

Respondent	Plan_rating	Plan_comments	Benefits_rating	Benefits_comments	Public realm_rating	Public realm_comment	Implementation_comments	General_comments
1	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			
2	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.
3	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.
4	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			
5	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			
6	Very Satisfied		Neutral		Neutral			
7	Very Satisfied							
8	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?
9	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.
10	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
11	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.
12	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.
13	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
14	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	
15	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.	Chris Webley - 336-406-3428 Owner of New Rules (minority owned) Work space, event space, art gallery 2015 Lowry Ave N Minneapolis MN 55411 newrulesmn.com	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.
16	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.
17	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			
18	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			
19	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
20	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 26th street.		A freeway lid connecting the North Minneapolis community across 94 to the site should be a long term goal.
21	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 Wheelmed 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!
22	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
23	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
24	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
25	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.		
26	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
27	Very Satisfied	It will be a beautiful amenity for the community, removing an eyesore and giving the area vitality. Affordable housing in attractive surroundings, a place to gather and places to work. I like the idea of an open air round gathering place that would not be a commercial venue. I hope that the landscaping use of native plants and storm-water management continues. The renderings are breathtaking.	Satisfied	Could affordable housing go beyond rentals? Would it be possible to create affordable condos? Owning ones home provides some stability from rising rents along with more stability to the community.	Satisfied	I love the proposed park in renderings. I do question if the Park Board will carry through on the native plantings and rain gardens. Many of their parks are given over to turf grass at trees. Trees are great, but I hope they will evolve to creating beautiful native gardens.		Thank you!
28	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
29	Very Satisfied	I like the integration and focus on the North Mpls, providing back to the marginalized North on many different levels, inclusion of senior housing and other mixed use purposes on the site as well as keeping the outdoor CPAC working with a nationally known, MN institution to create a destination venue to bring outside people to our community.	Very Satisfied	I look forward to bringing and giving life back to North.	Very Satisfied	the full stretch of the park along the river to devote and create a way for people to enjoy this resource that is currently cutoff is wonderful and should be good for both people and animals.	I love that this guarantees it gives back to the community rather than shovels it away. Thank you!	I'm quite excited about this. Thank you.
30	Very Satisfied	I live in North Minneapolis, and we need more nice, safe places to enjoy nature. Additionally, opportunities for local businesses to be created will help strengthen the community.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
31	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
32	Very Satisfied	I appreciate the intentionality that is going on towards making sure the current north side community is being taken into account. Development instead of gentrification.	Very Satisfied	Focus on the development of the current community is great and won't drive out the people who live here now.	Very Satisfied	It's a tough area to get to but I like the way they are making it accessible.	I don't have any specific organizations. I think focusing on organizations and partnerships that place equal importance on profit as well as developing the community is important.	I think the project needs to focus on creating partnerships that are financially sustainable as well as developing the broader community. It's difficult to find the balance but to truly have a successful project I believe there needs to be an economic motive for the partners.
33	Very Satisfied	Many benefits for the community and a variety of areas for all people	Very Satisfied	I am a part of the community and think all of these goals will improve the community and provide better space	Very Satisfied	This park is very important to the area!		
34	Very Satisfied	Please improve our neighborhood for everyone	Very Satisfied	Unifying community is essential	Very Satisfied	For lots of the community accessibility is important.		
35	Very Satisfied	much needed improvements for the neighborhood	Very Satisfied	Ready for updating to the area!	Very Satisfied	Access is important for the diverse population	I love the work of reaching within the community to develop community-based businesses	

36	Very Satisfied	I saw clearly the evolution from earlier versions. I see clear articulation of values and guiding principles that prioritize north Minneapolis neighbors. It is obvious to me that the committee has been doing a lot of work listening to the community and integrating feedback into the plan.	Very Satisfied	I see how the values and objectives shaped other aspects of the plan. The draft plan pushes the city and developers to keep those community benefits front and center.	Satisfied	I am not as much of an expert in this area and don't fully know what the alternatives are. However, the approach proposed seems thoughtful and efficient.	New Rules, Markella Smith, NEON	I want to keep seeing the evolution of this plan and design. How will the city evaluate early progress towards community benefit goals? What opportunities exist to re-evaluate contracts/plans if it evidence shows that benefits aren't being realized? I want to know what the evaluation and accountability plan is.
37	Very Satisfied	It is much needed in the North Minneapolis community. Minneapolis has been dealing with so much gentrification and this plan sounds like the perfect opportunity to prevent some of this.	Very Satisfied	North Minneapolis is always neglected when it comes to the actual needs of the community. Upper Harbor looks to provide great opportunity for North Minneapolis to really flourish without gentrification and pushing out long-term residents to appease white residents of Minneapolis.	Very Satisfied	Again, I believe this will be very beneficial to North Minneapolis. North is consistently neglected by the city.	I do not have any suggestions at this time.	None at this time.
38	Very Satisfied	I am happy to see that plans and funding are being made to build-up an area of our city that seems to have been kicked to the side for a very long time.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
39	Very Satisfied	I feel the process for getting community input and participation through the Learning Tables organized by Public Policy Project and Environmental Justice Coordinating Council was wonderful. It gave residents a chance to ask critical questions of the developers, city staff, the Minneapolis Parks, and other professionals about the development's particular.	Satisfied		Satisfied		Start with black-owned business leaders from around the state. Michael Wright; Tim Baylor; Dorothy Bridges; Marcus Owens - African American Leadership Forum; Pilsbury United Communities/Justice Built Communities; Alfred Babington-Johnson - Stair Step Foundation; NEON; Devin George	It is critically important that community benefits and community ownership remain paramount throughout the life of the development. The Black and brown community in north Minneapolis must be the focus when any discussion about community benefits, ownership, and participation happens.
40	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
41	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			I'm very excited about this project and the vitality it'll bring to this part of the City. As a NE resident in Bottineau neighborhood, I look forward to visiting the site once it's developed. I appreciate all of the intentional outreach and community benefits for north siders/ADOS.
42	Very Satisfied	The riverfront in Mpls is under utilized and much can be done to improve that space, especially in the upper harbor terminal space. I'm looking forward to more opportunities, affordable housing, and businesses opening in north Mpls.	Very Satisfied	This all makes sense to me. I can see how this plan with benefit our community greatly. I don't see any downsides.	Very Satisfied		Webber Camden neighborhood organization	I really want to see this project realized
43	Very Satisfied	This seems like a comprehensive plan that recognizes the unique potentials of the site, neighborhood, and region as well as the historic capacity for development such as this to displace and disrupt the lives of current residents. I appreciate the thoughtfulness with which the plan addresses concerns of racial justice, environmental impact, traffic safety, and much more. I have a couple of suggestions, but I'll save those for later questions.	Very Satisfied		Satisfied	I think there are significant improvements included in the plan, but I'd like to suggest a couple more. While the primary access point will be Dowling Avenue, I think that the site will greatly benefit from an additional non-motorized access from the neighborhoods across I-94. (I saw that this is noted in plan strategy 5.2.2 or Environmental Justice/Increase Access to Mississippi River/Construct new non-motorized bridge.) This effort should get on MnDOT's radar immediately. Looking at a map, I would suggest crossing at 34th Ave North. It will provide a near, but not direct, connection to the improvements planned on 33 Ave North and not terribly disrupt the school on the west side of the freeway. It would be very convenient for residents of the neighborhood or visitors to Perkins Hill Park. Additionally, I would suggest working on plans to connect the UHT site to North Mississippi Regional park and the other riverside parks south of the UHT site with non-motorized infrastructure, specifically walking and bicycling trails. This will further complete MnDOT's Mississippi River Trail state bikeway initiative (and would be all around good anyway).	I have no comments.	Please do not forget to plan for ubiquitous bicycle parking (especially near the performing arts venue).
44	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
45	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
46	Very Satisfied	I have been following the UHT Development since August of 2018. The Development Team has done a great job of listening to community input and integrating that into the revised plans. The Learning Tables have been very helpful in equalizing and disseminating information about the project and ensuring everyone has a common basis of knowledge. They have done a really good job of making sure all voices are heard.	Very Satisfied	I think the proposed Community Benefits are very compelling and aspirational. I have my doubts that all can be achieved in a reasonable amount of time, but the fact that the Development Team listened to all of the input, distilled down what was doable and achievable and then the results were played back to and finalized with participants, is impressive. It will be interesting to see how many of these Community Benefits are actually realized.	Neutral	I still have some questions about the infrastructure section of the Coordinated Draft Plan but I am waiting until the Public Realm Infrastructure meeting on January 26th to better understand the context of some of the comments and the details.	There are many Northside and Northeast organizations that have potential to add value to the UHT project, such as faith organizations, music and dance groups, and others, including: - Hopewell Music - Growing North - Youth Resources - Family of Trees	I am submitting a number of ideas and comments to offer that I hope will add value to the project. Here they are: *Work with city housing agencies to put a percentage limit (e.g. 5%) on the amount of rental increases in the 64111 and 64112 zip codes for some period of time to mitigate impacts of gentrification created by the UHT development. *Using either COVID relief funds, Opportunity Zone funds or other private equity sources, create a new homeownership fund to help Northside and Northeast residents buy and/or improve properties in the 64111 and 64112 zip codes. Wealth creation needs on-going focus. *Organize a volunteer corps to help staff large events in the area and provide ticketing, usher and set-up and tear-down for large events, largely consisting of Northside people and volunteers from other areas of the city or civic groups (e.g. Boy Scouts). *“Community policing” - Security for the music venue (CPAC) and the surrounding area should be composed of local men and women to the extent possible and practicable. Northside residents should be given priority in hiring security details. Emphasis will be placed on non-violence and de-escalation protocol. *Work with North High School, Hopewell Music Cooperative, and Northside dance theater, churches and other music groups to identify promising singers, musicians and dancers and provide opportunities for them to perform in a public setting (e.g. revues or talent contests). *Use the CPAC music venue to host regional or state choir concerts, dance performances or other competitive performing arts events, mainly for not-for-profit organizations. *Plant a tree or trees in the park area and other areas around the UHT to commemorate the loss of lives to COVID or to police violence (e.g. for George Floyd or Philando Castile) or to another cause. Have small plaques explaining what is being commemorated and the actions taken to address the loss of life. *Set aside a small plot of land near the CPAC as “the Ever-Growing Forest”. Plant a tree or flower for each music act that performs at the music venue! Let local Northside gardeners’ plant, tend to the plots or trees and organize bigger neighborhood or community tree planting or gardening projects as needed. *Hold riverside meditation, Tai Chi, yoga, kick boxing and other outside regularly scheduled classes events in spring and summer to engage local residents in healthy activities. The UHT volunteers would ensure signs, access and areas used for group outdoor activities are cleaned and cleared before and after activities. *Engage the local Northside faith community to both contribute to local music and performing arts programming but also to hold faith services on Sunday mornings, etc. in the UHT public areas, including CPAC. Of course, you would need a process to ensure access and representation by all faiths. *Organize bicycle races, 5K and 10K fun runs and other athletic activities that would originate and/or end in the UHT area.
47	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
48	Very Satisfied	The Upper Harbor Terminal can have a significant impact on the lives Black and brown people not only on the Northside, but also Twin Cities, and the state of Minnesota. The plan addresses housing, employment, and racial inequalities.	Satisfied	Good job on online some of the benefits for the community, but what I am not seeing are the educational and academic benefits for children and youth.	Neutral	Access was one of my initial concerns, because I don't want there to be the same type of access that there is for North Mississippi Regional Park - one road in, and one road out.	I am seeing City of Mpls support, but nothing from the State of MN.	

