

Respondent	Plan_rating	Plan_comments	Benefits_rating	Benefits_comments	Public realm_rating	Public realm_comment	Implementation_comments	General_comments
1	Neutral	I'm worried that this continues a trend of Minneapolis pushing for mixed income housing everywhere but North Minneapolis where developments skew highly affordable and continue concentrate poverty and perpetuated the idea that only poor people want to live in North Minneapolis. While there is some mixed affordability housing it is not nearly what is seen in neighboring NE. Mpls keeps acting like the only way to avoid gentrification is to continue to concentrate poverty. It is a very old school way to look at affordable housing and perpetuates the racial divides between neighborhoods	Neutral		Satisfied			Also would like more information about what the food processing would entail.
2	Very Satisfied	I think it checks all the boxes with regards to beautification and the environment, and commercial interests and community interests.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
3	Neutral		Unsatisfied	My dissatisfaction mainly stems from the tenant of environmental justice and sustainability. From a high level, this sounds great. But when looking into the specific initiatives being taken, it's lackluster.  Minneapolis has an opportunity to create a world class environmental center and restore our relationship with the river we have turned our back on for 100 years.  I fear that when budgets get tight, the unquantified environmental strategies will be the first to get cut. I'd suggest 1.) dedicating 2,000 square foot to an environmental justice/sustainability center/museum (inside or outside) that showcases the sites environmental initiatives.  Adding this would also discourage environmental budget cuts on the site by holding everyone accountable.	Neutral			
4	Neutral	There are some aspects of the plan that are very exciting! -building west river road and a concert/event venue and the opportunity for business incubation/community benefit agreements. But overall, the plan does not seem realistic at all and is way too low density.	Very Satisfied	I like this component of the plan. It appears to be a piece that can hold everyone accountable over the years.	Very Satisfied	This is the best part of the plan! The park programming should be very different and intentional - too much passive green space in Mpls already.		The implementation section needs a lot more information. This section should identify the true costs of this project (land acquisition and environmental clean up are completely missing!) and outline city investment in this site a lot more clearly.  Re: the land use plan section: 500 units of housing is not enough for this signature site! More people in this neighborhood allows more flexibility, creativity, and more opportunities for shops and other supportive uses. In 25 years, we will look back and ask ourselves why on earth we allowed 4 to 6 stories buildings and townhomes right along the river. Also, a greenhouse on the riverfront belongs in the park/public land, not on a prime piece of real estate. I would support another light industrial user (like Coloplast) in that location, or an additional affordable/mixed income housing development to support the mixed use retail portions of the project, but I do not support a greenhouse immediately adjacent to the river.

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

5		Just stop it. Please put this plan in the recycle bin as it will be a huge white elephant. How about you take the TAXPAYERS money and help the people? Self-Sustainable shelter to start. A shelter where those in need a part of a community where they clean, cook, learn skills for the workplace. Can get mental health help. So many things to do with \$50 million dollars in what will be an aftermath of a virus that will wipe out so many businesses downtown. A downtown that is already a ghosttown with high crime. My friends in the Suburbs think I'm crazy to still live and work in Minneapolis. I only rent now but have decided against buying in Minneapolis. Will be leaving soon. Along with so many others. I was born in Swedish Hospital on 8th Street. I am no longer proud of my City after 54 years. Are you not realizing what is happening to Minneapolis?? WAKE UP. Do something for the people in need. And stop with the pandering.....	Very Unsatisfied					
6	Very Satisfied	It brings together a lot of groups and developers to create something beautiful. I live in North and will gladly utilize this new park. I'm a big parks user.	Very Satisfied	It's well thought and the think the benefits to the community are at their max for this proposal. Many say it should do more but it does exactly what it's capable of doing.	Very Satisfied	I drive to the North Loop to walk by the river and now I can stay in my own neighborhood.	I remember reading about that mushroom farmer who'd get displaced. I'd say work with existing business owners so that the necessary gentrification doesn't hurt existing businesses. Other than that, it's a well rounded proposal that includes lots of groups.	I'm excited to see it happen! I'd say maximize the number of residents because that's what makes North such a boring neighborhood - not enough retail because not a dense enough population. I don't think this new area will really identify with North that closet but it doesn't hurt having more people nearby which can help spur more retail.
7	Satisfied	Love the concept and idea, out with the old and in with the new for north Minneapolis	Satisfied		Satisfied			Hope for bike paths that connect to downtown bus services as well with security
8	Very Unsatisfied	Pay for your social justice stadium first! A bunch of rich entitled blacks playground!	Very Unsatisfied	Will be destroyed in first riot,	Very Unsatisfied			
9	Very Unsatisfied	There was no listening to the community. Period.,	Very Unsatisfied	This is sugar coating a big land grab where public land is given to private developers for their profit. The only ones who win are Pohlrad, United Properties and First Avenue - not the community.	Very Unsatisfied	An outdoor amphitheater for our climate is the cornerstone of this? Really? And with MPRB involved, it is just a matter of time before they put Housing on parkland - Theodore Wirth had a vision and Housing WAS NOT a part of it.	With the City defunding Neighborhood Orgs, stealing MPD funds by shifting CPS officers to NCR, there is no real interest in any "partnership." This has been obvious since the start.	The developers win, the community and taxpayers lose. Probably doesn't matter anyway, our city population is about to flee based on the permission City Council gave to criminals to come pillage our city with no consequences. Why would any business or homeowner ever choose Minneapolis?
10	Very Unsatisfied	this is not a reason to do this: "grounded in a restorative approach towards racial justice that meets the needs, aspirations and priorities of the nearby residents."  the work should be for all those living in Minneapolis	Very Unsatisfied	to focused on one group	Neutral		anyone who can afford the fees should be allowed no matter whether the city thinks they be worthy or not	focus on all of the city and the future not the past
11	Neutral	This is much better than the original plan, but huge NO to the parking ramp. Instead the city should be planning for ways to increase access via biking, walking and transit.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
12	Very Satisfied	I believe it is well diversified and will be an asset to our North Minneapolis community.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Many of the Northside Youth organizations are looking for space. It would be great to have a space they could have access to in order to have greater capacity to serve more youth.	As a Northsider, I feel this project is a much needed investment into the Northside.
13	Satisfied		Very Satisfied					
14	Satisfied	Affordable housing, stormwater mgmt emphasis, urban farming/food production. Want to see a continued focus on stormwater mgmt	Satisfied	Emphasis on building and keeping wealth in North and also on health. And on climate change.	Neutral	Doesn't seem like the plan for the park is very detailed yet. Like the idea of trails, would like to see infrastructure for children and families. Would like to see parks designed for year-round use, not just summer. Would like to see trails that are designed to be easy to clear of ice/snow, or are graded like roads are to prevent ice	Wilderness Inquiry, Paddleshare	How will connectivity to the rest of North be improved, in terms of pedestrian, bike, wheelchair, transit travel? This parcel is very cut off, how will streets be improved to integrate this parcel with the rest of the city?
15	Neutral	it has some good things but there is too much building and I don't know how i feel about it all yet.	Neutral		Neutral		please listen to those who have lived here a long time and have wanted access to the river for decades, not just young renters who come and go.	
16	Very Unsatisfied	We should not be doing this. We are stuck paying for half of that stupid stadium, and police funding is getting cut. Take this money and put it into those things.	Very Unsatisfied	We should not be doing this. We are stuck paying for half of that stupid stadium, and police funding is getting cut. Take this money and put it into those things.	Very Unsatisfied	We should not be doing this. We are stuck paying for half of that stupid stadium, and police funding is getting cut. Take this money and put it into those things.	We should not be doing this. We are stuck paying for half of that stupid stadium, and police funding is getting cut. Take this money and put it into those things.	You don't really want to hear from us. You are going to push forward with these idiotic plans no matter what us citizens say. Building a complex like this in the poorest part of Minneapolis, with the highest crime, during police budget cuts and downsizing, is simply wrong.

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

17	Unsatisfied	Why does building affordable housing for indigenous peoples have to take so long (and waste so much money?)	Unsatisfied	If this land was stolen by the Dakota then why not just do the right thing and "trade" it back. All residents of the city would benefit from giving this land over to what could be a big homeless and low income starter area.	Unsatisfied	These infrastructure models don't take into account correctly how (and even if) we might be moving around in 5-10 years.	Governance should be refreshed annually by actual residents and neighbors with no one from outside the area that thinks they know better than those living here.	
18	Very Unsatisfied	Use all funds on existing parks, schools, and community outreach programs in north Minneapolis. Making buildings doesn't solve anything. Also building so close to the river is environmentally dangerous. Remove all man made structures and let nature return and extend the riverside parks system.	Very Unsatisfied	Use all funds on existing parks, schools, and community outreach programs in north Minneapolis. Making buildings doesn't solve anything. Also building so close to the river is environmentally dangerous. Remove all man made structures and let nature return and extend the riverside parks system.	Very Unsatisfied	Use all funds on existing parks, schools, and community outreach programs in north Minneapolis. Making buildings doesn't solve anything. Also building so close to the river is environmentally dangerous. Remove all man made structures and let nature return and extend the riverside parks system.		Stop building things and actually help people. Go door to door and survey what their most needs are and fulfill those first.
19	Very Satisfied	I am a Black man, and this is the type of opportunity our community needs to reconnect with the river and inspire our children	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
20	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
21	Very Satisfied	It seems to have a great mix of business and housing. Just be careful to maintain enough market level housing so that people will actually be willing to go into that area to spend money.	Satisfied		Satisfied			
22	Very Satisfied		Neutral		Neutral			
23	Satisfied	This is a good use of the property for the greater good of the entire Twin Cities metro.	Satisfied	Public safety will be key to participation from the community named as well as the general, overall Twin Cities community. If the site ends up being a reflection of the crime levels in the area in general, the project will fail.	Satisfied	Access via all modes of transportation from all areas of the city will ensure good participation from all Twin Cities area residents.	Law enforcement, Fire Departments, and schools should all be working together as integral parts of the project. Family support types of organizations should be heavily involved to address the major concerns and causes of single parent households in the area and the problems the community faces because of these types of family situations.	It is vital that in the entertainment and park areas, all vendors for special events are welcomed. The current situation at the Nicollet Island Pavilion, where one vendor is allowed to operate, is the exact opposite of what should be planned for this project. This includes caterers, photographers, djs, rental companies, bar tending services, etc. All licensed vendors should be allowed access to this publicly funded project.
24								Why would you invest anything in a concert venue during a pandemic when the future of large gatherings and concerts are so uncertain? I'm on board with the other community aspects of the plan but not the concert venue.
25	Neutral	I love the light manufacturing idea. I think that this should be increased. I see the government support as a way to bring in jobs to the area. Having locals with more money will create a wellspring of good in the community. I don't think yet another large venue is needed in the city. There are already so many large venues for events downtown.	Unsatisfied	I think the flexibility and riverfront access are great.  The affordable housing and community programming feel like pandering in order to get the project built.	Satisfied	This makes sense	I don't think this is a good idea. I think that whatever businesses are most likely to be successful will apply for the commercial spots. I think that the section is really paternalistic and takes the decisions away from people and businesses operating at the site.	Think it is fantastic to redevelop the site. I think that bringing in light manufacturing with a food focus is a great idea. The CPAC seems like something the city is doing to pat itself on the back to point to something it built, but the people of the city don't actually need or want. I think this space should be repurposed as additional manufacturing or warehousing. The riverfront park is wonderful. I think that the housing should be partially market rate as all income levels should be represented at the site.
26	Very Satisfied							
27	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			I'd like to make sure that there is an area to enjoy and take in the view of the river. The city does not have enough nice public spaces to go and "hang out" and watch the river. It would also be nice if there was some sort of opportunities for food trucks and or small cafe's to be in this area to attract people to come and spend some time - perhaps ice cream shop or coffee shop etc?
28	Satisfied	Goals of the plan are commendable. It is obvious that the plan is targeted to the local community of minority residents.	Satisfied	I would prefer to see more green space. Once it is built to hardscape, the environment has been diminished. Being touched by nature is so important for a person's well-being, especially when surrounded by freeways and asphalt. I would encourage more green space.  Also, I would challenge the Park Board to do 100% native plantings to support our local habitat. This could be a teachable moment for the public, with educational signage, etc.  I believe the stadium is too big for a neighborhood entity. It feels more like a downtown size of space. Perhaps something more like Lake Harriet Bandshell?	Neutral			

