Comments from Above the Falls Master Plan Update as of 2/11/13

Public Comment Period: December 11, 2012 – January 24, 2013

This includes all substantive comments made during the public comment period, as well as the way they were responded to by staff editing the plan. This does not include minor typos and edits that were corrected.

Due to the size, complexity, and number of stakeholders in the study area, some comments outside the comment period were included as well, to reflect as best as possible the diversity of stakeholders and opinions.

Source	Referring to	Comment	Response
Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities 9/19/12	Introduction – Chp 1	Be careful of wording in materials; do not use the term "handicapped;" instead can use "people with disabilities"	Language reviewed and edited accordingly
Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities 9/19/12	Introduction – Chp 1	Accessibility needs to be taken into account from the very start of the planning process; accessibility is for all people, not just a limited number	Goals feature reference to accessibility
Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities 9/19/12	Land Use – Chp 5	Need a purpose to go to the upper riverfront – e.g. restaurants, drinks, etc. – needs to be included in the area	Destination uses are encouraged in plan
Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities 9/19/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Would like to see kayaking as part of the area's attractions	Water access, including kayaking, featured in plan for parks
Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities 9/19/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Marshall St has many inaccessible spots along its sidewalks; lots of bicycle and pedestrian use this – it needs to be improved	Adding reference to accessibility for Marshall corridor
Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities 9/19/12	Implementation – Chp 9	Involve motorcyclists in this area; they like this area, and are watchful and can help the area be safer; rollerblades and scooters should also be accommodated	All stakeholders are welcome to participate in process
Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities 9/19/12	History and Background – Chp 2	Reach out to nontraditional populations, including people with disabilities and seniors	Nontraditional populations were targeted as part of outreach process
Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities 9/19/12	Health - Chp 4, App D	Environmental health and contamination are concerns	Addressed in health impact analysis
Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities 9/19/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	The arts community needs to be involved; art is a huge draw for the area. Develop attractions with experiential art, including tactile art (for visually impaired)	Adding reference to public art in plan
Advisory Committee on People with	Introduction – Chp 1	Accessibility is more than wheelchairs; includes accommodation of and experiences for visually impaired, hearing impaired, etc.	Adding reference to accessibility for everyone plan goals

Disabilities 9/19/12			
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Transportation – Chp 7	Riverway Streets, parkways, trails, and bikeways should be designed for diverse users (i.e., of all ages, abilities, modes, etc.,) and should be implemented as opportunities arise (e.g., Marshall St NE resurfacing provides the opportunity to integrate an on-street bicycle lanes in 2013).	Adding language to support facilities for a range of diverse users.
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Transportation – Chp 7	Linear connections should be extended to/from the river to the city's boundaries to improve access to and across the river (e.g., connect Theodore Wirth Parkway to the river via 26th Ave N, repurpose the BNSF bridge to provide pedestrian and bicycle connections over the river, etc.).	Map and language in plan show connections into surrounding neighborhoods, as described.
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Riverfront parks should provide access to various recreational opportunities including fishing, swimming, wading, birding (including binocular stations), resting in open space, biking and walking (including boardwalks over the river).	The plan supports the development of a variety of facilities to access waterfront recreational opportunities
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Enhancements should provide destinations along the river, amenities for walkers and bicyclists, lighting, and wayfinding signage.	The plan supports the development of a variety of facilities to access waterfront recreational opportunities
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	The Regional Park Development Plan map (page 108) provides information about existing and planned parks. The map should label all existing parks as this map will be displayed in public meetings and provides the opportunity to raise awareness of existing parks. Parks that do not have a name should be named (e.g., riverfront parkland between 22nd Ave N and Plymouth Ave N).	Added map labels to show existing park locations
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails, Land Use – Chps 5 & 6	The width of the parkland along the west side of the riverfront between Dowling Ave N and 34th Ave N should be extended to the railroad tracks. The Upper Harbor Terminal Redevelopment Study (2004) included a design concept that illustrates parkland extending to the rail road tracks that could provide both transportation options (e.g., pedestrian trails, bicycle trails and a parkway) and a significant ecological corridor.	The plan shows park being extended from the riverfront to the tracks for the portion of the site north of Dowling. Some of the southern portion of the site is shown having development, in addition to parks and parkway, between the tracks and the river. This is consistent with the original Above the Falls plan, and reflects the fact there is room to accommodate new development.

			The 2004 study did show some possible scenarios with park, but additional analysis of feasibility suggests that more development (as shown in the 2000 plan) is needed to support public investments and amenities.
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Transportation – Chp 6	Riverway Streets may serve as transit routes as new residents, businesses, and destinations will provide the density needed to support establishing transit service on the west side of the river and Nice Ride stations (i.e., the Twin Cities bike sharing system) on both sides of the river.	Adding language to note that a number of these streets also are community corridors and commercial corridors, supporting increased density and transit service.
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Subarea 5 and Subarea 6 (generally located from 21st Ave N to 31st Ave N along 2nd St N) act as a wall of industry creating a barrier to the river from neighborhoods in North Minneapolis. Subarea 5 is guided as Transitional Industrial land use that will evolve into a mix of uses over time. The City will need to be proactive for this transition to occur. In Subarea 6, the Industrial land use is planned to continue as it is located in an industrial employment district and guided for continued Industrial use in the Plan update. The City should reconsider the location of industrial employment districts. The goal of revisiting the policy is to look at its affect in creating impediments to Plan implementation. Specifically, AFCAC recommends changing the land use from Industrial to Transitional Industrial to allow this area to transition to mixed uses overtime. Proposed Riverway Streets and/or pedestrian and bicycle connections to/from North Minneapolis are planned to penetrate the wall of industry (e.g., 26th Ave N and 29th Ave N); however, these revitalized corridors will not be successful if industrial uses will persist and continue to compromise the health and safety of people wanting to access the river.	Subarea 5 is guided to transition in use, as time and opportunity present themselves. Significant resources will be needed to relocate the uses in this area, though it is possible some may leave voluntarily. Subarea 6 – consistent with the original Above the Falls plan – is shown as a location for industrial jobs and development. The amount of land where this industrial employment could be relocated in the city is extremely limited, and there are currently no other areas where a new industrial employment district could be established. The plan will focus on making high quality green connections through this 2 block wide area to ensure it does not create a substantial barrier to access to the river.
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Land Use, Economic Development, Parks and Trails – Chps 5,	Subarea 1 and 2 provide opportunities for new businesses (through redevelopment and filling vacancies) and to connect businesses to the existing parkland along the riverfront. This parkland should have a name and	These comments will be considered in discussion of future plan investment and programming.

	6 & 8	programming to provide access to recreational opportunities. In these subareas, along with other planned industrial and business park areas, a business development strategy should be developed to recruit and retain businesses that provide living wage jobs for Minneapolis residents.	The business development strategy suggested is reflected in the plan's economic development chapter. The parkland on the west bank between Plymouth and Broadway currently is referred to simply as "Above the Falls Park" because it is within the ATF Regional Park, and it is not a parkway.
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Land Use and Design – Chp 5	Park adjacent uses should, at a minimum, be compatible - but more so be an enhancement to the park amenities.	Adding details to urban design section regarding details of site design and compatibility
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Community Development – Chp 8	The residential uses within the Mixed Use areas should provide diverse housing (i.e., ages, household types, price points, etc.)	Housing section addresses mix of housing types and options
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Implementation – Chp 9	An Upper River Development Corporation that embraces and proactively implements the Plan is needed. The development entity needs to establish a strategy to target and recruit businesses and redevelopment in accordance with the Plan.	An organization like this is described in the Implementation chapter
AFCAC letter – 1/24/13	Implementation and Land Use – Chps 5 & 9	We believe that the Plan update must be comprehensive and take into account the interactive aspects of the proposed park, residential, retail, office, light industrial and industrial uses in the upper river corridor. The Plan envisions reconnecting the North and Northeast neighborhoods to the Mississippi River, physically and socially, in a creative and effective manner; therefore, we are concerned that large industrial areas will compromise these connections and decrease the likelihood of enhanced livability (particularly in North Minneapolis). We urge you to consider the best use of this land - now is the time and here is the opportunity!	The plan is designed to create land use change via the establishment of strong new connections to the riverfront, both in terms of development and corridors. While jobs are an important component, land use and design guidelines suggest how they can be accommodated without creating barriers.
Bicycle Advisory Committee comments	Transportation – Chp 7	The BAC strongly supports: • the establishment of Riverway Streets that provide east/west connections between the river and neighborhoods and continuous parkways along the river • using the proposed Riverway Street typology based on cross-sections developed as part of the ACCESS Minneapolis Plan • the recommendation that space and safety for pedestrians and	These are reflected in the draft plan language and recommendations

		cyclists be enhanced on the Riverway Streets ahead of the need for automobile traffic • completing the parkway and trail system along the riverfront in North and Northeast Minneapolis • the 26th Ave N Riverway Street and its connection over the river on the BNSF bridge to the 18th Ave NE bikeway	
Bicycle Advisory Committee comments	Land Use, Transportation – Chps 5 & 7	The plan update does not attempt to finalize a new cross section for Marshall St NE, yet references the 2003 Hennepin County "A Design Development Plan for the Marshall/Main Corridor" that found it not possible to accommodate both on-street parking and bicycle lanes. The BAC recommends the following in regards to Marshall St NE: • On-street bicycle lanes in both directions should be design and implemented on Marshall St NE in 2013 and this facility should be included in the plan update • The list of elements to accommodate in Marshall St NE corridor should be revised to include "adequate accommodations of traffic, while enhancing maintaining a safe pedestrian and bicycle environment and crossings. • The Marshall St NE corridor should integrate a continuous bikeway and the parkland adjacent to Marshall St NE should integrate continuous off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities. As the bikeway and trail corridor are implemented, any co-located facilities should work well for all park visitors and commuters.	Additional clarifying language put in plan to discuss the former study as a starting point, with revised recommendations likely More detail provided on interim strategy for bike access
Bicycle Advisory Committee comments	Transportation – Chp 7	The plan notes that Marshall St NE is currently designated as the Mississippi River Trail. The BAC recommends that the plan update note that the Mississippi River Trail is the first designated state bikeway and that 2nd St N, 22nd Ave N, and the existing trail between 22nd Ave N and 8th Ave N along West River road is the designated Mississippi River Trail in North Minneapolis through the study area.	Language added to plan regarding Mississippi River Trail
Bicycle Advisory Committee comments	Transportation – Chp 7	The BAC recommends that bicycle amenities and services be planned throughout the study area, including, but not limited to, air, water, Nice Ride stations, restrooms, rest stops, scenic overlooks, and bicycle parking.	Additional language regarding amenities included in plan
Bicycle Advisory Committee comments	Transportation – Chp 7	The BAC recommends that the list of Riverway Streets (page 139) be comprehensive by including all Riverway Streets shown on the map (page 108) as 36th Ave N, 29th Ave N, and 14th Ave NE were omitted. The BAC recommends that one additional Riverway	Suggested routes added to plan

		Street – 34th Ave N – be considered as it provides a connection from City View School to the river and is a planned facility in the Bicycle Master Plan	
Bicycle Advisory Committee comments	Transportation – Chp 7	The BAC recommends better coordination between the BAC and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to ensure that future off-street design works well for all park visitors and bicycle commuters.	Ongoing coordination between partners will be key to implementation
Billy Binder letter – 12/31/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Here is a paraphrase of my testimony at the Above the Falls Master Plan public meeting on Monday December 10th. There were a lot of "thumbs up" signals from the audience when I made the appeal for bike lanes on Marshall Street NE as an interim use until Hennepin County reconstructs Marshall from Lowry to Broadway NE to make the all-important bike and pedestrian connections on our RiverFirst project on the east side of the river. A Minneapolis Board of Park Commissioners resolution in support of the interim bike lanes would be a key step in encouraging the Hennepin County Board to take this action. Unfortunately, for reasons that many of us cannot understand, the Hennepin County staff is unwilling to take this common sense and professionally accepted practice of traffic calming along the eastern boarder of the park and any action that you can take now could safeguard park users and residents of Northeast Minneapolis. I cannot imagine a park without contiguous bike lanes and pedestrian trails on both sides of the River. There are three recommendations in the Draft Park and Urban Design Recommendations handout that call for just that and I read them to the audience. We have a great opportunity today to make bike lanes a reality on Marshall St NE between Lowry and Broadway in Hennepin County's 2012 Marshall St NE paving project already on the street but not yet striped. It will be a long time to wait for Hennepin County to reconstruct Marshall Avenue NE after this year's paving program---much too long to wait for needed bike and pedestrian improvements on the center of the Northeast side loop of the park.	Additional clarifying language put in plan to discuss the former study as a starting point, with revised recommendations likely. It is beyond the scope of the ATF Master Plan to determine lane-striping widths for Marshall Street NE in 2013.

		We should put in 10 foot traffic lanes, 5 foot bike lanes and 7 foot parking lanes on Marshall St NE, a layout that is commonplace and popular in the rest of the US and the world. Narrow lanes slow traffic, reduce accidents an average of 10%, make roadways easier to cross for pedestrians and get bike riders off the sidewalks onto bike lanes in the street where bike belong to the delight of pedestrians everywhere. The reasons Hennepin County does not use the 10-5-7 foot layout is that 1) " We have never done it before" and 2) "If we do it for one, we will have to do it for all". The audience laughed. My question is, seeing that Minneapolis City Council Member Diane Hofstede is the leading voice for the 10-5-7 layout in Hennepin County's Marshall Avenue NE paving project, what are the park commissioners and the other city council members going to do to convince the Hennepin County Commissioners to do as Council Member Hofstede suggests?	
Gayle Bonneville letter 1/24/13	Environment, Health – Chps 4 & 7	It is essential that the City of Minneapolis take a more assertive, active role in monitoring and advocating on issues related to pollution remediation in areas in and around the Above the Falls project area. The city has generally been absent from and silent on discussions related to one of the state's largest and most complex polluted sites, which borders the targeted Above the Falls core area. This pollution has seeped directly into the Above the Falls area and beyond, according to the State of Minnesota. As a community volunteer on the Shoreham Area Advisory Committee, I have seen first-hand how the city's hands-off approach to this 230-acre Superfund area has had a negative impact on my neighborhood and this city, and has resulted in a negative impact on redevelopment and revitalization in this community.	Environmental concerns and the need for cleanup, including potential health impacts, are discussed in the plan
Gayle Bonneville letter 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Please be sensitive to the Law of Unintended Consequences that could result from the Above the Falls plan and make arrangements now to address them. I don't see this in the current draft. For instance, I am concerned with the city's rezoning of industrial sites to non- industrial uses. This places extra stress (and traffic impacts) on neighborhoods in Minneapolis that do have remaining industrial lands – most of which are on the Eastside, specifically many in northeast Minneapolis. Some of this land is currently for sale, yet the city appears to be taking no action to help mold a vital	The plan retains more industrial lands that in the original Above the Falls, in part because of restrictions on alternate available sites elsewhere in the city. Addressing needs in other industrial areas outside of this current study area are outside the scope of the plan, but are certainly topics to be discussed with the

		community at these sites. Instead, the neighborhoods become overly impacted by more and more intensive industrial-zoned uses (or proposals for such) that are not in keeping with the city's own Comprehensive Plan. If land in the Above the Falls area is rezoned and the Upper Harbor Terminal tenants relocated, what are the city's plans for addressing the impact on the "receiving" community?	City.
Gayle Bonneville letter 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The plan refers to creation of new/additional office-industrial development areas. While this sounds sensible, there is a theme of Attention Deficit Disorder in the city's planning here. The city appears to jump from shiny object to shiny object on a whim, failing to follow through on its own commitments, statements and plans. The city has previously identified such areas that have yet to be addressed, decades later. For example, Shoreham Yards along Central Avenue was slated for city efforts years ago both verbally and in written plans. This has not materialized. Initially, community members were told Shoreham, a key development opportunity on 18 acres along a key commercial corridor that has been for sale for years, was moved to "next in line" once the Sears Global Market project was completed. Then it was moved down the line when some other project allegedly came up … and again and again. Then community members were told there was "no money." Of course, crises crop up. But political whim needs to be deleted from community planning in Minneapolis, and a factual examination of the city's needs vs. wants should take place and be documented in a work plan. Complete (or at least pursue) what you have already started, please.	This plan does not negate or replace any priorities for other areas of the city.
Cheryl Burrington – 1/1/13 letter	Land Use, Transportation – Chp 5 & 7	I was born in North Minneapolis, as were my parents and some of my grandparent. I have owned my home for over 22 years and my Mother still lives in the home I grew up in at 5223 Newton Ave. N. She has owned that house for 45 years. She grew up across the street from Webber Park. The plans you are working on for the upper Mississippi area make me very happy, I only wish someone had a magic wand to make it all happen right now! Thank you for all of the work you are doing for all of us. I would like to ask you to make security a priority. I see from your plans that is already a consideration and I really like the 24/7 use	Additional reference to safety and security added to plan Destinations are an important part of the plan's guidance for the riverfront Improvements to Lowry, Broadway, and Dowling are addressed in the plan

