheater – 11
- Impressed with development team (including fact they’re listening to community) – 8
- Disappointed/questioning why there was only one submission, whether RFQ should have been better publicized or open longer, what choices that leaves and/or whether additional time/effort should be used to find other interested parties– 4
- Questions about amphitheater parking, traffic, noise impacts (and importance of involving community that will be impacted) – 3
- Development is too close to river – add riparian, green spaces – 3
- Other questions/concerns (impact on Mississippi Mushrooms, no wetland) – 2
- Include technology spaces – 2
- Not impressed with plan; or wants to keep more of existing infrastructure – 2
- Keep views by keeping structures closer to river lower -- 2
• Glad to see zip code priority hiring, affordable housing, local businesses and startups – 1
• North Minneapolis should be involved in planning and implementation – 1
• Revenues from project should be used to benefit North Minneapolis, particularly low wealth communities – 1
• Music and event revenue should be used to provide free or subsidized programs and activities on site (e.g., music, swimming/boating lessons, educational activities) – 1
• Add a tall climbing structure (e.g., one at High Line) – 1
• More river-related activities – 1
• Include creative industries -- 1
• Yes, but include strong language about not allowing gentrification in neighborhood -- 1
• I live here and am glad to see marina, housing, amphitheater, arts -- 1
• Mix use with industry and public such as distillery, brewery; use the silos for grain – 1
• Would like to see more detail about natural/green spaces being preserved – 1
• Concerned that review is being rushed – 1
• Need a community benefit agreement or similar – 1
• Don’t combine music venue with NIMBY residential – 1

**Question 2**

_The development team submitted an initial development program, but the final coordinated plan still needs to be determined. What do you like about the proposed initial development program submitted by the team? What would you like to see changed, and what other questions or ideas do you have?_

No input provided -- 52% of survey respondents

Comments provided -- 48% of survey respondents

Comments from online survey (through November 13) and community input meeting related to Question 2:

**General**

Liked:

• **General support – 22**
  
• Good to approach site planning holistically; thinking big and proposing both a large amenity and many smaller ones – 2

Disliked/consider changing:

• Scrap entire project or at least do EIS and plan for affordable housing – 1

Other ideas/comments:

• Make sure that all factors (economics, environmental, transit, community desires) are studied in depth -- 1
• Make sure that project is what’s best for city, its current and future residents to enjoy river – 1
• Provide a vibrant community space welcoming to all to live, work, play – 1
• Expand planning to include adjacent properties – 1
• Hold community meetings at Capri Theater – 1
• Thinks timeline will be 2020-22 instead of 2017-19 -- 1

Development team

Liked:

- Quality of team members with experience in programming and/or with strong community connections and/or national connections and/or strong track records and/or big vision– 11
- Development team also is considering development of nearby parcels -- 1

Disliked/consider changing:

• Include one of the potential development partners – 1

Other ideas/comments:

• Hope team will be open to making major changes as result of community input – 1
• Include Pan Asian Community Development -- 1

Destination components (music/performances, water-related and other)

Liked:

- Amphitheater/performing arts center – 34
- Inclusion of arts and arts-based partners – 5
- Inclusion of small harbor/marina – 5
- Music concept honors history of area as place that hosted marginalized arts and music communities in industrial space; this is a great place to be loud -- 2
  • Rock climbing – 1

Disliked/consider changing:

- Concerns about noise pollution from amphitheater (and whether North or NE will be impacted more), inclusion of housing so close to amphitheater that will hinder venue’s ability to thrive and/or seasonality of use –8
- Concerns about traffic/transportation/parking for amphitheater (and other development); need to give attention to access challenges and/or come up with sensible plan – 5
- Expand size of amphitheater – 3
- Location is not safe; build amphitheater somewhere else – 1
- Likes everything except amphitheater – 1
- Move amphitheater further to south so warehouse can be retained – 1
- Wants to better understand site access and what will happen on site when there isn’t a musical event – 1
- Docks/marina would need to be changed due to heavy water flow in river -- 1
- Want more family-friendly areas – 1

Other ideas/comments:

- Water access is desired (especially non-motorized); make sure to include canoe/kayak share program – 5
- Find ways to keep performing arts center and/or park and/or amenities/programming active all year – 4
- Include a small side stage for pop-up performances (and reuse Camden Theater sign there) – 3
- Love the docks; public rentals – 3
- Make it a year-round destination and provide low cost family winter activities (e.g., skating, sledding) – 2
- Include dining options right next to river – 2
- What will be governing board/body and philosophy? Who will own amphitheater and what will happen when it’s not in use? – 2
- Allow access to green and nature anytime, not just when amphitheater is open – 2
- Include River Rats Ski Show (stage, seating, boat and equipment storage) – 2
- River boats between UHT and Boom Island – 2
- Include river water feature like Chattanooga, where kids can play in the water – 1
- Consider fishing and swimming in enclosed “crib” – 1
- Music could be so loud – 1
- Make it summer home for Minnesota Orchestra – 1
- Suggested a theme for an event at amphitheater – 1
- Would like to see public access to amphitheater when it’s not in use and ample opportunities for community programming – 1
- Would like to include hip hop events, Soundset – 1
- Include music/performances that draw from more than just North Minneapolis, not just hip hop that attracts gangs – 1
- Include a curling club (with restaurant) to help activate site year-round and allow sharing of parking between summer and winter amenities – 1
- Outdoor children’s museum and Maker’s Fair – 1
- Planetarium – 1
- Mill City Museum add-on – 1
- Parking should be free – 1
Park

