

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

Comment Number	Topic	Comment	Timestamp
1	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	great. The policy does not really make clear how parking requirements will be eased to encourage more non-car use of businesses.	3/27/2018 15:45
2	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	Could the city make provisions for live/work ADUs or other type of home businesses with smaller visitors/customers?	3/28/2018 4:26
3		Why not allow more mixed use by right along all transit corridors?	3/28/2018 4:26
4	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	Apparently there is a regulation on the number of liquor stores that a grocery store chain can operate in the city. I think this should be revised.	3/28/2018 4:30
5	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	I'm not sure where exactly this fits, but it would be nice if the city were to find a way to allow/encourage smaller commercial spaces as well as bigger ones. It seems like a lot of newer mixed use buildings have really big commercial spaces in them that can be hard for a small business to afford. The most dynamic spaces are often in smaller footprints in older buildings. If we allow older buildings to be redeveloped into large mixed-use buildings, we should try to ensure that these new buildings allow local small business owners a chance to stay in the area.	4/16/2018 19:24
6	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	Everyone needs a full service grocery and hardware store nearby. However it is not possible for everyone to walk or take public transportation to work. My daughter used to walk to work, but her company merged and moved out beyond the suburbs, while her husbands work was in the other direction. The other daughter takes public transportation to multiple jobs while her husband commutes to another town.	4/21/2018 18:18
7	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	More density and more amenities please. This looks great! Let's become a real city, not what a Minnpost author stated in the past, Minneapolis reminds me of a 100 year old suburb in New Jersey.  Let's be the new Denver, the new Portland, the new Austin. Someplace where people are like, gosh, I should live in Minneapolis. That is is so cool!	5/7/2018 20:53
8	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	Don't understand exactly what is being proposed here	5/12/2018 2:17
9	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	How will you ensure that rent for commercial spaces in areas with high densities will remain low enough to support small businesses (most of which may be specialty businesses) so that they are able to stay in business?	5/14/2018 19:26
10	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	Excellent ideas. I think that the City should work hard to bring a vibrant retail environment into the downtown core. It lacks it now!	5/22/2018 21:35
11	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	There needs to be credits and or incentives for locally owned and small businesses to be installed in new commercial developments. Many times the rent from large property management companies is exorbitantly high as to be cost prohibitive except for large chain businesses.	5/31/2018 11:23
12	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	Mixed commercial is a great idea however don't underestimate the need for a car in extreme cold with snow and ice. Plans to simply not allow access for cars, parking and repair shops is shortsighted.	6/3/2018 19:20
13	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	I agree with everything in this policy. Higher density all around, to actually provide enough people within walking distance of local businesses to support them staying open, is key. Having small-scale mixed-use buildings would work great in neighborhood interiors at transit stops, and mid-rise mixed-use along corridors. Buildings should be oriented to the sidewalk, and either have no off-street parking, or have parking tucked behind the building. I think it's very important to have a variety of small businesses inside neighborhoods, so enable car-free living. You can paint as many bike lanes as you want, you're only going to be able to get so many people biking, unless you allow useful destinations within a short, practical distance to where people live. Same goes for walking. We have sidewalks, but most people can't use them to get groceries, simply because the nearest grocery store is just too far away to walk easily.	6/6/2018 2:32
14	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	I like the idea of complete neighborhoods with walkability. Where I see a huge opportunity for completing neighborhoods and growth is over in the Northside. I live in Folwell neighborhood (near Humboldt and dowling.) From what I can see, the availability of business to walk/bike to, as well as proper/safer pedestrian and biking spaces are far lacking compared to other places in the city. North is a beautiful area with historic homes, many large parks and a population eager for the same amenities and opportunities provided on South Mpls or other neighborhoods that seem to have historically received more attention and/or funding.  Thank you.	6/12/2018 13:08

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

15	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	Dear City,  Get out of the way of business. Trade should be as free as people demanding a product and someone providing it at a price the consumers will agree to pay. The city doesn't need to step in unless an act of fraud, force, or coercion occurs. Get out of the way. Don't be a barrier to economic improvement and trade.	6/20/2018 18:18
16	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	This is perhaps my favorite policy on this plan. It is fantastic! Increasing walk-ability/bike-ability throughout the city will make this city such an amazing place to live!	6/21/2018 5:07
17	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	Please allow the large commercial marked buildings in NE Minneapolis to remain commercial. Several of these are used as art production buildings. These should remain used for art production. Tax benefits should be given to the owners to keep the owners from selling out. Maybe mark the buildings as historic and significant to the arts community. The arts community NEEDS to have the space to produce art. College and University accreditation requirements require that art is offered. Artists do graduate and after working out of their home, they grow to need the space. Business is not brisk, but it's consistent. We cannot work out of a house anymore.	6/22/2018 15:23
18	/policies/access-to-commercial-goods-and-services/	Access to the studio requires HAULING art supplies and materials. This cannot be done on a bike.	6/22/2018 15:29
19	/policies/access-to-employment/	Increase access to infant and toddler childcare.	3/23/2018 17:13
20	/policies/access-to-employment/	Sounds good. perhaps clarify point d. to explain what "grow within their existing footprint" means. Upward?	3/27/2018 15:40
21	/policies/access-to-employment/	I just want to write in to support this part of the plan. Anything the city can do to discourage employers from locating jobs in far-flung, not-transit-connected suburban spaces seems like a good idea. Obviously this isn't always possible for large-footprint industrial uses, but for offices and services, there's no reason not to be near a transit node in Mpls.	4/16/2018 19:27
22	/policies/access-to-employment/	We need to give local transit routes that serve job centers, especially downtown, more priority and greater frequency on our city streets. We should have more bus-only lanes (both 24 hour bus-only and peak-time bus-only) on streets like Hennepin and Central. For transit to be a viable option for more people, buses cannot be held up by single-occupancy (or possible future zero occupancy) vehicles.	5/10/2018 16:59
23	/policies/access-to-employment/	Why is the focus outside of the downtown area only applicable to "non-production" jobs currently served by public transportation since MN is primarily an agriculture state with limited transit options in those ag areas.	5/14/2018 12:54
24	/policies/access-to-employment/	Action step (a) is particularly important. We are running out of undeveloped land downtown, and we should be requiring new development to be significant in scope. Likewise, new development in areas like Lake Street (near where I live) should be dense, with mixed commercial-residential uses.	5/21/2018 1:18
25	/policies/access-to-employment/	Minimum wage laws, insane regulations and high taxes continue to drive business out of Minneapolis. Your projections seem unlikely. More than likely you will need to convert office space downtown to housing.	5/26/2018 2:20
26	/policies/access-to-employment/	I definitely agree with having minimum development densitites downtown, where land needs to be utilized as efficiently as possible. As far as outside downtown, I would love to see more opportunities for small businesses and offices to find a place in our neighborhoods. We have lots of lovely nodes in our city, that used to be streetcar stations, and now the few remaining brick commercial buildings still offer great spaces for small local businesses. We should absolutely follow that pattern, and allow new construction by current transit stops. In interior neighborhoods, where many of those older brick buildings are, small two story live/work buildings would be a great addition, and along corridors, following a traditional "main street" model of development, with rows of mixed use buildings of two or more stories, with no off street parking, or parking hidden behind the buildings, would be amazing	6/6/2018 2:21
27	/policies/access-to-employment/	Allow for entrepreneurs and minority business owners greater access to affordable office spaces. Subsidize office spaces or shared equipments.	6/15/2018 0:32
28	/policies/access-to-employment/	Encourage all typea of businesses rather than large ones.	6/15/2018 0:33
29	/policies/access-to-employment/	Dear Minneapolis,  Get out of the way of local businesses and you'll see an increase in opportunity. People in society are no worse than government employees. In fact, many may be smarter, more successful, so why is it the city feels the need to dictate what business owners and property owners do with their own labors, their own fruits? Creating opportunity should not come at the price of freedom. Want opportunity? Get out of the way or support the efforts of local businesses to do as they wish. If their ideas are not good, they will not succeed in business. That's their risk to take. Not yours.	6/20/2018 18:17

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

30	/policies/access-to-health-social-and-emergency-service/	Look to Higher Ground and The Rose apartments for successful adventures. Giving people a place to be is the first step in creating a relationship between them and social services. Also for addition treatment, MN has basically NO HEROIN out-patient centers and right now the system is basically screwing people who can afford insurance and giving free treatment to those that don't, REGARDLESS IF THEY WANT TO ACTUALLY BE IN TREATMENT. we dont have enough spots or money for people who dont want to be in addiction treatment. we need to DECRIMINALIZE MARIJUANA, it is proven to help people get off opioids, reduce opioid dependence, is safer than alcohol, and keeps kids out of jails that turn them into criminals. Taxes from recreational marijuana have been put to addition treatment successfully in states like Colorado. MN also has basically no place to go if you're a man with children. Just now, we have a couple shelters that take pets since most women know what will happen to Fluffy if they leave the abuser ;(. Pets and children are a reason why women stay and we need to give them every opportunity to leave for a better life.	4/3/2018 17:32
31	/policies/access-to-health-social-and-emergency-service/	increase mental health advocates support on the police force as first responders to avoid incidents of someone being harmed by an officer in the midst of a mental episode.	4/9/2018 15:13
32	/policies/access-to-health-social-and-emergency-service/	redefine our in-patient addiction treatment guidelines, our mental health and addiction counseling professionals are being made to put any one in treatment even if they dont want to go to treatment. time and again, no space is left for people who want/need emergency placement. to tell a heroin addict they need to wait a month for treatment is like a death sentence. they've even told users they "haven't used heroin long enough" to go to treatment. we need to relook at our guidelines to make sure that there's room in treatment facilities for people who want it. What is the success rate of our current guidelines or are they overkill? painting with a broad brush, when we don't have room for that and can't help people when they've reached their "rock bottom". We need to assess what works with reduced relapses and returning to treatment to ensure we're using our treatment resources responsibly.	4/9/2018 15:24
33	/policies/access-to-health-social-and-emergency-service/	Study how the narrowing of streets effects emergency response.	4/22/2018 0:27
34	/policies/access-to-housing/	This is a fantastic idea and will help Minneapolis lead the nation on fighting housing shortages.	3/22/2018 22:31
35	/policies/access-to-housing/	I love it. More density is more sustainable and, other things being equal, affordable. This is a great baseline to start from.	3/23/2018 12:15
36	/policies/access-to-housing/	I support the policies that help to remedy the racist housing policies of the past, and I support the inclusion of up to four dwelling units on neighborhood interiors furthest from downtown.	3/23/2018 19:24
37	/policies/access-to-housing/	People are using the 46th street I-35 transit center as housing and a base for pan-handling	3/23/2018 23:24
38	/policies/access-to-housing/	In regards to multi-dwelling development, there NEEDS to be requirements for offstreet parking required per dwelling. It's irresponsible to do otherwise in these residential areas.	3/24/2018 16:21
39	/policies/access-to-housing/	Hmm.. Apparently cannot respond with full statements. Only one-liners, otherwise this system says "Oops"	3/24/2018 20:03
40	/policies/access-to-housing/	I REJECT item e. We have a connected neighborhood in Windom. We know our neighbors by name, even their pets. We did not choose to live in high-density Uptown or Downtown.	3/24/2018 20:05
41	/policies/access-to-housing/	To cram 4-plexes onto single-family lots, must have to ditch any setback requirements, or have any adequate space for yards for children to play in. I absolutely reject item e.	3/24/2018 20:07
42	/policies/access-to-housing/	This is an excellent policy, I fully support this.	3/26/2018 3:48
43	/policies/access-to-housing/	Sounds great! More clarity on how parking requirements for new developments will be reduced would be helpful.	3/27/2018 15:38
44	/policies/access-to-housing/	The expressed housing policies are based upon the false premise that population growth is good. It is not good, but must be accommodated.	3/27/2018 18:48
45	/policies/access-to-housing/	All housing should have off-street parking. Even if reduced auto trip goals are met, nearly 60% of trips will be by auto. Further, even those who utilize non-auto for most will want to have an auto for the rest.	3/27/2018 18:59
46	/policies/access-to-housing/	I like the plan. It addresses the issues of housing, transportation, and carbon pollution. It should be stated that the housing should be affordable in whatever percentage matches the need.	3/27/2018 21:18
47	/policies/access-to-housing/	I love it!	3/28/2018 6:14
48	/policies/access-to-housing/	I support the plan to allow 2-4 units in areas of the city where typically there is just SFH. But this has to be done in a way to insure that owners stay local, either owner occupant or co-op and condo owners.	3/28/2018 9:50
49	/policies/access-to-housing/	I couldn't agree more with the policy and fully support it! Minneapolis should be accessible to all income-levels in any neighborhood and not segregated. This is smart policy and should proceed as such.	3/29/2018 14:36
50	/policies/access-to-housing/	The action is to increase the amount of housing, but the action steps only talk about allowing things. Without incentives, housing development will still follow the money, so what guarantees do we have that anything will change?	3/29/2018 23:03

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

51	/policies/access-to-housing/	Hi, I support the proposal all action steps in the "Access to Housing" policy section. In particular I believe that action steps 'd' and 'e' are positive and I fully support them!	
52	/policies/access-to-housing/	-Jordan	4/2/2018 15:55
53	/policies/access-to-housing/	Would love to see the city encourage small-scale (i.e. duplex, triplex, fourplex) condos where possible.	4/3/2018 6:17
54	/policies/access-to-housing/	provide work/live incentives where the security guard can live at the apartments or the nursing home cohabitating with a daycare or a shelter for women with children. people who work at the nursing home can live there. allowing people to live where they work - using coexisting circumstances to benefit from each other in a symbiotic relationship to create more useful space - 24 hour use of space will equal less space needed overall.	4/3/2018 16:26
55	/policies/access-to-housing/	provide work/live incentives where the security guard can live at the apartments or the nursing home cohabitating with a daycare or a shelter for women with children. people who work at the nursing home can live there. allowing people to live where they work - using coexisting circumstances to benefit from each other in a symbiotic relationship to create more useful space - 24 hour use of space will equal less space needed overall.	4/3/2018 16:26
56	/policies/access-to-housing/	Please stop building solely new luxury apartments. Please start building non-luxury apartment building or start to build townhouses in zip codes 55404,55408, 55403, 55405.	4/3/2018 19:15
57	/policies/access-to-housing/	This is a wonderful idea, as long as there are strong incentives for owner-occupied multiunit buildings (or a condo model for building such as a fourplex); I don't want to see fourplexes that are managed by absentee landlords; Perhaps there could be incentives for owners of multi-unit buildings to rent out one unit to a low-income family?	4/3/2018 19:40
58	/policies/access-to-housing/	Saving consistently vacant areas in production and distribution areas in the hopes that they will be occupied by industry is not helpful in solving affordable housing. Use consistently vacant land (i.e. 345 Industrial Blvd. NE) and turn it into affordable housing.	4/3/2018 21:47
59	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am opposed to converting Single-family dwellings into multi-unit housing for two reasons: 1. Landlords tend to not support their rental properties as do committed home owners. The risk of degraded and degrading properties (eyesores and safety hazards) grow as a result. 2. Home ownership is a goal to which many should strive as it provides a solid investment in they and their families futures as well as the future of the community.	4/4/2018 20:07
60	/policies/access-to-housing/	I think there is a very good reason for zoning areas for single-family housing as opposed to multi-family dwellings, light industrial or commercial developmentâ€”so that homeowners know what to expect from their surroundings before they buy a home and that the city is following that zoning agreement. Homeowners, all of whom make a huge financial investment in purchasing a property, should not be then subject to changes in zoning or housing that materially change their living experience or negatively impact the value or desirability of their property. Neighborhoods have been planned to accommodate lots, houses, garages, and streets of particular sizes, and a certain number of properties per block. A typical city lot in Minneapolis is not large enough to accommodate a 3- or 4-unit building with a sufficient setback from neighboring houses, nor is there enough street parking to accommodate all of the vehicles that come along with such density. Would homeowners in surrounding properties be able to approve or veto such plans? I assume they would get no say in the matter, and the city has no right to retrofit neighborhoods against the will of the people who live there. By choosing to live in Minneapolis, homeowners already accept higher taxes, more noise, pollution, stress, traffic, wastewater runoff, crime, density, and other annoyances (alongside of perceived upsides). I strongly oppose add tearing down single family houses in neighborhood interiors (e.) to build multi-family dwellings. What's more, if the city of Minneapolis were serious about affordable housing, it would stop allowing teardowns of small, affordable houses which are then replaced with ridiculously expensive houses that loom over neighboring homes, both out of character and out of scale with their neighborhoods.	4/4/2018 21:30
61	/policies/access-to-housing/	Totally against "small-scale residential structures on traditional size city lots with up to four dwelling units, including single family, duplex, 3-unit, 4-unit, and accessory dwelling unit building types." Minneapolis was built upon "the family neighborhood concept" that has worked very well. Why do you people want to destroy that concept. I love my neighborhood and the families that chose to live here and raise their children. COMMUNITY is why I live in Minneapolis! Do your urban experiments somewhere else! I am regretting voting for Jacob Fry. Is it his goal to turn Minneapolis into an East coast "Ghetto?"	4/4/2018 21:38

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

61	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am opposed to allowing more than two units (I.e. Duplex) on a single 40 foot city lot. If the single family home is in one of the "farthest from interior" areas, reality is that each unit will have at least one vehicle if transit is more than two blocks away. There will be inadequate garage and/or parking space without eliminating the backyard. To accommodate four families, the footprint and height of the building would have to be increased-at that point, wouldn't it be better to have planned multifamily housing on bigger lots? We have experience in our area with 3 or 4 story apartment buildings built within 15 feet of a single story, single family home that has lost any privacy and sunlight exposure. If the multi unit dwellings are built by investors, I do not have any faith that the good of the people or the neighborhood will be considered.	4/5/2018 0:50
62	/policies/access-to-housing/	This comment screams eminent domain: ...minimize the displacement of existing residents... You are claiming that your ultimate goal is to provide more affordable housing and yet 'McMansions' for half million dollars are going up in place of those 'affordable homes' that were torn down. Seems there's a problem right there. You are looking to add single family (starter homes) but what's going up isn't affordable to anyone who would be interested in starter homes. Perhaps look internally at what the City is allowing before going after the neighborhoods that are functioning and stable, already (happily) full of diverse members: ages, race, creed, color, gender and income. Finally, I did not work hard over the last 20 years on the betterment of this house and subsequently, the neighborhood, to move out as I age. Stop trying to push the elders out!	4/5/2018 1:33
63	/policies/access-to-housing/	Yes. These are all commonsense statements.	4/5/2018 14:30
64	/policies/access-to-housing/	I fully support increasing density in all areas of Minneapolis. This is essential to prevent rising prices from driving all but the wealthiest from the city.	4/6/2018 23:17
65	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am concerned about the proposal to build multi unit dwellings in Mpls. I have lived in Mpls proper for 40+ years. It has been exciting to see the growth of new businesses but the increased traffic and parking issues detract from the excitement. We are all ready experiencing parking issues in much of Mpls. The thought of increasing the population without requiring parking for new units is concerning. I own a car but am an avid walker. I love walking to restaurants, the grocery store, the library, the movies, the parks, etc. When I worked, I often walked over a mile to/from the Light Rail. I don't remember ever walking with a fellow LR rider more than a few blocks. And on most other pedestrian outings I am usually one of the few people walking. I fear Mpls residents are not ready to walk more than a few blocks. If that is true, the traffic and parking problems will continue to accelerate as multi unit dwellings are added.	4/7/2018 4:04
66	/policies/access-to-housing/	I oppose removing zoning limits on multifamily housing in single family neighborhoods. Its not the 1930s and zoning in 2018 isn't about restricting access to one race or another, its about creating neighborhoods of similar types of structures, not similar types of people. Housing choice should be about giving people the option of living in beautiful low density, mid density or high density neighborhoods. Eliminating zoning restrictions could lead to every neighborhood turning into a generic mid-density neighborhood with a Frankenstein mix of structures that don't fit together. We should preserve the character of our individual neighborhoods and let people choose what type of neighborhood they want to live in, rather than letting developers build 4-plexes wherever they want.	4/7/2018 13:27
67	/policies/access-to-housing/	Yes, diversity of housing options is essential. Single family homes are not affordable for many residents who might desire home ownership, but more options to buy a portion of a duplex, triplex or fourplex may provide more access across racial and generational lines.	4/8/2018 22:00
68	/policies/access-to-housing/	This does not address affordable housing, just more housing which may drive down rental prices a bit but will not help those who make 30% or lower AMI. It will just make developers rich. I support some changes in zoning to increase different housing options but some need to be affordable for the very very low income and supporting NOAH apartments and homes is a helpful way to do so. I also want to preserve small family homes and not see them knocked down to build 4 plexes.	4/12/2018 2:05
69	/policies/access-to-housing/	This does not address affordable housing, just more housing which may drive down rental prices a bit but will not help those who make 30% or lower AMI. It will just make developers rich. I support some changes in zoning to increase different housing options but some need to be affordable for the very very low income and supporting NOAH apartments and homes is a helpful way to do so. I also want to preserve small family homes and not see them knocked down to build 4 plexes.	4/12/2018 2:05