		plan, but I need to say that if I don't feel safe getting to the river, and biking or walking at the river, I can't go there and others will feel the same. I would love to see security cameras in strategic places. We also need destinations to go to. Restaurants, playgrounds, shops, theatres and boat rides are all reasons to go there and once we are there, enjoy the green spaces. Getting there from the neighborhoods could be easier if the stop lights were synchronized to allow for better traffic flow. Also Dowling on the west side and Lowry and Broadway on the east side should be widened they are far too narrow to handle even the current traffic. I have not been able to go to any of the meetings because they tend to be held on weeknights and I work 2nd shift so I appreciate being able to see all of the plans online.	
Columbia Park meeting 1/21/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The park frontage on the river near OATI shows up as white because there is no parcel there; it should show up as green	This was a mapping error, as this land was not parcelized, and non-parcelized parkland was inadvertently left off the map. This will be corrected.
Columbia Park meeting 1/21/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The business park concept seems like a good idea that makes sense for the area	Thank you for your comment
Columbia Park meeting 1/21/13	Implementation – Chp 9	How will the plan be implemented over the long term? It seems like it will take a long time to realize the vision of continuous riverfront trails	The implementation section describes the process for implementing and updating the plan over time
Columbia Park meeting 1/21/13	Transportation – Chp 7	Look forward to being able to jog down the riverfront to Downtown	Thank you for your comment
Columbia Park meeting 1/21/13	Land Use – Chp 5	What does the term "transitional industrial" mean? It needs to be defined	Language added to define transitional industrial and other land use categories more clearly
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The current Above the Falls plan is a balance of residential, park, and commercial/mixed use. The plan has equal areas of new residential, new park, and commercial/light industrial. The draft revision eliminates the new residential. This is a significant change. Residential on the river is a key provision of the Above the Falls Plan and should remain in the plan. In North Minneapolis, the current Above the Falls plan will	The plan does not eliminate residential, but rather puts it in the context of compatible mixed use communities. This is the same categorization used throughout the city, and supports walkable, livable communities. The plan offers a number of potential

		construct riverfront housing in the two block wide strip of land that currently separates existing single family homes and the new riverfront park. Residential, with supporting commercial nodes at Lowry and Dowling and parkland between the railroad and river will be the land uses north of 31st Ave N. the River First vision calls for a 1 mile long park over I-94. When completed the current single family residential neighborhood would be part of a continuous park and residential neighborhood connecting to the river with shops and restaurants along Lowry and Dowling. The draft revision eliminates the residential neighborhood. North Minneapolis would be denied the same riverfront housing opportunities all other Minneapolis riverfront neighborhoods enjoy. The draft revision limits the riverfront to industrial, business park and commercial mixed use zoning. The rationale for this proposed change is a lack of clarity that Minneapolis is willing to invest the money, and effort to redevelop this part of town. Minneapolis should reaffirm its commitment to riverfront housing in North Minneapolis. Subareas 8 and 10 should remain residential use. Subareas 7 and 9 should remain commercial/residential mixed use. OR2 zoning is the highest and best use.	locations on both banks for riverfront residential. It is more limited than the original plan simply because changes in state law and more extensive feasibility analysis have suggested an alternative, more strategic path towards positive change.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	The River First final vision calls for riverfront park between the river and railroad from Lowry to the Camden Bridge. The River First plan calls for the West River Parkway to be on the west side of the railroad. This provides the residential neighborhood with a parkway location overlooking a regional park and the Mississippi River. The River First plan replaces a windowless cold storage building with a recreation center overlooking the river, wetlands and Downtown skyline. The draft revision shrinks the park, removes the recreation center, builds the road on parkland, and obstructs views. The October 16, 2012 Master Plan presentation shows the area between the railroad and river as park on pages 39 and 43. Page 34 of the River First final vision shows the area between railroad and river as parkland. Page 36 of the final vision shows a year around recreation center replacing the cold storage. The area between the railroad and river should remain parkland as shown in the River First plan. As stated above, the River First plan calls for replacing the windowless cold storage building with a Recreation Center. The	The River First plan did not specify the location of the parkway explicitly, though it has been developed on the river side in subsequent work. The concepts for park features were conceptual in the plan, and details are still in development. This input will be used to inform the implementation of the parks vision as it moves forward.

		windowless cold storage building does not benefit from or add to the scenic river views. The building size and location blocks views along the park and does not leave adequate room for riverfront trails and shoreline restoration that is called for in the River First plan. Semis hauling freight in and out would go through the park. The land between the railroad and river should be parkland.	
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	The Above the Falls plan and page 21 of the River First final vision show parkland between 41st Ave N, Camden Bridge, I-94 and the river. This parkland should be shown on the land use map.	The park concepts in this area are still under development, due to the complexity of land uses and road access. Riverfront parks will be part of the vision regardless.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The current Above the Falls plan has a mixed residential/commercial district called the promenade district. The promenade district is bounded by Lowry on the North, riverfront park on the East, Ole Olson Park and housing on the south and railroad on the West. The River First plan adds new parkland between the existing housing and the promenade district. The promenade district is an east/west north/south trail terminus and gathering place that supports riverfront vitality. Farview Park extension, the 26th Ave N Greenway the BNSF bridge to North East Minneapolis, the west bank riverfront trail and the river amphitheater all meet at this location. The draft revision eliminates the promenade district, housing, and commercial from the Above the Falls plan and replaces it with industrial. The draft revision also eliminates the new parkland from the River First plan. Industrial does not benefit from or add to this important riverfront location. At the public hearings, there was strong interest in attracting museums, an environmental learning center, Universities, urban outfitters, marina and other activities to the riverfront. Subarea 5 has park to the north, park and rivefront on the east, Riverview Town Homes and Northwind Lofts to the south and west. It has stunning views and is only minutes from Downtown. Minneapolis should reaffirm its commitment to the promenade district as a vital mixed use activity district on the riverfront. Subarea 5 should remain commercial/residential mixed use. OR2 is the highest and best use of this riverfront property. Subarea 4 with Riverview Townhomes and the Park District office should be commercial/residential mixed use. OR2 is the highest and best use.	The plan recommends a concept similar to the promenade district in subarea 5 in the longer term vision plan. As there are a number of uncertainties regarding the timing of the implementation, it is currently shown as “transitional industrial” to indicate that it is an evolving area. The plan describes steps needed for this transition to happen.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The three subareas that should be considered for change from the adopted plan are Subareas 4, 11 and 12. Subarea 4 would change	Subarea 4 is recommended for mixed use, to reflect changes since the original plan.

		from residential/industrial to commercial/residential mixed use. Subarea 11 would change from residential to commercial/residential mixed use. The north section of subarea 12 would change from industrial to commercial/residential mixed use.	Subarea 11 has been changed to reflect that it is already functioning well as a landscaped office park, and is too isolated to succeed as a stand-alone residential area. Subarea 12 is controlled by Xcel Energy, who wishes to maintain the site for energy-related purposes.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The current Above the Falls plan points out that land in close proximity to single family neighborhoods, in the heart of the City, and abutting riverfront parkland is to valuable a resource to be used for material handling, outside storage and other uses that provide relatively few jobs per acre and low compatibility with desired uses.	The plan supports a transition away from the low value uses mentioned here, building on the advantages of the area.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Health – Chp 4, App D	The recent health impact study highlights neighborhood impacts from traffic, noise and pollution in connection with current land uses. The draft revision would increase truck traffic, noise, and pollution compared to the adopted Above the Falls plan. The Above the Falls plan recommendations that reduce truck traffic, noise and pollution should be retained.	The plan supports reduction of all the impacts described through clean, green development. Support for ongoing freight rail service provides an alternative to truck traffic.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Parks and Trails – Chp 7	The draft revision eliminates the continuous riverfront park and trail. The riverfront park and trail between 28th Ave NE and St Anthony Boulevard is eliminated. The park and trail are part of the adopted plan. The draft revision also calls for industrial and no riverfront park or trails on vacant riverfront land north of 31stAve NE. Page 57 cites Xcel operations and safety concerns with park and trail along the river. Xcel concerns may be a rationale to include an interim off river trail but the long range plan for a continuous riverfront park and trail should remain in the plan. It should be noted that Xcel operates a similar generating plant on the river in St Paul. In St Paul, Xcel is able to address operations and safety concerns with a continuous park trail along the river. In St Paul, Xcel leases their vacant land for park use. The plan for a continuous park and trail along the river should be retained and the area should remain within the boundaries of the regional park.	This was a mapping error – the continuous park and trail is still in the plan for this area. It will be corrected. The plan does show long term a trail connection on the river side of Xcel Energy as well.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The draft revision eliminates new residential in subarea 11. Unlike the planned residential on the west side of the river this new housing would not bridge the gap between existing housing and the river. However, the riverfront park location does offer an	This isolated area is generally better suited for business park development. Other sites are better suited for residential.

		opportunity to increase housing in the city. In St Paul, there is a new riverfront housing abutting the Excel generating plant property. A suggested compromise position for Subarea 11 and Subarea 12 north of 41st Ave NE is commercial/residential mixed use. OR2 is the highest and best use. Zoning should not preclude residential as part of the redevelopment mix.	The business park zoning proposed would be compatible with residential, however, if there was interest at some point.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Minneapolis owns 40 acres planned for the Northside Wetlands Park. With the sale of this land for park use the City will have $14.4 million that could be dedicated to riverfront redevelopment. The City owns another 8 acres abutting the new parkland that could serve as the first phase of residential and commercial redevelopment. The State of Minnesota owns land abutting the City property that could expand the first phase of redevelopment. The redevelopment of these properties would help prime the pump for additional redevelopment. With City and State support 50 acres of park and residential development could commence this year.	Disposition of the publicly owned land and the development of a riverfront park in this area is a priority in the plan for implementation. Actual land values and sale prices (or means of transfer of title) are to be determined.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	If completing the West River Parkway is a priority, it could be run along the river side of the railroad north of Lowry and use Pacific south of Lowry. With a short extension of Pacific south to the current parkway there could be a completed West River Parkway. This could significantly reduce the cost and time to build the parkway. Construction of the parkway would provide much needed access and spur redevelopment along the river.	The plan supports the development of Pacific as an interim route for the parkway, prior to more complete riverfront land acquisition.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Minneapolis owns property at the promenade. Sale of this site for park use will provide the City with funds for relocation and provide public access to the river.	The waste transfer facility located here may be an opportunity site, but at present no alternative site for this function has been identified elsewhere in the city.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Environment – Chp 7	Asian carps pose a great threat to our rivers and lakes. The State of Minnesota spent $12 million on a barrier in Coon Rapids. The State plans to spend $18 million more on a bubble and sound barrier at Lock and Dam 1. These barriers are less effective than closing the lock. The Corps of Engineers can not close the lock without Congressional approval if barge traffic remains. Minnesota is seeking emergency authority to close the locks. Unfortunately, Congress seems to be in gridlock. The Above the Falls plan offers a way around this problem. The Above the Falls plan phases out heavy industry and the three remaining barge facilities. Minneapolis has committed to closing the port next year. If the State provides funding for acquisition of these three	Additional language added regarding the threat of Asian carp and the implications for the study area

		remaining facilities the COE does not need Congressional authorization for emergency closure. Expedited parkland acquisition would be a prudent strategy for the State to ensure its has all the tools it needs to prevent the catastrophic impacts of invasive species getting past this stretch of the river. This could also reduce the $3.6 million annual cost to operate the locks. The State should expedite funding for parkland acquisition and redevelopment and give the COE the flexibility to act if the bubble barrier is not effective.	
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Environment – Chp 7	Some people have asked what a naturalized river will be like. Dredging began in the 1960's. People used the river for thousands of years before that. Dredging in the river is like letting a backhoe loose in a nature preserve. The end of dredging will allow restoration of islands and river habitat restoration. The end of dredging will benefit clam and mussel populations. Ending dredging will eliminate the need for a 9 acre dredge spoils site.	The plan supports a more natural riverfront edge as part of park development.
Tom Dimond letter 1/22/13	Land Use and Economic Development – Chps 5 & 8	The Northwest Quadrant redevelopment report to the City Council offers a valuable perspective. On the industrial land that is planned for redevelopment as riverfront housing there are 7 jobs per acre. Minneapolis residents are 13% of industrial employees or 1 per acre. Let's say that North Minneapolis residents get 25% of industrial jobs. This would mean 1 job per 4 acres. The report states that the City can play a role in businesses employing higher numbers of city residents and creating more jobs per acre. If this is true, why not implement this plan throughout the City? The adopted Above the Falls Plan includes industrial, creates 2,000 net new jobs while freeing up land for parks and housing. This is the balanced urban approach that Minneapolis needs to create both jobs and housing opportunities. The report overlooks an important factor in the effort to increase the number of City residents filling jobs in the City. Employees can live where they choose. Cities need to offer a wide array of attractive housing opportunities to keep current residents and attract new ones. In particular, the City needs to maximize high amenity value sites on the river and adjacent to regional parks.	The plan prioritizes job intensive uses for the area, and supports an emphasis on local hiring. Significant shrinkage of land dedicated to industrial citywide means there is only so much that can be fit within a smaller footprint of industrial areas. Added language saying that supporting industrial/office development in the core strengthens and diversifies the city tax base (which has increasingly in recent years relied on residential uses), and supports the regional transit system.
Faegre Baker Daniels letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	In connection with the City's 2009 adoption of the Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth, which incorporated the land use guidance from CPED's existing Above the Falls Master Plan (the ATF Plan), GAF and other property owners and businesses within the ATF area raised concerns that the future land use guidance in	The planning process did include the analysis discussed. The results of this are in the plan's technical appendices. The analysis concluded that the value of

		the ATF Plan would lead to the rezoning of their properties to non-industrial uses which would severely restrict their operations and endanger the economic viability of their sites. In response to such concerns, the City Council directed CPED staff to "explore policy and regulatory strategies for providing existing property owners clearer expectations about the phasing of long range land use transitions" and to analyze "potential impacts of the [ATF plan's land use guidance] related to the extent and phasing of the … transition from industrial to nonindustrial development." CPED subsequently developed and, in late 2012, issued the draft 2012 ATF Plan Update. Unfortunately, the proposed plan update does not respond to the City Council's direction (by, among other things, failing to analyze potential impacts on industrial sites which would be reclassified as nonindustrial) or alleviate GAF's original concerns. To the contrary, the draft 2012 ATF Plan Update exacerbates GAF's concerns by expanding the portion of the GAF site guided for Park and Open Space and guiding the balance of the site for nonindustrial mixed use. The plan update, if not modified to restore an Industrial use guidance for the GAF Plant site, would have severe adverse consequences for the Plant.	much of the existing industrial was significant enough that cost-benefit analysis would not justify buying it up and redeveloping it with additional private development. As such, the development strategy focuses on public sites and infill opportunities as they emerge. However, the analysis also suggests that developing a riverfront park amenity was needed to spur most types of higher value investment, as the area currently had very low amenity value to inspire private investment. This would require the acquisition of some riverfront land over a very long implementation timeline.
Faegre Baker Daniels letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The GAF Plant site is currently zoned I3, General Industrial; and I2 Medium Industrial – classifications that are consistent with its historic and ongoing use. The future land use map in the ATF Plan guides the portion of the GAF Plant site nearest the Mississippi River as Park and Open Space and the remaining portions of the site either as residential Urban Neighborhood or Mixed Use. The draft 2012 ATF Plan Update proposes guiding more of the GAF site as Park and Open Space, with the remainder to the west as mixed use. Pursuant to Minnesota state statute, zoning ordinances – including zoning district classifications – cannot conflict with the land use guidance in the municipality's comprehensive land use plan. Accordingly, the land use guidance in both the 2012 ATF Plan Update and the existing ATF Plan would ultimately require that a substantial part of the GAF Plant site be rezoned from the existing industrial uses to a nonindustrial use. The result would be "split zoning" of the Plant site into commercial or other nonindustrial use in one portion and industrial use in the other. In the event of a split zoned property, the City's Zoning Code requires that the more restrictive of the two zoning classifications control. Accordingly, the entire Plant site would be governed by	The wider application of the Park category to the GAF site reflects the realities of road portal under the new Lowry Bridge, which effectively dictates the placement of the new parkway. As the parkway forms the boundary between the park and other development, a larger portion of the GAF site is captured within the park footprint. Added language to clarify that the City has a policy which does not support creating split zoning. A determination would be made regarding the rezoning of this site. The plan is also written to allow for it to be consistent with policy to delay the rezoning of sites to a future date, based on the expected phasing of the redevelopment.

