

1. Is the draft plan document as a whole understandable?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		93.6%	102
No		6.4%	7
	Other (please specify)		11
answered question			109
skipped question			5

2. In general, do you support what is written in the plan?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		94.3%	100
No		5.7%	6
	Other (please specify)		11
answered question			106
skipped question			8

3. Do you believe the goals and strategies in the plan support the mission statement of the MPRB? MPRB Mission The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board shall permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve, and enhance its natural resources, parkland, and recreational opportunities for current and future generations. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board exists to provide places and recreation opportunities for all people to gather, celebrate, contemplate, and engage in activities that promote health, well being, community, and the environment.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		94.4%	102
No		5.6%	6
answered question			108
skipped question			6

4. Do you support the three goals of the draft plan?

	Yes	No	Rating Count
Goal 1: Park programs and services provide public education, access to healthy foods, and economic support for the local food system.	97.2% (105)	2.8% (3)	108
Goal 2: Park facility renewal and development fosters urban agriculture activities.	94.4% (102)	5.6% (6)	108
Goal 3: Food available on parkland benefits residents, park visitors and the environment.	95.4% (103)	4.6% (5)	108
answered question			108
skipped question			6

5. Please rank the draft plan goals based on their importance to your community (1=most important).

	1	2	3	Rating Average	Rating Count
Goal 1: Park programs and services provide public education, access to healthy foods, and economic support for the local food system.	45.4% (49)	34.3% (37)	20.4% (22)	1.75	108
Goal 2: Park facility renewal and development fosters urban agriculture activities.	16.5% (18)	52.3% (57)	31.2% (34)	2.15	109
Goal 3: Food available on parkland benefits residents, park visitors and the environment.	38.5% (42)	13.8% (15)	47.7% (52)	2.09	109
answered question					109
skipped question					5

6. Please rank the benefits of urban agriculture in order of how well they are supported by the goals and strategies of the draft plan.

	1	2	3	4	Rating Average	Rating Count
Health	50.0% (52)	28.8% (30)	20.2% (21)	1.0% (1)	1.72	104
Environment	21.2% (22)	31.7% (33)	29.8% (31)	17.3% (18)	2.43	104
Social	26.9% (28)	27.9% (29)	30.8% (32)	14.4% (15)	2.33	104
Economic	1.9% (2)	11.5% (12)	19.2% (20)	67.3% (70)	3.52	104
answered question					104	
skipped question					10	

7. Are the appendices informative?

	Yes	No	Rating Count
Community Engagement Summary	89.5% (85)	10.5% (10)	95
Related Policy Documents	89.4% (84)	10.6% (10)	94
answered question			95
skipped question			19

8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

	Response Count
	58
answered question	58
skipped question	56

9. ZIP code (5 digits)

	Response Percent	Response Count
	100.0%	99
answered question		99
skipped question		15

10. Age Range:

		Response Percent	Response Count
under 18		0.0%	0
18-34		35.9%	37
35-55		43.7%	45
56+		20.4%	21
answered question			103
skipped question			11

11. Highest Level of Education Attained:

		Response Percent	Response Count
Less than High School		0.0%	0
High School Degree or GED		2.0%	2
Some college, but no degree		9.8%	10
Bachelor's Degree		50.0%	51
Master's Degree		33.3%	34
Doctoral Degree		4.9%	5
Other (please specify)			5
answered question			102
skipped question			12

Page 2, Q1. Is the draft plan document as a whole understandable?

1	I already answered the survey but wanted to add additional comments and your web link is telling me the comment period is over, so I will add comments here that I didn't get opportunity to add to the very bland survey. 1. Don't impinge on existing farmers markets by adding new ones to compete with existing programs. 2. Draft is vague on animal agriculture -- you need to address this -- that is, nip it in the bud and cease expansion of animal food production in parks and throughout Minneapolis. Animals viewed as edible are morally and ethically offensive to many in Minneapolis. In addition, it is a non-environmentally friendly way to get "food" -- wastes water, bad air quality, waste is unsanitary, meat eating perpetuates global warming, etc. 4. Compost -- what neighborhood gets stuck with this????? It stinks. 5. No sales at parks. 6. Kitchen space at park buildings are too often filthy and have kids unsupervised in and out of these areas. Nice idea, but how will this draft plan address that, since it appears to seek expansion of kitchen space? Also, will these kitchens merely be used as someone's for-profit use? 7. Stop using pesticides/insecticides and the like on ALL park property. 8. Only merit I see so far in this plan is educating people via classes, etc. on best practices in their own yards -- such as how to grow fruit trees in this inhospitable climate, "vegetable gardening for dummies," etc. 9. Don't take away the little passive greenspace left (outside of the Chain of Lakes or downtown) for further use like community gardening, parking lots for markets, sales, etc. Leave some nature!!!! 10. Demographics of who responded in the draft are not the target demographic. Seems like it's upper income white homeowners with college degrees (your data) who just want more community gardening space for free -- and they admit they are already doing this anyway, without intervention from MPRB. This indicates this should not be a priority for MPRB. Spend your (our) public resources on other priorities -- like maintaining the existing infrastructure and programs you already have! From looking at most, it appears shabby -- at least on the Eastside.	Dec 28, 2013 12:54 PM
2	can't find it	Dec 26, 2013 7:20 AM
3	It uses very technical language, often not understood by mainstream community members. Additionally, it is English only, which excludes many community members from accessing this plan and offering thoughtful feedback. Translations are absolutely necessary for any kind of public plan.	Dec 18, 2013 8:57 PM
4	I understood it; however, I'm familiar with the planning process and planning language. I'm concerned that people who are new to English or to planning might find it difficult to understand.	Dec 18, 2013 12:52 PM
5	Pretty complicated as a policy like this must be, but not an easy one to communicate to public.	Dec 16, 2013 5:55 PM
6	Nice format. Fairly long to read but thorough.	Dec 9, 2013 9:13 PM
7	Draft plan document is understandable, but very wordy in portions. Bullet points highlighting specific activities, goals, and resources would be appreciated.	Dec 9, 2013 5:03 PM
8	No esta en diferentes lenguajes	Dec 6, 2013 4:07 PM
9	It's very hard to find it and what I did find lacked any concrete information	Dec 1, 2013 7:28 PM
10	Organics is used as a blanket term for what? Organic is a type of food, soil,	Nov 24, 2013 10:07 AM

Page 2, Q1. Is the draft plan document as a whole understandable?

chemical, mineral.