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

70	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I live the SE Minneapolis and I do not like POLICY 1. The lots and tear-downs around my house are relatively cheap compared to other great locations in MPLS and developers are buying them before families can and turn them into these 3k-4k sq. ft. houses that don't match the neighborhood around them.</p> <p>If POLICY 1 is passed I believe the city will see more outside developers turning single family neighborhood and turning them into 4-plex neighborhoods. Prices for these apartments will still remain as high as the going rate. Parking isn't necessarily a problem here, but when I lived on 48th Ave with all the condos, apartments, and light rail riders my street was packed. I just don't want my neighborhood to turn into a cheap Uptown. Where you can conveniently park four blocks away from your apartment when the snow emergency is called.</p> <p>I'd send more effort in the areas that already low-income and building those places higher and making them better appealing for single family urban dwellers...Like the Bossen field apartments would be a great start. Or more high raises, condo on the LRT-Blue line where the builder can supply underground parking.</p> <p>I don't think POLICY 1 is solving a problem as it is creating more.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Anders K.</p>	4/12/2018 14:08
71	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>As a resident of South Minneapolis, I am incredibly concerned about the prospect of lifting zoning restrictions to allow the construction of fourplexes in virtually any neighborhood. To suggest that this will somehow "solve the affordable housing problem" is ludicrous. If I wanted to live in an area ripe with apartment complexes, I would move to Uptown. I'm also skeptical that this rezoning will be implemented equally across neighborhoods/wards. The primary beneficiary from this policy change will be investors, not Minneapolis residents.</p>	4/12/2018 16:22
72	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I think 4 units per lot in all areas is unworkable and will have many adverse effects. It will NOT create affordable housing but will enrich developers. I bought my home with the expectation that my block and area would remain SFHs and this will devalue my home. I already pay very very high taxes and cannot go on with this change.</p>	4/13/2018 22:08
73	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Make sure you think about parking policies. When you relax requirements related to off street parking, those of us that live in the neighborhood have difficulties parking in front of our own homes. Eg....Red Cow parking issues in Fulton.</p>	4/14/2018 12:37
74	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I love the plan that allows 1,2, 3, 4 unit buildings and adding ADU but the ordinance around ADU's needs to be modified to allow non owner occupants to build ADU's. This is a biggest opportunity to add more housing options since landlords of 2-3 unit buildings already own the land and adding an ADU becomes more affordable to build and thus can be rented more affordably.</p>	4/15/2018 1:11
75	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I want to comment in support of these plans. If anything I would have gone farther to upzone deeper into the neighborhoods, particularly near high-frequency transit. Fourplexes are nice, but we are going to need larger buildings, too, and not always on arterials. The rate at which we need to be building housing to keep up with population growth and shrinking household size is considerable, and anything we can do to make sure that we keep up is helpful.</p>	4/16/2018 19:57
76	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>What areas of the city is housing not allowed?</p> <p>What is a traditional sized" lot? What should parking requirements be? How big is a fourplex? What percentage of a lot can it take? Is that percentage one of the zoning laws that would be changed, but that would be allowed under a new plan?What would a typical unit in a fourplex sell for? Would it be cheaper than an old single family house?</p>	4/18/2018 20:49
77	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Do not support e. Single family homes and neighborhoods are very important. This is so in terms of investment in property, maintaining value, neighborhood character and safety. I have owned homes in both areas allowing multi-family units and that don't. In 11 years owning a home next to and near multi-family dwellings, I suffered two robberies, one involving a gun. I sold the home and made absolutely no money. In 25 years in a neighborhood allowing only single family homes I have had 0 incidents. The platitudes for this concept are different from what the reality is. I know from personal experience. I am absolutely against this part of the plan.</p>	4/20/2018 1:07
78	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>In order to create more affordable housing, care needs to be taken that higher density is not just a goal in itself, but that specific measures are taken to keep that housing affordable, especially when the free market is involved.</p>	4/20/2018 1:15

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

79	/policies/access-to-housing/	I would like to strongly support this policy. I live in an area where very large single-family homes are being built, a 3- or even 4-unit building would not actually be out of scale with the buildings being built, often on speculation, and sometimes sitting empty for long periods of time. This would allow us to redevelop our lot to provide us an income stream, and/or to have our parents live close enough to help them while still maintaining some privacy.	4/22/2018 1:45
80	/policies/access-to-housing/	Offer surplus property that is ideal for housing development for free to those developing a building that is used for affordable housing creation. (The city shouldn't charge fair market value for affordable housing only to have the developer come back and ask for that same amount in subsidy from the city's affordable housing funds)	4/24/2018 4:33
81	/policies/access-to-housing/	Offer surplus property that is ideal for housing development for free to those developing a building that is used for affordable housing creation. (The city shouldn't charge fair market value for affordable housing only to have the developer come back and ask for that same amount in subsidy from the city's affordable housing funds)	4/24/2018 4:33
82	/policies/access-to-housing/	No R 4 zoning where it is now R1 or R2. High density will ruin Mpls single home neighborhoods!	4/25/2018 17:51
83	/policies/access-to-housing/	Upzoning to allow fourplexes will be great! We own a triplex that was originally built as a single family home (plus servants quarters) in 1893. We want to protect the unique aspects of that home, while also being able to build a one or two unit structure behind it that is energy efficient and allows us to spread out fixed costs to more tenants. Upzoning is a critical step to making that a reality and allowing us to bridge the historic with the new!	4/26/2018 21:45
84	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am absolutely against higher density housing zoning to replace residential or 2-family housing. The parking and traffic congestion is already an unpleasant problem in my neighborhood (57th and Nicollet, with trips to 54th and Lyndale to library and Walgreens). I am a senior citizen and must drive to most destinations. Your proposed policy is agism! You want to eliminate cars! Who says Minneapolis has to supply more housing, there are plenty of suburbs where housing is available. Sally DuFour, 5655 Nicollet	4/27/2018 21:01
85	/policies/access-to-housing/	Sorry cut off. I strongly oppose building in single family neighborhoods four plexes The four plexes will add parking problems where none exist now. We should protect our neighborhoods farthest from Downtown. Currently my neighborhood is Diverse and is replacing housing with single family homes. We should attract more diversity by providing homeownership help to low income and middle class residents.  Let us have a meeting in Longfellow and Nokomis neighborhoods to discuss this.	4/29/2018 19:33
86	/policies/access-to-housing/	Thanks for bringing light to the connection between historic redlining and modern exclusionary zoning. We can only move forward and make positive change when we recognize that current policy restricts access to safe and stable housing for more people. I am excited to see movement beyond "high density on frequent transit lines" (which are often in areas of higher pollution, fewer parks, etc.) to allow a diversity of housing structure types across the city. I am excited to support this!	5/1/2018 19:50
87	/policies/access-to-housing/	As to e), I'm a resident home-owner in one of these areas (Waite Park). I fully support the proposal. It's becoming clear that the meager supply of starter-homes is not enough to meet the demand for living in the outer neighborhoods of Minneapolis. More people should be able to live in all neighborhoods of the city. 3 and 4 unit building don't really deviate a great deal from some of the large single-family homes being built throughout the city. Much like the ADU ordinance, this policy change would likely be barely noticeable to existing residents once enacted. There are already thousands of non-conforming duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes that blend in seamlessly with rows of single-family homes. Let's simply legalize what we basically already have.	5/3/2018 20:11
88	/policies/access-to-housing/	How does this approach tie back to or relate to Equity?	5/5/2018 3:18
89	/policies/access-to-housing/	This is the most exciting thing in the 2040 plan that could transform the city. We are lagging behind other cities in growth due to being land locked in and almost every city lot currently utilized (with the exception of lots on the Northside).  This will allow greater density in all areas of the city which will make our streets more vibrant, our sidewalks more filled with pedestrians and kids playing, and our restaurants and other establishments in business due to the increased local population that adds to additional customers.  Plus, it increases the tax base, keeping property taxes in line.	5/7/2018 20:27
90	/policies/access-to-housing/	I live in one of those "farthest from downtown" neighborhood interiors in a single-family home. I would love to see multi-unit buildings on our block! There's plenty of available street parking in our neighborhood (just like there is most single-family-home neighborhoods), and the lot sizes are enormous. Let's not hog our most desirable neighborhoods for the benefit of the few.	5/8/2018 12:50

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

91	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I live in Howe and I do agree with the overall goal of increasing housing density to address the supply issue. I live in an area that would be impacted by allowing small-scale residential structures to be converted into 4 unit dwelling units. I disagree with allowing unlimited multiunit housing in my neighborhood. Perhaps allowing up to 2-4 units per block would be a good compromise. Additionally, any new construction should blend in with the unique neighborhood we live in. I do not want to live next to a cheaply built new construction building that looks like it should be in the suburbs.</p> <p>In conclusion, I think the number of allowed multi-dwelling units in single family neighborhoods be limited per block. Additionally, the building code for these new construction units should insure they blend into the neighborhood.</p>	5/8/2018 15:53
92	/policies/access-to-housing/	Thank you for allowing greater housing supply and diversity to be built in Minneapolis. Without more options, I would not be able to afford to live in Minneapolis as costs continue to rise.	5/8/2018 20:06
93	/policies/access-to-housing/	What is going on now is very sickening in terms of options for affordable housing. I am a Millennial and a county worker and I can barely afford a one bedroom apartment in/near downtown Minneapolis. I currently live in a studio and honestly I was disgusted that "luxury" efficiencies are being built in the neighborhood I live in (Elliot). I am glad there is a plan that will address these housing problems I just honestly hope I don't have to wait until I am 51 years old (my age in 2040). I know these things take time but can there be a push for these so-called luxury apartments to set aside affordable one bedroom apartments/housing for folks like myself and more? I mean seriously, I don't need extra costly maid services (one of the unnecessary services those luxury apartments offer) I can wash and take care of my home myself and I'm trying to rent an affordable one bedroom NOT a hotel room.	5/9/2018 13:08
94	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I support these policies in general and in particular as a resident of SW Minneapolis on a block affected by proposed policy 5, I would comment that I would welcome thoughtful additional housing up to 4 units in residential neighborhoods, particularly as planned near such commercial nodes as 50th and Bryant, 50th and Penn and 46th and Bryant. Not only do I believe this is sensible change from a density, diversity and economic development perspective, but as I age out of my single family home I would appreciate more rental/condo options in my existing neighborhood.</p> <p>Wood Kidner 4926 Colfax Ave S</p>	5/10/2018 22:45
95	/policies/access-to-housing/	What about co-housing designed area that access green space and elder services,potentially schools and daycare..what about creating a model co-housing design in a large currently under resourced area and creating a beautiful model or hub for a new housing kind of thinking. But it has to be beautiful and not just another high rise badly maintained with a common space.	5/10/2018 23:13
96	/policies/access-to-housing/	- Multi-family housing of densities discussed along transit routes should not be limited only to those transit routes. Whether this is closer to the core where densities/heights are 4-6+ stories or a little further out where built form along transit route	5/11/2018 0:33
97	/policies/access-to-housing/	I strongly disagree with allowing multi family housing to be interspersed, ad how, in single family neighborhoods. We bought our home in the neighborhood because it was single family and we pay a tremendous amount in taxes to do so. This should not be able to be changed without a vote by those of us who have made an investment in the neighborhoods and pay the taxes associated with that. Increased density, along with the decrease of single family neighborhoods, will only force people to the suburbs, thus reducing your tax base and reducing diversity.	5/11/2018 18:59
98	/policies/access-to-housing/	Neighborhoods away from downtown that consist almost entirely of single family housing should remain that way! Multifamily structures will create instability in the neighborhoods by creating more renters and absentee owners who have less stake in the neighborhood. At this point, it doesn't matter if there were restrictive covenants in the beginning. Don't destroy the things that make it a great city!!!!	5/12/2018 2:07
99	/policies/access-to-housing/	Please stop using historic discrimination and other injustices as a justification for selling out our City's neighborhoods to real estate developers, this is offensive.	5/12/2018 14:08



Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

100	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p><del>NO, NO, NO: to allowing residential structures on traditional size city lots WITH UP TO FOUR (FOUR) DWELLING UNITS...</del></p> <p>I live on Oliver Ave. S., and the thought that you would allow a 4-plex to go up next to me is absolutely crazy. Not just because I wouldn't like it, but because the city does NOT have the infrastructure in place to be able to handle something like that. The city needs to PREPARE for something like this, not just start ALLOWING it.</p> <p>Here's a simple example: the city has no regulations on trash and recycling bins. They litter the alleys. Now you want to add MORE units? There is no room for more bins.</p> <p>The city sanitary sewers will NOT be able to handle the increased run off from the elimination of grass and yards.</p> <p>There is no parking NOW for vehicles of residents and visitors to local restaurants and there is no parking plan to address that.</p> <p>The city is not currently able to keep sidewalks clear in the winter and keep access open to bus stops year-round. The city also doesn't enforce snow removal within 24 hours. If you can't keep access to transit stops open NOW, it will even be worse if more and more people need to use that transit stop.</p> <p>Speaking of transit, there is no effective mass transit to handle moving people around outside of the 10-12 hours during the day, and only to downtown.</p> <p>You say that 50th St is where more people should be able to travel. The street is already at capacity. The streets, such as 50th St., are clogged with traffic NOW, with no solution on the horizon.</p> <p>But, the city council and Mayor are ready NOW to put multiplexes next door to me? Without having thought through and having any plan TO PAY FOR the improvements that are necessary before you allow such building? The cart is in front of the horse...</p> <p>I bought my home 28 years ago and have seen prices for homes like mine go up and up. The city even increased the assessed value of home on my block an average of 16% this year. So THIS TYPE OF HOUSING is CLEARLY desired by people in Minneapolis. Your plans will drive home prices DOWN.</p>	5/12/2018 17:05
-----	------------------------------	---	-----------------

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

101	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>The stated purpose of the new zoning proposals is to try to help correct the negative effects of the history of racist practices such as redlining and federal regulations that contributed to the poverty that keeps many areas in the city segregated by race and class even today. This is a valid concern and efforts should of course be made to level the playing field regarding who can live where in the city. The related concern is the decreasing availability of affordable housing in the city, both for the very needy and, I would add, for those who are not wealthy enough to live in the more expensive new buildings that are currently being built. I am concerned that the City is moving more and more to a place that caters to primarily young people, who are happy to live in 400 square foot spaces and wealthy people who can afford these rising prices and that gives lip service to catering to the very poor. No concern is expressed, and, as far as I can tell, no policy developed, to ensure that those who are not poor enough to apply for assistance and not wealthy enough to buy mega mansions and ritzy new apartments and condos will still be able to live in Minneapolis and raise their families here.</p> <p>Along Lake Street, small "micro" apartments (aka "studios") are being rented to the tune of \$1200 for a 375-400 square foot space. This article: <a href="https://www.rentcafe.com/average-rent-market-trends/us/mn/minneapolis/">https://www.rentcafe.com/average-rent-market-trends/us/mn/minneapolis/</a> shows that the current average rental rate in Minneapolis is \$957 for 508 ft.Â² or \$1.88 Per square foot. These new rates are 37% higher than current ECCO rates (which consists of over 70% renters and where the argument for new development is to give more people the ability to afford to live in the neighborhood) and 42% higher than elsewhere in Minneapolis.</p> <p>In a recent program on MPR with Kerry Miller, CM Bender stated that, whereas people assume that the new buildings themselves are the reason for the currently rising rents, there are other factors at play and that we need even MORE buildings to address the problem. Another expert on the show did mention that it is cheaper for developers to build smaller structures, such as fourplexes rather than tall buildings and that this should mean rents can be lower. This sounds reasonable to me. However, this plan also assumes a lot of tall buildings in various parts of the city, so what about the influence there?</p> <p>In addition, WE CANNOT IGNORE THE INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SPECULATION. Although the standard argument is that more places to live will inevitably lead to lower prices, the evidence shows otherwise. This article, <a href="http://livableballard.org/density-debate/">http://livableballard.org/density-debate/</a> is an informative report about what has happened in Seattle due to a push for density and concurrent construction. Extremely dense cities, such as New York and Hong Cong have prohibitively high rents, except in segregated slum areas" a condition we at least say we do not want in Minneapolis. An article in Colliers Magazine, a publication for real estate investors, considers the Twin Cities an area that is ripe for speculation. It shows that the cost of housing in Minneapolis (income to housing cost ratio) is identical to the national average and significantly lower than large cities such as Denver, San Fransisco, Phoenix and Seattle, indicating that there is room to come in and buy and</p>	5/13/2018 18:28
102	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>The city should avoid becoming perceived as "family unfriendly" if it were to adopt multiple-occupancy policies--in the name of "density"--which would impair the character of long-established single-family neighborhoods. The location of such neighborhoods--relatively near the downtown center, the lakes and elsewhere--has traditionally been one of the distinctive features of the City, and a major draw for families relocating here from elsewhere. It is often overlooked that these single-family neighborhoods existed during the years when the population of the City was much higher than it is today. That additional population--much of it occupying much more affordable housing--was accommodated by apartment buildings (largely since torn down) located in appropriately zoned, denser neighborhoods. Rather than accommodating developers' understandable commercial desire to build in areas that are already attractive--regardless on the impact on current residents--they should be given incentives to build in the truly underdeveloped areas of the City.</p>	5/14/2018 1:59
103	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>How am I supposed to know if a duplex, 3-unit or 4-unit structure is something allowable on my street? I am generally not opposed to multi unit structures on main thoroughfares, in business nodes, but I don't know if I want to live right next to one any more than I want to live next to a garish mcmansion that blocks sunlight, adds to congestion, etc...</p>	5/14/2018 13:39
104	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I fully support more density in all neighborhoods in Minneapolis. I live in two blocks from high rise apartment buildings and I see the vitality and importance of having lots of people living close together. Our neighborhood, Seward, is consistently rated as one of the best neighborhoods to live in across the city, and across the country. Our density along transit allows for businesses to thrive and people from all walks of life to live near one another.</p>	5/14/2018 14:32

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

105	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Thus plan makes the assumption that most of our citizens agree with the plan.  I am against it and from what I've read less than half of the city agrees with it.  I do not want 4 plexs built on present single family lots in my neighborhood.  I moved here 40 years ago to be in a great part of the city.  The basis of this plan is full of errors.  We in Minneapolis will drive our cars. Most, (96%0 will not ride bikes or use public transportation.  Most in Minneapolis, want our neighborhoods to stay the same.  A minority is trying to shove a plan down our throats.  Michael Hanson  4001 Ewing Ave. S.</p>	5/14/2018 18:14
106	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I oppose allowing 4-story buildings along all public transit routes. Many of these streets/neighborhoods, including many on and near transit routes, are predominantly traditional single unit family housing and this change will destroy the fabric of several of these strong historic neighborhoods that make Mpls a great city. Further, the notion of not requiring new units to provide parking will create an added strain on neighbors, neighborhoods and livability, especially in winter months.</p>	5/14/2018 20:14
107	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>We need to stop kowtowing to neighborhood NIMBYism. If we let our goals for density be derailed by the folks "who pay a lot of taxes, and who have lived here forever" we will get nowhere. We need density. We need a variety of housing. We need height to support wider set backs, more greening, to facilitate multi-modal transit, and encourage zoning of residential, commercial, art/making, and other enterprises to keep people close to jobs and services. Not everyone wants to, or should, live in a house. Let's create apartments or co/ops that are affordable and flexible - so they may accommodate singles, families, or elders depending on layout/amenities. Multi-generational neighborhoods are preferred. WE need to stop concentrating poverty. We need walkability, architectural integrity, beauty, greening, and joy. Housing needs to be safe - it is the cornerstone of how we live, and how we live well.</p>	5/14/2018 23:51
108	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Terrible policy, protect the beautiful old single family homes... promote high density housing only close to Transit corridors, not in the middle of single family housing areas.. you will destroy some of the most beautiful things this city has to offer... terrible policy</p>	5/15/2018 1:46
109	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Zoning is what protects the home owners in a given area from undesirable changes in the residentialcommunity.. like people opening up businesses next to house's, like prevent apartment buildings from going next to your house... people want to know that what they are investing in is protected.. you are creating uncertainty and stress.</p>	5/15/2018 2:12
110	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>There is no way I would support a 4 unit dwelling in linden hills. we are already trying to balance single family homes of normal size to McMansions that push the boundaries of zoning. There are places throughout the city that are more appropriate for multi-family/four dwelling housing.</p>	5/15/2018 14:19
111	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>As a landlord in Minneapolis providing affordable housing, I would love to be able to add more units to my existing triplex. I would jump at the chance to add 1-2 accessory dwelling units to my non-owner occupied property. I live in the neighborhood in which my rental resides and would want to maintain the "neighborhood feel" with these additional units. I think allowing 2-4 unit non-owner occupied properties to add additional units with the understanding that they must blend into the existing housing stock, would help deal with the shortage of housing without damaging the "neighborhood feel." If the ADU program was opened to non-owner occupants, I would definitely participate with my triplex.</p>	5/15/2018 19:46
112	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Disagree with bullet e as 3 and 4-unit dwellings are too large for the current small size city lots. This would further stress parking and likely depreciate current single family and duplex units in those areas.</p>	5/16/2018 19:34