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

29	Very Satisfied	I like the job opportunities provided and the mixed income housing. I like the public/private partnership and the opportunity for community input on operations.	Very Satisfied	I am grateful for the community engagement in planning. I like the job opportunities provided and the mixed income housing. I like the public/private partnership and the opportunity for community input on operations.	Very Satisfied	Improving community access to the river and parks is a baseline benefit of this project, in addition to all the other attributes.	I like the public/private partnership and the opportunity for community input on operations.	It is important to me that people who live and work in this area of the city continue to be heard and involved in this project. The increase in affordable multifamily housing is also very important to our city. I hope there will be ways to support first-time home owners for the for sale units.
30	Satisfied							
31	Satisfied		Neutral		Neutral			
32	Satisfied	It sounds really good — I hope that it will include enough affordable housing and that it will stick to its goal of serving Northside residents	Satisfied		Satisfied			
33	Unsatisfied	Too much emphasis on redevelopment and not enough of restoration of nature.	Neutral	I am too cynical to believe that the city truly let the community lead the design.	Unsatisfied	The riverfront has been exploited for over 100 years. Isn't it time to heal the riverfront?	I have concerns about building so close to the river. It is a national treasure and there are restrictions that are being ignored.	So, you are putting a park next to one of the biggest polluters in the city and folks have to cross a functioning active railroad to access it. And you are putting a ton of money to attract business to that area while ignoring Broadway, Lowry and 44th?
34	Satisfied	I like to see more green natural space.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
35	Neutral	Lots of good ideas but plan doesn't seem to speak enough to how income inequality and affordable housing are going to be addressed.	Neutral	Again, lots of good ideas but plan doesn't seem to speak enough to how income inequality and affordable housing are going to be addressed. Average income in Minneapolis proper is quite a high figure. Average income in North Minneapolis specifically is sometimes only 40-50% of Minneapolis as a whole which greatly impacts affordability.	Neutral		I'd love to see increased connection with organizations that are doing work in North Minneapolis and who can be a voice and direct funds to important places of need.	It can't be overstated that it would be a shame to have such an amazing project developed and to have it negatively affect low income families, the BIPOC community, and force people in North Minneapolis to have to relocate or to take a financial hit when they're already living on tight budgets.
36	Very Unsatisfied	Waste of money. Who would ever go there? Put this on hold until the police department is figured out and until we figure out future viruses. COVID-21, COVID-22, COVID-23, etc...	Very Unsatisfied	See above.	Very Unsatisfied	This area takes money from all to benefit only a few.	Get this city safe.	This is the wrong time to be considering this project. Civil unrest and Covid-19 have set humans back 10 years at least.
37	Very Unsatisfied	This sounds expensive. Maybe we should sell the land and give the money to the police.	Very Unsatisfied	Community means different things to different people.	Very Unsatisfied	I hope this doesn't effect the Twin Cities River Rats from performing their ski shows.		
38	Satisfied	I want to be sure the people in the community will have greater access to the jobs they want, not just the jobs that are put there by the planning committee.	Satisfied	I'm happy to see a focus on social and racial justice and would like to see more improved walking and rolling access across 194.	Satisfied	any improved access within the site would be welcome. I love the idea of a continuous path along the waterfront. I would like to see more focus on walking and rolling access across 194.		I would really like to see transportation infrastructure that minimizes dangerous interactions between modes of transport and makes it easy for people to keep transportation systems harmonious. Think about cyclists, pedestrians, and other vehicles interact at corners and parking areas, for example.
39	Satisfied	It looks like some of the initial concerns of the local community are being addressed with an overall focus of providing jobs and benefits to the people who live near this development.	Satisfied	It seems like the values and objectives have been tailored to the unique site this development is proposed for. There is a good balance of addressing social, cultural, and environmental concerns for the site.	Neutral	I am very glad that the riverfront portion of this land will be used to develop the regional park as a community asset. I wish more reuse of the existing structures was being considered. The domes and silos could be reused in many cool ways that would make this park unique within the city. I'm thinking like the Gas Works Park in Seattle.		I'm excited to see this project move forward. I just want to make sure with COVID-19 that adequate opportunities for engagement are still made as the process moves on over the next year.
40	Very Unsatisfied	This is a waste of money. It's not going to be safe to go there. Unless you want to get carjacked, stabbed or shot. It would be better to build a wall around the city limits. I live in this city and its terrible. No one wants to come into this city to spend any money.	Very Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied			
41	Very Unsatisfied	Its active gentrification- there should be a cap for all rent at truly affordable prices for North Mpls (not just Minneapolis average affordability). This whole process has been a show and has not actually come from people who live in North. The chosen developers are the worst development company in MN and do not have North Minneapolis' interest at heart. Cancel this plan and start over with TRUE community engagement, not just a bunch of meetings and a half-assed committee.	Unsatisfied	They are symbolic rather than concrete community benefits.	Unsatisfied	I believe this land should absolutely include public open space, but the as it is public land it should serve a public benefit (like expanded Public Housing!) rather than private interest (expensive housing, private entertainment venue, private development interest).	NRCC, JXTA, neighborhood orgs, Defend Glendale & other public housing entities, Parks & Power, Indigenous groups and organizations.	Clearly there has been enough backlash for the city to pause the project and seriously consider alternatives. Public land must be for the public good, and those in power must be serious about being dedicated to that purpose. We have seen extreme privatization of everything in Minneapolis for the sake of "the economy" and have only seen a rise in inequity and the poverty gap because of it.
42	Very Unsatisfied	The city is either deluding itself or the citizens into thinking this is a good deal for anyone other than rich, white developers. The city should retain all ownership and use the land to benefit north Minneapolis and the residents it has continually discriminated against, over policed, and kept in economic oppression.	Very Unsatisfied	Surface level, no accountability	Very Unsatisfied			It doesn't matter how many community members are against this. The city will ignore us like usual and cash out, leaving its most vulnerable citizens more vulnerable

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

43	Unsatisfied	It seems to benefit big businesses more than local communities, especially people on the North side.	Unsatisfied	Make sure it represents black and indigenous individuals more than in currently does.	Unsatisfied	Make sure it is utilized by people on the North side.	Partner with black owned businesses, not big corporations.	It should represent all individuals in Minneapolis, not just white, wealthy individuals.
44	Very Unsatisfied	You had an incredible chance to take an international level site, on the top of the Mississippi, overlooking the great city of Minneapolis, and turn it into an international level destination that would put our city on the global map with other great cities such as Chicago, Paris, or Barcelona. But no, the site will be turned into a juvenile hodgepodge of lego like structures with be cloaked as community housing and mixed use retail with a small stage under the foil of high end architecture and urban planning. This site has potential to be the Eifel Tower site for both Minneapolis, and the State of Minnesota. Yet this will not be anything more than glamorized cookie cutter architecture.	Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied. The benefits are for a very small segment of the Minneapolis population--when they could have benefitted the whole state. You took an incredible site with international potential and you are doing nothing more than minor window dressing it with homogenous design that placates the loudest voices.	Unsatisfied	Parks? Really? Parks? Where? Where are the parks? Take a hint from the Gardens of Versailles, or the boulevards of Barcelona, or the Bean in Chicago.	Sell the Darth Vader Death Star Stadium to raise money for the plan. A nude swimming beach would be well received, as well.	Your planning process is dehumanizing at best. Where are the design charrettes? Where are the models? Why was the job given to the cutesy architecture team, when many other teams were equally qualified to a more credible job? I would like my taxpayer money back that has gone into this planning process.
45	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
46	Unsatisfied	We have a huge unhoused population in Minneapolis and spending this much money for a few units that are considered "low-income" is frankly bullshit. We don't need any more giant apartment complexes that remain mostly empty for the majority of the year. In addition, many companies will remain remote post Covid-19. Building more office space, when so much already sit empty around the city is an ineffective use of taxpayer funds and space.  Hold off on this project, and do more for ALL citizens of Minneapolis.	Unsatisfied	Again, this is all just pandering nonsense. Talking about 30-70% of AMI is a HUGE range and if other spaces prove true, a very ineffective way to benefit the community at large. In addition, I'm sure the park space will be exclusive as our current parks are not allowing unhoused individuals to use it as encampments because it will offend whoever buys the penthouse.	Very Unsatisfied	MPRB has used skid loaders to forcibly remove folks items from parks around the city all year. Why should we trust them to host another site and claim any kid of improved access?	Same answer, different question y'all! For example: "Managing and deploying the use of ticket fees towards wealth building activities that benefit historically marginalized communities that have been the target of redlining processes." Let's not pretend that redlining is over, like this sentence implies, and instead use the millions of dollars this project is wasting to actually and effectively end redlining practices in Minneapolis. This project is gentrification at its finest and seemingly completely blind to that fact.	Can we not do better as a society?
47	Satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
48	Neutral	I love the breakdown of intention and outcomes	Neutral	I wish the specificity would have been on the fore front of these pages as opposed to further in the program around page 84. These particular pages lacked specificity	Satisfied			
49	Very Satisfied	This thinking is past due and need to happen. Maintaining public ownership is also a step in the right direction. As a society we have reached the limits of what a capitalist culture can provide. I understand the need for commercial space to provide for the residents but the focus must be on public use.	Very Satisfied	Important to think people first, especially local residents and happen to be people of color.	Neutral	The access will be limited to two streets at either end. A bridge in the middle that could include more park space would provide walk-able access to the neighbors who live west of 94.		People and public ownership first, sustainable infrastructure and setting aside prime riverfront space for future generations must be a priority.
50	Very Satisfied	This brings an openness and vitality with the arts and music as a backdrop to the big river.	Very Satisfied	Brings business in. Perfect.	Satisfied	I would like to see more walking and biking options.	The more business opportunity the better.	I hope this goes through. Other cities I have visited like the Cincinnati waterfront with outdoor venues and miles of walking space comes to mind.
51	Very Unsatisfied	This is a terrible and inefficient use of city funds that would be far better be spent on restoring the many small businesses devastated by the riots in May/June.	Very Unsatisfied	This is an inefficient use of city funds at this time.	Very Unsatisfied			It is very rude that your survey does not acknowledge the existence of multiple racial/ethnic identities. This is an act of erasure, and highly offensive.
52	Very Unsatisfied	I am adamantly opposed to the concert venue. Not needed. Duplicative. Not a good use of site that should have more park space. Just a handout to greedy First Ave ... Again! No real job creation. Not suitable for our weather either. Will be noisy too. This site should be more environmentally friendly. More quiet green space. As usual, park board mucks it up by over- programming everything.	Unsatisfied	If it's so great, why were we constantly hearing opposition from community, resignations, etc? Sounds like community was not respected and this turkey is just a development deal benefiting two private corporations, First Ave and United. Should be more public greenspace.	Unsatisfied	More nature, more quiet greenspace. Stop over-programming everything. This city is losing too much greenspace park space for the enjoyment of all.	This sounds sketchy. Better pick that partner carefully, given some if the many unqualified nonprofits hovering around Minneapolis these days. Dime a dozen and not properly vetted or qualified.	Do any existing businesses need to be moved out? If so, what are or were your relocation plans for and with them?