49	Very Satisfied	I trust Markella Smith's leadership to advocate for the needs of Northsiders. This is a resilient, strong community that historically has not received the same investments as South Minneapolis. I fully support the efforts to curb gentrification, support wealth creation, affordable housing, and new local businesses while partnering with the Northside community that exists here now. This project can celebrate the beauty and community based in North Minneapolis.	Very Satisfied	Yes, 100%! I love the proposed community benefits, particularly the opportunity for local businesses to pursue ownership. I want to see a lot of support for these businesses to make sure they can be successful for the long term -- the city needs to make a serious investment in order to bridge the financial gaps that exist for many Northside residents. I also support home ownership opportunities and affordable housing. We have a housing crisis in this city and this project can be part of the solution. This also relates to goal #3, which aims to advance and center the needs of Northsiders without gentrifying the area.	Satisfied	The park should be easily accessible by public transportation -- please keep that a priority.	I hope you are working with the folks at the Northside Economic Opportunity Network to provide small business support to community members who are opening their stores within the complex. Also, I hope there are plans to have an ice cream shop! ;)	There is a great opportunity to utilize the waterfront with children and youth. Have you considered talking with the Loppet foundation or NAZ about how Minneapolis Public School kids can access the area (Isn't Cityview near by?)? I'm thinking about canoeing, kayaking, and other water sports. What about Kroening nature center and their "rent a kayak" program? Or the wonderful folks at the North YMCA and their summer power program? One note: the Loppet has done a good job of partnering with MPS elementary and middle schools in North Minneapolis; however, their tubing hill is now \$17/ticket and out of reach for most local folks. Most of the people using that ski and mountain bike area are not local. If there are more outdoors/river oriented programming, PLEASE make it accessible and affordable to Northsiders. People want to feel like the river is "for us" just as much as it's a destination for other people in the city.
50	Very Satisfied	Love that embraces the riverfront (much unlike the rest of the riverfront projects which turn away from the river). We have such an opportunity to embrace the rivers beauty, much like Milwaukee, Chicago, other waterfront cities. I'm happy they are using the opportunity.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
51	Very Satisfied	It appears to be very comprehensive and responsive to Northside communities	Very Satisfied	One of my specialties is looking at diversity in construction. It looks like you're expecting a higher percentage of minorities working on the project as well as minority-owned businesses. Just seen that part makes me understand that the committee really does understand the Northside communities	Very Satisfied		I do think it's imperative that all of the communities of North Minneapolis have the opportunity to be involved and to direct this project as it is built and on going.	The only thing I don't see mentioned, yet, is my thought of having a zipline from North Minneapolis to Northeast Minneapolis over the Mississippi. I think that it would be a Revenue producing effort. They did it for the Super Bowl so it can be done. And I would think that 1st Ave or Psycho Suz's or some other Entertainment Group would take that on. Even if it was only open for a couple weekends a year. It would certainly be a novelty and community members could watch for entertainment purposes. Just my two cents
52	Very Satisfied	As executives of local nonprofit organizations that provide community programming on the Mississippi River, we - Penelope Pate Greene (Board Chair, North Star Community Rowing) and Greg Lais (Founder, Wilderness Inquiry) - have closely followed the work of the various planning entities - The City of Minneapolis, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, the Upper Harbor Terminal Collaborative Planning Committee, and the development team. We have also participated in relevant community engagement activities. We are satisfied that the Draft Coordinated Plan will deliver a community-building asset that meets the dreams and needs of the North Minneapolis Community, while respecting the Mississippi River environment which we care deeply about.	Unsatisfied	Because the Draft Plan fails to provide actual shoreline access to the Mississippi River, we are concerned that it will fail to achieve the Project Value for Environmental Justice, which calls for the project to reconnect the river and the Community. The Draft Plan envisions spaces where people can overlook the river, but not actually touch it or interact with the riparian environment or the water. Historically, Community members who live within a short distance of the UHT site have been prevented from accessing the riverfront by physical barriers such as the construction of I-94, lack of public transportation within walking distance of the river, and property zoning along the river. The current plan envisions a development that is closer to the river, but still does not provide the Community with physical access to the water in the way that other Minnesotans enjoy access to bodies of water within their communities. Direct water access - the ability to be ON, not just near the water - is desirable and necessary to enjoy the health and recreational benefits of water sports such as rowing, canoeing, kayaking, fishing, and the life-enhancing benefits of environmental education and nature study.	Unsatisfied	Without assurance from Metro Transit that there will be public transportation available at 33rd Avenue N. & N. 2nd Street, the southern end of the UHT will be inaccessible to people who do not own a car, or who have disabilities which prevent them from walking or riding a bike. The Phase 1 road plan calls for 33rd Avenue N. to terminate in a cul-de-sac. There is no way to get from the cul-de-sac to Parcels 4 or 5, or to the riverfront. Further, the Draft Plan takes a step backwards by eliminating access to Parcels 4 and 5 from a service road which runs north from 33rd Avenue N. The Utilities Phase 1 plan calls for that road to become a utilities right of way. We are concerned about this lack of access because North Star Community Rowing has built on Parcel 4 the Twin Cities' first and only ADA-compliant river access on the Mississippi River. The accessible walkway and dock are currently approached from Parcel 5 where people can park, and where boating equipment is stored. It is possible that storage and parking for the river access can be moved to Parcel 4 which is due to be developed after Parcel 5, but without road access to Parcels 4 and 5, people will not be able to access the riverfront by way of the walkway, nor will they be able to enjoy recreational programming offered there to all in the Community, regardless of physical ability or ability to pay.		North Star Community Rowing and Wilderness Inquiry are providing this feedback on the Draft Coordinated Plan on behalf of our program participants, many of whom are from North Minneapolis. Our programs offer recreational opportunities for people of all abilities who have been historically prevented from participating in recreational and leisure activities on the river due to a lack of access to the shoreline, or because they do not have access to private clubs in other parts of the city. Access to the health and recreational benefits of boating, fishing, birding, and enjoying nature, should not be denied to the Community in this once-in-a-generation redevelopment project. We encourage the UHT CPC to provide access to the southern end of the UHT, including Parcels 4 and 5, as a part of Phase 1 of the project.
53	Very Satisfied	I am satisfied based on all of the various meetings that have been meaningful and with direct support and voices from the community that have believed in a new opportunity for North Minneapolis residents, business owners and guests/visitors. I believe the information and opportunity for community engagement and the opportunity to lean towards diversity, inclusion and equitable support for all, more specifically around the BIPOC community that needs this the most.	Very Satisfied	I believe this has been a very transparent and well intentioned project. I believe the board and the overall process in developing the Community Benefits were well intentioned.	Satisfied	I believe United Properties did a great job, however I am very interested in seeing more access to the park owned land connecting to the larger community and access to the river through other means of transportation, i.e. water taxis, recreational boats and touring water crafts (dinner boats or attraction/history tours).		I am very thankful for the additional participation of involving individuals like Devean George and Jamil Ford for continued support and authenticity for a project that is worthy of support and opportunity for residents of North Minneapolis.
54	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Unsatisfied	I live in Near North, and my only way to access the river is by crossing 94 on Plymouth or Broadway - both of which are very busy and unsafe for pedestrians. I think the pedestrian-only bridge on Dowling is a good start, but we need pedestrian-only bridges in Near North as well (15th + 16th +17th would all be good options).		
55	Very Satisfied	Please see my comments below in 3 parts starting in the field below and ending in the field under "Additional Comments" Answer - Because this is a monumental effort to bring the diverse interests of many together for the good of the community. You have come a long way from first conception. You cant please everyone but its clear you are trying to do the best you can Thank You.	Satisfied	Please see my comments below in the field below" I'm proposing a large civic scale sculpture. This is larger than just a public sculpture and would require some location planning. I would like to have the opportunity for input so you can have the advantage of forethought. This proposal is so large that it couldn't just be dropped in as an after thought.	Satisfied	Apologues in advance. This is not the place to present a proposal of this scale but being brand new to your process and being told that today is the final day for input I am dropping in 2 & 1/2 page brief on what I'm proposing. I attempted this a week or two ago on the fly and hope this bullet point format is easier reading. I've been attending online meetings in an effort to find out who to talk to but haven't had the opportunity to have more than 2 phone conversations with people who may be concerned. My hope is the proper authority will contact me and arrange to meet - Thanks - Russ Erickson 612-267-6605, russee4@msn.com 1/15/21 Sculpture Concept Brief Paper - Three Rivers Unity Purpose - This is a presentation for a sculptural concept for the Upper Harbor Terminal park project. <input type="checkbox"/> To serve as a vehicle for the community's history -- and indigenous community's - concerns. <input type="checkbox"/> To provide a voice for the community. <input type="checkbox"/> To serve as a cultural attraction for the city. <input type="checkbox"/> To serve as a beacon for moral values of inclusion. <input type="checkbox"/> To provide educational opportunities for the north side youth. <input type="checkbox"/> To involve members of the community in planning design and building. <input type="checkbox"/> To support the local arts groups. <input type="checkbox"/> To create jobs during construction. <input type="checkbox"/> Hopefully to become a treasured part of the community. Artist History - My name is Russell Erickson. I have been an artist a good portion of my life. I worked in and taught sculpture at MCAD for 6 years and spent 20 years making large scale metal sculptures on a commission basis. Motivation - I have had a dream of making a large-scale sculpture for my city.	CONTINUED:" and stand as a beacon for the struggle to achieve equal human rights for all". (The museum cost was 351 million and took over 10 years to build) The proposed Three Rivers Unity sculpture could take on a similar role and share the moral stories of our histories individually and collectively in the light of Unity at a much smaller cost and shorter build time. Traditional Form -- The three smaller structures and one larger structure would be of a traditional form. Tradition for longevity in comparison to the ever-changing current modern trends in the art world. Each of the structures would have an exterior surface design and an entryway with interior space to incorporate a narrative that fits the desires of the community - the African American artists -- the First Nations artists and the diverse group artists. (By diverse group my current thought is to be inclusive for example of the Hmong culture, Hispanic culture, Somali culture, the European cultures etc.) All three of the smaller structures would be the same. The large sculptural structure would be massive -- have a large interior space for displays. It would have an inner and an outer shell. It would have a ramp to accommodate people with disabilities with a (as per Americans with disabilities act) "slope" located in between the two shells that allows viewers to walk or roll up to a high overlook of the river and the downtown city skyline. The Structures - This sculpture - one large structure with three satellite structures - would allow human scale interaction with the piece and the river. The viewer would be immersed within the structures when walking into the interior	CONTINUED: An overall structural guiding theme we all know of: Body, Mind, & Spirit. Youth -- Education -- Jobs - It would create opportunities for the involvement of a number of local artists and could include small group educational opportunities for local high school students, arts groups, as well as construction jobs. My hope is the sculpture could be built in two places. One an indoor studio for inclement weather times. The other on site. I would like to bring in adult artists to work in committee to develop their designs and messages and do the actual building. I would like to offer junior mentoring training for youth, say high school age or college age. They could learn planning, welding, construction, logistics, etc. I would like to create some temporary jobs for artists that do the actual building and to work with me in the mentoring. I'd like the community to have a clear part in the say of what the narrative content is. What will the structures look like? -- I have purposely - not -- explained what the sculpture will look like. Words and drawings could help and would be needed eventually but they will never convey what the actual experience of encountering the sculpture would be like. I don't want to lessen the excitement by presenting just another set of words and drawings. There is a spatial experience that no drawing -- no set of words -- no video can convey. I think my vision would best be explained with an in person visit to a real hands-on sculpture to touch -- feel -- experience not only with your thoughts but your eyes and the spatial experience I was talking about. 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. For 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 surrounded at three points with smaller satellite structures bring the needed ground space to over 100 feet on a side. I would like to connect with a representative(s) from your groups to meet me at that sculpture to show you this concept. I believe once you see how this older structure illustrates what I'm talking about, it should generate some excitement -- some inspiration. Words can only convey so much -- I think seeing, touching and believing will best bring life and reality to this idea when meeting with me to explain the idea at the Two Wing site. Scale -- This is not just a regular sculpture idea. It's also not just a "big" sculpture idea. It's much more than that. Think of it as a combination of the Chicago Cloud Gate (The Bean) civic attraction and the Human Rights Museum in Winnipeg. Because it's so big (Needs +/- 100 feet in each direction) it's not something you can just drop in later as an afterthought. Although you may not be ready to put out an RFP for art work at this time, in order to consider something on this scale you should at minimum get a feel for what I am proposing. This will give you time to incorporate Three Rivers Unity into your planning. Help - Please help me connect with the appropriate people on your development committees to start presenting this idea. Thank You for your time - Russell Erickson - 612-267-6605, russee4@msn.com.
56	Very Satisfied	I'm very excited to have a new multipurpose space on the river and in north mpls!	Very Satisfied		Unsatisfied	My neighborhood, Near North, doesn't have great or safe access to the river/UHT currently. From my address (16th Ave N & Irving Ave N), you'd have to cross 94 at Broadway or Plymouth, which are super busy streets. I would prefer a pedestrian bridge/path to be built for safer and more scenic access to the river.		
57	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
58	Satisfied		Very Satisfied					

59	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?
60	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
61	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.
62	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			
63	Satisfied							
64	Satisfied		Neutral		Neutral			
65	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			
66	Satisfied	I like to see more green natural space.	Very Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
67	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 I94.	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 I94.		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.
68	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.
69	Satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied			
70	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. Th 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 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 benefitting their community.
71	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.	
72	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
73	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 concept. I believe once you see how this older structure illustrates what I'm talking about, it should generate some excitement – some inspiration. Words can only convey so much – I think seeing and believing will be easy when meeting with me to explain the idea at the Two Wing site. This sculpture would allow human scale interaction with the piece and the river. The sculpture would be constructed of steel rods – be open and see through to not obstruct the river view. It would have seating on two sides overlooking the river. There would be an exterior structure and an interior structure. It would have a ramp between the two structures that would allow people with or without disabilities to go up to a high overlooking position with more seating. The ramp sides would provide see through walls with wording

								of community choice to reflect wisdoms, poetry, history etc. There would also be a walk-in ground level area with the opportunity to incorporate a narrative about the community and the sculpture. There would be this one large structure with three satellite structures which each satellite structure illustrating designs for the African American, Native American and the third group choice. The interior of the large structure would illustrate the evolution of each of these groups designs and the final unity design in the piece. My involvement would be to build the base structures. The collaborative groups would come up with the design faces and work toward the larger unity design to be placed on the face of the large central sculpture. The history – the narration – the evolution – the people – the diversity of backgrounds, opinions and designs coming together – show and celebrate how working together to build a strong unity in community is a worthy goal. The sculpture would be a focal point for other park activities. It could be a focus like the Cloud Gate sculpture (Known affectionately as “The Bean”) in Chicago’s lakefront Millennium Park. I wouldn’t say it would be as great as that as I think the Bean is one of the most fascinating objects ever produced in the world. But – this could have a local influence in a similar way. It also could be produced at a tiny fraction of the cost of the Cloud Gate (Bean) which was in the 10’s of millions of dollars. The materials cost of Three Rivers Unity is ballparked at \$100,000. It would create opportunities for the involvement of number of local artists and could include some small group educational opportunities for local high school students. Please help me connect with the appropriate people on your development committees to start presenting this idea.
74	Satisfied	There seems to me a significant amount of thought 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?
75	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			
76	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
77	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.		
78	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		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. 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
79	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?		
80	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
81	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?
82	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.
83	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
84	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.	
85	Satisfied	Expands park space along the river	Satisfied		Satisfied			
86	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.
87	Satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied			I hope this area construction project will be designed to be “highly accessible” to people in our community with disabilities.
88	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.
89	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.		
90	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) -https://www.nber.org/digest/apr05/lock-effect-californias-proposition-13. 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	This would be a great place to plan a future land bridge across 94 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.	
91	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			
92	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 council does little to nothing to protect the property owners and citizens of North Minneapolis.
93	Satisfied		Satisfied		Neutral			

94	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.
95	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.
96	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			
97	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			
98	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied		Did you look at the Warf development in DC? It's been a very successful model. This seems close.	
99	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.		
100	Satisfied	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.	Satisfied					
101	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied			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.
102	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			
103	Satisfied		Neutral		Very Satisfied			
104	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
105	Satisfied	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.	Unsatisfied	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.	Unsatisfied	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 last 1/2 of North Minneapolis.	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.	
106	Satisfied	I like the inclusion of affordable housing and urban agriculture. I also like that the project gives a historically underrepresented community access to the Mississippi. I am concerned about the potential for gentrification around the site and that the "affordable housing" will still be unattainable for many people in the area if it is not priced at an extremely reduced rate.	Satisfied		Satisfied			I am concerned about the potential for river pollution during the construction process (off-site sediment movement)
107	Satisfied	There are some aspects that I like very much. I like that the plan has shifted towards more housing. I thought the hotel seemed poorly conceived. I also like the fact that there is more specificity around how the development will benefit residents. I think the uses being proposed are spot on for the site and the community. There are other aspects I'm very displeased with. While I support the idea that the Community (defined term) should benefit, I'm disappointed that the definition of community is so narrow and divisive. That really doesn't seem necessary, and will result in this plan being viewed negatively by many in the community who aren't included in definition. Also, I think the direction of ground lease funds, and the \$3 community development fee will present huge opportunities for conflict of interest, cronyism, or downright fraud. The city needs to be very careful here.	Satisfied	See above. I like that the focus is on ensuring the community benefits, but I think the planners went too far in trying to limit who can be included in the definition of Community.	Unsatisfied	I know you've heard it a million times, but parking...and transit. In spite of the seemingly endless supply of dedicated bike lanes, its still not a popular mode of transportation in this area, and not one you should be relying on to get people to use these new amenities.	I just suggest you be very careful to avoid conflicts of interest. The people making recommendations on the organizations and projects should not have any financial interests in those entities. I see this being a major issue.	I'll repeat my overall feelings. I like the plan, and am excited about what this can be. I'm a little worried about parking, and am feeling a little excluded as someone who doesn't meet your definition of "Community" even though I work and live less than a mile away and am 3rd generation from this area.
108	Satisfied	This draft plan is the result of HARD work! I am impressed at its complexity and a little overwhelmed, but nonetheless impressed.	Satisfied	There are a few questions I have about long term community benefits, as well as the preservation of those said benefits and the opportunity for those community benefits to change and evolve to meet a different need for a community benefit, if that makes sense.	Neutral	I didnt catch much about this that I can readily respond to or synthesize. I look forward to learning more soon.	NEON West Broadway Business Coalition I don't know if this was not on the table, but I would recommend having northside residents be able to pool business \$\$ to become development landowners.	I'd like to see more communication that is targeted toward different demographics. For example, How would a teenager experience UHT? A senior citizen? A young person? a tourist? a family? consumers? Single Adults? Business owners, people who commute to work on the northside, etc... Also - how will the community know when business leasing space will be open for them to apply and how will those businesses be selected? Historically Northside based first, and then BIPOC, etc.
109	Satisfied	I like the plan, I would like to understand what kind of jobs you plan to bring? I am concerned about pollution going into the river. There is so much open land on Broadway - why would the jobs need to be by the river? Why can't we have a Shopping center or restaurants or something "pretty". I would love to see a Global Market in N Minneapolis or an entertainment area like Lake Harriet.	Satisfied		Neutral	I would like to ask for maintenance to the bike lanes all down Plymouth and surrounding area. The lanes are not swept often and a lot of glass from broken bottles creates an unsafe riding environment. If the bike paths will connect to this park this would be a priority for me. Also, as mentioned above, I would also like to ask for an outdoor entertainment center like Lake Harriet.	I would love to see a Trader Joe's in this area, grocery stores are minimal in N Minneapolis. Also a Chipotle and local coffee shop with an awesome ice cream store.	I love the plan for more senior apartments. Will the money given back to the community help rebuild Broadway?
110	Satisfied	First Avenue has stepped away from supporting Local Music as much as it did in the past. While in general I support First Avenue, their business model is one of a local monopolist similar to a National Promoter. Therefore any special preferences extended to them should be limited in scope. Turf Club and 7th street Entry were much more supportive of local music in the past. Now these are largely run as venues for National tours. I support First Avenue but the music community has noticed the lack of support in the 2 preceding years prior to 2020.	Satisfied		Satisfied			First Avenue has stepped away from supporting Local Music as much as it did in the past. While in general I support First Avenue, their business model is one of a local monopolist similar to a National Promoter. Therefore any special preferences extended to them should include ties to support of local music. Turf Club and 7th street Entry were much more supportive of local music in the past. Now these are largely run as venues for National tours. I support First Avenue but the music community has noticed the lack of support in the 2 preceding years prior to 2020.