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

113	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Ward 13 Comment:</p> <p>I DO NOT support introducing 2,3, 4-plexes or above as permitted uses into historically Single Family neighborhoods!!!</p> <p>The snow plowing of our streets is already severely substandard (school was cancelled once this year because of it), our schools are overcrowded (our child at SWHS had to drop a class she needed as the school couldn't fit anymore chairs in the classroom and next year they are cutting even more teachers) and our parks (except for the Regional ones) are run down (the fields are poorly maintained and are a detriment to having active children). This document does not adequately describe the impacts (nor future funding strategies) to address these critical public infrastructure needs that directly relates to these goals.</p> <p>The home values (and thus tax revenues) generated by the neighborhoods in this ward continues to climb, which means that consumers desire these areas for what they are. Randomly scattering 4-plexes is a poorly conceived land use strategy that will not strengthen these neighborhoods, nor will it produce affordable housing. It will produce anger and high-value rentals. To produce high-quality affordable housing in our neighborhoods (which I think most people would support - at least I would) - you need to locate it on high quality sites!</p> <p>This one-size fits all approach to land use is beyond idiotic. The City should identify high-level goals and then work with the neighborhoods within the city to develop specific implementation strategies that work for each of those neighborhoods and then hold everyone accountable including yourselves!</p>	5/17/2018 16:40
114	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I'm a resident of the Waite Park neighborhood, and I totally welcome the initiatives to make more multi-family housing and improve transit access. I live in a single-family home, and I'm dying for more options for retail and transit so I don't need to use my car as much. We use transit now and walk to the grocery store nearby, but our neighborhood could use more walkable destinations and more frequent buses. And I'm happy to have 4-plexes on my block if it means more people have affordable places to live within the city. This is a city, after all.</p>	5/17/2018 17:22
115	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>This is misguided social engineering. Single-family homes build wealth for Minneapolitans. Apartments and fourplexes build wealth for out-of-town developers, investors and REITs. Plus they destroy asset value of the adjacent current homeowners. Everyone in Minneapolis ends up poorer. Or maybe that is the goal.</p> <p>Single-family homes and condominiums have to be built to different standards (10 year builder warranty). Apartments do not.</p>	5/17/2018 18:28
116	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Home ownership is path family wealth for working people. We need more homes and increased density to make housing more affordable but we shouldn't eliminate opportunities for families to buy homes by converting otherwise affordable homes into rental properties.</p> <p>Meanwhile we can't allow the most affordable homes to simply be converted into McMansions. If the choice is between McMansions and multi-unit housing we should favor multi-units.</p>	5/17/2018 19:46
117	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>We already have this. They look terrible and do NOT contribute to the health of the neighborhood! Just look at 50th and 49th and Sheridan Ave S. The properties are not well maintained and the residents come and go without engaging in the community.</p> <p>W 50th Street is already very congested and parking is tight on side streets. It's unrealistic to think more people won't equal more cars. And rental properties never have the same curb appeal or neighborhood engagement of sgl family homes. Why are you putting great city neighborhoods (and your tax base) at risk? I grew up here in the 1970's. We've come a long way. Let's not mess it up!!</p>	5/18/2018 19:01
118	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>What guarantees that these multi-unit dwellings will be more affordable than the single family units? In a more affluent area like 50th and France, how much will these rents be? Does the city have any control over that? Because there is a new place going up on 51st and York where the rents will be \$3,500. Is that affordable? Will that increase the diversity of rich people in our neighborhood?</p>	5/20/2018 17:48

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

119	/policies/access-to-housing/	The words "affordable housing" are sprinkled in the discussion but what is Minneapolis currently doing to HELP people with affordable housing? Are there programs for rent relief? Rent caps? Plans to build more Section 8 style housing? Maybe subsidies for property owners of affordable multi-unit places to offset utilities? Anything? If you're not already helping low-income people stay in Minneapolis, building fancy new dwellings with high rents is not going to help. Our most vulnerable residents are HURTING for help and the city council won't listen. Please do not be persuaded by sexy high rises. Maintain and improve the current housing stock that we have!!! Help our CURRENT residents before trying to attract new ones.	5/20/2018 17:53
120	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>There is nothing in this goal that addresses affordable housing. Adding more housing choices does not address affordable housing. HOW WILL MINNEAPOLIS ENSURE MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING CHOICES IN ALL NEIGHBORHOODS? If the goal is to reverse some historical wrongs, then HOW HOW HOW are you going to do it? It appears that this only applies to RICH MINORITY PEOPLE... Reverse the wrongs by actually helping people out. Where is the rent relief? Help with utilities? Access to child care?</p> <p>How are we helping our residents out when a neighborhood becomes "gentrified"? Does the city help with displaced residents? Does the city require developers to help the displaced residents? Or provide similar affordable housing options?</p> <p>How about focusing on home ownership for our residents? Make that affordable city-wide for our economically disadvantaged residents. Why tear down homes suitable for families? Do all economically disadvantaged Minneapolis families want to live in apartment buildings?</p> <p>It is very patronizing to tell people how to live. There is nothing wrong with wanting to live in a house with your family and have a little yard. That is why so many of our residents LOVE Minneapolis. But now you're insinuating that we are wasteful and selfish.</p> <p>Has the city even considered the fact that our historically wronged groups might ALSO want to live in single family homes?</p>	5/20/2018 18:15
121	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Reference Goal 9...if there are pockets of the city that are a long distance away from good public transportation and do not have easy access to retail/jobs/parks...why build up more housing along public transportation corridors? Why not develop retail centers and support small businesses willing to set up in these areas? Why MOVE people from existing housing stock?</p> <p>Minneapolis seems hell bent on tearing down existing homes and building new structures (more expensive). Look at the HISTORY of Minneapolis. Let's try to preserve what we have instead of always knocking things down. Help PEOPLE, not developers!</p>	5/20/2018 18:24
122	/policies/access-to-housing/	I support these action steps. I recently purchased a home in Minneapolis after renting here in the past, and the market for housing has become extremely competitive. I am fortunate to have the resources to secure stable housing, but the housing shortage must be inflicting serious stress on low income people. The six-plex across the street from my house is a great feature of the neighborhood, and I hope to see many more in the city in the future.	5/20/2018 23:51
123	/policies/access-to-housing/	If your goal is really to remedy problems that originated with discriminatory practices in the past then you should have a policy to increase home ownership in those affected areas. I have lived on the Near northside for more than 40 years and there is a long legacy of housing that is increased in density above the base zoning when it was built and it has a history of being a problem property. You can find this if you look at most buildings with more than 2 units. For one example that has always been a problem despite many attempts to fix with public subsidies look at Plymouth ave townhouse	5/21/2018 12:14
124	/policies/access-to-housing/	You increase density all along bus routes with out taking in to account that the plan is to convert these to bus rapid transit which will greatly increase the distance between bus stops. If density increases are really needed they should be closely tied to a bus stop and rapidly decrease when you move away from them. You can always expand the area later if increesed density is shown to have any value	5/21/2018 12:19
125	/policies/access-to-housing/	In action step e you refer to density goal in neighborhoods farthest from downtown as getting increased density with 3 and 4 plexus being allowed. Yet your plan would permit these units in all of the city neighborhoods. At least in Near North MPLS these smaller units are the most likely to turn into problem rental properties. If you have had any discussions with police or inspections you should know that they are the hardest to control	5/21/2018 12:54

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

126	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Allowing 4-unit housing without off-street parking on any lot in South Minneapolis is not a good idea for many reasons. Here's a couple:</p> <p>1) One 4-unit property on a block may cause eight (8) or more vehicles to be parked on the street. The effect of allowing 4-unit housing without off-street parking on any lot in Linden hills will be the lining of both sides of every street with automobiles, as is currently the case in Uptown, resulting in a decrease in home values and a decline in the use and enjoyment of property by owners.</p> <p>Winter narrowing of streets from plowing will exacerbate the problem and cause additional safety hazards. Guests may not be able to park anywhere near the home of their hosts.</p> <p>Linden Hills residents pay a huge property tax premium to enjoy our neighborhood as it is, how many will choose to pay the premium if the aesthetic is taken away?</p> <p>2) 4-unit housing will likely be owned by non-resident, profit driven investors. Linden Hills will become a neighborhood of renters who are not financially and emotionally invested in the health and vitality of the neighborhood. Yards/gardens and renters generally do not mix well.</p> <p>Popular thinking has it that the personal automobile is on the way out in the near future. Think of how many promises for the future have never come to pass. Where's my flying car?</p> <p>Planning is good. Bad planning isn't.</p>	5/21/2018 13:42
127	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Items d &amp; e are so ridiculous that I can't believe that I'm even reading this. This will do nothing to lower cost of housing. It will enrich developers, destroy single family neighborhoods (which is why I chose my area over an area such as uptown to call home) and drive out stakeholders (homeowners)that pay taxes and care more about their community than the majority of renters.</p> <p>I've lived next door to a duplex for 20 years and there have been good and bad tenants. Very few have stayed for over 2 years and this is a decent affordable property. Few of these tenants have shown pride of ownership that stakeholders (homeowners) in the area do. The landlord is licking his chops in anticipation of squeezing in a few more units into that property. If it turns to a 4-plex that will create up to 8 autos that need to find a place to park. 4 more sets of people and their friends that come home after a night out slamming doors and talk loudly at 2am.</p> <p>This so called plan would allow a developers to purchase the small houses on the street, tear them down and build 4-plexes because it would now be profitable for them to do so. so much for affordable home ownership.</p> <p>Density does not bring affordable housing it only brings density and removes the reason why many have chosen their neighborhoods to live.</p> <p>As I just read in the paper today. If density made cities more affordable NYC and Hong Kong would be a homeowners/renters dream with all the inexpensive housing available.</p> <p>If this passes I can guarantee that myself and the majority of my homeowner neighbors will never vote for a council member that doesn't have the guts to put an end to this.</p>	5/21/2018 16:25

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

128	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>As a single-family homeowner in south Minneapolis (Ericsson neighborhood)I am concerned about "allowing small-scale residential structures on traditional size city lots with up to four dwelling units, including single family, duplex, 3-unit, 4-unit, and accessory dwelling unit building types". I'm primarily concerned regarding my investment in my home and how that would be affected (future home value) if a developer buys a house next to mine and puts up a multi-level multi-unit structure. We recently invested in a privacy fence which will be essentially ineffective if the building next door is suddenly 3-4 stories tall. I would like to see strict regulation on the size of these depending on where they are placed in our neighborhoods so a large building can't be built next to my modest 1.5 story house.</p> <p>Will there be a requirement that the owner of the building must live on site? Developers do not invest in neighborhoods and relationships, neighbors do.</p>	5/21/2018 18:22
129	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Allowing 3 and 4 unit housing in current single family home neighborhoods is in conflict with the goal of keeping historic buildings, insuring residents are not financially compromised, reducing traffic, and reducing parking problems. The single family neighborhoods even close to major transportation hubs do not have the parking available for adding multi-family structures. The streets are already getting clogged with increasing traffic. Our culture historically depends on single occupant vehicles and we are not wanting to change. Adding multi-family structures to streets built to serve single family homes will change the historic nature of those neighborhoods. Along with renters who are not invested in these neighborhoods, historical evidence is clear that property values will decline for houses close to the multifamily units causing unintended financial consequences to residents. The reason I purchased the house I did is because it is not in a neighborhood filled with multifamily housing units. Finally this will not add to diversity as families that want to live in a neighborhood will move out of the city or never move in. The recent election showed that those with a pre-ponderance to single family homes often have a different worldview than those who want to live in a neighborhood of apartment buldings. A diverse city will encourage a multitude of worldviews. Increasing multiunit housing structures will discourage single family homeowners and cause a concentration of 3 and 4 unit buildings as single family homeowners move out and sell to developers.</p>	5/22/2018 2:01
130	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I live in the outer city with single family homes and do not want giant four-plexes built next to me. Maybe if you didn't let greedy builders come in and tear down all the affordable single family homes in the city to build mini mansions, there would be more affordable housing.</p>	5/22/2018 2:01
131	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Much of the background here relates to racist policies of the past. These policies ended a few decades ago and the overemphasis of those policies is not helpful. As pointed out, despite the termination of those policies, the racial segregation of neighborhoods is still quite resilient. It would be better to examine why that segregation continues. There may be more innocuous reasons and some that are just personal/cultural preferences. For instance it might be centered around an ethnic church/tabernacle/mosque that keeps some ethnic groups from moving to a different area of the city. The regurgitation of racism at a point begins to sound hollow and even abusive. It is correct to recognize but not to the point of missing other clues.</p>	5/22/2018 2:11
132	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>TOTALLY in support of more density! More people, as long as accompanied by investments in public infrastructure, make cities MORE livable, more interesting, more vital. Apartments are less of an environmental drain than suburban sprawl. And more units, all things being equal, could make the Twin Cities more affordable, particularly if the greater metro area could get on board. My suggestion to make this even more attractive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Permit smaller apartments in units.</li> <li>2. Provide some level of tax relief for landlords that are willing to rent a % of their units at lower tates lower-income households, thus subsidizing their loss of income.</li> </ol>	5/22/2018 21:31
133	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Allowing fourplex construction in neighborhoods currently zoned for single family housing is basically stealing money (property value) from current residents and giving it to developers.</p>	5/22/2018 21:54
134	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Interesting, how what Fulton is today has been viewed in a racial, segregation and anti-climate change. I am very sad and insulted. I think the powers that be really do not understand who lives in Fulton. Shocking.</p>	5/23/2018 0:30

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

135	/policies/access-to-housing/	I'm not in favor of adding higher density housing to my neighborhood (Armatage.) I'm in favor of adding more high density housing closer to downtown or along critical transit lines where high density housing currently exists. I moved to my Armatage neighborhood because I wanted to live in an area with nicer housing where individuals cared more about their neighborhood and houses (this is one of the few reasons I'm ok with the high property taxes assessed in my area which are significantly higher than my friends in Edina.) If higher density housing is added to my neighborhood, I will likely start looking to the suburbs where I can get more house for the same money and maintain the upscale neighborhood I desire.	5/23/2018 3:50
136	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am concerned that if we have 4-plexes popping up on vacant properties, 3 story buildings on the quiet streets like Dupont, and 6 story building on Emerson and Fremont, the character of our neighborhood will change drastically. Our neighborhood is already very "dense" and the reason we purchased our home in North Minneapolis was because it was not a dense neighborhood, not lacking in parking, had homeowners invested in the community and had beautiful character homes. My block alone already has 5 houses that are rental units ( and three of them are duplexes). You are crazy to think that dropping more rentals on my block is a good and 'fair' solution to housing needs in the city where I've infested in. 1619 Emerson Ave North	5/23/2018 17:33
137	/policies/access-to-housing/	Four unit small-scale housing is a formula for slums. The reason duplexes seem to work is that they are often owned by the resident of one of the two units and that resident is likely to be intimately aware of the condition of the units, heating and maintenance issues generally and the conduct of his or her tenant. A 4-plex is a substantial investment, and less likely to be owned by one of the residents. An absent landlord is more likely to be out of touch and to cut corners.	5/23/2018 20:27
138	/policies/access-to-housing/	I live in Near North. There is already a lot of affordable housing here both owner occupied and rental. The newspaper today just had an article about the shortage of for sale house in the starter home category. Most of what is available in this category is in North Minneapolis. If you permit higher density buildings and developers start buying up the cheaper land in Near North, the opportunities for ownership will be lost and the rental housing that replaces it will be more expensive than current rental here.  This is not like the areas in South Minneapolis where the Mayor justifies building fourplexes by saying that people are tearing down starter home to build huge houses so why not allow competitive use of the land to create more rental. I think this logic is faulty because there is no shortage of large expensive homes in the for sale market and they are still doing teardowns so any building of fourplexes will likely result in the loss of more starter homes.  Near North is never going to change into what neighborhoods are like in SW and around the lakes. Houses here (if not replaced by rental) will for a long time be the most affordable for starting home ownership.  For diversity Near North is very diverse now if you replace the housing here with the large rental buildings now being built on all the available sites in North loop you will end up with less diversity.  The shortage of affordable for sale housing has increased home ownership in Near North, driven problem properties to be fixed up, and significantly lowered the crime rate.  BOTTOM LINE: THE CHANGES WE HAVE SEEN FROM MORE HOME OWNERSHIP SHOULD BE NURTURED, NOT REPLACED BY HIGHER DENSITY HOUSING.	5/23/2018 21:17
139	/policies/access-to-housing/	Do not like	5/24/2018 3:01
140	/policies/access-to-housing/	It seems like developers have the upper hand and will push the middle class and low income out completely. Also don't understand how tearing down housing left and right, where those materials will forever sit in a landfill is environmentally friendly in MPLS's eyes.....but driving cars is not?	5/24/2018 3:41



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

141	/policies/access-to-housing/	Density on transit corridors makes a great deal of sense. Adding 3-unit, 4-unit, and accessory dwelling unit building types in the neighborhoods farthest from downtown will not alleviate the problem of access to affordable housing. In many of these neighborhoods like Fulton where I live, the cost of homes plus land exceeds \$350,000. That cost plus the cost of demolition and construction will make any necessary rent above anything that would be considered affordable. Moreover, adding density to these neighborhoods will impact the desirability of the neighborhood. If a 4-plex was approved and built on the lot next to mine, we would move out of the City.	5/24/2018 15:08
142	/policies/access-to-housing/	While I'm sure the Council feels that they have adequate public notice, I do not believe this is the case based on discussions w/ neighbors. This is too complex an issue, with too many significant policy changes, to limit discussion - we need more time. I can hardly find the information I need on this website and it isn't clear about the specific actions and impact. I can tell you this - I am not supportive of these recommendations though I do appreciate the issue. I think assumptions on impact are not valid and some of these recommendations (because I certainly can't find a clear document outlining them all with easy to navigate specifics) for change will adversely damage our neighborhoods for the future. Be very careful about how dramatically you are recommending change because there will always be unintended consequences and these will be difficult if not impossible to reverse once implemented.	5/24/2018 15:40
143	/policies/access-to-housing/	This is an extremely well-crafted policy. Increasing the number of homes in Minneapolis is crucial. A home in Minneapolis is more environmentally efficient and more economically efficient than a home in the suburbs, where the losers of the housing shortage will be pushed to. In a housing shortage, landlords win while renters lose - and the easiest way to remedy a shortage is to acquire (or build) the thing that you're short of. Minneapolis should make it easy to build housing.	5/24/2018 17:02
144	/policies/access-to-housing/	I love the idea of more duplexes, fourplexes, and ADUS. As a renter though, I am concerned about these being owned by absentee landlords and large management companies, because this can lead to inflated rent and a lack of responsiveness. It's essential to require or strongly encourage owner-occupancy. My fianc� and I would love to buy in the city at some point, but we can't afford a single family house- a fourplex or duplex unit would be a really nice option; for fouxplexes where the units are rented out, it would be nice to see something like down payment assistance to make it feasible for local people to be the owner-landlords.	5/25/2018 13:12
145	/policies/access-to-housing/	This is a joke!	5/25/2018 13:13
146	/policies/access-to-housing/	Do not eliminate single family housing stock in exchange for multi-"family" housing stock.	5/25/2018 15:49
147	/policies/access-to-housing/	I firmly support allowing up to four dwelling units on all properties. We absolutely need to increase our housing capacity.	5/25/2018 16:02
148	/policies/access-to-housing/	Cui bono? Developers! Why are there 96 other policies when this one pretty much sums up the plan? I am against Freyplexing single family neighborhoods. Maybe ADUs, ie granny flats, that are not developer owned would be ok if tested in a small area, but as for the rest of it the single family zoned neighborhoods are dense enough in the SW. Respectfully submitted.	5/25/2018 16:18
149	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am for zoning to allow multi-family dwellings throughout the city. I currently live in an area where single-family homes, duplexes, and quad-plexes are all part of the housing mix. That being said, with the increase in density we will need more neighborhood resources, including retail, public services, etc. We will also need an increased commitment to neighborhood safety. In my experience, those who own their homes are invested in the neighborhood in a way renters are not. This makes sense to me, as someone who has been both a renter and a homeowner. We definitely need more affordable housing. I just want to make sure that as we incorporate more of this throughout neighborhoods, the city is matching that growth with a commitment to public safety, preservation of neighborhoods for families, and an appropriate ratio of population density to goods/services available. I love my neighborhood because most people in it care about its well-being. It's worth noting that will be diminished to some degree with an influx of renters	5/25/2018 16:18
150	/policies/access-to-housing/	We should all have free housing provided by the city!  And we should be able to pick where in the city we want to live!  Anything less is racist!	5/25/2018 18:16
151	/policies/access-to-housing/	Single family homes help people build wealth.  Hence, they are, by their nature, racist.	5/25/2018 18:18
152	/policies/access-to-housing/	If we can just lower the quality of life in SW Mpls, we will have made things more equal.	5/25/2018 18:20