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

53	Neutral	It is my impression that the community in which this site is located is not on board with some of it and that the resources directed to parts of the project could be better applied to address some of the problems community has advanced. I could be wrong on this but my impression is based on news reports from some time ago that may have been addressed with the community since then. I am most concerned about the inclusion of what appears to be a very (too?) elaborate performance center. While some sort of venue can bring others from outside the area (a good thing), the Twin Cities has an abundance of venues and adding another in a crowded entertainment segment may make this an expensive venture with risk.	Neutral	I would have marked "Unsure" if that was a choice based on my previous comment. While many of the initiatives within the plan address key issues, e.g. affordable housing, food deserts, etc., concentrating them in this area doesn't address the needs in some of the neighborhoods.	Satisfied	The improvements are attractive and welcome for an area that is really quite unattractive currently.	I'm not qualified to answer this but continued engagement throughout the process is obviously necessary. That includes flexibility to modify plans as conditions or needs change.	What contingency plans are in place for cost overruns, unforeseen economic impacts (downturns), tax implications for all Minneapolis residents in the face of defaults, etc. In other words, who is accountable for failures to achieve the vision and who is on the hook?
54	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
55	Satisfied	I like that this project recognized the institutional harm done to ADOS and BIPOC groups residing in North Minneapolis and the opportunity this project provides to those groups. My concern is the connection to the communities on the other side of 94 and the rest of North Minneapolis. The area itself is slightly isolated so my concern is in access to the area and ability for those communities to enjoy/use it.	Satisfied	I love the idea of local, public art in the space. I think there is a long way to go in acknowledging the U.S.'s troubled history with racism and slavery so I would love it if there was something that was created to do just that. I think one of the greatest gifts we could give to the North Minneapolis community was acknowledging what we did. Maybe something near 94?	Satisfied			I know that the city has engaged key community partners, but how are you engaging residents specifically in North Minneapolis? Are residents excited by the project? I live in South Minneapolis and while I like what I am seeing, I want to know that North Minneapolis also wants this plan and can see it benefiting their community.
56	Satisfied	After decades of study and planning, I think this draft plan is very good. It will bring needed River access to the Camden Community and provide nice, varied amenities too. The Northside is greatly underserved in such public amenities and this plan will help to right that imbalance.	Satisfied	Same as above. The river access, paths, parkland and the music venue will be great additions to Camden.	Very Satisfied	Plan has great access to the river and reclaims private, unsightly land for public use and enjoyment.	Once Covid19 passes, present overviews of the plan to the official Camden neighborhood organizations at public meetings.	
57	Unsatisfied	What is the affordable housing? Don't we want a sustainable mix of people in the northside? We have plenty of affordable housing on the northside right now. What about security? We've done other projects in Minneapolis that have not survived. The co-op on Golden Valley Road and Penn Avenue? The project on one with Ave and Penn, Broadway and Penn Avenue- Doesn't look like a diverse group of people that live in the buildings? Seems to be all section 8 and affordable housing. Where are the high end buildings on the north side. Why don't we try doing something like the north loop. Also Bloomington did a nice job of developing their projects. We can't just have poor people in one area it doesn't make for a good mix. What would that mix be? Racially diverse, economically diverse. What are cities in the world with that mix and it works?	Unsatisfied	Are we going with a bunch of nonprofits here again? The reason the northside will not be sustainable is because of the nonprofits, we have businesses in Minneapolis the southside seems to work? Why does the northside not work? You've got five hair shops in the block radius? Does that make sense? When people shop and they live on the northside they go elsewhere. And that's really sad because businesses here cannot trust the police department and the prosecutors to go after the criminals. Unity benefits? You're speaking of jobs? There are plenty of jobs out there now? People just don't want to work here on the northside. That's not the case there are lots of jobs out there and they're just not willing to go get them easier to sit back on section 8 and collect welfare. so are we limiting the people that can get the jobs to minorities? Is that the benefit what about white people? Living on the northside I consider myself a minority I am a white woman.	Very Unsatisfied	This should've happened a long time ago. What happened to delayed us?	Community ownership. Does that mean somebody with a good credit score? In previous business experience? Somebody who's proven themselves?	
58	Very Unsatisfied	Shame on you all - what about all the businesses that were destroyed by the Riots?? And now, you're just going to move on to something new??	Very Unsatisfied	Shame on you all - what about all the businesses that were destroyed by the Riots?? And now, you're just going to move on to something new??	Very Unsatisfied	Shame on you all - what about all the businesses that were destroyed by the Riots?? And now, you're just going to move on to something new??	Shame on you all - what about all the businesses that were destroyed by the Riots?? And now, you're just going to move on to something new??	Shame on you all - what about all the businesses that were destroyed by the Riots?? And now, you're just going to move on to something new??
59	Very Unsatisfied	The loss of a viable dump site for tree waste. With EAB in Minneapolis, there will be an uptick in the need for residents and tree services to get rid of waste, companies will be forced to make longer trips (more emissions) to dump debris with the loss of the OTI site. A private/public partnership with the MPRB should be established so that private companies could use their dump site near their north shop. I find it hard to swallow that private companies will lose their dump site, but the park board gets to keep theirs.	Satisfied		Satisfied			
60	Very Satisfied	Seems thoughtful and I appreciate the mix of people involved and reaching out to community members.	Satisfied	It all looks great but I am a newer Northside resident so I defer to those who have a longer history here.	Satisfied	same as above	NorthPoint Health and Wellness	

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

61	Very Unsatisfied	Lack of authentic community engagement. Back-door deal to include private land ownership with First Avenue Corp The usual piece-meal, one-off approach to decisions that negatively impact the community No clear displacement and gentrification plan currently implemented, too-little too late. Community should own the land, not political, public officials Why give-away land when its not yours to give-away (MPRB)	Very Unsatisfied	Little or no opportunity for generational wealth building for northside residents.  No timeline nor penalty for non-compliance related to the training plan for living-wage jobs or small business ownership.  Words like "Identify" and others are non-action words and don't necessarily require follow-up or follow through.  What entity/person at the City will manage all the aspects of this plan, if approved. What happens to "community benefits" when the CPAC says it didn't make any money? Who will audit them? What's the penalty for non-compliance? What is the target number for jobs, small businesses, etc.at the	Neutral	The MPRB should not be a land owner at the UHT, the land belongs to the community.	You always select the "usual suspect non-profits" who have a dismal success rate in their community benefits or engagement.  It's the same as "we can't find any qualified Black people for...fill in the corporate America blank"- The City can't seem to locate viable, community-focused non-profits to assist the northside community  Once again, piece-meal, competitive among each other, approach by the City. We need a CLT (community land trust) to hold the UHT in perpetuity for northside residents and for their benefit without City involvement or oversight. We are working on such an agreement and will present to the City Council on or before 02/2021	A Community Land Trust (CLT)to own the 48 acres in it's entirely permanently and will be managed by an 11-member Board of community members only. Certain northside residents to receive monthly cash stipends from the profits/ground leases and other revenue generators at the UHT. Ward 4 residents to receive free electricity from mandated solar installations at the UHT. Ward 5 on the list for future solar installations and free electricity. CDC's and other entities will sit under the CLT and may handle mgmt, staff, acquisitions, etc. The CLT is NOT a land bank.
62	Satisfied	I think this plan takes into account previous community desires for the project	Satisfied	I love that the City will maintain ownership of the site through ground leases and am a fan of the First Avenue/ Community Entity tbd partnership for ownership. I think this takes into account previous discussions about community ownership in this development	Neutral	I think a lot of my satisfaction for the access portion of the plan will depend on transit connections. Would love to see high frequency bus get routed to this site. I am encouraged by the mention of curb protected bike lanes down Dowling and would love to see other option beyond Dowling to link across 94. Additionally, being able to somehow connect to Mississippi Park and 42nd Ave bike routes would be incredible, if difficult to implement	Would like to continue to see as much nonprofit involvement as possible and continued community control (ground leases, land trust type ownership model, etc.)	I think this plan is a great update and I love seeing community feedback taken into account here. Large investment like this is needed on the North Side! The transportation and connection piece will be a huge development for me with this project
63	Satisfied	Just learned about the whole project 2 days ago. After years of evolution sorry I never encountered this before. Its obvious that mountains of work and involvement from many people have already taken place to form a vision. Its a huge undertaking to take input from many people and shape it into a plan. I would simply like to commend you on your efforts and the evolving results. I would also like to present a sculptural idea in the additional comments question below.						I just learned about the Upper Harbor plan 2 days ago.  I have been an artist a good portion of my life. I taught sculpture at MCAD for 6 years and spent 20 years making large scale metal sculptures on a commission basis.  I have had a dream of making a large-scale sculpture for my city, Minneapolis, for many years. This may be the opportunity I've been looking for.  The sculptural idea I have would be very large and "Collaborative Project". The title of the sculpture would be "Three Rivers Unity". Unity in the sense it would include attracting an African American artist or group – A first Nation Native American artist or group and a third undecided group to work together. The concept is to build a large structure that incorporates design elements from each group and then have them work in unity to build the single larger unifying design.  I have a sculpture just north of the project site on the East River Road just south of 694. The sculpture is called Two Wing. Fr years I've envisioned expanding on the structural concepts presented within that piece to produce a 3-sided sculpture approximately 80 feet on each of three sides and approximately 68 feet high. I would like to connect with a representative(s) from your group to meet me at that sculpture to show you this
64	Satisfied	There seems to me a significant amount of though and intention into how this will benefit the Northside community and specifically how to creating wealth for the community	Satisfied		Satisfied			What is the exact amount the project defines as a living wage?