Liked:

- Public riverfront access and green/park/healthy living elements – 15

Disliked/consider changing:

- Park strip along river should be wider (two suggestions for 400 ft. and another for 500 ft.) and there should be more parkland overall; consider all aspects of Above the Falls Regional Park Plan, including standard parkway, bike trail, walk trail configuration; start over to plan real park (perhaps back to oak savanna) – 11

Other ideas/comments:

- Emphasize activities that connect people to river; water use is good – 2
- First-class regional park is important; think large and give Northside a success that serves Northside and draws people to area – 2
- Explore other recreational possibilities (e.g., skate park, sledding, climbing wall, ice rink) to keep site active year-round and for extended hours – 1
- Provide places for people of all ages to play and room for large group sports/activities – 1
- Note heron rookery on island in river – 1
- Returning any shoreline to natural condition? -- 1

Equity

Liked:

- Attention/commitment to equity – 5
- Community being included in planning and then in development itself – 4

Other ideas/comments:

- Work to avoid/minimize gentrification and make sure that local community is involved in equitable planning process and programming so that it feels ownership of final plan; work to make sure that local community is involved in programming and benefits from free or subsidized performances, activities, educational opportunities, etc. – 6
- Seek to add (or require) jobs for North Minneapolis residents and minorities – 5
- Include local components, local community agencies, local talents and surrounding community – 3
- Make sure that development is accessible and affordable to surrounding community – 2
- Development should benefit, and be in best interests of, North Minneapolis (and improve its perception); project revenue should benefit North Minneapolis – 2
- Find ways to engage and integrate youth in aspects of project – 1
• Project should attract visitors from all over who will spend money in North Minneapolis – 1
• Inclusion of marina where few residents can afford boats (or have a license to rent one) reeks of gentrification – 1
• Include a riverboat with proceeds going towards Northside programming and infrastructure – 1
• Pursue a balanced development for all ages and incomes; shouldn’t minimize any type of project – 1
• How would you stop gentrification? – 1
• Development should stand on its own – 1
• Work with neighborhood to develop a community benefits agreement that includes: jobs for North Minneapolis residents and small businesses, venue that caters to all cultures in North Minneapolis, and a component that creates a Northside investment fund -- 1

Connections/access

Liked:

• Provides better access from Northside community to project and riverfront; inclusion of ped/bike bridge; bridge location is good – 12

Other ideas/comments:

• Make sure there are varied ways to get to site (bike, transit, boat), from North and NE and great bike infrastructure; tie into Grand Rounds and West River Road/Parkway trails; make sure site is not an island – 11
• Make sure there’s a good connection from North to river; Dowling and Lowry aren’t walkable and need re-configuring; explore land bridge/capping (as Duluth did with I-35) – 9
• Also consider enhancing access from Northeast – 2
• Explore ways to tie into plans for bus rapid transit and/or light rail transit and/or add more public transportation – 2
• Limit car access; no car access to development along river, but OK for parcels along Washington – 2
• Focus on bike and transit access, limit car access – 1
• Don’t discount need for parking – 1
• Consider air boats for taxi service – 1
• Length of ped bridge? – 1

Land uses

Liked:

• Mixture of land uses (that will keep site active all day) – 7
• Housing available to mix of ages, demographics, etc.; that will provide 24-hour “eyes on
  the park” – 2
• Inclusion of commercial and industrial uses – 1
• Mixture of park and urban built-up space – 1
• Housing/restaurant/office uses – 1

Disliked/consider changing:
  • Don’t displace Mississippi Mushrooms (or do include them in light industrial space);
group them with other green businesses, aquaponics – 5
  • Add more commercial space for restaurants and shops – 2
  • Housing appears small and unattractive and will be disconnected from neighborhoods
to west – 1

