

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DECEMBER 2007 – FEBRUARY 2008 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON DRAFT MINNEAPOLIS PLAN FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH WITH STAFF RESPONSES**

**GENERAL**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Response</b>
Great presentation but as usual few North Side pictures. Maybe because we have few of the qualities or goals here, present or in future plans	1/8/08 open house	Carefully balancing photos in actual document
Don't forget the Far North, fewer problems and less wealth production means low investment; one only need to look at the <i>utter</i> lack of cmty. ed. pgms. to demonstrate the lack of attention this part of the city receives	1/8/08 open house	Plan is committed to providing a vision for the entire city
Some things are vague – more details explaining exactly what or how	1/8/08 open house	More clarification as to role of plan added to Implementation chapter
How does the plan speak to resident comments and concerns? Does the plan involve input from residents and business?	1/8/08 open house	Yes. All comments received on plan are being reviewed and addressed
This is my first time here so I'm assuming it'll get easier	1/12/08 open house	Making the plan more understandable and user-friendly is a high priority
The role of neighborhood organizations in planning and decision making is not in the plan. Is the city going to neglect them in this plan and the future of the city?	1/17/08 open house	More language on neighborhood associations added to Implementation chapter
The plan is too general and lacks money to implement. It is more wishful than factual. It will be amended as soon as a developer wants it to change. Some parts of the plan are based on input from years ago.	1/17/08 open house	More clarification as to role of plan added to Implementation chapter
Get neighborhoods involved much sooner. LCC should have at least seen the proposals. After the city puts this much work it is essentially a done deal. In the 80's the neighborhoods wrote the plans, actually the planning districts; we need to return to that model.	1/17/08 open house	Neighborhoods have been given a chance to review and comment throughout the process
Good job with the open house format and the use of the city's website to communicate updates	1/28/08 open house	Thank you.
Occasionally need to connect policies to implementation more clearly	1/28/08 open house	Making the plan more understandable and user-

		friendly is a high priority
Vision and goals are good. Action steps and timelines will be more difficult. It will be important for the city council to be on board with the plan and support and enforce it. Otherwise, it's just going to be a plan.	1/28/08 open house	City Council will be reviewing plan in detail and will approve the final version.
Hyperlinks to other resources was referred to in the slide show. I'm wondering how extensive those links are? This relates to how the city and its plan affect and are affected by other important governmental jurisdictions (with the city, adjacent municipalities, watershed districts, etc. – need for better working relationships!!!)	1/28/08 open house	Hyperlinks will be added to link to many relevant plans and other websites, including other agencies'
Words like “consider” and “encourage” should be replaced with more action-oriented verbs.	1/28/08 open house	Verb choice reflects city's role in decision-making process
Other than the “Where do you live map,” I didn't see any recognition of neighborhood organizations and the ongoing role they can and should be playing in plan development and implementation. Holding a few open houses at locations around the city is not adequate for plan development, and I didn't see any neighborhood organization involvement strategies for implementation. The accomplishments of the NRP, its future, and the Community Engagement process should be directly addressed in the Minneapolis comprehensive plan update.	1/28/08 open house	More language on neighborhood associations added to Implementation chapter. See also Appendix B
Citizens need to know whom to contact and what will happen to their comments, especially if they feel the plan is not being implemented in their area; either Haila needs to be clearly identified as that person, or the sector planners, or both	1/28/08 open house	Website updated accordingly
Explain governance issues – city vs. county vs. state vs. MPRB vs. UM	1/28/08 open house	Being addressed in Executive Summary
Thanks for the personal open house! (Todd Rasmuson, Midtown Phillips MPNAI Board Chair)	1/28/08 open house	Thank you!
Would like details	1/29/08 open house	More clarification as to role of plan added to Implementation chapter
The issue of <i>money</i> to do all of these wonderful plans is completely ignored other than the “partnerships” mantra throughout	1/29/08 open house	More clarification as to role of plan added to Implementation chapter
Provides vision in general terms; there are not a lot of specifics	1/29/08 open house	More clarification as to role of plan added to Implementation chapter
CEAC also recommends changes throughout the Plan. In particular, CEAC believes that the City should directly reference the Sustainability Indicators where Comprehensive Plan goals and policies address a topic covered by the Indicators.	email - CEAC	Addressed in Environment chapter

<p>Hello, just wanted to share my view on "The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth" call for public input. To be perfectly blunt, I've attended a number of public meetings and hearings over the years, and rare is the day when the city has actually done anything the public wanted. Keeping Hi-Lake intact is about the only instance I can recall, back when they wanted to tear it down. Normally, the developers and the people with MONEY are the ones whose ideas get put into action and to hell with the rest of us. Attending a public meeting like this one is pointless. Sorry, but the City has a piss-poor track record of listening to what the taxpayers and ordinary people want and don't want, like, oh I dunno, the stadium fiasco for example...</p>	<p>email - Joe Sehl</p>	<p>All public comments on comprehensive plan are being reviewed and addressed</p>
<p>The goals were what I thought the city already should be doing for the cities but it was nice to see them written down. Did I see my community of north Minneapolis in any of the graphics or pictures? Yes thank you for the one picture of North Regional Library. Whoops thought the presentation was to represent the whole city. But your right we don't have many of the amenities you talked about in your boards that are happening on the northside. Bike path yes the parkway or down 26th (let's see a southsider ride that at night!) Housing we have many houses available through foreclosure, vacancies how were they represented? Transportation lets keep cutting that service from the northside it's to dangerous for anyone to ride anyway. Art in our community we have done that without the cities help we know the value in that the northside it is known for their creativeness, entrepreneurs and artists who live here. Open space/ parks/ schools we have them but programs /building have been cut to little or no service. I could go on but I hope you understand my concerns that I have grown up in Minneapolis and have lived most my life on the northside. I think my neighborhood is a great place (most the time) but I expect my tax money, my volunteer hours, my city representatives and my commitment to be recognized and be equitable on the north side. The city is big but when it is represented to the world and the good things we only see the southside wake up and represent my community too.</p>	<p>email - Lynne Moriarty</p>	<p>Carefully balancing photos in actual document. Public safety addressed in Public Facilities chapter. Foreclosures addressed in Housing chapter. Open space and parks chapter prioritizes improvements in under-served areas of city. Overall, plan presents visions for improving entire city.</p>
<p>The most striking flaw in the document is its utter lack of understanding of the role neighborhood organizations play within Minneapolis' ecosystem. Neighborhood organizations are officially recognized by the City of Minneapolis to act as vehicles for civic participation in Minneapolis. This role currently includes an official role in soliciting, collecting, and making recommendations on land use and development issues coming before the City. A relationship that has worked exceptionally well over the past twenty years and based on recent City Council Action appears to be growing. Yet there is scarcely a mention of these organizations or the current role they play anywhere in the document. This flaw needs to be remedied in the next draft of the plan. It would be a travesty if the City's future plan for Minneapolis was one devoid of citizen participation. The next draft of the plan should not only reflect the existing role of neighborhood organizations it should look to expand the role of community members in the decision making process within the City and acknowledge the value that engaged and committed residents bring to Minneapolis. It is frustrating for an organization that invested over 6,500 hours of volunteer time into Minneapolis last year, largely on environment, housing, and public safety issues to only find three</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	<p>More detail on role of neighborhoods added to Implementation chapter, due to their important role in implementing the entire plan. A version showing edits to the plan based on public comment will be available.</p>

<p>acknowledgements of the role we play in the City and for those references to be in the Historic Preservation, Arts and Culture, and as an after thought at the end of the Implementation Chapters. The longterm plan for the City of Minneapolis should include a dedicated funding stream for neighborhood organizations. The plan currently calls for dedicated funding streams for historic preservation work (9.10.3) and for arts and culture activities (10.31). This would be an appropriate action for the City to include based on its commitment to funding neighborhood organizations over the past twenty years through NRP and the recent Council directive which determined that funding neighborhood organizations was a core city service. Another general recommendation would be that in addition to the regular next draft that the department releases there should be a redlined version, with notes, so people can easily see what changed from this version and why.</p>		
<p>Regarding Section I Community Building in the draft Plan, PWCC urges the City Council to continue to support the Neighborhood Reinvestment Program. It provides much needed funding to community organizations throughout the City and it places the City nationally in high regard for its innovation in community resource support. Support of buildings and institutions must include building the lives of residents and in particular those residents who need it the most. In this category of the plan the emphasis on the bonds of the community linking city dwellers to each other and to their neighborhoods that they call home we enthusiastically support. Gathering places and programs that serve a wide range of resident interest are important tools to and contributors to making communities strong. This goal area is also directly related to our core issues in the strategic plan see facility (see strategic plan attachment).</p>	<p>letter - Phyllis Wheatley</p>	<p>The future of the NRP is uncertain at the time of this plan draft, but the plan affirms a commitment to continue working with neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Increase the plan's specificity and implementability. Throughout the plan, there are many general policy statements (for example, Chapter 1, Policy 1.1) which express laudable goals but for which no clear implementation steps are articulated. Often, these policies imply that current practices are already achieving the desired goals, at least in part, and that these practices should simply be continued or supported. In fact, our experience has been that existing regulations have little effect on ensuring achievement of high standards in the areas of visual quality, design excellence, and compatibility with nearby properties and neighborhood character. As written, policies seem to state that those goals are being met and that all that is needed is to continue current practices. Without more rigor and specificity, we will continue to see that these high-minded goals are rarely enforced in practice.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>More clarification as to role of plan added to Implementation chapter</p>

<p>Fully address the impact of University of Minnesota on adjacent neighborhoods. The plan briefly mentions the spillover impacts on surrounding neighborhoods of the anticipated growth of the University of Minnesota. However, this recognition is couched in rather tentative and weak language, and no specifics are provided for managing this impact, which is significant, real, and already having a major effect on these neighborhoods. We would recommend the designation of an overlay district that encompasses the University-adjacent neighborhoods and which would permit special regulation of such challenges as the explosion of student housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address the opportunities presented by partnering with the University of Minnesota. Partnering with the University of Minnesota offers significant opportunities proportionate to the University's impact and influence on the community. The legislature has recently created a University District Partnership Alliance between the City, the University, and the University-adjacent neighborhoods in response a report on the impact the University has had on those neighborhoods. The Alliance will identify and foster projects which maintain and enhance the residential and commercial viability of the University district. This effort should be explicitly mentioned in the plan and should be a major City priority.</li> </ul>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Additional language on partnerships added to U of M Growth Center section in Land Use chapter and Implementation chapter. Appendix C provides details on U of M transportation issues, and Urban Design addresses impacts of institutional campuses on surroundings.</p>
<p>We are generally pleased that the new plan is more visually interesting and readable; We especially like the photo of 5th St Historic District homes included; We approve of the major goals and the focus on sustainability. We find the plan lacking adequate mention or focus on the University of MN, an institution that greatly impacts the neighborhoods surrounding it and the city as a whole; We would like to see more about new light rail routes, especially since the Central Corridor line is now being studied for a northern alignment and the new 35W bridge is being built "light rail ready"; We would like more focus on the Mississippi River as an amenity that needs protection and highlighting; we are not just a city of lakes.</p> <p>Be sure that Times New Roman is "the" font. Legibility could be improved with a san-serif font. Indent text to allow rapid understanding of major headings, subhead...</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes</p> <p>AIA urban design mtg.</p>	<p>Additional language on partnerships added to U of M Growth Center section in Land Use chapter and Implementation chapter. Appendix C provides details on U of M transportation issues, and Urban Design addresses impacts of institutional campuses on surroundings. Document template developed by graphic design professional. Main font is Garamond, 12 point.</p>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment	Source	Response
<p>pg. 11 paragraph 1 beginning with 'maintaining...' NRP is referred to as 'state mandated'. It was not, it was a cooperative agreement. Please remove 'state mandated' as it is misleading. It is stated that NRP will end in 2009 and the city needs to address this change. NRP commitments extend past 2009. This is premature as the program may be extended. Since this document is a blueprint for 2030, it is premature to make this judgment. Also reference the implementation section (pg 13 ) where it states the program may end. The appendix for the NRP projects within the comp plan is listed but has not been inserted. pg. 13...2030 livable neighborhoods makes no mention of neighborhood assns or their and the neighbors role in public engagement. Are both to be eliminated by 2030. pg. 11 references the park board but on pg13 for 2030, the park board is not mentioned...only a reference to a generic 'partners.. Park board should be specifically referenced in the 2030 vision. Elimination of that reference could be viewed as suspicious (2/15/08)</p>	Website	<p>Thank you for the feedback. The language in the Executive Summary was taken from city budget documents, but changed in response to this feedback. The word neighborhood, as used in the TMP, is not synonymous with NRP. Unclear what is meant by inserting NRP projects. Those will not be inserted into the body of the policy document.</p>
<p>Our comments begin Chapter 1, Land Use. (2/15/08)</p>	Website	<p>No response.</p>
<p>Three comments 1) Where is the vision for drawing more people and businesses to a vibrant city. Why do Best Buy and Medtronic choose to put thousands of jobs in the suburbs and not in the city? 2) Where is the vision for creating and sustaining a retail and entertainment center in the downtown area, it looks like the city is assuming the Vikings, Twins, and Timberwolves will be in Minneapolis in the future, but there is no effort to create a great city experience along the river with restaurants, or to surround any cultural centers with a reason to stay and experience the city? Their millions of fan visits to the city should be exploited. 3)To promote less automobile traffic, the transportation plan should reflect using current corridors for dedicated street car, buses, bikes, etc and ban the autos/trucks from those streets. These corridors should also not parallel major auto routes to encourage different development in other areas. (1/31/08)</p>	Website	<p>Thank you for the comments.</p>
<p>"....and value our natural environment..." Confusing. Does this mean we value our natural environment, or the value of our natural environment or something else? (1/23/08)</p>	Website	<p>It means the former, that the natural environment is important.</p>

<p>INCORPORATING A VISION FOR FARMERS' MARKETS INTO MINNEAPOLIS' FUTURE As Minneapolis looks toward sustainability in 2030, developing an urban farmers' market system should become a greater municipal priority. A geographically diverse system of neighborhood markets should be integrated into transportation, land use, economic development and arts and culture planning by the city. The 100 year old, central farmers' market and it satellite Nicollet Mall market are both well established and have been wildly successful. In the last five to ten years there has been a grassroots movement of primarily neighborhood-based organizations initiating and sustaining smaller, neighborhood-based markets (Kingfield, Northeast, Midtown, Mill City). This process has met with success but has occurred with limited organizational capacity in a piecemeal fashion and without much planning or systemic support from city government. The city should support taking this foundation to the next level in the next 10-20 years. Nationally, farmers' markets are increasingly seen as vital and sustainable economic redevelopment tools. A strong urban farmers' market system would build a city of unique urban spaces integrating many of the shared values of Minneapolitans and the larger civic goals outlined by Minneapolis 2030. A geographically diverse farmers' market system accomplishes the environmental goals of supporting sustainable, small-scale, local food systems and offering shoppers increased multi-modal transportation options if markets are located within walking/biking distance of their home or work, along transit corridors or at activity centers. From a public health perspective farmers' markets are vehicles for fostering a more healthy diet and places of potential nutritional and culinary education can occur. Creating dynamic, beautiful, socially interactive urban spaces where informal and formal civic engagement takes places addresses both community building and urban design goals. A strong farmers' markets system would foster the economic development goals of small business incubation and neighborhood revitalization. From a cultural perspective farmers' markets can offer family friendly, accessible art space and foster the development of local traditions and community rituals. Farmers' markets bring consumers together with the origins of their food. They often bring urban consumers together with rural producers. Farmers' markets are urban forms that transcend history and culture that unite and celebrate our city's diversity. The city of Minneapolis should prioritize support an urban farmers' market system into the future with planning integrated into the larger city plan, on-going sustaining resources &amp; promotion. The mechanisms for this should be created and integrated into the city infrastructure. Currently, most of these markets lacks capacity for marketing, business planning, capital improvements, sufficient staffing. While, farmers' markets must rely on a diversity of resources and community support, the city is well positioned to strengthen this system and would benefit immensely from a strong system. With minimal investment, the City of Minneapolis could see much improved and coordinated capacity in this system. Future areas for development could include: direct grants, technical assistance, programming initiatives, coordinated marketing efforts, regularly convening leadership and capital improvements. The city should develop a ten year plan that establishes priorities for an urban farmers' market system. (1/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thank you for the comments. Used to inform the final draft of several TMP chapters.</p>
<p>Page 3, first paragraph below the bulleted points, delete the word "is". (12/31/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thanks for catching this.</p>

<p>Just a short comment on the opening. You list as an accolade that Minneapolis has been named the most affordable city in the country. I trust what you mean is the most affordable city of high quality in the nation. Statistically speaking, the last thing you want to be is "affordable." Dying towns in western Oklahoma, the Mississippi Delta and the Rustbelt are affordable because no one wants to live there. (1/9/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Affordable in this context means that people can actually buy homes here. Affordability applies to civil service employees too. The term is not a synonym for subsidized housing. We've added a web link to this accolade so readers can see the methodology.</p>
<p>Would like a more prominent location for City goals ("right at front")</p>	<p>CM Gordon</p>	<p>We anticipate prominence for city goals in the adopting resolution and draw attention to analysis that shows consistency between the goals and the TMP.</p>
<p>Executive Summary: pg 12 Housing stock – best preservation tool – NRP is being allow to expire; pg 13 Livable neighborhoods – should read – such as schools, libraries and PARKS</p>	<p>1/29/08 open house</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment. We removed the reference to the NRP sunset.</p>
<p>"Minneapolis is a multi-modal center for a regional transportation system that features light rail, rapid transit and superior bus service." (quote from chapter) I have been translating "transit" as "bus system". From what I remember from my stay in Minneapolis, the Metro Transit is the metropolitan bus service. But here, they also mention "bus service", as if it were something different. What do you think? What is the difference between transit and bus service? This is the image of the city in the future, so maybe that has something to do with it.</p>	<p>email - AZ Translators</p>	<p>The transportation system is broader than bus service. Transit includes BRT, bus rapid transit, a category separate from bus service.</p>
<p>** See edited draft document from CEAC **</p>	<p>email - CEAC</p>	<p>Thanks for the written letter. Many of the suggestions raised go beyond the scope of this policy document and are best addressed as the city implements</p>

<p>Why Plan: Add the following bullet point. Recognized nationally for its interconnected parks system including lakes, trails, and tree lined streets. History of Planning in Minneapolis Add: In the late 1800s, the Minneapolis Board of Trade created the finest system of parks and parkways of any city in America. The natural beauty of the Chain-of-Lakes, and the later evolution of the playground and neighborhoods center movement augmented this very special park system. Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board was created as an independent board so that its innovative creation could be maintained at the early onset of the maturing City of Minneapolis. Today the Park Board and the various departments of the City of Minneapolis work cooperatively to integrate the nationally recognized park attributes to help maintain the vitality and sustainability of Minneapolis. Livable Neighborhoods Add: The very character of the neighborhoods and their connections with each other are based upon the strong presence of tree lined streets leading to interconnected park systems. The urban forest becomes the living fabric that unites and sustains the character of Minneapolis.</p>	<p>letter - Tree Advisory</p>	<p>its sustainability plan. Thank you for the comments. Used to inform the latest draft.</p>
<p>page 11: thank you for mentioning the importance of implementing the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board's and the City of Minneapolis' comprehensive plans in tandem</p>	<p>letter - MPRB</p>	<p>You are welcome!</p>

## DATA PROFILE

Comment	Source	Response
<p>pg 10-data will need to be re-evaluated before submitted...particularly median home values. pg 11- transportation, paragraph 2...admit that public transit users for buses face big challenges. Acknowledge the gap. What will the city do with partners to improve bus service on small corridor routes. pg 14-no mention of board of est and tax. Add the BET to this section. pg 15- '3 separate governing boards linked by annual budget'. Need to make a change...the schools are not linked by the city budget. pg 15 - same paragraph (library) "latter is a shared management function with Hennepin co" This is very wrong. While linked for the next 10 years in the budget...all management functions now reside in HENNEPIN COUNTY. There is only consultation on the county appointed board for 3 years. Since the Co. Board of commissioners makes the final decisions, there is nothing "shared" pg 16- the term 'frolic' in the parks. This term should be removed from a comp plan. More appropriate in a Meet Mpls document. (2/15/08)</p>	Website	<p>Thanks for the comments. The data profile will be updated annually. The profile is meant to provide a snapshot, not detailed discussion of governance. Please refer to the implementation chapter for that discussion. The data profile will also be a stand-alone marketing piece.</p>
<p>Graphs are misleading. A different style or type of graph should be used to demonstrate the statistical information provided. (2/14/08)</p>	Website	<p>These are the same graphics as used in Results Minneapolis. Your comments are forwarded to CPED Research.</p>
<p>It provides a superficial discussion in a way that does not reflect the issues or concerns that the neighborhoods have been trying to get addressed for years. (2/14/08)</p>	Website	<p>The data profile introduces topics discussed in more detail elsewhere in the TMP.</p>
<p>Page 9, 14 and 15, there is a lack of transparency and/or discussion of the problems that are confronting the city in housing being demolished, government structure being so convoluted, and a general lack of inclusion of input by the neighborhoods that are impoverished. (2/14/08)</p>	Website	<p>Thanks for the comment. The point raised are beyond the scope of this data profile.</p>
<p>Overall, this is a solid report on the state of the community. Yet all is not well in a city that remains silent on addressing the major issues of access to all members of the society. In other words, there really is a need to address the issues that confront the city in terms of poverty and crime. (2/14/08)</p>	Website	<p>Thanks for feedback.</p>

<p>page 1: The Park board currently has 182 park properties. We recommend double checking the number of lakes. We note 21 lakes; however, we know that there are four lagoons that are sometimes included in the counts</p>	<p>letter - MPRB</p>	<p>The numbers cited were provided by MPRB staff.</p>
<p>page 16: To recognize the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board's contribution to parks and recreation in the city, we recommend the following edits to the second and third paragraph The edits also include changes in the number of amenities currently provided by the MPRB: "Minneapolis residents not only watch sports, they participate as well. In 2005, Men's Fitness magazine named Minneapolis 'The Most Athletic City'. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board reports over 15 million visits to Minneapolis parks each year." "The Park Board provides 396 sports fields in the city where people gather for softball, football, soccer, and lacrosse. Golf enthusiasts enjoy seven public courses within the park system, while tennis players utilize tennis courts the Park Board provides in the City. Young and old swim and frolic at the supervised, public beaches. Sailboats, canoes, kayaks, and windsurfers dot the public lakes in the summer while residents can be seen fishing from one of several piers. Other favorite pastimes are biking, jogging, and rollerblading along paths provided by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. The City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County and Hennepin County Rail Road Authority also actively provide trails for city residents. In winter, residents ice fish, cross country ski or play hockey at rinks scattered across the city."</p>	<p>letter - MPRB</p>	<p>Comments informed Dec 2007 draft.</p>
<p>In a few areas, such as page 15, the name of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is misspelled. There should not be an "s" after the word "Park".</p>	<p>letter - MPRB</p>	<p>Changes incorporated into Dec 2007 draft</p>
<p>page 17: To recognize the founders of the Minneapolis Park system, reference to the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board should be given in the caption under the photo as well as the text. Suggestion: Caption - "The legacy of the Minneapolis Park system founders, who secured land around the lakes, creeks, and the Mississippi River in the City, provides year-round recreation opportunities." Paragraph - "Early in Minneapolis' development, the land around five large lakes, along the Minnehaha Creek and the banks of the Mississippi River was acquired by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board and dedicated to the public as parkland. Today, the Park Board provides a park no more than six to eight blocks from every home This city is also well known for its street trees, which are planted and maintained by the Park Board. In 2004, the City and Park Board adopted an urban forest policy out of recognition that trees provide important ecological and aesthetic functions. The city's green environment enhances the quality of life for residents, and makes it an attractive place for visitors and habitat for urban wildlife. The Park Board currently manages 60 sites (totaling more than 450 acres) of natural areas within the park system."</p>	<p>letter - MPRB</p>	<p>This level of detail is captured in the Open Space and Parks Chapter. The data profile only intends to set the stage for that discussion.</p>