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

153	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Name a city that is more dense than Minneapolis and is also more affordable?</p> <p>Boston?  NYC?  Seattle?  SF?  Hong Kong?  Singapore?</p>	
		Oh, wait....	5/25/2018 18:30
154	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Name a city that has looser zoning than Minneapolis and is also more beautiful or has a better quality of life.</p> <p>Dallas?  Houston?  KC?  Phoenix?  Vegas?</p>	
		Oh, wait....	5/25/2018 18:33
155	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Creating additional housing options in our city is critical. I am in the process of buying a single family home. The house inventory is at an all-time low. It's only because we lucked out that my partner and I are able to buy a house in our neighborhood. I want housing options for everyone on my new block. I don't want the neighborhood to keep getting more expensive so that only wealthy people can afford to live there. I want a mix of housing types so I can have a wide range of neighbors with different cultural, racial, and economic backgrounds. This is even more important as my new block is very walkable. We need more people to live in walkable and bikeable areas of the city to reduce our carbon footprint.</p> <p>I have been to some comp plan open houses and I understand that people are scared of this policy in particular. However, many of them are older, white homeowners. These folks already have their assets and their stable housing. These folks aren't experiencing skyrocketing rents. These are not the folks who will suffer the most if we don't build more housing in this city. Please do not think that they speak for all of us. All of my 20- and 30-something friends are 100% behind the housing policies in the plan. I really hope they get adopted.</p>	5/26/2018 0:14
156	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>So we are blaming policies from 84 years ago for creating lovely single family neighborhoods in Minneapolis? These plans will destroy the neighborhoods.</p> <p>Stop making this a race issue-it is an issue that impacts all humans. If a human earns an income that affords them a house within their means they may choose to buy in Minneapolis or a suburb. These humans currently have no discrimination against them EXCEPT what their budget is. This is how the free market works. Minneapolis provides plenty of affordable housing and there is more in the suburbs. There are numerous jobs in the suburbs and Due to Minneapolis driving businesses out by legislating policies that make it hard to do business in the city more businesses will move out. Target, Medtronic, Best Buy,Amazon. Stop socially engineering my city. I oppose this plan.</p>	5/26/2018 2:15
157	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>It's essential that new housing option developments include mixed-use spaces - commercial, retail, etc. transit is great but realize that it's freezing for the vast majority of the year and people need fresh grocery corner store options - please look at Montreal for direction. Is this provision part of the plan?</p> <p>Are you incentivizing homeowners</p>	5/26/2018 3:22

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

158	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I am commenting on the inclusion of 4600 Aldrich Avenue in this plan.</p> <p>My husband and I have chosen our retirement home to be a home we recently purchased on the 4600 block of Aldrich. We paid a substantial sum of money for the house because of its location and have put additional money into remodeling three levels.</p> <p>We are moving in next week.</p> <p>We chose this block specifically because we already knew that it was a wonderfully cohesive group of neighbors who take great interest in their homes and each other. Mixed age residents, organic gardens, pollinator gardens, neighbors who keep leaves and grasses out of the street, composters, friends who shovel for others, bi-yearly gatherings—these are just some of the wonderful parts of this neighborhood. It will disappear if this zoning law is allowed to exist.</p> <p>Imagine our disappointment that the city of Minneapolis would actually consider destroying a neighborhood like this! Isn't this a neighborhood the city should be proud of and want to nurture? Imagine our financial dismay at the prospect of being surrounded by multi-story buildings!</p> <p>DO NOT LET THIS LEGISLATION BE PASSED!</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Jude and John Reiling 4632 Aldrich Avenue</p>	5/26/2018 19:20
159	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am a single family home owner in Waite Park and I fully support this policy. I recognize it means our neighborhoods will look different over time, but change is constant, and it is most important to me that we make policy through an equity lens and address our city's housing crisis.	5/27/2018 12:05
160	/policies/access-to-housing/	Allow non owner occupant landlords to add ADU to 2-4 unit rentals to increase housing in areas that are close to amenities	5/27/2018 12:33
161	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>As a lifetime Minneapolis resident and current North Minneapolis homeowner (Victory Neighborhood) I strongly support this vision our city. I appreciate its attention to creating equity and sustainability and applaud this forward-thinking plan.</p> <p>Johanna Miller Victory Neighborhood</p>	5/27/2018 15:59
162	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I feel strongly that off street parking MUST be provided for new duplexes, triplexes and four-plexes. Street parking is already at a premium. On my street, Sheridan Ave So, there is only street parking allowed on one side of the street already due to buses and it is filled completely. More density would require off street parking to make the density tolerable.</p>	5/28/2018 1:38
163	/policies/access-to-housing/	Off site parking must be a requirement for multiple dwelling buildings. There is not enough street parking available currently on the transit route I live on.	5/28/2018 18:12
164	/policies/access-to-housing/	This is great!!! As the co-owner of a single-family house in CIDNA, I welcome the thoughtful development of fourplexes on quiet streets and larger developments on main thoroughfares such as Lake and Excelsior. Part and parcel of that is we'd LOVE to see more commercial development on those strips too. We can only walk to one or two restaurants from our house and would RELISH the opportunity to walk to local shops, restaurants and bars in our neighborhood. I come from the East Coast originally (Boston, Philly, DC) and miss having local commerce that doesn't require PARKING.	5/29/2018 22:36
165	/policies/access-to-housing/	Don't overbuild like the hospitals did. Require vacancy rates to reach a threshold before more units are created.	5/30/2018 13:59
166	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I FULLY support this draft. We live in southwest Minneapolis in Ward 13 in a single family home. I applaud the forward thinking in this draft. This bold plan seeks to make housing more equitable across the city. To fully redress past exclusive and racist policies we cannot allow exemptions for certain wards especially those wards where there is bound to be opposition (Ward 13 among them). We welcome housing more people in our great city and putting a fourplex, triplex or duplex next to our single family home would only allow us to connect to more people and build a city that is equitable for ALL.</p>	5/30/2018 14:07

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

167	/policies/access-to-housing/	Allow 4-plexes in all neighborhoods, build up our downtown. We need the housing!	5/30/2018 17:04
168	/policies/access-to-housing/	Are there examples of other cities who have made these plans work? And what are the problems they have encountered? And what are the plans to deal with the increased density? Cutting back on school funds seems like a short sighted plan if we are increasing population density.	5/30/2018 18:06
169	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am opposed to Policy 1, Goal 3 in the Minneapolis 2040 plan because it identifies an entire transit corridor as eligible for multi-family, multi-story structures. This suggests that every block through a neighborhood gets the same approach to potential development and that's not smart planning. Allowing an individual or a developer to purchase one lot or many along and adjacent to transit corridors for 3 and 4-unit structures would be disruptive in sections of those transit corridors with small, story-and-a-half homes. A better option is to concentrate multi-story dwellings around the intersections of major arteriole streets in neighborhoods along a transit corridor. There should be clear requirements for height, setback and overall footprint of any new construction that conforms to the proportions of existing dwellings on the block.  In addition, the Minneapolis 2040 plan includes no requirement for additional off-street parking for the density it strives to create. The plan should require a minimum of ONE off-street parking space for each new housing unit created. We do not need to spread Uptown's parking woes citywide.	5/30/2018 22:29
170	/policies/access-to-housing/	I really like this idea of mixing up the housing options in neighborhoods. Diversity is our strength. Make sure our neighborhoods are welcoming to all who want to live there.	5/31/2018 1:20
171	/policies/access-to-housing/	We are already a densely-packed area of multi-unit dwellings in the Calhoun Isles area (towards Bde Make Ska Parkway and Calhoun Boulevard). Over the 30+ years that I've lived here, I've seen upward growth in condo and apartment-style buildings. The shared or common roads, streets, pathways and parking areas have noticeably retreated to the uncontrolled onslaught of humanity. Human beings are essential to the makeup of a city. But there is already an increase in density here. This has brought about an unsustainable, environmentally unsafe, resource-challenging situation. Please consider this when allowing plans for more multi-unit dwellings to receive permits to build in this area.	6/1/2018 23:18
172	/policies/access-to-housing/	"The people of Minneapolis...are becoming older... aging single-family home dwellers do not have the option to move ... This further restricts access to single-family homes for households with growing families who desire that housing type ..." This concept that I must/should move out of my home that I have lived in for nearly 2 decades -- that I have loved, that I have enhanced, that I have paid taxes on, that has allowed me to be a neighbor in this city that I love, is insulting. This tells me that it is my fault that there are 'no homes'. If you insist on 'encouraging' the elders out you won't have anyone around to teach of to be a neighbor, a home owner, a citizen. Shame on you all.	6/2/2018 0:33
173	/policies/access-to-housing/	I believe the city mandating off-street parking is still crazy and we should stop that and let the private citizen decide that. However, we should be more accepting of transit routes that are not "high-frequency" by current standards. A big portion of riders, especially riders who have been riding since before LRT, use regular ass busses and they don't see any of the benefits that come from TOD as we define it today. We should expand our definition to allow more bus routes to qualify as sufficient to justify reducing off-street parking requirements AND OTHER COOL BENEFITS. We all want busses with benefits.	6/3/2018 3:12
174	/policies/access-to-housing/	As a future resident of Minneapolis, I am delighted to see an option to build fourplexes throughout the city. I am concerned about the rising cost of rent in our country and within the city of Minneapolis, and I believe the land use map as it currently stands will start a long process of making affordable housing easier to build in Minneapolis.	6/3/2018 5:51
175	/policies/access-to-housing/	A thousand times yes! I want to be able to live on a quiet block in Fulton and walk to 50th and France without having to own a single-family home.	6/4/2018 13:43
176	/policies/access-to-housing/	I think an effective way for the city to provide more affordable housing is to loosen the restrictions on and incentive the development of accessory dwelling units. Removing the requirement for a property with and ADU to be owner-occupied is vital. This requirement severely limits the potential buyers pool for a property and is the reason I will not build an ADU. I want to build and owner-occupy an ADU on my property at 211 17th Ave NE. I also never plan on selling my property and would like to continue to live there for the foreseeable future. The future is unknown though and circumstances change. Other incentives the city could provide for ADUs include lower permitting fees and pre-approved building designs and contractors. ADUs are a great tool to help relieve the affordable housing issue while maintaining neighborhood character. It would greatly benefit the city if the requirements(owner occupancy) were relieved and the development was incentivized.	6/4/2018 14:01

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

177	/policies/access-to-housing/	I fail to see how building fourplexes randomly all over will correct historical problems like redlining and segregation. I've heard it proposed by some as a way to accommodate low-income residents and correct for historical injustices due to housing discrimination and red-lining. These are primarily going to be absentee owned and operated apartments renting-- not selling-- to low income clients on sites already located in low income areas on the North Side. These areas already have more than their share of this kind of activity. The city, county, state, and federal government can promote property ownership and real wealth accumulation in other ways. If anything, I fear that this kind of investment property activity will only exacerbate income inequality between large corporate (often national) landlord holding companies and tenants.	6/5/2018 1:56
178	/policies/access-to-housing/	This is awesome! This kind of plan makes me proud to call Minneapolis home. It's time to move past our history of racist housing policies and make the city more livable for everyone. As a homeowner who lives near the light rail, I'd welcome more multi-unit housing in my neighborhood.	6/5/2018 16:46
179	/policies/access-to-housing/	It is so important that we allow more density in all neighborhoods in Minneapolis, from smaller "missing middle" projects on up. This is perhaps the most important issue of all these, because many of the other topics here depend on first having good places to live for more people. Things like infrastructure maintenance, public transportation, supporting small businesses, it all will be easier to accomplish with a higher population density to provide a larger tax base, and large local customer base, so we can all have nice things. We can also start to de-gentrify places like my neighborhood of Longfellow by adding more housing options for all income levels. Lessening restrictions for what kind of residential structures can be built where will also help there be more natrually occuring affordable housing someday, even if that construction is expensive at first. Local businesses that thrive off of foot traffic would benefit so much from added local density, and having a variety of small local businesses in turn are what help make neighborhoods walkable, and also give citites a great unique character. So my answer here is a huge, resounding YES PLEASE let's allow more kinds multi family of housing everywhere in Minneapolis, as soon as possible!!!	6/6/2018 2:02
180	/policies/access-to-housing/	I 100% support this policy. As a resident and homeowner in southwest Mpls, we need to harness the energy and desirability of our fine city by allowing and approving as many housing units as possible. The demand will not last forever, so let's take advantage of growth and all it has to offer (opportunities for more people to patronize local business, start businesses, enjoy parks, trails, and other infrastructure, invest their time and money in the community, and create and enhance a sense of community.	6/6/2018 2:09
181	/policies/access-to-housing/	Force, require, legislate that at least half of the units in EVERY building be rent controlled/affordable to a single person making the legal minimum wage. Require all buildings to accept section 8 vouchers for any unit. Require all the downtown zone multi family buildings to create affordable spaces within every building by 2040. We seriously do not need more luxury housing downtown. We need more affordable housing and we need it sooner rather than 20 years from now.	6/6/2018 8:08
182	/policies/access-to-housing/	Looks like you want to destroy nice neighborhoods to generate more tax revenue.	6/6/2018 13:03
183	/policies/access-to-housing/	There is inappropriate density planned for residential neighborhoods far from downtown. 4 plex is ok but the 3 4 and higher story apartment buildings are not appropriate.	6/6/2018 15:28
184	/policies/access-to-housing/	The principle is admirable. But there is no detail on execution. How will you prevent the construction of luxury condos in large single family homes that are still too expensive for moderate and low income families? How will you prevent the construction of low quality, cheap rentals that deteriorate? How will you ensure there is enough parking without clogging up streets and alleys? It's all in the execution.	6/7/2018 0:11
185	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am so excited about this policy. This gives us the chance to make Minneapolis the national leader in keeping housing affordable to all residents. It will ensure our city remains a vibrant place where immigrants, older folks, working families, recent grads, and creative people can enjoy all the things that give Minneapolis such a high quality of life. I am a renter two years out of college. Because rent here is affordable, I can work a job that I like, live in a safe and clean place, and save money for grad school. For people at my stage in life, Minneapolis is almost perfect. It has good jobs, decent transit, access to higher ed, and decent parks and amenities - all for a cost of living that is economically accessible. It is really important to me that we keep it that way.  As you consider this plan, know that there are plenty of people like me who care about affordable housing Their voices may not be the loudest, but they are paying attention. They know that this plan means to them. And there are plenty of people besides them who care that our city continues to be an inclusive in deed as well as in word.	6/7/2018 3:30

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

186	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>Instead of promoting a stable, working, middle class that contributes to the community, the City is inviting large amounts of unstable, under employed, publicly funded lower class residents which will destabilize the City. The concept that the City is deploying will drive out the productive residents and leave Minneapolis to struggle as a welfare city with lower tax collection, fewer profitable businesses, uncared for properties and growing crime. It is not a City's role to be a Charity. That is the role of State govt. As Minneapolis expands this concept, the problems that it is trying to resolve will only create bigger problems and destroy the foundation it needs to thrive. Learn from other Cities that are making the same mistakes.</p> <p>Stop attracting and inviting the unproductive and out source some of the needy to other Cities and the problems you are addressing will go away without creating bigger problems.</p> <p>I know my concerns will be ignored by the City and that is why I, and a large percentage of the quiet majority are planning to leave Minneapolis as it continues to destroy its productive middle class.</p>	6/7/2018 3:57
187	/policies/access-to-housing/	I'm sure I've commented before but I'm very excited about this policy. There's been very little new construction in my neighborhood (East Isles) and what has been built seems limited to extremely large single family houses. I'd love for the zoning code to reflect the diversity of housing we already have here and allow for different housing options in the future.	6/7/2018 20:28
188	/policies/access-to-housing/	As a homeowner in South Minneapolis, I think it's great that the city will expand the types of housing available in my neighborhood. Not every family is lucky enough to be able to afford a single family home! Plus, there's just not enough space in Minneapolis for everyone to have a single family home with a yard, detached garage, etc.	6/7/2018 21:32
189	/policies/access-to-housing/	I do believe that building more housing is necessary, but we cannot claim to fix a racial inequity problem with a supply solution. If we want to alleviate the housing cost-burden for American Indian and African-American families, we need policies targeted towards building and preserving the housing they need - aka subsidized. The policies that discriminated against communities of color were not race neutral, therefore our solutions cannot be either.	6/8/2018 13:41
190	/policies/access-to-housing/	I have spent most of my life's work serving and supporting families living in poverty. While I support much of this plan my fear is that new multi family housing will be purchased and erected by landlords who all ready own much property and therefore have no true understanding of the issues facing the poor. Look at Ben Johnson recent solution to homelessness, to raise the rent on HUD housing by 20% . I think the answer is to make purchasing g housing more accessible. and to look at land use differently, why not break up City lots and let folks build Tiny housed on them, ownership encourages community investment and builds strong neighborhoods. Or make multi unit/ 4=plexes only accessible to folks who do not already own tenant housing. Lets put a stop to the greed in multi unit housing!!	6/8/2018 15:30
191	/policies/access-to-housing/	It might be true that outdated policies have shaped the neighborhoods in Minneapolis, but now they are vibrant communities that make this city unique and livable. I think it is a huge mistake to drive multi story apartments and condos through the center of healthy neighborhoods in an experiment to reverse policies of the past. It makes much more sense to allow ADUs and see how these areas grow organically	6/12/2018 16:13
192	/policies/access-to-housing/	I see increased density in the Uptown area. All luxury apartments; none affordable! The businesses are closing all around these apartments. There are many empty storefronts. So far I see nothing positive about this development in Uptown.	6/12/2018 22:10
193	/policies/access-to-housing/	will there be size restrictions for building on traditional city size lots?	6/14/2018 1:59
194	/policies/access-to-housing/	Policy or action steps should expressly include proactively mitigating historic redlining.	6/14/2018 15:42
195	/policies/access-to-housing/	You seem to be trying to force us out of our cars without anywhere near adequate transit. And biking and walking do not work when it is 30 below and 2 new feet of snow, not to mention the elderly and moderately disabled. As well as transporting young children, trunkloads of groceries and sundries, getting to work outside of the city or to employment not located along our limited transit. Considering the initiative of allowing mixed use housing "everywhere", already the variances granted to developers pushes the above outlined policies well past the parameters presented.	6/14/2018 16:37
196	/policies/access-to-housing/	I don't see how any of this supports affordable housing. Developers are building amenity filled units that attract high rents, high profits.	6/14/2018 16:42
197	/policies/access-to-housing/	I live in south Minneapolis in a small house on a small lot. I paid a premium for this privilege and continue to pay very high taxes, as well. I worked hard for 40 years to afford this. I oppose this measure, as it will change the look and feel of my little neighborhood, making it much less desirable.	6/14/2018 20:16