111	Satisfied	I love most aspects of this project, especially the park space and riverfront trails. There are a few things that I wish could be adjusted somewhat, though: 1. There are very few places in Minneapolis with retail/restaurant and patio space fronting the Mississippi Riverfront. Many other cities with less impressive rivers take advantage of the views with a whole district for riverfront dining. This spot would be perfect for a restaurant row with patios lining the riverfront. The entire length of the Parcel 1B Affordable housing building and 1A Senior housing building along the riverfront should be lined with restaurant patios (especially with a focus on immigrant and minority owned restaurants). We need to really embrace the river, including riverfront dining. 2. The Community Performing Arts Center amphitheater should be right up alongside the riverfront. The amphitheater should not be separated from the river by a road. The parkway should be routed around the other side of the amphitheater, and the amphitheater pushed up more against the riverfront. This goes hand in hand with embracing the river and Minneapolis's identity as a premier river city. The amphitheater should afford people views of the stage/performance, the river, as well as the skyline to make it a truly remarkable space. We want this venue to be a really unique music destination, sort of like Minneapolis's version of Denver's Red Rocks amphitheater, but with the Mississippi River being the star attraction instead of the foothills of the Rockies. Red Rocks has the foothills, rock formations, with the Denver skyline in the distance. This venue needs to have the stage, river/green space, and Minneapolis skyline within the same view. It would be amazing if the amphitheater could almost be projecting out over the river a bit, though I doubt that is feasible.	Very Satisfied	I'm happy that this project prioritizes affordable housing, affordable commercial space, livable wage jobs, health and wellness spaces, and green/park space that will benefit the northside neighborhood.	Satisfied	I love the renderings of the riverfront trails and almost boardwalk-like feel of parts of it. The negative comment I have, to reiterate what I've previously written is that the river parkway should not separate the community performing arts center from the river. That is just a missed opportunity if the performing arts center's riverfront impact is lessened. The parkway should be re-routed around the other side of the amphitheater so that it goes: riverfront, pedestrian trails/boardwalk, amphitheater, bike trails, THEN the parkway. It would cool if the park could have a hill element involved, kind of like the mound in Gold Medal Park, but even taller. I know there isn't much that could be done regarding this, but I wish there were tall river bluffs in this area, similar to Barn Bluff in Red Wing or Sugarloaf Bluff in Winona to give a bigger geographical marker. I know the cost involved, and probably lack of available space would make this a non-starter, but it would be awesome if some kind of river bluff could be constructed with hiking trails and rock climbing walls. Maybe someday a tall (300 - 500 ft tall) bluff could be constructed in Minneapolis somewhere, so we can shake off the impression that it's just a flat city.	I just want to say that I am very excited for/supportive of this project. I live in south Minneapolis, though, so I know the views of the northside neighborhood should be prioritized over mine. However, this site would definitely be a destination I would utilize frequently (for the green space/bike/pedestrian trails, retail/restaurant businesses and the music venue amphitheater). I do want to reiterate my hopes of increasing the riverfront dining possibilities at this site with restaurants/patios lining the riverfront in the Parcel 1B and 1A buildings, as well as my hopes of re-routing the parkway road around the other side of the amphitheater and pushing the amphitheater up closer to the riverfront. These two improvements would really solidify this project as a win.
112	Satisfied	The attempt to increase inclusivity in the community looks great! I think there is always more that can be done, but this is a good start. As a person who works on the river, and frequently uses this corridor, I applaud efforts to improve this eyesore, improve the infrastructure, and bring communities to the river, rather than saving it for utilitarian/business purposes. I also think the mixed housing/small commercial combination is a great way to reduce environmental impacts.	Satisfied	Again, I think this is a great start, but there are always more ways to improve. Much of the 'community health benefits' part of this plan look to me like what a white person would look for in a suburban community health center. Is this truly what the local community also envisions? I think it looks nice, but it should really be geared towards the people who will be using it most. What do they value in their community? How can it best serve them?	Satisfied	I think the parkway, and limited access look good, but can also lead to decreased access for the community and traffic congestion. This looks similar to the layout near the Stone Arch Bridge in ways, and that can be a problematic area for traffic back ups at busy times/during construction/events, and is also an area where car/pedestrian/bike accidents are a big concern. The area should not be a high traffic zone, but I think additional safety precautions need to be implemented, and greater local access to improve the flow.	As a person who frequently uses the river, I think that this is a great opportunity to utilize more vegetation buffer zones and permeable surfaces to reduce runoff into the river, and increase water filtration. The plans appear to contain a great deal of turf grass and impermeable surfaces, which would allow the increased traffic (foot and otherwise) to increase the amount of pollution flowing directly from the hard surfaces into the river. Is it possible to use more permeable surfaces, install rain gardens, have more rooftop gardening/green roof structures, and place buffer demonstration prairies similar to the one at Mill Ruins along this corridor? Doing so could help make this an example for future development and also make this a more sustainable community. Another suggestion would be to create a sort of gutter system that would catch run off water as it comes off the impermeable surfaces. The water in the gutter could run to a rain barrel-type system, and could be used to water (non-edible) gardens/green spaces.
113	Satisfied	Looks to be the result of a thorough, thoughtful, and inclusive process, particularly in regard to issues supporting BIPOC residents of N. MPLS, although I did not see as much material related to the Indigenous rights and treaty rights as I think are warranted. I would prefer making even stronger connection to the river, and being bolder in the vision of how communities there can see the Mississippi as an integral part of their life and community.	Satisfied	Good progress from the original plans, but there needs to be ongoing vigilance and oversight regarding the potential for the project to get taken over by the developers and outside economic interests.	Satisfied	I see that this is trying to balance out a lot of competing interests and concerns; the move toward having more public land and having MPRB working on the riverfront plans is also a positive step.	Greater involvement from Indigenous leaders. Friends of the Mississippi River brings a valuable perspective to these discussions as well. MWMO is already involved, which is great, and I think they can continue to provide excellent input and ideas for the stormwater management. The composition of the "Community Entity" will be key as well, with need for local voices, and creative thinkers like Project Sweetie Pie. This would be a great location for an outdoor recreation
114	Satisfied	Any new energy and construction, especially something arts-focused and meant to drive business to the neighborhood is needed desperately! Take a look at the depressing corridor just along Lyndale from 41st to 46th. There are beautiful buildings along this stretch that are boarded up and in inviting. We want this to be a vibrant and walkable neighborhood.	Very Satisfied	More businesses mean a more walkable neighborhood which improves the quality of life for everyone.	Satisfied	The residents in the vicinity of the UHT have seen so many great things come out way in the last decade. We can walk to our market, our beautiful new library and pool, and a bakery. If we get to see the revival of this sorely neglected swath of land, this area will be just about perfect.	Please listen to the voices of the people in the neighborhood of this planned development. We will be directly affected by its success or failure.
115	Satisfied	Lots of progress has been made in terms of involving and listening to the community in the past 3 years since I moved to the area, which is encouraging.	Satisfied		Neutral	Want to see the Native/First Nation concerns included and recognized in the part plan, for acknowledgement of the sacredness of the land to this group and how it was lost to them. Definitely Mississippi Mushrooms, small entrepreneur restaurant and business opportunities made available to existing North Mpls. businesses and restaurants, or those that were lost to the unrest on Broadway and other places in the community. Opportunities for local organizations to rent meeting and event space, such as the neighborhood organizations, senior and youth groups, etc. Ideas: Breaking Bread, Cookie Cart, Juxtaposition Arts installations or gallery, coffee shops, such as McKinley used to have, etc.	I am most concerned about how the traffic will be managed on the Dowling Bridge and at the corner of Lyndale and Dowling. I live a block from there. This area is congested, with only one lane each way on the bridge, which at rush hour already can't handle the amount of traffic. I would recommend a separate pedestrian and bike bridge for this type of traffic, and taking out the sidewalks on the bridge itself, to widen it to 2 lanes, if it can't be replaced at this time. Another idea would be to have the main access to the area be off of the Lowry bridge end of the park, which is wider for traffic. I also hope that bus service, which is how many Northsiders will access the area, and will reduce car traffic, as well, will be available and planned for from the beginning. Thirdly, there are repeated accidents that have damaged structures on all but one corner of that intersection, numerous times, in the 3 years I have lived here, including the traffic light, private fences on all 3 corners that have one, and even pushing the concrete waste receptacle through one fence and into the yard of the property.
116	Satisfied	I want the park board to develop their land sooner than later	Satisfied		Satisfied	walking and biking access 2 North residence will be limited	
117	Satisfied		Very Satisfied	I appreciate the work that was done to engage North Minneapolis residents. The Learning Tables were a great space to learn about the project and offer my direct input. I see some of my ideas/dreams in the plan! It does have EVERYTHING I want, but I understand that UHT isn't just about me.	Neutral	I feel like there could be more detail in how this space connects to the neighborhoods around it. I think effort needs to be put into supporting those residents offering input on how best to do that. How will this honor the culture of how people navigate the community?	I'm excited to see McKinley named because of their current leadership. It's been really amazing seeing the way Markella has stepped into that role and breathed new life into McKinley. And I know that will extend to how she leads in partnering on the UHT project. KEEP FOLLOWING BLACK WOMEN
118	Satisfied	If the City could have bought out the shingle manufacturing plant this would be exponentially better, as the city would've added continuous new development from the stunning Lowry Ave bridge all the way to north of Dowling. Given that this did not happen, the plan seems well-rounded.	Satisfied	Again, seems like a well-rounded approach.	Satisfied	Seems like lots of upgrades that will facilitate access for the new developments. I think there needs to be a stand-alone section added regarding CPAC event traffic management planning.	Do we want food processing to be that close to an asphalt shingle manufacturing plant? I think an oak savanna/prairie buffer zone between that plant and the redevelopment would make sense. How about marina-type slips or tie-off posts for small watercraft to dock during CPAC events (or day trips to the other facilities of the redevelopment)? I didn't see much about art installations, but the more the merrier, especially if created by north side artists.
119	Satisfied		Satisfied		Satisfied		
120	Satisfied	Whenever you give all parties affected a voice you will come out with a better process. I believe trust is and was built which allows us to give positive messages to the greater community. Not only where voices heard but ideas implemented.	Satisfied	Opportunities for funds to be put back in the community. There will be culturally relevant experiences that honor our community. It is so respectful to those who live in and have given back to the community to have a historical place.	Very Satisfied	That transportation will be better accessible for Northside residents. This will improve access to more jobs and services. Bettering the utility services, it is an upgrade globally in all the aspects addressed.	More so than the who, I think the goals of the people especially the part about a transparent process and given all a fair share and voice is the most important. This process has been extremely effective from my point of view.
121	Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Satisfied		
122	Satisfied		Satisfied		Neutral	It would be good if the area could be better served by frequent transit as opposed to primarily cars.	It would be great if the realignment of the Blue Line extension project could serve the Upper Harbor Terminal and more of north Minneapolis as a whole.
123	Satisfied	I appreciate the incorporation of many aspects of community feedback received over the course of many months. Here isn't as much commercial space as I had initially thought there would be. I also think ownership within the affordable housing plans should be more clear and made available beyond the single developer--is there an opportunity to incorporate a rent to own model and have a condo structure?	Satisfied		Neutral	I live the idea of bike and pedestrian paths that can connect this area to other parts of the city. I wonder if there is an opportunity to incorporate a street car or something beyond a bus line to also connect this area to other parts.	I appreciate that McKinley is named as part of determining CBOs, but given their involvement throughout the entire process, a "neutral" voice may be more appropriate Under First Ave-- "Providing a Community voice and decision making input regarding which artists are brought into the venue for free events" it should read DECISION MAKING POWER. Overall, I like how explicit, detailed and clear you are on expectations, time commitment, roles.
124	Satisfied	We need development and public spaces in North Minneapolis	Satisfied		Satisfied	As a resident of North Minneapolis, we need more parks access and investment here	