**LAND USE**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>38th Street &amp; Fourth Avenue in the Minneapolis Plan: CANDO (Central Area Neighborhood Development Organization) Economic Development Committee has recently become aware that the Minneapolis Plan is considering removal of 38th Street &amp; Fourth Avenues “commercial node” status. Our committee promptly took up the subject. We believe that 38th Street &amp; Fourth Avenue in the Minneapolis Plan should not have the designation of “commercial node” removed from the plan. It was pointed out that this intersection is recognized as a historic hub of African-American business and community institutions, with the Urban League, Minneapolis Spokesman-Recorder and others. I am currently contacting these organizations and residents for further comment It was further noted that loss of the designation could make that area ineligible for funding through such programs as Minneapolis Great Streets and possibly other opportunities. As the CANDO board does not meet before the comment period closes, the committee recommended that I file a comment online to reflect our concerns and that the board take up the issue at its next convening to ratify the motion that; 38th Street &amp; Fourth Avenue in the Minneapolis Plan, should not have the designation of “commercial node” removed from the plan and send a letter to Councilor Glidden to that effect. Victor Suarez, CANDO Economic Development Committee Chair Please Contact CANDO at: CANDO 310 E 38th Street #304 Minneapolis, MN 55409 612-824-1333 (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>38<sup>th</sup> St &amp; 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, while important to the community, does not meet the plan's criteria for commercial nodes. However, the urban neighborhood designation allows this to continue as it is today.</p>
<p>Pg 3 1.1.6 - When referencing small area plans, add in consultation with neighborhood assns and local residents. There isn't any reference to community engagement. pg 5...general commercial - directing new commercial activity and redevelopment to designated areas. Needs to be clarified as it sounds like redlining or invasive. pg 6 1.7.2 - auto oriented on commercial corridors not at intersections of 2 designated corridors. Are there grandfather provisions if there is a change in ownership, conversion to corporations or bldg/design changes? Without grandfather clause, could dissuade owners from making property improvements. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Added reference to neighborhood associations. Clarified reference to commercial areas. Grandfather clause is a regulatory issue, addressed in zoning code.</p>

<p>p. 3, policy 1.1 How will these general statements be translated into regulations that will actually achieve the stated goals? Existing regulations have, in practice, little effect on ensuring achievement of high standards in the areas of visual quality, design considerations, and compatibility with nearby properties and neighborhood character. As written, the policy seems to state that those goals are being met and that all that is needed is to continue current practices. Without more rigor and specificity, we will continue to see that these high-minded goals are rarely enforced in practice. p. 4, policy 1.2 The recognition here of the importance of transitional areas between land use types is significant. It would be appropriate to include a reference to the necessity of appropriate transitions between residential areas of different density, not just between residential and non-residential uses. p. 7, policy 1.8 This policy should more explicitly recognize the deleterious effect that high-density residential development can have on the character and stability of existing neighborhoods within which they are located. The need for careful transitions and buffers between densities should be highlighted, as well as the importance of enforcing high design standards. The city should also articulate a policy of fostering owner-occupancy and arresting the turnover of such properties to rental use (often with absentee landlords). Owner-occupied housing is typically better maintained, and the long-term commitment that owners make to a neighborhood results in greater community stability and investment. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Policy 1.1 – ensuring regulatory consistency with the plan will be part of comprehensive plan implementation. Policy 1.2 – existing policy is broad enough to cover conflicts between different residential densities. Policy 1.7 – regulations provide more specifics on transitions between uses. Housing chapter addresses strengthening residential neighborhoods</p>
<p>The University of Minnesota plays a large part in the Minneapolis community and is hardly mentioned in the comprehensive plan. The University is mentioned in the Land Use chapter in a vague paragraph only mentioning the surrounding neighborhoods concern of deteriorating conditions with no specific goals or plans addressed. There is currently not an effective method in place that enforces housing codes or property upkeep. The neighborhoods surrounding the University campus have seen a decline in housing/living conditions and residents are concerned what the future holds for these neighborhoods as it has been hard to attract buyers. These neighborhoods have many houses that are historic, dating back to the early 1900s, and have a lot of potential if they were restored and properly maintained. The new Gopher football stadium, TCF Bank Stadium, is currently under construction on the U of M campus as well. Nothing in the comprehensive plan mentions this huge development and how increased traffic, tailgating, parking and other factors that will come along with having this on campus development will be attended to. The future of the University of Minnesota campus and its students are overlooked in this current plan as no real future planning or goals have been made. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Added content to Growth Center description to better clarify role of U of M in the City.</p>

pp. 12-14 (and Land Use Features map) University Avenue through the Prospect Park neighborhood is designated as a Commercial Corridor, thus accommodating “intensive commercial uses and high levels of traffic” and supporting “all types of commercial uses, with some light industrial and high density residential.” Insufficient recognition is given to the challenges these uses will place on the adjacent existing lower-density residential neighborhood. In the case of University Avenue through Prospect Park, the residential neighborhood starts literally one parcel back from the commercial corridor. If University is developed as described, it is likely that the adjacent tier of housing will transition to similar higher-density and commercial uses, and a domino effect will ensue that will erode the stability and integrity of the neighborhood. Much more thought must be given to appropriately designing these difficult edges where incompatible land uses are squeezed together. The eastern end of University Avenue is also designated as a Neighborhood Commercial Node. While neighborhood-level services are needed and appropriate for this location, is it realistic to propose this type of limited and small-scale development at the same location as the higher-density pattern encouraged for a Commercial Corridor? This is the only Neighborhood Commercial Node which is located on a Commercial Corridor; all others city-wide are on the lower-volume Community Corridors. This appears to be an inconsistency that should be resolved. In addition, policy 1.11 encourages high-density housing at Neighborhood Commercial Nodes, again posing the issues raised above. Another inconsistency is the failure to recognize that accommodating high traffic volumes and fostering a quality pedestrian environment may be incompatible goals. Commercial Corridors are designated as high-volume roadways, and Map 2.x, 2030 Forecasted Traffic, indicates that University Avenue through Prospect Park and the University of Minnesota will have among the highest traffic volumes of the entire road network. Congestion is likely to be increased by the presence of light rail along the corridor, particularly if an at-grade alignment along Washington Avenue is selected. It may be laudable to encourage a pedestrian orientation for development in these corridors, but, in practice, how can that be accomplished in the face of such high traffic counts? More consideration needs to be given to how to manage these traffic volumes, including the sensitive siting of structured parking facilities. pp. 16-17, Transit Station Areas The text and accompanying map seem to locate these areas only along the existing Hiawatha LRT corridor. Since this Plan is intended to be forward-looking, should it not also designate TSAs along proposed new transit lines, such as the Central Corridor LRT? In fact, the node at University Avenue SE and 29th Avenue SE is already designated in Article 551.175 of the Minneapolis Zoning Code as a TSA, so it would be appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan to reflect this. pp. 20-21, Growth Centers (also Land Use Features and Future Land Use maps) The symbol used on these maps to indicate a Growth Center has the unfortunate effect of making these centers seem highly localized, while the text indicates that they are more in the nature of a district. It would be helpful to indicate them as such. The University of Minnesota Growth Center appears at different locations on these two maps; on the Land Use Features map, it is actually well outside the current boundaries of the campus. The text appropriately recognizes that the growth of the University of Minnesota can have spillover impacts on surrounding neighborhoods. However, this recognition is couched in rather tentative and weak language, and no specifics are provided for managing this impact, which is significant, real, and already having a major effect on these neighborhoods. For example, we would recommend the designation of an overlay district that encompasses the University-adjacent neighborhoods and which would permit special

Website

The plan supports addressing and mitigating negative impacts of commercial and industrial development on surrounding neighborhoods. Removed node from commercial corridor. The transportation and urban design chapters provide guidance regarding balancing traffic with pedestrian access on City corridors. Adding TSA at University and 29th. Correcting inconsistency of Growth Center location on maps. Regulations will provide more specifics on mitigating impacts.

<p>regulation of such challenges as the explosion of student housing. (2/15/08)</p>		
<p>There should be policy change that reflects similarly to sections 1.14.1 through 1.14.5 that states "Strongly discourage new or additional industrial growth in areas that are impoverished or densely populated." I am speaking specifically to the new burner to be built in south Minneapolis. It will detrimentally impact Longfellow and East Phillips neighborhoods. The city council should rescind its vote and reconsider. (2/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>The Environment chapter addresses concerns of environmental justice. The specific project mentioned has already been approved by City Council.</p>
<p>There needs to be a map associated with the lists at the end of the document. (2/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Maps will be located close to tables in document.</p>
<p>On page 7 there should be a redaction of the language to "increase density." The city should not be in the business of increasing density. Especially in neighborhoods that are historically impoverished. (2/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Existing City policy supports increasing density, while mitigating negative impacts on adjacent areas.</p>

<p>42nd and Thomas Avenues North should be included in the Neighborhood Commercial Node land use. The intersection of 42nd and Thomas Avenues N. have four corners that are currently zoned C-1, the buildings are used for commercial purposes that provide goods and services to members of the surrounding community. There are over 10,000 square feet of commercial space. The businesses include a restaurant, tailor, dry cleaner, auto repair (newly built), deli, and there is space available for additional retailers. 42nd and Thomas are bus routes; 42nd Ave is part of the bike way system; 42nd Ave N connects Robbinsdale and Fridley (via the Camden Bridge) and used by local residents as a thoroughfare. Historically, this has been a business node for over 80 years with uses from grocery store, drug store, drapery shop, bike store, gas station, etc. (2/12/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. 42nd and Thomas added as neighborhood commercial node.</p>
<p>Many neighborhood nodes are not recognized as nodes. There may be some other category that needs to be created to include those small nodes that add to the vitality of the community but which don't meet the criteria based on traffic counts, road usage, or some other formula. These nodes can be the area that starts the revitalization of a neighborhood. Those neighborhoods without commercial nodes are at a disadvantage compared to other areas of the city. On the land use map that indicates where commercial are nodes are located indicate a much greater concentration of opportunities on the south side of the City compared to the north side. This equates to dollars available in the great streets program is available to more locations on the south side than on the north side. (2/12/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>The urban neighborhood category allows for these undesignated nodes to continue to exist and serve their neighborhoods. Designations will be periodically reviewed. Concentration of nodes in certain areas reflects market area of businesses in these nodes, and what is supportable.</p>

<p>Minneapolis has historically and currently been too dependent on public subsidies. Rather than create a plan such as this (which is good) and let people, either businesses or residents build as they see fit within the boundaries of the plan and codes, the city likes to "foster" things that it deems more appropriate, better, or different than the people who would do it themselves. For example, at Lake and Nicollet Ave, business fronts were created that almost immediately failed. Rather than zoning it and letting people decide what was appropriate, the city developed a project that told people what was appropriate. It didn't work. Same thing that happened with the K-Mart in the middle of Nicollet Ave. Decent idea to bring business in, but rather than making it inviting, and letting people do the investing, the city imposes one business, in the center of the street, and ends up killing off the businesses north and south of it due to messed up traffic. This repeated pattern and effect can largely be avoided if the city would stop micromanaging everything, create a plan such as this, and let people do it. Don't go subsidizing it with some grandiose "vision" like Block E. Investors, both business and residential will build up what is appropriate within the guidelines. The city will naturally evolve and grow in a far more appropriate manner, that will actually be sustainable, rather than the unsustainable projects the city is so known for. (2/12/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>The plan works to balance guidance to further important public purposes with flexibility to respond to opportunities and change.</p>
<p>22nd and Johnson is currently a neighborhood node and the proposed city plan doesn't include it as a node (page 26). I request that you reconsider this decision. To neighbors surrounding this area, this area provides a variety of services: Restaurants, hair salons /barber shops (3), insurance agency, a frame shop, sign making shop, and a unique neon store. The node sits at the intersection of two important streets that bisect the neighborhood: Johnson is divides the west and east and 22nd divides north and south. Additionally, 22nd is a designated bike route. The U of M recently completed a study of Johnson Street that emphasized the potential of 22nd and Johnson. Please attach the node label to 22nd and Johnson St NE to help the node realize its full potential. (2/9/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Added 22nd and Johnson to list and map of designated neighborhood commercial nodes.</p>
<p>Unless one has a map in front of them, it is difficult to visualize the boundaries of the corridors listed at the end of the chapter: Land Use. (1/17/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Maps will be located close to tables in document.</p>
<p>In Chapter 1 (Land Use) on p 20, University of Minnesota: It should be noted that the legislature has recently provided for the creation of a University District Partnership Alliance between the City of Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota and the neighborhoods bordering on the University campus in response a report on the impact the University has had on the neighborhoods. The alliance will facilitate, initiate and/or manage projects that are intended to maintain the university district as a viable place to study, research and live, with an emphases on increasing home ownership within the district particularly for employee of the university and of other major employers in the district. (1/11/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Additional language added to description of U of M growth center discussing need for partnership effort. More detail in Implementation chapter.</p>

<p>A lot better than the last comp plan. Simple to read with nice visuals. It's nice if the maps are right in the text, or links to the maps in the text. (12/28/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thanks for comment. Maps will be located close to tables in document.</p>
<p>Nicollet Avenue south of 58th is designated as a commercial corridor and a major retail center, which implies bigger box. This should be re-examined. It cannot handle high traffic volumes due to its size and stop light configuration. I don't believe Nicollet south of 58th is historically prominent, compared with many other areas, and I don't believe it should be slated for more high density residential development. I believe we should be looking more at strong pedestrian connections, like a community corridor, not accommodating more automobiles, since there are many, many, transit users and walkers in the area. Also, with the reconstruction of the 35 and 62, the connections to major highways, which defines a major retail center, will be more limited. I understand what's there is there, but should any redevelopment happen, I would not want to see more "major retail" in that location. While it does support a mix of uses, I don't believe this alone should define it as a place to add more residential density, since the pedestrian connections are limited in this area. Finally, I don't a Commercial Corridor should be 4 blocks in length. It should be more substantial. It should be a neighborhood commercial node designation. I like 58th and Lyndale being designated as a neighborhood commercial node. Even though it's relatively small, I believe it's a great place to create a new node. I think commercial territorial expansion should be allowed on a limited basis at neighborhood commercial nodes. We want to encourage and support the addition of businesses in the community, as long as the expansion would meet the design standards set forward. (12/28/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Nicollet south of 58<sup>th</sup> is largely commercial. The plan supports redevelopment in this area which is more pedestrian and transit oriented than existing conditions. Nicollet has posed challenges in designation since it has characteristics of both commercial and community corridors. Small area plans provide additional guidance for this area.</p>
<p>OK with industrial areas (though noted he has a majority of them in his ward), as long as they are low impact and high job density. Can we call industrial areas "industrial/job creation" in land use map category? just industrial has negative connotation</p>	<p>CM Ostrow</p>	<p>Job creation not a land use issue. Focus on industrial job creation in Economic Development chapter.</p>
<p>Audubon is working on neighborhood plan now, make sure they're developing something that can be adopted</p>	<p>CM Ostrow</p>	<p>Future land use recommendations from small area plan incorporated into future land use map.</p>

Overriding concern: Chicago Avenue corridor; subject to blanket 1999 rezoning but still largely residential; people aren't investing in their properties along Chicago because think they will just be redeveloped anyway. Double check on location of institutional campuses along Chicago – he thinks we are a block off. The area around Chicago Ave is a residential area	CM Lilligren	Plan for area is underway. Land use map revised to reflect institutional campuses.
Check on 29 <sup>th</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> land use guidance (red, but he thinks it shouldn't be); he has had extensive conversations with Barb on this, so go ask her about it	CM Lilligren	This is consistent with the adopted small area plan for the area.
Most important issue is redevelopment along upper riverfront in North Minneapolis; high priority but likely gradual change; did update her on involvement of AFCAC and plan for rezoning study	CM Johnson	This is reflected in the plan. Upcoming rezoning study will provide additional implementation support.
Need to develop “banana” area near Bassett Creek Valley (not use as park land) in order to generate revenue to do other improvements	CM Goodman	This is consistent with adopted small area plan, and reflected in the comprehensive plan as well.
Should we show green space along rail line parallel to Hiawatha? Might be otherwise redeveloped, particularly if can get funding to modernize the power lines; is currently requesting funds for this but acknowledges it may take years	CM Colvin-Roy	Green space reflects recommendations from adopted small area plans.
Do you actually plan to open Nicollet Ave and redo what other morons did? It needs to happen before Nicollet south of Lake will prosper again.	1/12/08 open house	The plan supports reopening Nicollet Avenue
TOD is super important and should be a central component of the Plan	1/12/08 open house	Thanks for your comment. Transit oriented development is an important feature of this plan.

<p>Lowry east of Washington is <u>not</u> noted as a future Activity Center. No growth center is noted for the Upper River. Community Corridor designation excludes Lowry from I-94 to river. See p. 76 of Above the Falls: the Lowry Bridge is now being planned, should be iconic. And it should extend to Washington Ave instead of only 2<sup>nd</sup> St or the railroad tracks.</p>	<p>1/28/08 open house</p>	<p>The future land use map provides support for commercial development in this area, but designation considered too speculative given existing conditions. Corridor designations corrected on map.</p>
<p>Nicollet from Lake to 46th should be a commercial corridor with nodes</p>	<p>1/28/08 open house</p>	<p>Nicollet Ave provided a challenge since it has characteristics of both a commercial and a community corridor. Due to this, policy implementation in this area will be carefully considered for this area.</p>
<p>Chp 1: Bassett Creek Valley – proposed to include a large new park – how with no \$ for MPRB to acquire or maintain let alone construct</p>	<p>1/29/08 open house</p>	<p>This is a MPRB issue. The plan supports the development of this park.</p>

<p>CANDO (Central Area Neighborhood Development Organization) Economic Development Committee has recently become aware that the Minneapolis Plan is considering removal of 38th Street &amp; Fourth Avenues "commercial node" status. Our committee promptly took up the subject. We believe that 38th Street &amp; Fourth Avenue in the Minneapolis Plan should not have the designation of "commercial node" removed from the plan. It was pointed out that this intersection is recognized as a historic hub of African-American business and community institutions, with the Urban League, Minneapolis Spokesman-Recorder and others. I am currently contacting these organizations and residents for further comment. It was further noted that loss of the designation could make that area ineligible for funding through such programs as Minneapolis Great Streets and possibly other opportunities. As the CANDO board does not meet before the comment period closes, the committee recommended that I file a comment online to reflect our concerns and that the board take up the issue at its next convening to ratify the motion that; 38th Street &amp; Fourth Avenue in the Minneapolis Plan, should not have the designation of "commercial node" removed from the plan and send a letter to Councilor Glidden to that effect.</p>	<p>email - CANDO</p>	<p>Duplicate comment – see response above</p>
<p>I received a request from Metro Transit to change the language in the design guidelines to "Transit Station/Center Areas" because it would then be inclusive of bus only facilities such as the Chicago Lake Transit Center. I told them that our language needed to be consistent with the comp plan but that I would forward this request to CPED for consideration as a change to the comp plan. If this hasn't already been discussed, it should be. This makes some sense from a transportation perspective; it may not make as much sense from a land use planning perspective. However, if we do implement streetcar service in these areas, these transit centers will become major hubs for streetcar service. Could you please let me know CPED's opinion on this. If you do change this now or at some later date, we'll update the design guidelines text to be consistent. Since these area designations are really about development potential and land use type, it makes sense to me that they would be treated differently. In most cases, I don't think that bus transit hubs (unlike the LRT stations) are in locations where there is a plan for intensification of development unless it is already in an activity center (Uptown, for example). On the other hand, from a transportation perspective, these are areas that need extra attention paid to pedestrian and bicycle access and to managing higher bus volumes, longer dwell times, etc. I had a follow-up discussion about this with Steve Mahowald and they don't feel too strongly about this. Instead, it might be better to make specific mention of these hubs in the transit section of the design guidelines and their special design and modal needs.</p>	<p>email - Charleen Zimmer</p>	<p>This has been discussed. It was decided to use the designation only on fixed route transit stations (e.g. LRT) rather than major bus stops due to (1) unique land use impacts of fixed route transit and (2) lack of good criteria regarding what bus stops to include. Since streetcar development is still in conceptual phase, the plan has not yet addressed how these stations will be treated.</p>

<p>I was looking through the Comprehensive Plan draft and was curious about how areas are designated as commercial nodes. Is there a reason why 60th and Penn is not considered a commercial node? Is it possible to have it changed to one? It would be a significant improvement to the neighborhood if the ANA could apply for the Façade Improvement Program for that intersection.</p>	<p>email - Jennifer Swanson</p>	<p>Added 60th and Penn as a commercial node.</p>
<p>The plan also fails in that Hispanic communities don't have a good sense of how this plan excludes activity centers for them, excludes entertainment centers and only serves to push them out of South Minneapolis, Lake ST, and does not take them into account for the tremendous growth this community will have 10, 20 or 30 years from now. The outer limits of the City of Minneapolis will not become a center of Caucasian people only. There are too many minorities. Where would Minneapolis want us to go? Richfield, Bloomington, Brooklyn Park, Brooklyn Center, Anoka County or Mexico?</p>	<p>email - Luis Caire</p>	<p>Plan is not legally able to designate culturally-specific activity centers. Land use feature designations reflect existing concentrations of activity, regardless of culture. The plan strives to provide a vision for a city meeting the needs of a diverse population.</p>
<p>Then, I agree with looking toward the future. Not to do this is incompetence. However, I see no mention in the plan of designating growth areas for the large population of Hispanics. Yes, many are illegal but all their children born every year are first generation Americans entitled by birth to a good life. Where are all these new citizens going to go to gather for social events, for dancing, restaurants, to develop and practice their culture among their own kind. I am not racist but the fact of the matter is that each particular race/culture seeks out their own to socialize. Hispanics are not going to go to American night clubs, American bars, American lodges or American community centers to rub elbows with strangers. This explosive growth of Hispanic American first born generation is going to get larger in 10 years and even larger in 20 years. I believe that the City and CPED officials consider designating areas for the culturally different minorities of this city who happen to be citizens. Chicago Avenue South east to Lake St to Cedar Avenue South could be a designated Hispanic corridor. Which the City could develop community centers, with appropriate zoning to accommodate dancing, drinking, activity centers etc. Similar to areas like Upton, Hennepin, Lagoon ST, 1<sup>st</sup> Ave etcetera. We would also like roof top clubs! Hispanics may be different but we are no more troublesome or irresponsible than other races or cultures in the City of Minneapolis as some would contend. This plan fails to make the minorities "aware of its significance" and the affect it will have on them in the future. For example, this plan can be used to circumvent eminent domain laws, it could be used to create containment zones by the police and city government to drive property values down and then raise the issue that these properties are nuisances and it could force diverse communities to move out of Minneapolis or establish their businesses in other</p>	<p>email - Luis Caire</p>	<p>Plan is not legally able to designate culturally-specific activity centers. Land use feature designations reflect existing concentrations of activity, regardless of culture. The plan strives to provide a vision for a city meeting the needs of a diverse population. Additional planning is underway for the Chicago Ave corridor. The City</p>

<p>areas. (away from Minneapolis) Lastly, the City and its departments should not rely on so called self appointed leaders, some neighborhood groups or service agencies as being the voice of the people. These parties are not going to bite the hand that feeds them (agencies that rely on CPED or city money for programs or wages). Many of these groups ride the fence for them own benefit: Public and Personal.</p>		<p>is continually working to improve its outreach efforts.</p>
<p>When did pedestrian overlay district at 26th and Nicollet, the C3A zoning seemed to go beyond the boundaries of the activity center shown on future land use map. Should check on this for boundary. Also have questions regarding how much growth is too much growth.</p>	<p>meeting - Whittier</p>	<p>Boundary fixed to coincide with C3A zoning.</p>
<p>The system of classifying corridors and nodes needs to be updated. The current system of having corridors designated as either community or commercial does not reflect the variation within Minneapolis. Within Lyndale we have two corridors Lyndale and Nicollet that are currently designated as community corridors. While they clearly do not reach the designation of commercial corridors, they are not really community corridors either. LNA recommends that a third classification be created for corridors that fall between community and commercial, referred to here as neighborhood corridors. The neighborhood corridor designation should be defined by a mix of commercial, office, retail, and multiunit residential properties. This classification should utilize the OR designations to help create areas that are focused on fostering mixed use development LNA recommends that the future land use map reflect the neighborhoods' desire to see Nicollet and Lyndale Avenue include more mixed use development. The future land use map in the plan shows both avenues as almost entirely residential, which does not reflect the current number of mixed use developments and commercial uses that currently populate these areas. LNA would also like to see the following nodes designated either as a single or series of neighborhood commercial nodes: - 34 th and Nicollet - 35 th and Nicollet - 36 th and Nicollet LNA believes that an investigation of these corners will find that they meet the definition of neighborhood commercial nodes. One of the difficulties that Lyndale has as a neighborhood is the current designations of Lyndale and Nicollet have made it difficult for the Neighborhood and property owners to access City resources. Currently, LNA is unable to apply for the Great Streets Program, the current business façade program RFP, etc. as well as a host of low interest loan and rehab programs that are targeted only at commercial corridors. LNA recommends that areas designated as neighborhood corridors be eligible for these programs. Areas like this are often the toughest areas to turn around in Minneapolis, because the</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	<p>Nicollet Ave provided a challenge since it has characteristics of both a commercial and a community corridor. Due to this, policy implementation in this area will be carefully considered for this area. Consideration was given to creating a third category, but it was determined there was not distinct policy direction for these areas. While</p>

economics of revitalization don't work for developers looking for the density and uses offered through the higher C zoning codes and there are not enough residential property owners invested to make an area prosper. LNA also recommends that neighborhood organizations have a more active role in determining how parts of their neighborhoods are designated. To this end LNA would encourage more small area plans, which can provide a vehicle for community oriented planning efforts that can better delve into the details necessary to create vibrant, functioning, neighborhoods. LNA strongly recommends that the plan specifically call out that Nicollet Avenue be reopened at Lake Street. This is currently a City priority as reflected by its inclusion in the CLIC 5year budget. Further Questions Why doesn't the future land use map take more current uses into account? It seems like a lot of areas that are currently mixed use areas are defined as single family homes in the future plan.

designations are important, they are but one layer of policy as part of a larger decision process. Neighborhood commercial nodes are also eligible through Great Streets. This plan supports further small area planning as needed. This plan also supports opening Nicollet at Lake Street. The urban neighborhood category on the future land use map is inclusive of a mix of uses and densities – will add clarification on the map to reflect this.