11 A little long

Nov 14, 2013 10:38 AM

Page 2, Q2. In general, do you support what is written in the plan?

1	This is important work and the MPRB is in sync with national trends supporting food production in urban areas. Thank you for drafting this plan.	Dec 31, 2013 8:48 AM
2	MPRB needs to focus on existing infrastructure and existing plans/projects before wandering off to another one, like urban agriculture. MPRB's priorities seem to be all over the map -- no focus, no attention to detail. Like someone with ADHD.	Dec 28, 2013 12:35 PM
3	I support the opportunities that would be created for community organizations to partner with the Parks to help bring some of these gardens and programs to fruition. I also support access to local foods, especially if it's being served to youth during programming, it seems like a GREAT opportunity to improve our eating habits.	Dec 18, 2013 8:57 PM
4	I feel that if there is not land available for individual use that it will be hard to motivate people to use community garden spaces when anyone could come to harvest and benefit from the hard work put into the garden.	Dec 16, 2013 10:19 PM
5	I do believe that the concerns for pollinator insects and healthful groundwater should override the interests of turf uses at golf courses and parks.	Dec 16, 2013 1:32 PM
6	I'm not sure that I've made up my mind, yet.	Dec 14, 2013 11:45 PM
7	This proposal sounds like an Urban Farmer's dream!	Dec 9, 2013 9:13 PM
8	NO entiendo que dice!!!!	Dec 6, 2013 4:07 PM
9	I support urban agriculture, not sure how the park board plans to do it...	Dec 1, 2013 7:28 PM
10	The park land should be made available for community gardens and community orchards managed by or licensed to responsible groups that will maintain the spaces and benefit the community. Remove the maintenance expense and model after the Joliet, Mi fruit tree program.	Nov 24, 2013 10:07 AM
11	I would like to see every park incorporate a community garden on the land. I am tired of seeing the acres or grass being maintained by mowing, watering, and yet almost never used. There is so much more the land can do for the community than just look "pretty".	Nov 10, 2013 8:58 PM

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| 1 | It would be great to have some of the more interesting specific ideas from community members and local institutions/partners listed or highlighted in the appendices or the plan itself – or for those ideas to be available somewhere else. | Dec 31, 2013 5:18 PM |
| 2 | In general, I find the reference of using tax-forfeited properties for new community gardens to be completely appropriate, particularly when vacant lots no longer meet current zoning minimums for single-family or multi-family new homes. I also agree that such use should be under the supervision and intermediate control of the various neighborhood councils where possible. Two suggestions for more detail: One, it would be a tremendous boon for the Minneapolis Parks system to carry the liability insurance for all such properties, whether "pocket park" public orchards or edible landscapes, regional parks or neighborhood parks for partly edible purposes, or for community gardens developed on tax-forfeited properties. The burden of liability insurance has been a huge stumbling block for these purposes and the Parks Department could go a long way in encouraging hyper-local food by assuming this coverage. Second, there needs to be a great deal more work done in how to handle edible landscaping, its maintenance and harvest. One suggestion: a template for coordination between Parks Department employees, Public Works employees, and community organizations and their volunteers (like Fruits of the City, Gardening Matters and the like). Granted, this was a draft document. The next version, however, could begin to explore how it would all work out. | Dec 31, 2013 4:49 PM |
| 3 | There is no arguing with the goals put forth in the proposed Urban Agriculture Policy, but the strategies to reach the goals are often vague and it is questionable how they will be implemented. For example in Goal 1 the strategy to * seek opportunities to increase amount of local food served within park food environments--who is going to be held to this standard? the parks I work with hold very few of their own events where they purchase or contract for food, and instead the neighborhood or sports groups associated with the park are the ones applying for softly food per mists to serve food. Will this policy result in just another layer of bureaucracy and scrutiny, and cost for community-led events on park land? Also, another strategy under this goal states to *Award contracts to food vendors that procure from local food sources and adopt an organization standard for these requirements. Again this seems only applicable to large events or long term contracts that the park board holds, unless the requirement is going to simply be passed down as a requirement to community groups. Goal 2 speaks to a strategy to * Add flexible outdoor spaces within park master plans for promotion, sale and distribution of local food which is to be met by creating outdoor spaces where community members engage in growing their own food, buying food or products at farmers markets. Yet other policies of the park board clearly work against these strategies being implemented. For example in goal 3 it clearly states that "privatizing" community gardens will be against the policy meaning people will not be able to grow their own food and expect it will remain their for them to harvest. Additionally although buying food on park that was gown elsewhere may be allowed, the fees generally charged by the park board to run an event such as a farmers market and sell anything would most likely prove prohibitive to a local farmer, since the park boar charges for all of these actions as income generating activities on their land. Goal 3 is the one many residents care about, including the establishment of community gardens on park land. As mentioned above, however, since a single person cannot be guaranteed to reap the benefits of what you sow, I doubt many residents would | Dec 31, 2013 3:32 PM |

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

invest the time and money in growing food on park land. That means community gardens must be operated by an outside organization with significant means, enough to build the site, monitor the site, provide insurance for volunteers, and assume responsibility for the garden with no possibility of recouping any of those costs. Additionally the plan of the park board holding tax-forfeited land elsewhere for community gardens may be possible in some parts of the city, but is not a reality in southwest Minneapolis where many people also do not have access to community garden space since there is so little open land. Essentially, I feel like the policy attempts to position the park board in a place where they can claim they support urban agriculture, but many of the implementation steps are either simply investigatory or out of control of the park board and will instead be passed onto community groups as an additional burden. The simplest step to supporting urban agriculture (allowing citizens to grow food for individual consumption or sale on park land) is clearly denied as an option in this policy. This strategy could be easily met by allowing nonprofits to manage community garden space on an annual basis on park land as they do at countless other properties across the twin cities.