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

198	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I believe the lack of affordable housing is a huge concern. When we moved to the city, we had to pay \$840 for a tiny one-bedroom in an area where we had to rent parking and pay for storage, resulting in a monthly bill over \$1,000! (From a well-known slumlord, by the way).</p> <p>I fully support the idea of higher density housing near and around downtown, and more density along major transit lines. I think housing should be built all over the city.</p> <p>I think the proposal to allow four-plex units to be built on single-family lots in low-density neighborhoods is a foolish solution, though. Single family homes are going for shockingly high rates right now. For a developer to buy and demolish a single-family home and turn it into a four-plex would be cost-prohibitive. The only way to recoup that money would be to turn the apartments into luxury apartments and charge a ton of money. That won't boost affordable housing a bit. Subsidizing the building or rental of a single building into a four-plex is cost prohibitive, too -- very little bang for a lot of buck.</p> <p>The unintended consequences are great, too. Allowing four-plexes to be built on any city lot will change the quality of life in neighborhoods where people have saved their whole lives to have a home. It will mean more noise, more traffic, more parking messes, more congestion, more wear and tear on streets and other infrastructure and more pollution.</p> <p>It could mean a building towering over the garden I've saved 49 years for, blocking all my light. This is deeply personal to people.</p> <p>My husband and I are really worried about this. We finally were able to afford and buy our first home two years ago (in our late 40s!). We moved back home to Minneapolis from Chicago a few years ago due to all the issues above. The congestion, noise and traffic got so stressful, it felt like we were living a reduced quality of life. (I didn't appreciate the comment from the city council member about how Minneapolis could be just like Chicago. Why would that ever be a goal? Chicago doesn't have Minneapolis' energy, vibrancy, focus on environmentalism, excellent bike paths, investment in infrastructure, etc. etc. It does have a lot of debt and a lot of corruption.)</p> <p>I think there are smarter solutions that won't change the nature of our neighborhoods while still meeting a crucial need:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Require more density along transit routes and major streets (nicolett, lake, etc.)</li> <li>2) Allow more four-plexes on corners or busy streets</li> <li>3) MAKE builders set aside a certain percentage of affordable housing in each new development (apartment/condo).</li> <li>4) Hold builders accountable to make sure they're providing the agreed-upon percentage of affordable housing by asking them to provide income verification and do "sting" operations to make sure they're not steering away renters/buyers.</li> <li>5) Work with builders to turn vacant lots into nice, size-appropriate complexes.</li> <li>6) Make sure Section 8 vouchers are being honored!</li> </ol>	6/14/2018 21:02
199	/policies/access-to-housing/	I have concern about accessory building use as a dwelling space. We have tiny, tiny lots in the city, especially in the less affluent neighborhoods. Dwelling spaces in accessory buildings would work around lot line restrictions and put us into very close contact with neighbors, increasing noise.	6/14/2018 21:05
200	/policies/access-to-housing/	Homes closer to public transportation should be given to lower income family or they should have the priority because many of these families do not owe a car or share their transportation. This will give this families more disposable incomes.	6/15/2018 0:27
201	/policies/access-to-housing/	I support all of the points above, but I want to add that the housing added must be affordable. Nearly, or perhaps all of the condos recently built in Uptown have been luxury condos. This gentrification is awful.	6/15/2018 18:21
202	/policies/access-to-housing/	Yes allow denser housing along Metro transit sites.	6/15/2018 22:10
203	/policies/access-to-housing/	Sounds good.	6/16/2018 16:50
204	/policies/access-to-housing/	Please spread low income housing across the whole city!!!! Not just in North Minneapolis. Concentrated poverty is not good for communities, we need diversity of income in our communities for them to survive and be safe. Please listen to the voices in North Minneapolis, we are important. North needs to thrive and violent crimes needs to decrease!	6/17/2018 17:21
205	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>œIn neighborhood interiors farthest from downtown that today contain primarily single-family homes, achieve greater housing supply and diversity by allowing small-scale residential structures on traditional size city lots with up to four dwelling units, including single family, duplex, 3-unit, 4-unit, and accessory dwelling unit building types.œ NO! This will change the character and livability of these single-family neighborhoods too much. I object. They were zoned originally the way they are for a reason. The scale of single family is what makes these neighborhoods attractive to live in in the first place. You will ruin the character of these neighborhoods. Also, I know that adequate parking is not being planned for these multi-unit buildings. It is folly to think that everyone will want to, or be physically able to, use mass transit, in place of owning an automobile.</p>	6/19/2018 10:09

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

206	/policies/access-to-housing/	Single family means less transient. Less transient means more stability. This should be a goal, too. I do not support putting multi-family housing in areas farthest from downtown that are currently primarily single family. I think this is extremely short sighted.	6/19/2018 10:36
207	/policies/access-to-housing/	My biggest objection to the housing policy is the part of e) allowing 3 and 4 unit housing on "traditional size" (40'x110'?) residential lots. There is nothing "small scale" about a 4-plex, which would drastically degrade the character of neighborhoods for existing residents. Duplexes would be far more acceptable. -Dan Burbank, 3940 41st Av S	6/19/2018 17:59
208	/policies/access-to-housing/	I do not believe expanding corridors and up zoning across the city will make healthy communities. I believe it will open the door to speculation, raising prices of rentals and homes.	6/19/2018 19:30
209	/policies/access-to-housing/	I believe we are developing along critical corridors near the lakes before we have the light rail paid for. This is very dangerous. Many of us cannot bike to work.	6/19/2018 19:31
210	/policies/access-to-housing/	Upzoning across the city will create more noise issues. It will also reduce the sense of community in neighborhoods.	6/19/2018 19:32
211	/policies/access-to-housing/	I believe we should not expand commercial corridors along all transit routes. We have too many empty businesses already along Lake and Hennepin. Gentrification has driven out small businesses. This plan will not work. We'll turn the whole city into Nicollet Mall.	6/19/2018 19:34
212	/policies/access-to-housing/	The developers have ruined Uptown. We have ugly architecture and terrible traffic. Now this plan proposes to do that to the whole city? This is terrible.	6/19/2018 19:35
213	/policies/access-to-housing/	I believe the development intended for Lake Bde Maka Ska will ruin the lakes. They are already overwhelmed by cars. People will not bike in winter!	6/19/2018 19:36
214	/policies/access-to-housing/	While I agree with the need to consider density, especially around transit hubs, it should be handled in a planful manner. In neighborhoods that are primarily single-family homes, perhaps there should be a limit on how many multi-family units can be added to each block to ensure parking and other infrastructure can handle the increase in population.	6/19/2018 22:35
215	/policies/access-to-housing/	Dear City,  Allow people to use their land however they wish, to build what they wish, and you will see more opportunity in housing and business. Reduce personal freedom and rights and you will see limitations on housing and business. Don't be a barrier, get out of the way of the people. If you want to help, facilitate how people may better achieve their business and property goals.	6/20/2018 18:14
216	/policies/access-to-housing/	I am concerned about meeting the needs of people, but am concerned that developers not be allowed to take advantage of policy changes. Will they put pressure on residents to sell, walk off with \$\$\$ without producing the needed affordable housing? As this is getting off the ground, how do we handle the resentments I hear (and occasionally feel) about a significant influx of new residents. How comfortable will the new residents be with their new neighbors? From what I read on Nextdoor and some of my own reservations about property values, it seems there's an incredible amount of work to do to arrive at an implementation that will make such a transition smooth.	6/21/2018 1:43
217	/policies/access-to-housing/	I'm writing specifically with objection to the plan in zoning changes from Lyndale to Bryant along 50th. Specifically for this area, allowing developers to build four-plexes would do nothing but destroy the character of the neighborhood and allow developers to exploit the zoning for a high return. This change in zoning for these blocks would not create affordable housing in the slightest and would increase the seriousness of off-street parking, which is already an issue specifically for the areas highlighted for a change in zoning. Would parking be taken into consideration at all? Would developers be required to provide off-street parking? Would they be required to build to reflect the history and aesthetics of the area? This change in zoning creates an opportunity for developers and nothing more. It would have a serious, negative impact on the neighborhood itself and the community surrounding it. Please consider duplexes and two stories as a revision to this policy.	6/21/2018 18:23



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

218	/policies/access-to-housing/	<p>I love this plan. It is a great step toward creating (maintaining) diversity and preventing gentrification. Density is great.</p> <p>I would like to see a commitment to improving the infrastucture required to service the concentrated density. If a current northside city block were to be replaced with 4 plexes, the city must take action to improve sewer and water supply. The hidden services that people neglect to consider (most people donâ€™t know the required sizing of drain lines needed to service a given area) can be ignored by developers who build these units. That neglect then is put back on the people renting or owning there. This to me has potential to create a new form of disparity or inequality.</p> <p>Create requirements for developers who buy bungalows and replace with multi-unit housing. The burden to improve the infrastructure in the area should be on them.</p>	6/22/2018 2:54
219	/policies/access-to-housing/	I absolutely love this idea! I currently rent in the Fulton area, but even finding an affordable spot to rent was extremely difficult. We're hoping to buy a home within the next few years, and would much prefer to stay in Minneapolis, but housing prices right now are making us also think about St Louis Park or Hopkins. With this idea,housing can be more accessible for all! What drew me to Minneapolis was the large mix of people I interact with on a daily basis: rich, poor, black, white, everything in between. That being said, my neighborhood is not nearly diverse as I think it could/should be, and I am excited to see change being implemented.	6/22/2018 15:04
220	/policies/access-to-housing/	Build carefully around the buildings already used as art production buildings in NE Minneapolis. The artists need space to load and unload art. They need to rent trucks to do this. We need the commercial buildings now being used as art production buildings to STAY as art production buildings. The artists enhance the city with their art.	6/22/2018 15:27
221	/policies/access-to-technology/	I would like to see something in here that identifies the role of advancing universal high-speed internet across the city.	3/27/2018 20:45
222	/policies/access-to-technology/	the State of Minnesota needs to stand up for Net Neutrality protections to ensure everyone has equal access to information no matter their income. We need to teach 'adulging' in high school: here's what your credit score means, here's how loans can screw you, maybe you don't need a 3,000 sf house when you're 30, living within your means sometimes means you can't have a \$5 latte every day, doing your own taxes, etc to get people financially prepared as a defense against the shark of a banking institution looking for their money through fees and selling the 'american dream' to someone who can't afford it. knowing their rights with healthcare and the legal system.	4/3/2018 16:47
223	/policies/access-to-technology/	US Internet offers the best and most affordable rates for internet but isn't installed in some of the lower income areas (including powderhorn) where the residents would benefits from greatly.	4/5/2018 16:55
224	/policies/access-to-technology/	Will you be using the local libraries to teach this technology?	5/7/2018 1:17
225	/policies/access-to-technology/	How will you pay for fiber and high speed internet for low income families?	5/14/2018 15:28
226	/policies/access-to-technology/	Prevent brittle monopolies from taking over ,ensure more than one internet provider per unit is available	5/18/2018 0:14
227	/policies/access-to-technology/	<p>We need the technology in hand, trainers and mentors in local libraries and community centers. The issue of security and proper care of technology must be taught as well. It seems essential to get the computers and iPad iPhones, etc in the hands of people of all ages in the minority communities.....with some skilled oversight and mentoring.</p> <p>What city departments can get involved in helping residents hook up, troubleshoot and ask for help with technology.</p> <p>Connectivity, trouble-shooting, training videos, and resources nearby.</p>	5/29/2018 18:44
228	/policies/access-to-technology/	The city of Minneapolis is going to need to consider developing Municipally controlled broadband internet if we want to be able to ensure equitable access to the internet which provides access to technology, job training, and employment in general. Municipal Broadband is going to be critical in keeping Minneapolis an equitable place for all, and keeping Minneapolis a city at the cutting edge of technological advancements.	6/1/2018 15:20
229	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	Look at decking over the freeways, for space for parks and/or housing! This would provide access near, for example, downtown, if between downtown and Cedar/Riverside	3/26/2018 23:33

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

230	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	Many of the parcels targeted by this plan that are close to streets deemed transit centers are stable, primarily single family homes. It is very destabilizing to have the city targeting these areas for forced development with plans that include acquiring and combining parcels to promote the affordable housing push. Why attack stable family neighborhoods with this destabilization when there are undeveloped parts of the city crying out for investment. The idea the city should acquire parcels that are not in need of development, neglected or blighted in a social engineering initiative is completely unacceptable.	4/8/2018 22:35
231	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	Many of the parcels targeted by this plan that are close to streets deemed transit centers are stable, primarily single family homes. It is very destabilizing to have the city targeting these areas for forced development with plans that include acquiring and combining parcels to promote the affordable housing push. Why attack stable family neighborhoods with this destabilization when there are undeveloped parts of the city crying out for investment. The idea the city should acquire parcels that are not in need of development, neglected or blighted in a social engineering initiative is completely unacceptable.	4/8/2018 22:35
232	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	Many of the parcels targeted by this plan that are close to streets deemed transit centers are stable, primarily single family homes. It is very destabilizing to have the city targeting these areas for forced development with plans that include acquiring and combining parcels to promote the affordable housing push. Why attack stable family neighborhoods with this destabilization when there are undeveloped parts of the city crying out for investment. The idea the city should acquire parcels that are not in need of development, neglected or blighted in a social engineering initiative is completely unacceptable.	4/8/2018 22:35
233	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	<p>The plan to increase density along high traffic corridors is much too aggressive. These are often single family areas with small multi-family buildings scattered between. To upend this with 4+ story buildings (up and down the street per the illustrations) is very disruptive to the current residents who have already chosen to live in these convenient transit friendly areas. The city should not be picking winners and losers in this way.</p> <p>Also the threat of eminent domain to take property against the will of the owners for large scale development is very concerning.</p>	4/19/2018 18:04
234	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	This is very good. Anything the city can do to promote and develop affordable housing in dense, desirable areas is great. A percentage of affordable units per project could allow developers to waive any needed variances or increase height and floor area ratio even more than is currently permitted.	5/10/2018 16:46
235	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	Care must be taken to avoid making Minneapolis "family unfriendly," by such measures as, for example, impairing the quality of long-standing single-family residential neighborhoods by allowing developers to construct dense, multiple dwellings. For example, at the proposed 21st Street station of the SWLRT.	5/14/2018 1:19
236	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	This is a nice idea as long as the high density does not sacrifice amenities, healthy living design and existing community culture. The danger is that this strategy is used to displace residents from other locations, promote concentration of poverty and encourage gentrification in non-transit corridors of the city. This could be mixed income housing.	5/14/2018 20:48
237	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	These ideas are so positive and smart as to be obvious. The only thing to add is that the relationship should also work in the reverse: transit should be planned around where dense housing exists. Spending billions of dollars on trains to non-dense suburbs is not a great use of anyone's money.	5/21/2018 0:56
238	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	Identify & map "high-frequency transit corridors". Define "larger-scale development" in detail.	5/21/2018 14:52
239	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	<p>My concern is the statement that the city will, "Identify and pursue opportunities to acquire and assemble property for larger-scale development near transit stations and along transit corridors."</p> <p>I live in a single family home on Lyndale (surrounded two blocks in every direction by exclusively other single family homes and duplexes). Living on a busy street is the only way I'm able to afford a home in Tangletown. Should the city elect to "acquire" my house through eminent domain or highest and best use taxation, they would force me out of my neighborhood. The city needs to provide definitions and restrictions to the "acquire and assemble" statement. I don't mind having the option to sell my property to a developer, but the thought of being forced into it by the city is heartbreaking.</p>	5/23/2018 15:46

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

240	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	As a homeowner, I am absolutely thrilled about this policy. It's high time the city put a history of housing discrimination behind it. As a young professional, I decided to move here because it was so easy to bike! My affordable apartment was next to major bus routes, the light rail, single family homes, other apartment buildings, shops, grocery stores, everything I needed within easy walking and biking distance. If the city wants to retain a vibrant workforce, we need to take action to make the city more livable. Creating a denser, friendlier space with easy access to biking and transit is best way to secure a solid future for a growing population. We can't keep assuming that every individual needs to drive everywhere. Honestly, I wish my current neighborhood had more walkable and bikeable development. I chose to buy a house close to the lightrail, so that I can bike and ride the train to work each day. However, there simply isn't enough housing near transit lines for everyone to have the same option. If the city is going to grow and retain a young, talented workforce, we have to embrace a dynamic city and not rely on stereotypes about life from 50 years ago - car traffic destroys roads & the environment, widens waistlines and decreases our sense of community. Housing prices are out of control, and seriously limiting people's access to transit - people I know can't afford to live near transit, or even in the city. It only makes sense to encourage transit use, walking and biking for a safer and healthier city!	5/24/2018 2:22
241	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	I live in a beautiful neighborhood and am committed to ensuring that Washburn high school continues to improve. We have just moved our parents in across the street because our community and our block is tightly connected. This plan would allow our block to be completed overrun by multiplex housing units-destroy our neighborhood. I am not opposed to 4-plexes but beyond that I wonder about the importance of community in neighborhoods. I wonder about the character of the neighborhood. Our neighborhood is not like uptown was 20 years ago. It is a block of well maintained homes from the 1920s-these would/could be torn down in support of this plan. I wonder how the parking situation will be managed and who will fund the school systems since this year created an incredible amount of chaos. I wish the city would consider existing housing stock as an asset, not something to be acquired and assembled. I also wonder how affordable the housing can be in our neighborhood if you have to purchase something at \$500K and tear it down. This does not seem to be a part of the solution. Finally, we were going to invest in our property to improve it. If this plan passes, we will no longer do so. We know our neighborhood will be erased, houses will be bought and multiunit plexes put up in their place and our neighborhood school would not be funded to support the influx. I fundamentally believe that the city needs to consider the value of communities within neighborhoods as part of the strength of Minneapolis.	5/26/2018 1:46
242	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	Affordable housing near the downtown area should be the highest priority for the city.	5/26/2018 3:59
243	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	There are no details in this plan. I want to know what type of housing will be built along Bryant Ave S	5/29/2018 17:42
244	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	You need to be equally responsible to those already in neighborhoods. To ensure good neighborhoods are preserved you should require new housing more than duplex size to be owner occupied. That way you preserve the accountability of neighborhoods and safeguard against builders creating housing that makes them money and the city taxes but at the expense of current neighborhoods	5/30/2018 13:44
245	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	Don't be naive. Just because someone lives near public transportation doesn't mean they won't own a car. Any new housing should be required to provide off street parking - if not used it can be common area for the residents and protects very small mpls lots from becoming all building and no place for water runoff and for snow to be piled. We already have parking congestion, don't make the problem worse while fooling yourself into thinking you're solving it by adding housing near public transportation.	5/30/2018 13:47
246	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	At the proposed 1400 Nicollet development alone, we are seeing the city negate what this policy action states. Please, respect your constituents and stop lying to us.  Studios for \$1100 along a transit corridor is 1) not affordable and 2) contradictory to what you are saying.	5/31/2018 19:28
247	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	The city should not be considering eminent domain to take property along bus lines to give to developers to build affordable housing. The policy to acquire and assemble parcels is very concerning on top of the huge density increase for these same neighborhoods. It feels like people who live near bus lines are under attack in this plan with huge buildings possible and now the potential for the city to get involved to accelerate this build-out.	6/6/2018 15:30

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li> <li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li> <li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li> </ol> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	
248	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/		6/7/2018 20:40
249	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	The city should have first priority in purchasing land along transit lines and preserve it in land trust.	6/8/2018 13:59
250	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	<p>This makes perfect sense as a starting point, and in fact has begun but for a high rent market. Identifying properties is one thing, how will you recruit and select developers? It seems to me it is to their benefit to build high end and charge premium rents. Lets put an end to granted those developers nearly every variance they request and save those approvals for affordable housing developers. I also like a proposal I have heard that awards property tax rebates for multi unit housing with less than 10 units that hold rents to affordable limits. I understand this is already approved for Larger units? I would MUCH rather see it for smaller units to preserve the quaint but well built older units with character that suits the community.</p> <p>As this initiative develops it is imperative that transit continue to improve. Currently transit options are far to limited to think we can reduce the use of cars.</p>	6/14/2018 20:20
251	/policies/affordable-housing-near-transit-and-job-centers/	In many areas especially those on the Northside close to downtown these policies will remove current affordable housing and even if replaced by new affordable housing that new housing will be less affordable than what it replaces	6/17/2018 22:37
252	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Really like this idea. It seems vague as to what is the proposed way to achieve it.	3/27/2018 20:16
253	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Focus more on current residents' needs in affordable housing than enticing new, white, rich money into the city with luxury apartments. Give tax breaks to orgs building affordable housing, and tax spikes on orgs building luxury housing. Make it more enticing to build and renovate affordable housing than luxury housing.	4/4/2018 13:31