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

65	Unsatisfied	<p>1. The plan sort of tangentially acknowledges that Dakota land was stolen by the U.S. government, and acknowledges that the Mississippi is important to the Dakota people. Why, then, do the Dakota receive no ownership over the land? What is the point of making any kind of land acknowledgement if the project will neither return to Dakota control and possession, nor fiscally benefit Dakota peoples? It's egregious in 2021 to be working on a plan to redevelop the Mississippi River and to not substantively address the historic injustices that the U.S. has committed against indigenous people (e.g., genocide, land theft, displacement, etc.). <a href="https://landback.org">https://landback.org</a></p> <p>2. I saw no indication of the efficiency standards for the housing or commercial buildings. Are you going to work with e.g., testudio.com or other local architects to build passivhaus or net-zero energy buildings? You can easily do so, meeting both your environmental justice goals and your housing justice goals (by eliminating utility bills for residents). And if you "don't" build houses meeting such high efficiency standards, it's also not clear how families with young kids are going to deal with the noise from outdoor concert venues when they need quiet by 6-7pm for bedtime. But no mention of these issues.</p> <p>3. Even if the housing is affordable (and it does not look affordable—60% AMI for Hennepin County is still like \$60k, which is an outlandish sum of money), I see no inclusion of amenities that will make it affordable for people to actually live there. Is there on-site daycare? Are there on-site medical services? Needle exchanges or safe injection sites? Will there be a year-round on-site grocery store? (Not just a farmer's market that caters to wealthier NE residents or young people who will eventually flee to the suburbs, but a place for residents and neighbors to buy/find affordable, locally-grown, organic foods in what is otherwise a food desert). What transit options will be available? There is no LRT, or aBRT nearby.</p>	Unsatisfied	See 1.	Unsatisfied	I'm also not satisfied with the means of accessing the park. Lowry is an egregiously under-utilized road in Minneapolis, especially as it hits the Mississippi and crosses into NE. It is in desperate need of a 4-3 conversion (if not a 4-2) and the introduction of grade-separated bike lanes or aBRT lanes. At any rate, again, it seems like UHT is mostly accessible by car.	<p>testudio.com (whose lead architect is also co-founder of the 2000-watt-society.org) for passivhaus/net-zero energy building design.</p> <p><a href="http://cedarcohousing.llc">http://cedarcohousing.llc</a> for co-housing. We don't need a flimsy destination park with assorted market-driven commodities that can be exchanged as the market demands. We need a model for sustainable living that shows the rest of the city and state how climate-friendly intentional communities can thrive.</p> <p><a href="http://inquinixsunidxs.org">http://inquinixsunidxs.org</a> for housing justice.</p>	Honestly explain to the public what happens if the City Council denies the plan in February '21. The land will be there, and it can always be re-developed. There's no need to rush this project!
66	Unsatisfied	You are talking about putting in Community Performing Arts Center when there are already a lot of Art organization in North Minneapolis . Capri Theater, Hollywood Studio of Dance , Dance City, Lundstrum Performing Arts, Les Petite. Instead of building another art organization to compete against the organization that are already in the community. Why don't you look at funding these existing organizations that have been in the community. Some of these organizations have been in the community for 30 years or more. Your not doing your research to find out what is already in the community, why reinvent the wheel. When you can enhance what is already here.	Neutral	Don't know enough about	Neutral		You should be working with existing Art organizations that are housed in north Minneapolis.	Don't just throw up plans without knowing what is already in the community. There is people like myself who have taken their own money to purchase property to provide the kids in North Minneapolis opportunity to be exposed to the art of dance, who have difficult getting funding to continue to provide the service. I've been doing this for 30 years, what is Minneapolis doing for us.
67	Very Unsatisfied	The city SHOULD NOT be selling public land to be developed privately. Especially not in north Minneapolis to the wealthiest family in the state. What is wrong with you all. Disgusting and shameful.	Very Unsatisfied	They are bogus. They lack community input and do not allow for a changing of the master plan put forth by developers.	Very Unsatisfied	Stop selling public land.	Privatization of public space across the city is a disgrace. Acting like community orgs have an power is lying.	Yall are disgusting. This city deserves better
68	Very Satisfied	I've been closely following the slow, steady progress of the UHT project. The positive ripple effect will, in many ways, be difficult to quantify, but I believe this will do wonders for N. Mpls and the twins cities metro area in general. The only way for N. Mpls to fundamentally change is by investing resources in it. Yes, there will be "outsiders" cashing in on the deal, but such is life. The benefits to the community far out way any issue I may have with "outside investors".	Very Satisfied	I am very pleased with the results of the community benefits plan. My wife and I had a great deal of direct input on this and it's right on target	Satisfied	I'm still not entirely sure how your committee plans to make sure the UHT is accessible to N. Mpls residents within walking/biking distance of the UHT. There is no good (safe) way for pedestrians to cross over the freeway and frontage roads. I'm assuming you're considering a UHT ped-only catwalk or something.	<p>Chris Webley - 336-___-___</p> <p>Owner of New Rules (minority owned) Work space, event space, art gallery 2015 Lowry Ave N Minneapolis MN 55411 <a href="http://newrulesmn.com">newrulesmn.com</a></p>	I began attending UHT public input meetings since the first one several ago, when the project was still in it's infancy. As a self-employed minority business owner and property owner of several rental properties in North Minneapolis, I have been impatiently waiting, with great anticipation for the ground breaking ceremony of the UHT project. N. Mpls needs an economic machine, circulating money in, through and around the area, increasing property values and the associated benefits, while decreasing poverty and the associated ills.

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

69	Neutral	<p>Plus Side: City will retain ownership. I think this is a great way to limit the reach of private organizations that don't have as much of an incentive to serve the social needs of the area. The biggest risk to this project is that the gentrification of North Minneapolis will speed up and a community that has been built by Black people is no longer welcome to them.</p> <p>Cons: Economic Inclusion, when the US Bank Stadium was built I noticed most of the license plates of construction workers were from out of state.</p> <p>Gentrification, how does any of the city retained rights and planning for the UHT prevent private enterprises from buying up nearby North Minneapolis land, on Lowry across the bridge for example, and turning those homes into condos and town homes. If the UHT brings high income homeowners who want a townhome by the water, it will bring interest to others. And if the gentrification brings in new, higher than historically average, income homeowners to North Minneapolis, how does the Northside fund prioritize help to original residents, and what about those that get displaced and leave the area?</p> <p>Everything I've brought up may be covered in this document, but 97 pages is not a realistic plan to ask for public review and probably hasn't encouraged participation in this survey.</p> <p>I think the best way to prevent gentrification, or slow it considerably, is for the land to feature a museum and park, or other public spaces. Remove the stores and private housing. Make a Minneapolis African American History Museum or something.</p>	Neutral	The pedestrian and access improvements are great and probably have potential to improve mental health and life satisfaction. The focus on housing and income generation I think should be weighted very low in consideration. There are more important things than housing and both housing and income usually benefit people that already have opportunities for both more than create new opportunities.	Satisfied			
70	Satisfied	As a current northside resident I appreciate the variety of economic and recreational aspects of this plan, as well as the inclusion of affordable and mixed housing. This is a space my family and I will use.	Satisfied	I appreciated the inclusion of the historic and social context of previous development, or lack of development, on the northside. It helps me trust that this will not be a repeat of past development on the northside that has not always benefitted the existing residents.	Satisfied			
71	Very Unsatisfied	Absolutely no private development, retail or housing, please. Priority should be natural shoreline, park space and trails. The for-profit construction is horrific and would be a tragedy. The opportunity here is something more like Como Park, Minnehaha Falls or Wirth. A public, river front park would be a huge economic driver, all by itself.	Very Unsatisfied	Textbook blind faith in privatization and markets. The real benefit to the community would be more trees and less concrete, with easy access to all. Private developers should not be considered stakeholders at this point, and jobs should not be an objective. Let's start simple with natural shoreline and trails, and hold off on further development until people have had a chance to experience the site in an undeveloped and fully public state.	Neutral	Just make it easy to access by any mode of transportation.	I'd like to see this project 100% under the Minneapolis Park Board.	100% of the shoreline should be natural, and open to the general public.
72	Neutral	Lots of planning and thoughtfulness went into this. But the blandness of the design solution is disappointing. Discrete buildings of no particular architectural distinction--the only one that looks even a little interesting is the greenhouse-like food production building. The one terrace overlooking the river looks great--why just one? And why do we need a manufacturing facility (i.e. factory)--because it will (if it works as projected) pay for itself or come closer to doing so? Can't it be further from the river and some other housing, or restaurants, or whatever be closer to the river? This city so badly needs more real urban non-industrial use of the river. This is kind of a timid step.	Satisfied	Some good moves to avoid some of the damage that gentrification so often does to the community it displaces.	Satisfied	Obviously the long term connections go beyond this immediate parcel. The railroad bridge to the south is already used (illegally) as a pedestrian crossing of the river. I know railroads can be bastards to deal with, but it would be great if that bridge could become a legal pedestrian/bicycle crossing. The day when the parkway connects "all the way" to parkways north and south, well, that will be a great day (probably after I'm gone from this earth).	-	How do we get better architecture? Even when "star" architects are engaged in this city the result is often disappointing and watered down (e.g. the downtown library, the new Federal Reserve Bank, or private projects like the NW, now Wells-Fargo, bank building). (Exceptions are the new Guthrie and Walker). If ever a site called for interesting, green buildings this site is it. I'm thinking about some of the reclaimed industrial space along the rivers in Lyon, France I saw last year (they have two rivers which join in the city).
73	Very Satisfied	It looks like there has been a lot of thought and care go into making sure this project benefits North Mpls and people who have been traditionally left out of decisions and policies and wealth. It's great to see this city trying to make amends.	Very Satisfied	The focus on the community benefits is comprehensive, from home ownership, to opportunities, to financing.	Very Satisfied	Giving public access to the waterfront and reconnecting the community to it is the right thing to do.	I'm not familiar with these types of organizations.	I like the focus on wellness and renewable energy and goals for LEED certifications. It sounds like it'll be a unique and vibrant community. I'm so proud of First Ave's involvement and the amount of work and thought the city has put into this. I even said to myself, 'Hey, maybe it'll be a cool place for me to live someday way down the road when that senior housing project gets built!'. I'm really excited to watch this project develop.

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

74	Very Unsatisfied	<p>You continue to willingly gentrify one of the only affordable places for low income people to live in Minneapolis.</p> <p>Our city council demands that they want to integrate low income housing with high income housing and then turn around and fuck the low wage earners by raising rental prices with "market rate" housing. Jesus christ... When will you stop forcing poor people out of the city?</p> <p>You bring in an outside New York architect to build some of the most expensive condos in Minneapolis, tear down neighborhoods for wealthy buyers, and then wonder why BLM is burning shit to the ground?</p> <p>C'mon. Get your shit together and stop selling out to lobbyists and billionaire developers.</p>	Very Unsatisfied	See above.	Very Unsatisfied	You're not providing anything for the communities in the area other than higher costs of living.		<p>Our city council. Our mayor. Our governor... They're all paid with tax payer money, yet they choose to deny the tax payers rights.</p> <p>You've already fucked small businesses and low income earners during the pandemic by approving bailouts for airlines and gas pipelines nobody wants.</p> <p>Our government is shutting down businesses that employ people because it's not safe, while simultaneously agreeing to let 1000s of people to enter at-risk areas on tribal land to build a pipeline... Areas not suited to handle the spike in covid cases and with complete disregard for Native tribes.</p> <p>Get off your high horses and stop serving yourselves and start serving the people who pay you.</p>
75	Unsatisfied	Too close to river, not enough natural space	Neutral	Be nice to have a large nature area dog park too	Unsatisfied	Development too close to river, more space for nature needed		
76	Neutral	<p>I appreciate the project goals of offering a sustainable and vibrant space in North Minneapolis. I also love the goals of affordable apartments in the plan, and wish the hotel was still in the plan as well. However, to ensure that redevelopment is a bustling and vibrant tourist destination the type of retail and how that retail is developed is important. The trend in retail destinations is semi-open market concepts. Pike Place in Seattle and Ponce City Market in Atlanta are concepts that we need to strive to create in this space for Minneapolis. Key themes from those concepts that are attracting to create a tourist and gathering destination, but also jobs and opportunities in the community are: a wide variety of local vendors including many food and small gift shops, a covered atrium with a glass roof and indoor/outdoor places to sit, hallways could be open to the elements if outdoor style heating was installed, similar to what 50th &amp; France has.</p> <p>Ultimately, the food and retail needs to be local, abundant, and vibrant to where someone could come back to the area daily or weekly and experience something new.</p> <p>On the park and outdoor theater, I like those ideas for summer time fun and parks are always nice but the theater doesn't achieve the goal of a stimulating experience EVERY time someone visits the space, only when there are events.</p>	Neutral	I agree with the project goals, and I agree with the community benefits but as stated in the first question we have to be hyper focused on repeat visitors from our community and around the country. I think focusing on a large scale market-style retail venue that celebrates North Minneapolis culture can pay dividends in the community. I am not satisfied to see manufacturing plants proposed along the river as a revolutionary idea. I understand manufacturing plants provide jobs, and that's good for the community but further polluting our rivers and putting it right next to the park is bad idea.	Very Unsatisfied	<p>Minneapolis has failed on so many levels to provide adequate transportation and this plan is no different. Bike lanes and expanded sidewalks are great, don't get me wrong. However, without a plan for rapid, easy, and non-weather dependent access to the area we'll find this spot a wasteland in the winter.</p> <p>Ideally, the light rail should be planned to run through this area however I would also settle for BRT. Minneapolis also needs to ditch the "all roads lead to downtown" thinking and start connecting communities without going through downtown. This can be done by making Route 4 BRT and providing a new BRT route that connects south and north Lyndale avenues.</p>	I would like the city to start working with local employee owned companies, especially when searching for food and retail vendors. There are few employee owned businesses out there today, and city support to expand locations is a big win for our community.	<p>My final comment is to keep in mind that building this plan for one community doesn't guarantee success. Ensure success by building this as a city gathering spot that celebrates a community, but allows easy access from all over the city to allow that celebration to happen and flourish.</p> <p>Don't build a bubble, build a destination.</p>
77	Neutral	It doesn't yet feel community driven.	Neutral		Neutral			I would like to see this plan included more of the north side community, ability to attract and sustain diverse businesses, incorporate a food and artisan market, restaurants and community spaces. It needs create more affordable housing that's truly affordable. 65% I'd not sufficient. I'm tired of seeing apartments go up that are ridiculously expensive and have little parking options which create commuting nightmares on top of pushing hardworking people out of their communities.
78	Very Unsatisfied	it is a reverse red-lining production	Neutral	they don't help the whole city	Very Satisfied	it needs to be done		
79	Neutral	<p>I want to see a very large area to rest quietly in nature and look out at the river.</p> <p>Free of picnics, frisbee players etc.</p> <p>Also housing affordable to who? Should be affordable to people in North Mpls.</p>	Neutral		Neutral			