We would like to suggest that the City Comprehensive Plan identify the Near North community as one of the growth centers. We would like to suggest that the City Plan to designate our Area as one of the Growth Centers. It will be a gateway from Olson Memorial Highway (and other geographic points) to the new stadium and from downtown to the West Broadway area and beyond. This emphasis is not intended to diminish the importance of the revitalization underway on West Broadway and other corridors and locations in north Minneapolis – rather it should be viewed as an integral link.

letter - Phyllis Wheatley

While the City supports redevelopment in this area, it does not meet the primary criteria for Growth Center – that is, a focus on sustaining a large concentration of employment

<p>Sensitively address land use transitions. In general, the plan needs to more fully and sensitively address the importance of transitional areas between land use types. Incompatibilities can arise not only between residential and non-residential uses but also between residential areas of different density. A range of policies is needed to suit the diversity of land use situations that occur throughout the city. In Prospect Park, for example, the existing low-density residential neighborhood is literally a single lot back from areas, particularly along University Avenue, designated in the plan as high-density and/or commercial zones. Handling this abrupt interface between uses in a manner which preserves and fosters the existing residential patterns is a difficult issue and is not addressed in the plan.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Transitions between uses are addressed throughout the plan and are a major consideration in the development review process.</p>
<p>Recognize the impact of new high-density residential development directly adjacent to existing lower-density residential neighborhoods. The development of high-density residential areas is consistently advocated throughout the plan. We recognize the need to provide sufficient housing to serve the full diversity of the city's population and to accommodate the anticipated increase in metro-area residents over the next several decades. However, the plan should more explicitly recognize the deleterious effect that high-density residential development can have on the character and stability of existing neighborhoods within which they are located. Those neighborhoods should not be sacrificed in the enthusiasm for higher-density development. The need for careful transitions and buffers between densities should be highlighted, as well as the importance of enforcing high design standards. The plan also suggests that locating dense housing on transit corridors is the least disruptive of existing neighborhoods." This cannot always assumed to be the case, with the University Avenue corridor through Prospect Park being a prime example.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Transitions between uses are addressed throughout the plan and are a major consideration in the development review process. Specific community context is taken into account when applying land use feature guidance.</p>
<p>Understand the negative consequences of streamlining development review. In several locations, the plan encourages the streamlining of development review as a way to encourage new residential and commercial development. However, streamlining this review has sometimes had the effect of allowing sub-standard and inappropriate projects to proceed. For example, while the plan promotes the use of high-quality materials in new construction, the current practice of approving small multi-family projects (up to four units) through administrative review with only the most minimal standards has resulted in a proliferation of poor-quality, context-insensitive student tenement developments on sites previously occupied by older homes, demolished with HPC approval. Development should not be pursued at the expense of high design standards, sensitivity to context, and true consideration of neighborhood input. The plan offers policies that appear to support these concerns, but current City practices have been at odds with these goals. How will current City procedures change to ensure that he stated policies are put into practice?</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>The city's regulatory framework will be reviewed during plan implementation to ensure it is consistent with the comprehensive plan.</p>

<p>· <i>Recognize neighborhood input as a benefit to the development process.</i> The plan places little stress on the importance and value of bringing neighborhoods into the planning process as true partners, and this appears to reflect the attitude often expressed by city officials when dealing with the neighborhoods. In fact, developments are likely to be more successful if the “local knowledge” of neighborhoods is incorporated early and consistently. Policies should state that there should be ample opportunities for neighborhood input and review of developments, and this input should be fully incorporated into the approval process.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>This is already included in city regulatory processes. The neighborhood's role in plan implementation (which extends well beyond land use) is discussed in the Implementation chapter</p>
<p>Address the potential incompatibility between Commercial Corridor development along University Avenue in Prospect Park and the existing neighborhood. University Avenue through the Prospect Park neighborhood is designated by the plan as a Commercial Corridor, thus accommodating intensive commercial uses and high levels of traffic" and supporting "all types of commercial uses, with some light industrial and high density residential." Insufficient recognition is given to the challenges these uses will place on the adjacent existing lower-density residential neighborhood. In the case of University Avenue through Prospect Park, the residential neighborhood starts literally one parcel back from the commercial corridor. If University is developed as described, it is likely that the adjacent tier of housing will transition to similar higher-density and commercial uses, and a domino effect will ensue that will erode the stability and integrity of the neighborhood. Much more thought must be given to appropriately designing these difficult edges where incompatible land uses are squeezed together.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Duplicate comment – see above</p>
<p>Address the incompatibility of designation of an area as both a Commercial Corridor and a Neighborhood Commercial Node. The eastern end of University Avenue is designated as a Neighborhood Commercial Node, but it also falls within an area generally designated as a Commercial Corridor. While neighborhood-level services are needed and appropriate here, is it realistic to propose this type of limited and small-scale development at the same location as the higher-density pattern encouraged for a Commercial Corridor? This is the only Neighborhood Commercial Node which is located on a Commercial Corridor; all others city-wide are on the lower-volume Community Corridors. This appears to be an inconsistency that should be resolved.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Duplicate comment – see above</p>

<p>Expand designation of Transit Station Areas. The plan designates Transit Station Areas only along the existing Hiawatha LRT corridor. If it is to be forward-looking, should it not also designate TSAs along proposed new transit lines, such as the Central Corridor LRT? In fact, the node at University Avenue SE and 29th Avenue SE is already designated in Article 551.175 of the Minneapolis Zoning Code as a TSA, so it would be appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan to reflect this.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Duplicate comment – see above</p>
<p>Correct issues with the location of the University of Minnesota Growth Center. The Land Use Features and Future Land Use maps use an asterisk to indicate the location of Growth Centers. This has the unfortunate (and perhaps unintended) effect of making these centers seem highly localized, while the text indicates that they are more in the nature of a district. It would be helpful to indicate them as such. The University of Minnesota Growth Center appears at different locations on these two maps; on the Land Use Features map, it is actually well outside the current boundaries of the campus.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Duplicate comment – see above</p>
<p>Address consequences of eliminating minimum parking requirements. Consideration of eliminating parking requirements should be tempered by a recognition that drivers will be likely to seek parking in nearby residential areas, with a resultant negative effect on those neighborhoods.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Parking is addressed in the Transportation chapter, as well as through City regulatory processes.</p>
<p>Fully indicated alignments of Granary Parkway and Kasota Parkway. Several maps within the plan show the alignment of the proposed Granary Parkway, but the extension of Kasota Parkway and the bridges between Granary and Kasota parkways are not shown or referenced. These are called for in the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) Master Plan.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Added to maps in Transportation chapter.</p>

<p>The Victory Neighborhood Association (ViNA) Board of Directors has reviewed land use and some other components of the proposed Comprehensive Plan , the Minneapolis Plan. Reviewing the Future Land Use maps revealed a disparity between the number of neighborhood commercial nodes and community corridors in north Minneapolis and in south Minneapolis. The ViNA Board of Directors believes that the draft plan is missing several critical neighborhood commercial nodes and community corridors in North Minneapolis. It is essential that these nodes and corridors be identified as such in the Minneapolis Plan as this designation will make these nodes and corridors eligible for grants from Minneapolis and other funders - as we have seen in the recent Great Streets RFPs recently issued by the City . The Victory Neighborhood Association is requesting the following changes to the draft Minneapolis Plan / Chapter 1 Land Use: 39th and Thomas Avenues North be designated a neighborhood commercial node. 42nd and Thomas Avenues North be designated a neighborhood commercial node. Dowling Avenue North from Victory Memorial Drive to I-94 be designated a community corridor. 42nd Avenue North from Victory Memorial Drive to Lyndale Avenue North be designated a community corridor. Penn Avenue North /Osseo Road from Dowling Avenue North to 49th Avenue North be designated a community corridor. A review of the descriptions of community corridors and neighborhood commercial nodes along with thorough and first hand knowledge and understanding of the activities at the above mentioned nodes and on the above mentioned corridors have satisfied us that their designation as such in the Minneapolis Plan is both appropriate and necessary.</p>	<p>letter - Victory neighborhood association</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. 42nd and Thomas added as Neighborhood Commercial Node. Penn Avenue from Dowling to 44th Ave N added as community corridor. 42nd Avenue not added as community corridor, but 42nd and Fremont added as Neighborhood Commercial Node.</p>
<p>Finally, we request that when updating the Comp Plan that you do not change the past designation of "neighborhood node" for the area at the intersection of 22nd Ave. NE and Johnson St. NE. We believe it has all the significant characteristics of other areas designated as neighborhood nodes in the Comp Plan. It is also how the community and WPCiA have generally thought of and have described the area in public discussions. It should be further noted that the node at Johnson and 22nd serves an important identity point in the center of the Windom Park neighborhood. Neighbors point with pride to businesses such as the neon shop, Marino's, and the upscale Boji Salon. In the proposed city plan, the city removes this area from its listed commercial nodes. So, not only do we request that you reconsider changing the status of this area but assist the neighbors in strengthening the unique character of this section of Windom Park . The node sits at the intersection of two corridors in Windom Park. Johnson Street divides the neighborhood west and east, and 22nd Avenue divides south and north. Additionally, 22nd Avenue is a designated bike route. The site of Marino's Deli has served as a focal point of the neighborhood for several generations. Prior to its existing use, the building was used as a doctor's office and a pharmacy. Some neighbors tell stories of jumping off the street car in front of the building to get an ice-cream cone there. In 2005, the University of Minnesota's Metropolitan Design Center completed a study of Johnson St. NE. The study indicates that the businesses at 22nd and Johnson provide a sense of identity for the neighborhood. Additionally, the study suggests changes to the streetscape to beautify and attract the attention of those outside the neighborhood.</p>	<p>letter - Windom Park</p>	<p>Duplicate comment – see above</p>

<p>1.1.5 Concerning compatibility with nearby properties, neighborhood character, etc. Our neighborhood has suffered because new developments are not considered in context by those reviewing plans and in many cases neighborhood groups are not notified or not given an opportunity to give input. The City's Administrative Review process has allowed inferior development to occur without neighborhood review and needs to be amended. The character and charm of our historic neighborhood is being wiped out in favor of expediting the development process.</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes</p>	<p>Duplicate comment – see above</p>
--	------------------------------	--------------------------------------

## TRANSPORTATION

Comment	Source	Response
<p>It seems weak on the LRT and Trolley section and details. I believe the city should develop fixed rail lines like the old street car lines in a system so that people don't have to rely on automobiles. We've become automobile crazy and it hurts the livability of the city. Buses, while an adjunct do not provide an attractive alternative, and because of their flexibility do not influence development along their corridor. The city needs to identify and promote LRT and other similar alternatives. It's not enough to go to the public and just ask what they want. The public wants another beer and another law and order TV series. Too often asking the public, without any leadership from our elected officials, becomes a justification of the status quo. (2/19/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Plan provides strong support for transit options, including seeking funding. See Appendix C for additional detail on transit planning efforts.</p>
<p>p. 10, policy 2.8.4 Consideration of eliminating parking requirements should be tempered by a recognition that drivers will be likely to seek parking in nearby residential areas, with a resultant negative effect on those neighborhoods. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Land Use chapter addresses mitigating negative impacts of development on surrounding areas</p>
<p>Add-encouraging more frequent and expanded feeder bus lines into major lines and into connection with LRT 2.4.2 – “disadvantaged” – add increased mobility options for seniors/disabled. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>See Appendix C for more details on transit planning based on primary transit network concept. Made change to 2.4.2</p>
<p>General comment: The University of Minnesota is the single largest employer in Minneapolis. Studies of the labor shed of these employees show that a large majority (76%) live outside Minneapolis, and only 3.6% live in University-adjacent neighborhoods. Vehicular commuting by this population has a major impact on the city's road system. One way to ease this burden would be for the City to delineate a policy of working with the University to encourage employees to live close to campus. This would have the auxiliary effect of countering the dramatic shift currently occurring in these neighborhoods from owner-occupied to rental housing, as faculty and staff would be likely to purchase homes and become longer-term residents. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Appendix C provides details on transportation strategy for U of M area</p>
<p>It is not a specific policy, but the plan mentions that the barge terminal in Minneapolis will be shut down. This is a mistake. With peak oil coming, alternative modes of transporting freight will increase in use and trucking will decrease. Barging, the most fuel-efficient method of transportation, will become more relevant as volatility of oil prices increase. I repeat, it is a mistake to be closing the barge terminal, it will regain its importance as a transportation method. (2/1/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Shutting down the barge terminal is adopted city policy.</p>
<p>Encourage employers to reward employees for choosing to live close to the workplace. (Improves productivity: less stress from long commutes, fewer work days lost to travel problems, better health if more walking/biking to work is possible) (1/31/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Not generally enforceable</p>

<p>Please consider the critical importance of the emerging transportation crossroads at 5th St. N. and 5th Ave. N. This area needs special attention to make sure there will be sufficient capacity to accommodate the many forms of convergent transit, including pedestrians. Skyways at this location are inappropriate in that they discourage best efforts to make our city walkable and take too many eyes off the streets. It would be a mistake to try to funnel pedestrians into tubes and skyways and separate pedestrians from trains, buses and cars. Transportation crossroads are supposed to be busy and vital. The mix provides energy and excitement. Too often our (unfortunate) cultural instincts lead us to plan for the worst conditions and separate rather than mix the elements. Skyways bifurcate pedestrian flows and leave us with little chance to create the critical density required for great cities. (1/28/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Access Minneapolis planning process addressing specific transportation issues downtown. Urban design chapter has skyway policy, as do Downtown small area plans, incorporated by reference in comp plan (see Appendix B).</p>
<p>I'd like to see greater attention given to parking as it relates to the city's ability to plow and maintain roadways... one side of the street parking for instance -- park on the even side in even years, the odd side in odd years. In the winter in particular, navigating streets (by bike or car) is dangerous. The extra space would ensure adequate snow removal to the curb and a more friendly experience. In high density areas where supply of parking is critical, roads currently noted as "no parking" could be opened for one sided parking - minimizing the impact. Also, reopening Nicollet Avenue (yes, the Kmart site is critical) and should be addressed as a major artery in the trans system for 2020. (1/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Parking/snow removal concept is a regulatory, not policy, issue. Plan supports reopening Nicollet Ave in Land Use chapter.</p>
<p>Additional tactics related to improving safe bikeways would be helpful - dedicated bikeways on low use city streets for instance - bike highways for instance... (1/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>City bicycle plan, which will provide more detailed guidance on developing bicycle facilities, is currently underway.</p>
<p>Pg 5 discusses the Primary Transit Network, including LRT, BRT, and commuter rail, saying that the city should grow around these corridors. This seems to assume that any significant extension of the LRT, BRT, and commuter rail systems is actually in the works. The Central corridor LRT will be done by 2014 at the earliest, and it could be another decade after that until we see the Southwest corridor LRT or any other real advancements in our metro's transportation network. So how can we grow around these corridors when they do not exist and may well not exist for decades? Growth does not occur around city bus routes. It takes LRT, BRT, commuter rail, or streetcars for real density and prosperity to occur. It just seems like this plan is dependent on fantasies that are years away from becoming real. (1/11/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>The City is actively working on developing fixed route transit facilities. Growth and development already have occurred along major bus routes in the City, as well as the Hiawatha LRT.</p>
<p>There is too little explanation of what can be done to secure funding for expanding the PTN. Pg 11 states that regional transit lines like LRT, BRT, and commuter rail are "typically financed through a combination of local, state, and federal dollars". Given Governor Pawlenty's stance against funding LRT in particular, how can state dollars be expected to come through? And without the state dollars, federal matching funds will be hard to come by as well. The plan should offer a better idea than waiting and hoping that these projects will get done. Minneapolis should dedicate time and energy to supporting transit growth independently if need be. Just because the state balks at expanding transit doesn't mean the city should as well. (1/11/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>The plan supports advocating for additional transit funding (policy 2.9), and exploring a range of options for funding sources, including state and local ones.</p>

<p>Several statements refer to limiting car use. While improving walkways and bikeways is important, along with having some public transportation, you cannot convince people to stop using cars by limiting development of roadways and parking. Striving to make car travel difficult will convince people to leave the city. This has been proven as the suburbs continue to grow significantly while the city has to fight for every inch of growth. Make car travel a priority rather than fighting it. (1/5/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>The plan provides support for maintaining and improving roads for auto traffic (policy 2.6).</p>
<p>Car travel is a reality. Please work to make it more efficient by improving the infrastructure not by forcing people out of their cars. Make parking a priority. Good walkways and bikeways are nice, but face it, nobody wants to walk during the winter. Quality roads and parking are necessary. (1/5/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>The plan provides guidance for ensuring adequate roads and parking (2.6 and 2.8)</p>
<p>2.2.4 Residential areas (for example Park and Portland Avenue) have been severely impacted by increased traffic and must be protected from excessive use and speeds. 2.2.6 and 2.3.4 The severing of major arteries, Nicollet Avenue in south Minneapolis for the construction of the Kmart at Lake Street, is a perfect example of the negative impact this can cause. Where this has happened, it should be restored. 2.6.4 Lights in the city should be re-timed to promote traffic flow and reduce fuel consumption. (1/1/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>These statements reflect existing policies in plan. Support for opening Nicollet Ave in Land Use chapter.</p>
<p>A moratorium on land acquisition for motorized transportation would be a strong tool in guiding the city toward alternative transportation. Streetcars are a large part of the solution. Too truly be a city of the future we must take a serious look at more innovative concepts such as Taxi 2000 that could free up as much as 30% of land use in downtown Minneapolis, this would pay for the rails in tax revenue while improving air quality and pedestrian safety and possibly increase green space. (1/1/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Consistent with existing plan policy direction</p>
<p>Thank you to all the City officials and everyone involved who support alternate modes of transportation such as biking, LRT and buses. I am dismayed that 62% of commuters still drive to work alone – I encourage co-workers, friends and family to give the LRT and buses a chance. Good experiences have converted a few people. As a tax payer, I am willing to pay more for expansion of LRT, bike trails and additional buses. Please pass this information on to the decision makers that the City of Minneapolis needs to continue funding for these types of transportation. (12/12/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>The plan supports funding for these improvements</p>
<p>Check on streetcar lines – would like to reference more explicitly in transportation chapter (including five alternatives)</p>	<p>CM Gordon</p>	<p>The city is still considering options for streetcars, and discussions is still in preliminary stages</p>

		regarding preferred routes. Plan supports further study and analysis of options
Discussion of Lowry Ave bridge – how will this fit into plan? Long vs. short bridge design has implications for adjacent land uses. Lowry Ave bridge will be very wide – could be bikeway or major transitway, not certain if needs to be so wide; doesn't want 4 lanes of auto traffic making it pedestrian and bike unfriendly. Do we need better discussion of how this is going to happen citywide? Don't miss opportunities	CM Hofstede	Plan supports prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian improvements on new and rehabilitated facilities
Transportation chapter: need to add "improve and increase the bike path network to increase efficiency and safety"	1/17/08 open house	Additional language on bicycle network and safety added
Would like more emphasis on access consolidation and access closure onto trunk highway system	1/28/08 open house	Plan supports needed improvements to highway system in City. Appendix C provides more detail on access management strategies
I live in Hale-Page-Diamond Lake, and feel an east-west corridor including bus transit is needed. It is very hard to use 50 <sup>th</sup> Street other than by car.	1/28/08 open house	Primary transit network is being developed to serve all areas of the City
I'm glad for the increased attention and expectation on traffic issues/transportation. This is embedded in a successful plan. I need to know that neighborhood input will be weighed seriously.	1/28/08 open house	Thank you. We are reviewing and responding to all comments received from neighborhoods and other stakeholders
You state in this plan that multimodal and bikes are a priority. However, Access Minneapolis proposes eliminating two of the most heavily used bike lanes for parking, 2 <sup>nd</sup> and Marquette	1/28/08 open house	Noted. A citywide bicycle plan, now under development, will address the need for bicycle routes downtown and elsewhere in the city.
Chp 2: Transportation – Thrilled to see more rail, not thrilled they are ignoring city rules for building maintenance, paying for road improvements, and stacking of containers 5-8 high at Shoreham	1/29/08 open house	Regulatory issues, not policy

I'm wondering why the City of Mpls., seems not to acknowledge a future with electric & hydrogen cars? Is this something that should receive some attention in the "transportation" section of the upcoming city comp plan revision? I'm not interested in providing a treatise on it, just raising a concern about perhaps a "blind spot" here. Around mid to end of December of 2007, I read the highly celebrated book "Zoom" ... most of it's difficult to plow through, but last couple chapters are quite telling. I think the electric & hydrogen cars will come about as fast, or faster, than the conversion to portable computers (1980s to present). First the CEOs will have 'em, then the VPs, then the managers, and then common to most households. (Obviously it took IBM by surprise and a lot of other mainframers ... but when the transition occurred, wow and watch out ... sort of also like the early portable phones, the precursors to the cell phones of today!) **I just noticed in the STRIB, perhaps a week or two ago (main section & also in biz section) that Nissan, Renault and Israel, will engage in a real demo of how the electric car is feasible in urban areas.** The City appears to diminish its claim to be engaged in a really forward-thinking planning processes by refusing to acknowledge that cars (albeit perhaps smaller and with other energy than gasoline) WILL be in our future; I can't see folks in several neighborhoods relying solely or mostly on transit. Heck, we have a lot of households with 2 or more cars (and some neighborhoods with extra garage space reserved for the guys' 'classic cars'); surely, however, they'll retain one car at a minimum. I can only imagine that the vast majority of upper income and even most middle-class folks will NEVER go without a car in MN. (I look at even a lot of low-income folks, and they have cars, if not used or beaters.) Plus, many with cars, provide rides to some without cars (esp friends/relatives), especially to locations not conveniently served by transit. And, there's segments of the population who can't avoid "multi-tasking" (esp for some members of a family with assorted roles & responsibilities) and the car facilitates that. (I could go on.) Yes, many will hop on transit if it's provided & takes them where they want/have to go, but many will continue to have 'garages' at their homes (or under or next to their condos) for their car(s). Plus, a lot of more highly paid professional jobs require a car, because servicing the client-base doesn't mean one can simply go to one office, and remain there all day from 9 AM to 5 PM. I personally do not understand how South Hennepin Ave. from Franklin to Henn-Lake will be able to "handle" two lanes of transit, two lanes of motor vehicles, and one 'parking lane.' Why? Because this stretch of South Henn (Franklin to Lake & Henn) carries about the same volume (almost 28,000 vehicles/day) that Washington Avenue near U of M carries. As you probably know, the U of M is spouting that it needs a different transit alignment other than Washington Avenue because it can't handle both the cars, and the transit. So, if the U of M is begging for a re-routing, I can't imagine why the businesses and neighborhoods (esp upper income ones) will not eventually ask for a different routing of transit & cars along South Hennepin. Obviously I'm transit-supportive; but that doesn't have to translate into "let's ignore the future for/of cars" , esp those with alternative energies such as electric & hydrogen.

email - Lin Schutz

Environment chapter has policy supporting use of alternative fuel vehicles, and other strategies to reduce reliance on fossil fuels. Transportation chapter does address need for accommodating automobile traffic, balanced against other modes.