		the more restrictive provisions of the nonindustrial use within the nonindustrial zone. Under the Zoning Code, a nonconforming use cannot be expanded, enlarged or intensified in character or operation without discretionary approval from the City Planning Commission or City Council. The resulting uncertainty as to what operations and improvements the City might permit at the site would destroy GAF's ability to plan for both the present and future, undermining the stability of a plant which has been in operation for many decades. As noted earlier, land use guidance in the proposed 2012 ATF Update has, by itself, created a level of uncertainty significant enough to affect 2013 capital expenditures budgeted for the Minneapolis Plant. The zoning restrictions discussed above would severely limit the Plant's operational flexibility in the future, including the ability to modify the Plant to keep pace with evolving technological and manufacturing standards…. The land use guidance set forth in the 2012 ATF Plan Update (as well as the guidance in the existing ATF Plan) and the resulting rezoning of the GAF site pose a significant risk of economic harm to GAF. Conversely, if the future land use guidance designated the entire Plant site as Industrial and supported continued Industrial zoning of the entire Plant site – and if such zoning actually was maintained on the site – the incentive for GAF to continue its long-standing program of capital investment in its Minneapolis Plant would continue into the future. Given the severely adverse impact of a potential rezoning on operations at the GAF Plant and its economic viability, GAF asks that CPED reconsider the proposed 2012 ATF Plan Update, modify the proposed future land use designation of the GAF Plant site to Industrial, and support a continued Industrial zoning at the Plant site.	
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails, Land Use – Chps 5 & 6	Broadway to Lowry Riverfront District (Subarea 5). We are pleased with several marked improvements we see in the designated future land uses in this area. Past public meetings demonstrated some popular concern that earlier versions of the plan update underserved the North Side – particularly already	The current recommendations reflect comments received during the planning process

		struggling areas between Broadway and Lowry. You will recall the concern at that point was that the parkland design and land uses in that area did not go far enough in promoting an active, welcoming riverfront that is needed for new parkland to feel safe for local residents to utilize And so we are pleased that the new Future Land Use Plan from December makes a few important changes to address this concern. First, the plan expands the area of the regional park inland from the river. This provides the opportunity for a more meaningful "destination"-quality riverfront park – with the exact nature of that park to be refined in the future. We hope accompanying park plans might begin to suggest possible directions for this site. Second, the revised Future Land Use Plan draft reclassifies this area from industrial to "transitional" industrial. This distinction, along with the notation that the long---term plan "allows transition to other uses to occur if there is an opportunity to do so that furthers the vision of riverfront development" (page 78) gives us confidence that this area may have a chance to fulfill its potential, while still recognizing the present heavy industrial uses will be hard to relocate in the short term. As we think far into the future, we believe encouraging housing and commercial mixed use development through much of this area is in the best long-term interest of the City.	
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Land Use, Transportation, Parks and Trails – Chps 5, 6 & 7	Parkland vision much too limiting in parts of the Upper Harbor Terminal District (Subarea 8). Our principal concern in this area is that the parkland is too limited in lateral width in too many areas. The Plan creates an area of parkland between about 34th Avenue and Dowling Avenue that appears to be around 100 feet or less in width, in which a parkway, pathways, some green space, and riverbank slope all need to be accommodated. This is too constrained, and will create an undesirable and unwelcoming corridor through the area, similar in character to the narrow passage that currently exists between Graco and the riverfront, just south of Broadway. This undermines the public-spiritedness and boldness of the overall vision for the plan. We wonder how the overall acreage in subarea 8 compares with the plan we worked with the City of Minneapolis to create for the Upper Harbor Terminal about ten years ago. We would be interested to see such a calculation and comparison prior to the plan going to the Planning Commission and City Council. On a simple visual	While not always clear on the map, the minimum width of the cross section for parkway, trail, and parkland is being designed to be adequate, consistent with what is currently in place for West River Road north of Broadway Ave. Adding more cross section detail to Land Use chapter to illustrate and provide more details. The exact dimensions will depend on more in-depth development study work done after the plan has been adopted. Effort will be made to ensure the parkland is placed appropriately to support development and river access.

		inspection, the Upper Harbor Terminal Redevelopment Study would seem to offer more acreage in its scenarios. Particularly on this publicly-owned parcel that will be redeveloped in the near-term, it is very disappointing to us that the plan so short-changes the potential for a destination park here. As you know, the MPRB prefers a larger park from the river to the railroad right-of-way in this location and is prepared to secure the resources to purchase the additional acreage from the City. The North side has largely been excluded from the benefits of riverfront parks, we urge the City to reconsider this aspect of the plan. Further, the bulk of acreage in the Northside wetlands park is concentrated a few blocks too far south in our minds. We suggest it would be better located further to the north to anchor redevelopment in the area. More specifically, we want to see more parkland acreage included within the city-owned UHT boundary itself. If the City is serious about accomplishing the parkland goals of this plan, the City should set an example for other private developers. If the City is not willing to give up more acreage for park, it will be that much easier for private property owners to resist adhering to the regional park boundary – something experience tells us is bound to happen when redevelopment occurs. Finally, there is one portion of a block we think ought to be park, and not private development. We would trade the small development parcel on the north side of the eastern terminus of Dowling Avenue for parkland – which would seem a small price to pay to better connect this parkland with surrounding development.	
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	We are pleased with emphasis on increasing trail access and moving toward a continuous riverfront in Subareas 13 through 17. In particular, we have been concerned in the past that we focus intently on creating a continuous riverfront park on this part of the river. We have comments elsewhere on some textual changes for the goals impacting much of this area, but think the map is solid conceptually.	The map reflects comments and input provided during the planning process
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	We would like to offer what we think is a small correction to Subarea 11 on the land use map. We think you intended to identify the land between St. Anthony Parkway and the river on the northern end of the corridor as parkland, as you had in previous drafts of the map. If this area is not to be designated as parkland, we are curious why that is the case.	This was a mapping error, as this land was not parcelized, and non-parcelized parkland was inadvertently left off the map. This will be corrected.
Friends of the	Parks and Trails –	We think it would be useful for the plan to make note of the	Reference to Cleveland model added to

Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Chp 6	Horace Cleveland model of parkland development in Minneapolis, perhaps in the context and history section, and perhaps elsewhere. The Cleveland model is perhaps the central defining feature of the waterfront design in both Minneapolis and St. Paul. It is a fundamental part of the success enjoyed by the Minneapolis Park system. The model protects the riverfront as public open space. Inland from a public open space area there are trails, and inland from that, a parkway road that provides some definition of public space. Private development, except as an accessory to the parkland, is limited to the areas inland from the parkway. Cleveland's waterfront design undergirds your cross---sectional views of public and private development through the upper riverfront, and the historic precedent it provides to the DNA of the Minneapolis Parks system deserves to be called out, if only briefly. Though some of your intermediate steps provide for a temporary parkway inland from existing private development, most models of new development you provide adhere to the Cleveland model. You also draw on the Cleveland model when you refer to riverfront parkways as fundamentally being a "park framing" device on page 111, and again at the bottom of page 139. Thus, calling out the model seems a useful contextual tool in evaluating future parkland, parkway, and development proposals.	plan and regional park plan
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Implementation – Chp 9	We are pleased with how the plan has taken shape when separated into a Priority Plan and a Vision Plan (described in detail on page 155). We had previously commented that we were concerned too much of the previous planning work was being lost to the wisdom of economic analyses that, while useful, are also somewhat limited in their capacity to predict far into the future. The demarcation between the priority plan and the vision plan helps provide a realistic path forward for actionable development items in the vision plan, without leaving behind some longer-term ideals, which are retained in the vision plan. This benefit is further amplified by some of the area-specific goals, which still allow for some alternate paths for redevelopment in future decades, if conditions change sufficiently to make those paths more feasible.	This reflects input on both feasibility and long range vision provided during the planning process
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Implementation – Chp 9	We are pleased with the emphasis on reevaluation of the plan at least every ten years. As the plan has noted throughout, this revision moves the Above the Falls Plan to be much more responsive to local economic conditions than the original 1999 version. In the process, it encourages some approaches over	This reflects input on both feasibility and long range vision provided during the planning process

		others, while retaining the fundamental vision of the original plan. But of course, economic conditions change, and to a lesser extent, the needs of the City change over time, and require plan revisions. Revising a Master Plan once every ten years is simply a best practice.	
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Policy Issues – Chp 3	We are generally pleased with how the report discusses the plan to close the Upper Harbor Terminal. However, on page 37, as one small change, we would suggest revising the last sentence on the page, which reads, "At present, the City's plan is to close the terminal and redevelop the site." We suggest the qualifier of "at present" may make the City's plans sound too tenuous to readers of the plan. If anything, we think the question has been whether closure will be occurring immediately, or instead simply in the near future.	Language in chapter has been clarified
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Environment – Chp 7	We think the plan gives too little emphasis to the threat of Asian Carp, and its possible relationship to waterway and land use change in the upper river. Much consideration is given to the development marketplace, and what that implies for development, but little consideration is given to Asian Carp, which could have implications rivaling those of the development marketplace on several key sites. While the threat of Asian Carp is noted briefly in a couple of locations, we think the threat merits more than the couple total paragraphs across the report's 179 pages. It is true that the City of Minneapolis is not generally a principal actor charged with the control of the statewide invasive species. But in this particular case, how we respond to the threat of Asian Carp is likely to be a significant factor in how land use evolves in this area, Moreover, our response to the Asian Carp threat deeply changes how the central uniting resource in the plan – the Mississippi River – is used by both businesses and recreational users. Not acknowledged in the report, nor necessarily understood by the broader public, is that the Mississippi River provides a central conduit for carp into lakes, rivers, and streams through much of central Minnesota, well beyond the Mississippi River. As such, if carp get past the Ford Dam and St. Anthony Falls, they will likely degrade great swaths of important aquatic natural environments, undermining treasured fisheries, and undercutting a considerable portion of the state's tourism economy. Articulating such a fact would give the reader of the plan some basic context to understand the likely gravity of the motivations and tradeoffs	Additional language added to further identify threat and potential impacts on the area, with suggested edits to existing content. It was determined this would not be the City's primary policy plan for addressing Asian carp, but additional context is helpful

		policymakers at all levels will be weighing as the future of this area is considered. Such an exploration seems necessary to have the context-setting sections of the plan be sufficiently comprehensive in their scope. Indeed, the Mayor of Minneapolis has been a particularly vocal supporter of action to limit the spread of carp. We therefore believe, given the threat, more ample consideration in the plan is also in sync with a body of thinking shared by prominent local policymakers. Indeed, if regional shipping routes and economy is given so much consideration, we think it appropriate that the ecological and economic impacts of carp be given a parallel consideration. We would be happy to assist and point you toward additional resources that could better develop a quick but more fully-grounded consideration of the evolving discussion around invasive Asian Carp. As more of a footnote, we would point out that the statement made midway through page 127 may not be true – "While fish are large enough to be able to jump over many barriers, they would not be able to jump over St. Anthony Falls if the lock was closed". Many professionals working on the Asian carp issue believe that the slope of the apron of the lower falls is not steep enough to prevent Asian carp from swimming upstream at certain flow levels. However, the Ford Dam just downstream is universally believed to act as a total barrier, were the locks kept closed.	
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Land Use and Urban Design – Chp 5	We are quite pleased at the early attempts to spell out key design guidelines for the areas along the river. Obviously, there remains some ambiguity about exactly how these guidelines will be implemented – by code or otherwise – but some ambiguity is appropriate for a Master Plan of this scale. To this end, we thought it would be helpful to know that Minneapolis's closest peer – St. Paul – is in the final stages of updates to its industrial land use standards that provide citywide industrial design standards in code that could provide some models for approaches taken in Minneapolis, either Citywide, or in the Above the Falls area. A quick scan of Minneapolis' overall zoning code suggested many of these do not yet apply to industrial areas. Which requirements apply varies by intensity of industrial zoning district, but some examples of requirements include: • Buildings are required to "hold the corner" in pedestrian---oriented areas, or alternately use other architectural or public art elements to hold the street corner.	Additional language added to urban design section. Noted that some of these recommendations are already included in Minneapolis' site plan review chapter of the Zoning Code.

		• The bottom 25 feet of building facades must include human---scale elements such as doors, windows, variations in material, ornamentation and color, bays and recesses • Restrictions on materials, generally not accepting the use of concrete block, synthetic stucco, corrugated metal, reflective glass, and vinyl, fiberglass, asphalt, or fiberboard siding. • All office areas in industrial uses must have at least 15% of the exterior walls be translucent windows. • To the extent possible, parking must be behind or to the side of the property, with a limited allowance for parking in front of buildings. • Landscaping should be provided along streets and street edge. • Public sidewalks should be provided. We believe these may inform some additional potential directions for inclusion in the Above the Falls Master Plan prior to forwarding it to the Planning Commission, and would certainly be useful context as you draft code revisions for the area. For more information on these design guidelines, and the (generally positive) public response from industrial developers, contact St. Paul Principal City Planner Allan Torstenson	
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	We think the goals for the Marshall North Riverfront District (Subarea 13) and Marshall South Riverfront District (Subarea 15) could be more forcefully worded. Goal number one states that "in the near term, allow a mix of uses compatible with park development and riverfront location, making accommodations where possible for riverfront trail connectivity and access" (italics used for emphasis). We think careful thought should be given to how to achieve this goal. It has been our experience that if a site is constrained, future trail access gives way too easily to other concerns. Taking the words "where possible" out, or finding a way to rewrite the goal seems important in providing robust guidance that a continuous riverfront trail is a laudable, and important, goal. Goal number two for subarea 13 is that "in the longer term, when feasible, make strategic land acquisitions and investments to allow for more extensive parkland, with limited accessory uses that bring activity and interest to the riverfront." We might suggest adding a few words to this goal, specifically acknowledging the ultimate vision, decades in the future, is that the area is a continuous green riverfront. We've found that without putting that vision out there, there is too often pressure for short-sighted, short	Additions and edits made to plan reflecting suggestions

		term decision-making that undermines what is our ultimate goal of a continuous riverfront park. Additionally, still on goal number two for subarea 13, we think the goal ought to spell out that accessory uses must be park-compatible. Perhaps this is implied, but given the range of private uses that exist there today, one or two additional qualifiers would be prudent. Similar language is also used in the narrative for subarea 13 (page 91), the narrative for subarea 15 (page 92), and the second goal for subarea 15 (page 100).	
Friends of the Mississippi letter – 1/24/13	Environment – Chp 7	We are pleased with the call to review the Critical Area ordinance and study any needed zoning changes to assist in implementation of this plan (page 116). Most of the City's riverfront is parkland, and so how the Critical Area ordinance treats the private development is a particular concern to helping land use change in this area be as strategic and environmentally-sensitive as possible.	Thanks for this comment
Sally Grans-Korsh letter 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Attached is the letter sent in August from the official neighborhood group. This letter noted the concern for blanket one-type of zoning for this entire area. It requested the concept of mixed use and this issue was also raised at the Nov 11, 2012 visioning session you both attended. Since this document However, on page 9 the plan for Above the Falls still lists this unique piece of property as all business park. This may be a direct relationship to the current Graco industry but does not reflect appropriate community and economic development as noted on page 6 of the plan. The community has stated that it prefers a more mixed use development and not the mega-zoning of these mega blocks. It is grossly unfair that unique mixed use is proposed in the area north of Broadway but south of Broadway to 8th Ave it is a broad brush mega industrial/businesses area. We have discussed this at our community meetings and have noted the importance of protecting a world class company like Graco but do not feel the entire property needs to be developed for them. The park development adjacent to this area is 8 acres and may be the first RiverFirst site with a proposed 4 acres mixed use. To zone ALL of the area from the park property to Marshall Ave and ALL of the area from 8th Ave NE to Broadway with business is	The business park guidance is consistent with the original adopted Above the Falls plan. The update does show mixed use around the new Scherer Park, an addition based on community input. The intent is that the uses would be park supportive. MPRB intends to pursue a community engagement process as part of an RFP process seeking park-supportive development of the MPRB-owned parcel adjacent the future park site.