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| 4 | Could it be more specific as to plantings ? Where and what trees and shrubs (food producing) would start to be included in the parks long term planting vision ? | Dec 31, 2013 1:11 PM |
| 5 | Urban agriculture is experiencing a new renewal across the country. Because of this recent emergence, I would encourage the MPRB to write some flexibility into the plan to allow responsiveness to new models and trends as they are developing now in real time. Part of what makes urban agriculture so powerful is its ability to convene community stakeholders and start big picture conversations about what kind of food environment, parks, city and world we want to create together. I would encourage the MRPB to use strong language in the plan regarding community engagement, and to prioritize this in implementation. | Dec 31, 2013 8:53 AM |
| 6 | I think we should not use any pesticides or herbicides in the parks. Incorporating goats into the plan would save on mowing costs see Seattle's example it can be done. The more of a fruit and nut food forest we can build in our wonderful city the better. Bring in permaculture in a big way from the trees down to the herbaceous shrubs and plants. Thanks for working on this project. | Dec 30, 2013 9:12 PM |
| 7 | I think more emphasis needs to be placed on utilizing park land and related resources as demonstration and education areas, vs actually providing space for community gardens. | Dec 30, 2013 2:51 PM |
| 8 | 1. Document is too technical for the general public to understand. It needs a summary or an accessible, streamlined version or something. 2. Document makes no mention of equity anywhere in the plan. How will this be implemented to ensure that historically underserved communities have access to this? Just implementing it at the same level across the system will not accomplish this - there needs to be specific attention to equitable (not equal) implementation across the board. | Dec 30, 2013 1:50 PM |
| 9 | The golf course pest management, and, in general, the use of chemicals in our parks, is unclear---seems wordy while leaving use of all applications up to whomever is in charge. The real effect would depend on judgment so there is no clear picture of exactly what will be used in what quantity. | Dec 28, 2013 7:33 PM |

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

10	I think it's still a little heavy on the jargon; e.g. "local organics". Why not just call it composting? Or perhaps have an expanded glossary in the appendix which explains many of the terms used: green roofs, CSA, etc. Perhaps use a copy editor who it not familiar with food and ag policy.	Dec 28, 2013 6:55 PM
11	See comments in Question 1 space.	Dec 28, 2013 12:54 PM
12	More specifics on budgeting/funding of this idea. How is this going to be paid for? Can MPRB really afford it (better yet, can taxpayers really afford it?)?	Dec 28, 2013 12:39 PM
13	Stress that it is the responsibility of the City of Minneapolis, as a major public land owner, to acknowledge and demonstrate the importance of food production and the fundamental relationship between human beings and arable land. To ignore this relationship is to perpetuate the illusion that people are somehow above and separate from the natural world. We use park resources to teach children to do sports and pursue physical fitness. It is just as important to teach them where food comes from, and how healthy soil is connected to their own health and survival.	Dec 18, 2013 10:46 PM
14	The term equitable distribution was used a few times throughout the plan. Please define this term and offer strategies to measure your commitment to equity. The term "access" to local foods was used, please consider encapsulating both an economical and geographical lens in defining access. People can be across the street from a park, but if their economic situation keeps them from being able to afford a \$15 fee for a cooking class, that is not true access and we are not meeting the needs of the community. Additionally, there is no mention of racial equity in the plan. This needs to be included! This is a public entity, committed to ALL members of the community and should make a commitment to ending systems of oppression and isolationism. The first opportunity is to make this plan accessible to all cultures and languages and keep in mind the barriers that are still created when a plan is only in English. There is no mention of the number of jobs this plan might produce. Are there jobs in this plan? Or does the park board plan to rely solely on community organizations to fill those needs? Will there be financial support to these community organizations who take on the maintenance of gardens? The short 6 week period of public comment is inconveniently lined up with two holidays and a time at which people's energy and focus is not on civic engagement. A suggestion is to expand the public period time and set it up during a time when people will have more time to pay attention to it. You will get more feedback this way AND you will engage more people in the process. A win win. Overall, constructive feedback aside, I think this plan has great potential to change our local food system, to improve our environment, decrease our dependence on fossil fuels and to build community around food and public green spaces. I want this plan to move forward and am excited for this to be passed. I just want to ensure that the process and the implementation uses a clear frame of equity and considers the long-term sustainability of these projects. I also would like to stay connected to the process and next steps. Alisa Hoven, alisa.hoven@gmail.com, 763-218-3241	Dec 18, 2013 9:13 PM
15	A. Improving how the plan is presented: a) More "laypeople" language b) Available in non-English format c) Larger print B. More clarification and detail on important concepts/terms - I'd like to see the plan include more details on how some of the core principles will be implemented and evaluated. Specifically: ?	Dec 18, 2013 1:39 PM