<p>Observations LNA's reading of the plan is that vehicle traffic will be discouraged in the future in order to help make Minneapolis a more pedestrian friendly city. If the intention is to go down this road, LNA would encourage the City to take a broader look at policies that encourage automotive transportation, particularly zoning regulations that require large number of parking spaces for businesses. Recommendations Extend the amount and number of bike lanes to encourage more bicycling. On street bike lanes should be constructed from Lake Street to 42 nd Street on Blaisdell Avenue and from MLK Park to downtown on 1 st Avenue. LNA recommends that there be a greater effort to locate bike racks around the City to help foster economic development and greater use of bicycles. LNA recommend that the City focus on developing a multimodal transportation system, including street cars. Further Questions · Where does the City contemplate using toll roads? · Where would toll roads create traffic on residential streets and how much more traffic they would create? · Would the focus of toll roads be to move traffic smoother and faster, to collect funds for improvements, or both? · The city should further define what a "walkable" city means?</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	<p>Regulatory requirements for parking are now under review. Citywide bicycle plan, now under development, will prioritize bicycle facility improvements. Specific plans for toll roads have not been fully developed, but tolls should be considered as an option for funding/traffic flow. Citywide pedestrian plan now under development to clarify vision for a walkable city.</p>
<p>Address the inconsistency between accommodation of high traffic volumes and creation of a quality pedestrian environment. Accommodating anticipated high traffic volumes on many roadways and fostering a quality pedestrian environment on those same corridors may be incompatible goals. For example, University Avenue through Prospect Park and the University of Minnesota is expected to carry among the highest traffic volumes of the city's road network. Congestion is likely to be increased by the presence of light rail along the corridor, particularly if an at-grade alignment along Washington Avenue is selected. It is certainly laudable, in theory, to encourage a pedestrian orientation for development in these corridors, but, in practice, how can that be accomplished in the face of such high traffic counts? More consideration needs to be given to how to manage these traffic volumes, including the sensitive siting of structured parking facilities.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Policy 2.2 addresses the balance between traffic flow and pedestrian orientation. Access Minneapolis design guidelines provide specific guidance for corridor design.</p>

<p>Consider the impact of the University of Minnesota on the city's transportation challenges. The University of Minnesota is the single largest employer in Minneapolis. Studies of the laborshed of these employees show that a large majority (76%) live outside Minneapolis, and only 3.6% live in University-adjacent neighborhoods. Vehicular commuting by this population has a major impact on the city's road system. One way to ease this burden would be for the City to delineate a policy of working with the University to encourage employees to live close to campus. This would have the auxiliary effect of countering the dramatic shift currently occurring in these neighborhoods from owner-occupied to rental housing, as faculty and staff would be likely to purchase homes and become longer-term residents.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>See Appendix C for discussion of transportation issues in U of M area</p>
<p>Chapter 2: Transportation Policy 2.2: Support successful streets in communities by balancing the needs of all modes of transportation with land use policy. Add 2.2.7 Successful streets are connected to the communities through the comprehensive boulevard street tree system. This benefits the pedestrian activities, provides cooling, and adds not only ecological value but also social value to the street system as it serves all the neighborhoods and business areas. Policy 2.3: Encourage walking throughout the City by ensuring that routes are safe, comfortable, and pleasant. Add 2.3.8 Street trees are a key element to encourage walking on sidewalks and along streets throughout the neighborhoods and provide part of the essential infrastructure to make the walking experience safe, comfortable, and attractive. Policy 2.8: Balance the demand for parking with objectives for improving the environment for transit, walking, and bicycling life while supporting businesses. Add 2.8.9 Require that trees be planted and maintained in parking lots to help mitigate the heat island effect and provide attractive settings for pedestrians while integrating parking lots into the neighborhood. Trees also can be used in combination with storm water features to assist in the evapo-transpiration of storm water without the use of land consumptive ponding systems.</p>	<p>letter - Tree Advisory</p>	<p>Policy supporting trees found in Environment and Open and Parks chapters. While important, this is more of an environmental than a transportation issue. Landscaping around parking addressed in Urban Design chapter.</p>
<p>Also, there is a desire to make comment on the ongoing concerns about the traffic situation at the Quarry shopping center. Much discussion has been recorded, neighborhood studies conducted, communication with the City and the mall property owners have been had and all the attention continues to point to this being a problem unsolved. The greatest area of concern is how car traffic is accommodated in a manner that encourages a problematic tangle of pedestrian and car flow-through traffic at the store entrance areas. We believe this is an area for improvement that merits attention no less than any other section of the City or traffic intersection.</p>	<p>letter - Windom Park</p>	<p>Support for balancing the various modes (auto, pedestrian, etc.) in Policy 2.2</p>
<p>We need greater emphasis on non-car transportation...more people on public transportation</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes</p>	<p>Consistent with policies in plan</p>
<p>DETAILED TRACK CHANGE COMMENTS - See other document</p>	<p>letter - Downtown</p>	<p>Most comments are incorporated into draft.</p>

	TMO	Specific goals for sustainability indicators are not. The comprehensive plan will link to the sustainability indicators in the Environment chapter. The comp plan in general will not have specific numerical goals.
--	-----	--

## HOUSING

Comment	Source	Response
<p>3.7.1 Support rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, and sensitive renovation of older or historic housing stock, through education and financial incentives. I am currently trying to create an apartment in a 110 year old house. This would be a low income affordable housing unit. The city plan review process are more concerned with exact code, than with preservation of historic housing or the need for affordable housing. As a result this unit may not happen. The city should work with owners and landlords to find workable solutions, not just use a heavy hand. This heavy hand is what has resulted in so many abandoned properties in Minneapolis. (2/19/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Affirms policy in draft plan</p>
<p>3.8.2 The phrase 'to make sure buildings and yards are properly maintained.' seems to emphasize the exterior aspects of property maintenance. How about something like '...building systems, building exteriors and yards...'? Thu, 1/31/08 5:27 Affordable housing and the continuum of housing needed by Minneapolis residents could be better further woven throughout the section and not only located just in an affordable housing section. Additionally, there needs to be greater attention to the disparity between community of color and Caucasian homeowners. (2/17/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. Added language related to property upkeep [1]. Added language concerning improving minority home ownership [10]</p>
<p>I would recommend adding a sub-section under policy 3.3: 3.3.9 The City of Minneapolis recognizes the importance of ensuring affordable housing for its residents today, but also for future residents of the City. The City will continue its efforts to support programs and methods that ensure perpetually affordable housing opportunities. Add the following language within the narrative in Policy 3.5: The City of Minneapolis recognizes that the type of housing also impacts who is socio-economically and demographically served. The city is cognizant of this and will incorporate these considerations into planning and market building strategies. (2/17/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. Added language related to perpetual affordability [2].</p>
<p>Affordable housing and the continuum of housing needed by Minneapolis residents could be better further woven throughout the section and not only located just in an affordable housing section. Additionally, there needs to be greater attention to the disparity between community of color and Caucasian homeowners. (2/17/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. Added language concerning improving minority home ownership [10]</p>

<p>I would like to see innovation in terms of co-housing. How can we build more LEED certified shared housing that will be better environmentally and support people to live in closer connection to each other. I am a part of a group, Sage Green Co-housing, that wants to live in the city, as elderly folks, within close range of grocery store, a transit and help each other age in place. (2/17/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Affirms policy in draft plan</p>
<p>Foreclosures, long-term affordability, and racial disparities in housing need to be more prominent in the plan. These are all issues that will not go away in the next couple of years and will unfortunately be part of the next Mpls. Plan comments unless we are more proactive in addressing now. (2/17/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. Declined to adjust language related to foreclosures [3]. Added language related to long-term affordability [2]. Added language concerning improving minority home ownership [10]</p>
<p>3.6.5 - Increase emphasis on dedicated senior housing, within legal restrictions. 3.7.4--"high quality materials' Add-promote and give incentives for environmentally sound materials and practices ...LEED standards. This compliments design and environmental section (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. Added language increasing the plan's attention to the need for additional housing for seniors. [4] LEED comments support policies already addressed in Environment chapter.</p>
<p>Chapter 3: Housing pp. 4-5, policy 3.1.3 Streamlining development review has sometimes had the effect of allowing sub-standard and inappropriate projects to proceed. Development should not be pursued at the expense of high design standards, sensitivity to context, and true consideration of neighborhood input. This policy also suggest that locating dense housing on transit corridors "is the least disruptive of existing neighborhoods." This cannot always assumed to be the case; please see previous comments regarding the likely impact of high-density housing along University Avenue on the directly adjacent existing low-density residential neighborhood. pp. 9-10, policy 3.6 In the Prospect Park neighborhood, we are eager to see the development of housing for seniors who are unable to stay in their older single-family houses but would like to remain in the neighborhood. To date, private developers have not yet appreciated the size of this potential market, and active involvement from the City may be required. While rental housing is needed, the city should be proactive in guarding against drastic shifts in the relative proportion of ownership and rental housing in any area. Some neighborhoods are moving toward an inordinately high concentration of rental housing. This has become a particular issue in the neighborhoods around the University of Minnesota, where owner-occupied housing has been</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. Added language increasing the plan's attention to the need for additional housing for seniors. [4] Added language related to the rental-ownership balance and enforcing occupancy codes. [5] Strengthened language about being slow to demolish housing [6]</p>

purchased (often by absentee landlords) and converted into student tenements. The stability and integrity of these neighborhoods has been significantly diminished by this trend. The city should articulate a policy of fostering owner-occupancy in these areas. Owner-occupied housing is typically better maintained, and the long-term commitment that owners make to a neighborhood results in greater community stability and investment. pp. 10-12, policies 3.7 and 3.8 policies 3.7.1, 3.7.3: For the City to truly advance the policy of maintaining its older housing stock, the Heritage Preservation Commission must alter its rather cavalier approach toward demolitions. Currently, the HPC appears to reward a property owner for failure to perform ongoing maintenance on a structure by granting a demolition permit when the structure has deteriorated. The property owner is then able to pursue his ultimate goal of replacing the older structure with new infill, often designed in a manner incompatible with its context. policies 3.7.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.2: Inspections, particularly of rental housing, should be frequent and rigorous to ensure that declines in condition are arrested before they have gone too far. Enforcement of occupancy codes should also be increased and additional regulations should be put in place, as current City codes have proven inadequate to address this issue. The consequences of over-occupancy in rental housing are creating an expanding blight in the University-adjacent neighborhoods of Southeast Minneapolis. The language in these policies appears to support these concerns, but current City practices have been at odds with these goals. How will City procedures actually change to ensure that the stated policies are put into practice? For example, while Policy 3.7.4 promotes the use of high-quality materials in new construction, the current practice of approving small multi-family projects (up to four units) through administrative review with only the most minimal standards has resulted in a proliferation of poor-quality, context-insensitive student tenement developments on sites previously occupied by older homes, demolished with HPC approval. (2/15/08)

<p>There should be more attention made to affordable housing and it should be related to each policy initiative and not separated out on it's own with a reference to the Unified Housing Policy. Additionally, it is very important that the plan speaks to how we are going to decrease the disparity between the community of color and Caucasian homeowners and be cognizant of who we are serving when we focus on corridors or high end condo developments in the city. I would venture to guess that the condos downtown are serving a disproportionate number of Caucasian owners. It's not a bad thing to support high-end condos, but we should recognize who we are serving and ensure there is a balanced approach across the city. (2/11/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Added language concerning improving minority home ownership [10]</p>
<p>In general, living and working on the North Side, I feel there is a lot of language in this chapter that makes value statements. It seems like there is a lot of Myron Orfield language in here, which talks a lot about deconcentration of poverty, but does not provide a good way to re-integrate our urban neighborhoods with a good cross section of incomes and diverse households. There should not be content and tone in this document that makes one socio-economic class less valuable than another, even if it is a blue collar, working class neighborhood (i.e., the introduction to policy 3.5, bottom of page 7, top of page 8.) Low-income is not bad, nor is it a "fundamental pre-condition". It is a reality for the vast majority of people on this planet, and it is frustrating to be de-valued just on the premise that my household income is less than the guy in Linden Hills. I live in North, and I love my neighbors, as low-income and valuable citizens of this city. 3... this document does not address the issue of foreclosure, which will be one of the most significant municipal efforts over the next 3-10 years. "Housing in Minneapolis" -- "about half the housing units in the city are single family homes". I have heard it stated that out of the 15,000 rental units in the city, 80% of them are in 1-4 unit buildings. The rest of this document goes on to talk about "medium and high density housing", and fails to address the 1-4 unit building that constitutes the vast majority of our housing stock. "Housing Growth, Density and Location" -- The picture should be changed to a project that undergirds the points next to the photograph, like a picture of the Corridor Flats, or Cedar28... The project shown is in a fairly stable environment, with an ample propensity for a significant tax base. 3.1.1 - it sounds like the "appropriate" locations have already been determined (by whom?) and that it sounds like a matter of</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. Adjusted tone referencing "disadvantaged communities" and "fundamental pre-conditions" [11] Declined to adjust language related to foreclosures. [3] Made a number of additional modifications to language.</p>

educating the community of these locations and their intrinsic (but not obvious) appropriateness. I would suggest a rewording of this statement. 3.2 - Picture is one of very little architectural interest, how about Hiawatha Commons, or the Corridor Flats? 3.2.2 - "Educate" is a very paternalistic term, maybe "facilitate a discussion", or "dialogue" with communities? This has the sense that determinations have been made, and communities have very little to no input, but need to be "educated" to understand how and why their neighborhood or community is "appropriate". "Affordable Housing and Homelessness" - It is unclear what the target income of the City's housing efforts are focused on with the language in this paragraph. Is mixed-income the strategy? What about the vast number of single family structures? 3.3.9 (new policy sub point) - add something in here that speaks to the importance and strategy of and for the preservation of existing 1-4 unit buildings in our city that make up the vast majority of our housing stock (both rental and owner-occupied). 3.4 - although PSP is a great program, we deal with folks that come out of their housing with all of their resources used up and nothing to get them to the next step in the "housing continuum". Could there be some language in 3.4.2 that states: "... by becoming a conduit of resources via partnerships to provide transitional support up the housing continuum that cannot be exhausted in the previous step or is refreshed at each step" 3.5 - as stated above, I feel a lot of the language in the preface to this policy is de-valuing, judgmental, and bordering on offensive. In addition, we talk about the "disadvantaged" neighborhoods and talk about diversifying the economic mix of households, BUT, when looking at the strategy to do that, there is a disproportionate number of "neighborhood commercial nodes" identified through which the economic stimulation will occur, largely NON-EXISTANT NORTH MPLS. To cure this, we need to recognize the lack of NCN's on the North side and set aside (either geographically designated or undesignated) an equivalent number of NCN's to be assigned or available to the North Side. The number of nodes could be calculated by taking the total number of nodes on the South Side divided by the area (square feet or square miles) and then apply that to the area (sf or square miles) of the north side to determine how many NCNs the North Side should have (just to establish equivalence to the south side, not to mention progress). 3.5.2 – the “middle-income” connotation is a reference to “middle class” and has a lot of “value” references implicit in the language. I think it should be changed to

<p>“mixed-income”. 3.5.6 – as it is stated, this does not recognize the existing pathways to home ownership. Maybe: “Utilize and support existing and new pathways for qualified low-income families to become homewoners, with appropriate support”. 3.5.7 – this recognizes the owner-occupied mortgage defaults, but ignores the investor related defaults, which in our experience is more prevalent than the owner-occupied defaults. 3.5.8 – Mirror comments above talking about neighborhood commercial nodes and the lack of these “fundable” nodes on the north side to address the “disadvantages” of the north side. Who are the “investors” and are they the same investors that are being discouraged from buying foreclosed homes on the north side? How do we stimulate sustainable investment and discourage exploitation? 3.5.9 – Vacant lots are an issue, but VACANT BUILDINGS are a MAJOR issue. Consider changing the language to encourage rehab, tear-down, AND infill housing. 3.5.10 – This is probably one of the most significant issues in our community. Addressing the adequacy of management is far more substantial than hitting rental property owners with additional fees at rental unit sale or conversion from owner-occupancy to rental. We need attention paid to MANAGEMENT issues and enforcement of the powers that the city already has to address these issues, including the Tennant Remedies Act, License Revocation, and a number of other tools. Housing Choice – the picture does not depict housing that accommodates the caption. These are mostly condos that are not deemed necessarily “affordable” and defiantly not accommodating to households with multiple members, including children. 3.6 – what is a “complete community”? How is that measured? Who determines what that looks like? Who determines if that is desirable to all residents of the city? With “high-quality” comes cost, especially to the lower-income brackets. However, in the previous policy 3.5.9, it is clear that the city is trying to lower the subsidy... how and who will achieve this level of quality? (2/5/08)</p>		
<p>It is too vague, and needs action items under each of the Policies to provide clarity on what kind of measurable activity the policy is going to stimulate. (2/5/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comment focuses on a level of policy more detailed than TMP</p>
<p>Again, it is very brief, and lacks detail. It is very difficult to determine how the policy is going to guide and influence decisions. (2/5/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comment focuses on a level of policy more detailed than TMP</p>

<p>The chapter-opening picture shows homes built in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, but refers to the neighborhood as one of the oldest in the City. Perhaps a photo showing some of the really old Marcy Holmes homes would be more appropriate, or the caption should be adjusted. (1/31/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Language adjusted</p>
<p>There could be some mention, perhaps in the narrative material, of the potential for revitalizing the residential neighborhoods near the University of Minnesota through the new University Community Partnership District and its alliance with the University. Other valuable partners in housing might also be mentioned, all in one short paragraph in the opening 'Housing in Minneapolis' section. Such a mention would be a reminder to readers of the necessity for such partnerships. (1/31/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Declined to make changes</p>
<p>Could there be a comment somewhere about encouraging incentives (by businesses and institutions) to promote employees living near their workplaces? (1/31/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Declined to make change. Could still be considered in a more detail level policy document. [7]</p>
<p>There is a great deal of vagueness when the word “support” is used. For example The City of Minneapolis will “support” the enforcement of the current housing codes and ensure landlords are keeping their properties up. That’s great but how? Doesn’t the city currently support enforcement? How will enforcing the housing codes and maintenance affect those who don’t maintain their homes because of financial inability? Many people don’t have the skill for “do it yourself” projects and can’t afford contractors to do the work for them. This leads to the deterioration of the housing stock. How will landlords be forced to maintain their properties? Relying on tenants to complain doesn’t work, they don’t want to lose their home because their landlord isn’t doing his/her job. Housing is hard to find here in Minneapolis and affordable housing is even harder to find. How will the city address finding adequate housing for those displaced by the city enforcing code on slum lords? I support the action, landlords in North Minneapolis have allowed housing to deteriorate out of control, but I wonder how it will be accomplished and who it will affect. (1/9/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comment focuses on a level of policy more detailed than TMP</p>

Page 3 “More recently, multifamily housing developments have been primarily located Downtown, or focused along the city’s commercial corridors.” What does the city plan to do to reverse this trend? Multifamily housing would be beneficial to all areas of the city, not just a few corridors. People living in multi-family housing are usually unable to afford to purchase a home, which means they are low income. By ignoring this issue of bringing lower income people into all neighborhoods in Minneapolis you add to the concentration of poverty in only certain areas. This trend is bad for the city and for development efforts. My son attends Dowling, but we can't afford to live in that area because there are few housing options for low income residents in that neighborhood. Page 4 “For this reason, housing growth frequently requires acquisition and demolition of previously developed areas, with new construction following at an increased density.” Is it reasonable to ask for the city to make it possible or attractive for individuals to purchase and create infill housing? Right now I don’t think we could do this, because there are no current programs to allow for the construction of a new home. Perhaps an infill development program for non-developers could be created. I would ask that you require new housing fit in with the surrounding neighborhood housing stock. 3:1:1 and 3:2:2 What do you mean by “appropriate?” Is this language to protect you from having to create affordable housing in all areas of the city? Is this to keep apartment buildings out of south west Minneapolis? It sure sounds like it. 3:3:1 There are housing development finance programs? Are they available only to developers? What about people who want to buy a house (like my family) but can't because the only ones we can afford are run down and the banks won't loan money to rehabilitate those properties. Will there be consideration of this issue in regards to housing development? What about making it feasible for a single family to create infill housing? 3:4:1 There is a lot of talk about bringing higher and middle income housing into disadvantaged areas but little talk about how the city will encourage the development of affordable housing in “advantaged” areas. This is a two way street and working on one side does not indicate good intentions on the part of the city. Affordable housing can't be located in just a few areas, this leads to the problem we see now. 3:4:3 How will the city support the creation of this housing? Will they advocate for supporting the nonprofit agencies providing this housing? Hennepin County forced the closure of a successful group home for homeless youth in recent years by

Website

Comments informed final draft. Made language changes clarifying that affordable housing is desired in all Minneapolis communities. [14] Strengthened language about being slow to demolish housing [6]

cutting contracted payments to such a level that the housing could no longer operate. The money paid just wouldn't support keeping the housing open. How will the city work around those tough issues?