		unfortunate and does not respect the livability issues and small scale economic growth that would benefit the most residents. The document notes the varied and interesting uses currently in place with the Teachers Union office building and other commercial enterprises (page 25 business cluster). The blanketing of this huge area to all be industrial/business does a strong disservice to the community and the region that will be attracted to the RiverFirst project. The St Anthony West Neighborhood has very little pocket commercial areas and mixed use is more appropriate. This was stated in writing in August and in person to both of you on November 11, 2012. It is most unfortunate that this more appropriate, site sensitive zoning cannot be accomplished with mixed use more than just the proposed 4 acres not owned by the Mpls Park and Recreation. I urge your reconsideration of this massive blanket business zoning in our area and add in more mixed use to compliment the 4 acres proposed by the Mpls Park and Recreation plan.	
Sally Grans-Korsh letter 2/8/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Page 9 proposes the Future Zoning. This map clearly indicates all blue "business" between 8th and Broadway and between Marshall and the river with the exception of the pink "mixed use" for the 4 acres proposed for the Mpls Park and Rec property. It has been and is requested, that the area 8th to 9th Ave NE and Sibley to Ramsey be noted as "mixed use" or "pink and not shown as blue "business". Colors are important and these colors do represent different levels of zoning. This is a requested change of use from the document originally created some twenty plus years ago. Nowhere (that I could see) in this 179 page document does it go into specific discussions of what exact type of exact letter or alphabet of type mixed use or business with zoning categories. This request is to have this one block (currently with small business and teachers union) be "downzoned" to mixed use - or pink in color – to better reflect local changes in the community, livability issues and benefits to	The Business Park designation shown is from the original 2000 plan and is further supported by additional analysis. This designation allows for a range of active uses, including commercial, retail, and hospitality. There is concern in showing residential as an option (implied in mixed use) because that has created conflicts in business and industrial areas elsewhere The Park Board is proposing compatible and active uses near the 8th St NE frontage they own as part of the Scherer Park development

		smaller businesses. Additionally, this change in pink would match and align much better with the proposed uses that the Mpls Park Rec Board is proposing for their 4 acres adjacent to the Park site.	
Hawthorne letter 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	As the Above the Falls Plan moves forward to the final vote by City Council to approve re-zoning in sub-areas 4, 5, and 6, Hawthorne Neighborhood Council finds it necessary to reiterate our position on the proposed changes. We support mixed use zoning for each of the above referenced areas. Purposing these areas for industry is exactly opposite of what City Planners assured us was in store for the riverfront – increased housing stock, river access for neighborhood residents, and recreational opportunities. The occupants of the Riverview Townhomes already have to deal with excess noise and poor air quality including fine air particulates and other dust/sediment from existing industrial business located on the river. To approve zoning changes that would encourage industry to locate to this area would further detract from their quality of life and could result in many homeowners having to walk away from the prime real estate in which they have invested. Essentially, it is no longer necessary or appropriate for future or current industrial businesses to be on the River.	Riverfront areas 4 and 5 are guided for mixed use in the long term, though the plan describes the conditions needed to ensure such a development is possible and viable. Parks and recreational opportunities are in the plan as well. Shorter term recommendations focus on mitigation of the negative impacts described; health impacts are evaluated. Consistent with the original Above the Falls plan, Subarea 6 is shown as an industrial employment district.
Hawthorne letter 1/24/13	Land Use and Community Development – Chps 5 & 8	We want to make our position very clear that when we approved the Riverview Townhomes development, we believed then, as we do now, that the Hawthorne neighborhood deserves varied types of housing (not just workforce housing). The proposed zoning changes that allow industry to come to this area defeat the purpose of having housing on the river. We recommend that you follow through with the original Above the Falls plan that indicates that sub-areas 4 and 5 be used for housing – NOT industrial	The plan does support potential housing on the river in subarea 4, and in the longer term in subarea 5. Plan specifically references the need for a range of housing types, across a variety of households and price points
Hawthorne letter 1/24/13	Economic Development – Chp 8	There are very few North Minneapolis residents employed by the businesses already located along the River and if there aren't any stipulations or incentives woven into plan for bringing jobs to the River, then this is a trend that you can count on continuing. Addressing the need for varied types of housing, especially along the River, thereby becomes a far more important issue for this organization than bringing in industry that has not been drawn to hiring from within our community for a very long time.	The plan recommends such requirements being an essential part of the economic development strategy
Hawthorne letter	Land Use – Chp 5	It often seems as though this neighborhood, and North	The intent of the plan is to support high

1/24/13		Minneapolis in general is excluded from some of the City's purported goals like: Many People, One Minneapolis; and Livable Communities, Healthy Lives. This is a prime opportunity to invest in North Minneapolis and give it the attention it needs to become, as it once was, a strong and thriving community. Voting No to the proposed re-zoning for the Above the Falls plan will demonstrate a commitment to this.	quality development that will improve the area, including public and environmental health As a point of clarification, the land in question is already all zoned industrial, though this may change in subsequent rezonings
Matt Johnson letter – 12/29/12	Environment, Parks – Chps 6 & 7	I was reading through the draft plan for the Above the Falls plan and it's quite interesting. I was hoping to find environmental concerns in a prominent place within the plan and indeed it was. I'm a member of the Audubon Society and have been an active park steward at Roberts Bird Sanctuary. I would like to request that plans be made in this new draft for another bird/wildlife sanctuary someplace within this Above the Falls area. I know that the neighborhood around Roberts and many other people from the city appreciate the sanctuary for its wildness and the refuge it provides wildlife. By my research there are 6.400 acres of parks in Minneapolis and only a very small fraction of that land is managed as bird sanctuaries (just Roberts and Eloise Butler). I hope that a wild area or areas will be possible. I know that many of the people I know are sick and tired of just have large mowed areas. p.s. Perhaps an outdoor archery range would be nice too as that sport has been making a comeback lately.	Natural habitat areas are an important component of the plan for riverfront park development, as described in River First
Lao outreach 11/17/12	Parks and Trails, Health – Chps 4 & 6	The Lao community is not familiar with participation in community events such as the Upper Mississippi Riverfront Project where their input and opinions are requested to implement a change in the community. For the most part, they would prefer to stay out of the decision making project due to intimidation as well as respect for the authority. Because of this reason, it was difficult to get the discussion going, but some of the things that the participants expressed included: more bathrooms that are clean and usable, benches to sit on, trails to walk to and from the river from their cars and parking destination and free parking. Some recreation activities the expressed during the forum includes use of trails, volleyball courts, soccer fields for soccer tournaments and paddle, canoe and kayak rentals that are affordable. Some participants expressed interest in having shopping centers and restaurants along the Riverfront that faces the river so that they are able to park and go shopping or take food down to the river to eat	Suggestions for park features have been documented in this plan and appendices, and will be used to inform future park design and programming

		from nearby restaurants. The participants would also like to see more pavilions so that they can have picnics and small outdoor gatherings and birthday parties at the park along the Mississippi River with propane tank hook-ups so they can have barbecues and grills, clean water access. One of the major requests from several participants of the forum was the need for efficient and cheap parking that is easily accessible and close to the park, trails, soccer fields and fishing docks. They stated that many times when parks are made in big cities, they have to pay to park and walk a few blocks to get to the river or parks. It is not ideal when young children are involved or when setting up for small parties or picnics. This is the main reason why many Lao community members prefer to use parks out in the suburban areas, state park areas or in less crowded stretches of the Mississippi River like further up north Youth input included playgrounds for young children, fishing docks that are easily accessible from trails and picnic areas as well as beaches for swimming. A particular youth stated that she would love to see community events such as college fairs, summer festivals, park cleaning opportunities to meet other youths in the area as well as encourage youth to use the parks and Riverfronts more. The community also expressed interest in having cultural events such as those practiced in Laos such as boat races, farmers markets and food markets along the river that is run by local vendors and private families. They believe such events builds community and respect for others. In regards to the health impact of the project, the Lao community would like to see more trails in the park so that they can go for walks. Some of the elders expressed walking on the trails while the younger ones fished or grilled. LACM is interested in the health assessment and impact of the Upper Mississippi Riverfront project because of its goal to help the Lao community improve their health conditions. With the increase in trails, bike rentals, soccer and volleyball courts in the Upper Mississippi Riverfront, LACM can help organize more group exercise programs and	

		events in the future that is easily accessible and convenient for those who use the LACM services. The project will positively affect the health of SEA residents in the area because it will allow them cheap and affordable access to the riverfront for daily walks and exercise which will ultimately help the Lao community members take control of their health condition.	
Latino outreach 11/11/12	Parks and Trails, Health – Chps 4 & 6	Families were asked to fill out a survey regarding changes they would like to see to the Upper Riverfront. A total of 150-200 people were present at the public gathering. Twenty-eight surveys were completed. Additionally, post it notes were handed out to each family to "vote" for changes that the perceived as important to them. Votes were than counted for each category and will be used make recommendations on how to prioritize changes in the revised plan. Category # votes More industry 0 More jobs 9 More parks 20 Shops and restaurants 0 More art, music, and cultural and historical sites 2 More residential neighborhoods 2 More walking paths from neighborhood to the river 7	Additional parks are a high priority in the plan
Latino outreach 11/11/12	Parks and Trails, Health – Chps 4 & 6	A few guiding questions were asked to generate discussion. Although the intention was to have a group discussion, input was provided by speaking directly with the moderator. Some questions/information to the moderator were: -Is the plan to knock down my home and build parks? -Can we get volleyball courts, turf, soccer fields? -There's dust coming from the Lumber yard at Lowry & Main? We are breathing in all of that dust -Is this plan good or bad for me? Will I lose my home and need to move?	Additional language about mitigating noise and dust added Clarification that this plan will not involve the involuntary removal of residential neighborhoods
Lind Bohanon meeting 12/17/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Upgrade the park entrance along 42nd – need to make it a "real" entrance with pedestrian friendly access; address (1) semis that block the way, (2) drainage problems with standing water after it rains, and (3) graffiti. Install some sort of drain under the freeway to handle stormwater in the park entrance area; MWMO could possibly assist with this?	Recommendations to upgrade access included in plan. This level of park improvement will be prioritized as riverbank parks and trails are developed and as funding becomes available.
Lind Bohanon meeting 12/17/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Enlist DNR support for greening along the riverfront; keep Upper Mississippi Riverfront Park green and natural like it is	Thank you for your comment

Lind Bohanon meeting 12/17/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Need better signage to Mississippi River access points; get signs installed off of highway (MRP was working on this)	Recommendations to upgrade access included in plan
Lind Bohanon meeting 12/17/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Accommodate need for affordable housing options, including halfway houses and public housing	Plan includes language regarding provision of wide range of housing options
Lind Bohanon meeting 12/17/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Maintain boat access at the Upper Mississippi Riverfront Park	It is the intent to maintain boat access at this site
Lind Bohanon meeting 12/17/12	Introduction – Chp 1	Plan should clearly show the location of the study area, so there is no confusion where it is located	Locator map has been added to plan
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails, Implementation – Chps 6 & 9	I greatly appreciate the time and analysis that this major body of work represents. I know staff were constrained by elected direction on the scope of the project and the topics to be explored. That was unfortunate as the impact of what happens here has the potential to make North and NE very desirable areas with amenities comparable to other areas of the city, improved health in an area with limited opportunities for outdoor non-team recreation, and access to the natural world, a basic human need and value. It could also promote a growing tax base or not make much more than a very local ripple. This area has been overburdened by pollution and lack of amenities and soul reviving natural experiences. My experience of not having experienced a Mpls lake until a senior in high school is not unusual. Kids involved in the youth survey were invited on the Paddlewheel boat based out of Boom Island. One teenager was so excited – it was the first time he had been on a boat. Another local teen was so excited to learn that there was a river a few blocks from her home – there is just limited connection now and great opportunities to change that. International visitors want to see the Mighty Mississippi as they envisioned Huck Finn on it – not the manicured view from the downtown riverfront (although that's beautiful and a favorite destination). Two thirds of all tourism in MN is in the metro – think of the opportunities to create new experiences for persons attending conventions or arts events in our area. Too often the interaction with this part of the city's potential is a "dream small, be practical" approach. But that is not what previous generations of planners did. It certainly is not what happened along the Central Riverfront. I will share my feedback in two parts – some broad concepts for a new regulatory structure	The plan supports the development of a riverfront park system, providing access for local residents and other visitors. The plan accommodates both practical and visionary concepts through its two-staged Priority and Vision plan components.

		that will govern who and what is located along this very precious land and a separate document with very specific comments and reactions. The second one was created over time as I managed to squeeze a little time here and there to read the lengthy document. (Please never again ask for public review and comment over a holiday period!). I'm not an expert on zoning conventions but would like to propose a new regulatory structure with sufficient "teeth" to limit and guide changes. Given the overburden of pollution in this area we need a special pollution mitigation zone that will prohibit adding to these burdens(see the map on page 115 of the numerous MPCA involved sites). I look forward to helping you forge the partnerships that will take these dreams to reality. It is only by dreaming big that we will engage the hearts and minds of others in our fair state to step up with state resources. We need to highlight that THIS IS A NATIONAL PARK and work give that proud boast credibility. This is one of the great rivers of the world – an internationally cherished migratory flyway for birds, butterflies and other natural species. What are we doing to make those seasonal visitors healthy and welcome? I work a lot in health care and the lack of affordable and pleasurable exercise opportunities for low income people and adults is reflected in the higher than average rates of obesity in these communities. Together we can achieve impressive outcomes on a variety of indicators. As important as this document is the plan (not included in the report) of how to nurture and sustain the enthusiasm. I look forward to doing my part.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails, Land Use and Urban Design – Chps 5 & 6	Public Amenity Zone: A new form of development rules for all properties adjacent to regional parks and/or with waterfront views: The rarest and most valuable land aesthetically and in terms of its contribution to natural and human habitat and activity is adjoining regional parks and natural waterways. The Above the Falls Area is an even more important area to demonstrate these values due to it being the only national park in our city. A new set of development and use guidelines must be established and enforced	The plan does include development guidelines in the land use and design section. Adding reference in introduction to this content. More specific development standards outlined here will be considered in context of existing regulations and specific development projects.

		to assure the public enjoyment of these unique areas and to maximize spin off value and tax base enhancement in areas miles from the site. Developments must contribute to the activity level of the park and attract people to the area – a key criteria for establishing safety and securing regional parks operating funds based on non-local resident use. Most of these guidelines reflect values that have traditionally been "the Minneapolis style" in all other areas blessed with major natural water features. They are consistent with and define the guiding principle on p6 related to the need to establish design guidelines and standard. • All new and renovated buildings must be oriented and designed with extensive views of the natural amenity to those living or working inside. • Allowed property use must generate activity during the times park users are most likely to be present – nights and weekends (more eyes on the park/access to others). • All new residential uses must be at least 500 feet from activity zones of the park to minimize conflicts with people who don't appreciate the early morning sounds of children, the playing of music, early morning visitors seeking boat rentals, and other likely distractions. Priority shall always be given to public activities in the park. As is true in all other areas, a landscaped parkway shall separate public and private spaces. • If non-residential, all new businesses must generate at least one living wage or higher job per 2,000 square feet (no warehouses, businesses with limited employment or primarily automated manufacturing). Conditional use exceptions will be allowed for businesses that primarily serve the public and contribute to the recreational, aesthetic, entertainment or educational use of the area (an art gallery for example). Living wage should be defined as above that qualifying for affordable housing in the metro area. • All developments, leases, and new businesses licensed to operate in a public amenity zone must agree to establish priority hiring goals that recruit and give preference to persons living within 3 miles of the location. Failure to employ 20% within the broader amenity zone will require a contribution of $2,000 per employee below that level to a scholarship fund for area residents administered by the Minneapolis Public Schools. • All other potential uses are not allowed but are instead to	Job generation and hiring goals will be priorities as part of economic development approach. Limitations on park activity sites will be considered in park design process.