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

How does the MPRB define "equity" ? How does the MPRB measure "equitable distribution" ? page 9 refers to a "risk factor" related to "slow rate of return for capital investment" - how is that measured? are social benefits included in this cost analysis? ? How does the MPRB define "accessible" (as in "publicly accessible" or "accessible to all") - there are many aspects of accessibility including: * geography (for example, on page 4 reference to "opportunities available in all geographic sectors of the city, and are accessible to the high percentage of the city's population living within walking distance of a regional or neighborhood park" - define "walking distance"?) * language (programming and information available in multiple languages, not just English) * physical abilities, ADA requirements * economics (for example, on page 7 the plan refers to "increased fee-based program registration" - this could make programs inaccessible to some) * what constitutes a welcoming environment for people of different ages, races, cultures, abilities? C. What's missing: a) The city is not uniform - environmental conditions, demographics, race, class, age, culture... how will the MPRB develop urban agriculture activities/infrastructure that responds to these different conditions in a circumstance-specific yet equitable way? For example: some areas of the city have a long history of environmental "dumping" and currently experience a high concentration of traffic and related congestion/air pollution. Not coincidentally, these same areas tend to be where you would find lower income residents, more people of color, more people who have experienced historical or current trauma, older infrastructure, fewer resources, higher rates of crime, etc. The "rate of return" on investments and activities in these areas should be measured and perhaps prioritized differently than investments and activities in more affluent, less dense, less "stressed" areas of the city. b) There are currently huge disparities between parks in terms of number of activities and conditions of park facilities - implementing this plan can be a strategy for addressing some of those disparities; I hope the MPRB can embrace that opportunity.

- | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|
| 16 | I would like to see a stronger commitment to reducing petroleum based fuels, fertilizers, and pesticides used in maintenance and upkeep of all Minneapolis parks including golf courses. Some possible strategies are increased native wild spaces, use of goats for mowing and manure production, bio-fuel conversion for park vehicles, and use of organic growing standards. All in all though this draft plan is a huge step forward for the city in sustainability. | Dec 17, 2013 2:51 PM |
| 17 | I would say that the MPRB worries a bit too much about maintenance of ALL landscapes to the detriment of allowing certain things to be. For instance, there are plenty of edible plantings that the MPRB could allow to develop and thrive that the Board does not need to be overly concerned with their "respectability". Species that are tough and will provide lots of collecting are Serviceberry (I have had lots of luck with the species Amelanchier arborea in the city, whereas the cultivars have been more of a struggle. Red and Black Currant and gooseberry can and do thrive here. These species are not in our regular fruit repertoire here in the cities, but they could form the basis for your/our plantings and with time and education, become a regular part of the regional diet. Seems the MPRB also has a difficult time with "weeds" so it has a policy of mowing everything always so that nothing but turf is the norm. The MPRB should train or hire staff that is committed to landscapes that actually heal soil and protect water resources. The color green does not in and of itself mean sustainable. Planting deep rooted native perennials may present a challenge, especially if anything other than a tall tree, or mowed grass is considered a "weed" by your staff. True | Dec 17, 2013 1:27 PM |

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

nasty weeds will be a component of restored prairie and forest, but that should not stop the Park Board or the city from trying to really do the right thing by embracing, encouraging, restoring and installing deep rooted native plantings.

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------|
| 18 | I don't believe that the majority of the community actually does want to grow their own food. However, they would like to see someone they know on a personal basis grow their food for them. That's why I think we should allow the park land to be used by urban farmers to grow for their community through the sale of CSA shares. I feel there needs to be jobs created to design, maintain, and harvest the gardens if they are not going to be available to the community for personal use. Why would someone invest so much time into growing and maintaining a garden if anyone could come and reap the benefits? By allowing the land to be used for individual use or by urban farmers in the parks the community would feel more invested and therefore will care for the space as if it was their own. | Dec 16, 2013 10:35 PM |
| 19 | Content is good and your presentation is good. There should be some way to boil it down so that a person can get a better overview and then get into the details. | Dec 16, 2013 5:57 PM |
| 20 | In addition to improvements for future programming, I believe the park board should align local and healthy food policies for Como Park Zoo, Como Park Aquatic Center, Highland Park Aquatic Center, and other larger public facilities. The refuse and general non-engagement of environmental issues at these places is behind the times. Another improvement that could be developed for dog parks would be composting containers for dog mess - Cedar Falls, Iowa has an excellent tank system installed underground to capture this waste. Improved community sharing for food stuffs would also be great - if, for instance, the city web site would allow people to list a surplus of apples, produce, eggs, etc., for sale or giving? This would be a great way to foster community. Others could access this if they need food. A program that worked like Sisters Camelot at park programs would be excellent. Also, I don't think yard waste from the parks should be sent to incineration, but should, instead, be composted. | Dec 16, 2013 1:37 PM |
| 21 | I would like to see more mention of cross-departmental partnerships and public-private sector partnerships when it comes to the public education and access to healthy, local food components of Goal One. So much education takes place at parks that's administered by outside organizations, like Minneapolis Kids. There needs to be more training and resources available to folks, or partnerships with educational providers who know how to teach lessons about food, nutrition and agriculture, so that they can actually make the shift described on Page 7. Additionally, so many outside vendors are involved with providing food at parks (particularly in the summer when food is in season). I would also mention the increase of year-round growing opportunities, since so much of the year is too cold for growing outdoors in the ground without hoop houses or greenhouses. Additionally, the Healthy Foods Policy really doesn't have any enforcement mechanisms, nor does it really go all that far in getting healthier foods in the parks system. The ideas about adding contract language or preference in awarding bids to vendors who serve healthy, local food is a good idea. I don't think you should measure an increase in the number of vendors offering local food options, but rather the AMOUNT of local food actually served. If you require all vendors to REPORT which quantities of local foods they're serving, you could have that information and can look at % change over time. Food safety will also be a concern, if you aim to serve park-grown food to the public | Dec 16, 2013 1:30 PM |

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

but you don't have any cold storage or washing facilities at each site.