Policy 3:5 I am concerned by the overall lack of mention of developing affordable housing in all areas of the city. There should be an effort to develop and assist people in moving from North Minneapolis to other areas of the city. This effort should coincide with moving middle class and higher income earners into North Minneapolis. Doing one without the other looks like you are just ridding the city of the "problem" people in North Minneapolis. 3:5:4 You also need to work with the advantaged neighborhoods to promote affordable housing in THEIR areas. This isn't just about creating higher priced housing in North Minneapolis, is it? It sounds like it. Affordable housing should be available in every neighborhood. They need to know that teachers, nonprofit workers and others are the people who need affordable housing. We must fight the stereotype of affordable housing residents. 3:5:6 We qualified for a loan, but found working with the banks that own foreclosed properties difficult. They don't care about the community, all they want is profit. Some of them prefer to write the property off in their taxes so there is a disincentive to sell for what the house is actually worth. The price is often much higher than can be afforded with repairs needed and loan officers will not sign off on loans where the rehab cost is more than a certain percentage of the total amount borrowed. Supporting and encouraging isn't enough, what is the city willing to do to forge partnerships with the banks that own foreclosed homes? 3:5:9 Support timely infill housing, that is also environmentally friendly, fits in with the neighborhood look and feel and adds to the culture of the area it is to be located in. I am sickened when I see some new vinyl clad home amongst older homes with more character. The newer homes should not stick out like a sore thumb like that. People can move to the suburbs for plastic housing. Minneapolis should do better. 3:6:2 It needs to be stated that this will happen in ALL neighborhoods. You will plan for low income housing and development in the south west area, which is typically high income, and you will plan for higher income housing options in the northern area. Picking just one area to implement this strategy looks like you are kicking out poor people in favor of wealthier individuals. 3:7:4 Require long lasting and environmentally friendly materials to ensure the longevity of housing stock. As the green movement rightfully builds retrofitting housing with energy saving options will be a

<p>burden the home owners won't be able to afford. This will place retrofiting into the city's lap, so it's best to require it up front to save money overall for the city and for the residents. 3:7:5 Continuing regular inspections of rental housing is not good enough when it hasn't been carried out in the past with any regularity. If it has, the inspectors have missed a great deal of housing problems on the North side. There should be an increase in the inspections and you need to outline how the inspection process will be improved and implemented fairly. 3:7:8 Truth in sale inspections are already required for the sale of housing. I have looked at several truth in sale reports, as I have been seeking housing. These reports are insufficient at best and I have had to pay for private inspections to get a more detailed and accurate report. Being low income this is a tremendous cost for me. Policy 3:8, my concerns are mentioned in the comments above. 3:8:4 Vacant buildings in North Minneapolis are often boarded up to prevent theft and vandalism. These properties are then condemned simply for being boarded. This makes it harder for the sale of these homes, especially when they are often very old and far from being current on code. Is there any plan to increase the funding available or to advocate for funding to bring these homes up to code? Buyer incentives? We wanted a home desperately that was condemned (just for being boarded, it needed work but it was not unlivable as a condemned house should be) but our bank would not allow us to use the loan for that home. The work portion of the loan outweighed the cost portion and overall it was deemed too much of a risk. This is a beautiful home with natural woodwork and many amenities. It would break my heart to see it torn down because the owner chose to put wood on the windows to keep the pipes and natural wood in tact. Condemnation of boarded buildings seems extreme and based on laziness. An inspection should be done to determine condemnation rather than basing the condemnation on boards alone. It needs to be acknowledged that boards are used for protection of the property and that should not be discouraged. Open buildings are far more dangerous than boarded ones are. (1/9/08)</p>		
<p>The city needs to preserve the various small houses in the city such as the hundreds of bungalows. This homes can be marketed towards singles, small families, couples etc. They may not appeal to all persons at this time since the trend is toward large square footage, but as the climate/environmental crisis becomes more of an issue these home will gain in popularity. (1/4/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan</p>

<p>3.3.5 3.3.6 3.5.6 3.5.7 If the carriage house was allowed through zoning, density could be increased, household incomes and pedestrian traffic as well as smaller more affordable unit housing that would serve a wider range of housing needs. (1/1/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Declined to make changes related to making carriage houses an allowed use in more zoning districts [13]</p>
<p>I believe there should be a policy to emphasize dispersing and de-concentrating affordable housing in the City. I believe we should continue to build more in all neighborhoods, but we should be critically analyzing those neighborhoods with no subsidized or affordable housing, especially in southern Minneapolis where there's good transit connections and in areas that are not impacted. This is very important, and not emphasized enough in the housing section. The Hiawatha transit line should be an area of distinct, affordable housing advocacy by the City. (12/28/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan. Comments informed final draft. Strengthened statements to make it more explicit that we want affordable housing in all Minneapolis communities. [14]</p>
<p>Much better than last Comp Plan. Very easy to read and concise. (12/28/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan</p>
<p>Pg 3, first paragraph...there is a typo... "vary" should be "very" (12/11/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comments informed final draft. Spelling adjustment was made.</p>
<p>I do not feel that Minneapolis is strict enough on house upkeep. I think that they should come down on slum lords heavy and fine the heck out of them. It would be a way for Minneapolis to raise money and improve the city. The city should focus most on the improvement and growth of Elliot Park first. I believe that if that area is improved, improvement and investment will spread into Whittier and Ventura Village. Elliot Park, Whittier and Ventura Village should be Urban neighborhoods with retail that promote tall buildings and lights that make them exciting. It will attract young people and home ownership. (Please help the 1900 and 1800 block of Portland! These blocks have incredible views and tall buildings should be built there- it's currently wasted space- doing so would promote East Franklin more.) Eventually, this would spread into Phillips. Phillips, Ventura Village, and Powderhorn are neighborhoods that are still a little dicey that are surrounded by goodness and excitement that will eventually leak into them more- it all ready has. It is also affordable. Some of the most significant historic architecture is located in these areas. Focus on Portland, Park, Chicago, Bloomington, and Nicollet- Ventura Village has come a long way with East Franklin- Keep it up! These streets connect downtown to the first ring neighborhoods. To improve North Minneapolis, focus on Camden and economic improvements (North of Dowling). North Minneapolis. North Minneapolis has some of the best housing stock that is affordable (Class houses!)If that area is</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Most comments related to a level of policy more detailed than TMP. Declined to add tax burden language. [9]</p>

improved enough (Could take 15 years)- The goodness could spread more past Dowling- spreading South East. Finally- promote new businesses and stop taxing the heck out of them. It is very hard to start a little business in a neighborhood. Give them incentive to come to Minneapolis. Tax them less and build a bigger tax base by having more businesses move here. Don't tax home owners too high- that's why they move out of the city and into the suburbs. these tax increases are too much. Again- tax them less and get more people to move here and occupy the foreclosures to build a tax base. Be helpful and friendly to those who by foreclosures with RRs- don't charge them like 20 inspection fees. These people are helping by fixing up these boarded houses- give them incentive to improve the city and occupy a house. Keep going with the light rail! (12/6/07)		
Need more tools for addressing housing crisis in Housing Chapter (e.g. what are best kind of programs for doing this?) Disconnect between finance tools and what we really need	CM Ostrow	Comments relate to a level of policy more detailed than TMP
Please add support for mixed-income housing. This provides a sustainable alternative to concentrating poverty. Support LEED communities	1/12/08 open house	Comment informed final draft. Language re mixed income housing added [8]
3.7.8 (Housing): Not just seek funding and partnerships – needs to be stronger to get grants; committed to ending lead poisoning as major health hazard by strict enforcement of...paint conditions, LL education (contact Lisa Smestad, Environment Services Manager, 673-3733)	1/17/08 open house	Comment informed final draft. Strengthened lead statement [12]
Chp 3: pg 2 – Housing quality – NRP really helped this; pg 9 – 3.5.10 – code enforcement to ensure quality rental – SO DO IT ALREADY! Another issue – taxes driving out one segment of homeowners – those on fixed incomes!	1/29/08 open house	Comment focuses on a level of policy more detailed than TMP. Declined to add tax burden language. [9]
I generally agree with the concept, except that residences should not be torn down to accommodate the future slums of the City. The City of Plymouth entered into partnership with Metropolitan Council to renovate 300 homes at a cost of 1.9 million. The city then sold these at about 150,000.00 dollars and up. Why isn't Minneapolis doing this?	email - Luis Caire	Comment focuses on a level of policy more detailed than TMP.

<p>I would like to see the following to meet my needs as an elder: -One story private homes with modern conveniences with yards so that; we can garden and keep dogs/cats in the city; -Green living/energy efficient (cheap for us old folks); -SAFE nterconnecting public transportation (for those who will have to give up driving or don't want to drive) - more trains that connect throughout the Twin Cities.; -SAFE neighborhoods for the baby boomers who are aging by the nanosecond _Activity centers for the elderly - to make new friends as we age and feel we have community support with others to share our joys/problems, etc. Craft centers, etc. (just not in yucky Arizona) - Part-time job availability for seniors/retirees -Community help (like Habitat for Humanity, ony to help elders fix-up/maintain their homes and do chores around the house - so we can stay in private homes longer Thanks for listening.</p>	<p>email - Susan Wrayge</p>	<p>Comment focuses on a level of policy more detailed than TMP.</p>
<p>Observations The City asserts that an increase in the number of households will ensure the City has a strong and vibrant future. The City should examine its zoning code to ensure that specific zoning classifications foster this City goal (e.g. according to City ordinance a lot of 5,000 square feet established prior to 1979 is sufficient to support a duplex, but a lot established after 1979 must consist of at least 10,000 square feet.) The City used to have a population of around 500,000 or 120,000 more than today. While there are many factors that may explain this substantial difference (e.g. smaller household sizes, duplexes and triplexes converted to single family homes, etc.) It may make sense for the City to also explore these additional factors to inform its stated goal of growing the City's population, rather than relying exclusively on redevelopment with higher densities. LNA would also like more information regarding comments appearing on page 6 of this chapter, related to the steps the City could take to promote the development of affordable housing for the residents most in need, who otherwise have very few options. Recommendations In place of the ideas presented in the second paragraph on page 2, LNA recommends inserting the following: "When people have access to appropriate housing, essential endeavors like maintaining a job or supporting the education of a child become possible." Appropriate housing takes many forms, including, but not limited to: - housing provided by the private market (e.g. owneroccupied housing, rental housing); housing made affordable to a segment of the City's residents by a unit of government, philanthropic organization, nonprofit, or other interested entity (e.g.</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	<p>Much of the focuses on a more detailed level of policy or implementation methods than what is appropriate in the TMP.</p>

housing made affordable to low wage workers, senior citizens living on fixed incomes); housing made available to a segment of the City's residents by a unit of government, philanthropic organization, nonprofit, or other interested entity along with support services (e.g. supportive housing, group residential housing). In addition to appropriate housing, the City should expand on its vision for how it will ensure that existing housing stock is maintained and new housing stock is durable and of high quality. As the City develops/redevelops all segments of the City's residents will continue to have access to "appropriate housing options". (3.1.2) States that the City will establish a process to build community understanding of the important role that urban density plays in strengthening and stabilizing the City. LNA recommends that the City actively engage community members in the process of redevelopment, in whatever form it may take (e.g. from lower to higher density, from one use to another, designation of a given street as a commercial corridor or a community corridor etc.) (3.1.3) While LNA applauds the efforts that have gone into creating the onestop shop to help aid developers, LNA cautions the City in going too far down this road. An important step in any development process is in the discussions that happen between the developer and the community members who already live and work in the surrounding area. LNA recommends that the City develop a process that balances the needs of the interested parties (developer, community members, neighborhood, broader business community) and focus on streamlining the process that takes place within the City bureaucracy. (3.4) & (3.5) The plan does not appear to consider using NRP and neighborhood organizations to achieve these goals. LNA recommends that the plan include specific references to utilizing the work of neighborhood associations to support these goals; work that is already a high priority and focus for many neighborhood organizations. Further Questions · In addition to providing families with increased access to rental assistance, what plan does the City have to increase access for seniors and others living on fixed incomes, as well as other segments of the City's population? · Each night, 500 plus people are turned away from shelters in Minneapolis. On Page 7 of this chapter, the plan states that it supports the creation of additional shelter beds for youth. What about emergency sheltering options for other City residents? · What concrete/tangible steps can the City take to make sure it can promote a healthy mix of housing throughout the City, including areas that historically have little if any

housing affordable to the City's poorer residents? · Could the City issue bonds and use the proceeds to provide affordable mortgages to residents who otherwise would face certain foreclosure?

Comments: **Issue 1. Targeting Scarce City Resources.** MCCD is disappointed that the Plan appears to back down from the City's previously strong commitment to directing scarce resources to those most in need of assistance, households earning less than \$39,250 (50% of Metropolitan Median Income for a family of four). Our members understand the need for a continuum of housing options that include both homeownership and rental opportunities affordable at a variety of income levels. However, while households with moderate incomes have opportunities on the market to secure safe, decent, affordable housing, those with lower incomes (below 50% AMI) struggle to afford the average monthly rent of over \$1,000 for a two bedroom apartment or median home sales price of over \$200,000. We encourage the city to continue targeting scarce public resources to meet the needs of our community members that are the most vulnerable and unable to find safe, decent affordable housing in the market. **Issue 2. Community Development Strategies.** MCCD supports the City's goal of market-building in low-income neighborhoods, but urges the City to recognize that market-building does not simply consist of building a market rate or luxury housing development in a low-income area. Franklin Avenue in South Minneapolis is illustrative of how market-building efforts could be conducted in the future. In addition to the business recruitment, infrastructure, and public safety investments along the Avenue, six new mixed-use developments have added hundreds of housing units, including affordable and more recently market-rate, to the area since 2003. MCCD urges the City to use all of the tools available to help

letter - MCCD

Comment informed final draft. Issue 1: strengthened text emphasizing importance of housing at 50% MMI or less. Issues 2 & 3: made change emphasizing the goal of locating affordable housing in all city communities [14]. Issue 4&5: program criteria modifications are an issue for the QAP, too detailed for the TMP. Issue 6: reviewed foreclosure language. Declined to change it [3]. Issue 7: strengthened language related to preserving housing structures [6]. Issue 8: Added language related to addressing vacant buildings [15]. Issue 9: added language re minority home ownership [10]. Issue 10: added language supporting long-term affordability [2]. Issue 11: invited pictures from MCCD. Issue 12: modified language to make it less value-laden [11].

revitalize neighborhoods that have previously represented concentrations of disinvestment. MCCD believes that high-quality tax credit rental housing development can help to promote economic diversity and is often a key component within a larger revitalization strategy. In general tax credit developments have much higher income limits than what is considered poverty level, and therefore, can be a critical first step in increasing economic diversity in neighborhoods. **Issue 3.** MCCD supports the development of affordable housing in all neighborhoods of Minneapolis and in suburban jurisdictions. We strongly believe that quality, well-managed housing that is also affordable is an asset to any community. However, in order to build more affordable housing in neighborhoods that currently lack this amenity, the City must be more proactive in identifying sites, assisting with land assembly, and willing to provide resources to help off-set the increased costs of land. **Issue 4.** The City should modify funding criteria so that mixed-income developments in impacted neighborhoods are not at a disadvantage when competing for funds. **Issue 5.** In addition, the City should utilize program criteria in City housing finance programs to encourage developers to include more than the bare minimum proportion of affordable units in non-poverty concentrated areas in order to maximize the use of City resources and available sites. **Issue 6.** **Additional Comments on the Housing Chapter.** The plan does not adequately address the issue of foreclosure, which will be one of the most significant issues the City will be dealing with over the next 3 to 5 years. **Issue 7.** The majority of the City's existing housing (owner- and renter-occupied) is comprised of 1 to 4 unit buildings, but the Plan neglects to recognize the importance of - or identify strategies for - the preservation of existing 1-4 unit buildings. **Issue 8.** While vacant lots are addressed in the Plan (3.5.9), there is not a strategy identified for dealing with vacant buildings. With approximately 700 vacant buildings in Minneapolis, the City should work with its partners to identify strategies for dealing with this escalating problem. **Issue 9.** Throughout the housing section of the comp plan, there are numerous opportunities for the City to recognize and state they will be cognizant of decreasing the disparity between community of color households (homeowners and program recipients). **Issue 10.** The City should add ensuring long-term affordability as a priority (Policy 3.3 and 3.4). **Issue 11.** The pictures included in this chapter are not representative of the quality and aesthetics of many of today's affordable housing

<p>developments. MCCD would be happy to provide pictures of exemplary projects. <b>Issue 12.</b> In general, there is concern about the value-laden language in this chapter, including labeling neighborhoods with lower incomes as "communities of concentrated disadvantage" and maintaining that low incomes are "a fundamental pre-condition" to urban problems.</p>		
<p>Recognize the value of owner-occupied residential stock. The city should articulate a policy of fostering owner-occupancy and arresting the turnover of such properties to rental use. Owner-occupied housing is typically better maintained, and the long-term commitment that owners make to a neighborhood results in greater community stability and investment. While rental housing is needed, the city should be proactive in guarding against drastic shifts in the relative proportion of ownership and rental housing in any area. Some neighborhoods are moving toward an inordinately high concentration of rental housing. This has become a particular issue in the neighborhoods around the University of Minnesota, where owner-occupied housing has been purchased (often by absentee landlords) and converted into student tenements. The stability and integrity of these neighborhoods has been significantly diminished by this trend.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Comment informed final draft. Added language that identified a preponderance of rental housing as a potentially destabilizing conditions, and policy that supports additional homeownership in such communities [5].</p>
<p>Strengthen inspection procedures and enforcement of occupancy codes. Inspections, particularly of rental housing, should be frequent and rigorous to ensure that declines in condition are arrested before they have gone too far. Enforcement of occupancy codes should also be increased and additional regulations should be put in place, as current City codes have proven inadequate to address this issue. The consequences of over-occupancy in rental housing are creating an expanding blight in the University-adjacent neighborhoods of Southeast Minneapolis.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Comment informed final draft. Added language calling out the importance of enforcing regulation related to the number and occupancy of rental units [5].</p>

<p>Actively encourage the development of lifecycle housing. In the Prospect Park neighborhood, we are eager to see the development of housing for seniors who are unable to stay in their older single-family houses but would like to remain in the neighborhood. To date, private developers have not yet appreciated the size of this potential market, and active involvement from the City may be required.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Comment informed final draft. Modified introductory text in "Housing Choice" section [4].</p>
<p>3.6.6 Maintain a healthy supply...such as cooperative housing and co-housing. We are very interested in cooperative home ownership in our neighborhood. It's an affordable solution for many, including first time homebuyers. One of the oldest cooperatives in the city is in our neighborhood. Co-housing mixes generations and is another way seniors can stay in the neighborhood after leaving the family home.</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes</p>	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan</p>
<p>3.7.2 Encourage and support programs that reduce foreclosure...and demolition of city's housing stock. We are in favor of saving housing stock and if new construction is built, require it to be "100 year" quality. So much housing looks bad from the outside yet is actually sturdy and capable of being beautifully restored. We are getting very low quality vinyl clad boxes lacking architectural detail that do not fit in with the surroundings. Much of what is being built in the R5 zones of our neighborhood has inappropriate massing and inadequate parking. The area around U of MN needs special consideration.</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes</p>	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan</p>
<p>3.7.5 Continue regular housing inspections... We would like more frequent inspections of rental property in our area, including relative homesteads being used as rental property.</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes</p>	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan</p>
<p><b>Changes Made:</b></p>		
<p>1) Added a general policy promoting property upkeep</p>		
<p>2) Added an implementation step that supports long term and perpetually affordable housing</p>		
<p>3) Reviewed language relating to foreclosures. Decided it was adequate.</p>		

4) Strengthened the plan's attention to senior housing through text changes introducing policy 3.6.		
5) Expanded policy 3.5 to include community impacts related to a rental/ownership housing imbalance, and added attention to # units & occupancy laws as an implementation step		
6) Strengthened anti-demolition policy.		
7) Considered a suggestion to encouraging incentives by businesses to promote employees living near their workplaces. Declined to modify policies.		
8) Reviewed language related to mixed income housing. Decided it was adequate.		
9) Considered adding language concerning the property tax burden as it relates to affordability. Decided against it.		
10) Added language pertaining to fostering minority home ownership.		
11) Adjusted the tone of the introduction to Policy 3.5		
12) Strengthened statement on lead hazards		
13) Considered adding carriage houses as an implementation step in the housing density policy. Decided against it.		
14) Strengthened policy language stating that we want affordable housing in all Minneapolis communities		

15) Added language about dealing with vacant buildings		
--	--	--

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Comment	Source	Response
<p>4.8.3 - not sure why eldercare services is in this section While important, Downtown development receives over 7 out of the 16 pages. Less than a page for other business districts. only 1/2 page for industrial. Scant mention of Basset creek plan/potential. Downtown is not the only engine driving economic development. Need more attention to other areas in this report. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Aging population important to identify; Downtown required further analysis due to lack of previous specific direction; Industrial policy direction in Industrial Land Use &amp; Employment Plan.</p>
<p>Chapter 4: Economic Development p. 2, policy 4.1 policy 4.1.3: In particular, partnering with the University of Minnesota offers significant opportunities proportionate to the University's impact and influence on the community. The legislature has recently created a University District Partnership Alliance between the City, the University, and the University-adjacent neighborhoods in response a report on the impact the University has had on those neighborhoods. The Alliance will identify and foster projects which maintain and enhance the residential and commercial viability of the University district. This effort should be explicitly mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan and should be a major City priority. policy 4.1.5: Streamlining development review has sometimes had the effect of allowing sub-standard and inappropriate projects to proceed. Development should not be pursued at the cost of high design standards, sensitivity to context, and true consideration of neighborhood input. p. 3 and p. 5, policy 4.10 While the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) plan is mentioned here, essential components of its future road infrastructure (the extension of Kasota Parkway and bridges between Granary and Kasota parkways) are not shown on any of the Comprehensive Plan maps. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Good comments about University Alliance, informs final draft document; Streamlining development review partnered with Urban Design policies and zoning requirements will hopefully catch substandard buildings; full SEMI Plan is a component of the comp plan</p>
<p>There was not one mention or inclusion of persons with disabilities in any part of this document. The document does not include the use of the Civil Rights Ordinance to advance employment opportunities for the underserved and disenfranchised, especially in the construction, professional and technical services, purchases of goods by the city itself. Having the ability to fully use the civil rights ordinance as written as well as intended will lead to improved employment as well as a "safer downtown because some of those they may be involved in illegal activity. may be able to find gainful employment (1/31/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Civil Rights Ordinance is an implementation tool of broader policy direction for removing barriers to employment</p>
<p>There should be more of a focus on farmers' markets as a tool for neighborhood revitalization and economic development (1/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content</p>

<p>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: 4.25 “Encourage small business opportunities such as appropriate home occupations, farmers’ markets and business incubators in order to promote entrepreneurs and business formation.” P. 8 Business Districts “Minneapolis supports commercial growth in areas well served by transit and good pedestrian environment and correspondingly a growing residential population....Many business districts are destinations as well, attracting visitors to the city or neighborhoods to sample a unique restaurant, visit a farmers’ market, buy specialty goods or experience the diversity of an urban environment.” Add 4.9.3 Prioritize the development of an urban farmers’ market system to spur economic development and neighborhood revitalization (1/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Too detailed for comp plan, dealt with in some specific small area plans where a neighborhood priority</p>
<p>No mention was made of the Upper Harbor redevelopment in the Minneapolis Plan. I would think that by 2030 the city would be starting redevelopment. I saw it on the Land Use map but know mention otherwise. The city needs to include this in the plan even if its 20 years away. (1/4/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Included in Transportation chapter</p>
<p>Include the Upper Harbor redevelopment by 2030. (1/4/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	
<p>The assumption that the market will do better than the “plan” is not addressed. (12/7/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>No barriers in the comp plan to accommodate an even more thriving market</p>
<p>When you subsidize one business or activity or piece of real estate you equally ruin or cause problems for another. economic development is a transfer payment. Non Profit developers are particularly inefficient and even corrupt in their activities. Big buildings, built new, cause wind shear and they discourage pedestrians who often must walk past them. One never knows if the doors of a big building will be locked when one arrives, and the street number is seldom in view. These are some of a plethora of small details that turn people off to planned development. (12/7/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>I work for the Central neighborhood group, and we are concerned that the City not disinvest in our small commercial nodes, such as 38th Street and 4th Avenue. Whether private investment comes in with mixed commercial/residential redevelopment depends in part on continued public investment in right-of-ways, streetscape, signage – the “attractive public realm” is so important. (Jim Parsons, Community Coordinator Central Area Neighborhood Development Organization, 612-824-1333, mplscando@gmail.com)</p>	<p>1/28/08 open house</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>A bit more explicit attention to the Upper River (“Above the Falls” Master Plan), to better encourage implementation with many partners, and to stimulate interest from the private sector.</p>	<p>1/28/08 open house</p>	<p>Above the Falls Plan incorporated into comp plan as adopted policy</p>

<p>Chp 4: pg 5 – 4.5.2 – set aside at least half of city’s available business assistance for targeted industries – WHO DETERMINES targeted industries? – IS THIS A GOOD IDEA?</p>	<p>1/29/08 open house</p>	<p>Directly from approved Industrial Plan</p>
<p>It appears as though the comp plan is more interested in housing density with not much concern about economic development. More and more of industrial land is being converted to other uses. 50 acres in North Minneapolis where the barge terminal was located has been rezoned.</p>	<p>1/29/08 open house</p>	<p>Direction for industrial policy taken directly from approved Industrial Plan</p>
<p>I find the rest of this plan fine, but please be sure that the working class have jobs that permit them to buy a home a raise a family.</p>	<p>1/29/08 open house</p>	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan</p>

**PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES**

Comment	Source	Response
<p>5.1.3 - 'work with mpl's public schools and henn. co library to find appropriate uses for unused facilities. Delete reference to the co. library as there are no unused facilities and the co. has said it is committed to the community libraries. Weber park library is on park board land. 5.2.3 - encourage educational institutions to locate downtown. What about other areas in the city.. basset creek, uptown, unused school buildings. This along with other references gives the impression the city only cares about downtown. Preferential bias that diverts jobs and resources from the communities to downtown. pg 8 Equal access and community engagement. This section uses the CE term only for its city departments dealing with residents.. it's only 3/4 of a page in the whole section. It should receive more attention . (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p><i>Unused buildings:</i> This comment brings to light the fact that the implementation step regarding unused buildings is not necessarily appropriate for a 10-year document given that the specific facilities needs of various agencies will change over time. It is also duplicative of the more general implementation step that calls for ensuring consistency between facility planning and the policies of this plan. In response to this comment, staff have removed the implementation step related to unused buildings.</p> <p><i>Downtown vs. neighborhood schools:</i> Please note that implementation step 5.2.2 addresses appropriate locations for schools outside of downtown.</p> <p><i>Community engagement:</i> The details of the city's approach to community</p>

		engagement are being addressed in the separate CE process led by the City Coordinator's office. Staff added some language to the narrative in response to this comment.
Chapter 5: Public Services and Facilities p. 4, policy 5.2 The City should include a policy of supporting neighborhood schools. These schools have a host of benefits: parents are more likely to be involved, children can often walk to school, partnerships can be formed with the neighborhood, and the presence of the school promotes neighborhood stability. (2/15/08)	Website	Such a statement would be beyond the scope of a comprehensive plan. The intent of the education policies is to clearly state how the city can be a partner in supporting all types of education, which would include neighborhood schools.
I would like to see a plan for the City to collect organic waste from residential and commercial sites, and along with that, a plan to develop the infrastructure necessary to compost this material. There are other major cities that do this, so the examples to follow are out there. I am disappointed that waste prevention methods, such as commercial composting, are not mentioned in the Mpls Plan. Please consider adding an aggressive plan to reduce Minneapolis's residential and commercial waste. (1/28/08)	Website	Generally consistent with policy 6.10 (Environment chapter).