125	Satisfied	I really appreciate the progress this plan has made over the past few years regarding community involvement. I am happy to see the stated commitment to not only include community assets but also give back to the community monetarily. There is still a lot that can be said and not carried out, so a part of me is still skeptical, but I trust many of the names I see who are involved, and that keeps me hopeful.	Satisfied	The efforts to support and benefit the Northside community are well thought out. I think the word "prioritize" is a little vague (when talking about hiring community members), and this should maybe be more concrete to ensure that this actually happens.	Very Satisfied	I'm really excited about the parkways/trails for outdoor activity and riverfront access.	Juxtaposition Arts Appetite for Change/West Broadway Farmers Market Capri Theater Anthony Taylor/ Melanin in Motion West Broadway Business and Area Coalition Northside Economic Opportunity Network	
126	Satisfied	This community needs to be a priority focus of investment and redevelopment that will support the people who live there and provide safe and desirable living.	Satisfied	Would like to see support of businesses that are currently in the neighborhoods and surrounding neighborhoods be supported to be able to improve services, accessibility etc. (Not just supporting new business - help those that are present improve and grow)	Satisfied	Please incorporate pet friendly spaces in the park. Please consider a dog park, perhaps something that allows pets to go into the river safely off-leash	Camden Pet Hospital - providing pet care to people of the community and park spaces that are pet friendly	Please allow inclusion of non-BIPOC business owners that are present within the surrounding community
127	Satisfied	I like the level of detail and thought put into the plans. I like the plans to make drowing safer to access the UHT for us north Minneapolis residents.	Satisfied		Satisfied		Neighborhood associations, local business and entrepreneurs with priority given to Northside residents and businesses.	
128	Satisfied	I like the fact that there is a defined out line around economic inclusion, Wealth creation, affordable housing and environmental justice that will promote sustainability for the residence of North Minneapolis in support of community revitalization.	Neutral	I don't think that the city should be trusted to maintain control or ownership interest of the land if it is written to maintain a reinvestment back into the community of North Minneapolis. I think historically there have been some issues with the trickle down effect.	Satisfied	I like the parkway and Park concepts the accessibility to the community as a whole, green pathways and landscaping	I think that all who are not involved should definitely get involved this project seems like its going to take a lot of collective efficacy. We may not all agree on everything but there are smaller objectives that people can come together to meet on and get accomplished that all work together for the greater collaborative.	None at this time
129	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.
130	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			
131	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.
132	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			
133	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.	
134	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.
135	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.
136	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			
137	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?
138	Neutral	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. 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. 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? 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. 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.	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			

139	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 final 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).
140	Neutral	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 & France has. 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. 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.	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	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. 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.	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.	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. Don't build a bubble, build a destination.
141	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.
142	Neutral	I want to see a very large area to rest quietly in nature and look out at the river. Free of picnics, frisbee players etc.	Neutral		Neutral			
143	Neutral	Also housing affordable to who? Should be affordable to people in North Mpls. 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.						
144	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?
145	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		
146	Neutral		Neutral		Neutral			
147	Neutral	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. 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. 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. THANKS for asking for input!	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!
148	Neutral		Neutral		Neutral		I would like to see this project partner with the Sex Workers Outreach Project, and support the development of the adult entertainment industry in this location, particularly of granting licenses for small business strip clubs or peep shows. Sex workers are a part of the community and the adult entertainment industry in Minneapolis is monopolized by chains that make it hard for many people to be hired in the industry.	Would like to see the mushroom farm come back. I am sad they had to close down due to this development.
149	Neutral	I don't know enough about it to speak about it.	Satisfied		Satisfied			
150	Neutral	not sure about affordable housing or rental housing going in with mixed use and destination venues. Would like more amenities in the north side for restaurants, shopping and entertainment, but keeping it safe and welcoming.	Neutral		Satisfied			
151	Neutral	It's a fine vision, but not enough affordable housing and no public housing. The city needs to push developers to include more affordable housing and the city needs to find a way to build more public housing just about everywhere.	Neutral		Satisfied			
152	Neutral	I want a development in N MPLS to benefit N MPLS and not wealthy white suburbanites who litter there trash all over our city.	Neutral	the bullet points say that N MPLS will benefit from this... the land HAS to stay in the public domain, it cannot be sold to private buyers who will price out N MPLS	Neutral	there needs to be public transportation to the area, there needs to be access for people in wheelchairs, there needs to be non-gendered bathroom facilities. I hope there are no plans for luxury housing, that just prices out people	I hope that N MPLS is included in all of the planning and carrying out of plans, this is our community. We deserve a voice	I hope that the committees have thought about how climate change may affect the Mississippi River.
153	Neutral		Neutral		Neutral			
154	Neutral		Neutral		Very Unsatisfied	The south end should directly connect to Lowry Avenue, with possible connections to I94 from Lowry. The north end, north of Dowling, should connect directly to Washington Avenue. The current map shows significant bottle necks at both ends, effectively dead ends as people double back to find their way in or out. It should be VERY obvious how to get in/out of this long, narrow property. It appears that the day to day traffic of residents and businesses, will endure significant traffic jams before/after concerts. Will sound walls be constructed along I94? I live almost a mile from I94, and can hear it quite well depending on the weather. The statement of I94 coming thru North Mpls in the 60s is incorrect, and the historic aerial photographs prove that. It came thru in the late 70s, early 80s, and I watched the construction. 1972 photograph shows no freeway, 1984 shows the freeway.	As always: follow the money! The new or existing organizations that receive income from this plan must be vetted and managed carefully. They must be transparent and accountable. I suggest that they be required to partner with the City of Mpls for proper accounting and oversight, with annual public reporting of income and expenses. We do not need another "Community Action" scandal where a corrupt non profit leader used public money for his own gain. Many of the listed board of directors were absent/negligent in the fiscal oversight of CA, but they used their seat on the board to get out their own agenda.	Ironically, in its efforts to be "inclusive" the tone of this plan seems to be "exclusive". There are many different people/cultures that have lived, or now live, in North Mpls. This area should be welcoming to all, like the entire Mpls-St. Paul riverfront. It should not be regarded as the North Mpls riverfront. During the recent draw down of the river basin this past summer, and despite the pandemic, thousands of people explored both sides of the Mpls riverfront. It was interesting, it was exciting, and every possible demographic was represented. That is what you need to recreate.

155	Neutral	Plan shows townhouses in community benefits, but don't see them in plan, would like them included for variety in housing, affordable options, options to build wealth. Would also be good to have small businesses mix with smaller housing options. If townhouses are just in larger housing buildings, how does ownership work? Typically condos (with association fees) don't appreciate in value, so not as much of a wealth building opportunity. Also I think a hotel would be important for performance center to do well. Okay to actually mix housing and incomes! A mix of housing and businesses is good for walkability and livability. Groceries in walking distance for example. Segregating people by age and income is hard on people. Public housing could potentially help. Someone mentioned social housing, also a good idea. Public utilities info looks awesome. Glad to see the park space and affordable housing get priority. Excited to see the Wellness hub more developed. It would be wonderful to have some commercial growing in this space, hydroponics or aquaponics maybe?	Satisfied	Goals look good, implementation is the question.	Satisfied	Glad to see increased riverfront access for the public. Excited for the plan to lean in on storm water management. Curious about any floodplain concerns for the space.	This is an interesting idea. I am not sure what organization would be able to handle this and represent the community well better than the city itself.	
156	Neutral	The direction of much of the plan is fine but I do not feel the CPAC (performance center) is appropriate or beneficial and do not have confidence that the City can deliver on many of the promises. United Properties has put effort in but cannot deliver without support from the City or an outside funder. The CPC and City and United Properties have put a lot of work into the plan but do not have the tools to change the reality of the market. The housing seems like a good plan and with lots of thought and work invested. United Properties is putting in significant effort to hire and market to ADOS residents and leaders and that is commendable.	Unsatisfied	the ground lease payments do not address the fact that small and local businesses may not be able to afford to be there without assistance. The choice may become allowing a fancy chain to pay the ground lease or not receiving enough funds to put back into other community benefits. When relying on the market, those realities always end up being the bottom line. Public money should be sought but not for a market driven benefit scheme like the CPAC. If the market fails the benefits die. if the market booms, the benefits won't be enough to combat gentrification. First Avenue is the winner.	Neutral	Access is fine given the existing constraints. Please continue to support larger area efforts to bridge the freeway, reduce traffic, build alternative transportation networks etc.	Hire people to take non-traditional roles on project teams. Don't rely on committees and boards.	Why was there never a real alternative to the CPAC? This dishonesty on the part of the City is damaging what could otherwise be a strong effort. Saying that the concept plan would ONLY define music and it could be anything from a bandshell to bigger and then restricting the CPC to a 7 to 10 thousand person CPAC is dishonest. Trying to say that the community chose the larger CPAC when they were given those limitations and not much other information is misleading. Comparing very different CPAC options along with very different options (not CPACs) would have been honest. how much time and money and effort is spent behind the scenes to make the CPAC work? The City priority seems to be First Avenue and a glam project.
157	Neutral	The Upper Harbor Terminal is a unique, large piece of property that will help chart the future of the city. The proposed plan is ~fine- but I would love to see LESS park space and more dedicated space for unique entertainment space like an outdoor ice rink or an art house cinema like the multi-screen and multiple building FilmScene development in Iowa City (which includes a rooftop movie experience in one building and a large outdoor movie screen lawn at the other.) The UHT could also include other family friendly spaces like a bowling alley or Children's Museum. I would love to see this project take a page out of the Navy Yard project in D.C. or the Lawn on D in Boston with unique public swings, outdoor ping pong tables, and lighting.	Neutral		Very Unsatisfied	Minneapolis already has decent parks spread across the city. I don't see why this project needs to include traditional park space.	The city and development team should engage with the Minnesota Children's Museum, the MIA, a new art house cinema and bowling alley complex (think Pinstripes)	I would like to see more density to the whole project. Build up not out.
158	Neutral		Satisfied	The City could have funded this community benefit without the sales from the concert venue. With the amount of disinvestment that has happened on the Northside, the City should be matching the funds annually until there is significant progress in quality of life for the BIPOC communities near the site. Home ownership rates should be increasing as well as lower crime. This budget set aside is not enough on its own to provide the impact needed. They City should be adding more and taking ownership of its role in the historic redlining and divesting it participated in.	Satisfied		These organizations should have similar roles like boards. Every three years, a third of the members should be shifted to bring in new members to ensure the process allows all voices to be included.	Invest directly on the Northside. Work with community in creating more home ownership opportunities. Leverage public land to increase quality investments in the area. Stop giving our city away to developers.
159	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.	
160	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. Partner with black owned businesses, not big corporations.	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? It should represent all individuals in Minneapolis, not just white, wealthy individuals.
161	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.		
162	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?
163	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?	

164	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.). https://landback.org</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/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> <p>4. Why are you converting an empty polluted wasteland into a park system that still intends to let cars drive through it, and bring 7-10k carbon-fuel-burning and greenhouse-gas-emitting cars into the area on concert nights? The Northside Green Zone is already polluted, and you want to draw 10k cars in multiple nights per week? (Including in the winter, when people will leave cars idling to stay warm.) How does that serve environmental justice goals? How does that meet the Minneapolis 2040 goals, or the Vision Zero goals? There should be zero new projects in Minneapolis that increase car traffic; every project should be required to show it will reduce or eliminate cars. This dramatically fails to do this.</p> <p>5. It's not clear how the project will actually benefit Northsiders. Unless there is explicit priority, why won't this just allow cop-calling wealthy singles/couples-wo-kids to take up all the 3-bedroom homes (because no family that needs the 3-bedroom will actually be able to afford it)? What are you doing to ensure that (a) the UHT will be safe and (b) that it will be cop-free? Other than mockups of trendy Black folk sitting around texting, I don't see anything in the plan addressing how you will ensure that Black folks, poor folks, and other marginalized folks feel comfortable and welcome at UHT, instead of surveilled and policed.</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-wait-society.org) for passivhaus/net-zero energy building design.</p> <p>http://cedarcocohousing.llc 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>http://inquinilxunids.org 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!
165	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.
166	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		
167	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.	Neutral		Neutral			
168	Unsatisfied	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" Halunrenn	Neutral		Neutral			Please reconsider the larger amphitheater.
169	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		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.	
170	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.	Neutral	Waiting for next phase of project.		How do I stay more connected to this project
171	Unsatisfied	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.	Unsatisfied	I do not see the financial get back to education in north Minneapolis	Neutral	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?
172	Unsatisfied	I have not received enough information for this project as a current north Minneapolis resident.	Unsatisfied	The community would benefit more from development of commercial areas that have been forgotten , Broadway and Lowry.	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!
173	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 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	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	Any park expansion and improvement is desirable.		

174	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 Strib 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 meetings with all stakeholders.</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>	
175	Unsatisfied	<p>Appears too much emphasis by United Properties on floating Devon George and First Avenue's somewhat luke warm 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	<p>Does not appear to be a plan that will be successful-questionable leadership on the developer side.</p>		
176	Unsatisfied	<p>I see nothing about helping or even compensating current businesses that will be displaced.</p>	Neutral	<p>Too much legalese.</p>	Neutral	<p>This is not my forté.</p>	<p>Again, I see nothing about helping or even compensating current businesses that will be displaced.</p>	
177	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 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>	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 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 SWL RT</p>	Unsatisfied	<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 SWL RT and professional football stadium.</p>	<p>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.</p>	
178	Unsatisfied	<p>It does nothing to celebrate the location on the river. This should be an iconic build yet it is not. Manufacturing & 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 & 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 & 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 & 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 & 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 & 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>Has anyone thought to contact one if the amazing northside celebrity returnees to gauge interest? Several young men who grew up in North mols, made a name in the sports arena of North High and went on to play professionally. And then came home to invest in THEIR hometown. Have any of these exceptional young men been approached? Khalid el Amin for one. Perhaps THIS is one way to build that destination restaurant?</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 must. The process to determine how monies are divided needs be transparent and designed by the effected parties on an</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&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. Strive for the best & brightest.</p>
179	Unsatisfied	<p>I would like to see more engagement with the residents of minneapolis who will be most impacted by this. This project has been planned and moved forward for far longer than these opportunities for public comment have been welcomed.</p> <p>Have their been studies done one how this project will effect (short and long term) the cost of living or environmental impact in the immediate neighborhood?</p>	Unsatisfied		Neutral			
180	Unsatisfied	<p>More natural areas, less building structures, at least make them environmentally efficient and esthetically tasteful, not tacky nor trendy.</p>						
181	Unsatisfied	<p>You have housing on the loud side of the amphitheater. That sounds like a disaster for those living there who will endure concerts regularly.</p>	Satisfied		Satisfied	<p>Needs more transit.</p>		
182	Unsatisfied	<p>It should have way more housing units. It ought to be more dense.</p>	Satisfied		Satisfied		<p>Why not make it have more housing units? Couldn't developments be higher to accommodate more residences?</p>	
183	Unsatisfied		Unsatisfied		Unsatisfied			
184	Unsatisfied	<p>I understand the intention of having a central attraction as part of the development, but continue to be frustrated that community engagement didn't begin prior an agreement with First Ave. This development could have set a more equitable standard for future developments, but was not bold enough initially.</p> <p>That said, the CPC and surrounding team have done an incredible job imagining what the future of this site needs to look like in order to benefit the Northside, particularly our BIPOC community members and people experiencing poverty. I wish more concrete guarantees around Community Benefits were on paper prior to a vote on this iteration of the plan.</p> <p>The Learning Tables haven't always been very accessible, and it's almost impossible to participate in the Teams meetings.</p> <p>Finally, while access to the river is so good and exciting, I worry about the impact on the river of such a development. If I understand it correctly, an AUAR has not yet been completed. I think it should be completed before this vote.</p> <p>TL:DR-- The framework of this development was not bold enough in imagining a more equitable way of doing development on public lands. Despite the flaws from the outset, however, the leaders involved have shaped something that seems better than what has been done on the Northside in a long, long time.</p>	Satisfied	<p>On the whole, they seem good.</p> <p>At the same time: -I would hope for more and deeper levels of affordability mixed into the varied levels of housing. -I wish the ticket surcharge were a percentage, rather than a flat fee. That way, the expensive events could help yield huge benefits. -I'm concerned that very few of the benefits are guaranteed and enforceable in writing yet. I understand that the Community Organization/Partner hasn't been identified yet, but maybe it should be.</p>	Satisfied	<p>Lots of meaningful improvements! I'm excited about the work Juxta is doing on and with this project.</p> <p>I'm still wary of the safety and overall chaos at the intersection of Washington and Dowling. Until the land used for industry turns over, I worry the other access points might be preferable.</p>	<p>I hope that our next development opportunity begins by asking the community what it wants and needs. I realize it's slower, messier, and less effective--but could be more just, wealth-building, and beneficial for neighbors.</p>	
185	Unsatisfied	<p>The proposal appears to require sustained public subsidies. The proposal does not provide equitable solutions for the entire community. The entertainment venue benefits a private operator, the special board is controlled by First Avenue.</p>	Neutral		Unsatisfied	<p>The redevelopment presents a futuristic, idealist presentation that likely will not come to fruition if public safety concerns are not addressed.</p>	<p>The City or State should have strict ethical rules in place so that political cronyism does not come into play for how financial benefits from the project are awarded to CBO's.</p>	<p>What is the total public subsidy anticipated over the life of the project, and how will the funding be derived. The housing mix appears to once again concentrate low income residents rather than striving to have a healthy mixed income community.</p>