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------|
| 22 | "Lack of resident time to participate or awareness of programs offered" is a concern and also transportation to facilities (i.e. the newly renovated picnic pavilion kitchen in Wirth Park is in Golden Valley and is difficult to get to). The awareness of facilities and programming is a big barrier to get residents involved and active! Goal #3 is a great idea, but in practice there are legitimate concerns for those foraging or attempting to eat from park board land because of the common practice of using synthetic and toxic chemicals on park property. Not only because the staff are used to and trained in using chemicals in certain areas, but also the drift effect of those sprays wafting from landscaping to edibles nearby. | Dec 16, 2013 9:17 AM |
| 23 | Is there a way to include/emphasize accesses for home gardeners to many of the facilities and programs offered at the park. There are numerous studies that have shown how residential private gardening is often three times that of community gardening in urban spaces. Home gardeners would appreciate access to classes, shared tools/resources and use of park facilities even if they were not participating in community garden plots. Obviously the park is open to all residents but it might helpful to state that urban agriculture is not just community gardens. Additionally, in regards to resource sharing it may be beneficial to use parks as potential shared tool sites where members of the community could borrow tillers, rakes, hoses etc..and then also have community forums to exchange knowledge amongst gardeners not necessarily participating in communal plots. Finally, the park board may want to work closely with each district council in addressing the use of vacant lots. If access to land is an issue for many people, converting vacant lots into food producing spaces could be a way to address this problem. Perhaps the city could buy the lots and convert them into parks specifically for food production. Or maybe the parks department can facilitate an easy way for residents to lease/buy vacant lots in order to have access to land to grow food. This may require changes to zoning. Working with district councils and the city can help residents take ownership of their neighborhoods and of their access to food. Giving residents the chance to define their own specific needs in regards to access to healthy food and the use of space near their homes will procure more successfully cultivated and cared for food production. | Dec 16, 2013 8:40 AM |
| 24 | I'm not quite certain if we're talking converting some existing park land into gardens or just the tax-forfeited land, so that could be better explained. I think that requiring park vendors to use local food sources is a great idea, as long as that doesn't eliminate someone like Sea Salt (is sourcing your food from Coastal Seafoods considered local? I hope so). I think fruit trees would be great, as long as there is some education or signage so that people know what the fruit is, how it might be used, whether they can pick it. I do wonder whether some people might take advantage and come out and harvest all the fruit, perhaps at night (although someone taking advantage is a risk of any endeavor). | Dec 14, 2013 11:52 PM |
| 25 | Thank u for compost opportunities. I refuse to drive to Brooklyn Park to drop off my compost. | Dec 14, 2013 7:01 PM |
| 26 | More focus on community driven urban ag. initiatives, let the people direct the programming and outcomes through their shared knowledge. The community engagement seems to need more work in general, perhaps visiting more | Dec 13, 2013 2:57 PM |

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

organizations and/or tabling at the parks themselves for feedback.

27	I would add that city park operations should support the goals of this plan so for instance chipped wood is used in gardens rather than burned and no toxic pesticides are used in the parks.	Dec 13, 2013 10:53 AM
28	I love this! Adding goats to the plan to deal with buckthorn and possibly establish a program for residents to be able to "rent" goats to help with their problem invasives (that goats like) could be a good way to reduce chemical use. The Parks should lead the way on getting all chemicals out of plant care as a model for all Minneapolis residents and beyond. The draft plan is a good start. I'd like to see stronger funding for this draft plan over time - especially for greenhouses. Having a local space for winter warmth and greenness would be awesome as well as the food potentials of greenhouses. The Parks could learn about Precision Greenhouses that are being developed by Clarence Bischoff which will be super energy efficient with solar LEDs and vertical growing. I'd love to see much of the food sold at the Parks grown in the Parks in the future.	Dec 13, 2013 10:24 AM
29	Clarification that adding urban ag does not compete with recreational opportunities. (No playing fields will be turned into gardens, etc.) Clarification about on site composting - will compost and/or mulch also be made available to residents to take off-site? My understanding is that wood chips, previously distributed to the public are now going to the garbage burner? Clarification about pest control and gardening. It would be conterproductive to try to attract and maintain bees while spraying bee-killing pesticides. Likewise, spraying would have negative impact on edibles.	Dec 13, 2013 9:55 AM
30	Develop an executive summary for those looking for brief overview. Expand the connections between park goals and gardening benefits more explicitly for readers who are unfamiliar or unsupportive.	Dec 12, 2013 4:17 PM
31	I love the inclusion of the glossary in the plan. I think including a projected timeline would be helpful. I think the plan does a great job defining and emphasizing local food, but I think the emphasis (or not) on organic could be clearer. If and how will food be grown organically? Will that change MPRB existing policies? (I'm not sure if MPRB uses organic practices for current landscape maintenance).	Dec 11, 2013 6:12 PM
32	Ban pesticide use on all park property. Implement strict adherence to organic growing methods for all produce plants and food forests.	Dec 11, 2013 3:00 PM
33	Clearly state what the goals are; this appeared to be missing in the plan as I viewed it (see the strategies but what the goal is, is not stated). Generate a 1-2 page Executive Summary listing purpose, goals & targets - more people are likely to read this than the whole plan.	Dec 11, 2013 8:16 AM
34	I would like to see foraging expanded beyond the "edible" landscapes to be included in the integrated pest management plan. Mulberries make great pies, and bees love canada thistle. Allowing foraging of perfectly edible but less desirable plants such as these would potentially lessen the use of pesticides that pollute our parks.	Dec 10, 2013 11:05 PM
35	The pest management sections are verbose and could be much clearer. Not	Dec 10, 2013 9:02 PM

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

sure if golf courses need to be discussed, since those kind of areas likely wont be farmed. The chemicals used to grow plants and kill "pests" and prevent livestock diseases are my only gripe with urban agriculture - I wouldnt want the vacant lot on my block to be wafting chemicals into my yard - the park across the street uses enough chemicals on the lawns and sports fields. But I would still enjoy seeing people farm that vacant lot, as long as it is done in a healthy way for people, insects, pets, birds, etc