		be referred to other non-river sites in the area. • All properties shall be extensively landscaped with attractive greenery and tree cover emphasized for storm water and air quality improvement. Minimum expectations need to be outlined. • Business use shall be compact in a historically appropriate way to allow almost all green space to be clearly public. (No large private owned "campuses" where there is a lot of open space that is mowed grass and private).	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Nothing should be located along the waterway that would just as appropriately, or more appropriately be located in an existing industrial or job zone area – most of which now have significant vacancies and properties for sale. For example, the reuse of 807 Broadway, the former school administration building, should be the primary focus of business recruitment and location in the NE community until it is full so that lunch time users can once again stabilize the existing businesses of Central Ave. and create a market to fill current commercial vacancies. Much research documents the value of natural amenities, particularly those of significant size to improving property values and stability as far away as two miles. In public meetings on this plan, the staff were asked to more fully research this phenomena and include maximizing its impact in the final report. Unfortunately, the final report focuses primarily on impacts in a very narrow zone and doesn't tie development restrictions to contributing to stability in the greater NE, SE. and North communities. These are also "aesthetically deprived areas" who have been characterized by hard scape, minimal landscaping (none creative), and utilitarian design. Other health studies demonstrate the value of just seeing nature in health improvement, the most striking being the controlled studies that showed dramatic differences in recovery speed and reduced complications when hospital patients had a natural view window vs seeing a wall. Even having a natural scene as artwork showed preference over an abstract image. Park and trail design and the extensive landscaping of all properties should be demand aesthetic quality and maximizing natural views and impacts.	While outside the study area, other industrial locations citywide are being taken into account. Research suggests there are some viable industrial sites in other parts of the city, and City staff considers these when assisting businesses with relocation. However, analysis suggests the size, features, and location of available sites is unlikely to accommodate some of the larger industrial users, especially heavy industry. The appendices to the plan summarize research that was done regarding the value of public amenities on adjacent areas. The research did not demonstrate that the increase in value (measured by increase in property value) extended far beyond a couple blocks – not necessarily because it wasn't there, but rather because it is very hard to measure in a complex urban area. Regardless, it is the intent to create value to benefit the entire North and NE area. Aesthetic improvements are an important part of the plan's recommendations for the area.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Environment, Health – Chp 4 & 7	Pollution mitigation zone	The plan prioritizes new development that is non-polluting and sustainability designed

		No business may locate in the zone that will contribute more than minimal fine particulates to the air of the area. No wood burning fireplaces or other activities that will contribute to air quality burdens shall be allowed in new or renovated uses. Priority in relocating businesses and redeveloping sites shall be given to those that burden air quality. This area has many permitted and non-permitted (due to size, not pollution levels) businesses that contribute to unhealthy air, particularly as measured in exposure to fine particulates. Elevated emergency room and school absence due to asthma and other respiratory ailments have been documented. The Harvard School of Public Health and other academic researchers have tied long term exposure to fine particulates to respiratory ailments, some cancers, and shorter life expectancy. In responding to violations by Northern Metals that exceeded permitted levels by over 200% in some measures, the MN Pollution Control Agency discovered the high concentration of polluting businesses, cumulative impacts that they are challenged to address, and has committed to adding an air monitor to the area to learn more. Noise and water pollution are ongoing challenges and establishing this as a maximally green zone where hard surface is minimized, green ground practices required, reduced truck traffic and better transit connections are established should also be reflected in the expectations for this area's future. It would be wonderful if the first 5- 10 years of this plan were focused on reducing negative environmental impacts, acquiring land and bioremediating past pollution while restoring natural shorelines and public access to them. Moving inappropriate businesses to other industrial zoned areas would stabilize those areas while allowing this area to rest and recover from a history of bad ideas in the quest for immediate development. For example, the River Run affordable apartments with extensive family use do not have any common areas for gathering or playing. Those should have been a requirement and face the river so all have access to its views. There is basically no tree cover or landscaping on the river side and access to the river is blocked. As a result the river side is seldom seen in use.	and managed. The health impact analysis addresses the environmental pollution impacts on public health, and the plan recommends a range of strategies to remedy these impacts. Acquisition and cleanup of riverfront lands for park use (addressing environmental concerns and lack of open/recreational space) is a priority in the parks plan implementation. The plan is designed to encourage viable redevelopment of additional sites, as this triggers compliance with current remediation and landscaping standards. The lack of facilities in North and NE Minneapolis provides an important motivating factor for how this plan was developed.

		These areas of Minneapolis have some of the highest health disparities by income and race and least access to outdoor recreation. The only large green areas in NE are a golf course and athletic field complex and most have no access to a bikeway or trail that doesn't cross streets every block and many are located in traffic, some on truck routes. Economic barriers are also a burden – while one can swim for free at a lake beach (if one doesn't have to pay gas or bus fare to get there), the only swimming opportunity in the NE/SE quadrant is the Lupient/Rosacker pool at NE Park – accessible by bike only by traveling along exceedingly busy streets unprotected from traffic (Johnson, 18th, Broadway). The only loop trail is along the Columbia Golf Course, is hilly, and is a mostly industrial view route or along Central. Given the lack of "eyes" on much of the trail many single people do not feel comfortable running or biking it. Similar challenges are evident in the North Minneapolis area. So trail use and kayaking and canoeing are likely to be very popular new exercise and recreation outlets and the health benefits of cardio activity will be questionable if air pollution in the area is not improved. The historic overburden of health concerns in these communities must be addressed in all park and redevelopment planning,	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	History and Background – Chp 2	P 10-12and p 31 This seems to reinforce old stereotypes without updating them. For the greater NE community, there were more Scandinavian and German immigrants than Eastern European. All seemed to pick different areas to initially cluster in but then dispersed into the larger community. This section concludes "Throughout the history of these areas, they have remained largely blue collar and working class neighborhoods". This section needs to be updated to reflect current realities if it is to attract and inform potential residents and businesses. Most of the factories in NE closed or dramatically downsized long ago. Some became warehouses will little employment. Many have been converted into creative industry use which is why the city designated this area the Minneapolis Arts District. It has over 700 working artists, more live music than Uptown and many in the creative industries (arts administrators, musicians, actors, and visual artists) now call this area home. While I couldn't find	The language from the plan was taken from other published descriptions. Details added to history section to reflect this additional information.

		occupation info on the city's census information by neighborhood, I would guess that a majority of area residents are professionals or work in the service industries. No people assets are highlighted. For example, our NE neighborhoods are among the most diverse in the city but don't over concentrate any one background. With over 60 languages spoken at home by attendees at Edison High School, the area has the native speakers that global businesses need to forge and maintain relationships in the global economy. The attraction of young professionals to the area due to the lively arts, entertainment and bar and restaurant offerings and quality rental and starter home housing is something that should be mentioned as well. This document will be used and accessed by many exploring our community and how it might fit their life plans. Let's update and reality test the image of this area you are presenting.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	History and Background – Chp 2	p.15 Coordination and outreach While numerous public meetings were held, the final plan was put out for review and comment over the end of year holiday season when most neighborhood and business groups only gather for social events, if at all. This should be avoided at all costs in future efforts.	Added language to describe outreach done during public comment period, including meetings with all interested neighborhood organizations.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	History and Background – Chp 2	p. 17 Study area Public meetings often raised the issue that this was too narrow for a major regional amenity zone. By narrowing the east side study area only from the river to Marshall there was no documentation or consideration of the status of the surrounding areas – many of which are characterized by vacant, for sale and for lease business properties in need of tenants and revitalization. Infilling those areas before attracting businesses to the river area should be seen as a priority that could facilitate the relocation of incompatible uses and reduce the environmental burden on the nearby residential areas.	The study area was predefined by the area guided in the original Above the Falls plan. Additional planning with adjacent neighborhoods in NE Minneapolis is ongoing to address concerns in these areas. Residential and mixed use areas along the riverfront were reduced from the original plan in large part to reflect the need to focus resources first on strengthening adjacent communities facing stresses
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	History and Background – Chp 2	p. 17 Study area This narrow band also prohibited focus on the impacts on the larger area and how to maximize regional park use so as to maximize the earning of metro parks operating and capital funds. That there is not one mention of this area as being in a national park is amazing. The plans as a result are as Rep. Phyllis Kahn	Adding more references in plan to status as a national park and status as a migratory flyway (both mentioned later in plan)

		said more than once – could just as well be plans for an industrial park along a highway. The same results would likely be seen if the planning were done for Mid-City Industrial Park for example. No mention of how to enhance the internationally significant migratory bird flyway (which will be impacted by light and building design). As someone who lives a few miles from this area, my interests and needs were never addressed. This was not seen as a unique treasured opportunity zone.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	History and Background – Chp 2	p. 17 Geology and Soils No notation of superfund or MPCA permitted uses. Past remediation efforts (such as those that limit the treescape of Boom Island), etc. The report should also address the likely impacts in river change given serious consideration of closing the lock and dam to prevent the advancing of Asian Carp. My understanding is that this will change the depth and natural features of the river. Projected changes in water levels given climate change should be addressed using U of M info and/or the commissioning of studies by the hydrology lab on the river. The transportation impacts of this should also be noted in transportation section on p. 37 (It is addressed on p 44 – cross reference) Check re: silt in preventing most boats – don't think that will normally be true for recreational boats, certainly not canoes or kayaks.	Adding more references to MPCA sites and Asian carp (both mentioned later in plan) Adding clarification that silting in will likely continue to allow boats such as canoes and kayaks
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	History and Background – Chp 2	Lacks attention to air and water quality concerns This is a major challenge and a glaring omission. Air quality is terrible due to the fine particulates released by area businesses, a concern that the MPCA is now seriously stepping up to study and address. The health impacts in increased asthma, respiratory illnesses, cancer and shortened longevity merit this being a key component of planning. While mentioned in the public health section on p 31, it merits a separate review with permit data, violations, etc.	These topics are discussed more extensively in later environment and health sections. Adding more cross referencing.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	History and Background, Transportation – Chps 2 & 7	Lack of East/West Bus Service p. 38 this should be noted as a major access issue. It is only available at Lowry while the major park amenities are near Broadway. Even going downtown and doubling back would leave river users with a significant hike (up to a half mile). Evening and weekend service is limited. A Sheridan neighborhood survey found 20% of households do not own even one car. So transit is key to attracting local residents and customers. This lack of transit	Discussed in more detail in Transportation section later in plan. Adding more cross referencing, and more focus on lack of east-west transit access.

		options has made it difficult for students attending school on the other side of the river and increased their travel times.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	History and Background, Transportation – Chps 2 & 7	Utility impacts on development options p. 38 The high voltage power lines noted prevent development near or under them. That needs to be stated and mapped. There is no discussion of the telecommunications infrastructure – for example high speed optical lines could attract high paying high tech businesses and residents in IT supported fields who telecommute.	Discussed in more detail in Infrastructure section later in plan. Adding more detail on power lines, fiber cables
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	History and Background – Chp 2	P 40 Infrastructure Barriers It should be noted that the ribbon of industry on the east bank serves as similar "barrier" to residential access for most who live on the east bank. Walking or biking though industrial zones with high truck use and exhaust and little shade or natural stops disconnects this part of NE from the areas more "up the hill".	Adding reference to NE side industrial barriers and need to address them
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Public Ownership p. 40 It should be noted that the city owns a triangular shaped parcel, crossed by power lines that should be donated to adjoin the neighboring proposed Sheridan Park. River first designers noted this as the best location for a natural amphitheater that could accommodate community scale performances. Both N and NE are disadvantaged by not having free nightly entertainment accessible like that provided at Lake Harriet and at Minnehaha Falls and Kingfield on the south side. Yet the income characteristics would make these areas much less able to attend ticketed events. Creating this would be a catalyst for nearby restaurants, housing sales, and get utilization counts up to justify regional parks investment.	This is discussed in land use guidance for Grain Belt area. Adding more details on suggested use of site. MPRB currently is pursuing design of Sheridan Memorial Park.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Policy Issues – Chp 3	p. 45 Community and Economic Development Doesn't adequately address the research that green space and the size of greenspace can on its own increase the market value of existing homes and businesses as far as two miles away. Adding just 5% more value to the adjacent neighborhoods would be a major contribution to tax base growth (and doesn't require TIF or other on-going subsidy after the parkland is established). Given the stresses on the city, county, and school operating budgets, focus on real net tax base growth is important to continue services that will make the city safe and attractive.	Adding reference to increased tax base resulting from investment in parks.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Policy Issues – Chp 3	p. 46 Affordable housing Thank you. It is important to note that these areas already have	Strategies related to strengthening existing housing stock discussed in chapter 8.

		substantial affordable housing and doesn't need new subsidized competition. Earlier sections noted the average to below average condition of existing properties. A component of this plan should be affordable loans and grants to improve and sustain that existing housing and commercial stock and help it remain competitive. The leverage of this will be much less expensive than the traditional affordable housing subsidies of new construction. The area has solid building with brick, woodwork, and details not affordable in new construction. They are highly desirable and promoting improvement in these will yield significant benefits. If new affordable housing is developed without rehab of existing, deterioration can be expected as current homes and duplexes fail in the competition with the new. More needed in these areas is households with sufficient disposable income to spend money on restaurants, entertainment and at local shops.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Policy Issues – Chp 3	P 46 Job Development Most manufacturing jobs now require post- secondary training. Graco is an example. Manufacturing jobs without special skills required do not any more pay living wages Is my understanding. Like specific job goals to square footage. Riverfront land should NEVER be exempt from living wage (and higher) requirements. I would like to see successful models of job linkage. In an earlier transportation study, it was learned that almost all the workers in the high paid jobs commute from the suburbs via car and that jobs are filled by word of mouth ensuring a suburban workforce. It may not be realistic to tie job development hopes to location. Few households have all adults working close to home. Given the likely 5 or more job changes in a typical career, this is really old school thinking. The city may want to attract businesses for a variety of reasons (although housing is generally a higher tax base contributor), but employment opportunities for people living in the 'hood seems an unsustainable goal. Coloplast seemed to have that focus yet the lower skill manufacturing jobs promised stayed in the suburbs. See my initial comments re: development near water amenities. The survey on p 48 notes that job creation is the second to the last goal of the community with less heavy industry as the first ranked after amenities.	The plan prioritizes job linkages, job training, and living wage jobs in this area. While not all jobs will necessarily go to city residents, it will remain a goal to encourage local hiring whenever possible, particularly in areas with high unemployment. Additional work related to the survey demonstrated that people considered jobs to be important, but thought that new jobs would likely benefit others rather than themselves.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Health – Chp 4	p. 50 Health impact – Air, water and noise pollution It is amazing that the solution to ambient air is proposed to be tree and open space, not reduction in the truck traffic and industries	The plan supports new development which is non-polluting, and cleanup of existing uses.

		that contribute fine particulates. Not sure we could plant enough trees to mitigate that the way just moving these businesses or forcing them to clean up their business practices would. Unfortunately MPCA doesn't have sufficient monitoring staff and as Northern Metals demonstrated, it can take years to address and resolve pollution. A more active role by environmental health in the city and strong policies would assist. The presence of noise and pollution is a major detriment to reinvestment and attraction to this area and causes stress. Not to tie that to business impacts is not being fair to the health information available.	Due to the immense complexity of the area, the health impact analysis focuses on only some of the impacts, based on the availability of research and data to support recommendations.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Health, Housing – Chps 4 & 8	P, 52 Housing Suggestions to provide funding to improve existing housing would be a positive response.	These are discussed in Chapter 8. Adding more cross references.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Health, Transportation – Chps 4 & 7	p. 52 Off road trails Why should this only focus on the north side? Most will not be comfortable biking with the heavy truck traffic on Marshall St. The eastside has no nearby loop trails that are out of traffic. That is a major impediment to many doing recreational biking. An elevated trail attached to the bluff could allow continuous walking/biking in sight of the river as the trails move North towards the city limits. This has been done further south. People want to be near and see water, birds, nature. Peek a boo glimpses will never attract like the loop trails of the Chain of Lakes.	Chapter 7 discusses bicycling facilities on Marshall St. and on parallel off-road trails; the park plan prioritizes trail loops along the riverfront on both banks
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Economic Development	p. 53 Retail and other commercial not analyzed separately – seen as accessory use This does not reflect input from the public meetings. There was a high degree of interest in non-profit and entertainment businesses that would attract people to the area both as visitors and residents. It would help local businesses attract employees. One major non-profit committed to the river when challenged to consider locating their offices in this area said they preferred the restaurant variety and amenities of more developed areas. The River First international design competition, including the winning team, stressed opportunities for a museum (the relocated Bell Museum or a National Park museum), a campus (one just relocated in downtown), a bed and breakfast, arts and culture center, etc. These are very desirable as they would attract people year round and from outside the area. They would also keep the area safe and lively during the important night and weekend hours.	Added language supporting the importance of this, and clarifying that it was not analyzed separately in the market study not because it wasn't important, but because additional development was needed prior to the development of retail in order to strengthen the customer base for significant new retail.