186	Unsatisfied	Im disappointed because time and time again the way in which we engage communities who have historically been left behind is to sell and promise them things and small fraction of dollars and benefits for other wealthy White people from outside our communities. This plan was always forced on us and many of our leaders have been made to believe the same development rhetoric. These Jobs that are promised is the same thing always promised to us but when we ask questions about what the names of these jobs are and how many local or BIPOC people will get them we don't get clear answers. When we ask how long these Jobs will last we are still not given any real answers about the sustainability and accessibility of these jobs. We are told they will be at least a livable paying wage but what is the definition of livable when the cost of living keeps rising faster than our incomes... This is a Promise Zone and a Green Zone and an Opportunity Zone(Not just an Opportunity for already wealthy White people) and it is supposed to address the historic disinvestments, housing, and Environmental Racism and Economic Justice. This plan falls short of the promises that were continuously made to us within our own city policies and plans that community members have fought long and hard to manifest. I have nothing against United Properties or First Ave. Ive went to First Ave since I was old enough to get in and I appreciate many things about the music scene however the times we are in call for an urgency economic plan and to repair the historic harm and invest truly in the people of this community and the People of Native Heritage and the environment we need to thrive. With Covid-19 deaths impacting our communities the worst and music venues not being a priority or even accessible in our lives at this time its important to take many steps back to re evaluate this city's priorities, goals and promises and also before any vote takes place we Must BY LAW complete a quality environmental review. Please hold off on this decision. We want the city to do this right for the first time in history and set a precedent on how Community and Development can go hand and hand not just Government and their faithful committees they chose making all the decisions.	Very Unsatisfied	What Community Benefits? I don't see anything substantial.	Neutral			How can you build something for people next to all that pollution GAF and Northern Metals? You are willing to displace people but not pollution??? Its Covid-19 out here and everyone acts like they cares until they actually have to do something about it.
187	Unsatisfied	None of these things are realistic with the high level of violent crime taking place.	Very Unsatisfied		Unsatisfied		incense police funding	
188	Unsatisfied	There is not deeply affordable housing included.	Neutral	I honestly lack the trust in developers or the city that they will come through on these plans. Especially anything in phase 2-3 and on I doubt will happen as the developer will just be so excited to get the concert venue then they will run out of steam.	Unsatisfied	Creating a park without mitigating the environmental issues is irresponsible. And the access to the site is poor now, the plans don't improve it.		I'm not interested in Beyoncé by the River if it doesn't include living wage full time jobs and deeply affordable housing.
189	Unsatisfied	Would like to see more opportunity for water recreation. Maybe marina, beach, restaurants, perhaps boardwalk or even a venue along the water.	Neutral		Satisfied			
190	Unsatisfied	This project is getting funding based on the back of black and brown struggles. Our narrative is being co-opted - black and brown people will not get the same opportunities as the developers behind the project.	Unsatisfied	Community Benefits sound good on paper but we all know after the project is funded and breaks ground, those benefits take the back seat. There is no accountability to adherence to them. There are no consequences if these goals are not met. We all know extractive developers say whatever they need to say to get the money and then ultimately do whatever they want.	Neutral	This seemingly connects to the non-north (white neighboring) communities. Why are there no connection points to the few trails here in North	We all know this project is set up for "community ownership" but nobody in the community is getting the same FREE money as the developers. Somehow we are suppose to find our own ways to finance being a part of this project.	Share the wealth. The public dollars coming to this project should be evenly split with bi poc developers to have the same opportunities as the developers leading the charge.
191	Unsatisfied	Given Minneapolis' sanctioned racist laws and intentional disinvestment of North Minneapolis, the Upper Harbor Terminal Site should not go to a white developer. It should be gifted to the Northside Neighborhood Council to be developed as a radical act of restorative justice. With NRRC as its leader, the Northside Neighborhood Council will then develop this property into an international model of restorative justice, affordable housing, 21st century transportation implementation, and a renowned performance venue.						This development has the potential to be a model for reducing car usage. My dream for this space is that is truly eco friendly without any cars. Regardless of the affordability of the housing residents should not be allowed to park cars on the property and visitors should not be able to access the site via car unless by way of a Lyft, Uber, etc. This step will not only help meet Minneapolis' goals to reduce car dependence but allow for investment in better public transportation in North Minneapolis and encourage visitors of the site patronize Northside establishments.
192	Unsatisfied	Given Minneapolis' sanctioned racist laws and intentional disinvestment of North Minneapolis, the Upper Harbor Terminal Site should not go to a white developer. It should be gifted to the Northside Neighborhood Council to be developed as a radical act of restorative justice. With NRRC as its leader, the Northside Neighborhood Council will then develop this property into an international model of restorative justice, affordable housing, 21st century transportation implementation, and a renowned performance venue.	Neutral		Unsatisfied			This development has the potential to be a model for reducing car usage. My dream for this space is that is truly eco friendly without any cars. Regardless of the affordability of the housing residents should not be allowed to park cars on the property and visitors should not be able to access the site via car unless by way of a Lyft, Uber, etc. This step will not only help meet Minneapolis' goals to reduce car dependence but allow for investment in better public transportation in North Minneapolis and encourage visitors of the site patronize Northside establishments.
193	Unsatisfied	Devisive - political/cultural objectives offensive! This is "riverfront land" requiring responsible stewardship alone!	Unsatisfied	Inappropriate. This is Mississippi Riverfront land. Treatment needs to be commensurate with disposition of Federal land referencing Department of Interior's Twin Cities Research Center land distribution in 1990's era.	Neutral	Ok with emphasis on safety and protection.	US Department of Interior, MN Department of Natural Resources!	Political Agenda inappropriate; Racial-cultural inclusionary agenda inappropriate; stable law & safety measures need addressing! Moral issue is Mississippi Riverfront land and environmental protection ALONE!
194	Unsatisfied	The plan is missing a heart, the heart of the Northside of Minneapolis. I do not see anything here that incorporates or embraces the richness of the history of North Minneapolis. I was one of a trio rooted in the Northside selected by Coen & Partners to serve as consultants in planning the park. Members were artist Charles Caldwell, business coach and connector Tene' Wells, and myself, a recognized historian of the community. We focused on capturing and sharing stories which would become a part of this public space. All three of us have numerous ties to cultural groups and individuals, the many layers of immigrants and migrants. Despite our backgrounds and gifts to offer to the Upper Harbor Plan, and the expertise of Coen & Partners, the opportunity was given to another group, one without ties to our community. Personally, I had ideas for connecting nature and play having visited Princess Diana's Playground at Kensington and connecting past and present from visiting Philadelphia's restoration of their docks. I attended some meetings in McKinley at the beginning when asked for community input but they were 1) poorly led, 2) acrimonious, and 3) primarily attended by people from outside the community. I found the research done using youth out of a local non-profit to be exploitive, lacking reliability, and poor in methodology. I found the treatment of Ian Silver-ramp, entrepreneur of Mississippi Mushroom abhorable. I hope that the blue herons who rest and gather in the grasses of the western bank and nest on the islands are not the next to be forced to succumb to the money mongers.	Unsatisfied	Having been a member of the Northside community for over a half-century and having been an active participant in organizations of North Mpls. and having served as a teacher in this community for the majority of the past 50 years, I have a healthy skepticism recording corporate promises and sustainability. It behooves me as to how the planning committee did not include a historical context. "The process is the product" as Brother Shane Price says and I see the process as having had serious flaws as stated above.	Satisfied			
195	Unsatisfied	The history of land ownership and development is rooted in the fundamental realities of systemic racism that continues to this day. In Minneapolis the proposed UHT development in North Minneapolis continues to perpetuate this injustice. The UHT development could be a transformational project in the city of Minneapolis. Land development does not have to continue to be an extractive wealth process. However, starting the project by proposing the sale of city owned land to a white-owned, affluent real estate company, while requesting \$12.5 million in state bonding to support a performance center benefiting another privileged, white-owned company clearly demonstrates the depth of injustice embedded into the current system. If First Avenue had to go out and borrow \$12.5 million, the total amount of the loan payments, including interest, would be multiples of that amount. If they had to get the money from investors, the payments to them would probably be even much higher. That is a huge gift to First Avenue by the governments. The value of the \$12.5 million in public funding that First Avenue received from the Minnesota State Legislature shows once again how governments help non-community-based wealthy companies and individuals disenfranchise low income communities and communities of color from income while taking the profits and burdening those communities. It isn't exactly rocket science to figure out that most of the attendees at the huge concerts will not be from north or northeast. Yet almost all of the profits go to First Avenue and not to the community. AFCAC shares similar concerns of the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board Community Advisory Committee about First Avenue's performance center's negative impacts on the park and public realm (i.e. noise, parking, traffic, and pollution). AFCAC wants to see these concerns addressed before the coordinated plan is approved. Development & Housing Opportunities AFCAC supports a mixed range of housing options/costs to ensure a healthy and stable community and to address our affordable housing crisis. AFCAC urges the development team to find ways to allow for mixed-income opportunities in housing parcels across the site and throughout the various phases of housing development.	Unsatisfied	Community Performing & Arts Center The community has the right to request and review the 10-year project proforma for First Avenue's performance center considering the \$12.5 million in public funds going to this project. It is important to consider, what percentage of the total profits is the \$500,000 - \$1 million being offered to the community? If you don't know how much First Avenue plans to make each year at the performance center, how can you determine how much of a benefit to the community will result from a \$3 ticket fee? Providing anything less would be a dereliction of duty to the community. It appears as though the \$3 fee isn't based on what the community is entitled to, but rather on what First Avenue is willing to pay. Perhaps the community would better served by receiving a percentage, at least 10%, of the total annual profits from First Avenue's performance center. While we see redevelopment along the riverfront as a net positive, we caution a full review and study of the development risks, benefits, environmental impacts, and any latent costs associated with the project must happen before the coordinated plan is voted on and approved by City Council.	Unsatisfied	Transportation/Traffic & Congestion/Parking AFCAC vehemently opposes using the UHT riverfront for big parking lots/ramps. The likely initial solution for on-site parking for each of the proposed uses multi-family, hospitality, business, industrial, will be for large asphalt surfaced lots, traffic lanes, and driveways. The UHT Draft Coordinated Plan does not show the location nor the size of any of the areas required to be covered with an impervious surface for parking. Recently, the City rejected an 800-stall parking ramp on the riverfront next to the Federal Reserve Bank. Why should the North Minneapolis' riverfront be held to a different standard? The draft UHT coordinated plan lacks any substantive plan for public transit to service this site. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) is planning a highway expansion project along Interstate 94, which will run directly adjacent to this project. MnDOT has conducted a study to look at the potential of having Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along this corridor. While the study concluded this corridor ranked as highly competitive for a BRT route, there is no funding to make this public transit option a reality. Without public transit included in the redevelopment plans for Upper Harbor Terminal, this project excludes many city residents from accessing the site and increases auto emissions in a neighborhood with poor air quality. Except for the adjacent biking/walking paths along the Mississippi River (with connection to the Above the Falls Regional Park system), this community lacks healthy-living amenities within a short walking distance, lacks protected bike lanes to access commerce along various corridors, and has limited public transit options (Metro Transit routes #30 and #14). It is unacceptable a traffic study and AUAR/environmental review would not be completed prior to City Council approving the draft coordinated plan. The UHT Draft Coordinated Plan should be informed by an AUAR and traffic study showing	Northside Neighborhood Council (NNC)	Do not approve the coordinated plan until an AUAR is completed and plans are made to thoroughly address how to mitigate concerns found in the environmental review process--including issues related to noise, pollution, traffic and parking. Reduce the size of the performance center to a capacity of no more than 7,000 attendees (or less, if indicated by the results of the AUAR). A full review and study of the development risks, benefits, environmental impacts, and any latent costs associated with the project happen before the coordinated plan is voted on and approved by City Council. Review and ensure language in any redevelopment contract agreements/term sheets between the City of Minneapolis, United Properties, and First Avenue is to the benefit of existing community members and does not intentionally or unintentionally displace current Northside residents. It's fundamental this project provide inclusive economic opportunities throughout the different phases of the project: procurement, employment, sustainability, development, construction, management, operation, and maintenance. AFCAC urges the development team to find mixed-income housing opportunities in parcels across the site and throughout the various phases of housing development. Ensure affordable ground and/or building leases which enable current Northside businesses to own, manage, rent, or operate commercial space located at the site. Include accessible, affordable community space within both the community hub and First Avenue's performance center for use by residents as well as others within the broad community of North Minneapolis. Provide a wide-array benefits to the community (i.e., urban agriculture, farmers market, more than one sit-down restaurant at various price points, for example, with accommodation for a commercial cooperative kitchen). Use the interim planning and design period to create opportunities for pop-up activities such as mini community festivals, food truck events, etc. Connect existing Northside neighborhoods west of I-94 to the river and create connections to nearby parkways, greenways, and trails. Enforce building height limits at this site: Building design at this site is extremely important. As a result, we adamantly urge the City to not permit manufacturing and industrial uses so close to the river and utilize setbacks, tiering, and other techniques to protect riverfront