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

254	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	One way the city and county could make it easier for lower-income people to stay in their homes is by stopping the rapid escalation of assessed values of homes that has taken place in the past few years. When assessed values of homes rise by double digits, far outstripping incomes, people can no longer afford to stay in their homes. This applies both to owner-occupied and rental housing, since higher property taxes lead to higher rents. The increase in assessed valuation of homes should be held down to the rate of inflation.	4/5/2018 18:00
255	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	I agree with these action steps	4/8/2018 22:09
256	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	<p>No kidding, but your "action steps" are anything but. What does it mean, exactly, to "create and strengthen strategies to retain naturally occurring affordable housing?" In Armatage and its surrounding communities, houses used to be relatively affordable 1.5 stories and ramblers with access to some of the best schools in Mpls. In the 18 years we've live here, more and more houses are being purchased by builders, demolished and rebuilt into huge homes of 3,000 sq. ft. or more. Frankly, living next to a fourplex would be little different to living next door to a 3,000 sq. ft. house. It appears that the Council has preferred milking these properties for the enormous property tax potential rather than focusing on keeping these homes available to families who don't have high incomes. The yearly rise in property taxes truly do price out families on fixed incomes who already live here (so no "minimization of displacement of existing residents") and certainly don't allow for someone living on a minimum wage to move in (you surely haven't help maintain the housing stock here).</p> <p>When we paid thousands of dollars to the city to get a waiver to put on a front porch, we were told to build in our backyard, yet builders have had free rein to build houses that completely overshadow any original housing stock, including filling up entire backyards with house and putting on front porches.</p> <p>Our neighborhood has lost its economic and social diversity due to the council's lack of interest in affordable housing, so some specifics would be appreciated. There's not much to comment on here apart from the complete lack of action over the past 10 years.</p>	4/17/2018 15:37
257	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	The city has been ripping down 'naturally affordable housing' for well over a decade. I see absolutely no change in direction here. Our leaders keep offering variances for the condo monstrosities, but they are not affordable for most people. QUIT RIPPING DOWN OUR NEIGHBORHOODS!! Not only do they not make housing more affordable, they make those neighborhoods worse for those still living there.	5/4/2018 10:21

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		<p>How about preserving Heritage Park south of Olson Hwy to develop an affordable senior retirement community?</p> <p>Welcome to the Cora McCorvey Community Center for older adults, located at 1015 4th Ave N, Mpls. 55405. I am Leon Wallace, a retired real estate broker with over 30 years of real estate experience serving North Mpls. I am retire &amp; 76 years of age. I am currently a member of Redeemer Lutheran Church on 1800 Glenwood Ave N, Mpls. I'm a resident of St. Anne's @ 2323 26th Ave N, living in an efficiency Apt which is all that I can afford without Sec. #8. I demand more affordable housing for seniors like myself.</p> <p>It is my intention to organize a community based non profit organization to represent seniors in contacting our Minneapolis City Leaders to designate a Senior Retirement Community @ the South end of the Heritage Park Community between Olson Hwy, Van White Blvd &amp; Glenwood Ave N.</p> <p>I would propose that we seniors (62+ &amp; our representatives organize a non profit development Corp. to develop affordable senior Hsg in the proposed Heritage Park Senior Community. It is my belief that a cooperative ownership of senior housing would provide for the most affordable housing for seniors in North Mpls. This is not about profit or capitalization, this would be a ministry of providing desirable housing choices for seniors in North Mpls.</p> <p>I have presented the concept to Council Person Ellison &amp; to our Mayor Frey. They have expressed their interest, but not offered any assistance. I would suggest that we seniors need to advocate for our own housing needs. The only two residential senior housing in the proposed Heritage Park Community is the Commons &amp; the Feeney Manor (independent living &amp; assisted living owned by Mpls. Public Hsg.) Both units have over 5 years waiting lists for seniors who need immediate housing. This is totally unacceptable, since our seniors are forced to seek housing in other surrounding cities away from their community. Providing affordable housing choices for our seniors must become a priority.</p>	
258	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	I welcome your response & communications. God Bless you, Leon Wallace(leon01@q.com) 612-521-5581	5/5/2018 16:51
259	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	We should establish a rule that a landlord selling an affordable building, especially multi-family, needs to inform the city before selling so that it does not go to a developer who refurbishes and then leaves the tenants out in the cold since they cannot afford the new rent!	5/8/2018 18:13
260	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	These are nice thoughts but we need more specific strategies as part of this plan. This area has lost about 15,000 NOAH units! How will we meet our goal of providing 3,500 affordable units in the coming decade? One very important strategy would be inclusionary zoning, similar to the Edina policy. What about TIF?	5/18/2018 20:23
261	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Strongly in favor of retaining existing small houses that are more likely to be affordable, even if refurbished, than the mega-mansions (or even fourplexes, or larger) that are or will be replacing them. They supply the starter homes for young people and downsized homes for seniors that want to stay in their neighborhood. Density alone will NOT help with affordability. So much new construction is "LUXURY" - hardly affordable!	5/22/2018 13:11
262	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	<p>Great!</p> <p>Each Minneapolis neighborhood has its own vibe and character. In 1993, my husband and I were looking at both Minneapolis and St. Paul to call our home. The suburbs were not appealing. We loved the character and thoughtful planning and presevation St. Paul has. Ultimately, Minneapolis made more sense for work and parks. We visited many different neighborhoods and settled on Fulton for its small town feel, small homes and yards, parking and garages. Each neighborhood seems to meet special needs of a growing city. Perhaps this explains why people are coming back to the city.If all the neighborhoods start to feel the same, I think Minneapolis will lose it's soul in a way. Prince did not make a song about Fulton, but he made one about Uptown. Please do not change our uniquely designed neighborhoods</p>	5/23/2018 0:13
263	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	On the one hand the plan suggests creating and strengthening strategies to preserve naturally occurring affordable housing. And then on the other, it puts forth a Built Form Plan that that would encourage the destruction of large portions of this same housing in Downtown's edge neighborhoods. This makes no sense. This is NOT equity.	5/24/2018 20:26

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

264	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Bring back dorms and rooming houses. Or micro apartments. Also find opportunities to increase people's wages so they can afford more. Reducing regulation and taxes will put more money in people's pockets and they can afford more.	5/26/2018 3:55
265	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Affordable housing isn't just about buying the home or paying the rent. The ridiculous spending of Mpls and the favors done to shield businesses from paying their share of property taxes has made it unaffordable to stay in the home you bought. High Property taxes cause unaffordable housing - all of our neighborhood went up \$75-100,000 in value in one year. The methodology needs to be fair. You exclude houses that sell for less, calling them distressed but when they get overhauled and sold for a premium you include them in the comp pool. How about excluding homes that have sold for ridiculously high prices - or at least be consistent and include the 'distressed' properties	5/30/2018 13:52
266	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	How about addressing unreasonably high PROPERTY TAXES that burden home owners? Ours have gone from \$1200 per year in 1994 to \$4379 in 2018!!!	5/31/2018 0:31
267	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	This is a joke. We are aware that you are not protecting NOAH. This comp plan is an advertisement stating that Minneapolis is a developer free-for-all.	5/31/2018 19:23
268	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Define: legally binding affordable housing. This is used often but it's not clear what the definition is and defined by whom? City planners? Mayor's office? A particular statue...?	6/2/2018 0:00
269	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Of the 15,000 housing units (apartments? houses?) how many were lost from being razed to build a \$500,000+ home in it's place? How many were lost as the result of some many monster homes raising the value of those surrounding homes? Seems that this is a crisis allowed by the city in an effort to create and increase tax values. Now you are looking to the home owners whose taxes are higher to again bear the burden of these actions.	6/2/2018 0:05
270	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Your comments on wages having "slightly decreased" since 2000, bears more explanation. I imagine just about anywhere you check, you'll find similar. And if you parse this out over years it will show that this stems from the 2008, 2009 crash. Recovery in many fields are only now -- tens years after -- appreciating a recovery. Further, that there is a wage 'decrease' simply cannot be assigned to Minneapolis. On my block alone, there are 5 people who work in Minneapolis -- everyone else works in other cities. This decrease is not a MPLS problem but a Minnesota problem. Residents cannot be held accountable for their neighbors' salaries.  Additionally, your choice of verbiage when presenting a breakdown by percentage by race, using numeric (visually strong) for people of color but spelling out "one in three" for Caucasians is a shameful manipulation.	6/2/2018 0:18
271	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Create housing for LGBTQ community	6/6/2018 2:45
272	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	discourage housing "flippers" cap the number of properties that international and out-state investors can purchase adopt "Right of First Refusal" to allow tenants to form housing co-operatives within aging buildings and access settlement money (for the really bad cases) and city affordable housing dollars to make improvements to properties that were not maintained by landlords. require all cost-effective energy efficiency improvements to be made by landlords along with timely repairs and maintenance of building.	6/6/2018 20:10
273	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	I'd love to know more about the strategies to retain affordable housing and promote naturally occurring housing, but I'm still glad this statement is in the plan.	6/7/2018 20:55
274	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Thank you for considering multigenerational housing! As someone who grew up in a large home with my whole extended family, I believe it was critical to our mental and financial stability. I would go home and spend time with my grandparents, and my parents wouldn't have to worry about after-school daycare. We were all able to support one another under the same roof.	6/8/2018 13:46
275	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	I think some of the strategies associated with preserving NOAH can come from tenant protections. For example, if the city passed a 90-day notice of sale ordinance, right of first refusal ordinance, and had funds available to help tenants form cooperatives to purchase their buildings, we would be empowering renters to build equity. If the renters did not want to purchase, they could transfer their rights to a non-profit developer who would keep the building permanently affordable.	6/8/2018 13:48

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

276	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Create and strengthen strategies to retain naturally occurring affordable housing In the Near North side of Minneapolis which has the majority of Minneapolis's affordable housing this policy is in conflict with other policies that recommend an increase in density as the solution. Any removal of lower density housing to build higher density housing on the Near Northside will result in more expensive housing. Much of the increase in density proposed for the near Northside would allow densities similar to the warehouse district and that housing is way more expensive than most of the current housing	6/13/2018 20:24
277	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Create and strengthen strategies to retain naturally occurring affordable housing In the Near North side of Minneapolis which has the majority of Minneapolis's affordable housing this policy is in conflict with other policies that recommend an increase in density as the solution. Any removal of lower density housing to build higher density housing on the Near Northside will result in more expensive housing. Much of the increase in density proposed for the near Northside would allow densities similar to the warehouse district and that housing is way more expensive than most of the current housing	6/13/2018 20:40
278	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	great idea for multigenerational housing	6/14/2018 2:09
279	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Again, shouldn't these strategies already be outlined to move forward with any kind of plan? The plan is not fleshed out here at all.	6/14/2018 16:47
280	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	Yes, on the multi generational housing.	6/15/2018 22:04
281	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	I have lived in my home in Longfellow since 1992. When I moved in, it was still an affordable working-class to middle-income neighborhood. Several of my neighbors grew up in the neighborhood and now own homes. It suffered from the racial segregation typical in the city (very white..), but that was slowly changing. Now, with the advent of developers,this neighborhood is losing its character and affordability. Small, very affordable homes are bought up, torn down, and replaced by single-family homes that cover as much of a given lot as they legally can. Most of the existing vegetation on the lot, including mature trees, is destroyed. The little bit of land left not filled by a Mc-mansion has bits of grass, and maybe a little new tree (I have noticed that those people who do not value mature trees are always willing to plant a little one..). The new house is generally more than a story higher than the houses on either side. This means that the house on the north side of one of these houses will never see the sun	6/15/2018 23:56
282	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	I was in the middle of a comment when mine was submitted (too verbose, I guess). Big new houses in Longfellow 1.block the natural light to the neighboring houses. 2.Destroy existing affordable housing 3.increase the amount of paved/developed land. (This is a problem because many of my neighbors have problems with water in their basements. There are undiagnosed ground water issues here) 3.Increase the market value of existing homes. Some of my neighbors think that this is good. I am not happy that my home value jumped \$100,000 in the past ten years. This raises my taxes and makes my neighborhood un-affordable, even for people like my neighbors or me. Not good. Andrew Johnson once explained to me that this area doesn't have tighter development controls because it isn't considered to be architecturally significant. I'm sure that Mr. Johnson isn't responsible for this view, it is simply the discriminatory view of those more upper-class folks who do not value affordable neighborhoods.  I think that NE Mpls may be suffering a similar fate. It seems that in this situation, we do not need more funding so much as we need MUCH tighter regulations about what can be built, and where. Developers who object, claiming that this is an assault on their rights, do not acknowledge the effect that their development has on the neighborhoods they choose to target. I get solicitations every day from people looking for desperate homeowners (we will pay you cash! you don't have to even clean the place!). After the last real-estate bubble burst, I saw several families having to move out of their affordable homes which were subsequently sold off and torn down, replaced by houses that none of their neighbors could afford. The neighborhood could certainly use more high-density affordable housing. That's not what we are getting. It seems to me that this plan says nice things while at the same time simply allowing "market forces" (bullying by people with money, really) to plunder the existing neighborhood. Please, tighten-up the redevelopment regulations now. We have already lost too much. Sincerely, Gretchen Harry 4209 45th Ave S Mpls	6/16/2018 0:26
283	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	These policies are in direct contradiction of recommendations to increase density. Those areas with the greatest proposed increases in density are also areas that have the largest stock of affordable housing. By making the land those housing units are on move valuable all you will accomplish is to replace them with more expensive units	6/17/2018 22:29
284	/policies/affordable-housing-preservation/	I agree wholeheartedly with those two policies in general, but they need to add more specific information. Those policies are directly tied to certain parts of the 2040 plan to increase density, which I agree to in principle, but disagree with the unnecessary adding fourplexes where they disrupt the neighborhood charter. And I am not a nimby!	6/18/2018 17:13
285	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	Here's an idea. Lower property taxes!! It's already some of the highest in the country and it's been going up 10% each year. This is not sustainable and counter productive for the goals stated here.	3/23/2018 15:02



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

286	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	One of the most important factors in housing affordability is ensuring accountability to tenants. What are the city's plans to support cooperative housing and other formats that ensure that affordability over profit-taking through rising housing markets.	3/27/2018 19:26
287	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	This is great and will help with the needs of a variety of people	3/29/2018 19:58
288	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	The actions talk about promoting housing and diversity options, but don't talk about how this will be done. The devil is in the details. Something not to be forgotten is that you don't want to destroy the desirable aspects of existing neighborhoods.	3/29/2018 23:08
289	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	If a household income is 30 percent of area median income, that's going to be based on what? Is area a portion of the city or the city as a whole?	4/3/2018 14:14
290	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	i like the Hex House idea of a pre-fabricated small house that would last 5-10 years and can being easily combined with others to form a community with minimal environmental impact, especially for homeless population, it would give them an address for other services to contact. Would also be a good idea to have affordable housing that easily separates into two units for either elder care, or renting out a room since more people live single now, could help with cost of rent/mortgage.	4/3/2018 16:30
291	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	While I support the goals here, there's very little meat on the bones. I would like the city to make more concrete commitments on supporting affordable housing. Both funding commitments and taking a harder line on not letting communities reject affordable housing developments in their neighborhoods would help. Perhaps relaxed land-use requirements for affordable developments. Give projects a density bonus for being affordable, and other commitments like that. Obviously the current situation is leading to the loss of much of our affordable housing stock, so we need a more concrete plan to address the problem.	4/3/2018 17:07
292	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	One problem that I have seen as a homeowner advocating for affordable housing rentals in my neighborhood, is that other homeowners associate affordable housing unjustly with crime and they don't want it "in their back yard." Instead, we should look at areas where the affordable housing will create the neighborhood and current neighbors won't oppose it and as more people move in, it will already be affordable housing and there won't be a fight to add it to the neighborhood. In South Minneapolis, the old Sears tower (Midtown Global Market) is an excellent example of a industrial / commercial space turned into multi-economic housing. We should definitely do the same thing in areas of the city where there are vacant industrial / commercial lots that have been vacant for a long time. It has been a very long time that the building 345 Industrial Blvd. NE has been vacant. This would be a perfect location for affordable housing and other rental units. It is near bus lines and across the street from a school and playground and very close to the Quarry. If the concern is to keep that building industrial / commercial, create a building that has commercial on the bottom floor and apartment units on the top floors. As someone who works in a building close to that building, I would 100% support this option.	4/3/2018 21:42
293	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	It should no longer be legal to convert a duplex into a single family home, and it should be legal throughout the entire city to convert a single family home into a duplex. This is a way to put more NOAH on the market.  Make fourplexes legal throughout the entire city.	4/5/2018 14:34
294	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I agree with these action steps and would suggest looking at adding a policy for larger scale projects that require a minimum number of affordable units	4/8/2018 22:03

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

295	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	<p>Zoning to build more 4-plexes must be included (better if this happens immediately rather than 22 years from now). I currently live in Lowry Hill East and formerly lived in South Minneapolis. Brick 4-plexes look great, add character to the city, and are easy to maintain and affordable. The city is growing rapidly. I think of all those homes in South Minneapolis, if just one of those houses could be turned into a 4-plex (which is unintrusive enough that many have expressed that they live in a single-family neighborhood even when there are a lot of duplexes and 4-plexes around) on each street, that is so many more units.</p> <p>4-plexes are also affordable enough for local community members to afford and manage, rather than passing it off to some company who doesn't care for the neighborhood because they are so detached from this city.</p> <p>My father who is a homeowner in Loring Park, in walking around Lowry Hill East with me, expressed how he would love to buy one of the homes in that neighborhood or really anywhere in the city and turn it into a 4-plex. He could manage and maintain the building himself (after all it would only be 4 units) and be able to create an income for himself. This allows for people to create a job and an income for themselves, pumping that money back into the local community and its members rather than paying some non-local company's bottom line.</p> <p>I'm a homeowner myself, at 24 years old. The only reason I was able to do this was by saving my inheritance of 10k throughout my undergrad in San Diego and keep building on that with my 40k job. If I didn't have that it would take me years to build up a down payment, especially considering that I used to rent an apartment ONE block south from my current home and would pay double the price, draining me into debt and inhibiting my ability to save further... I wanted to save further to afford more than a 450 sq ft home, but my finances could not take it, I had to buy while I could; especially seeing as how within the last two years I have been in MPLS, similar apartments were going for 20-30k less. I couldn't afford to wait another year and I was prepared and blessed with money, I can't say that for anyone else in a similar position (which is common)</p>	4/13/2018 16:55
296	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I would like to see more specifics regarding steps d. and e.	4/20/2018 1:18
297	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	When fancy new apartments were built near an older apartment it's rent went up \$100 in one year without any improvements to the building. Building luxury apartments decreases the availability of affordable housing. I propose that all new apartment buildings include 25% affordable units. Another idea is the creation of affordable condos so people have a reasonable mortgage that won't go up. Turning renters into owners gives them some housing stability.	4/21/2018 17:59
298	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	My neighborhood of Central and the Hiawatha-Lake street light rail station (which used to be a major park and ride hub until the parking lot was closed to commuters) has seen an increase in the numbers of vehicles trying to park there and in traffic congestion around these areas. Although it can be good to encourage more biking, walking, and public transportation, please recognize that many of us are aging, and we cannot bike or walk to where we need to go. Some of us still need our cars, so when buildings are added to neighborhoods that are already becoming congested, please adhere to the requirements for off street parking that are currently in place.	4/26/2018 17:17
299	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	simply increasing density does not increase affordability, as evidenced by the uptown area, a dense but extremely expensive area of the city. It is not clear how you will increase diversity of housing, at a time when all new construction appears homogenous and there is very little incentive to provide adequate affordable housing.	5/3/2018 15:54