<p>Under Education, will it be possible to locate a public elementary school close to the North Loop neighborhood? Many young families choose to leave the area because of the lack of downtown schools. We choose a school for our child (Marcy Open) because of the diversity and proximity. It is too far to walk and we are not in the bus zone. Having one car, like many downtown residents, often creates a hardship for school transportation. If a school can't be located in the area, providing adequate transportation is important. A playground area in the North Loop neighborhood is also needed. We have to drive across the city to Loring Park, Elliot Park, or across the river for our children to play outside. We think living downtown with children is something to be valued. Please help the experience be valuable for our children and all children living downtown. (12/5/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Affirms policy 5.2. Implementation step 5.2.3 addresses downtown schools. Also affirms policy 7.9 regarding downtown open spaces.</p>
<p>What are your plans to take care of crime? Until you focus on that, forget your fancy plans.</p>	<p>1/12/08 open house</p>	<p>Policy 5.6 addresses public safety.</p>
<p>Page 7: I would a sentence at the end of this section (after the sentence about having a safe downtown) to say: It is also important to strengthen and maintain coordination with other police departments in Minneapolis (i.e. - University of Minnesota, Public Housing, Transit and Minneapolis Park Police).</p>	<p>email - Emily Ero-Phillips</p>	<p>Affirms implementation step 5.6.2 regarding coordination with other law enforcement agencies.</p>
<p>Please, please, please, can we recognize the basic fact that this is a WINTER CITY? Given that fact of life, can we please put snow removal at the top of the list? Clear all the streets down to the pavement AND send a Bobcat behind the plows to clean out the icy ridges left across the carriage walks, driveways, alley entrances, bus stops and intersections. I can shovel my walks and driveway, but I cannot shovel icy ridges! (Being 81 with chicken muscles puts a limit on what I can manage.) Don't we have people sentenced to community service who could do some of this? It does no good to plow the streets if we can't get to them. Not all of us have the agility needed to negotiate the icy mounds left by the plows. You want us to use public transportation but I would not even think of trying to get to the bus stop. The plowed up ridges between me and the bus stop are a real deal breaker! Sheesh! Winter is certainly fun for the young and spry, but why make it so miserable for the rest of us? Thanks for considering this basic common sense request!</p>	<p>email - Marie Castle</p>	<p>Affirms policy 5.5 which includes language about educating the public about regulations affecting property maintenance (this would include the requirement that property owners clear snow from the public sidewalk in a timely manner). Also affirms policy 5.4 which includes language about special service districts. Often special service districts hire a contractor to take care of snow removal.</p>

<p>Recommendations The opening paragraph of this chapter should reflect the important role of neighborhood organizations in civic engagement (5.6.1) Should focus on reaching out and working with the community. It currently reads is if outreach is a oneway dialogue.</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	
<p>Articulate support for neighborhood schools. The City should include a policy of supporting neighborhood schools. These schools have a host of benefits: parents are more likely to be involved, children can often walk to school, partnerships can be formed with the neighborhood, and the presence of the school promotes neighborhood stability.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>Such a statement would be beyond the scope of a comprehensive plan. The intent of the education policies is to clearly state how the city can be a partner in supporting all types of education, which would include neighborhood schools.</p>
<p>Upon review, we did not see Pillsbury elementary school represented in the draft Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan). We hope that this is a type omission and not indicative of some planned future erasure of this important neighborhood institution.</p>	<p>letter - Windom Park</p>	<p>Discussion of individual schools is beyond the scope of a comprehensive plan. Pillsbury school is shown on the Public Facilities map, which is provided for context.</p>

## ENVIRONMENT

Comment	Source	Response
Mitigation of light pollution should be included in this chapter. There are many reasons to pay attention to light pollution, including reduced energy use, increasing security by reducing glare and focusing light better, reducing potentially fatal distractions for wildlife, and making it possible to see the night sky better. Attention to this problem should also include education of the public about better ways to light their properties, and perhaps incentives to change the public's lighting practices. (1/30/08)	Website	Affirms policies in draft plan, see Urban Design
We don't all have time to read through this stuff. Just want to say PLEASE stay on the absolute cutting edge of energy reduction and environmental sustainability. (1/29/08)	Website	Thank you!
Just want to say PLEASE stay on the absolute cutting edge of energy reduction and environmental sustainability. I want my grandchildren to live and love this city like I do. And I'm 26. (1/29/08)	Website	Thank you!
There is no focus on the environmental impact of agricultural practices and the effect of urban food consumption on the rural (and potentially urban) environment. Promotion of urban neighborhood farmers' markets would address global warming and pollution on a number of levels. (1/14/08)	Website	Affirms policies in draft plan, see Open Space and Parks or Public Services and Facilities
ENVIRONMENT: Add 6.5.5 Support local sustainable agriculture through development of an urban farmers' market system throughout the city tied to transit oriented, mixed use development projects and open space creation Add 6.15.3 Support local and regional farmers who practice sustainable farming methods (1/14/08)	Website	Affirms policies in draft plan, see Open Space and Parks or Public Services and Facilities

<p>General comment: I believe that the City of Minneapolis has adopted the 2030 Challenge by Association with the Council of Mayors. I would suggest putting the targets in this plan and that all renovations and new buildings be required to demonstrate their compliance with the challenge. I would also ask that the City formulate a measurement tool for tracking the entire City's achievements toward the 2030 Challenge. 2030 CHALLENGE: <a href="http://www.architecture2030.org/2030_challenge">http://www.architecture2030.org/2030_challenge</a>. To accomplish this, Architecture 2030 has issued The 2030 Challenge asking the global architecture and building community to adopt the following targets: All new buildings, developments and major renovations shall be designed to meet a fossil fuel, GHG-emitting, energy consumption performance standard of 50% of the regional (or country) average for that building type. At a minimum, an equal amount of existing building area shall be renovated annually to meet a fossil fuel, GHG-emitting, energy consumption performance standard of 50% of the regional (or country) average for that building type. The fossil fuel reduction standard for all new buildings shall be increased to: 60% in 2010 70% in 2015 80% in 2020 90% in 2025 Carbon-neutral in 2030 (using no fossil fuel GHG emitting energy to operate). These targets may be accomplished by implementing innovative sustainable design strategies, generating on-site renewable power and/or purchasing (20% maximum) renewable energy and/or certified renewable energy credits. Be more specific about the importance of good design - proper siting of a building allows for harvesting of daylight, renewable energy, water from the site the building is set upon. Good design and siting will allow opportunities to harvest wind for natural ventilation, etc. PAGE 9 - Solid Waste Chart: Confirm that all products should be recycled rather than be used as waste for fuel. Some recycling efforts may use more embodied energy for recycling than the benefit of making new materials or the recycling effort may provide unwanted air pollution. We should discourage use of the products that fit this category rather than encouraging their ongoing use. We should also be educated on the down-cycling of materials and know if this is better than waste as fuel. Our goal should be to encourage existing material that can be recycled/reused as it's first use without downgrading quality. We do have a lot of material in the waste stream that will be around for a long time so we need to find better uses for the material than going straight to the landfill so this effort is applauded. PAGE 3-4 First and foremost I would suggest encouragement of reduction and conservation measures in all categories but especially in energy. It is through an understanding of reduced use that we will start to change the habits of everyone and encourage innovative design thinking and implementation. (1/13/08)</p>	Website	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan – specific goals are beyond the scope of the plan</p> <p>The Solid Waste chart is from the State of MN and cannot be altered</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
Great job! I'm proud to be a citizen in the great city of Minneapolis. (1/13/08)	Website	Thank you!
I would like to know more specifics about tree planting, types, number per year lost and planted. (1/4/08)	Website	Affirms policies in draft plan – specific goals are beyond the scope of the plan
City of Minneapolis needs to develop a comprehensive food policy that is beyond farmers' markets, community gardens, and school meals: <i>local</i> , sustainable food	1/8/08 open house	Affirms policies in draft plan, see Open Space and Parks or Public Services and Facilities

I'd like to see more use of sustainable or green products throughout the city. More hybrid buses, lighting (solar, LED), re-use. We should be further ahead than other cities of our size.	1/12/08 open house	Affirms policies in draft plan
A vision in 2008 might not need the term carbon footprint, but if citizens and city staff are to produce less carbon dioxide in 2050 than 2010, it seems to mean a comprehensive plan needs to lay out the painful truth of the cost to all of us to reach goals reducing CO2 use.	1/12/08 open house	Beyond the scope of this update
There has been a change in the understanding of the issues of global warming, since Kyoto. No one wants to hear it but the needs changes are much more than expected. This is not something that we can not do. It will affect all aspects of the comprehensive plan, and will require a complete reappraisal and change in the way things are approached. The idea "sustainable growth" is an oxymoron, as for instance. As one small aspect, for example, of something politically unapproachable but unavoidable, growth of the airport is unsustainable and reduction of airport use is unavoidable. Planes that do not produce greenhouse gases are a very long ways away. Read George Monbiot of Guardian UK for one place for some more info.	1/17/08 open house	Thank you!
Address: NRP, stormwater, air quality, greenhouse gases	1/17/08 open house	Affirms policies in draft plan
Is there information and consideration for geothermal heating/cooling being made available to businesses and churches?	1/17/08 open house	Affirms policies in draft plan – See 6.4
In summer of 2007, 28 <sup>th</sup> Ave was resurfaced with tar and gravel. When it rained, Minnehaha Creek was covered with a surface of oil. When streets are resurfaced, use of booms and oil run-off would seem important.	1/17/08 open house	Affirms policies in draft plan – See 6.3
The plan needs to more explicitly acknowledge the regional and global changes that are likely over the next 20 years. Resource depletion, peak oil, global warming, demographic shifts in terms of older and less mobile households, etc. The plan currently is just tinkering around the edges. We need to prepare more aggressively than we are.	1/28/08 open house	Beyond the scope of this update
Chp 6: pg 7 – Urban tree canopy – fund MPRB!	1/29/08 open house	Affirms policies in draft plan – See 6.8
There's nothing about greening up the fleets of city vehicles	1/29/08 open house	Affirms policies in draft plan – See 6.1.5

There's nothing here about specific measures to be taken to a) improve city tree canopy; b) reduce air pollution; c) deal with polluted plume of groundwater coming into NE Minneapolis from Shoreview Ordinance Site (Jake Jacobi – 612-378-3954)	1/29/08 open house	Affirms policies in draft plan – See 6.8, 6.2 and 6.9
ITEM 1 -- Caption for photo on page 4 of Chapter 6: Existing caption: <i>Landscape area provides for stormwater management</i> ; Better caption: <i>Rain garden provides stormwater management for parking lot.</i>	email - Lois Eberhart	Incorporated within draft
ITEM 2 -- 6.9.3 still states, “include here the hyperlink to Appendix x, which is the entire Local Surface Water Management Plan” -- instead of actually including the hyperlink. Maybe it's impossible to fix it in the online version, but I thought I'd follow up. (If it could be fixed, then people could actually click on the link to get to the Local Surface Water Management Plan)	email - Lois Eberhart	Incorporated within draft
Good for city's environment to plant industrial hemp and mushrooms; would assist each other. Problem getting permission to grow industrial hemp - may be in the power of the governor to do this. Would be very good for the city environmentally.	phone - Bernard Bleeker	Thank you!
Need to plan for very different environmental conditions in the future due to impending climate change, rather than just focusing on current conditions.	phone - Carolyn Carr	Affirms policies in draft plan – See 6.2
Observations LNA is strongly supportive of the City's efforts to become a more sustainable city. As a neighborhood we have worked on storm water management, waste reduction, household toxicity, and energy efficiency issues within the past four years. As Minneapolis moves forward it should look for ways to encourage residents to make changes in their own lives as well as lessening the impact City services have on the environment. <b>Recommendations</b> (6.3) & (6.9) LNA recommends that the City start looking into (storm/gray) water reuse opportunities and technologies. The demand on municipal water supplies is rapidly growing and the area relies predominantly on ground water for the vast majority of its water supply (6.10) The City should expand its discussion of hazardous waste to specifically call out electronics as hazardous waste. The City should continue to support and promote recycling programs that properly recycle/reuse these products and increase the frequency of collections. There also appears to be no discussion of increasing the number of collection receptacles for trash and recycling throughout Minneapolis in public locations and no discussion of improving the City's recycling program. LNA recommends that the City look at: · Making it easier for businesses to recycle · (6.10) Expanding recycling pickup to every week and expand the number of items picked up · (6.10) Developing a plan to deal with green waste	letter - Lyndale neighborho od association	Affirms policies in draft plan – See 6.9 and 6.10

<p>In the beginning paragraphs of this section with the tagline "the City promotes environmental stewardship in a variety of ways:" Add bullet point: By maintaining the urban forest canopy and this green infrastructure throughout the entire City. Policy 6.2: Minneapolis will protect and enhance air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Add 6.2.8 The urban tree canopy is a significant sequestration of carbon dioxide and must be maintained and enlarged where possible by maximizing street tree plantings, park plantings, and on private property. Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the construction and operations of new developments, large additions, and building renovations. Add to 6.3.9 Urban street trees not only benefit the reduction of the heat island effect of the City, but also provide storm water treatment through evapo-transpiration. Policy 6.4: Expand the use of renewable energy. Add 6.4.5 Utilize tree waste for bio-energy sources to be coordinated with the maintenance of the urban forest canopy. Policy 6.8: Minneapolis will encourage a healthy, thriving urban tree canopy and other desirable forms of vegetation. Add 6.8.7 Utilize urban trees for their ability to treat storm water and recognize this as part of sustainable development BMPs. Policy 6.9: Minneapolis will be a steward of clean water by protecting and enhancing its surface and groundwater systems. Add 6.9.9 Utilize urban trees for their ability to provide stormwater treatment through evapo-transpiration.</p>	<p>letter - Tree Advisory</p>	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan - See 6.8</p>
<p>DETAILED TRACK CHANGE COMMENTS - See other document</p>	<p>letter - CEAC</p>	<p>See 030708 chapter</p>

## OPEN SPACE AND PARKS

Comment	Source	Response
<p>pg 2 - change 'semi-autonomous' park board to 'independent park board. Although it depends on the city for money, in the Charter it is an independent entity. It was created by state statute and later added to the city charter in the 1880's. It is elected and makes its own decisions. That term creates confusion. pg 6 - using cemeteries as part of our "public" open spaces is misleading. Many limit access to certain hours. It better belongs in historic preservation where you have made other references to cemeteries. Or in environmental green space. 7.6.2 - 'views' may conflict or compete with economic development goals. I.e., the erosion of shoreline overlay provisions. You may wish to revisit this section. (2/15/08)</p>	Website	<p>The language on page 2 now matches the language in the adopted City budget which refers to the Park Board as "legally separate".</p> <p>Although cemeteries may have limited hours the open space is a resource in the sense of being open space that we can see and experience from the outside.</p>
<p>There needs to be more focus and priority given to promotion of farmers' markets as important public spaces. (1/14/08)</p>	Website	<p>Farmers Markets are discussed in Ch. 5.</p>
<p>OPEN SPACES AND PARKS: p.2 Introduction "Minneapolis residents also benefit from the presence of other open spaces such as school facilities, greenways, gardens, farmers' markets and plazas." p 6 Additional Open Spaces Future possibilities exist to give downtown or a neighborhood the equivalent of a central square; capital improvements for a neighborhood farmers' markets; provide green infrastructure such as green roofs, bio-swales and rain gardens; develop high quality open space as a part of new developments and to better preserve the city's existing open spaces. 7.1.6 Support the creation and improvement of community gardens and farmers' markets which sell locally and regionally grown foods. 7.71 Support marketing of the city that involves festivals, farmers' markets and other events that take place in open spaces throughout the city. (1/14/08)</p>	Website	<p>Because farmers markets may not be in a traditional open space, they are better addressed in Ch. 5.</p>
<p>Love the arts, lakes, trails, and recreation, and I'd love to see more done to preserve and enhance!</p>	1/12/08 open house	<p>Affirms policies in draft plan.</p>

<p>Chp 7: Restructure relationship w/ MPRB; loosen funding in exchange for more “supervision” by City – combine community engagement into city process – projects through planning committee; 7.6.4 – the park dedication fee as written works against this</p>	<p>1/29/08 open house</p>	<p>Restructuring the relationship between the City and MPRB is beyond the scope of this chapter. The city and the MPRB continue to try to improve coordination through planning processes, including the City Planning Commission.</p>
<p>just completed reading the Open Space &amp; Parks section and would like to offer the following: Page 1: substitute the word are for is so that sentence will read: The plaza at the Hennepin County Government Center . . . . and the Minnesota Orchestra, below, are popular gathering spots. Page 2: bulleted list. My suggestion would be to add a few words to the first two bullets: o Enhance the health of its citizens through recreation pursuits o Provide opportunities for environmental education and preservation Page 3: I am checking with my colleagues to get the correct number of park properties and will send that number over. Page 8: Policy 7.2.3 - the sentence doesn't make sense to me. I would change it a bit so that it will read: Promote educational events for residents, businesses, and developers to highlight the opportunities regarding or on which include how they can protect and enhance the Minneapolis' natural environment.</p>	<p>email - Emily Ero-Phillips</p>	<p>Part of these suggestions incorporated in to final draft.</p>
<p>ITEM 5 -- Photo Caption on Page 11 of Chapter 7 - I'm raising the point that the viewer isn't readily aware that this is an INDOOR space. This type of planting would not be good for trees OUTDOORS and we wouldn't want it to serve as an example outdoors. For an indoor courtyard it's fine (and very nice). Existing caption: <i>Important open spaces, like Crystal Court in the IDS Tower, are often provided as part of development projects (photo used with permission of the Inland Group of Companies)</i>; Better caption: <i>Important open spaces, like the indoor Crystal Court in the IDS Tower, are often provided as part of development projects (photo used with permission of the Inland Group of Companies)</i></p>	<p>email - Lois Eberhart</p>	<p>Suggestion incorporated.</p>
<p>Observations (7.4) The section on partnerships between the parks and private vendors should be expanded to include more information about what criteria will be used to judge whether or not these partnerships are in the public interest and what the process will be to determine this.</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	<p>Partnerships between the parks and private vendors are beyond the scope of this chapter.</p>

Improve exterior lighting at the Community Center and Bethune Park to promote safety, resident access and utilization of the Park	letter - Phyllis Wheatley	Affirms policies (of creating safe spaces) in this draft
We would like to see more parks developed in Southeast Minneapolis. The plan shows a bias toward Northeast and North. Marcy-Holmes has over 9000 residents and we are growing. Of special interest to us are a dogpark and a park that spans over 35W. We agree that more parks and amenities should be built in growth areas, and we are growing. We are in favor of additional "pocket parks" with public art and seating.	letter - Marcy Holmes	This is beyond the scope of this chapter. See MPRB Comp Plan for priorities for new parks.
In a few areas of the chapter, such as page 2, the name of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is misspelled. There should not be an "s" after the word "Park".	letter - MPRB	Suggestion incorporated.
page 2 - Explanation of the park governance structure is greatly appreciated. We recommend adding the word "governing" in addition to "maintaining and developing" in the last sentence of the first paragraph in this section	letter - MPRB	The this language was pulled from the adopted City budget which describes the governance of the Park Board.
page 5 - In the paragraph starting "Each of these themes" we recommend changing the last sentence to: ...speaks directly to future park needs	letter - MPRB	Suggestion incorporated.
Overall, we appreciate the great care that has been taken to accurately reflect the responsibilities of the City and the MPRB in the development of the policies and sub-strategies. It is clear where the policy or sub-strategy addresses the "additional open spaces" as it includes the term open space in it. In cases where the term "park" is used the statement is written to support the MPRB's work. Policy 7.1 may be the exception as it suggests that the city provides outdoor amenities and spaces without reference others that are responsible for providing them. We suggest modifying the policy to be consistent with others in the document.	letter - MPRB	Wording changed.