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

80	Unsatisfied	The commitment to solar, wind and water power is lacking. You do not need a dam to generate power from a river's flow. There are many flat-roofed buildings indicated that could support solar or wind turbines. River "corridors" often enhance wind speeds. Solar or wind turbines could be a great asset for affordable housing if some of their utility bills could be reduced or eliminated.  Minnesota has a great Accessibility Code. It is better than the Federal ADAAG. However, I haven't seen any mention in this document. Are there opportunities to go beyond the basics and get into a "wish list" of facilities or amenities for our disabled citizens? Thanks, R J "Tate" Halvorson	Neutral		Neutral			
81	Very Unsatisfied	Now is bot the time to demolish and area. Rebuild the city where it was destroyed by rioters. Rebuild the neighborhoods the city sat back amd watched get destroyed. Or was that the olan so developers can profit off those neigh orhoods and the city can cushion it's coffers with a larger tax stream?	Very Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied	We don't need more parks for homeless people to camp in amd drug addicts to toss their used syringes in	Again, focus on rebuilding the areas destroyed by rioters. Keep neighborhood organizations to truly have community i put not developers lobbyists	How isbthe city planning to rebuild the damaged areas they let burn? Building a new neighborhood whete there wasn't one will not help all of the neigh orhoods damaged
82	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
83	Unsatisfied	I liked the old plan with the amphitheater. What happened to that? The community performing center seems like a way smaller version of the larger idea. It was better when upper harbor would be a destination. Huge mistake if the plan is to take the amphitheater out.	Neutral		Neutral			Please reconsider the larger amphitheater.
84	Satisfied	I love this park space and potential for new business. I also love the idea of having an entertainment venue so near to my home.	Very Satisfied	Living in the Weber Camden neighborhood, I feel that the proposed plan will really benefit my community.	Satisfied	That appears to have many ways for visitors to enter exit via main roads.		I'm very excited for this! I have lived in the Weber Camden neighborhood for almost 10 years. Having a place to access the river, enjoy food and community time together is a much needed addition to our community.
85	Very Satisfied	I'm aligned to the values of the plan and the outcomes it seeks to achieve.	Satisfied	Looks good overall. I don't know if affordable house for 1000 is enough to make a difference, so did not put very satisfied.	Very Satisfied			
86	Very Satisfied	Great input from the community, will serve North Mpls well and be a place that serves our community and will draw people to it.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
87	Unsatisfied	Too much development of the riverfront. The housing, food processing, etc. should be back further away from the riverfront, so that there is more universal public access to riverfront parkland. Also, too much industry. Efforts should be made to move GAF off of the riverfront. Also, why have a urban food production and processing plant right on the river? There is so much potential for the riverfront and this plan looks like mostly development and very little parkland. Everything should be setback as far as the health and wellness proposed spaces. Also, having high-rise buildings along the river is not environmentally friendly. The river is an avian highway.	Neutral	I think that whole process has problems. Who is benefitting? There is all this talk about the "community" benefitting, but who is the "community"? My sense is that the community is very narrowly defined. Also, the so called benefits put profit and construction over preservation and creation of parkland and riverfront. There are ways to be creative about development that would keep the focus on the natural beauty of the river. The pictures are beautiful, but they could be in any suburban development. They don't blend with the environment - they look like something out of a Maple Grove catalog.  Also, I think it should be ALL publicly owned. I don't like the idea that only the land is owned by the public and so much else is privately owned. We should know how that goes by now. I don't think there should be ANY housing along the river. THIS seems like a very short sighted vision - we have an opportunity to reclaim the river with all of it beauty. The housing can be built back away from the river to maintain the wild nature of the river. The river is a wildlife highway that extends from the Gulf of Mexico to Lake Itasca. Too much development along the river disrupts nature.	Very Unsatisfied	It is unclear to me what is going to happen to improve Dowling from Lyndale to the Freeway. That stretch of road is very hazardous currently and there almost needs to be a buy-out of property to improve the flow of traffic and safety for pedestrians.  The bike and walking lanes are good, but I do not like the roads next to the river. It looks to me like there will be roads north of the music venue and south of the park. Why do we need to have a road any closer than 2nd Ave? Please, put more emphasis on the river and less on creating roadways and development. Take a look at other river areas that have been developed for public use - not private use. This area should be a commons - an area for wildlife and for all people. It is a tragedy to me that you are planning to put a roadway along the river, and the "focus area" in the northend of the park area looks like there is a plan for even more construction.		
88	Unsatisfied	I have not received enough information for this project as a current north Minneapolis resident.	Unsatisfied	I do not see the financial get back to education in north Minneapolis	Neutral	Waiting for next phase of project.		How do I stay more connected to this project

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

89	Satisfied	I appreciate the effort to reclaim the River for Minneapolis residents use because it is currently a dead space within the city that could be better used. Let's make this space a crown jewel for the city. Love the inclusion of the concert venue and park.	Satisfied	As important as it is to make sure North side residents feel the benefits of this space, I also hope it isn't lost that this is a space for the rest of the Twin Cities community broadly.	Neutral	I am mainly concerned with bone accessibility to this park space. A little bit concerned because it looks like you have to enter the area from 2nd Avenue rather than being able to continue north from the West Bank river trails. Also does it end in a dead end? Would be nice to get to a place eventually where it is all interconnected well with the current pike and pedestrian trails		Does this space connect to the rest of the river trail system? Can someone biking or walking continue from the current system along the river into the Upper Harbor area or do you have to come by way of 2nd Avenue? If yes, is there a future plan to integrate to the trail system? One of the biggest annoyances currently is the way the river trail ends and you get spit out to 2nd Avenue which is a busy and industrial street
90	Satisfied	I really appreciate the equity lens, but the non-automobile connections plan for the site still seem a bit early in concept. The housing, concert venue, manufacturing, office, retail would all benefit from non-car ownership possibilities. Biking, Local Bus, and aBRT should be well coordinated if this site is going to get public money.	Neutral		Satisfied	I'm satisfied with the pedestrian connections, but driving seems to be a favored option. What improvements to existing bike routes are needed to the north and south. Is a pedestrian bridge from Dowling to 31st Ave NE possible in the future?		
91	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
92	Very Unsatisfied	Why would you put a loud music venue on the river? This noise will carry miles away. Anything on the river should be peaceful not a music venue. Build a beautiful park that could have a farmers market and local vendor stalls.	Very Unsatisfied	I don't see any community benefits - other than some minimum wage jobs.	Very Unsatisfied	I can't be satisfied with any part of this.		
93	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
94	Very Unsatisfied	There does not seem to be an actual specific plan in place. There are a lot of buzz-words and virtue signaling, but nothing detailed.	Very Unsatisfied	The community will not benefit without adequate transportation to the venue. Until it is recognized that "gentrification" is a benefit to the community, the area will continue to be economically stagnant.	Very Unsatisfied			Start over. The drawings look dreadful. Affordable riverfront property should not be subsidized by tax payers when there are much more pressing matters. It is an insult to the people who work hard, pay high taxes and struggle to save.
95	Unsatisfied	I think the best option is to leave the riverfront alone, to allow nature to heal. That poor river has been exploited for over 100 years.	Unsatisfied	The community would benefit more from development of commercial areas that have been forgotten, Broadway and Lowry.	Unsatisfied	The most realistic and honest plan would be to replicate the North Loop and the townhouse development south of Plymouth. The land would become valuable and both GAF and Northern Metals would leave. Take the tax money from that to rebuild North Minneapolis..and keep a big park area.	I hope the community isn't relying on a volunteer committee to run these organizations. These are full-time jobs.	If you are putting a park and housing and a concert venue there, how are you going to deal with the pollution, the active rail line, and the traffic?
96	Very Satisfied	Focusing on the community hub aspect and affordable housing are the right priorities.	Satisfied		Satisfied	Problems: 1) The Xcel powerline crossing the river right in the middle of the site is unacceptable. In a new development ALL powerlines should be underground, no exceptions. If this is not possible, perhaps routing the lines under the deck of Lowry ave. bridge could be looked at. 2) Consider routing the parkway on the east side of the buildings to make a more peaceful and safe park experience. 3) Connections across I-94 are very important, consider a pedestrian connection at 36th street		A freeway lid connecting the North Minneapolis community across 94 to the site should be a long term goal.
97	Neutral	I don't like high density housing near the river. I think the land along the riverbanks should be kept as natural as possible to keep the river clean. Put the community areas nearer the river and move the housing and industrial further away. We don't need a road along the river and please get rid of those ugly fertilizer domes, clean up the site and make it a nature park.						
98	Satisfied	Overall it looks good, but I'm concerned that the planning for the park land is too undefined.	Satisfied	I like the idea of providing additional affordable housing in the city.	Neutral	From the renderings, it looks like the bike path will run right next to a road. It would be nice if the bike path was away from the road and closer to the river.		Do we really need the First Avenue concert venue? Was there any consideration of creating a public market on the site?  With the rerouting of the Blue Line light rail extension, has thought been giving to putting a light rail station close to this development?
99	Very Unsatisfied	It an unnecessary way of spending tax dollars. Give it back to the community in a way that will actually benefit everyone.	Very Unsatisfied	Terminate this committee. It is not useful. Wasting tax payer dollars is something I know yall are very good at but we need smaller government. You can't even control yours.	Very Unsatisfied	Park board can barely manage their snow on a timely manner. I have reported them many times for long grass as well. They don't need any more responsibilities.	Un needed development	Plant trees