		Given the concentration of arts employees (including professional orchestra musicians, playwrights, actors, set designers, etc) this would be an ideal area for concentrating creative industries whose employees (like those at RSP) like the urban environment. It is disappointing that a large anchor amenity tenant (say a west campus of the successful Circus Juventas) was not seriously looked at. There are much more limited performance venues and schools in the northern suburbs and we could easily tap that interest just as Heart of the Beast and Children's Theatre and Stages has for families in the south. For the regional park and the broad area to be successful, it needs to attract people on a regular basis, not just for an occasional 5K race. An education based effort would definitely do that – especially if it could attract field trip use by children and families.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Supporting Analysis – Chp 4	p. 55 Rents Source is not given. But if the major providers like Marquette, it only surveys larger apartment buildings while the predominant rental style in NE (and many parts of N) is duplex and 4-8 plex small scale rentals. The rents are often less than that in the larger buildings and many are owner occupied.	The plan appendices give a more extensive description of the rent structures, including the lower value ones mentioned Added language to clarify these rent levels are specified not because they reflect current conditions, but because they are needed by developers to make it cost effective for them to develop new market rate residential
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Supporting Analysis – Chp 4	P, 55 Office/Industrial I would have like to see a more focused analysis of freight based businesses. Many have extensive automation and few employees but major impacts in noise, air and water pollution. Finding a way to "retire" the spur lines would be an inexpensive way to create connecting trails and bikeways. There should be some analysis of the tradeoffs in costs and potential spinoff development. Few office users for example would want to locate near a railroad spur with lots of noise as a result.	As discussed in chapter 7, railroads are not used by a large number of users, but are protected closely by the railroad companies themselves in terms of the option of providing additional customers with service. Furthermore, while rail is not always desirable, it may be preferable as an alternative to high levels of freight truck traffic
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Supporting Analysis – Chp 4	p.58 Economic Analysis – It is important that you noted that additional residential tax base stays with our city, county and school budgets but 40% of all commercial/industrial growth is shared with the metro via fiscal disparities. That In part led to "bedroom" communities and should favor residential for many of the other reasons given throughout the report (that they are adjusted for given clear interest in	The plan in chapter 8 recommends a flexible approach to housing to meet diverse needs, such as those described here. The mixed use model does not mandate commercial space where it is not viable – it

		business development by the city). Re: the analysis of the condo/rental market – all of this seems to be based on a broader regional perspective and how they have fared in the downtown market of late. I'm not sure we need to "import" all new residents from areas outside this area. Instead I hear all the time from age 50 plus people starting to plan for their retirement years who want more affordable shared ownership models in our community. They see downtown as too pricey and not the lifestyle they desire. They want one floor living (not an option with area townhouse developments) and good value similar to the $150-$250,000 value of their current homes. Located near churches, favorite restaurants, and friends of the past decades is highly desirable. Residential/mixed use has not been successful in the NE Community. New housing developments on Central Ave with commercial space below have had years of vacancies in the commercial space and many new spaces have never had occupants or they quickly closed. Nonprofit purposes have filled a few. The lovely condo development at 1100 Main has never had most of its commercial space (brand new) occupied and the development was taken over by a local non-profit for rental housing. Only place I've seen this be successful was in "new towns" created in built out suburbs like St. Louis Park. Where it's been down successfully (if full rental is success) is Uptown and by Campus but it has been often to import chains that displace longstanding unique and cherished independents. If you ask people what attracts them to NE from outside the area, they tend to mention specific unique restaurants and bars, the arts scene. We must be careful in recruiting infill that it adds to the mix, rather than displaces.	is understood that the market cannot always support this. However, it provides the flexibility to accommodate uses (such as live/work or creative studio space) that provide options and diversity to the mix – and hopefully commercial as well, consistent with the vision of attracting activity to the riverfront
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	p. 89 North of Xcel District This area has one of the most cherished continuous strips of parkland with water views – a rarity in these river neighborhoods. However use of is somewhat limited by its isolation. If this area is further developed, consideration should be given to advantage businesses that are lively and used on weekends and nights (an urgent care clinic for example). Just to the north across 37th is Huset Parkway and a model of how housing can replace office/industrial use successfully in Columbia Park. This area could similarly house housing if done densely. Its access to trails	The business park concept for this area supports the concepts described here, with uses designed to be compatible with adjacent uses

		and the river would make it more desirable than areas farther south that adjoin industry.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	p. 91 Marshall North Subarea 13 Moving the cement operation here may be an opportunity	The plan supports the relocation of this business, when the opportunity arises
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	p. 91 Lowry Ave Node Subarea 14 The Lowry Bridge is a new iconic (and non-industrial looking) landmark. Given its colorful lighting and size, all development plans should be high restricted to not block views of this. It is currently visible as far to the East as the Central/Johnson stretch and keeping its view open will be another way to connect the neighborhoods on either side of Lowry to the river.	Adding language to support views of the river and bridge
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	p. 92 Marshall South Riverfront Subarea 15 This is a long term plan and the voluntary acquisition of privately held properties where life estates are matched with charitable tax benefits may be attractive to some. Preserving and enhancing the natural world is a high value to some. Establishing conservation easements to protect water quality would be good stewardship. Trail continuity without being in the truck traffic of Marshall is a challenge in this area. Perhaps cantilevered trails suspended above the river along part of this stretch would make biking and walking highly desirable while being less infringing to property owners. In fill housing to replace long blocks of warehouse industrial property in some stretches on the east side of Marshall would be great. So would somehow greening Marshall to make it feel less gritty and provide shade and environmental tree benefits.	The details of how the park will be developed around existing uses that may remain for some time is still under development, and will continue to be into the implementation of the plan The plan's language prioritizes trail connections but is somewhat flexible on how this is accomplished, based on opportunities that emerge
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	p. 94 Grain Belt District Subarea 17 It should be noted that the city owns a triangular shaped parcel, crossed by high voltage power lines that should be donated to adjoin the neighboring proposed Sheridan Park. River first designers noted this as the best location for a natural amphitheatre that could accommodate community scale performances. Both N and NE are disadvantaged by not having free nightly entertainment accessible like that provided at Lake Harriet and at Minnehaha Falls and Kingfield on the south side. Yet the income characteristics make these areas much less able to attend ticketed events. Creating this would be a catalyst for nearby restaurants, housing sales, and get utilization counts up to justify regional parks investment. It would honor the community's desire to maximize green space in the part of the city with the least access	Adding language to further describe this development/park opportunity Currently, but through a separate process, MPRB is pursuing design of improvements to Sheridan Memorial Park including a veterans' memorial. Parking is called out in the plan as an issue for this area

		to natural amenities and regular free concerts, plays and other performances. The Sheridan Memorial Park should convey the original vision of area Vets to have this be an "all wars" memorial and not highlight any particular ones. They were men who served in WWII, Korea and Viet Nam but knew future wars were likely and some lived to see it. The interest in conveying personal stories or other specific info should be met through the use of technology and smart phone interactivity, not more hardscape. Parking demand impacts on the Bottineau Library and easy trail access (and safer crossings) all need focus at this major intersection.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	Graco/Scherer Riverfront District Subarea 18 I am totally opposed to using any of the Scherer Park sight for private development. All private development must be kept across the street and only leased non-profit uses that enhance the park experience allowed into the riverfront zone. This was added to the plan by outside consultants who thought that development would be needed here to fund the amenities on both sides of the river. While state regional park funds cannot be used to acquire land for private development, there is apparently some scheme to say this part was bought with some other source while the legislative action on this was for acquisition of the full site. I think legal issues remain. When Lake of the Isles needed millions of restoration due to flooding, we didn't acquire the next mansion by it that was for sale and impose a high rise condo to pay for its amenities. Theodore Wirth has had millions invested that have not required the lopping off of a block of the park for mixed use development. It makes no sense to impose this on the poorer end of town where kids now have to pay to swim at Lupient Park while rich kids swim free at the city lakes. A compatible use would be to construct, own and operate (perhaps with a non-profit partner) an arts and culture center. This is in the Minneapolis Arts District and many of the 700+ visual artists who live and work here teach at the Minnetonka Center for the Arts, White Bear Lake, etc. There is no similar arts education center in the city and operating funds are available through a special Legacy program for these uses. This would attract people from throughout the area and year round. A museum would be a similar	These comments will be taken into account in park design. The presence of mixed use adjacent to the park reflects in part the surrounding neighborhood's request for active uses in this area. MPRB intends to pursue a community engagement process as part of an RFP process seeking park-supportive development of the MPRB-owned parcel adjacent the future park site. Windows and active street frontage are current city standards for all new development through the site plan review process, and are emphasized in the design section of Chapter 5.

		experience enhancing component to the park. The small Mississippi Museum on Mud Island in Memphis would be a good example of a sustainable model that attracts tourists and residents both. Other parts of the city have large green spaces and telling this area to "plan small" seems incompatible. I'm also afraid that locating businesses or residences in the park will create incompatible tensions. For example, some may want to rent a canoe for exercise before work at 6:30 a.m but residents could find the conversations and comings and goings distracting. It is a Minneapolis tradition to separate public and private use with a landscaped parkway and that needs to be honored wherever possible in RiverFirst. "High quality and complementary design" is too vague. When working with national firms on the Quarry Shopping Center they refused to put windows in the original design as requested by the project's design guidelines of an "updated main street" look. The architect for the company said they are instructed to go to the lowest denominator and in other areas he was designing tile roofs and other amenities demanded of the city. Design criteria must include such factors as glass to opaque ratios. I worked in college in what is now the Mpls Park Administration Bldg. It had tiny 2 foot by 5 foot windows at the corners and we worked in large warehouse style rooms with no natural lighting other than that tiny corner window at the end of 50 foot or more rooms. It clearly did not use its river location or add to the attractiveness of the area. The business park concept should reflect urban values of clustered building with attractive landscaping and design but not big campus style approaches that privatize green space instead of concentrating it in the public realm. Intensive tree canopy should be part of the environmental mitigation required of all properties.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use, Economic Development – Chps 5 & 8	Zoning p. 97 While some support "green industry" there have been raging disagreements on what that is. Do the processes have to be green? Only the end product? Is it green if it adds to the air and noise pollution of an overburdened area? A "green" campus found the commuting distances and parking demands of its employees negated much of their green goals when operational. It would be	This has been under discussion intensively at the City, as it is a mayoral priority. Added reference to this in the plan.

		wonderful for the city to develop key definitions and models in this area.	
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails, Environment – Chps 6 & 7	Gluek Park p. 103 It should be noted that the EPA work destroyed the only natural and accessible access to a sandy river beach in this area, a huge loss that is not replace by the formal landscaping and overlooks. Restoring a natural shoreline and access to it should be a priority. The east side of the river needs to provide that type of "real woods in the city" experience where a mixed understory leads to the water.	Shoreline restoration is a priority, as discussed here and in Chapter 7.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	Historical trail Both sides of the river have fascinating histories to tell and a history walk with appropriate signage should be part of the immediate draw to the area. The old Glueck mansion, the start of Scherer Brothers with lumber findings, and other stories should be shared.	Added reference to historic interpretation and preservation of historic resources
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Marshall Terrace Park p 104 No mention is made of the heron rookery visible from this area and a major attraction. A nearby resident said she loves watching the water birds drift by and then they fly back and do it again once they hit the more turbulent water downstream.	These and similar natural-resource concerns are addressed more fully in the appended Regional Park Master Plan.
Rep. Loeffler letter – 1/24/13	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Park Development Concept p. 104 Nothing here indicates any arts related programming or year round reasons to make this "a gathering place". Immediate short term programming should include canoe and kayak rental (and the ability to earn this via volunteering). Every Saturday and Sunday there should be group opportunities to explore and paddle together. Relocating Wilderness Inquiry, the urban boat builders, and the National Park Service in programming (and offices!) should be early priorities. Public access and use should always trump private for profit business or selfish use by a few able to afford it. While trail connection to St. Anthony Parkway is important, it is important to note that that is an underutilized trail due to its extensive industrial setting, lack of amenities or wayside stops, and very hilly nature. It is at the far north of the community. Abandoned rails or the idea of a "new parkway" should be explored in the more middle sections to promote recreational off-road bike connections.	These comments will be taken into account in the park design process
Rep. Loeffler letter –	Environment – Chp	Chapter 7 – environmental concerns	The plan prioritizes environmental cleanup

1/24/13	7	I agree that this needs to be a priority. The area is already overburdened with heavy truck and rail use and businesses that contribute to fine particulate overload. All new businesses in the area must have a net improvement impact. The level of soil cleanup should be addressed. Given that flooding and other natural events may occasionally cause erosion, clean up along the river should be to much higher than industrial use standards.	activities
Marshall Terrace letter 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	We strongly support the recommendation regarding Subarea 13 "to eventually transfer into primarily park use … [and that] the park area may contain uses that are accessory to the main park use, but it should be primarily park and uses related to the riverfront." We also support the recommendations for connections to this park area via 27th Avenue NE and urge the implementation of an off-road bike trail along this corridor. We continue to support the concept of "botanical gardens and conservatory" and "picnic shelters or pavilions" to host wedding receptions and other gatherings, as outlined in the Above the Falls Plan. It should be noted that CCMT has a strong commitment to these visionary plans and has designated NRP funds for the development of a park building for community gatherings (which would be available for rental use) and the 27th Avenue NE bike trail.	Thank you for your comment
Marshall Terrace letter 1/24/13	Land Use, Transportation – Chps 5 & 7	We support most of the recommendations for Subarea 14, for "mixed use development, with commercial and residential uses … compatible with the riverfront location." We also support the "Lowry Bridge … trail connections down to the adjacent parklands … under the bridge along [both] banks" of the river. We do not support "Improved neighborhood pedestrian and bicycle connections along Lowry Avenue NE" – due to the level of traffic (including many trucks), and prefer that resources be used to complete the bike trails along the river, Marshall St NE and 27th Avenue NE (as well as other east-west trail connections).	Improvements along Lowry are currently in the citywide bicycle master plan, but will be reevaluated in a process with the County prior to implementation
Marshall Terrace letter 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	We support the recommendations for Subarea 15, "to eventually transfer into primarily park use" from Marshall St NE to the river (with any uses within this park area to be river related), for a "continuous trail connection" along the river and for bicycle and pedestrian facilities along 22nd Avenue NE and Marshall St NE.	Thank you for your comment
Marshall Terrace letter 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	We have mixed feelings about the recommendations for Subarea 11. We think It makes some sense to develop this area as a "business park," if there is a significant green area on the north and east sides of St. Anthony Parkway to buffer the green space	The analysis done for this plan concluded that this location was too isolated from other residential areas to be an attractive residential community

		along the river. We also think this area might be appropriate for housing – as indicated in the Above the Falls Plan.	
Marshall Terrace letter 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	We support the recommendations for Subarea 12 to pursue a "riverbank connection … If and when Xcel indicates a desire" to work on this with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB), and to work with Xcel for an interim plan to develop "enhancements … including parkway features along Marshall St. NE" and to build bike/walking trails "on Xcel-owned property along the east side of Marshall St. NE."	Thank you for your comment
Marshall Terrace letter 1/24/13	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	We also strongly support: • Continuous, contiguous recreational, riverfront trails on both sides of the Mississippi River in North and Northeast Minneapolis – with significant public green space. • The "redesign" of Marshall St. NE as a "landscaped boulevard" and the "extension of West River Parkway" – with bike lanes and river-related signage (to complete these missing links in the Grand Rounds system). • The transition of industry (and other private ownership) off the river – with environmental restoration and an increase of green, public space (i.e. parks). We continue to be very excited about the Above the Falls vision for the Upper River in Minneapolis, and look forward to working with the City of Minneapolis and the MPRB to further implement the Priority and Vision Plans.	Thank you for your comment
Marshall Terrace meeting 11/15/12	Land Use – Chp 5	The plan for our area hasn't changed its recommendations; this is a good thing	Thank you for your comment
Marshall Terrace meeting 11/15/12	Land Use – Chp 5	There should be more development at Marshall & Lowry; need businesses that can be riverfront attractions as well	The plan supports additional development at this node
Marshall Terrace meeting 11/15/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Lowry bridge is a big success, very visible and attractive; makes the other side of the river seem closer	Thank you for your comment
NE Network meeting 10/11/12	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	Look at relationship between MNRRA boundary and study area boundary; note that MNRRA only owns and manages around 60 acres	MNRRA boundary considered in context of plan and implementation
NE Network meeting 10/11/12	Land Use – Chp 5	Include existing zoning map in the plan and in presentations, to provide context	Existing zoning map included in plan
NE Network meeting 10/11/12	Land Use – Chp 5	Show residential context of nearby neighborhoods	Residential context added to land use maps
NE Network meeting 10/11/12	Land Use and Design – Chp 5	Address how to reduce or mitigate odors and noise from existing industrial uses	Noise and odor mitigation language added to plan