## HERITAGE PRESERVATION

Comment	Source	Response
<p>9.8 - you reference the concept of a 'conservation district' used elsewhere. suggest you add this to the report as a vision/goal for 2030. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Affirms policies (9.8) in draft plan</p>
<p>Chapter 9: Heritage Preservation p. 9, policy 9.7 For the City to truly advance the policy of maintaining its historic properties, the Heritage Preservation Commission must alter its rather cavalier approach toward demolitions. Currently, the HPC appears to reward a property owner for failure to perform ongoing maintenance on a structure by granting a demolition permit when the structure has deteriorated. The property owner is then able to pursue his ultimate goal of replacing the older structure with new infill. Inspections, particularly of rental housing, should be frequent and rigorous to ensure that declines in condition of historic properties are arrested before they have gone too far.</p> <p>p. 12, policy 9.11 The city should provide stronger support and staffing to the Heritage Preservation Commission, which is currently in a weak and disorganized state. As a result, decisions regarding the fate of individual properties of historic significance are being made without sufficient analysis and consideration. Once a historic resource is lost, it cannot be recaptured. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>These comments affirm policies in the draft plan, specifically Policy 9.7 and the implementation steps.</p> <p>An additional implementation step (9.6.4) has been added in regards to the regulatory assistance the City provides in re maintenance of properties.</p> <p>The comments about the staffing issues and commission membership may not be best addressed in the policy focused comprehensive plan.</p>
<p>Heritage Preservation does not just have to be about bricks and mortar. It should include stories about Minneapolis which illuminate the experiences of the people who have lived here. Stories can also be made material if thought carefully about. The national offices of historic preservation do provide funds for just this purpose. Minneapolis libraries have made strides in this area by using chairs to memorialize and describe the lives of various writers from Minneapolis. There are examples everywhere. (2/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content. Additional text about preserving not just architecture, but places where significant people and events happened has been included in the section "Future Preservation Goals".</p>

<p>I really think that there should be more African-American people who are apart of this planning process around Heritage Preservation, as well as American Indians. The document as a whole focuses on the industrial period by focusing on milling and the breadbasket theme. Minneapolis has a much wider relationship to the rest of the United States. While milling is important, I think we have plenty of sites that can tell us about that. There are really no sites however that memorialize that Paul Robeson once sang in Minneapolis. I think that there should be more contemporary sites preserved which focus on contemporary American Indian themes. Minneapolis has a unique place in the history of National American Indian politics and this should be honored. These comments I offer in regard to the entire chapter. (2/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content. Additional text about preserving not just architecture, but places where significant people and events happened has been included in the section "Future Preservation Goals".</p>
<p>I was disappointed to see Native Americans only referred to in paragraphs dealing with archeological sites. What needs to be incorporated into this Heritage Plan is a strong commitment to working with the Indigenous communities that have and continue to live in Minneapolis to give a full spectrum of the heritage of this city. This city's history did not begin with the arrival of white settlers; because Native people are a part of the fabric of this community today and their history extends far beyond the 1820s, that should be acknowledged. When the city plans on working with educators about the city's heritage, Native American presence in this region must be incorporated in a meaningful and substantive way not just archeologically. How did Native people play a role as well in the industrialization of this city? How was the land of "historic landmarks" acquired from the Native people? What was the relationship between the Native people and the white settlers that created businesses? These are questions our city should be thinking about. Minneapolis can look for guidance on this subject from cities in the Southwest U.S. where there are also large populations of Indigenous people and a long history of the interaction between Native and non-Native people. Cities like Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Santa Fe, New Mexico, embrace Native and non-Native people's history to define their cities' character, culture, and make up. (2/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content. Additional text about preserving not just architecture, but places where significant people and events happened has been included in the section "Future Preservation Goals". While this chapter is not a comprehensive look at the history of the City, it attempts to outline broad policy direction that will influence other decisions.</p>
<p>On page 7 it says the Pioneers and Soldiers Memorial Cemetery has local designation, it does have local designation, but it is also on the National Register of Historic Places. That designation was sought for through the Corcoran Neighborhood Organization using the firm of Hess &amp; Roise. Designation was received in 2002 or 2003. (1/25/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thank you!</p>

<p>Many people visiting Minneapolis will make an impression of what the city neighborhoods are like based on two streets - Second Avenue South (or 5th after the curve) and Stevens Avenue. It is what you see. Sort of the Minneapolis "First impression." When you live here for awhile, you lose the perspective of what the salient features are to someone taking a fresh look. The three duplexes on 5th just south of Franklin that are similar and all stand in a row are what stood out in my mind when I was only a visitor. Before I moved here, I thought what lay just south of downtown was a long expansive ghetto - But with great potential. I think besides just the Healy Block, there should be some special incentives built into rehabbing properties along these avenues. These avenues contain wonderful old buildings, but the panhandling, noise, exhaust, litter can make it a very challenging spot to live (I know - I did briefly live on 2nd!) I think people in these locations should have some breaks for what they have to put up with to present a good image for the entire city and to encourage people to take a chance on these challenging locations. Also, as revered as the Healy Block is, the full restoration was never completed. When I moved here my impression was that at some point in time the city had a vision for this block, but the challenges must have been too much and that it was sort of given up on. At least some light pole banners to give it some acknowledgement would let those just passing through and don't completely understand the background of it all know that it is something special and continues to improve or move forward. (And 3045 2nd Ave S and 3044 3rd Ave S should be recognized as contributing properties to the Healy district). That's my 2 cents. Otherwise I say "Right on" to much of what I've read and continue to fall in love more and more with my new city!!! (12/3/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Good comments about historic properties being the "front door" of Minneapolis.</p>
<p>Chp 9: pg 7 – Property maintenance of historic structures; the codes need enforcement especially Shoreham Roundhouse</p>	<p>1/29/08 open house</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content</p>

<p>ITEM 7 I mentioned to Tom at one of the open houses that there is historic district that is not indicated on the map in Chapter 9. It's called the Oak Park Jewish Community Buildings Historic District. Here is an excerpt from the Programmatic Agreement: The MnSHPO has concurred that the Oak Park Jewish Community Buildings Historic District is eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. The City shall advise the HPC of the MnSHPO's decision through a written letter from the City to the HPC. In addition, the City will provide the HPC with a copy of the Stage One survey and evaluation report together with copies of supporting research materials so that the HPC may locally designate the three properties within the proposed district in accordance with its established procedures and city ordinance 86-Or-133. The Oak Park Jewish Community Buildings Historic District includes: the former Tifereth B'nai Jacob synagogue (currently Church of God in Christ), 808-810 Elwood Avenue; the former Emanuel Cohen Center (currently Oak Park Center of Pillsbury Neighborhood Service), 1701 Oak Park Avenue; and the Jewish Sheltering Home for Children (later renamed Oak Park Home), 1708 Oak Park Avenue.</p>	<p>email - Lois Eberhart</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content. The heritage preservation maps have been updated.</p>
<p>They noted that the Grain Belt Brewery does not seem to appear on the Historic Districts and Landmarks map. Ann Calvert seemed pretty certain that this was a designated landmark. On the map showing potential historic districts, they were puzzling over the large square potential district near the Upper River area at Lowry Ave. They were wondering what that could be, since they couldn't think of anything particularly historic in that area.</p>	<p>email - Riverfront TAC</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content. The heritage preservation maps have been updated.</p>
<p>They were also asking if a list of potential historic landmarks could be added to the heritage preservation appendix (it already has your list of all existing districts and landmarks). They thought people might find that interesting. Is that doable?</p>	<p>email - Riverfront TAC</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content. The list of potential historic districts is very extremely long, and may be better identified in another policy document.</p>
<p>I greatly appreciate that you have a section on preservation as part of your overall city planning. Without knowing our past, one cannot plan for the future and this will ensure that tourists and others will come because we will be able to offer stories and visuals of our city's history in the making. I would also appreciate that a preservationists input for future development is taken seriously when developers come in their plans to improve our landscape! Thank you for thinking of this angle.</p>	<p>email - Steve Budas</p>	<p>Thank you!</p>

<p>Observations Historic preservation should be an important component of Minneapolis's future. Too often we have been a City that has torn down and thrown away the old in the name of the new. Recommendations (9.12.3) is a stellar example of how the plan can be written to include neighborhood organizations. This item should serve as an example for how neighborhood organizations can be included in the rest of the plan. Further Questions (9.8.1) Why does the plan only preserve the character of residential neighborhoods? (9.10.3) LNA would be interested in finding out more about this potential funding stream.</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content</p>
<p>Strengthen tools and regulations to preserve older housing stock. For the City to truly advance the policy of maintaining its older housing stock, the Heritage Preservation Commission must alter its rather cavalier approach toward demolitions. Currently, the HPC appears to reward a property owner for failure to perform ongoing maintenance on a structure by granting a demolition permit when the structure has deteriorated. The property owner is then able to pursue his ultimate goal of replacing the older structure with new infill, often designed in a manner incompatible with its context. Inspections, particularly of rental housing, should be frequent and rigorous to ensure that declines in condition of historic properties are arrested before they have gone too far. In addition, the city should provide stronger support and staffing to the Heritage Preservation Commission, which is currently in a weak and disorganized state. As a result, decisions regarding the fate of individual properties of historic significance are being made without sufficient analysis and consideration. Once a historic resource is lost, it cannot be recaptured.</p>	<p>letter - Prospect Park</p>	<p>These comments affirm policies in the draft plan, specifically Policy 9.7 and the implementation steps.</p> <p>The comments about the staffing issues and commission membership may not be best addressed in the policy focused comprehensive plan.</p>
<p>We support the general principles of reusing older buildings. 9.12.6 Design and install appropriate and interpretive signs... The Heritage Preservation Dept. has already designed signage for historic districts. For some reason, this initiative has not moved forward. We would favor signage in historic districts of the city.</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes</p>	<p>Good comments, informs final draft content as well as programmatic work of CPED in relation to historic district signage.</p>

## ARTS AND CULTURE

Comment	Source	Response
<p>As a member of a tenant run artist (studio, non-live-in) space I would like to see more support for us and groups like us. We are for profit cooperative of members, so we are not interested in making a profit but making studio space affordable. We are a resource to the community offering classes and space for classes and studio space for artists to teach instrument and voice lessons, etc. We bring people out at night making it safer for everyone to be out and about. It would be great to have support via real estate tax breaks. This would especially be helpful in our case as our income isn't very high and our taxes very high. We are also interested in doing some environmentally friendly remodeling and would like the city to help us find contacts and possibly partner with us in this. (2/17/08)</p>	Website	<p>No changes made to any text as artist "real estate tax breaks" would fall under the larger category of "public funding mechanism" in 10.3.1</p>
<p>It is very general - how will this be actually happen in communities is the important thing, who is at the table, who gets to make decisions about how art and culture is supported in all ways - financial and in decision making. (2/17/08)</p>	Website	<p>We need to include to include the ACCC flow chart into the text somehow, perhaps in the implementation section?</p>
<p>It is very important to support the smaller arts organizations and groups, not only the larger organizations like the Guthrie and Walker Art Center. They have an advantage of having hired staff to do fundraising. (2/17/08)</p>	Website	<p>Small organization support is addresses in 10.3.1 and 10.3.3</p>
<p>pleased to see you have made the commitment and have acknowledged NRP's role. I would suggest you also complement the libraries during the past 7 years for their public art commitment.-I can't remember at this point, but did you talk about working with the county.. or the Met Council. their public art at the LRT stations was a great process...involving residents in every community on the line. Each station reflect a particular community's heritage. (2/15/08)</p>	Website	<p>Collaboration is already addressed in 10.6.1 and 10.6.3 in regards to libraries and other government partners</p>

<p>I think American Indian people should start with claiming the entire city... from it's historic beginnings to it's present. I do think it would be sort of interesting to try and identify a historic site in Minneapolis that preserves or restates an identity. I looked at the Arts Chapter and there are no photos or identifiable links to Minneapolis Native Arts Community. I think that is maybe an obvious comment. So much national and international Native Art is connected to Minneapolis. And that is not really reflected in the chapter that I read. If there were a preservation project that I think works in tandem with art projects going on right now in the city, I think of the George Morrison sculpture apart of the Indian Center, and the renovation of the center. But, I don't know enough about the renovation and don't want to make statements relative to what is being planned. I also think of Fort Snelling and the monuments there memorializing the Dakota-Settler conflict. I think that should be acknowledged somewhere in the plan in terms of the active participation of so many people in the events that take place every year throughout Southern Minnesota. Mendota is not Minneapolis proper, but there should be something that also acknowledges a Dakota presence in Minneapolis that dates the city, and the U.S.. Again, In contemporary terms, I think of the Library at the American Indian OIC with it's photographs and paintings. Then there are all those places that are not exclusively Native and still are part of the living memory of Minneapolis for so many people. I think of South High for people my age, and I know there are those individuals who remember places like Phillips Junior High. There is obviously so much room for comment. This is just to focus on the historic preservation of the plan and its connection to the arts chapter. I think things have changed so much in the last ten years on the Southside that it does become difficult to lay claim to the neighborhood as such, but something that should be said. Maybe there should be a project undertaken that remembers the work done by the larger urban community in the past 40 years that would be really significant. (2/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>These comments are too culturally specific to be addressed in TMP. If we address Native American issues we open ourselves to other cultural groups' issues. I think we need to maintain a culturally neutral stance in this document. Some locations discussed here aren't even within the borders of Minneapolis</p>
<p>In Policy 10.1, I'm particularly glad to see the intent to measure the economic impact of arts &amp; culture activities. The work already being done in this area (e.g., Ann Markusen's work) is very compelling and needs to be widely heard and understood. I'd suggest taking as wide a view as possible in this effort, and attempt to gather information not only about working artists, but also artisans/craftspeople who are earning all or some of their living by producing and selling their work. There is a burgeoning movement of DIY/indie craftspeople that might not always get picked up by surveys of "arts" or "artists" because they fall on the "craft" side of the perceived art vs. craft divide. Examples of how these activities are already demonstrating economic impact are the growing craft fairs - e.g., No Coast Craft-o-Rama and Craftstravaganza - that are a departure from the more mainstream art fairs (Uptown, Powderhorn, Loring). In Policy 10.7, lifelong learning is mentioned in specific strategies, but isn't explicit in the policy statement. The City should preserve and strengthen education opportunities for Mpls youth and adults - lifelong learning implies opportunities for all ages. And in addition to "arts and cultural institutions and community-based organizations, the City should also count amongst its partners the higher ed institutions, particularly public ones (e.g., MCTC) that already are working to meet the needs of MPS grads. (2/13/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>We are using the term artist in the most general way for this document. We cannot address each type of artist whether they consider themselves a musician, a woodworker, or quilter. They are all "artists" for the context of this document. I did make text changes in 10.7 with the inclusion of "adults" and 10.7.6 with the inclusion of high education institutions.</p>

<p>It's towards the end. In Education, I would recommend the city explore ways to bring more artists to the schools. First off, Arts funding gets cut when people do not approve adequate taxes to cover the expense of a good education; since taxes have been demonized by Republicans, the schools are starved of resources, and are always scrambling to make things happen. Second, it's been proven time and again that the arts help equip students to use their imagination, and it better prepares them for an ever changing world. The Star Tribune recently had an editorial about how Theater is used to motivate students. If foundation funding can be used to employ artists to bring their expertise into the classroom, it does two things: 1, plugs a gap that exists in arts education by getting around the tax-cutting problem; and 2, employs arts with viable work, which can be done in the day, around the evening hours when many performers are employed, or during the day when fine arts people are working anyway. Teaching is a superb way of firming up the skills of an artist. (2/9/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>All of these suggestions are outside the purview of what the City can do with regards to the Minneapolis Public Schools. This is something that needs to be a component of the MPS comprehensive plan</p>
<p>I think it's a great, comprehensive way of dealing with it. The previous administration had nothing like this. Another Improvement under our Mayor Rybak. (2/9/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>n/a to TMP</p>
<p>I would like to see there be a conscious effort to utilize the arts to promote a local food economy at farmers' markets (1/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Issue addressed in 10.1.8</p>
<p>ARTS AND CULTURE: Add 10.1.8 Utilize local arts and arts initiatives such as Mosaic to promote a sustainable, local food economy through a system of urban farmers' markets (1/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Issue addressed in 10.1.8 with "community development priorities". Calling out farmers' markets is too specific for a general document like this</p>
<p>I am against having a committee formed to see whether or not they like a piece of cultural art (maybe this is directed at the Mexican murals on East Lake St.) I think that having uniform art that blends into some of the new development around town stifles an artist imagination. The new architectural buildings are bland and leave little to be desired as far as good taste.</p>	<p>email - Luis Caire</p>	<p>n/a to TMP</p>
<p>Need organizational chart, procedures, and contact folks at Minneapolis Arts Commission and arts and culture staff at the city</p>	<p>meeting - arts</p>	<p>Link to MAC and Cultural Affairs staff in appendix?</p>
<p>Need to get more money to base/small organizations, esp. those involved with young people. How to organizations this size/level get access to funding to help move them forward, esp. at times of economic recession.</p>	<p>meeting - arts</p>	<p>Funding for small and medium-sized org. addressed in 10.3.1</p>

<p>Observations Arts and Culture activities have always been a core part of what Lyndale does as a neighborhood. As a community we are pleased to see the City's efforts towards more arts and culture activities. LNA would hope that these efforts would grow and that they would include an intentional effort to develop crosscultural appeal, to help build connections between Minneapolis' diverse communities. (10.7.6) This is the other reference to how the City currently connects with neighborhood organizations included within this draft. Yeah! Two whole positive references to neighborhood organizations in the whole plan. Recommendations (10.1.6) LNA is very supportive of creating and implementing more cultural plans in neighborhoods and districts across Minneapolis.</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	
<p>The City lacks infrastructure found in most American cities... The City should devote permanent funding to this concept. The City needs more public art. Also the City should add more artists-in-residency programs -- one for the Mississippi River, how about neighborhoods -- to celebrate sense of place in our time.</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes</p>	<p>Addressed by need for dedicated funding source 10.3 and formation of Office of Cultural Affairs 10.2.1.</p>

## URBAN DESIGN

Comment	Source	Response
<p>8.4 - "residential compatibility" Preferable to keep neighborhood character but add a modifying statement for environmental additions such as green roofs (including on garages). Pitched and gabled roofs don't work for a green roof. 8.84 - ' preference for detached garages'. I Realize attached garages can look like walls...but this is Minnesota. What is the preference on tuck-under garages? Is there a conflict with carriage houses/mother-in-law units (which are 'accessory' in style/use) with the policy of housing maximization? 8.11.3 - limit set backs if 'inefficient' Modify this statement to take into account the character and ambiance of the immediate area. 8.19.4 - "promote landscape/maintenance (e.g., medians)" This has been a major maintenance problem...leading east out of downtown, around Loring/Basilica and other areas. Maybe promoted but who is accountable for the maintenance? (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>Chapter 8: Urban Design p. 6, policies 8.4 and 8.5, and p. 10, policy 8.9 These policies should recognize the deleterious effect that new high-density residential development can have on the character and stability of existing lower-density neighborhoods within which they are located. The need for careful transitions and buffers between densities should be highlighted, as well as the importance of enforcing high design standards. There should be ample opportunities for neighborhood input and review of these developments, and this input should be fully incorporated into the approval process. pp. 8-9, policies 8.7 and 8.8 For the City to truly advance the policy of maintaining its older housing stock, the Heritage Preservation Commission must alter its rather cavalier approach toward demolitions. Currently, the HPC appears to reward a property owner for failure to perform ongoing maintenance on a structure by granting a demolition permit when the structure has deteriorated. The property owner is then able to pursue his ultimate goal of replacing the older structure with new infill. Other current regulatory practices seem designed to ensure that the infill development will be incompatible with its context and poorly designed. For example, the current practice of approving small multi-family projects (up to four units) through administrative review with only the most minimal standards has resulted in a proliferation of poor-quality, context-insensitive student tenement developments on sites previously occupied by older homes, demolished with HPC approval. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The city seeks to balance higher-density development with the existing single family character of the neighborhoods by focusing density on major corridors.</p> <p>Public notice of public hearing is given for all developments with site plan review applications. Renovation or new construction of residential dwelling units from 1-4 are done administratively due to the volume.</p>

<p>I feel that downtown streetscape design may not be addressed adequately. With the exception of a couple of priority streets (Nicollet Ave, Third Ave), downtown's streets are currently very unattractive and unwelcoming for pedestrians. Since the streets are the city's property and responsibility, it seems like the Comp Plan could have stronger policies regarding the city's need to provide more attractive downtown streets for residents, workers, customers and visitors of downtown. For instance, I think that the City's Comp Plan could have a policy regarding the development of a downtown streetscape master plan. Without a such a plan, it would be difficult to make major strides in improving downtown's streets, which is probably the most important component of the downtown public realm and downtown image. (2/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The comprehensive plan is a broader policy document. Access Minneapolis 10-Year Transportation Plan specifically addresses improvements to the Downtown streetscape that need to be made to improve the public realm.</p>
<p>A/B comparisons of what (not) to do should be built-out, enhanced and completed. (1/29/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>We will review the pictures used to ensure that we have a complete set of likes and dislikes for each design component.</p>
<p>The 'Signs' section of the Urban Design chapter on p. 22 contains a picture of Hymie's and identifies it as an example of inappropriate signage. In my view, this particular example does not represent inappropriate nor excessive auto-oriented signage. The painted building facade could more appropriately be considered a mural. Hymie's provides needed visual stimulation in an otherwise relatively dilapidated section of Lake Street. Further, Hymie's represents a portion of the interesting cultural musical and artistic diversity upon which Minneapolis prides itself. I think that a more appropriate example of inappropriate auto-oriented signage would be one of the many large stacked signs that are often found in front of strip malls. I also don't feel that it is appropriate to use images of local businesses or homes in the comprehensive plan to indicate the wrong way to do things. (1/29/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>We will review the pictures to ensure that we have the best visual examples possible.</p>
<p>The use of pictures, while abundant, could be improved to better illustrate the concepts described. I would have preferred quality examples over quantity, but more of both would be ideal. Some sections have no visual concept to relate the words to initiate action. This leads to ambiguity which leaves open a door to flouting the concepts espoused. We want these guidelines to be followed, right? (1/29/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>We will review the pictures to ensure that we have the best visual examples possible.</p>
<p>The Skyway policy (8.3) appears to be at odds with good Urban Design. Skyways discourage street life, street character and overall do not contribute to the life of downtown. Other cities of northern climates thrive without them, why shouldn't we? They discourage the types of interactions that make a central business district vital. They are a cancer to the street and merchant life of the city. (1/29/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>New concept, beyond the scope of this update.</p>

<p>A higher priority should be given to incorporating farmers' markets, which are highly dynamic public spaces into Minneapolis' urban design. (1/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>A farmers' market is a type of temporary land use and not necessarily an urban design element.</p>
<p>URBAN DESIGN 8.14.3 Encourage the creation of new parks, plazas and farmers' markets (1/14/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>A farmers' market is a temporary use and not a permanent public improvement like a park or plaza.</p>
<p>Environmental designs in the entire chapter omit to address surface drainage into the character of the design criteria. There are segments of environmental quality that fail to incorporate sustainable drainage or drainage is completely ignored. Failure to address drainage in the planning stages of infill development causes adverse effects on the adjacent properties and may contribute to the degradation of waters of the state within and without the city limits (1/4/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We will look at ways to show urban design examples that illustrate the importance of handling surface drainage.</p>
<p>Urban design chapter: delete "traditional" form the improve and maintain streets; some streets need to be converted to bikeways and that is not "traditional"</p>	<p>1/17/08 open house</p>	<p>We will clarify that the form for streets is a traditional street grid which can include bike lanes.</p>
<p>I don't agree with the plan's definition of traditional urban form. What exists today in Minneapolis is a suburban form, as the city outside of Downtown was developed as a suburban annex to Downtown, and the urban areas of Downtown were destroyed after World War II. The problem with confusing the existing suburban form for urban form is that suburban form is inherently unsustainable, and therefore conflicts with the goal of sustainability mentioned in the title of the plan.</p>	<p>1/28/08 open house</p>	<p>We will better explain in the draft chapter that the traditional urban form for Minneapolis is the built form that resulted from when the city developed.</p>
<p>ITEM 6 Page 19 of Chapter 8 -- The left-hand photo is a poor example. Or at least I should say, there are better examples that are attractive AND help to manage stormwater at the same time. Problem is, I don't have any GOOD photos in Minneapolis. Would you entertain the idea of using a photo from another city, if we were to look for some and send them to you?</p>	<p>email - Lois Eberhart</p>	<p>Indicated that we would use a better picture if she could provide it.</p>

<p>Observations There are a number of very positive things in the Urban Form chapter, particularly (8.10.1) through (8.10.07). LNA is very supportive of these efforts. Recommendations The plan should include clearer definitions of what constitutes smaller scale, medium scale, and large scale buildings that includes information accessible to community members who do not specialize in urban planning (8.5.1). This would help people understand what type of urban form is being proposed for their neighborhood. (8.8.7) Should be expanded to include guidelines developed by neighborhoods that incorporate neighborhood specific architectural elements (e.g. types of windows, styles of porches, types of materials, etc.). These types of guidelines should also be used with medium and large scale developments. (8.20) The City needs to develop a new policy related to signage the promotes the use of murals on buildings. The current policy is too restrictive, counting too much of many murals as signage.</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We will try to clarify what constitutes small, medium and large scale development in the text of the chapter. The issue of expanding signage to promote murals is a regulatory change that is something that may come out of the implementation of this plan.</p>
<p>We would like more attention paid to the multifamily residential dwellings to ensure they are of appropriate form and scale.</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>8.17.7 Additional pedestrian-scale lighting... We would like to see it in residential areas as well  (1) Flexibility in design – good idea needs control that precedence does not necessarily mean it will always be approved; (2) infrastructure needs to be in place and not a surprise when building; (3) infill encouraged and not teardown large areas as current development policy  More drawings would help explain what relationship graphic has to the text; traditional urban form is vague it needs to be further defined as it relates to Minneapolis in the 21st century; the chapter needs more teeth!  It appears that infrastructure is – each year – becoming more and more of an issue. How is the issue being addressed in the Minneapolis Plan?  As you progress, continue to simplify! After it is issued, is it still a working document  Clearer than previous comp plan  I like that you are moving to accessibility of the information in a more user friendly nature; sustainable design, solar, wind? How does it fit into historical preservation  Put graphic indicators on the photo to clarify the main idea, e.g. building height  I feel that I can't comment on the writing on sketches/photos without seeing the whole document...I'm being too nit-picky on terms not being defined and an unclear as to where this excerpt falls in the whole doc.</p>	<p>letter - Marcy Holmes   AIA urban design mtg.  AIA urban design mtg.   AIA urban design mtg.  AIA urban design mtg.  AIA urban design mtg.  AIA urban design mtg.  AIA urban design mtg.   AIA urban design mtg.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.   Thank you for your comment.   Traditional urban form is defined in the glossary. Beyond the scope of this update.  Thank you for your comment.  Thank you for your comment.  Thank you for your comment.  We will clarify photo captions to ensure that they are clear.   Thank you for your comment.</p>

Why is auto-oriented a sub-category in “commercial”? I thought this a major policy portion/change...no?

Would have been very helpful to see the chapter on implementation. Difficult to critique the document out of context. Show us the whole document.

Urban design encompasses everything within the comprehensive plan. It includes housing, commercial, but also environment, infrastructure, etc. Not sure how urban design was defined for this document.