36	<p>• Who will prune and maintain fruit trees in public parks? Will MPRB Forestry staff be trained to prune fruit trees? Pruning fruit trees for fruit production is far different from pruning landscape/street trees. • Will pesticides be used (organic or not)? Fruit that looks edible will require some type of a strategically timed pest management method. I have read the sections about IPM in the policy. It is very general. How will MPRB staff address apple maggot, plum curculio, apple rust, plum pocket, black knot, and the MANY other diseases and pests for fruit trees? Will the MPRB train IPM staff? Vigilant monitoring is required for a proper IPM program. Will the MPRB hire staff to do this? Their horticulture and forestry staff are already at peak work load. • Are Ginkgo tree fruits considered fruit? In some Asian cultures, they are sought after. • What about watering? Will the fruit trees be watered more so than street trees? • How will the “public harvest” be managed? How will the MPRB be able to verify “equitable distribution” [an Evaluation Measure] of landscape foods among members of the public? • I read the section on the two specialty gardens (pages 16-17), including the Rose Garden. Japanese Beetle is not only a rose pest. It feeds on 300 varieties of plants, including fruit trees (apple, crabapple, plum, cherry), vegetables, trees, shrubs, perennials, and annuals. The JB grubs feed on turf. According to a U of MN JB Management Publication, one method to control JB grubs is Imidicloprid (a neonic) in the soil. The pesticides labeled to manage adult JB are toxic to bees, fish, birds, There is no silver bullet for JB management. Pheromone traps attract more beetles to an area than are trapped. Milky spore (an organic grub control method) has not proven effective. The policy says that if Japanese Beetle and Rose Midge are not controlled, “the insects will effectively destroy the rose blooms.” As for Black Spot on roses, will the MPRB use Copper Sulfate (a Bordeaux mixture) as an organic control method? Copper Sulfate is very toxic to fish and somewhat to birds and other mammals. Why the double standard between “special” ornamentals (roses) and food-bearing plants? • In the draft policy, I do not see any cost estimates for additional staff and/or training to manage IPM, tree maintenance, and other program costs.</p>	Dec 10, 2013 1:57 PM
37	Action plan for getting people involved	Dec 10, 2013 12:24 PM
38	<p>Please avoid Neonicotinoid pesticide-treated plants and seeds. The damage caused by these is horrific. More evidence to support not only poisoning and death of bees, there is growing evidence that such chemicals change the genetic material of the insect. This is causing any surviving bees to be more susceptible to death by other stressors. please stop burning woodchips at the incinerators. Please make them available to us in the community at numerous drop-off and pick-up sites. organic fertilizers please. i love my parks. thank you.</p>	Dec 10, 2013 12:23 PM
39	<p>I felt that the Community Engagement Summary represented a very limited population and did not include much feedback from ethnically, racially and economically diverse backgrounds.</p>	Dec 9, 2013 9:21 PM

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

40	More specifics on what park areas could be used as edible landscapes and how foraging would be or would not be regulated. How the MPRB would offer alternatives if athletic fields were off-limits during a time of soil management and recuperation. How this plan could make everyone happy, including those that want to use the parks for athletic purposes - meaning, they need access to large areas of open land. Specifics on how this plan raise the needed funds to run the urban ag. programs and create steady income for the city. Draft a section concerning how the educational programs for youth and youth involvement not only would promote healthy diets, but offer an alternative to the usually unhealthy Mpls public school lunches or after school snacks.	Dec 9, 2013 5:25 PM
41	Given the amount of land owned and managed by the park board, it is extremely important that the needs of pollinators be front and center in any pest management plan. I would like to see more emphasis on community kitchens. Park buildings are a good place for cooking and food prep classes but often have only a typical sized range with 4 burners, not enough for groups to cook together. I believe cooking together presents an amazing opportunity for neighbors to get to know one another and for people to cross cultural boundaries, too. The Park Board could provide a tremendous service to the community by specifically creating such opportunities.	Dec 9, 2013 9:17 AM
42	I strongly support that part of goal two to support farmers markets within parks and on park board property. The plan is vague though in regards to percentage of sales and how it would affect farmers markets. If the sales % (essentially a park board sales tax) was applied to farmers market vendors, it would negative impact local farmers. This plan should support farmers, not take money directly away from their sales. The plan should include an elimination of the percentage of sales for farmers market vendors. It is encouraging to see composting as a part of the plan. Public education is important and I would like to see the addition of staff education (all staff) as well. Hopefully, MPRB can work with Hennepin County Env. Services to utilize their knowledge and standardized signage/containers when installing these systems.	Dec 7, 2013 8:16 PM
43	This is exciting! Thanks to all commissioners, advisory committee members and other staff and volunteers and visionaries who are making this happen. I am glad to see, for example, the emphasis on keeping organics (p. 8) here in mpls. To build up the soil rather than selling them (wood chips, for example) to outside companies. Remember the importance of pollinators/beneficial insects and try to further limit herbicide and pesticide use. The public would benefit from a longer comment period. Foraging and gleaning, yes! Fruit trees, yes! Partnerships with the city, with U of MN, Somali women's groups, Nepali and Karen communities as well as Latino, Native and African American communities. Have those who have experienced homelessness involved as well (ask Volunteers of America or Trinity on Lake or Lang Nelson or outgoing city council members or branch librarians for ideas). Thank you again for your good work.	Dec 7, 2013 2:53 PM
44	THis needs to be in different languages. Who was involved in this? Not recent immigrant I'm sure who could benefit from this.	Dec 6, 2013 4:08 PM
45	Specify which neighborhoods will be part of the implementation. I would like to see poorer neighborhoods given a higher priority.	Dec 5, 2013 9:24 AM
46	Incorporate the sustainable actions of permaculture and nutrient cycling back to	Nov 24, 2013 10:27 AM

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

the soil. Use the talents and tools of existing organizations, volunteers, ecological and permaculture designers. Speak in common terms. Reduce confusing and misused words like "organics". Add a calendar of seasonal use and activities that shows a parks year of use benefits and return.