NE Network meeting 10/11/12	Environment – Chp 7	Stormwater separation is still a concern for some older buildings; that should be addressed	This is addressed in the plan
NE Network meeting 10/11/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Emphasize the connections into the study area as well as changes within the area	Connections from surrounding area to study area highlighted in plan
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	26th Ave greenway connection to riverfront is important	This is a priority in the plan
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Economic Development – Chp 8	Need to approach businesses to encourage them to "adopt" public improvements and provide funding, e.g. interstate crossings; need to show how businesses contribute to making the area a better place	Language added regarding potential for business stewardship of area
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Introduction – Chp 1	Messaging around the plan needs to be simplified, with language at a 12th grade level; provide materials and meetings in other languages for non-English speaking people	Materials translated and provided at bilingual meetings, summaries provided
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Economic Development – Chp 8	North Minneapolis needs more homeownership	Plan addresses need for range of housing options, including homeownership
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Environment, Health – Chps 4 & 7	Concerned about Northern Metals and the environmental impacts on the area from pollution; consider impact on children and others	Addressed in context of the plan
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Land Use – Chp 5	There is a contrast between plan for riverfront for North and Northeast; equity needs to be considered in planning	Different historic land use patterns means the sides will be different; both have emphasis on riverfront parks, trails
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Need connections to the riverfront from neighborhoods, including visual connections	Plan includes riverway street and trail connections
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Economic Development – Chp 8	New industrial development needs to be guided by standards that encourage light industrial and green industry	Plan supports this direction
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Economic Development – Chp 8	80% of business employees aren't local; how do we get them to hire from North Minneapolis?	Local hiring is a key recommendation in this plan
Near North NRRC meeting 12/17/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Add new bike/pedestrian connection across interstate to river at 16th (neighborhood was designed to accommodate this)	Plan suggests exploring adding this corridor in the future, after additional analysis
Tom Nordwall letter – 10/27/12	Environment – Chp 7	It is my understanding that it is being put to a vote to allow this facility less restrictions of the emissions regulations in place today. During an inspection in 2009, this facility had a violation with the particle matter and mercury emissions levels and was cited for them. Those in the area that are in the most danger do not have the option of moving away as easily as most as the area consists of a low income population with little means of such action.	This plan does not directly deal with the regulatory issues involving emissions, which are under the purview of the MPCA. However, it does support new and renovated development that decreases pollutants and supports and healthier environment.

		Please consider the effects that the loosening of the allowed standards for the particle matter and mercury emission levels would cause the population if allowed and find a way to control this travesty so that the people in the area can live healthy and the river waters and soil can become clean.	
Sue Pilarski letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	I'm writing on behalf of the residents and Board of Directors of Riverview Townhomes regarding the Above the Falls Update currently under consideration. We acknowledge the effort and work of the CPED staff on this project, and while we agree with many of the comments and statements in the report, we disagree with the recommendations and conclusions. Although the recommended transitional industrial zoning of the subareas of the riverfront allows for the possibility of change at some time in the future, the term isn't definitive enough to begin to create a positive impact now. Many of our residents attended most if not all of the public forums regarding the Update, and it was clear from the community comments there is public consensus that the river should be more accessible and the surrounding neighborhoods more livable. It is very important that the voices of the community be heard and acted upon. The public discourse is significant because of the priority placed on the preservation of the River. In reading the Above the Falls Plan Update: Draft for Public Review there were two statements, for purposes of this discussion, which particularly resonated with us. First, the comment on page 63…The River is a great amenity, but not sufficient in itself to be the basis of a new neighborhood. Riverview Townhomes is a successful, stable development. Almost all of our current owners at Riverview purchased their townhomes relying on plans for future residential development surrounding our site. We relied on the statements and representations of City representatives and elected officials, who spoke of ambitious plans to revitalize the Northside and Upper River. We do not feel our reliance was unreasonable or unjustified. We observed the success of our riverfront neighbors, the Landings and the Renaissance townhomes. These developments created new neighborhoods out of blighted land, without nearby amenities. The fact that they are on the river contributed to the growth and success of the neighborhood. We	The plan states that the river itself is not sufficient to support new development, based on research into what developers look for in a viable development site. The area around Riverview Townhomes is guided for mixed use, which could potentially include residential, as it has a number of assets in terms of its location. The area to the north of this site (in subarea 5) is guided for transitional industrial because it is less ready for new development. The plan outlines steps for how to proceed with this transition, and what is needed to make it happen. While it is not likely to be immediate, there is a plan for moving forward toward the longer term goal of a riverfront without heavy industry, It may be possible to relocate some uses like Cemstone. However, due to its need for a centralized location, it would likely be in another central site – of which there are limited options.

		had ample reason to believe that our Riverview housing development would be equally successful as part of the continuation of the Upper River revitalization. When housing is built near water it is desirable and can typically command higher tax dollars. The same cannot be said for office parks which typically need good road access but do not need an expensive waterfront location. Again, on page 63 of the Update, the plan states: some (such as the Cemstone concrete plant) depend on their central location to function and serve the area; therefore do not find it attractive to relocate to a less centralized suburban site. Cemstone is located approximately 70 feet from our development and we have ongoing dialogue with the company representatives. It is our understanding that most of the cement to build the TCF Bank Stadium came from the large Cemstone facility located in Energy Park in St. Paul, approximately four miles from downtown Minneapolis. There is no need for Cemstone to relocate to a less centralized suburban site if they are willing to combine facilities. With the changing riverfront, the discussion regarding barging, with the surrounding land becoming more valuable, there may no longer be a need for Cemstone to be on the river. The Mississippi River is one of the three greatest rivers in the world and the decisions made now have a lasting impact. The future must improve upon the past and government plays a pivotal role. If we continue the status quo of industrial uses on the River, we lose an opportunity to create more and cleaner jobs which in turn allows for a more diverse workplace and a greener environment. We lose the opportunity to increase economic growth for the traditionally underserved neighborhoods of North and Northeast Minneapolis. The time for change is now, we don't want to hear how it can't be done, or it's too difficult. Progressive cities find a way to make this happen, because citizens demand it, because governments make it a priority. If current heavy industrial uses on the river continue as they have without meaningful mitigation from the City and the MPCA, and without a positive zoning change, our homes will lose value and the future development of the riverfront continues to be impeded by industry.	

Public forum – 12/10/12	Transportation – Chp 7	For government reps here, please make Plymouth bridge something special – a great opportunity to do something nice like Lowry bridge. Don't leave chain link fence and exposed electrical on Plymouth.	The plan proposes a range of improvements to the function and aesthetics of Plymouth Ave bridge
Public forum – 12/10/12	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	Webber Park has two connections to river that pass under I-94. Farview Park has no trail connection to the river on the map. I-94 isolates us from the river, is an ongoing insult to Northside and Minneapolis. To continue to maintain complete/transitional industrial zoning adds more impediments and insults to people in Hawthorne neighborhood and those who use Farview Park to access river. Can we modify zoning to expedite moving industry out of that area and making more viable, people-friendly connections to the river? Can we have an industrial zone that encourages transition to green industry?	A trail connection via 26th Ave from Farview to the river is a plan priority. The rezoning study following the plan adoption will provide an opportunity to reexamine the zoning along the riverfront, in light of the long term plan to transition these uses.
Public forum – 12/10/12	Health – Chp 4	Many people here been to MPCA meetings, #1 problem is air pollution and air particulates in this area. No mention of air pollution concerns in the plan, this is disappointing. In the plan air pollution is linked to parks and trails, but should be linked to jobs and industry. We should say we won't accept any more businesses in this zone that put pollutants into the air.	Air pollution issues were not presented at the meeting (due to time limitations) but are discussed in the plan health impact assessment
Public forum – 12/10/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Earlier public meetings had exciting ideas that seem to have diminished here such as green connectors to river from neighborhoods. These are important. The adopted land use proposals – large areas that go from residential to mixed use or even industrial – seem like a significant change from before. Housing market had tanked, but since then there's been a dramatic shift in housing, so we need to look long-range.	The plan supports the development of green connectors through the development of Riverway Streets, consistent with the original plan
Public forum – 12/10/12	Land Use – Chp 5	Hawthorne neighborhood's position is we don't want industrial use zoning in subareas 4 & 5 at Riverview townhomes and industrial areas north of that. Yet keep seeing this in meeting after meeting – its frustrating. What's process to continue city dialogue with the neighborhood? If there isn't one, we need to lobby our officials to reject this plan. Unfortunate because there are good things in this plan too.	The guidance for these areas is mixed use and transitional industrial. Both can be compatible with light industrial, but also (when opportunities and resources are available) can transition to non-industrial. The plan does not need to be fully voted down to address specific concerns, as the process will provide opportunities to amend the plan prior to adoption.
Public forum – 12/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 7	What is the status of cross-country ski trail added to the park?	This concept is being considered, along with other possible improvements to the park. Cost and feasibility issues will need

			to be resolved.
Public forum – 12/10/12	Community Development – Chp 8	What is the business commitment to this process? Let's ask businesses (like Coloplast) to re-commit to what's happening on the river. Also congrats to AFCAC for all their work.	Added language to Community Development section to encourage business partnerships with public realm stewardship
Public forum – 12/10/12	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	East bank is adjacent to residential, so those folks have direct access to river. On west bank, there's an industrial/commercial barrier to entire North Mpls riverfront, and it has always been the case. What will it take to break with the past and to create a new northside riverfront?	The commercial areas shown on the land use map are mixed use – which includes compatibility with residential. These mixed use areas are located strategically to place the new development in areas most likely to succeed, and therefore create change along the riverfront. The east bank has better access to the river largely because there are existing riverfront parks; the plan is to build these on the west bank as well
Public forum – 12/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Land bridge – is it feasible? When start and how long will it take?	This is still being evaluated. It is expensive, and the timeframe is uncertain. Implementation will be a multi-agency partnership challenge. Connectivity to neighborhoods is important regardless.
Public forum – 12/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	This is one of the few national water trails designated by the Dept. of the Interior. How will we improve water access and transit to it?	The park section proposes a variety of water access points and facilities in the context of new park development. Transit connections are outside the scope of the parks component of the plan.
Public forum – 12/10/12	Land Use – Chp 5	Future land use in subarea 6, one block from river, between W. Broadway and Lowry. Can we develop it like San Antonio Riverwalk? Can we change to light industrial or business park zoning because we have a lot of nice amenities there now?	Subarea 6 is an industrial employment district, designated by City Council in a 2006 plan to support areas for job growth. The zoning of this area will be considered in the context of the rezoning study, but it is expected to remain focused on jobs.
Public forum – 12/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Thank you for taking in feedback. In subarea 2, no proposed land use changes, but no proposed improvements for existing parks and trails either. Where and when will improvements happen when get access to river, what's proposed in front of Coloplast? How are you maximizing Bottineau LRT development, connecting transit-dependent people to river?	This area is already a developed park, and there are no specific improvements to this section proposed. Ongoing investment will be made as needed. Connectivity to Bottineau is uncertain, due to the distance from the preferred

			alignment to the river. However, neighborhood street connections to the river in general will be a priority.
Public forum – 12/10/12	Economic Development – Chp 8	People are more likely to care about and be involved in areas where they live rather than in areas where they work. Currently only 13% of jobs in North area filled by people who live there. Without specific zoning, how will you make a business park employ locals and not people from suburbs?	The Economic Development section of the plan addresses the need to prioritize local hiring (and related job training) when supporting business development, for the reason cited here. This can be a requirement tied to approval of public funding for a new development or supporting infrastructure.
Public forum – 12/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Really pleased to see park has been expanded at UHT and also where Northern Metals is now.	This change reflects public input on the need for parks on the west bank
Public forum – 12/10/12	Parks and Trails, Land Use – Chps 5 & 6	He was on RiverFirst steering committee. President Erwin said to him "well you won, the UHT will be all parks area with amphitheater, all for youth activities" but on this plan its business park and industrial except for a narrow strip along river. This is contrary to our RiverFirst meeting and what John Erwin told me. Jeff Skrenes spoke to what 90% of people on the Northside want. Why can't CPED understand no one wants industry on the Northside? Your answer to Jeff was extremely ambiguous. This is an issue of life there. Northside wants housing and a lot of parkland and the amenities and businesses that go with it. Industry just doesn't fit in there.	The plan proposes a number of areas for housing, located where analysis suggests they are most likely to be successful. At the UHT, this plan also proposes the Northside Wetlands with performance/gathering spaces as shown in RiverFirst. The project's findings on preferences for jobs are more mixed – a recent public survey conducted as part of the planning process showed that ½ of the respondents placed a priority on new jobs for the area. The percentage was much higher for North residents than for those in Northeast.
Public forum – 12/10/12	Parks and Trails, Transportation – Chps 6 & &	Can't imagine park without continuous bike lanes on both sides of river. Great opportunity now for narrow bike lanes on Marshall as recommended by Diane Hofstede. Get bikes off the sidewalks and onto the streets where bikes belong. Asked Park Commissioners their intentions.	Bicycle lanes are being considered on Marshall Street, though part of it depends on the inclination of Hennepin County to alter their standards on lane widths. Regardless, the plan supports the development of bicycle facilities (on street, off street, or both) along Marshall
Peter Radford letter 1/23/13	Land Use, Economic Development – Chps 5 & 8	I wanted to submit comments on the Above the Falls Plan. I would only support a slow development of some aspects of this plan. I feel a number of important industries are being weighted lightly mainly due to political considerations. My family spent time at the German Corner park in Koblenz, Germany at the junction of the	The plan would allow industry to remain in a number of areas, and would support the transition to other uses only in the context of certain conditions being met.