		<p>We support the efforts on senior housing and would like to see it get a stronger place in the draft coordinated plan. Recent studies show that senior housing provides eyes on the park at all times of day, which in turn provides a safer environment.</p> <p>AFCAC supports community, City Collaborative Planning Committee, and Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board Community Advisory Committee requests for the City of Minneapolis to provide 20-year property tax projections for this site and adjacent property owners (within 5-mile radius).</p> <p>There is some concern that this redevelopment will increase property taxes in the neighborhoods west of I-94. We believe there should be a method for the community benefit money to protect lower income households from negative effects such as gentrification.</p>				<p>potential traffic congestion and pollution mitigation strategies ahead of any official City Council vote. There should be a detailed plan presented for how First Avenue plans to get 10,000 people to concerts without parking in the UHT or surrounding neighborhoods, and without running shuttles from present amenities such as parks or businesses which would affect the normal parking needs for those entities.</p> <p>The AUAR/environmental review must address and mitigate the following concerns: parking, traffic congestion and emissions, noise (decibel levels, etc.), air quality, water quality, environmental review methodology and process, and any conflicts of interest.</p>		<p>views, the Shoreland Overlay District, and the Mississippi River Critical Area Overlay District.</p> <p>Do not permit manufacturing and industrial uses so close to the river, and utilize setbacks, tiering, and other techniques to protect riverfront views – as indicated in the Shoreland Overlay District and the Mississippi River Critical Area Overlay District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o AFCAC recommends any future industrial uses supports the concept of the UHT as primarily a river-centric destination first. We recommend, in addition to jobs creation, the businesses selected are appropriate to the overall riverfront park concept. The design of any industrial properties must avoid imposing on park users and becoming a wall between residents and the riverfront. In addition to minimizing noise, odor, and pollution, buildings should have lots of windows and active entrances, avoid big blank walls, not require a lot of freight traffic, and should be small enough they can be easily walked around/between. We recommended putting these standards in the coordinated plan so the expectations are clear from the beginning. <p>In addition to the included LEED recommendations, AFCAC believes the UHT site is a demonstration opportunity for new energy and resource sharing technologies beyond the current LEED standards. Requirements to meet this objective should be included as part of the project standards.</p> <p>The Mississippi is an important flyway/migratory route for birds and pollinators. AFCAC recommends the UHT site landscape and built environment should be designed with this in mind.</p>
196	Unsatisfied	Many questions are left. How/where is the parking going to be when concerts are held? How will traffic be accommodated?	Unsatisfied	Has the North Mpls community been involved? I don't see that listed.	Unsatisfied	Same as the prior question; Has the North Mpls community been involved? I don't see that listed.	All of the N. Mpls Neighborhood Associations.	
197	Unsatisfied		Neutral		Very Unsatisfied	Minneapolis's city has only 3 inspectors who barely inspect the calls that are complaints about soil management. There is no mention of any management of the soil. How will the city plan to manage the inspections when they have limited help in that area? Are they going to increase the number of inspectors? Where will the containment soil and other waste be moved to? How will much increase in air pollution be contributed to already polluted air in the area?	Recommend that the community have more education about the land management process in construction sites and the where the waste goes, the increase of pollution, that those who are hired to do the work in this plan provide a way to create jobs with training for the people in the community to do the work for this construction while it is being done. there is nothing about the management of the soil and the cost	This plan should include training for northside residents to be able to work on this project. and not watch all the work to go to the people who do not live in the community of North Minneapolis
198	Unsatisfied	The plan seems to provide a patchwork of all things to all agreed parties for the last 500 years. That is all correct. recreating river front original or close landscaping park would seem to be lost by the manufacturing facilities, Wellness hub, mixed housing of about 1k or more residents, 7 to 10k event arena, high voltage lines, parkways, bikeways, walkways and more, in 48 acres. The community engagement survey report indicates this benefiting 60k families in North Mpls, or 12k card surveys. With 200 or so replies, the survey does not seem to have statistical validity/reliability.	Satisfied	without a doubt.	Very Unsatisfied	The improvements would certainly seem to compete with each other, to the point of canceling out any hope for success of most to all.	Too many cooks will spoil the broth.	greater solid planning and many reliable sources on which to base decisions. Perhaps scaling back the many different and competing items in too small space to succeed.
199	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			
200	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 Pohlad, 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?
201	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."	Very Unsatisfied	to focused on one group	Neutral		anyone who can afford the fees should be allowed no matter whether the city thinks they are worthy or not	focus on all of the city and the future not the past
202	Very Unsatisfied	the work should be for all those living in Minneapolis 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.
203	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.
204	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.
205	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.		
206	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			
207	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.
208	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
209	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 Eiffel 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.
210	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.
211	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?
212	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??
213	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			

214	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 2022.	A Community Land Trust (CLT) to own the 48 acres in it's entirety 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.
215	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
216	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.
217	Very Unsatisfied	You continue to willingly gentrify one of the only affordable places for low income people to live in Minneapolis. 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? 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? C'mon. Get your shit together and stop selling out to lobbyists and billionaire developers.	Very Unsatisfied	See above.	Very Unsatisfied	You're not providing anything for the communities in the area other than higher costs of living.		Our city council. Our mayor. Our governor... They're all paid with tax payer money, yet they choose to deny the tax payers rights. You've already fucked small businesses and low income earners during the pandemic by approving bailouts for airlines and gas pipelines nobody wants. 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. Get off your high horses and stop serving yourselves and start serving the people who pay you.
218	Very Unsatisfied	it is a reverse red-lining production	Neutral	they don't help the whole city	Very Satisfied	it needs to be done		
219	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
220	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.		
221	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.
222	Very Unsatisfied	It an 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
223	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. Scrap it
224	Very Unsatisfied	Waste of tax dollars.	Very Unsatisfied	Arrogant self-congratulating lefties gone wild.	Very Unsatisfied	Waste of tax dollars	Reduce red tape	
225	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.
226	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						
227	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.
228	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				
229	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. 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
230	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	
231	Very Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied			
232	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		

233	Very Unsatisfied	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 & 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 & Wellness Community Hub where kids (and everyone else) have access to programming 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.	Unsatisfied	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. 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?	Unsatisfied	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. 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. Or consider a pedestrian bridge over I94 like we see at the Sculpture Garden or over Hwy. 100.	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?	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?
234	Very Unsatisfied	It isn't for the children in the neighborhood or the families in the neighborhood	Very Unsatisfied	Not a good use	Very Unsatisfied	It appears the people who don't live here that had the most import	Very much like weber pool it's a bad plan it won't turn out the way it should	Very much like weber pool it's a bad plan it won't turn out the way it shouldAnd it won't benefit the neighborhood it'll just cause our taxes to go up and then some of us to be forced out of the neighborhood. Same old story of Minneapolis
235	Very Unsatisfied	The cost and timeline are exorbitant when downtown proper has been degraded to a slum.	Very Unsatisfied	The city is too unsafe to enjoy the beautiful outdoor spaces we already have.	Very Unsatisfied	The city is too unsafe to enjoy the beautiful outdoor spaces we already have.		The city is too unsafe to enjoy the beautiful outdoor spaces we already have.
236	Very Unsatisfied	Lack of authentic community engagement, private land ownership for the benefit of First Ave corporation and minimum benefit to the community. Any planned industrial business will have a route thru the housing and recreational areas of the site, meaning increased pollution, noise and odors.	Very Unsatisfied	The so-called "trust" that will hold/manage the 48 acres is in the hands of people subject to political outcomes and decisions and doesn't ensure perpetual community ownership of the site. A Community Land Trust owned and managed by community members is a better way to "hold" the property.	Very Unsatisfied	The City of Minneapolis "gave" land to the MPRB prior to convening the CPC. It is possible that the community wanted the entire site dedicated to industry or housing, but they were never given that opportunity. Once again, impactful decisions by the City that have significant impact to the direction of development at the site, without authentic and meaningful community input. Not to mention, there's already a large park less than a mile away from the site.	Same old unsuccessful community organizations with a spotty success rate in addressing the needs of the community. A waste of time, money and resources with these groups that have never been held accountable for or justified the use of funds earmarked for the community they allegedly were serving.	I believe that the plan reflects a sincere effort by the City of Minneapolis (except for the agreement with First Avenue) to address the concerns of the community, focus on equity and benefit the local residents HOWEVER, the city is using the same old "piece-meal, bandage approach, one-off approach" that hasn't worked in the past and won't work now or in the future. A "darts at the arrow board" method of development at the site without a consolidated plan that includes a centralized, strategic plan for development activities is a losing proposition from the start. What will be developed by whom, type of industry to be developed and its benefit to the surrounding community should be planned now. Just don't take any old interested party regardless of their race and ethnic background, have an overall plan, that is based upon community needs and desires.
237	Very Unsatisfied	Gentrification of the northside is systemic racism.	Very Unsatisfied	Gentrification of the northside is systemic racism.	Very Unsatisfied		Gentrification of the northside is systemic racism.	
238	Very Unsatisfied	The plan looks horrendous. It offers tax payer subsidized housing on waterfront property. It is a perfect talking point for any Conservative about out of control Progressive spending.	Very Unsatisfied	A purposeful attempt to keep development stagnant is beyond bizarre. Every attempt should be made to encourage improvement of the area.	Very Unsatisfied	People drive cars and need parking to visit.	Hire business professionals with educational and business experience on the resumes. Community activists with no other qualification need not apply.	Start over from scratch. Hire professionals with the background experience needed to advance with solid measurable goals.
239	Very Unsatisfied	I live four blocks from the Mississippi, with access to the Winchester trail. Every day I get to walk my dogs and enjoy the beauty of the river. It's also notable that I had no issues taking a loan from a bank for buying a home in Seward, and that I'm white. I cannot say the same is necessarily true for people living in North Minneapolis. The Upper Harbor Terminal is prime land that is owned by the city--it is a rare example of riverfront of such size that is publicly owned, situated in a part of the city that is infamous for its inequities to people of color. What could have been a place of monumental transformation in creating a gem of equitable development has become an (embarrassing) failure of imagination. It seems this is largely because the city is operating on dated methods of allowing (wealthy and predominantly white) private developers to lead the show. This is public land--the people of the north neighborhoods (who have the most to lose and gain, and who have been historically repressed) should be allowed to create the plan for their space. Ideally, I'd like to see the representatives of the city of Minneapolis throw this project out and start over in a just and responsible manner. Representatives should step out of their "status quo" operations and for once meddle in another wards business--stick your neck out, take a risk. Has 2020 not taught everyone that life is too short not to do what is just? Yes, MPLS received a bond for a music stadium (to house 7,000-10,000 people). Do you really think, after the world shock wave caused by George Floyd's murder, that another stadium is what our communities need? Can you justify this? Here are some specific concerns with this project as it stands: The financial returns promised to the neighborhood (\$3 fee added to tickets and ground lease revenues) don't seem proportionate to the level of financial benefit the private development team is reaping from the use of public land and public funds. The environmental review (AUAR) won't be released until after the city council is scheduled to vote on the plan. The Community Benefits Agreement are not complete. Community members have never been permitted to critically examine whether they want a 7,000-10,000 person concert venue in their neighborhood. What are the noise and traffic impacts? Is there going to be public transit available or will 9,000 people be parking their cars in the north neighborhood? Will the park even be usable for the people of the neighborhood during the summer months or will they compete with concerns goes? Will the jobs created will have stable schedules and pay living wages? Is this project financially sound? We're disappointed that the city prioritized the venue for state bond funds in 2020, and equally disappointed that the Legislature awarded \$12.5 million in public funds for it with no answers to the actual public viability of this venture. It's not clear how much more public funding will be needed to develop the site to achieve affordability in housing and commercial/community spaces. What financial resources need to be marshaled? Can you deliver on these goals? The plan proposes exemptions from the building height limits set out in the city's new MRCCA ordinances. North Minneapolis should have the same high standard of riverfront development that the rest of us enjoy. Are you going to approve and commit to an incomplete plan that leaves many crucial questions unanswered? In a time when we must keep distance from others for safety, public space has never been more important and never in living memory has the need for public space been greater. I urge						
240	Very Unsatisfied	It is disappointing. The real asset of the opening of area is river and potential for green space. However, this has been planned as concrete village which could be placed anywhere. It doesn't appear much consideration has been given to transportation issues. The planners may think a lot of people will use alternative modes of transit besides cars to attend concerts and other venues, we are still an automobile culture. It is not clear to me there will adequate parking and there is no direct bus route I am aware of. Even if there was, I am doubt everyone would walk from the bus given the crime in the area.	Neutral	I don't directly live in the community so don't presume what will benefit this community.	Very Unsatisfied	I would like to have had an environmental assessment/evaluation before finalization of plan. I am concerned that the plan will be final before this is the natural area is considered. It appears to be a concrete area (parking, entertainment, homes, parking) with a large lawn.	Perhaps call it an urban development not a park.	
241	Very Unsatisfied	The plan is not developed in a way that is cohesive, nor does it show any respect for or relationship to the great Mississippi River. This is a special, unique site which needs development that takes that into account. I do not support the 10,000 seat music venue - I think it is way too big for the site and the proximity to residential areas (especially without an environmental review to understand the impacts). I do not support any kind of industry (whether or not it is "light" or "green") so close to the river - this land is much better suited for hospitality, recreation or housing.	Very Unsatisfied	It is not clear who will manage/monitor these benefits or what these benefits will be used for.	Very Unsatisfied	It is not clear what, if any, these "improvements" are.	Any community based organization needs to be just that: developed and supported by the whole community (not just a few people). Also the roles and responsibilities of this organization need to be clearly defined with a process/procedure to monitor follow-through and effectiveness.	A through environmental review, with community involvement, needs to be completed before moving forward. Also, the issues noted above need to be addressed.
242	Very Unsatisfied	The river should be parkland as in other parts of the city. With no lakes in north Minneapolis, this is our only waterfront. We anticipated an amazing park. The proposed plan is only a narrow walking/biking strip with a very small park. This very special, publicly owned property should not be primarily given over to private development. The concert venue is the worst! Traffic, parking, and crowds would overtake the area on weekend summer evenings when north Minneapolis residents should be able to enjoy the river, visit cafes and food venues, play, and gather.	Very Unsatisfied	Once this land is built on, it's gone. This is a land grab. Ground lease payments and ticket fees do not offset the quality-of-life opportunity this area could provide our community.	Unsatisfied	Besides Dowling, an additional connection is needed over the highway for the neighborhood.	Get rid of First Avenue at the UHT. Indoor urban agriculture is an excellent idea.	This is a major land grab. Scale back on development. Don't build close to the river. Remove the music venue. Provide more parkland with amenities for the community. Include pavilions for gatherings such as family reunions, neighborhood meetings, or small weddings.