47 Creating edible landscapes in Minneapolis is a wonderful idea from a food justice standpoint. But let's also keep in mind the importance of wildflowers and native plants to supporting honey bees, which we need to pollinate our food supply locally and regionally. It would be great to see more of both types of edible landscapes (for humans and for bees) in Minneapolis parks. Nov 22, 2013 3:24 PM

48 none, it is clear and concise to me Nov 20, 2013 12:06 PM

49 The reasoning behind the plan needs to be much more specific. While I completely support this plan and am incredibly impressed by the city's commitment to taking an active role to increase urban agriculture activities, the justification for the plan stinks of paternalism. While yes, obesity rates are at an all time high, providing better access to what you consider healthy foods in low income areas should not be one of the primary reasons cited for creating this plan. A meta-analysis of food desert studies shows that, as many things in life, how we understand "limited access to 'healthy' foods" entirely depends on what questions we do (or don't) ask--geographic distribution may not be as much of a barrier to eating better as having time to cook at home, for example. But attempting to ensure the creation of an aesthetically pleasing populace does not ensure a truly healthy city, in the most holistic sense of the word. Don't let the implicit, unspoken values of the privileged class that had the most impact on this document (and was given the most voice in shaping it) speak for everyone. Buying into the anti-obesity rampage that is quite fashionable these days is very tempting but it isn't going to create a long-term solution for the health and happiness of Minneapolis. So--please be more intentional about explaining exactly WHY this plan matters: for me and for other people passionate about urban ag, but especially for the dignified people for whom this plan could potentially have the most impact. Nov 19, 2013 9:30 PM

50 For goal 2, also consider: Finding spaces for an indoor farmers market. Planning, in the long term, to create a community "root cellar" or freezer storage. Both would save energy as a whole by pooling resources as well as provide better access to food year round via large quantity food preservation. Nov 18, 2013 2:31 PM

51 Question this: "Priority for capital improvement funding to replace aging park infrastructure" Would urban ag greenhouses and such be part of replacing aging park infrastructure? Indoor growing year-round should also be explored as a great place for people in the long, cold months, additional source of local food, and providing for additional local resiliency. New technologies are becoming available that would be great to have demonstration projects in at least some of the parks which could increase both local visitors and tourism. Main problem with the overall plan is I don't see enough money here to really do this well across all Minneapolis parks. Perhaps there is also some way to get community involvement in funding and building the projects to stretch whatever dollars can be freed up. Community "park-raising" days (like barn-raising) maybe?? Nov 16, 2013 2:45 PM

52 The proposal should contain explicit language allowing and funding community ovens as part of the urban agriculture policy. Nov 16, 2013 12:41 PM

Page 5, Q8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the content of the draft plan?

53	The report's contents are fine, but as a whole it's a bit wordy and redundant. A good copy editor needs to take a thoughtful but aggressive run at shortening the text. My cursory read is at least 1 page of the 18 could be eliminated. If it's important to have the document be as long as it is, then a larger font could be used to improve readability. The related policy documents could be handled in a hyperlink to further reduce the document's size, so that once printed fewer trees and eyes will suffer.	Nov 15, 2013 2:15 PM
54	My only concern is that Soo Line community garden members weren't invited to be stakeholders in this process. We are completely supportive of urban agriculture efforts and would like to have been included!	Nov 14, 2013 11:22 AM
55	The rankings in this survey do not work, the rankings always reset back to their numerical order.	Nov 14, 2013 10:40 AM
56	The overall context of competing uses and benefits needs to be more systematic.	Nov 14, 2013 9:36 AM
57	Please continue to pursue opportunities to support the expansion of urban agriculture, community gardens, and fair and relaxation of regulation on food distribution of 'cottage industry' food production (as Michigan/Detroit recently has). Minneapolis can be a leader in freedom and fairness of food availability to it's citizenry. Grass and 'ornamental plants' have their place in a well balanced garden, but as a percent of total land-use Minneapolis Parks are overwhelmingly slanted toward these non-productive plants. Dedicating a larger proportion of park land for productive plants (fruits, veg, fiber, etc.) is good for the biodiversity, ecology and a mixed landscape is good for the city and good for it's people in all socio-economic classes and areas of the city.	Nov 12, 2013 10:22 PM
58	Plans for disease control and Integrated Pest management seem excessively frightened. In 50+ years of gardening I have only had less than 5 instances of excessive invasion of insects or disease. In most cases there is damage to only a few plants as long as there is a diversity planted in any one area. Almost all damage is caused not by insects or disease but by mono-cropping	Nov 7, 2013 12:00 PM

Page 6, Q9. ZIP code (5 digits)

	1	
55409		Dec 31, 2013 5:18 PM
	2	
55406		Dec 31, 2013 4:49 PM
	3	
55419		Dec 31, 2013 3:33 PM
	4	
55406		Dec 31, 2013 1:12 PM
	5	
55406		Dec 31, 2013 8:53 AM
	6	
55409		Dec 30, 2013 9:12 PM
	7	
55331		Dec 30, 2013 2:52 PM
	8	
55411		Dec 30, 2013 1:50 PM
	9	
55407		Dec 28, 2013 9:04 PM
	10	
55407		Dec 28, 2013 7:33 PM
	11	
55418		Dec 28, 2013 7:08 PM
	12	
55405		Dec 28, 2013 6:55 PM
	13	
55418		Dec 28, 2013 12:55 PM
	14	
55418		Dec 28, 2013 12:39 PM

Page 6, Q9. ZIP code (5 digits)