Some redundancy in historic language; Parking, parking, parking – density and transit are directly influenced and controlled by parking requirements. Don’t listen to commercial/residential real estate and lease folks only – they are not innovating. Create good urban places first!!

When searching for graphic examples – please do not use an “almost right” Minneapolis example when an exact, perfect example from a European city will do a better job. Minneapolis has many unsophisticated solutions to common urban design problems and better examples can be found elsewhere.

Although it is hard to know seeing just a bit, it is a refreshing formatting change

Clarity on how this document should be used by designers, relation to code/zoning ordinances; clarity on historical or traditional – should one look at the immediate context or the city as a whole? What is the process for review of specific issues for owner’s needs

Images are a little unclear as to what they represent. Also better definition of terms or use of terms that are ambiguous.

Sustainable design should be emphasized more

Address sustainable design; define “traditional” and “flexibility”; what about already built areas that don’t fit the comprehensive plan?; better photos to illustrate more clearly what the policy is stating

AIA urban design mtg.

Thank you for your comment.

We will incorporate photo examples from other places that better reflect our desired intent.

Thank you for your comment.

The comprehensive plan is the broad policy framework for land use in the city and the zoning code is the specific regulatory tool used to implement the policies of the comprehensive plan. Property specific questions are handled via the public zoning counter on a day to day basis.

We will review all photo captions to ensure that they are clear and understandable.

We will review the narrative for the chapter to ensure that sustainability is present in the text.

Thank you for your comment.

The difference between the old version and this new draft is profound. This new draft is much better.

Definitions/terminology. For example, height, scale, character of existing neighborhood. Does “height” mean number of stories or height to middle of roof? Word “traditional” is very broad in country with so different and varied traditions from Asia, Europe, Africa. Does building in modern style will be prohibited in “traditional” neighborhoods?

I like the large scale retail and activity centers in the core. I’m also interested in the commercial development that is attractive and adds value.

Business incentives? (in residential areas); Residential development/housing (material) cost to maintain sustainable guidelines? Property rights?

A winter city needs greater care and understanding

Keep up the good work in changing the comp plan – be as creative as possible cuz the politicians will not be!

p.4 comments: “good design” – how do you define “good”? How do you define “attractive”? Regarding parking, consider policies like downtown Portland with 2 cars per 1000 SF vs. 4 or 5 cars on traditional shopping center uses. Define “traditional urban principles”. Regarding parking, only

AIA urban design mtg.

Thank you for your comment.

Height is regulated both via feet and story as stories can vary in height. Traditional scale and massing is defined by what is common throughout existing Minneapolis neighborhoods. The use of the term ‘traditional’ does not preclude modern design as long as it is comparable to the scale and massing of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Thank you for your comment.

The comprehensive plan is a broad policy document. CPED programs administered by the business development and housing divisions are tailored to support specific improvements that support larger comprehensive plan goals.

Thank you for your comment.

Thank you for your comment.

Beyond the scope of a comprehensive plan update. The regulation of

<p>underground, or both above (structured/ramp) and under considered? Regulation of articulation of the building especially at street level</p> <p>8.9.6 – store front transparency is hard to implement in most big box – however Target for example can place food/dining at street façade and offices/training spaces</p> <p>How does this plan address projects/plans already completed?</p> <p>Wiki plan edits from website (see separate document)</p>	<p>AIA urban design mtg.</p> <p>AIA urban design mtg.</p> <p>AIA</p>	<p>parking is handled through the administration of the zoning code.</p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The plan is not retroactive.</p>
--	--	---

## IMPLEMENTATION

Comment	Source	Response
<p>pg 3 -bulleted item- densities 5 units plus - unclear what this means. pg 4 - "innovative zoning techniques" Clarify...too broad, does this mean actions incompatible with the comp or met plan? Sounds like "creative accounting". pg 1 - 'consistency between plan and local controls'. What does this mean? Needs more clarification. pg 13 - 'Neighborhood organizations' Conflict between 'may' change and exec. summary saying it will change. Please add as soon as possible the link to the NRP actions and the Comp plan...no appendix, no links ...just a colored boxes. pg 14 - Mayoral initiatives. Okay to list new programs... but DELETE Mayor Rybak's name. This document is for the next few decades and it is *INAPPROPRIATE* to credit initiatives with one administration and to exclude past administration. This belongs in other documents or on the Mayor's web page. If kept in, to be *NON - PARTISAN* you will need to add initiatives of past mayors. Fair and balanced. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Added clarifying language to plan to address concerns. While reference to existing mayor is dated, it reflects the administration which is overseeing this update and will be officially approving it and starting on implementation.</p>
<p>This is a "far fetched idea" to obtain additional funding. Should the state or county ever pursue holding the "International Olympics" in the Twin Cities some redevelopment funding could be obtained via the Private sector, the federal and state government. An idea would be to develop the Upper Mississippi River area into an "Olympic Village" and turning it later into housing, etc. Can you imagine the terrific skyline views from the Upper Mississippi? (1/4/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Thanks for the idea. The Above the Falls plan, incorporated by reference in this plan (see Appendix B) provides a vision for the revitalization of the Upper River area.</p>
<p>How do we get neighborhood input into CLIC process?</p>	<p>CM Ostrow</p>	<p>Details of CLIC process beyond the scope of plan, though may well be part of plan implementation phase after adoption</p>
<p>It is not clear on how this plan will be used. After talking with staff it became clearer that the plan was meant to be broad and general.</p>	<p>1/8/08 open house</p>	<p>Clarifying language added to introduction of chapter</p>
<p>Without any examples or benchmarks, it's hard to tell what the broad statements will mean concretely in practice</p>	<p>1/8/08 open house</p>	<p>Clarifying language added to introduction of chapter</p>
<p>Needs, <i>must have</i>, quantitative goals, cost estimates, and some statement of meeting costs</p>	<p>1/12/08 open house</p>	<p>Clarifying language added to introduction of chapter</p>

<p>A vision needs to be supported by goals and objectives. Vision and direction are presented here, the plan offering the road map to reach the vision needs specific goals, with timelines and costs. Without quantitative goals, how do you know if your plan is effective and making progress?</p>	<p>1/12/08 open house</p>	<p>Clarifying language added to introduction of chapter</p>
<p>Goals are vaguely stated. Measurable/quantifiable benchmarks would be nice to see, and would facilitate progress evaluation.</p>	<p>1/17/08 open house</p>	<p>Clarifying language added to introduction of chapter</p>
<p>The document appears to me to be more of a "Vision" along with certain "guidelines" or "policies" than an actual plan. It's a good vision, but without some sort of action steps and timeline for implementation, and support from the mayor and city council and various committees and city agencies, I'm afraid it won't achieve the goal described in the document. It will be essential for all the city committees (Land Use, Transportation, etc.) to READ the document once it is finalized and use it as a guiding tool whenever they are considering various actions. The city council and mayor and all municipal agencies need to be completely on board with this "plan" or it won't be more than pie-in-the-sky. I think that too often certain agencies and individuals have their own personal agendas and don't seem to adhere to what the people of the community want. A lot of that is just pure politics, but if individuals can rise above that and recognize the vision outlined in the plan, we'll get somewhere. You have much work to do to move this "plan" from a draft vision to something solid and actionable. I certainly support the direction the plan describes for the city and I wish you good luck in keeping the powers that be on track and in line.</p>	<p>email - Doug Verdier</p>	<p>Clarifying language added to introduction of chapter. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City Council.</p>
<p>LISC is positioned to offer several supports to the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. We are experts at leveraging investments in housing and other real estate, business development, and neighborhood revitalization. At the same time, we are experienced in using holistic, cross-cutting strategies to improve quality of life and promote broader, deeper citizen participation-especially among people of color and those who earn low wages. We have been a pioneer in helping narrow the disparity between haves and have-nots, reconnecting distressed neighborhoods to the prosperity of the region. We know how to increase the impact of development by insisting on measurable outcomes and accountability among all partners for results. I look forward to exploring the ways we can partner with Minneapolis to successfully implement the Comprehensive Plan. We are a willing and able partner with valuable experience in building sustainable communities, and a strong commitment to help shape a prosperous future for this region.</p>	<p>letter - LISC</p>	<p>Added language in chapter on public/private partnerships</p>

<p>Observations In general the implementation component of the plan seems to be very focused on internal City processes. For the goals in the plan to be accomplished it will take a broader community effort, something that the plan should reflect.</p>	<p>letter - Lyndale neighborhood association</p>	<p>Additional language on the role of neighborhood associations and public/private partnerships added</p>
<p>Community Centers, parks and other non profit community based organizations should be identified as key partners in the City's plan. We are the glue that provides and facilitates making our communities strong. We promote and contribute to the quality of life for all residents by providing opportunities to meet their needs. The City's Comprehensive Plan can be a means to connect us without boundaries to what we have in common, along with promoting economic and related goals to learning from each other and advancing our culture, history and achievements.</p>	<p>letter - Phyllis Wheatley</p>	<p>Additional language on the role of neighborhood associations and public/private partnerships added</p>

## MAPS

Comment	Source	Response
<p>Surprised to see that most arts projects are around downtown...gap in other areas. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Public art implementation process for city puts priority on balancing projects across wards and neighborhoods. No new projects have been added Downtown since the 1980's.</p>
<p>Maps See comments above regarding the following maps: 1.x : Land Use Features 1.x: Transit Station Areas 1.x: Future Land Use 2.x Right of Way Needs 2.x Number of Lanes Additional comments on maps: 8.x: Era of Development It is likely that construction dates for this map were taken from the Minneapolis (Hennepin County) property database, which typically uses that year 1900 for properties constructed prior to that date. As a result, the many pre-1900 properties in the Prospect Park neighborhood (and probably elsewhere) are not shown. There is an error in the legend; the second date range should be "1890-1899" and not "1890-1889." 9.2: Historic Survey Areas and Potential Historic Districts The Prospect Park Historic District will seek National Historic Designation in 2008 and should be indicated on this map. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Corrected error in legend of Era of Development map. Also added "estimated" to title to indicate uncertainty regarding age of older buildings, based on database. Historic district map corrected.</p>
<p>Some were not accessible...including small area plans-later mentioned in appendix. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Issue resolved</p>
<p>Right of Way Needs map While the alignment of the proposed Granary Parkway is shown on this map as a future ROW need, ROWs for the extension of Kasota Parkway and the bridges between Granary and Kasota parkways are not shown. These are called for in the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) Master Plan. Number of Lanes map Text is needed to explain the meaning of the legend. This map also does not show Kasota Parkway and the connecting bridges, as noted above. (2/15/08)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Added Kasota and Granary to right of way and proposed functional class maps</p>

<p>The population and household maps for the period 2000-2030 seem unrealistic. In particular, the maps predict very little growth in households along the Midtown Greenway between Hennepin and Nicollet Avenue. Currently the LHENA neighborhood is seeing 250 apartment units being built right now. Between 2000 and now a couple hundred units in that neighborhood have already been occupied. I can't believe we wouldn't see more growth. I think the LHENA neighborhood will see a growth of 2000+ units between now and 2030 and Whittier to see somewhere over 800 units. Population should reflect the growth of households, to some degree. These maps will affect the Southwest Transitway Study, and I think it's important for the City to project growth in a more realistic way. (11/30/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Researching options for revising TAZ numbers. Will require reallocating from other TAZs to add to mentioned ones – total cannot change at this point.</p>
<p>Why not a proposed bike route north/south through North Minneapolis? (11/30/07)</p>	<p>Website</p>	<p>Comp plan reflects adopted city bicycle plan. Update to this plan, including new priorities, is now underway.</p>
<p>Did not like artist location map because didn't show concentration of artist in Northeast Arts District – need to check on this with Mary</p>	<p>CM Ostrow</p>	<p>Map based on mailing addresses for individual artists, not their places of work – will add disclaimer to this effect. Arts-related districts do not all have official boundaries.</p>
<p>Label affordable housing map to clarify that this is existing, not planned, affordable housing concentrations</p>	<p>CM Ostrow</p>	<p>Label added</p>
<p>Number labels on TAZ maps need to be fixed</p>	<p>1/12/08 open house</p>	<p>Numbering fixed</p>
<p>Differences in categories and degree of detail between present and future land use maps makes comparison difficult. Many of the maps seem to have missing data.</p>	<p>1/17/08 open house</p>	<p>Maps being revised and updated. Different maps legends necessary for existing and future land use map due to differing uses of the two maps.</p>
<p>Changes are not easy to understand. Should have a map that only shows changes.</p>	<p>1/17/08 open house</p>	<p>Future land use map is a new concept and does not correspond directly to any previous map. Most changes from existing conditions based on already adopted city land</p>

		use plans.
Land use map: 1. Industrial area and activity center area boundary colors are too similar (on some prints they look the same); 2. Don't understand activity center designations for Downtown – West Bank and entertainment areas are included while Nicollet Mall/Eat Street and Walker/churches areas are not	1/28/08 open house	Criteria for Activity Center designations described in chapter. Will make needed changes
The land use map does not reflect the various policies, particularly in regard to where the city will encourage higher density infill and redevelopment. The single "urban neighborhood" designation is inappropriate and potentially deceptive	1/28/08 open house	After considerable analysis, it was determined that the category of urban neighborhood was more compatible policy direction for the diverse urban character of Minneapolis than a density-specific map. Other plan policy gives guidance as to the location of density.
ITEM 3 -- On the Critical Area Overlay map, what was the source of "wetlands"? The Comp Plan should show the same wetlands as shown on Figure 3-6 of the Local Surface Water Management Plan. We also sent an email to Jerry V. wondering about the source. Who should we work with to furnish the correct data for the map?	email - Lois Eberhart	Updated map with current wetland data.
ITEM 4 -- The map of Watershed Management Organizations is incorrect - there was a significant boundary change a number of years ago. A PDF is attached showing the correct boundaries. Who should we work with to furnish the correct data for the map? Also (since it says Met Council was the source), do you know who we could contact at Met Council to let them know they are not giving out correct information? As an FYI, the name of the Mississippi Watershed Management Organization does not have the word "River" in its name. Here are the official names, for however you want to show them: Bassett Creek Water Management Commission, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, Mississippi Watershed Management Organization, Shingle Creek Watershed Commission; As you can see, all of the names are a little different. Technically, they are ALL "watershed management organizations". However, the Minnehaha Creek one is a type of "watershed management organization" that is a "watershed district". In general usage it is almost always referred to as a "watershed district" and many people think it is incorrect to call it a "watershed management organization"	email - Lois Eberhart	Updated map with current watershed management organization boundaries.

Revise parks on existing land use map; take Gold Medal Park out of the legend; show same color for Xcel Energy park, get rid of green on park board building	meeting - Riverfront TAC	Making revisions
Update future land use with West Broadway Alive information	Tom Leighton	Adding information
Update future land use with Audubon Park and Central Avenue plan information	Jen Jordan	Adding information
8.x: Era of Development It is likely that construction dates for this map were taken from the Minneapolis (Hennepin County) property database, which typically uses that year 1900 for properties constructed prior to that date. As a result, the many pre-1900 properties in the Prospect Park neighborhood (and probably elsewhere) are not shown. In addition, there is an error in the map legend; the second date range should be "1890-1899" and not "1890-1889."	letter - Prospect Park	Duplicate comment – addressed above
9.2: Historic Survey Areas and Potential Historic Districts - The Prospect Park Historic District will seek National Historic Designation in 2008 and should be indicated on this map.	letter - Prospect Park	Duplicate comment – addressed above
Based on the review of the maps, a few clarifications and changes are recommended. Maps with recommended changes or questions are attached (SEE OTHER FILE). Please note that a few of the bike map comments we submitted on a previous set were incorrect and have been changed on these maps. Some key recommended changes are as follows: * On several maps, Phase III of the Midtown Greenway appears as incomplete. This section has opened. We believe the same is true of the NE Diagonal. * The bikeways map does not include future, continuous off-street trails along the river above 18th Ave NE * The Above the Falls is not an MPRB study area, but rather is an approved master plan * Several regional parks are missing on the Regional Parks and Trails map. Please reference page 28 of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board comprehensive plan. The difference in coloration between parks denotes the boundaries of each regional park. * Both Columbia and Hiawatha golf courses are owned and operated by the MPRB. The "Existing Network" map shows part or all of them as "Other Open Space". * Considerable parkland is missing from the existing land use maps. Please refer to page 6 of the MPRB's comprehensive plan for an accurate view of parkland where the MPRB retains site control.	letter - MPRB	Updated map with new data from MPRB
ITEM 7 I mentioned to Tom at one of the open houses that there is historic district that is not indicated on the map in Chapter 9. It's called the Oak Park Jewish Community Buildings Historic District. Here is an excerpt from the Programmatic Agreement: The MnSHPO has concurred that the Oak Park Jewish Community Buildings Historic District is eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. The City shall advise the HPC of the MnSHPO's decision through a written letter from the City to the HPC. In addition, the City will provide the HPC with a copy of the Stage One survey and evaluation report together with copies of supporting research materials so that the HPC may locally designate the three	email - Lois Eberhart	Updating map with historic district

<p>properties within the proposed district in accordance with its established procedures and city ordinance 86-Or-133. The Oak Park Jewish Community Buildings Historic District includes: the former Tifereth B'nai Jacob synagogue (currently Church of God in Christ), 808-810 Elwood Avenue; the former Emanuel Cohen Center (currently Oak Park Center of Pillsbury Neighborhood Service), 1701 Oak Park Avenue; and the Jewish Sheltering Home for Children (later renamed Oak Park Home), 1708 Oak Park Avenue.</p>		
<p>They noted that the Grain Belt Brewery does not seem to appear on the Historic Districts and Landmarks map. Ann Calvert seemed pretty certain that this was a designated landmark. On the map showing potential historic districts, they were puzzling over the large square potential district near the Upper River area at Lowry Ave. They were wondering what that could be, since they couldn't think of anything particularly historic in that area.</p>	<p>email - Riverfront TAC</p>	<p>Updating map with landmark</p>

## APPENDIX

Comment	Source	Response
i imagine you are still adding things (2/15/08)	Website	Yes
Still adding items? including school board's strategic directive? (2/15/08)	Website	Investigating need to include supporting documentation from school district
Per my comments made in the exec summary, the Park board is not semi-autonomous. see exec summary for comments. (2/15/08)	Website	This language comes from official adopted City budget description
<p>ITEM 8 Glossary terms - I don't see "Clearwater" or "Rainleader" mentioned anywhere in the Plan, except in the Glossary. Why are they in the Glossary? ITEM 9 Glossary terms RE this definition -- <b>Impervious surface</b> – Any material which significantly reduces or prevents natural absorption of stormwater into the soil and cause water to run off the surface in greater quantities and at an increased rate of flow. Impervious surfaces include, but are not limited to, buildings or other structures with roofs, sidewalks, and all stone, brick, concrete or asphalt surfaces; Two things on this: 1) "cause" should be changed to "causes". 2) We are encouraging use of pervious surfaces such as pervious pavers, pervious concrete and pervious asphalt. Thus the word "all" is problematic. Proposed change: <b>Impervious surface</b> – Any material which significantly reduces or prevents natural absorption of stormwater into the soil and causes water to run off the surface in greater quantities and at an increased rate of flow. Impervious surfaces include, but are not limited to, buildings and surfaces paved with traditional concrete, asphalt, or pavers; ITEM 10 - I thought the following a little strange (but maybe there's a good reason) -- <b>Pervious/impervious surface</b> – an outdoor surface which will allow natural water flow into the ground and prevent water erosion except in very heavy rains, while providing a firm surface for travel; impervious surfaces do not allow water flow through them; I suggest the following change: <b>Pervious/impervious surface</b> – an outdoor surface which will allow rain and snowmelt to flow into the ground and prevent runoff except in very heavy rains; impervious surfaces do not allow water to flow through them</p>	email - Lois Eberhart	Clearwater and rainleader found in Implementation chapter. Other glossary definitions revised accordingly
<p>Thank you for taking the time to discuss the projections in the Minneapolis Comp Plan with me. As mentioned over the phone, I have concerns regarding the household and population projections in TAZ zones 333, 334, 337, 373, 375, and 376. I feel that the household projections predict too low of growth or in some cases negative growth. I'm curious as to how the research staff determined those numbers and their thoughts on my following comments: 1 - In general, it seems that in 2030 the total number of households are projected to decrease after a period of growth (from 2000-2020). What is the likely reason why growth would be negative during that period? My best guess is that they are predicting that the 1950s-1970s large apartment complexes will reach the end of their life and be rebuilt at lower densities. Is that a consideration? 2 - TAZ #375 projects a household growth of only 352 units between</p>	email - Thatcher Imboden	Researching options for revising TAZ numbers. Will require reallocating from other TAZs to add to mentioned ones – total cannot change at this point.

2000 and 2030. This seems low. However, the 2020 projection is 566 units higher than the 2000 projection (2010 is 517 over 2000). Since 2000, there has been at least 543 units built or under construction to date (that figure doesn't include any loss of units, which there was at least a few lost). Those new units are listed below: 2003 - Uptown City Apartments, Fremont Building: 72 units; 2003 - Uptown City Apartments, Aldrich Building: 84 units; 2005 - Midtown Lofts: 72 units; 2007 - Lumen on Lagoon: 44 units; 2007 - Track 29: 27 units; 2008 - Aldrich Avenue Apartments (under construction): 244 units; Also approved would include 70 condo units at Mozaic, 71 condo units and 27 townhouse units at Track 29. The Acme Tag Site has a development proposal that will be submitted to the City shortly, which is approximately 250 apartment units. Opus looked at buying the Bennett Site (where Sherman once had a development proposal), and is considering building somewhere in the neighborhood of 500 apartment units. I've also heard that the Turnstone Group has an interest in that property for apartment development. I think the sites could potentially see 250 - 500 apartment units when fully built out. The Track 29 site will be developed by 2030. That's for sure. There are additional properties in this TAZ that are ripe for housing development once some of the more prime sites are built out. I imagine that this will occur in the 2010 - 2020 period, depending on how quickly the current projects can be built out (and whether they can still hit this apartment development cycle).

3 - Why the substantial loss of households in TAZ #376? While I don't imagine there will be substantial development in this TAZ, I do expect some growth and likely enough growth to offset any losses associated with the conversion back of multi-unit houses. Sites likely to be redeveloped by 2030 include: 1700-1728 W Lake St, 1612-1620 W Lake St (+2915 James Ave S), 2910 Irving (+1609-1611 Lagoon), 2901-2909 Irving (+1511 Lagoon), 1438 W Lake St (rear), 2730 Hennepin, and 2880 Hennepin.

4 - Are the projected population increases in the Uptown area related to increased household size? It clearly isn't related to household growth.

5 - I was expecting household growth of the following: TAZ #333 - 1-200 (a few small projects, some small loss) TAZ #334 - 201-500 (new growth along Lake Street, infill of 3-plex + 4-plex on duplex sites, little loss) TAZ #337 - 501-1000 (new growth along Lake Street and Nicollet, little loss) TAZ #373 - 1000-1500 (significant growth along Midtown Greenway corridor and along Nicollet area, some loss in conversion back of multi-family homes) TAZ #375 - 1750-2250 (significant growth on currently non-residential properties and some loss in conversion back of multi-family homes and the rebuilding of dense apartment buildings to less dense apartment buildings) TAZ #376 - 1-200 (Some growth but also loss from the conversion back of multi-family homes) TAZ #377 - 201-500 (same) Those are my initial thoughts. I welcome any feedback, comments, questions. As previously stated, my concern is that I don't think the growth is realistic to the market and that without addressing this, there will be policy ramifications - such as a more difficult time for Uptown to get transit. A lot has changed in Uptown over the years, and I've spent considerable time studying both Uptown's social and building history, but also current market conditions. I feel strongly that Uptown can and will see substantial growth over the next 10-20 years and cannot understand how staff reached those projections.

We recommend including definitions for the features shown on the Critical Area Overlay and the Regional Environmental Features maps. This is especially recommended for the following features: Wetlands, Regionally Significant Ecological Areas, and Site of Biodiversity Significance. As many of these sites are within the Minneapolis Park system, clear definitions will help set expectations and reduce confusion for park visitors. Environmental operations employees are available to discuss this recommendation in greater detail.

letter - MPRB

Added to glossary