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

100	Satisfied	There is something for everyone but mostly BIPOC northside residents who will benefit from the project on so many levels. So many proposed projects on the northside have fallen away/failed so prayerful that this will come to fruition.	Satisfied	Please ensure that the BIPOC population is not shut out as the project progresses.	Satisfied		Juxtaposition Arts NEON All Northside neighborhood associations West Broadway Business and Area Coalition Lowry Corridor Business Association Northside Residents Redevelopment Council	Appreciate the anti-gentrification and anti-displacement considerations, as a Black long-term homeowner on the northside I have seen us be left out of the conversations regarding development opportunities. The part on wealth creation is crucial for the northside.
101	Neutral	I'll believe it when I see it. I live just across the river. The little I know says to me this is a yuppie project aimed at giving well-off yuppies another playground, and there will be very little useful outreach to the existing neighborhood. Prove me wrong.	Unsatisfied	I'll believe this when I see it.	Neutral		Dumping your ridiculous music venue plan would be a good start. I don't see it as something the neighborhood will be attracted to (or able to afford) attending. The parking and traffic problems should be pretty obvious.	I tried reading your PDFs. Can you translate the yuppie gibberish into something an average citizen can comprehend?  ps - jumping down the questionnaire from here, I see a red asterisk after the line "What is the ZIP code of your primary residence?"  What does that red asterisk mean? Clicking on it does nothing. There is no key to explain it. Did anyone proofread this questionnaire?
102	Neutral	Your vision looks great on paper, but I'm afraid that instead of helping our community... we will just be pushing out the people of north Minneapolis only to bring in a completely different demographic.	Satisfied	These programs will be great for children. They are the future and their development is crucial.	Neutral	No comment		
103	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
104	Very Unsatisfied	The city has a ton of other projects that need to be funded	Unsatisfied	All your reasoning for the project seem misguided and flat out lies	Very Unsatisfied	The park board needs to come back down to reality	What's it going to cost to clean up the site to just have it go to waste	This project seems like a huge waste of money and resources that could be better used in so many other places and to fix so many other things then to create a place people are afraid to go to and there aren't any police to protect it.
105	Very Satisfied	Only if they clean up the entire site and shut down current polluters in the area: Northern Metals, GFI roofing company and all those shady car repair shops riddling the street with broken down cars. Too many truckers parking on the street creating trash in the streets.	Very Unsatisfied	Please make sure you redeveloped the areas around too. Enforcement of laws to surrounded businesses air quality, trash, crime and aesthetic issues. We need clean public sidewalks and well lite walk ways too.  Trees and flowers that are welcoming to all.	Very Unsatisfied	A beautiful park can serve as a gorgeous stage to the star of the show the RIVER FRONT!  Make sure everyone has a view with clear sight lines to the WATER!  Ensure height requirements are enforced do not block the park or river views and access.  Clean up the rivers edge and grounds. Replant native plants that were established before the terminal as built.	Make sure any income generated goes to redevelopment with in the northside residential areas. Improved education, job training and medical care. Mental health, chemical dependency and CHILD CARE TOO!	Traffic Concerns. The only exit to the river front falls at DOWLING AVENUE EXIT. It already over Whelmed with trucks, it was cut down to one lane when someone decided to added a unsafe bike lane. The traffic is congested and no one is monitoring the drivers. Car accidents and lawlessness is abundant on Dowling and Lyndale and all over north MINNEAPOLIS high speed chases end in death. High speed chases with shooting involved is another common experience this area needs INTERVENTION!
106	Satisfied	I am happy to see a mix of affordable housing, commercial space for more bars, restaurants and small businesses along with more trails -s outdoor space.	Satisfied	We live in NE so always want to see more access to businesses for us.	Satisfied		Any small businesses. Work with local non-profits.	
107	Very Unsatisfied	Waste of tax dollars.	Very Unsatisfied	Arrogant self-congratulating lefties gone wild.	Very Unsatisfied	Waste of tax dollars	Reduce red tape	Scrap it
108	Satisfied	Expands park space along the river	Satisfied		Satisfied			
109	Satisfied	I think you've done a good job of managing the different strong voices that have been involved in the project.	Neutral	I'm glad you're not turning this into a massive public housing project. The city needs to stop packing the northside with all the low income residents. We need income diversity.  I also think the idea of keeping the land ownership public so we can reap recurring revenue from occupancy vs selling it once and then then only getting tax revenue.	Neutral	Can you please work with GAF and some of the other folks that are staying in their spot...to allow us to sneak a narrow bike/walking trail along the river? Its really unfortunate that the trail starts and stops.	I'm really concerned about creating yet another non-profit with fat executive director salaries to siphon off as much money as possible to administration versus the actual benefit the non profit is supposed to deliver. I would like there to be an executive compensation cap as one of the RFP requirements.	I'm disappointed the housing isn't more dense. Those housing buildings could easily all double in height. Look at some of the other housing buildings going up near downtown...you don't see little stubby buildings along the riverfront.  I also think its a miss to think the key to jobs is focusing on food industries as the major employers. We already have an abundance of fast food jobs in the north side...we need jobs that teach people how to perform services that actually have good margins. We need tech, financial services and other white collar jobs that have an opportunity to train people with less than a college education to be able to take on these roles and grow in their career. Bringing in a food manufacturer isn't going to do much of anything.
110	Very Unsatisfied	As usual, the city is ignoring the residents and putting more dollars in the pocket of developers. It's like you think we can't see you.	Very Unsatisfied	It's not enough.	Very Unsatisfied	There needs to be more green and park space and a lot less built event space.	You aren't doing enough. Where is the affordable space for macro and micro local businesses? The whole thing should be business opportunities for local residents instead of corporate.	The affordable housing needs to be low income, below 30% AMI.

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

111	Very Unsatisfied	There's nothing to bring pride into North Minneapolis. There are disparities in health, jobs and schools. My suggestion is to get the school involved. Have a program that rewards kids with good grades						
112	Satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied		I hope this area construction project will be designed to be "highly accessible" to people in our community with disabilities.	
113	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
114	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
115	Very Unsatisfied	The plan includes a thoughtful mix of uses, including residential, commercial, industrial, and new park space. I especially like the consideration given to affordability for both residential and business uses to keep the area accessible to members of North Minneapolis communities, as well as the extra push given to BIPOC-owned for-profit businesses to flourish.	Very Unsatisfied	I am impressed with how this plan intends to reinvest profits into the community through public ownership of the land and CPAC ticket fees. I also appreciate the plans to produce and preserve affordable housing right next to the brand new public park, especially the stipulation that the city has the right to purchase those buildings at market value once the compliance period ends. I also appreciate that there are plans to prevent gentrification and displacement of existing North Minneapolis residents and communities. However, the plan should state that its ability to prevent gentrification and displacement is limited by the availability of affordable housing elsewhere in the area. North Minneapolis residents may be displaced if housing becomes scarce, and while UHT provides invaluable additions in terms of housing, recreation, health, and employment, it cannot succeed if affordable housing initiatives are not also undertaken outside of UHT.	Very Unsatisfied	I like how the parkway travels along the river for most of the development and steers away from the river at the park. This allows park users to access the river without crossing a motorized roadway, and it allows buildings along the parkway to have the "front" façade be both street-facing and river-facing. The new alignment of the power lines is a good compromise, considering that they need to be there to provide electrical service to other areas.	Avoid neighborhood organizations when possible. Work directly with organizations that represent underrepresented communities.	I am really excited about this plan and the many ways it aims to uplift marginalized and oppressed communities. I think it strikes the right balance between development and community preservation. One thing I don't fully understand is the Community Hub. Is it a gym? Clinic? Both? Depending on what amenities the MPRB comes up with, perhaps the Hub could be replaced with a community clinic or other health-oriented space with additional affordable housing above. Because this plan includes so much affordable housing, I think that there is room for high-density market rate housing on parcel 7A, especially if affordable housing is aggressively constructed and preserved outside of UHT. The additional residents on parcel 7A could be valuable customers for the businesses in the UHT zone and contribute to its vitality. Thank you all so much for your hard work and dedication to this community and to the success of this project.
116	Satisfied	I want the riverfront to support north Minneapolis with affordable living for historical residents, to offer beautiful public spaces on the river to enjoy the outdoors for free and to connect this part of the city to the cultural attractions for tourism.	Satisfied		Satisfied			Please connect this section to the north Mississippi regional park bicycle and walking paths so we can enjoy the river all the way to downtown.
117	Satisfied	This will be a far better use of the land, and it will balance community desires and needs. I'm most excited for public space and affordable housing including ownership opportunities	Satisfied	The benefits balance needs and desires and are sustainable and measurable (affordable housing units, ground lease payment returned to the community, flexibility in future phases)	Neutral	North Minneapolis deserves a river parkway so that is good. I want to see a better plan to serve people walking and rolling at the Dowling crossing. The access to the mndot road (94) is too easy and accommodating to people in cars. There needs to be a major focus on infrastructure design that slows vehicle operators and prioritizes people walking and rolling.  This would be a great place to plan a future land bridge across 94		

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

118	Unsatisfied	Numerous reasons: 1) The 'vision' of repairing racial injustice through this effort is not addressing root causes, and is only a band-aid. Real solutions are not low-income housing but JOBS and education access that will raise the medium income. Meanwhile, commercial buildings on Broadway Avenue that could be renovated and made access to business and housing will remain dilapidated. The City of Minneapolis has failed Broadway Avenue, this corridor this the true symbol and barometer of the northside. 2) No public housing on the river. No one should be able to buy or live on the river. No one will visit the park, as they will view it as unsafe. 3) Get rid of the agriculture processing buildings. We do NOT want to be known as a 'copy-cat' of what Seattle did. Plus, there will likely be issues that require abatement (as noted), and we could use the land for more park space. 4) GAF toxic air pollution will have negative impact to the success of ANY outdoor activity, especially outdoor performing arts. EVERYONE that has ridden bicycle near GAF, knows that toxic smell, and has complained about potential health concerns.	Neutral	From the data I have seen, you are NOT getting the input from the community that you think you are, but only a small sample of the population. Can you please cite your statistical confidence level that the plan ACCURATELY reflects the interests of the northside, or only those that have been able to spend time citing THEIR interests?	Unsatisfied	Get rid of the domes, and all the fertilizer, grain processing equipment. Just because Seattle did the same with Gas Works Park, does not mean it provides 'value'. There is more value in the scrap materials and increased park acreage. Plus it would an EMBARRASSMENT if we were cited as 'copy-cats'.	It feels too much like a 'build it and they will come' project, without key commitments from partners.	How about simple green space? Use the KISS principle!
119	Very Unsatisfied	This will not service the neighborhood, and bs racial justice is nothing more than a racist catchphrase	Very Unsatisfied	Stop spending our money on useless pet projects				
120	Satisfied	The CPC has raised important questions and opportunities. The developer, the City and others have listened and adjusted to reflect most.  The commitment to rectifying the harms of systems that impact this area is strong. There are forces that wish to continue to keep this area without improvement and self-determined visions. When American descendants of slaves and poor people can be centered in the conversation of wealth building without apology or explanation I would be VERY satisfied.	Satisfied	There is still room to work on property tax reform. That has not yet been fully addressed. Proposition 13 (California) - <a href="https://www.nber.org/digest/apr05/lock-effect-californias-proposition-13">https://www.nber.org/digest/apr05/lock-effect-californias-proposition-13</a> has been introduced for consideration a number of times with no response on the potential benefits or challenges to this community.  there are other benefits that I am glad to see. Like the Community Entity's management of funds from First Avenues ticket sales and other revenue sources related to events. A Community Hub that could include a health clinic, fitness facility, youth focused activities and employment. The housing breakdown of 1/3. 1/3. 1/3 for Market, Affordable for this area and Subsidized otherwise including cradle to grave home/renter occupancy is to my liking and certainly the amount of green space leans toward North Minneapolis becoming a Blue Zone.	Satisfied	I look forward to hearing more from the MPRB as well.	NorthPoint Health and Wellness, RNR Real Estate, Metropolitan YMCA, Cultural Wellness Center, YouTROC, NEON, WBBAC, McKinley, Professors Sam Myers and Rose Brewer, Sharon Brooks - U of MN OBCED, PanHellenic organizations, Liberty Church PCUSA, Spokesman Recorder/Insight News, KMOJ, KBEM,KFAI, Aneka Sirwa - KMOJ, Anthony Taylor - Day One/ Create Balance, Long term connection to post secondary partnerships and learning, County Commissioners Fernando and Conley, Tri-Construction, Blanco painting, small construction and other contractors, local CDCs....that is all for now.	
121	Satisfied	I am happy to see that there is a desire to finally invest in North Minneapolis, it's a shame that for so long this area has been neglected. It's about time that residents in North Minneapolis have quality parks & access to greenery	Satisfied		Satisfied			
122	Satisfied	Utilize dead space, beautify the area and neighborhood, produce jobs, give the area a badly needed facelift.	Neutral	Community benefits need to be one of the highest priorities embedded within planning and implementation. However, anti-gentrification will only leave the Northside with higher crime rates, citizen concerns for safety, thus impeding the increase in property values in the area. Unfortunately, more lower-income housing will only attract more crime overall in the area and require more police presence, which is already strained.	Very Satisfied	Improved access will be necessary if the area is to be redeveloped as planned.	New community based organizations are badly needed in N.Mpls to help educate youth and steer citizens in the right direction.	Most likely, due to the fact that my step-son, age 11, cannot even play in this neighborhood due to vehicles occasionally driving 45-60 mph in the area, drug dealers up the street and gunshots going off almost every night - I will plan to sell my home in the area and move to a safer neighborhood where we will not have to worry nearly as much about being robbed, ran over or hit by a stray bullet. The police in this area is a total joke and the city counsel does little to nothing to protect the property owners and citizens of North Minneapolis.
123	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
124	Satisfied		Satisfied		Neutral			