	15	
55406		Dec 27, 2013 1:10 PM
	16	
55406		Dec 26, 2013 10:19 AM
	17	
55414		Dec 26, 2013 7:21 AM
	18	
55406		Dec 18, 2013 10:46 PM
	19	
55407		Dec 18, 2013 9:14 PM
	20	
55406		Dec 18, 2013 6:29 PM
	21	
55407		Dec 18, 2013 4:06 PM
	22	
55406		Dec 18, 2013 1:39 PM
	23	
55413		Dec 18, 2013 12:53 PM
	24	
55417		Dec 17, 2013 8:42 PM
	25	
55454		Dec 17, 2013 2:52 PM
	26	
55412		Dec 17, 2013 2:02 PM
	27	
55414		Dec 17, 2013 9:55 AM
	28	
55408		Dec 16, 2013 10:36 PM

Page 6, Q9. ZIP code (5 digits)

	29	
55406		Dec 16, 2013 10:35 PM
	30	
55414		Dec 16, 2013 9:25 PM
	31	
55406		Dec 16, 2013 1:38 PM
	32	
55411		Dec 16, 2013 1:30 PM
	33	
55406		Dec 16, 2013 9:17 AM
	34	
55116		Dec 16, 2013 8:40 AM
	35	
55409		Dec 14, 2013 11:52 PM
	36	
55417		Dec 14, 2013 7:02 PM
	37	
55408		Dec 13, 2013 2:58 PM
	38	
55418		Dec 13, 2013 2:01 PM
	39	
55406		Dec 13, 2013 10:53 AM
	40	
55406		Dec 13, 2013 10:36 AM
	41	
55409		Dec 13, 2013 10:24 AM
	42	
55406		Dec 13, 2013 9:55 AM

Page 6, Q9. ZIP code (5 digits)

	43	
55414		Dec 13, 2013 12:40 AM
	44	
55408		Dec 12, 2013 4:17 PM
	45	
55123		Dec 12, 2013 4:09 PM
	46	
55406		Dec 12, 2013 9:44 AM
	47	
55411		Dec 11, 2013 10:33 PM
	48	
55108		Dec 11, 2013 6:12 PM
	49	
55409		Dec 11, 2013 3:00 PM
	50	
55418		Dec 11, 2013 1:41 PM
	51	
55407		Dec 11, 2013 10:50 AM
	52	
55418		Dec 11, 2013 8:23 AM
	53	
55406		Dec 11, 2013 8:16 AM
	54	
55406		Dec 10, 2013 11:05 PM
	55	
55406		Dec 10, 2013 9:03 PM
	56	
55417		Dec 10, 2013 3:53 PM

Page 6, Q9. ZIP code (5 digits)

	57	
55410		Dec 10, 2013 2:19 PM
	58	
55418		Dec 10, 2013 2:15 PM
	59	
55417		Dec 10, 2013 12:24 PM
	60	
55406		Dec 10, 2013 12:23 PM
	61	
55404		Dec 9, 2013 9:22 PM
	62	
55408		Dec 9, 2013 5:25 PM
	63	
55406		Dec 9, 2013 9:17 AM
	64	
55405		Dec 7, 2013 8:16 PM
	65	
55406		Dec 7, 2013 2:54 PM
	66	
55407		Dec 6, 2013 4:08 PM
	67	
55405		Dec 5, 2013 9:24 AM
	68	
55408		Dec 4, 2013 8:33 AM
	69	
55408		Dec 3, 2013 12:54 PM
	70	
55419		Dec 2, 2013 5:39 PM

Page 6, Q9. ZIP code (5 digits)

	71	
55408		Dec 1, 2013 7:29 PM
	72	
55406		Nov 28, 2013 8:03 PM
	73	
55406		Nov 27, 2013 3:07 PM
	74	
55405		Nov 26, 2013 10:16 AM
	75	
55454		Nov 24, 2013 10:28 AM
	76	
55413		Nov 22, 2013 3:25 PM
	77	
55406		Nov 22, 2013 10:05 AM
	78	
55412		Nov 22, 2013 9:05 AM
	79	
55406		Nov 21, 2013 2:14 PM
	80	
55412		Nov 20, 2013 12:06 PM
	81	
55404		Nov 19, 2013 9:30 PM
	82	
55406		Nov 19, 2013 8:09 PM
	83	
55407		Nov 19, 2013 7:28 PM
	84	
55406		Nov 18, 2013 2:31 PM

Page 6, Q9. ZIP code (5 digits)

	85	
55409		Nov 16, 2013 2:45 PM
	86	
55414		Nov 16, 2013 12:42 PM
	87	
55406		Nov 16, 2013 8:14 AM
	88	
55414		Nov 15, 2013 2:15 PM
	89	
55417		Nov 14, 2013 8:05 PM
	90	
55407		Nov 14, 2013 11:23 AM
	91	
55407		Nov 14, 2013 10:40 AM
	92	
55406		Nov 14, 2013 9:36 AM
	93	
55407		Nov 13, 2013 8:31 PM
	94	
55408		Nov 12, 2013 10:22 PM
	95	
55417		Nov 10, 2013 9:01 PM
	96	
55407		Nov 7, 2013 9:54 PM
	97	
55407		Nov 7, 2013 12:01 PM
	98	
55406		Nov 7, 2013 11:40 AM

Page 6, Q9. ZIP code (5 digits)

99

55418

Nov 7, 2013 11:18 AM

Page 6, Q11. Highest Level of Education Attained:

1	lots of life experience	Dec 18, 2013 1:39 PM
2	local business owner	Dec 10, 2013 12:23 PM
3	training and experience as an urban farmer	Dec 9, 2013 9:22 PM
4	Associate's Degree	Dec 3, 2013 12:54 PM
5	Certified Permaculture Designer/Instructor, Horticulture Teaching Specialist, U of M	Nov 24, 2013 10:28 AM