243	Very Unsatisfied	I'm opposed to public funds being allocated to this particular private entity. I'm opposed to MY bond money being allocated to an organization that may be on the verge of bankruptcy due to Covid-19. I ask, WHERE IS MY 12.5M bond money? Where is the fiscal and fiduciary responsibility of the City Council and Mayor to the community. Have those funds be allocated to First Ave? Are the funds being held in abeyance until First Ave (or whomever) can show financial stability to receive these funds?	Very Unsatisfied	The \$3 fee per ticket doesn't nearly come close to the public funds investment (12.5M) both now and any future requests from First Ave	Unsatisfied	I'm encouraged to see 33rd Ave included in Phase 1, however, unsatisfied with the Park Bd portion	Same old-same old, ineffective organizations who have not served the community well in the past. They don't have the capacity, the expertise or the commitment to properly serve the north-side community	-No private ownership of the land. (period) ever. -No music venue owned by a corporation that doesn't reflect the northside community and its cultural makeup -The community decides what development happens on the site via a Community Land Trust (not land bank) -The City's role in UHT development projects is advisory, at best
244	Very Unsatisfied	Rental housing and rental business space doesn't provide for long term empowerment of the community. This plan may have positive intentions but is short sighted. Investing in the community should look like: maintain and upgrade existing homes by offering FULL funding for improvements to residents. Provide opportunities for affordable OWNERSHIP. Investing in local entrepreneurship should look like: giving lower income residents technology and good internet, not the kind you have to pay a discounted rate for and get crappy slow service. This plan needs a major update. As it stands it is an ugly enormous mall-like pretend universe for people who want to move to a different planet or live in the 1980's. Where there are "jobs" in big random warehouses and "housing" with endless monthly rent expenses instead of opportunities, empowerment, freedom, or independence. The kind of things home ownership, urban neighborhoods, access to technology, internet, and business education could provide. The park aspect of the plan is good. The rest is not part of a city I would even want to live in. 3\$ admission fee back to the community, fine, do it. But don't pretend it is part of this development because no ugly building development should be needed in order to implement that. Playing favorites to the performing arts collective isn't automatically in our interest. Yes, if you are going to rent out spaces on our public land then re-invest it in the community. That should really be obvious. I hope you will re-asses this whole idea and instead of building a bunch of buildings spend the money on the community by investing in what is already here and providing essentials to the community. Buildings are not it. Empower people for today. The economy is online.	Very Unsatisfied	See above.	Unsatisfied	The park and walking path is fine and will benefit the neighborhood. I think community gardening and agriculture and emphasis on BIPOC business getting priority is also good. The rest belongs in a tacky suburb, at best. And why does first avenue have anything to do with this??? Danya Frank gets to own land while everyone else has to rent? What is even going on with that?	This doesn't really make sense because the spaces for "community organizations" is all rental but you are talking about ownership opportunities. WHY don't you just build houses people can afford to buy instead. Why not let business that want to invest in the neighborhood do so by letting them purchase land and develop what they want. Or work out a contract of renting if they want to. I don't agree that it makes sense to build random spaces and then hope to find tenants. That sounds like a recipe for vacancy, reducing rents, and just another depressing mall. In addition, unethical business may choose to locate there if there is an enormous number of lower income tenants who are already disempowered due to the fact that they have no opportunities for home ownership in the area.	Please consider that current residents don't need more apartments. They need funding to help them maintain their homes. Long term investing in the neighborhood would look like supporting residents who already live here, not just trying to bring a bunch of renters and outdated business models. I don't agree with first avenue getting special treatment or that the kind of jobs that would be provided by a concert venue are really what the neighborhood needs. The future of the economy is online and if you want to empower people start there. Many jobs and entrepreneurial opportunities do not require special education or degrees. I don't think spending money on new buildings is necessarily in the best interest of the community. WHY don't you just build houses people can afford to buy instead? And the parks. GO ahead with the parks, walkways, bike paths, please. Just wait on the rest until you can update your assumptions about business etc and instead spend your money on SUPPORTING CURRENT RESIDENTS now. Just ask what they need, and they are going to tell you. I don't think it is a bunch of new buildings.
245	Very Unsatisfied	While its clear a lot of work has been done to recognize and attempt to address racial disparities, gentrification, and the needs of the North side community, especially its Black residents, this plan at heart continues to the process of building wealth for wealthy white developers who are not from the North Side. As the project website states out front, this is a once in a generation opportunity and it is maddening to see the city fail to take this opportunity to meaningfully redress underdevelopment on the North Side and instead continue the process of private wealth creation in real estate that led to the current situation. In particular, while the plan does a great job of laying out values and objectives around disrupting gentrification, it fails to connect the dots to actually preventing gentrification and displacement in the area around the site. 1 million/year (estimated to come from fees and ground lease) is a laughably small number to prevent gentrification and displacement as rents and property values rise. The planning process should re start, without the involvement of private developers, including First Ave and United Properties. The community should be engaged in a process that does not assume the presence of a concert venue (or anything else) on the site. The process should be focused on reparations, deeply affordable public housing, and wealth building for the Black Northside community. It should actively avoid types of development that will inevitably and predictably lead to gentrification and displacement. I understand the city has done development this way recently (finding a developer first), and that the city did not believe itself to have the capacity to engage in a complex planning process without a private developer. The city should find those resources so that the process can work for residents most impacted, and not be limited to what will be profit producing for private developers. Minneapolis is contending with a housing crisis and an ongoing reckoning with structural racism. We should dream FAR bigger in terms of what is possible with this project.	Very Unsatisfied	Again, I appreciate all the work of the CPC and the recognition and direction towards anti gentrification and community benefit. However, despite no doubt herculean effort and huge amounts of work, because the project is fundamentally structured around developer profit these benefits fall far short. In particular: Affordable housing - 30% of AMI is NOT affordable for a huge number of current Northside residents. There needs to be publicly owned housing in the development that includes free housing for those in need of it. The plan also fails to meaningfully address Phase 2 housing development in terms of affordability. Finally, goal 4 states that the plan should "Advance the interests of the Northside community without creating gentrification or displacement". But the plan does not meaningfully address how gentrification around the site will not happen. Creating 35 affordable homeownership opportunities in the form of the townhomes is not going to prevent rising rents and property values around the site, inevitably leading to the gentrification and displacement the plan is supposed to prevent.				
246	Very Unsatisfied	i do not understand why housing and commercial development are planned for a park, surely there are residential areas that can be rehabbed for better housing and commercial areas that can be rehabbed or developed for commercial real estate.i believe a park should be a park, not a commercial and residential area. i would prefer to see the site showing playgrounds , outdoor performance areas like lake harriet and opportunities to enjoy the river safely, such as a boat rental or a cruising boat like the one that used to be on lake harriet. places for volleyball or basketball or tennis, baseball field, etc would make more sense to me.		my comments are well covered in the above comment section.				
247	Very Unsatisfied	- Not enough time to review with neighborhood groups! -Missing importance of the RIVER; amazing natural resource to be shared by all - community - mixed use housing (affordable housing - both in terms of ownership, rental and coop needs to be confirmed!) - Must reduce building height - enforce and do not allow for variances that sneak in additional height - - advance flyway, natural environs, bird safe glass, respect environment allow for better community access to public areas of the river. - Have industry and manufacturing NOT by the river - review with master plan on transportation access. - Appears not to have a complete master plan that would include understanding of transportation impact: mass transit, parking large events, access for community - encourage a better planning effort that embraces small area planning on this AS WELL AS adjacent community. - Verify how how this will not harm existing community with gentrification and work with adjacent better on potential contribution to assure long term rental and low income housing not displaced. - Do NOT displace existing residents, and add funding and mechanisms to assure they are not displaced (both rental and home owners). - Reduce size and impact of performance center and assure a percentage will be reinvested in the surrounding community. Don't invest in this area like RiverPlace and within 10 years it was empty and a ghost town. (Now 30 years later and significant tax breaks it is under remodeling). - Create retail/hospitality that will respect the river and be a benefit to the community - not just a one shot event center that is used once a month and vacant remaining timeframe. - Concern on event center and noise transference (along with air pollution and water runoff, and other) across the river to adjacent neighborhood's.	Very Unsatisfied	Not specific. Harm will come to adjacent area rental and low income homeowners. No real benefit to them for access to river. See notes above	Very Unsatisfied	Incomplete transportation plan for major access to event center - and when event center in use prohibits community access. Poor guidance on noise transference to adjacent communities - both on land and across river sound will be louder. See notes above.	Event center should be limited in size and percentage of proceeds should go to the community . See other notes above	-This is being rushed with not enough time for neighborhood groups to respond! - Missing importance of the RIVER; amazing natural resource to be shared by all - community - mixed use housing (affordable housing - both in terms of ownership, rental and coop needs to be confirmed!) - Must reduce building height - enforce and do not allow for variances that sneak in additional height - - advance flyway, natural environs, bird safe glass, respect environment allow for better community access to public areas of the river. - Have industry and manufacturing NOT by the river - review with master plan on transportation access. - Appears not to have a complete master plan that would include understanding of transportation impact: mass transit, parking large events, access for community - encourage a better planning effort that embraces small area planning on this AS WELL AS adjacent community. - Verify how how this will not harm existing community with gentrification and work with adjacent better on potential contribution to assure long term rental and low income housing not displaced. - Do NOT displace existing residents, and add funding and mechanisms to assure they are not displaced (both rental and home owners). - Reduce size and impact of performance center and assure a percentage will be reinvested in the surrounding community. Don't invest in this area like RiverPlace and within 10 years it was empty and a ghost town. (Now 30 years later and significant tax breaks it is under remodeling). - Create retail/hospitality that will respect the river and be a benefit to the community - not just a one shot event center that is used once a month and vacant remaining timeframe. - Concern on event center and noise transference (along with air pollution and water runoff, and other) across the river to adjacent neighborhood's.
248	Very Unsatisfied	You have not listen to concerns addressed by the community you dismiss them and you took them off of your panels. This is obviously disrespectful and I'm not surprised because city of Minneapolis does a very poor job at engaging in the community and yet again you're showing that you've done a terrible job of that.	Unsatisfied	The planning committee is dominated by corporate interest and I don't think that I can rightfully represent the opinion of the community until you can actually listen to them.	Neutral	I'm for improving green spaces in Minneapolis, I have not seen this part of the plan though so I don't have an opinion.	I'm not a northsider but Juxta Arts is good.	