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		<p>I am Leon Wallace, a resident in St. Annes. My efficiency Apt is all I can afford without Sec. #8 &amp; I demand more Affordable Hsg Choices for Seniors like me (62+). I am 76 Yrs of age &amp; single.</p> <p>Welcome to the Cora McCorvey Community Center for older adults, located at 1015 4th Ave N, Mpls. 55405. I am Leon Wallace, a retired real estate broker with over 30 years of real estate experience serving North Mpls. I am retire &amp; 76 years of age. I am currently a member of Redeemer Lutheran Church on 1800 Glenwood Ave N, Mpls. I accepted the Lord Jesus Christ as a member of the old Zion Baptist Church, before the current church was constructed. I was a teenager, when the current church was constructed.</p> <p>I am extending the invitation for a representative of your church to assist me in organizing a non profit Senior Housing Developer of Affordable Housing.</p> <p>It is my intention to organize a community based non profit organization to represent seniors in contacting our Minneapolis City Leaders to designate a Senior Retirement Community @ the South end of the Heritage Park Community between Olson Hwy, Van White Blvd &amp; Glenwood Ave N.</p> <p>I would propose that we seniors (62+ &amp; our representatives organize a non profit development Corp. to develop affordable senior Hsg in the proposed Heritage Park Senior Community. It is my belief that a cooperative ownership of senior housing would provide for the most affordable housing for seniors in North Mpls. This is not about profit or capitalization, this would be a ministry of providing desirable housing choices for seniors in North Mpls.</p> <p>I have presented the concept to Council Person Ellison &amp; to our Mayor Frey. They have expressed their interest, but not offered any assistance. I would suggest that we seniors need to advocate for our own housing needs. The only two residential senior housing in the proposed Heritage Park Community is the Commons &amp; the Feeney Manor (independent living &amp; assisted living owned by Mpls. Public Hsg.) Both units have over 5 years waiting lists for seniors who need immediate housing. This is totally unacceptable, since our seniors are forced to seek housing in other surrounding cities away from their community. Providing affordable housing choices for our seniors must become a priority.</p>	
300	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I welcome your response & communications. God Bless you, Leon Wallace (leon01@q.com) 612-521-5581	5/5/2018 16:39
301	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	We need to prioritize housing for those at 30, 50 and 80% of median income with priority for those at 30%!	5/8/2018 18:11
302	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	The city should avoid becoming perceived as "family unfriendly" if it were to adopt multiple-occupancy policies--in the name of "density"--which would impair the character of long-established single-family neighborhoods. The location of such neighborhoods--relatively near the downtown center, the lakes and elsewhere--has traditionally been one of the distinctive features of the City, and a major draw for families relocating here from elsewhere. It is often overlooked that these single-family neighborhoods existed during the years when the population of the City was much higher than it is today. That additional population--much of it occupying much more affordable housing--was accommodated by apartment buildings (largely since torn down) located in appropriately zoned, denser neighborhoods. Rather than accommodating developers' understandable commercial desire to build in areas that are already attractive--regardless on the impact on current residents--they should be given incentives to build in the truly underdeveloped areas of the City.	5/14/2018 1:50
303	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	It all sounds great, but how will you accomplish these lofty goals	5/14/2018 13:15
304	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I applaud the city's focus on households with incomes at or below 30% of AMI and who are at greatest risk of homelessness.	5/14/2018 14:34
305	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	My growing business is located in NE Minneapolis. We hire a number of recent college graduates every year, in addition to interns. Finding affordable housing in the city is critical to our success, and such places to rent are becoming more difficult to find. Make sure gentrification doesn't erase the inexpensive flats for young people!	5/14/2018 23:51
306	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	How many housing units does Mpls actually need? Based on what stats? Can you specify so we know what there goal is? Otherwise too vague.	5/16/2018 0:28
307	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	Please don't put your trust in developers. They will build their dense projects, but will only attract rich people from other areas, further increasing income disparity. We will be overbuilt, but more stratified than ever. Supply and Demand will work, but on a regional level. The poor will get pushed out to the suburbs.	5/16/2018 13:41

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

308	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I am especially concerned that we have specific strategies to increase housing for those at or below 30% AMI. One way of doing this is by increasing the Affordable Housing Trust Fund to at least \$50 million per year and to allow subsidies to be used for both rent and operating. I have seen that we have lost some of our lowest cost housing, partly because owners have not invested in these properties that they meet the basic livability standards. We also see properties being sold to investors from other states that are only interested in profits and not in the community or the people in them.	5/18/2018 20:14
309	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	<p>Let's talk about HOW the stock of affordable housing decreases. Let's talk about how gentrification of a neighborhood drives prices up and people out. Look at Uptown and all of those high rent places. Sure, you increased housing density but how much does it cost to live there?</p> <p>I see how new development can increase property values and drive rents up. I see it all over the city. The question is, does the CITY see it? And how is the city helping people in the battle against developers? Do ANY of these developments have requirements for affordable units?</p> <p>The term "non-profit" developer is very misleading. The people who run it still need to be paid very big salaries.</p> <p>These developers do not care about the existing residents of Minneapolis. KEEP Minneapolis human-scaled. KEEP Minneapolis green. KEEP Minneapolis affordable by focusing on our current residents. Put money into the pockets of our residents, not developers.</p>	5/20/2018 18:00
310	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	<p>Let's talk about HOW the stock of affordable housing decreases. Let's talk about how gentrification of a neighborhood drives prices up and people out. Look at Uptown and all of those high rent places. Sure, you increased housing density but how much does it cost to live there?</p> <p>I see how new development can increase property values and drive rents up. I see it all over the city. The question is, does the CITY see it? And how is the city helping people in the battle against developers? Do ANY of these developments have requirements for affordable units?</p> <p>The term "non-profit" developer is very misleading. The people who run it still need to be paid very big salaries.</p> <p>These developers do not care about the existing residents of Minneapolis. KEEP Minneapolis human-scaled. KEEP Minneapolis green. KEEP Minneapolis affordable by focusing on our current residents. Put money into the pockets of our residents, not developers.</p>	5/20/2018 18:02
311	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	While these action steps seem vague to me, I strongly support the goal of increasing legally-binding affordable housing. I would be more than happy to pay higher taxes in pursuit of this goal.	5/20/2018 23:55
312	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	<p>I find these policy goal statements larded with tedious "expertise" and "corporate sing-song reportage" language that lack specifics. If I am to understand, as reported in local media, that one goal is to allow the construction of rental 4-plexes sans off-street parking absolutely anywhere within the city's residentially zoned districts, including single family districts, count me among those adamantly opposed. Your earnest equity engineering efforts can be seen as running policy decisions off the rails.</p> <p>If greater population density is the desired end then the means to successfully achieve that must be applied discreetly, like concentrating multifamily units along rapid transit corridors and not sprinkled willy-nilly throughout the city.</p>	5/22/2018 14:50
313	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I live in Near North. We already have a great deal of low-income housing. We don't need more low-income housing; we need low-income house equitably distributed throughout the city, NOT concentrated in poverty pockets!	5/23/2018 21:18
314	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I can't find it here, but have read in the paper about changing zoning to allow small apt. Bldings in all mpls neighborhoods. This is a terrible idea and will ruin some of the most lovely neighborhoods in the city. Do not let developers run amok with this silly idea. I live in a very dense neighborhood with many apts and condos so this doesn't personally effect me, but I moved from a pretty area with single family homes all built in the same era. These older neighborhoods pull people to the city with their beauty and architectural continuity. Loosening zoning in these areas will be a disaster and destroy the allure of these neighborhoods. Please extend the study and feedback period for Minneapolis's 2040 plan. I think this requires a lot more listening, research and wise planning. Do not quickly enact something that will result in actions you can never undo.	5/23/2018 22:17

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

315	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	<p>"Create housing for residents of all income levels across the entire city."</p> <p>It is not the cities job to "create housing." The city is not a builder or a developer. Instead, the city should focus on smarter regulation to decrease costs for landlords and builders so that additional affordable housing is generated organically, rather than through subsidy or city building projects. I personally worked on a city housing project in North Minneapolis, on Emerson Ave, several years ago, and several of those homes are still unoccupied, which is amazing to me. I would like my city government to "stay in its lane" and foster an environment where affordable homes are built, rather than being directly involved.</p>	5/25/2018 15:42
316	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	<p>Add a few high rises like Cedar Riverside with small affordable units close to down town. Oh wait the property is too expensive. Tell the to find affordable housing in the burbs.</p>	5/26/2018 3:52
317	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	<p>Ms Palmisano,</p> <p>Thank you for hosting the May 23 ward 13 meeting at Southwest High School last week.</p> <p>I have a few questions from that meeting which I'm hoping you can clarify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At the front of the room where the meeting was held there were several charts, one depicting current streets and neighborhoods that are impacted by this draft plan. I can not find this chart on the 2040 website. This chart more clearly lays out the projected areas affected (ours is one), as opposed to the website in which I can't find these specifics. How can I get a copy of this?</li> <li>2. In the planning process for this draft the website states that many art and cultural fairs were visited to gain attending peoples' views on Mpls' needs for the future. I don't recall it stating input to this initial draft was drawn from an event in ward 13. This is the first many of us are hearing about this plan which will have a huge impact on this area. Why does it feel like so much leg work was done secretly without the input of residents in areas to be affected?</li> <li>3. What contractors have already approached or been approached by the city to create multi use homes in ward 13 areas?</li> <li>4. You state that eminent domain is no longer a policy in Mpls. That is not a reassuringly strong statement. We envision it not mattering that it hasn't been used as a policy; there will be ways the city and contractors will get around this should they want to purchase and rip down our home, when we are the only one on the street refusing to sell(example).</li> <li>5. Little consideration is given in this plan to historical homes in this neighborhood and the families that have lived in them for years. The plan focuses on racial equity by stating increased affordable housing will be built. I guarantee you that if any multi-use housing is created on our street to replace existing single family homes, those units will not be affordable. (Based on previous projects done by city). Is this being studied?</li> <li>6. Your colleague and "owner of this draft" quoted many statistics at the May 23rd meeting, with no information on where these stats come from, from which study, by whom, where and when such studies were done.</li> <li>7. Will the next draft actually have clearly laid out information about how specific streets are to be affected?</li> </ol> <p>Thank you in advance for your response.</p>	5/27/2018 20:53
318	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	<p>In Loring Park alone we are only seeing market rate or luxury developments with ONE 60% AMI development. This Is Not Affordable Housing! Nor, does what we are currently seeing display any true commitment to creating affordable housing. This comp plan is nothing more than platitudes and lies.</p>	5/31/2018 19:25
319	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	<p>The need is going up because of decreasing wages? We are in the process of increasing minimum wages. The wages go up! The need is going up because our government leadership has embraced and enabled the out of control growth of people living entirely on government aid. Because of this taxes continue to go up to fund all the aid. We have reached the tipping point where the demand has out paced the tax funds. The solution is to Decrease government aid to able bodied recipients. Make people work for their food and housing and medical needs. The measurement of success of an aid program is how many people get off of it! Make the affordable housing affordable by being small and utilitarian. Not a place people want to stay for ever. This gives them incentive to move out to better housing. This is the reality in the real world that needs to be taught. I started in a shared apartment in a less than ideal suburban neighborhood, worked until I could move to a better apartment in a better community and finally buy a starter home. Then a better home in a better neighborhood. We can't give the luxury of great homes in great neighborhoods away. It must be earned.</p>	6/3/2018 19:14

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

320	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I think an effective way for the city to provide more affordable housing is to loosen the restrictions on and incentive the development of accessory dwelling units. Removing the requirement for a property with and ADU to be owner-occupied is vital. This requirement severely limits the potential buyers pool for a property and is the reason I will not build an ADU. I want to build and owner-occupy an ADU on my property at 211 17th Ave NE. I also never plan on selling my property and would like to continue to live there for the foreseeable future. The future is unknown though and circumstances change. Other incentives the city could provide for ADUs include lower permitting fees and pre-approved building designs and contractors. ADUs are a great tool to help relieve the affordable housing issue while maintaining neighborhood character. It would greatly benefit the city if the requirements(owner occupancy) were relieved and the development was incentivized.	6/4/2018 14:01
321	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	Create separate old age homes for LGBTQ people or trans people	6/6/2018 2:41
322	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	-cap # of luxury condos/apts allowed total within city. There is only so much space for all of our needs together and attracting more and more wealthy apt-dwellers (when the are 1-15% of the population)is not a wise or planful use of space. -require rig	6/6/2018 20:15
323	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	The definition of "affordable housing" has to be changed to include ownership. If we don't, whatever housing it is, wherever it is, does not build equity (and I mean that in the financial as well as the social justice definition) nor does it remain affordable.	6/7/2018 4:09
324	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	This is a necessary policy and I definitely hope it leads to further leadership and planning when it comes to new affordable housing construction. More details would be great, but I understand that isn't the purpose of this document.	6/7/2018 20:33
325	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I am very happy about all of the goals around housing affordability. My husband and I bought our home in Powderhorn two years ago, and while we are very happy to live here it was also one of the only neighborhoods where we could find a house that was in our budget and also fit all of our needs. And we could not have afforded to buy this house without having affordable rental housing beforehand...and since we have moved I have seen that those options are rapidly disappearing as have smaller single-family homes.	6/7/2018 23:30
326	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	Private developers often receive financial incentives to build 80% AMI affordable units. I believe that any developer who receives financial incentives should be held accountable to keep those units affordable for at least 30 years, if not permanently affordable. Currently, developers like Dominion keep their buildings affordable for 15 years and then flip it to market-rate. 15 years is not even long enough for a child to go through the K-12 education system. We need stability for all people, not just those who own homes.	6/8/2018 13:44
327	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	While I agree with the philosophical impulse of these action steps, they seem vague and ambiguous to me. Poor people, single women, single mothers, families, aging community members live in fear that their landlord will raise the rent and toss them out, leaving g them with no place to go.These are urgent matters, what are we going to do today? Why not look at some form of rent control that hold greedy landlords accountable for their behavior.	6/8/2018 15:36
328	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	From what I see, the zoning changes and drive towards density described in this plan do nothing to support the goal of affordable housing. Just like we are seeing now, it will promote construction o expensive apartments in desirable neighborhoods.	6/12/2018 16:02
329	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	Great goals, but no answers! At this point developers are allowed to build what ever they want at the market rate for both rentals and condo buildings. Developers should not be allowed to build more luxury apartments without adding a certain percentage of low income and moderate income units. ( 20% low, 40% moderate, %40 market rate). Increased density does not mean affordability. Restrictions need to be placed on developers.	6/12/2018 22:02
330	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	Affordable housing is a big priority, but there's another issue with housing that must be addressed when it comes to "affordable housing." We have a plethora of market-based "luxury" rentals popping up all over driving up the price of housing in this area. My fear is that people who are not considered low income, like myself, are going to be priced out of the heart of the city. Ten years ago I chose to abandon my car and commit myself to a true urban lifestyle. Two years ago I moved out of the luxury apartment I shared with an ex, and I decided to downsize to a studio in a small century old building with basically no amenities. My location is fantastic, but I'm paying \$745 per month for a 300 sq foot studio in the Stevens Park neighborhood. When I moved in my rent was \$665. I have no "luxury amenities" such as in-unit laundry and I barely have a kitchen. I can afford to upgrade to a nicer/newer apartment, but why should I, on a \$50K annual salary, have to spend half my check on rent just to live in a nice place?	6/13/2018 22:54
331	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	How do we entice builders to build low income properties?	6/14/2018 2:07
332	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	Where is the HOW of this policy? I only see dreams.	6/14/2018 16:45

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

333	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	I love our city. I was born and raised in the Camden neighborhood, went to the U, worked in downtown and now live in Page. Except for a year and a half in graduate school, I have never lived nor wanted to live anywhere else. We have the best parks; empowering schools (I am a proud Henry grad and my children are amazing Millers); thriving downtown; and a fabulous art scene. My neighborhood is wonderful for various reasons, but the most important reason is being threatened by Proposal 2040. The quiet peace we find in our little 'hood is a respite from the bustle we know and love in the other parts of the city, only a stone's throw away. The streets of our neighborhood have taught my children how to drive and parallel park, something I think would not be nearly as pleasant with increased traffic and street parking. I also love the stability of our neighborhood. We know every single person on our block and almost everyone on the other handful of blocks in our little community. I would love to see more affordable housing. I worked hard to support the building of Creekside Commons just a half mile from my home. It would be wonderful to find more fourplexes along bus routes such as Nicollet or Portland Ave, both shouting distance from me, but to have them in amongst the quiet of our neighborhood would just all but ruin it for me. Seriously. Please do not allow these fourplexes to be built within peaceful, quiet neighborhoods. Thank you.	6/14/2018 20:56
334	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	Start by holding back "luxury condo units" or "luxury" anything. Simple, safe and clean materials should be doable. WHO is able to afford those luxury units???	6/15/2018 22:03
335	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	In the NE Arts District we should see more artists offered the opportunity to purchase houses there. Artists can get the money for this purchase. What happens now is that realtors don't give artists first choice or even any choice. It's a bidding war! Living beside your work area or near the work area is best. It should be planned for all housing. Houses should be planned around the manufacture areas.	6/15/2018 22:30
336	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	This is a very important goal and I applaud the city for working to reach it. We definitely need to address and repair access to affordable housing for everyone. Jan Kleinman	6/19/2018 20:29
337	/policies/affordable-housing-production/	Excellent ideas. Further suggestions/questions:  1. HIGHLY support the "little house" movement. No need for thousands of feet per inhabitant - a couple can happily live in 450 Sq Ft, even a family - average living area for a family in Tokyo is under 1,000 Sq Ft. 2. How to combat NIMBYism? More people makes a better city, more apartments drives rent down. But it's up to you to open up the hearts of these others. Long time dwellers think that they own neighborhoods. But who does? It's a delicate dance. Good luck.	6/20/2018 13:20
338	/policies/aging/	e. Expand innovative housing options that provide in-home living support and add housing space for people who are happy to rent a room or access low-cost housing in exchange for assisting older individuals. This also provides income for "house rich, cash poor" seniors.	4/21/2018 18:32
339	/policies/aging/	Make it possible for residents who want to stay in their homes and/or communities to do so. Everyone needs to shovel their walks and corners so the elderly can get out.	4/22/2018 0:17
340	/policies/aging/	The VOA Southwest Senior Center used to provide senior services in my neighborhood, but closed due to lack of support. Perhaps, the City and County need to look into becoming more involved considering that our population is aging fast and services are disappearing?	4/26/2018 15:39

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

341	/policies/aging/	<p>I am Leon Wallace, 76 yrs of age, living alone in an emergency apt, because I can't afford a 1 BR apt without the help of Sec. #8. We seniors in the Northside demand an affordable senior retirement community, with land designated for development of affordable transitional housing for senior within our own community:</p> <p>Welcome to the Cora McCorvey Community Center for older adults, located at 1015 4th Ave N, Mpls. 55405. I am Leon Wallace, a retired real estate broker with over 30 years of real estate experience serving North Mpls. I am retire &amp; 76 years of age. I am currently a member of Redeemer Lutheran Church on 1800 Glenwood Ave N, Mpls.</p> <p>It is my intention to organize a community based non profit organization to represent seniors in contacting our Minneapolis City Leaders to designate a Senior Retirement Community @ the South end of the Heritage Park Community between Olson Hwy, Van White Blvd &amp; Glenwood Ave N.</p> <p>I would propose that we seniors (62+ &amp; our representatives organize a non profit development Corp. to develop affordable senior Hsg in the proposed Heritage Park Senior Community. It is my belief that a cooperative ownership of senior housing would provide for the most affordable housing for seniors in North Mpls. This is not about profit or capitalization, this would be a ministry of providing desirable housing choices for seniors in North Mpls.</p> <p>I have presented the concept to Council Person Ellison &amp; to our Mayor Frey. They have expressed their interest, but not offered any assistance. I would suggest that we seniors need to advocate for our own housing needs. The only two residential senior housing in the proposed Heritage Park Community is the Commons &amp; the Feeney Manor (independent living &amp; assisted living owned by Mpls. Public Hsg.) Both units have over 5 years waiting lists for seniors who need immediate housing. This is totally unacceptable, since our seniors are forced to seek housing in other surrounding cities away from their community. Providing affordable housing choices for our seniors must become a priority.</p> <p>I welcome your response &amp; communications. God Bless you, Leon Wallace (leon01@q.com) 612-521-5581/2323 26th Ave N #318, Mpls,MN 55411</p>	5/5/2018 17:18
342	/policies/aging/	I think finding ways to help elders stay in their homes with support services facilitating their needs and home maintenance is essential.	5/10/2018 23:00
343	/policies/aging/	<p>One comment I have on this is the literal ageism I've seen among members of the City Council and their supporters in the sense that, when a long time resident expresses concern about the impacts of the changes in the city, they are dismissed as irrelevant, old and probably racist people. There seems to be contempt, rather than respect, for the wisdom they may have developed that could benefit their communities. Therefore, I question whether action step #c reflects a genuine desire.</p>	5/13/2018 18:48
344	/policies/aging/	<p>I am retired. The biggest threat to my livability is the rise in property taxes. My neighborhood in SW was a nice mix of older homes. Now my bungalow is the smallest house on the block. Yet my value was raised \$30,000 this year. I have lived here for 33 years and love my neighborhood. But how long can I afford it? How can the city help us stay in our homes?</p> <p>I volunteer with homeless people, belong to an environmental committee, educate the community on pollinators and gardens, teach how to raise Monarchs, volunteer with schools, play concerts at the VA home,etc. I can go on and on about how important seniors are to their communities. We don't want to be priced out of our neighborhoods but I see more and more retirees fleeing to Florida.</p>	5/14/2018 11:39
345	/policies/aging/	This is critical, given the changing demographics. I think we could expand on this even more and be thinking about how technology( and closing the digital divide) can help seniors and our community.	6/6/2018 2:28
346	/policies/aging/	As many baby boomers will not have adequate family support, could we examine the opportunity to provide adult day programs in much the same way we provide childcare now? Could rec centers be redesigned for this purpose? Allow adult children the opportunity to work while their aging parents are cared for?	6/14/2018 11:19
347	/policies/aging/	This policy should be listed as supporting the affordable and accessible housing goal.	6/18/2018 15:58
348	/policies/air-quality/	Plant more trees!!!	3/23/2018 20:08