Other ideas/comments:
  • Include a mix of housing for all income brackets; include elegant/upper income – 9
  • Include group housing for ex-offenders, runaways, etc. with services and education,
training/employment opportunities in a Maker’s District – 7
  • Consider adding technology spaces – 3
  • All development along riverfront should be public and river-related, not industrial or
office; consider a hotel tied to amphitheater – 2
  • Include co-op housing, grocery, businesses – 2
  • In addition to small businesses, need an anchor business that will pay living wages – 2
  • Include space for small businesses/services: maybe co-working spaces, Maker’s District
– 2
  • Rental is overbuilt in city; this development should be condos; North Minneapolis needs
market-rate housing – 2
  • Develop a new urban living model – 1
  • Continue “loft-style” housing in downtown up to site – 1
  • Include higher density ownership row houses/condos to provide an urban riverfront
option for those living in apartments – 1
  • Consider incubator markets at site along Dowling or Lowry – 1
  • Include senior housing – 1
  • At least 30% of housing should be affordable to those who live in North Minneapolis – 1
  • Need some infusion of higher-income housing for tax base; take advantage of river – 1
  • Disagree: higher income housing would be gentrification – 1
  • New residential might be risky due to proximity to amphitheater; maybe move it further
north – 1
  • Designate area for co-op housing and small businesses – 1
  • Include residential above light industrial in L.I.P. – 1
  • Business and park development would be more beneficial than housing – 1
  • Include art space and artist lofts/studio space – 1
  • Education facilities – 1
• Asian restaurants – 1
• Business incubator space, e.g., Food Building and Midtown Global Market – 1
• Where is Donald Trump Tower? – 1
• Questions whether site is best location for incubator space or if that should be to west with connections to site – 1
• Site along Washington is OK for industrial with housing/office above, but two locations along river are not good locations – 1
• Where is Mixed Use-Open Space listed as #14 on plan? – 1
• Restaurants along Washington – 1
• Would “incubator space” be for start-ups? Locals? VC? – 1
• Instead of light industrial, consider vertical greenhouses to grow food on site -- 1

Environment

Liked:

• Stormwater management included – 1
• Creative reuse of brownfield site – 1
• Attention to green issues – 1

Disliked/consider changing:

• Add wetland and habitat areas and enhance stormwater quality – 1

Other ideas/comments:

• Prevent any long-term negative environmental impact; make new development as green as possible, consider impact of climate change – 4
• Be sure to take river and its natural ecosystem into account; can regional stormwater treatment/reuse be included; are outfalls shown new or existing? – 3
• Need to address air quality concerns in area or this development will be impacted – 2
• Get rid of wasteful lawns and instead emphasize areas for growing food and/or supporting pollinators – 1
• Remove river wall and add more natural shoreline with habitat – 1
• What is estimated energy need for site? -- 1

Historic structures

Liked:

• Preservation of historical structures/story – 9

Disliked/consider changing/questions:

• Remove at least two domes; skeptical about retention of “relics” unless new uses can be found for them (if not, remove them and add more residential or restaurants/shops); question why relics should be preserved—4
• Keep the warehouse instead of the domes – 1
• Would it be cheaper to build a hill/wall than to tear down warehouse? -- 1

Other ideas/comments:
• Like the “relics,” try to incorporate them with music venue -- 1

Other ideas/comments/suggested uses for domes:
• Children’s museum and amusement park – 2
• Planetarium – 1
• Music – 1
• Tour – 1
• Farmers’ market and incubator “flea” market – 1
• Technology spaces – I; Maker’s District -- 1

Ideas for other structures:
• Reuse industrial structures for similar purposes, e.g., grain silos could be used by brewery/distillery – 1
• Could you build a climbing wall with elevator? -- 1

Design

Liked:
• Attention to aesthetics/beauty/world-class design – 2

Other ideas/comments:
• Limit vertical development height to preserve views; reduce heights as get closer to river; building heights on Parcel 1 are too high (and question about how high they’d be) – 7
• Relocate or remove Xcel powerlines – 2
• Consider a tall, interactive sculptural piece that can be seen from downtown (e.g., High Line) – 2
• Would like amphitheater design to be modern and iconic – 1
• Make sure it’s beautiful – 1
• Design for entertainment site should be playful and blur line between function, sculpture and playground – 1
• Need sound wall on east side of I-94 – 1
• Design building massing to maximize river views and “eyes on the river” – 1
• Break up rectangular massing of industrial buildings, as is done in the Netherlands and Scandinavia – 1
• Industrial should be carefully executed so it doesn’t detract from park’s and river’s natural beauty – 1
- Activate “bridge” between freeway and riverwalk with boulevard features and functionality so that it creates significant “place” – 1
- Consider greater density/height – 1
- Put rail line below ground in a tunnel and cover with café-lined boulevard – 1
- Housing development should have an industrial “vibe” – how about using shipping containers? – 1
- (Xcel Riverside Plant across river) is nice to look at – 1
- Close Washington at 35th Ave. N. to create more developable space – 1
- Do seawalls remain? – 1
- How busy are rail lines? Safety issue? – 1
- Include Asian, water designs and other cultural motifs in all buildings -- 1