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

125	Satisfied	It seems like there is good community involvement in the planning - I know a few of the names. The goals and strategies are clear and I agree with them.	Satisfied		Neutral	I am holding back on "satisfied" because I think access across I-94 will be a significant issue for neighborhood people to fully engage in the place. I think the Dowling bridge and on additional bike/pedestrian bridge are needed right away.	I wish I knew more BIPOC leaders and firms. Redeemer Center for Life is a strong positive community center that could play a role in convening and providing feedback.	Please keep up the North community involvement throughout this process.
126	Neutral		Neutral		Neutral			
127	Unsatisfied	There should be more emphasis on home/housing ownership to ACTUALLY address the historic impediment to the accumulation of wealth by historically discriminated against populations and contribute to the sense of being stake holders by residents.	Neutral	Once again more emphasis on home/housing ownership would be a benefit to the project, the neighborhood and the city.	Satisfied	Any park expansion and improvement is desirable.		
128	Satisfied	Looks great, only one suggestion, Fishing! Recommend Fishing pier or direct river level access, the wall idea provides poor access to and unattractive habitat for fish; rocky shorelines are better for Smallmouth bass and Northern pike. The Mn DNR could help a lot, ask for their input.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			Fishing important, see above. Natural shoreline in park area should be a priority. Allow for canoe and kayak access.
129	Very Unsatisfied	The website states the project is "grounded in a restorative approach towards racial justice" and yet the plan will enrich some of the wealthiest people in Minnesota more than residents of North Minneapolis. No public housing. City giving away property to billionaires rather than giving it to the community to build wealth.	Very Unsatisfied	Given the structure of the affordable housing in Minneapolis, units will not be affordable in perpetuity. This means any benefits this projects bring for housing affordability will be short term. The community benefits note that "anti-displacement" initiatives will be used, but doesn't describe these strategies. This lack of clarity implies these ideas haven't been developed.	Neutral	There is not enough information here to determine what is actually proposed.	This section is written in such a confusing way that I have to assume it was done so specifically to obscure what is being proposed. I recommend that this is detailed in simple language and graphics so that the average person understand what the City is proposing.	While I appreciate both the complexity of the project and the difficult times we are in right now, this process has not been created to receive feedback from a broad swath of the community. The plan is very long and it may not be clear what is being proposed. There needs to be clear and concise information that people can find. Sharing a 100 page PDF is simply not good enough!  True engagement with community members during COVID ranges from incredibly difficult to impossible. Engagement should be stopped until after COVID when people can meet face to face. This project will have ramifications on the Northside for decades. Do not use funding/schedule as an excuse.
130	Very Unsatisfied	No direction, just endless begging for public input to be completely ignored on Facebook by elected public servants. Stop misusing tax revenue for garbage like this	Very Unsatisfied	Word Salad. Start acting and speaking like adults	Very Unsatisfied	Word Salad. Start acting and speaking like adults	Word Salad. Start acting and speaking like adults	Sell the land to private developers. That's assuming that anyone would be willing to take a risk of investment in this now uncivilized dump
131	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
132	Satisfied	It's a good plan but contains some superfluous, dreamy, non pragmatic elements such as the urban food center. While a wonderfully Utopian vision-I doubt it's impact. This needs more substantiation of stakeholder benefit/gain vs cost. Why not a state of the art middle/high school which hugs the riverfront and is connected to the performing art center?	Satisfied	See above	Very Satisfied			
133	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			Did you look at the Warf development in DC? It's been a very successful model. This seems close.
134	Very Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied			
135	Very Satisfied	looks good	Neutral	didn't read this section	Unsatisfied	I don't think a road for vehicles should go between the new development and the river. Bikes and walking only would be better here. Vehicle access only from behind the development parcels.		
136	Satisfied	It seems thought out and won't jeopardize the local community. ( I love in Camden as well)	Very Satisfied	I believe it will work and create another amazing area for people just like Mississippi north regional park(by connecting them via paved trail)	Very Satisfied	Outdoor music venue is a big win also local food been grown is awesome.		

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

137	Neutral	<p>I like the waterway canal coming into the park with the bridge as you enter the park. I also like the grain elevator being saved for climbing to see views of the river.</p> <p>1) I would really like to see some or all of the DOMES SAVED. It sounds like they are structurally sound. They are such architecturally interesting and unique buildings and they are part of the history and already exist! These could be used for shelters, restrooms, food vendors, music, classes, etc. They could be painted very artistically to blend into the park and provide a festive atmosphere too. The domes also are part of the history now of that site and could now be a unique architectural LANDMARK to the upper harbor. In the summer when I canoe down the Mississippi River towards Minneapolis, I always look for the rusty domes and now these could have a new colorful look and destination indicating the center of the park area. Please try to SAVE these and work in more green space around them.</p> <p>2) I know the tree planting details aren't included in the plan yet but please try to include a selection of trees that can add a "feel" to the place. It would be nice to have a grouping of pines (majestic white pines and Norway pines) to add an "up North" atmosphere in a portion of the park and also a grouping of Sugar Maples and Oaks to add a lot of Fall color in other areas. This will help draw people to the area in all seasons to walk, view, and relax in these unique areas of the upper harbor.</p> <p>THANKS for asking for input!</p>	Satisfied	It seems that thought was put into this to provide the community benefits in many areas.	Neutral	I'm not sure I fully understand how the proposed park and upper terminal will fully connect with the rest of the north side with highway 94 cutting in between. Maybe a wider Dowling Ave bridge with walkways and bike path and greenspace.	I don't know.	Please have regular meetings with the public before final decisions are made for each phase. Thank you!
138	Satisfied	<p>Good balance of land use. I'm glad to see affordable housing included because this is a critical need on the northside. Love the trails, access to river, restaurant/brewery, park for kids, activity/event space, environmental and green design. Looks exciting. And a big improvement over the current state of the landsite.</p>	Satisfied					
139	Unsatisfied	<p>the plan is ignoring the fact that this site is a regional and national park and the DNR, FMR, AFCAC, Audubon Society are all concerned about the fact that the developments are ignoring the height restrictions of the critical area - this is serious - by tiering the buildings those further from the river will have as sight line to the river - also taller buildings near the river will discourage the public from visiting the site as the Park will appear to be "owned" by those who live there.</p> <p>The affordable housing is a great idea - however we need to assure there is market rate housing as well as has been addressed by more than one article in the Trib so we do not create pockets of poverty in only one or two areas of the city and have the incomes to support those businesses that locate here and to encourage small businesses to thrive - we need sit-down restaurants at all price points</p>	Neutral	<p>Range of housing should include market rate - The ticket fee should be a percentage of the ticket price which could easily be folded into the ticket - Ticket Mater charges huge fees and people pay it so why not a 10% fee of ticket price so the more expensive tickets for those that can afford it are paying more of the money that goes back to the Northside</p>	Satisfied	<p>Improved access great but we need to remember access for seniors and disabled people not just those who are able to bike</p>		<p>Need to assure that factories are not on the River but near Washington Ave. The spot where the factory is now could be a hospitality sight to encourage those from outside North to come and spend their money in the northside businesses located at the site - again need to limit the the height of those buildings within the critical area.</p>
140	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			<p>I am happy with what I've seen and heard on the website and in the community meeting in December 2020. It sounds like there is a commitment to honoring the Northside residents wishes and avoiding gentrification. I appreciate removing the hotel and would consider adding discounted office spaces for community-focused nonprofits and healthcare organizations. Plus a grocery store and/or food market would be great.</p>

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
 Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