		Mosel and Rhine rivers, and the busy barge traffic made the river park there busy and happy. Barge traffic used the river, vineyards went right down to the river - they had multiple uses for their river. There are diminishing returns on additional park space so the idea of a continuous park at the expense of a diversity of river uses is unappealing to me. The historic culture of the river has mainly been a culture of work with leisure being only more recent.. This plan ignores work culture (or can almost be hostile) in its goal to entirely convert both sides into a culture of play and leisure.	
Peter Radford letter 1/23/13	Health – Chp 4	The health part of the plan is speculative, seems to be very subjective, and should be discontinued	Public health is an important component of the plan and a priority for many residents
Peter Radford letter 1/23/13	Economic Development – Chp 8	I don't like aspects of the plan that would eliminate barge traffic or industry through lock closure. There are people who wish to work with their hands and wish to still make a good wage. This plan would be expected to remove many manual labor jobs. Barge traffic often serves a critical purpose in moving heavy materials into the city and scrap metal out. Moving these goods without the aid (and energy efficiency) of the river would most certainly add to greenhouse gasses, road destruction, traffic backups, and diesel fine particles. Eliminating the concrete plant removes a source of concrete transportable (within the concrete setting time in traffic) to city building sites.	The lock closure discussion is largely outside the scope of this plan. The plan anticipates the opportunity to create a number of new jobs, including manual labor type occupations
Peter Radford letter 1/23/13	Transportation – Chp 7	Additional train traffic would interfere with passenger rail as freight currently has right-of-way on rail lines over passenger rail.	At present, there are no specific plans for increasing passenger rail within the study area on freight rail tracks
Peter Radford letter 1/23/13	Implementation – Chp 9	I would be solidly opposed to the use of eminent domain to acquire river industries.	In most cases, eminent domain is not an option, due to current legal protections and limits on resources
Senior Citizens Advisory Committee – 9/13/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Plan for how to get seniors to the riverfront, especially the elderly and low income; accessibility may be an issue	Adding language on accessibility
Senior Citizens Advisory Committee – 9/13/12	Transportation – Chp 7	What will police's role be along connecting routes to make them safe?	Adding language on public safety
Senior Citizens Advisory Committee – 9/13/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Safety and accessibility (including wheelchair) are major concerns	See above
Senior Citizens Advisory Committee	Transportation – Chp 7	Isolation and barriers to this area are a problem	Connectivity and safety are plan priorities

– 9/13/12			
Sheridan meeting 11/26/12	Land Use – Chp 5	Consider neighborhood context east of Marshall St in plan; mixed use may be appropriate in locations so don't just show as all residential	Future land use includes land use guidance for adjacent areas; urban neighborhood can include nonresidential uses
Sheridan meeting 11/26/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Marshall St should have boulevard treatment	Streetscaping elements are included in the plan for Marshall
Sheridan meeting 11/26/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Parking management along the corridor is important, especially how it impacts nearby neighborhoods	Added language on need to address parking issues
Sheridan meeting 11/26/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Develop cross country ski trail through riverfront parks, with loop in design (note: commenter also asked neighborhood to include this in a letter they're submitting; they agreed)	This will be considered during park design and development, and depends on MPRB balance of user needs and resources system-wide.
Sheridan meeting 11/26/12	Implementation – Chp 9	Provide information on how housing west of Marshall will be relocated	The plan describes the incremental, willing seller approach to property acquisition
Sheridan meeting 11/26/12	Transportation – Chp 9	Include Water St in the plan; it is important	This is included in the plan for the Grain Belt area
Sheridan meeting 11/26/12	Transportation – Chp 9	Support vacation of rail spur south of BN bridge (currently underway)	This is currently underway and will be completed as part of the work in that area
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Urban Design – Chp 5	Need historic interpretation of historic elements in the area, e.g. sawmilling operations	Added reference to interpreting and preserving local history in area
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Riverfront parks need people, programs, and activities to make them vibrant; should include activities for kids; natural areas are good but should not be too passive in design	These elements are included in the parks vision for the area and will be a focus in the park design phase
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Parking management is important, especially for large-scale events	Reference to need to address parking added to plan
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Urban Design – Chp 5	Arts needs to be visible in the neighborhood, with a link to land, history, and culture	Plan calls out need to incorporate public art and culture
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Upgrade the lighting and rails on Plymouth Ave Bridge; the Plymouth bridge over the railroad tracks in Wirth Park is a model for what it should be	These elements are included in the parks vision for the area
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Land Use – Chp 5	Would like to see residential or commercial development along Plymouth Ave, to provide activity and vitality to that area; not much commercial in the neighborhood now	Park-supportive commercial development is proposed along Plymouth near the new Scherer Park
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	MPRB should have long term ground lease for business on Scherer site; local businesses not chains	This will be considered during park design and development
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Need wayfinding and signage for 5th St bike connection through neighborhood; generally need wayfinding signage for bike routes like along Grand Rounds	This will be considered during park design and development
St Anthony West	Parks and Trails –	Install a chimney swift house (bird house) on riverfront near	This will be considered during park design

meeting 11/10/12	Chp 6	Plymouth Ave	and development
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Install water fountains along bike trails, including dog-friendly ones	This will be considered during park design and development
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Consider getting easements under power lines for open space	This will be considered during park design and development
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Infrastructure – Chp 7	Remove large power poles from riverfront; work with Xcel to get these removed or put underground; they are unsightly and unsafe; if the Midtown Greenway can get this done, we should be able to as well	This is addressed in the plan
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 7	Add signage, benches, picnicking places to Scherer Park site	This will be considered during park design and development
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 7	Rename Scherer Park "Hall's Park" – or investigate a better name; Scherer should not get all the credit	This will be considered during park design and development. Currently the former Scherer Bros. site does not have a park name.
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Urban Design – Chp 5	Density is OK, it just needs to be done well and be high quality	The plan contains standards to encourage high quality design for density
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Need a farmer's market in this area	This will be considered during park design and development
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	Plant more trees	This will be considered during park design and development. Also addressed in design guidelines for new development.
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Land Use, Parks and Trails – Chps 5 & 6	Beauty and aesthetics are important	This will be considered during park design and development. Also addressed in design guidelines for development.
St Anthony West meeting 11/10/12	Implementation – Chp 9	Strengthen ongoing partnership between government and neighborhoods	The plan describes the partnerships that will implement the plan
St Anthony West letter 8/20/12	Land Use – Chp 5	At the last regularly scheduled meeting of the St Anthony West Neighborhood Organization (STAWNO) on Aug. 9, 2012, the "Above the Falls" zoning map was distributed and discussed. Our neighborhood surrounds the area from Broadway to 8th Avenue NE, from the river to Marshall St NE. The following motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved: "STAWNO supports the existing industry zoning at Graco but also encourages mixed use/residential/commercial developed in the zoning plan. This additional use is proposed for the proposed zoning as opposed to it all being existing industry zoning."	The land use was modified to include some mixed use development adjacent to the proposed park.

St Anthony West letter 2/8/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Per a motion passed at the Feb. 7, 2013, meeting of our Board of Directors: In July 2012 the draft Above the Falls plan was discussed, and a letter from the St. Anthony West Neighborhood Organization (STAWNO) was sent on Aug. 20. The letter requested mixed-use zoning in the area by the Mississippi River and that not all of our community from Plymouth Avenue to Broadway Street NE and Marshall Street NE to the river be zoned Business. At community meetings on Nov. 11 and Nov. 14, 2012, this was also reiterated with planning staff. The STAWNO representative also reinforced this at his meetings. The plan issued for comment in January 2013 still indicates the entire area that is not owned by the Park Board is still zoned Business or Industrial and not Mixed Use. While STAWNO wants to be highly cooperative with existing businesses in this area, it is hoped that local mixed-use could be developed adjacent to the four acres of development from the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board site from 8th Avenue to 9th Avenue NE and from Ramsey to Sibley Street NE.	The Business Park designation shown is from the original 2000 plan and is further supported by additional analysis. This designation allows for a range of active uses, including commercial, retail, and hospitality. There is concern in showing residential as an option (implied in mixed use) because that has created conflicts in business and industrial areas elsewhere The Park Board is proposing compatible and active uses near the 8th St NE frontage they own as part of the Scherer Park development
Susan Vikse letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The City Council will soon be voting on the Above the Falls (ATF) Master Plan Update, (The Plan) a plan that dramatically changes the current ATF plan for the north Minneapolis riverfront. There are positive aspects to the new plan, such as a focus on access to the river for north and northeast Minneapolis residents, and new river front parks and trails. However, I have concerns regarding the lack of any specifically designated residential areas on the west side of the river and the problems associated with industrial zoning in subarea 5 (on the river from the BNR bridge north to 31st, the area home to Northern Metal, Cemstone, Aggregate, Lafarge and GAF.) The heavy industry located here is in direct conflict with the top recommendations of the Plan (page 8). It discourages park and recreational development, prohibits the Northside from obtaining safe access to the river and does not allow the area to capitalize on the "riverfront's potential for amenities." Last year, when Northern Metals applied for a permit to increase	The plan explores the options for transitioning from heavy industry. However, it also outlines that changes in eminent domain law limit how much the City can do without the cooperation of a willing seller. Rezoning, including possible downzoning of these uses, will be explored in a subsequent rezoning study. However, as the plan also notes, nonconforming rights have also been strengthened, and existing uses have the ability to stay at a location for some time. The plan supports a cleaner environment, including a reduction of pollutants from area industries.

		emissions, The MPCA received over 184 comment letters, overwhelmingly opposed and requesting an Environmental Impact Statement. In addition to numerous letters from residents, city and state officials, and neighborhood associations, the City Council passed a resolution regarding the negative environmental impact to the public. City staff testified before the MPCA regarding the 18,000 people that live within a mile radius of the area and are subject to the pollution emanating from it. Yet, under the proposed Plan, are recommendations that "accommodate industrial uses" (transitional industrial land use) and wait for "longer term" opportunities to occur for change to other uses (page 77). "Transitional industrial" recognizes that heavy industry is hard to move. However, there is a big difference between actively supporting a transition away from heavy industry and waiting for it to happen. As constant recipients of the pollution, dust, noise and foul odors emanating from Subarea 5 my neighbors and I feel that the city of Minneapolis should take a more aggressive approach and a pro-active role to encourage change instead of "waiting for opportunities to present themselves", particularly in an area that has been underserved for decades. For example, by changing the zoning to comply with the original ATF land use guidelines, my understanding is that limitations would be placed on future heavy industrial growth and the additional strain it places on nearby neighborhoods and parks. Although "grandfathered" in, current heavy industry would not be allowed to expand and new heavy industry would not be allowed to move in.	
Susan Vikse letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	There are some alternatives not realized in the report. On page 63 the Plan states "Additionally some (such as Cemstone concrete plant) depend on their central location to function and serve the area, and therefore do not find it attractive to relocate to a less centralized suburban site" In fact, Cemstone has a plant approximately two miles from Minneapolis in Energy Park, along the railroad lines. It is my understanding it was this plant that built the TCF stadium, at the University of Minnesota, in Minneapolis. Having attended all public forums over the past two years relating to this issue, it is clear to me that north and northeast Minneapolis residents want to rid the area of heavy industry, and to include more residential housing. Comments have been expressed not only	While there are no guarantees that relocation to this site is feasible, it will certainly be considered during the plan's implementation phase.

		by residents, but neighborhood associations and elected officials as well.	
Susan Vikse letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	Bulk industries such as Northern Metals are costing the city jobs. In 1997 the Japs-Olson printing facility moved away from "the riverfront in North Minneapolis to escape from its neighbor, American Iron and Supply, a metal-shredding plant because the constant vibration from the metal shredder disturbed its printing equipment." (Corporate Report, Minnesota, 1997) They moved to St. Louis Park taking 500 jobs with them. According to their website, they currently employ 700 people. The bulk industries located in Subarea 5 employ approximately one job per acre (page 20, 2000 ATF plan document) with no diversity of work force – very few, if any jobs for women. According to the original ATF Plan, in the entire ATF area only 10% of workers live nearby. While both plans propose adding much needed jobs, the city needs to assure they will be diverse and preference be given to nearby residents	The plan prioritizes clean light industrial employment over heavy industry. It also recommends that job linkage programs for local residents be an essential part of the economic development strategy for the area.
Susan Vikse letter – 1/24/13	Land Use – Chp 5	The Plan discusses that office/industrial use is more attractive than residential due to centralized location and proximity to downtown and states that "the river is a great amenity, but not sufficient in itself to be the basis of a new neighborhood." I disagree with this conclusion. There was no park when Riverview Townhomes (north end of sub area 4 directly adjacent to sub area 5) was built, but there was the river and close proximity to downtown. Typically, when a neighborhood is built near water people buy the homes. I am concerned that without specific areas designated as residential, the areas designated as "multi-use" will become business park "wastelands" surrounded by vast parking lots employing mostly those that do not even live in Minneapolis. When land becomes available it will go to the highest bidder as long as it "fits" within the zoning category. The revised ATF plan proposes 1000 less housing units. Residential housing increases the tax base. For example, in 2012, the 29 Riverview Townhomes residing on 2.5 acres together paid approximately $140,000 in property taxes. Northern metals sits on almost 11 acres of land, employs very few people, and paid	The river is an important amenity, but proximity to other amenities (including those in Downtown) is critical as well, especially for high value market rate residential. Mixed use areas are designed to accommodate development that is compatible with a range of uses, including residential. Added reference to fact that residential developers typically are willing to pay more for real estate, so areas attractive for residential will see stronger offers and projects from residential developers. The plan's analysis does show that residential uses increase the tax base more than industrial. However, this is largely outweighed by the fact that public services to residential are much higher expenditures

		approximately $140,000 in property taxes.	for government (city, county, and schools)
Susan Vikse letter – 1/24/13	Land Use, Health – Chps 4 & 5	People are more interested in the area where they live than where they work. The recent Health Impact Assessment (Health Department, city of Minneapolis) states that obesity decreases with an increase in housing density and that health improves with walkable neighborhoods, retail and amenities nearby and safe recreational areas patrolled and monitored by the people that live there. Without the assurance of nearby neighborhoods, there will be no restaurants, retail, hospitality and amenities that support a vibrant neighborhood population and draw people from all over the city to recreate and spend money in north Minneapolis. Finally, north Minneapolis residents need improved, safe, off road biking and walking trails to access the river. The border of Farview Park on 26th Avenue North is four tenths of a mile from the river. Yet, access from the park to the river is challenging and dangerous. The bike lanes on 26th Avenue North and North 2nd Street are consistently blocked by parked cars, and the street is overrun by cement and recycling trucks. There is no safe access using Broadway either as 55,000 cars pass the intersection of Washington Ave and Broadway daily.	For these reasons, the plan prioritizes residential development in areas adjacent to existing neighborhoods – to create a walkable context, rather than isolated sites. The goal of what is proposed is to encourage residential first in the most likely areas where it can succeed. Improvements along 26th linking the riverfront to the neighborhood are prioritized in the plan.
Susan Vikse letter – 1/24/13	Land Use, Transportation – Chps 5 & 7	A June 4, 2011 Star Tribune article stated that the "Cedar Lake Regional Trail -- connecting the western suburbs to the West River Parkway in Minneapolis -- was completed..." The final mile of this trail cost 9.2 million dollars. Along with the Greenway trail (which uses the Martin Sabo Bridge to cross highway 55) residents from south Minneapolis and the western suburbs access the river safely, without traffic, noise, dust and pollution. The inequities are staggering and frankly shameful in a city such as ours. As long as the north Riverfront is clogged with belching industry in lieu of neighborhoods and parks, and businesses that employ few nearby residents, not much will change	Prioritization of public resources is needed for there to be significant change on the upper riverfront. The plan recommends funding of a number of improvements towards this end.
Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Land Use – Chp 5	Concerned with balance with the plan on both sides of the river, and equity issues. But differences on both sides of the river reflect historic realities; it is OK if they are different because they have always been	As the two sides of the river have been developed differently, they will need to be addressed differently. The plan does commit to riverfront park and trail amenities on both sides of the river.
Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Land Use – Chp 5	Need more parks on the North Side	The plan supports the development of new riverfront parkland

Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Land Use – Chp 5	City need to have a balance of uses, not all parks and housing	The plan supports a balanced approach to land uses
Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Land Use, Economic Development – Chps 5 & 8	North Washington Jobs Park is a model for light industrial development. Need employment opportunities for the area	The plan supports additional employment opportunities. NWJP is a potential model for how this will be developed.
Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Transportation – Chp 7	Connecting to Perkins Hill Park via 33rd is a much better connecting corridor than 36th which is recommended in the plan; 33rd is ideal for this purpose	Adding language to support additional connection from 33rd and 34th to Perkins Hill, and then to the riverfront
Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Perkins Hill Park has more uses than it has room for – can the new riverfront park be designed to accommodate some of this?	This will be taken into account in park development
Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Transportation – Chp 7	42nd connection is an important one	This connection is recommended in the plan
Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Parks and Trails – Chp 6	Need to tie to MPRB water facility	This will be taken into account in park development
Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Economic Development – Chp 8	49th area – Impact Mailing jobs are valuable	While that site is outside the scope of the study area, priority for good jobs is reflected in the plan
Webber Camden meeting – 12/16/12	Economic Development – Chp 8	Business park idea makes sense; Medtronic campus as a possible model	Thank you for your comment