249	Very Unsatisfied	<p>The entire Plan needs to be thrown out and start over because if is so bad. And people who actually represent the broad realm of northside residents need to be appointed to the committee. It is a committee composed of activist special interests and has strong racial tones. For over a century the city has short changed the great people of the northside by imposing special interests in control of all waterfront development and that is what is happening again. This is the one parcel where the city has the rare opportunity to be fair to the people of north/northeast and give them a waterfront development like the rest of the city has. Instead, the city plans to redevelop the UHT basically ignoring the waterfront. The planned development could be put anywhere in the city—it has almost no connection to the waterfront. While cities all over the country are developing 21st century waterfronts tied to the water and focused upon creating a great recreational experience for the community, this plan is a 19th century plan that ignores the idea of making this one waterfront in north/northeast an amenity for all of the people of the area. As said, this is just another example of the city bowing down to one or another special interests, and spurning most of the community. Right off, it is clear that the city doesn't give a damn about having a 21st century waterfront for this area since it takes up a lot of the space with manufacturing, industry, food processing, assembly, etc. All other forward looking cities in the country, and in most of the world, are deciding not to put such monstrosities near a recreational waterfront. Its too bad city officials can't be convicted and given the guillotine if they approve this plan. The whole plan should be how to make this UHT a great amenity for EVERYONE in north/northeast. Instead it is a plan to appease loud activist special interests and it even clearly interjects race, while most people on the northside are trying to make things better for everyone. The people of north/northeast do deserve a music venue at least equal to what is at Harriet. It would be nice to have an amphitheater like Chicago's Millennium Park on a small scale. But the city is imposing an enormous performance venue that has nothing to do with serving the northside on its main 40 or 50 performance dates. Does anyone think there will be a lot of northsiders at those performances? The main goal should be providing amenities including businesses that benefit users of the waterfront, such as restaurants and other types of retail, etc shops that serve the people of north/northeast. Yet almost nothing is said about such entities. Some cities are putting in some housing near waterfronts, but only in a way that works well at making the waterfront succeed as an amenity for the community. In this plan, the worst proposal possible is set up for housing. In such a newly developing area, cities put in market rate housing in the best locations of the development. In a waterfront, obviously that is the housing nearer the water. And it is absolutely required that the market rate housing go in first and that it mostly be market rate so that the amenities have customers who can patronize them at a rate by which they can succeed. In this case, we want to have small local entrepreneurs (hopefully mostly POC), and most of them are not wealthy. In most cities of the country, all of such housing in waterfront areas is market rate, but we like some mixed income, so there should be some affordable housing. But this plan has housing backwards. It puts in 2/3 affordable housing and 2/3 of the initial phase of housing is at the lowest of the income levels. Most of the northside does not want those "so-called" relics to remain. We never liked them. And just because of a few loud voices the city is considering keeping them. That was always a bad idea. But it is far worse now that they are cutting down on the amount of park land. THEY NEED TO GO---PERIOD.</p>	Very Unsatisfied	Once again, the Plan is not designed to provide the rare opportunity the city has to provide a nice recreational waterfront opportunity. This section of the plan proves that once again the city is putting loud activist special interests ahead of providing a 21st century waterfront amenity for north/northeast. The prime goal of this waterfront amenity is not jobs. It is not affordable housing. It is not to create wealth for northsiders. I support those goals here and everywhere but they should not take preference over the main goal. I know from listening to the loud activists on these issues that these special interests prevailed with the council, while the interests of most of the northside/northeast, including ADOS and other POCi, were shunted out of consideration. If the council really cared about these issues, they would require them all over the city. It is apparent that once again, as has gone on for a century, the city tries to solve its problems on the back of northsiders.	Very Unsatisfied	<p>The plan really doesn't deal with the huge issue, namely parking. So near the river, it is extremely undesirable to have big parking lots. Yet, parking is needed desperately. It doesn't say there will be parking for all the tenants under their residences. In order to survive, businesses such as restaurants, retail and offices which have customers (including the Hub), need parking close by. But there is none. Moreover, there is very poor transit service to this area. And there is no real solution presented regarding how attendees at the performing arts center will get there. What will keep them from parking all over nearby neighborhoods, which will take away spaces where residents park? And will the neighborhood streets be jammed with attendees looking for parking? If there are shuttles, what will that do to traffic? There are a few good parts to this plan. It is a good idea to have the stormwater ponds, but only if they don't take up much open space. The improvement of Dowling (especially the corner with Lyndale where there are constant accidents), including bike ways and plantings etc, is good, but if something isn't done with the bridge, it really doesn't matter. (Maybe the bike and walking lanes could be hung onto the side of the bridge). Having the street between the public and private areas is good. Moving the highline to the west is good.</p>	<p>The Plan says the governance entity must be representative of the people of the northside. That sounds good. But the city intentionally has set up the committee for community input in a way which is extremely unrepresentative of the northside. In fact, it is amazing how unrepresentative the City's UHT-CAC is. In fact, it is outrageous. And that is shown in how bad many parts of their plan is. So the people of the northside cannot have confidence the city will set up the Community Entity Selection Task Force or any other of the entities proposed to be set up, in a way which really represents the northside. The Neighborhood Development Center in St. Paul should be hired to work with the businesses going into UHT. It has by far the best record of helping very small and beginning POC businesses become successful. It is much better than NEON, MEDA and other for such very small entities. Part of this topic contains some of the parts of the Plan which are good. It is a good idea to provide funding for the Health and Wellness Center and other initiatives in the Hub. And at least in their first few years, locally owned (hopefully POC) startup businesses in UHT may need some subsidy.</p> <p>There is no provision for office businesses. They can be helpful to such a development, especially if they cater to customers (That is one of the many good points of the Hub is that it will bring in people while serving all of north/northeast). People who work in offices are much more likely to go to lunch or dinner and in other ways support the commercial entities like restaurants and retail. And of course, doctors, lawyers, accountants, insurance and real estate agents, etc bring customers to the UHT. (Manufacturing etc workers almost never patronize the stores etc nearby). There has been no AUAR done for this property before the city considers this plan. By going ahead without the AUAR, the city is proclaiming they don't give a damn how it turns out and will basically ignore it or make sure it is written to give a go-ahead. There is a need for senior housing, since many northside seniors are having affordability issues and other want to move out of huge houses. And senior housing provides safety because there are eyes on the park at all times. Since the developers, First Avenue and United and whoever are getting subsidized, some in huge ways, on this project, the people of the northside should get a share of the profits to help fund initiatives for those in need. It could pay for the increase in taxes for long time residents if their taxes go up because of this development. It could help subsidize the Hub and small businesses, and programs at the performance center for the local community. The "racist" language of the Plan, namely defining the community as excluding whites who don't live nearby but do live north, should be abolished. At the same time, I think all the language about hiring POC, especially ADOS, as much as possible, for the jobs, and using such contractors, and trying to get such as the small business owners, should be accomplished. And we hope the housing is also mixed race. That is especially good for any children. The fact it doesn't deal with birds in one of the great flyways of North America shows that there was no consideration of the environmental effects on a river corridor (I do realize that city staff made one slight reference to this). The city is establishing new height limits to use everywhere in the city except here. That again shows the city's contempt for the northside, just as the fact the city is inserting manufacturing here whereas it isn't elsewhere in the city on amenity waterfronts shows the city's contempt for the northside.</p>
250	Very Unsatisfied	<p>What Black People in North Minneapolis Want from the Upper harbor Terminal Project 1. We are Black and live in North Minneapolis, "The Northside," Minnesota's largest Black community. We are the competition to what has been going on in Minnesota for the past 20 years. We represent the economic interests of the Black American descendants of slaves, who live in North Minneapolis and inner cities in Minnesota now as well as the Black Americans pushed out by the Minneapolis policy of gentrification: "de-concentration of poverty." Police serve and protect tax payers and guard taxpayer's property. The high number of Minnesota police shootings and Covid -19 deaths mirror the Minneapolis economic operating system, and everyday risks of inner city Black residents since 2000. Minneapolis economic policy is the root cause of Black American risk of death from police shootings and the pandemic. Minneapolis Black ownership and inclusion is the remedy.</p> <p>We represent the economic interests of Blacks who were displaced, marginalized, and taken advantage of in North Minneapolis and inner cities in Minnesota from 2000 up to now. Minneapolis City Leaders wrestled control of resources intended to "remedy historical racial discrimination in housing," and systematically changing the access to resources language to "minority." The same City leaders systematically rewarded whites and Blacks involved in the takeover of discrimination remedy funds from Northside Black resident leaders with permanent city jobs and contracts to control the resources. This history is relevant because the same people, organizations systems and policy are involved now in the Northside Upper Harbor project and have been underwritten in the Minneapolis Coordinated Plan.</p> <p>The Upper Terminal Harbor Project is a major economic project in the historically Black Northside Community. We represent the economic interests of the Northside community because we are the residents of the Northside black community who actually live in the Black community. We have a solution that will work because Minneapolis Black Americans are prepared to participate. Black economic participation organized by us will solve the race debate issues Restoring hope and working with all Minnesotans to combat climate change are our priorities. We focus on renewable energy, transportation, health, and agriculture to transform the Northside into a world class destination.</p>	Very Unsatisfied	<p>What Black People in North Minneapolis Want from the Upper harbor Terminal Project 1. We are Black and live in North Minneapolis, "The Northside," Minnesota's largest Black community. We are the competition to what has been going on in Minnesota for the past 20 years. We represent the economic interests of the Black American descendants of slaves, who live in North Minneapolis and inner cities in Minnesota now as well as the Black Americans pushed out by the Minneapolis policy of gentrification: "de-concentration of poverty." Police serve and protect tax payers and guard taxpayer's property. The high number of Minnesota police shootings and Covid -19 deaths mirror the Minneapolis economic operating system, and everyday risks of inner city Black residents since 2000. Minneapolis economic policy is the root cause of Black American risk of death from police shootings and the pandemic. Minneapolis Black ownership and inclusion is the remedy.</p> <p>We represent the economic interests of Blacks who were displaced, marginalized, and taken advantage of in North Minneapolis and inner cities in Minnesota from 2000 up to now. Minneapolis City Leaders wrestled control of resources intended to "remedy historical racial discrimination in housing," and systematically changing the access to resources language to "minority." The same City leaders systematically rewarded whites and Blacks involved in the takeover of discrimination remedy funds from Northside Black resident leaders with permanent city jobs and contracts to control the resources. This history is relevant because the same people, organizations systems and policy are involved now in the Northside Upper Harbor project and have been underwritten in the Minneapolis Coordinated Plan.</p> <p>The Upper Terminal Harbor Project is a major economic project in the historically Black Northside Community. We represent the economic interests of the Northside community because we are the residents of the Northside black community who actually live in the Black community. We have a solution that will work because Minneapolis Black Americans are prepared to participate. Black economic participation organized by us will solve the race debate issues Restoring hope and working with all Minnesotans to combat climate change are our priorities. We focus on renewable energy, transportation, health, and agriculture to transform the Northside into a world class destination.</p>	Satisfied	<p>The black residents who live in the black community do not have a problem with the Park board use of land or quality of Minneapolis Parks. We do require our architects and engineers at the table.</p>	<p>What Black People in North Minneapolis Want from the Upper harbor Terminal Project 1. We are Black and live in North Minneapolis, "The Northside," Minnesota's largest Black community. We are the competition to what has been going on in Minnesota for the past 20 years. We represent the economic interests of the Black American descendants of slaves, who live in North Minneapolis and inner cities in Minnesota now as well as the Black Americans pushed out by the Minneapolis policy of gentrification: "de-concentration of poverty." Police serve and protect tax payers and guard taxpayer's property. The high number of Minnesota police shootings and Covid -19 deaths mirror the Minneapolis economic operating system, and everyday risks of inner city Black residents since 2000. Minneapolis economic policy is the root cause of Black American risk of death from police shootings and the pandemic. Minneapolis Black ownership and inclusion is the remedy.</p> <p>We represent the economic interests of Blacks who were displaced, marginalized, and taken advantage of in North Minneapolis and inner cities in Minnesota from 2000 up to now. Minneapolis City Leaders wrestled control of resources intended to "remedy historical racial discrimination in housing," and systematically changing the access to resources language to "minority." The same City leaders systematically rewarded whites and Blacks involved in the takeover of discrimination remedy funds from Northside Black resident leaders with permanent city jobs and contracts to control the resources. This history is relevant because the same people, organizations systems and policy are involved now in the Northside Upper Harbor project and have been underwritten in the Minneapolis Coordinated Plan.</p> <p>The Upper Terminal Harbor Project is a major economic project in the historically Black Northside Community. We represent the economic interests of the Northside community because we are the residents of the Northside black community who actually live in the Black community. We have a solution that will work because Minneapolis Black Americans are prepared to participate. Black economic participation organized by us will solve the race debate issues Restoring hope and working with all Minnesotans to combat climate change are our priorities. We focus on renewable energy, transportation, health, and agriculture to transform the Northside into a world class destination.</p>
		<p>We have a detailed economic plan that integrates the Northside Black community residents into the Minnesota economic marketplace ready to go now. Our Minnesota Black Business Plan helps just as many whites and other people of color. It unites urban and rural Minnesota. We formed a business Trust comprised of Community residents to implement our plan. The Upper Harbor Terminal Amphitheater does not reflect the needs, nor does it benefit the Black community residents economically, but we would support the Amphitheater, if the following conditions are met first:</p> <p>Non-negotiable 1. Funding of 12.5 million dollars to the Targeted Group Trust to build, own, operate, manage and allocate community residents ownership interests to residents in an energy and food production business center, including air and mineral rights on the riverfront.</p> <p>2. First option of the Targeted Group Trust to participate in the development of, purchase, and sale of 51% of all residential and commercial development, except for the Amphitheater, to targeted North Minneapolis residents' for private home and business ownership.</p> <p>3. First option for TGT to purchase all municipal bonds underwritten for the Upper Harbor Project.</p> <p>Robert Woods Targeted Group TrustLL c r0bertwoodsjr@gmail.com</p>		<p>We have a detailed economic plan that integrates the Northside Black community residents into the Minnesota economic marketplace ready to go now. Our Minnesota Black Business Plan helps just as many whites and other people of color. It unites urban and rural Minnesota. We formed a business Trust comprised of Community residents to implement our plan. The Upper Harbor Terminal Amphitheater does not reflect the needs, nor does it benefit the Black community residents economically, but we would support the Amphitheater, if the following conditions are met first:</p> <p>Non-negotiable 1. Funding of 12.5 million dollars to the Targeted Group Trust to build, own, operate, manage and allocate community residents ownership interests to residents in an energy and food production business center, including air and mineral rights on the riverfront.</p> <p>2. First option of the Targeted Group Trust to participate in the development of, purchase, and sale of 51% of all residential and commercial development, except for the Amphitheater, to targeted North Minneapolis residents' for private home and business ownership.</p> <p>3. First option for TGT to purchase all municipal bonds underwritten for the Upper Harbor Project.</p> <p>Robert Woods Targeted Group TrustLL c r0bertwoodsjr@gmail.com</p>			<p>We have a detailed economic plan that integrates the Northside Black community residents into the Minnesota economic marketplace ready to go now. Our Minnesota Black Business Plan helps just as many whites and other people of color. It unites urban and rural Minnesota. We formed a business Trust comprised of Community residents to implement our plan. The Upper Harbor Terminal Amphitheater does not reflect the needs, nor does it benefit the Black community residents economically, but we would support the Amphitheater, if the following conditions are met first:</p> <p>Non-negotiable 1. Funding of 12.5 million dollars to the Targeted Group Trust to build, own, operate, manage and allocate community residents ownership interests to residents in an energy and food production business center, including air and mineral rights on the riverfront.</p> <p>2. First option of the Targeted Group Trust to participate in the development of, purchase, and sale of 51% of all residential and commercial development, except for the Amphitheater, to targeted North Minneapolis residents' for private home and business ownership.</p> <p>3. First option for TGT to purchase all municipal bonds underwritten for the Upper Harbor Project.</p> <p>Robert Woods Targeted Group TrustLL c r0bertwoodsjr@gmail.com</p>
251	Very Unsatisfied	<p>I was not made aware of all the economic opportunity that should have been available to local residents, and especially to local minority business owners.</p>	Very Unsatisfied	<p>I don't understand the ramifications of the plan.</p>	Very Unsatisfied	<p>I don't understand. It's like a soap opera, in that, of you've been following all along, then you know the plot and sub plots and all the main characters and side characters...But if you just found out about the show, then you are at a total loss about what's going on.</p>	<p>I can only imagine that each neighborhood council should be given a monthly or bi-monthly summary.</p> <p>I want to be involved in the building of the UHT project. Even if it's a small part, I want to be a part of the construction.</p>

252	Very Unsatisfied	This is a once a century plan and it is being rushed thru at this juncture. Significant issues on this unique environmental resource is being bulldozed by a desire to develop and political expediency. This is rushed so politicians can have a ground breaking and recoup tax dollars. North Mpls was separate by I94 - another black community hurt (Rondo in St Paul). Access is not clear - including how community members will use this area - and how North will be abused by lack of rental affordable housing and then by the gentrification in the adjacent community! MUST create an environmental evaluation on how this will all work - event center too large - not adequate parking and not adequate planning for mass transit, there needs to be a complete transportation plan with the environmental impact RIDICULOUS to have parking structures on the river so this must be evaluated and parking structures should not block community to the river.	Very Unsatisfied	These are not specific enough to work. Must create mixed housing. Must create mixed light industry NOT on the river. Must create retail and commercial that serves North Mpls as well as whoever lives or works or plays or prays there. Event center is too large and also will not benefit the community - 10% of ticket cost should be pulled back to the North side that suffered from years of industry . Event center will cause significant noise issues for residents on both sides of the river	Very Unsatisfied	Public park too insignificant and the whole project does not respect the natural river. Pity the Park Board that has to make this work	This needs significant work - there is a lot of con artists that will take the money for administration and not succeed. Need to emphasize jobs and youth and in a serious way. Need to figure out how to assist those adjacent so they don't get run out due to gentrification.	While it is was impressive the number of community meetings held it does not reflect in the plan. MUST get environmental and transportation master plans that this current plan does not reflect. Further mix of housing (affordable is lacking). Economic evaluation that will assist jobs to existing and proposed area. Find professions who can evaluate and create a more robust, environmentally sustainable, community based, new form.s RESPECT THE RIVER - this is a once in a lifetime to get environmental quality restored to our fragile river. Limit the heights of buildings please to not create some false canyon.
253	Very Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied			
254	Very Unsatisfied	North Minneapolis will never be a destination until crime is addressed.	Very Unsatisfied	The community benefits will never be achieved. This is simply more welfare and hundreds of millions of dollars funnelled through the same poverty pimps.	Very Unsatisfied	Where is public safety addressed? Who will be responsible for providing it?		
255	Very Unsatisfied	This once in a CENTURY opportunity is being developed like any old project. There is nothing about it that celebrates the river There is no recognition of the original inhabitants ~ the Dakota. There is nothing to guarantee this will benefit the local/area neighborhoods. There is nothing to protect against displacement/gentrification. There is manufacturing ON THE RIVER after spending decades and millions getting it off! Not where needed! You should never seriously consider approving this plan any environmental review is completed! That's simply malfeasance!	Very Unsatisfied	There aren't guarantees. There is no transparency. There is no accountability. There is no enforcement plan. There is built in conflict of interest. Frankly, its a bit of a mess	Unsatisfied	Transportation is a huge issue. The only thing covered are bike/ped trails ~ which is fine for day to day... But there is no plan for events! How will people get to, into , around and out? Unknown. The Mpls transit plan doesn't know and refers back to UHT. Which is woefully deficient	Engage community & neighborhoods early and often Then ~actually listen to them. Work WITH them!	So what if you've been working at this for 20 years! THAT is no reason to pass a bad plan! Please, day no to this proposal + as written. We can We MUST do better! Thank you
256	Very Unsatisfied	While I appreciate some of the improvements in this plan, such as retaining public ownership of the land, overall I feel like the central idea of major concert venue hasn't been adequately explored and there hasn't been enough discussion of what the on-the-ground impact of this venue to people living near it or to those who'd want to use the park space while a concert was occurring.	Very Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied			Having comments in a form like this is not best outreach practices; this plan is overwhelming and the powerpoint has so much text it's difficult to follow. I would like to see more community engagement using plain language and meeting the people where they're at before this plan is voted on; I'd also like the environmental review to be completed before the vote.
257		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					
258								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.
259								What level of LEED certification are you pursuing for this project? What alternative sources of energy (solar, wind, water) will be used to power the area?