141	Unsatisfied	<p>Appears too much emphasis by United Properties on floating Devon George and First Avenue's somewhat lukewarm influence. Leads to questions if there is a real commitment by both parties. And hasn't the landscape changed on non-sports events for the future? Where are the profitability projections for 1st Avenue and why should 1st Ave succeed to property ownership—a 100 yr land lease s/b sufficient.</p> <p>I don't doubt a lovely park will be well utilized, as we've seen with the Gold Medal Park, but if a park is built, who will assume the daily maintenance and security costs, which will be substantial. Hopeful it isn't a concrete barren park, as the block next to the US Bank Stadium.</p> <p>Does the city need more senior housing or rather isn't it affordable housing?</p>	Unsatisfied	<p>United Properties isn't tuned into this project as they would be for a riverfront development luxury property—they appear to be holding back on what could be a footprint for future development.</p> <p>If a substantive driver is to create jobs and the commercial manufacturers who would consider locating in the area s/b exhausted before worrying about a performance stage. Will the City provide incentives for the manufacturing tenant?</p>	Unsatisfied	Does not appear to be a plan that will be successful—questionable leadership on the developer side.		
142	Unsatisfied	I see nothing about helping or even compensating current businesses that will be displaced.	Neutral	Too much legalese.	Neutral	This is not my forté.		Again, I see nothing about helping or even compensating current businesses that will be displaced.
143	Very Unsatisfied	It is bad to put this in crime central. It is bad to do this kind of thing in today's COVID world. Leave it open air park, No music. BTW I love music and had a recording studio but COVID has changed everything. Glad to have the land recovered from industry.	Very Unsatisfied	Concert goers will be able to get their drugs as they exit the freeway. How brain dead are you. The parking lot will be like Merwyns but 100 times more gang bangers.	Very Unsatisfied	Leave it like Minnehaha Falls Park. No crowds no crime		
144	Satisfied		Neutral	More of the housing should be made affordable to those below the AMI, there are plenty of existing options nearby at affordable market rates.	Neutral			
145	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
146	Satisfied		Neutral		Very Satisfied			
147	Unsatisfied	Seems like it's taking housing away that is sorely needed. Also seems geared toward people with money coming from the suburbs. Sounds really expensive and the city doesn't need any more expenses. How will it pay for all the destruction of last spring? Raise my taxes more than that's what I think. I don't care to pay for an amenity like this until things are more settled here and more folks have permanent homes.	Unsatisfied	<p>Seems like it's taking housing away that is sorely needed. Also seems geared toward people with money coming from the suburbs. Sounds really expensive and the city doesn't need any more expenses. How will it pay for all the destruction of last spring? Raise my taxes more than that's what I think. I don't care to pay for an amenity like this until things are more settled here and more folks have permanent homes.</p> <p>I know you all are just asking to make the public feel like they have a say. We don't and some wealthy developer will for sure ram this through. Just like the SWLRT.</p>	Unsatisfied	I know you all are just asking to make the public feel like they have a say. We don't and some wealthy developer will for sure ram this through. Just like the SWLRT and professional football stadium.	Build more housing, build better roads and bridges, build better transportation options. Quit spending on sports stadiums and transit that wrecks the environment and displaces millions of animals and insects.	I think you know where I stand.
148	Satisfied	Nice redevelopment of a currently undesirable part of the river.	Satisfied	Pay closer attention to access to the River. Much like Bde Maka Ska, Near where boats are rented. Always a lot of activity—walking-bike riding- boating. Also include Public gathering space like lake Harriet band shell and the Minnehaha band shell - that makes for a great community gathering place. Interesting food venues are also important	Satisfied		Tin Fish (sadly gone) and Sea Salt, super fun food and gathering place. Sebastian Joe's—high quality, affordable food provide great reasons for people to gather. Perhaps a local brewery beer garden— could be coordinated food truck rotation.	Also rental canoes and kayaks. Rope swings into the River

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

149	Unsatisfied	<p>It does nothing to celebrate the location on the river. This should be an iconic build yet it is not. Manufacturing &amp; production is being moved off the river~ why are we introducing more? Move that to a block off the river and use riverfront for park and housing.</p> <p>There is not enough transit access. Public transportation to the area is very limited. How much worse will it get? What impact will I94 changes have on the site?</p> <p>Nothing about protecting the river flyway. All building materials, heights &amp; placement and all landscaping must have birds and pollinators in mind.</p> <p>As with the Broadway pizza redevelopment site ~ no sit down, destination restaurant to draw people. People on the Northside have been asking for this for years</p>	Unsatisfied	<p>How can we know if the benefits are adequate? There must be an annual, transparent review of the benefits earned thru ticket sales. A percentage of sales (10%) makes more sense than a \$3/ticket fee. And who holds &amp; dispenses the money? MUST be kept away from city govt so as not to be pilfered during lean times. But neighborhoods are illequiped and would be forced into becoming competing forces at a time they must work together. Who will carry this fiduciary duty? Very unclear and very important!</p>	Unsatisfied	<p>One, you propose adding manufacturing &amp; production space ON the River ~ at a time we've spent years and millions to relocate industry away from river road. Move to Washington (better transit possibilities anyway) and leave river road for park space, housing and amenities. The corner of 33rd &amp; river should be a buffer business which could also be the gateway draw... a locally owned restaurant/bar with midlevel pricing and a deck on the river. A nice buffer between industry south of 33rd and potential housing where food production is planned. Expand the open green space here. WHAT does the Neighborhood need in terms of sports fields? THAT, not production, belongs on the River.</p> <p>Access is extremely limited with just 2 buses serving the general area and rather infrequently. Will there be shuttles during events? Will a BRT line be built? Will the I94 commuter bus add a stop at Dowling? Will I94 be built to accommodate buses as I35W was? There seems to be something of a plan for bikes &amp; hikes. But what about trips to whatever grocery store can be found? How far away ARE such necessary elements? Are there ANY necessities baked into the project~ grocery, drug, hardware stores?</p>	<p>This is tricky business</p> <p>I've already written about the need to identify just who will bear the fiduciary burden? This needs to be a transparent, independent and highly skilled board. Who will fill this role? How much will this cost?</p> <p>Neighborhoods near the site will all be greatly impacted by this project. As such, each must have a voice in its ongoing development (over many years). Future needs should be identified, developed, and shared within the community so reinvestment of the benefits makes sense to all.</p> <p>HOW the dispensation of benefits is determined should be a Neighborhood driven process. Let those impacted decide on the process to share benefits ~ thus all are invested in the programs success</p> <p>Let each neighborhood identify projects or proposals for their area, what are their needs? Each neighborhood should be doing so now and be ready to share ideas ~ both for the UHT site and what they NEED to get out of it! It should be a net benefit to everyone ~ not just the builders, developers!</p> <p>An open, transparent annual review of benefits is a</p>	<p>Please, recognize this for what it is ~ a once in a generation opportunity to build something we can be really really proud of!</p> <p>This should be/needs to be/must be ~ a gateway to North mpls ~ As well as an extension of our great park system! Let this show folks they have arrived and give them reason to stay and return.</p> <p>~A destination restaurant (prime location would be where the you have the manufacturing/production space planned (on the river!!! That's as bad as that gawd awful self storage building allowed to be built ON THE RIVER! south of Plymouth bridge ~ we deserve so much better!) ~ No industry on the river. Parks, housing, amenities make much more sense) ~ what about a marina? We need boat docks for motorized and non. We should build a marina and get water taxis working the river ~ Start thinking BIG. Northside deserves something special! The Northside deserves an iconic, "spoon&amp;cherry" site.</p> <p>You have the chance to make something grand, amazing and wonderful. Something that can draw people from the Northside and tourist dollars from all over!</p> <p>Please, Dont settle for low hanging fruit.</p>
150	Satisfied	<p>This is mostly going in the right direction but emphasis on all affordable housing and amenities for only a segment of a very diverse population is short sighted.</p>	Unsatisfied	<p>Need more emphasis on economically viable benefits for all people; not just POC and ADOS. There is not enough balance in the plan; it seems too geared towards a segment of the population rather and allowing the entire population to thrive.</p>	Unsatisfied	<p>The document reveals a great lapse in awareness about the important role of Washington Ave as a north-south corridor that feeds the UHT site. The document emphasizes Dowling Ave and Lyndale Ave too much. There needs to be a parallel emphasis on long range facade and access improvements along Washington Ave to the North of Dowling Ave. Anyone who lives in the Camden area will know that Washington Ave (not Dowling Ave) is the major access into the Upper Harbor site. I strongly encourage the CPC to spend more time considering the need to include long term investment recommendations for Washington Ave to the North of Dowling. This might include lighting, bike lanes, pedestrian, and grants to businesses along Washington Ave. Again, Washington Ave to the North of Dowling is the true Gateway into the Upper Harbor for at least 1/3 of North Minneapolis.</p>	<p>The CPC needs to work harder to reach out the MPRB CAC to develop joint operation partnerships. Right now the CPC plans show only vacant park space. There needs to be an integrated plan and the CPC needs to take some leadership because it appears that the MPRB CAC is struggling to move forward with establishing park plan concepts. As a specific example, the continued inclusion of the domes and ruins in the park space represents very backwards thinking. There is little need to include those domes and ruins in this overall plan.</p>	

Upper Harbor Terminal - Draft Coordinated Plan  
 Public Comment Survey Responses - As of January 5, 2021

151	Very Unsatisfied	<p>If parcels like this were in bigger supply I'd be satisfied with the plan however they are not. It's my opinion this site should be restored with the environmental benefits to our northside community (and thereby the larger region) as the #1 consideration (including the fact this is a major international flyway, adding development and more glass is a bad idea). As a Northsider I see the disparities we suffer due to lack of access to quality-outdoor environments. Many neighbors do not have the resources to seek high-quality outdoor time and over the generations it's not even a consideration for many. Our neighborhoods have been cordoned off (as this project planners can see) by the few in &amp; out access points we have from these neighborhoods. If this containment wasn't planned by the city and wider metro area it certainly has been facilitated. I have examples that I won't list here. It would benefit us all to have an accessible site to be in nature but especially the children. The chaos that reigns many neighborhoods affects young brains and does society no favors as the wider region attempts to deal with it after the fact. While the plan takes this into account, it's too little and once this area is built up it's too late to go back to environmental restoration. It's my opinion the area should be restored and offer things like the Health &amp; Wellness Community Hub where kids (and everyone else) have access to programing and the Community PAC however the housing and industry component should be developed to the west of this project in the neighborhoods that are in dire need of this sort of investment and also have blighted land in which to build. If the site is accessible by different transportation means and safe for kids (and everyone) to travel without fear of crime and dangerous drivers then it makes a bigger impact for the surrounding neighborhoods. The way it's planned now it will still be a cordoned off and contained area, with benefits not reaching into the surrounding neighborhoods.</p>	Unsatisfied	<p>The values and objectives are all wonderful, however not in this spot. As mentioned above, reach INTO the neighborhood with these goals and projects. Imagine a hand; the fingers are reaching west into our neighborhoods bringing us to the palm (which is the riverfront). This model will benefit more people and have better impact on our Northside neighborhoods.</p> <p>While the amount of planning and redesign of planning has been tedious I do feel it was important to get more voices involved in the process. I've lived on the Northside since the mid-1990s and have followed various plans and strategies for the riverfront that have not panned out. I got involved in this specific site plan a few years ago, attending meetings, giving feedback etc. and I gave up because of how drawn out the process became, as someone mentioned on the YouTube video, it has been an eyeopener for the city and how to do engagement. While I'm sure the city learned, it also probably turned a lot of people away from becoming involved because of the fractious nature. Also I don't feel my voice is heard in any of the feedback projects run by the city and county. It's my opinion there's an agenda and feedback is not taken unless it's the loudest voice in the room. Sadly it's resulted in the plan attempting to fit too much and be too much in a limited space. That is why thinking bigger and reaching out into the neighborhoods with components of this plan is necessary. This space cannot solve the problems of decades of disinvestment by the city, county and state on the Northside. Who cares? Is anyone even reading this statement?</p>	Unsatisfied	<p>If / when this plan goes through there will a lot of increased traffic at the I94/Dowling exit. It's already a very busy intersection with little room to improve things. This is the result of our northside neighborhoods being segregated for decades - there are few points of entry/exit. It's another reason why spreading this plan out INTO the neighborhoods to the west would be wise.</p> <p>If the goal of this plan is to bring neighbors down to the site, consider a land bridge. Since the plan is happening in an established neighborhood, find a place where the least amount of displacement occurs; maybe south of Dowling at 37th Avenue North.</p> <p>Or consider a pedestrian bridge over I94 like we see at the Sculpture Garden or over Hwy. 100.</p>	<p>Who will be the community partner for environmental considerations and best practices? I "think" I recall MWMO for stormwater-related issues. Who will you be working with to guide best landscape design and plant selection for animals, birds and amphibians? And best practices for wildlife in regard to building design?</p>	<p>What considerations have been addressed in regard to this being a major international flyway? In regards to 1) building restrictions/adaptations i.e. glass collisions 2) shoreline design (I see the image of a seawall in one image) which is not beneficial to any animal / amphibian. 3) light pollution - what else am I missing? What is the plan missing?</p>
-----	------------------	---	-------------	--	-------------	--	---	---