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

349	/policies/air-quality/	Wood smoke is one of the largest sources of air pollution according to the MPCA. Ban recreational fires in our urban environment.	3/24/2018 18:07
350	/policies/air-quality/	It would be great to ID how a polluter-pays principle/ the existing PCAB fees tie into these strategies.	3/28/2018 4:16
351	/policies/air-quality/	I like the sound of these action steps. As a resident of Bottineau, I need to see actual results in shutting down the Gaff shingle factory. If we are serious about these commitments to clean air, that is the first change that must happen, as it is long overdue. The Riverfront property there could be repurposed for any number of your other forward-looking, sustainable, healthy ideas. Gaff has got to go.	4/5/2018 2:21
352	/policies/air-quality/	Adopt policies that encourage less mowing on public and private land. Enforce restrictions on idling. Transition city fleets to electric. Ban gas powered leaf blowers.	4/6/2018 23:04
353	/policies/air-quality/	Fire Pits. Eliminate them. NOW. They have no place in a dense city and are currently one of the most easily eliminated pollution sources. Fine them heavily enough to fund other initiatives and keep property taxes down.	4/29/2018 23:10
354	/policies/air-quality/	Why does the City own parking ramps, which provides cheap parking and promotes driving? Sell and/or tear down those awful structures and stop building more parking facilities. Air quality won't improve unless walking, biking, and transit become more convenient and efficient.	5/9/2018 15:59
355	/policies/air-quality/	One way to reduce emissions is to educate people o discourage car idling. Minneapolis has an ordinance that most people either don't know about or is ignored. I live near a school. 30 minutes before school lets out, people start parking on several blocks around the school and sit in their cars with the engine running. Multiply this by the number of schools. I have addressed this with the school principal and have gotten nowhere. He said they can't afford signage. I would like the city to address the problem through education: neighborhood publication, television, school parent awareness. I would like to see signs in school areas. That could make a huge difference	5/14/2018 11:26
356	/policies/air-quality/	Amazing. No mention of airport noise and fumes with FAA having the ability to completely change the southern neighbors with RNAV. Again, Fulton is amazing we are absorbing so much that the city needs and Minneapolis really does not understand Fulton.	5/23/2018 0:36
357	/policies/air-quality/	Some blocks of the city have multiple emitters such as gas stations, auto repair and car washes within a few hundred feet of residential housing. For instance, there is an auto repair place, a body shop and a car wash within a few hundred feet of my house which is just a few blocks from the freeway. The air quality testers are not positioned here, yet obviously that's a lot of concentrated emissions. There is also a daycare - right next to the body shop - who thought that was a good idea for kids? We need policy to change this and move these business types away from residential areas and especially away from daycares and schools. No housing should be exposed to emissions from three emitters like this and my block is not the only one concentrated like this. In the short term, move some of them and in the long term (but ASAP) eliminate these types of businesses in residential areas.	6/7/2018 4:45
358	/policies/air-quality/	Do people report air quality issues to 311? Does 311 do anything about those reports now? If the city is going to use that data to inform policy according to the 2040 Comp Plan, then people need to know to report and have some confidence 311 will do something - that confidence is already low on a variety of issues that are typically reported. I don't think 311 is the first place people think of to report air quality issues. If the city is going to use that data, then it also needs to ensure that it is quality, useful data.	6/7/2018 5:05
359	/policies/air-quality/	Penn ave has two lanes for traffic, not enough to support 4 story apartments along it!	6/13/2018 13:39
360	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	(re: f) The city planning department's current RFP process and structural biases results in bland, risk-adverse public art. Because the planning department is staffed by folks with a background in planning and architecture, they see proposals that look like the work they've done or seen from architects as more polished and professional than submissions from artists, who might not have the same academic background or ability to make a highly polished proposal. It would be far better to get some bad results, potentially divisive messages, and poor performance from actual artists than to get standardized, dull, design-blog-ready tripe from like-minded "creatives." Art is more than an instagramable experience. That's why public art is so hard to do, and the city isn't doing a very good job.	5/8/2018 18:41
361	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	Use Art programming to help begin dialogue between communities. Police and Black folks. Immigrant and established communities. Native Peoples and everyone.	5/8/2018 20:22
362	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	I truly believe that creating access to art activities is founded around allowing arts organizations and artist to maintain affordable studios and work space within the city. The rising cost of rent is also pricing out many valuable arts organizations. To keep the access close to wear people are living in working, the space most remain sustainable for these different earning models.	5/17/2018 23:12
363	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	Update the artist designs for Mpls Utility Box Wraps program. Some are not that good.  <a href="http://www.minneapolismn.gov/www/groups/public/@cped/documents/webcontent/wcms1p-121720.pdf">http://www.minneapolismn.gov/www/groups/public/@cped/documents/webcontent/wcms1p-121720.pdf</a>	5/22/2018 22:16
364	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	Give money to neighborhood groups to do placemaking and public art projects as part of community engagement.	5/22/2018 22:17

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

365	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	This is already happening. People will do what they are interested in. You can force people to do creative jobs if itâ€™s not their passion.	5/26/2018 3:48
366	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	<p>There is one major component missing in Minneapolis that would greatly improve the arts community and the prospect for artists living and working in the Twin Cities. We need an arts newspaper. The reason the 1980's were considered the high point for arts in the city; the reason we had 33 galleries all within 5 blocks of each other; the reason the nation referred to the Twin Cities as the fourth largest art market behind NYC, LA and Chicago, WE HAD ARTPAPER.</p> <p>The internet does not unify a community like a physical publication does. ARTPAPER gave the arts a voice and a sense of place. Put money behind print publishing efforts. They work.</p> <p>Talk to Jennifer Young, Springboard for the Arts, or Neil Cuthbert. They will know how to make this happen.</p>	5/28/2018 21:16
367	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	<p>More artists are moving to Minneapolis because of its diversity and music scene. Remember minneapolis is known as a Music City. Create more programs that facilitate music. More concert series in public places. How about hiring live music in the skyways? Also offering permits for musicians to busk in skyways much like subway systems in NYC. Musicians also need more respect from police. They can really make it difficult for us to load our instruments into performance space because dress or hairstyle. Mean cops are a huge problem in Minneapolis.</p> <p>Create public rehearsal spaces for musicians. A single empty warehouse could easily be converted into a wonderful arts rehearsal space as well as public dance studio. The city needs more public creation areas where artists can meet and create.</p>	6/12/2018 14:22
368	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	The long term vision of the arts program should focus on ART AS A THINKING tool. Movement of any type helps put ideas into place. Drawing of any type, scribbling even helps to get ideas out of the brain and into the world.	6/15/2018 22:18
369	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	Instead of using the language "...global competitiveness...", to define a major component of this goal, the city should seek to foster "global solidarity" and should model this by fostering stronger relationships between its 12 sister cities and local public schools and city youth programs. The city should also add more global cities to its sister cities list to reflect the growing and diverse immigrant population in Minneapolis. For example, there is only one Latin American sister city. There should be more. The city should create summer learning abroad programs in collaboration with local public high schools so that students can visit sister cities and learn how art and governance interact in other communities. This would benefit high school students when they apply to college, as admissions officers value students who spend summer months engaged in cultural activities that show a sense of international awareness and maturity.	6/17/2018 23:43
370	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	City support for studios... somehow. We are getting priced out.	6/20/2018 13:14
371	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	<p>Recognize Musicians as artists!</p> <p>The closures of small venues (400 bar, Triple Rock, Toybox, Bedlam, Medusa) over the last decade are appalling, and have drastically decreased my access to local, intimate music experiences.</p> <p>While it is possible that these venues closed due to the choice of the owners, I am still confident that the fee structures and licensing hoops imposed by the City on those venues were far too steep given the revenues these local bar operators were seeking. (\$5 concerts are no longer possible anywhere)</p> <p>Related, Alcohol is a very common aspect in the creative economy, and it seems that it would be much easier for a Painter to set up a gallery and serve wine, than it would be for a musician to play a concert and get paid in part through door sales and also from drinks.</p> <p>This does not seem fair to me.</p>	6/22/2018 18:41
372	/policies/arts-and-cultural-assets/	Legalize music practice spaces.	6/22/2018 18:42
373	/policies/arts-in-community-development/	Public spaces should be designed to reflect our shared culture as Minnesotans regardless of race or ethnicity. Creating public spaces that reflect cultures from other parts of the world only reinforces ethnic divisions. We shouldn't be celebrating the places everyone's grandparents are from, we should be celebrating the place that we have all chosen to live together.	4/7/2018 14:24

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

374	/policies/arts-in-community-development/	Yes, but make them accessible to all people. Let us get to know each other and appreciate all the cultures here. Integrate.	4/21/2018 23:33
375	/policies/arts-in-community-development/	Thanks for sharing these policies. Together they present an exciting road map. I would offer a suggestion for consideration that we substitute the term "creative placekeeping" for "creative placemaking". While creative placemaking is certainly widely understood and has entered the parlance of city planners, people in the creative sector and general audiences more widely, it can suggest a sort of "layering on" of culture-making something where perhaps there already are assets. Sarah Bellamy of Penumbra Theatre has suggested "creative placekeeping" points to the strengths already inherent in a place, and invites us to think of those assets as meriting protection, nurturing and investment. For your consideration- thank you. Nina Clark, Minneapolis, ninaclark.mn@gmail.com	5/9/2018 15:57
376	/policies/arts-in-community-development/	I like all of these action steps too. Great work!	6/15/2018 22:24
377	/policies/bicycling/	Can we add something about adding more greenways, and make better greenway connections throughout the city?	3/23/2018 1:38
378	/policies/bicycling/	Can we add something to support the popular greenway initiatives throughout the city, such as the Min Hi Line, Southside Greenway, Northside Greenway, and the Great Northern Greenway?	3/23/2018 1:42
379	/policies/bicycling/	Awesome! Thank you for continuing to support bicycling and its infrastructure in this city, especially despite all the many loud, squeaky wheels (no pun intended) trying to divert the conversation away from promoting transportation equity.	3/23/2018 14:31
380	/policies/bicycling/	I just spent 20 minutes writing a suggestion only to have it disappear as "Oops, something went wrong" you can start this process by making it work!	3/23/2018 14:51
381	/policies/bicycling/	Great! We really need to install physical protections in protected bike lanes, such as planters and concrete barriers. This is a must!	3/23/2018 19:32
382	/policies/bicycling/	Laws barring drivers from stopping/parking in bike lanes need to be enforced. Drivers use bike lanes for pick ups/drop offs, deliveries, parking, etc. and are rarely held accountable.	3/24/2018 0:44
383	/policies/bicycling/	Who will develop and manage greenways? Will the Great Northern Greenway, Min Hi Line, or Midtown Greenway become parks, and if not, who will maintain them?	3/24/2018 2:46
384	/policies/bicycling/	I recently converted to bike commuting all year long. I really appreciate this focus on the policy.	3/24/2018 23:21
385	/policies/bicycling/	I would like to see the city develop better design standards for bikeways so that bike lanes and bike boulevards work better. This would include signage, traffic calming, delineators, bike racks.	3/26/2018 3:19
386	/policies/bicycling/	This looks great!!	3/26/2018 23:53
387	/policies/bicycling/	great	3/27/2018 16:35
388	/policies/bicycling/	Minneapolis' commitment toward a strong city-wide system of bikeways are a major reason I continue to live in this city. I would, however, like to see it spelled out that protected, above-grade bikeways such as the one on Washington Ave. downtown are priority, with bollard-protected bikeways as second priority. These are necessary to truly keep pace with our reputation as a worldwide-respected biking city.	4/5/2018 14:03
389	/policies/bicycling/	Minneapolis' commitment toward a strong city-wide system of bikeways are a major reason I continue to live in this city. I would, however, like to see it spelled out that protected, above-grade bikeways such as the one on Washington Ave. downtown are priority, with bollard-protected bikeways as second priority. These are necessary to truly keep pace with our reputation as a worldwide-respected biking city.	4/5/2018 14:03
390	/policies/bicycling/	The map published at <a href="http://www.minneapolismn.gov/www/groups/public/@publicworks/documents/webcontent/wcms1p-081436.pdf">http://www.minneapolismn.gov/www/groups/public/@publicworks/documents/webcontent/wcms1p-081436.pdf</a> should be updated so format, content and web access match other Mpls bike system maps.	4/5/2018 19:23
391	/policies/bicycling/	Building bikeways is fine but adding on-street bike lanes only makes the commute worse for the 95% of us who are using some type of vehicle transit to get to work. Downtown traffic is a mess and those new bike lanes are largely to blame.	4/7/2018 13:53
392	/policies/bicycling/	Please consider adding better maintenance of bike lanes and other bicycle facilities to your list of action steps. Many of the city's bike lanes and trails are virtually unusable during the winter due to lack of maintenance. Bike facilities should be maintained as well as the streets used by automobiles if you actually want people to use them.	4/8/2018 18:39

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

393	/policies/bicycling/	<p>I have already left comments under Policies 18 and 19, but again, I have to say THANK YOU! here as well. I live in south Minneapolis and ride my bike for a vast majority of my travels. The tipping point for me was realizing how easy it was for me to get to the places I need to go on protected bikeways (Minnehaha Parkway, Hiawatha Ave, the Greenway, etc). Even though I bike a lot I don't consider myself a "hardcore" biker - that is, I don't want to fight and go to war with automobile traffic. I have a family to consider and don't want to die on a street. But building and maintaining bicycle-specific infrastructure including signals, laws, signage, enforcement, and protected paths for both recreation and as "thoroughfares" for bicycle commuters helps me feel safe, engages me with the community in ways not possible in a car, helps me maintain a healthy lifestyle, and fills me with enormous pride for my city.</p> <p>I simply cannot say enough about how much this focus-shift from cars to other forms of transportation, especially bicycles, means to me and my family. In fact, it's a major reason we continue to live in Minneapolis. KEEP IT UP!</p> <p>“Cities get the cyclists they deserve. If you have good infrastructure, you will get good cyclists.” -- Reetta Keisanen, cycling coordinator of Helsinki.</p>	4/13/2018 18:35
394	/policies/bicycling/	Enough with the bike lanes!!! Every time the city adds more bike lanes it creates a traffic nightmare. This can easily be seen near Childrens hospital. This new traffic disaster seriously impacts families trying to get care for their sick children, it seems like a terrible policy, and ignores the fact that the greenway is only 2 blocks from those bike lanes. If the city really wants to take action on climate change I would suggest installing EV chargers in more areas.	4/19/2018 15:48
395	/policies/bicycling/	Offer free bike lessons for children starting in school along with bike safety and helmets.	4/21/2018 22:52
396	/policies/bicycling/	Please consider the implementation of the bike lanes on 26th and 28th Streets when planning future bike transit planning. These bike lanes are a disaster. I drive or bike to work (depending on the weather and my schedule) using this corridor. When biking, I find the Midtown Greenway to be a much safer and calmer route vs 26th or 28th Streets. Traffic has become much more congested and confusing for drivers with the bike lanes making it much less safe for bikers. A better alternative would have been to make a less traveled street such as 27th Street a bikeway or just use the current Midtown Greenway.	4/22/2018 18:24
397	/policies/bicycling/	Please consider the implementation of the bike lanes on 26th and 28th Streets when planning future bike transit planning. These bike lanes are a disaster. I drive or bike to work (depending on the weather and my schedule) using this corridor. When biking, I find the Midtown Greenway to be a much safer and calmer route vs 26th or 28th Streets. Traffic has become much more congested and confusing for drivers with the bike lanes making it much less safe for bikers. A better alternative would have been to make a less traveled street such as 27th Street a bikeway or just use the current Midtown Greenway.	4/22/2018 18:25
398	/policies/bicycling/	Please consider the implementation of the bike lanes on 26th and 28th Streets when planning future bike transit planning. These bike lanes are a disaster. I drive or bike to work (depending on the weather and my schedule) using this corridor. When biking, I find the Midtown Greenway to be a much safer and calmer route vs 26th or 28th Streets. Traffic has become much more congested and confusing for drivers with the bike lanes making it much less safe for bikers. A better alternative would have been to make a less traveled street such as 27th Street a bikeway or just use the current Midtown Greenway.	4/22/2018 18:25

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

399	/policies/bicycling/	<p>I'm sure that there are regulations about how wide bike lanes need to be, but I am honestly fine just having a 4-6' lane without needing the extra bollards and buffer. I do understand the intent that biking should be safe for everyone (and not just someone who is quite comfortable biking, like myself). At a minimum, though, there has to be some way to roll these projects out without pissing off the driving community. I enjoy 26th and 28th street, but the animosity that I have endured when discussing it with friends who drive has not been great for my cause of trying to encourage them to bike more. They take it personally.</p> <p>As a year round biker, the bollards also cause problems because the City then needs to send special plows for the bikeways. This often leads to just awkward piling in the lanes because car lanes are plowed more frequently. Maybe the compromise is actually to have city plows just plow closer to the curb so the bike lane is also covered by that plowing pass? Aside: the off street bike path plowing has been amazing for the past few years!!! A lot of compliments to the City for that. That would be my main plug for more off-street bike routes - not having to worry about cars tramping down the snow and driving all over the place makes bike trails like the Greenway lovely to ride on in the winter.</p> <p>That was a lot of rambling. Overall, I like bikes and I bike year round. I just wish there was a better way to share the existing structure. Have a bike lane but also somehow keep the driving lanes and parking. Maybe just have narrower lanes like in Europe? Or have the City annex more of the boulevard so we could widen everything? That seems costly and long-term, but I wanted to spit ball.</p>	4/26/2018 21:54
400	/policies/bicycling/	Bikeways are great, but are not useful during the winter, when they continue to block traffic without use; redundant bikeway (such as 26/28, 1-3 blocks from the greenway) remain unused as commute options. As the working mother of 3 small children, I cannot bring my kids to school or daycare only by biking- I must have a reasonable alternative.	5/3/2018 15:47
401	/policies/bicycling/	Protected bike lanes are a bad idea. I am a biker; I don't like them. Too many bike lanes are inordinately wide.	5/4/2018 11:45
402	/policies/bicycling/	I also recommend that the City improves connections between neighboring suburbs. Nicollet Ave. and Portland Ave. at the Richfield border are good examples where a bike lane just ends and starts again 8 blocks down. It is a frustratingly bad design that suggests that people will just stop biking once they get close to city borders.	5/7/2018 20:43
403	/policies/bicycling/	Bicycling is the most efficient way to move the greatest number of people through our city and it must be a greater focus going forward. Bicycle storage facilities in new housing should be required to be easily accessible from street level (not in the center of an underground car parking garage), and short-term parking near all sorts of business entrances must be increased. The easier bicycling becomes, the greater the mode share we will see.	5/10/2018 17:13
404	/policies/bicycling/	Create more bicycle boulevards and remove as many bike lanes from busy streets as possible. Bicycle boulevards would be designated on residential streets that do not normally have through traffic. Parking could remain on both sides of the street. Bicycles would share space with cars. Through traffic for cars could further be discouraged by reducing speed limit to 20 or 25, mini traffic circles place in intersections, etc. Bike travel could be improved by allowing bicycles to yield at stop signs, rather than stop. Streets could be plowed along with snow emergency routes. With this plan, residents on the street would probably request their street be made into a bicycle boulevard, rather than fight against it!	5/12/2018 3:35
405	/policies/bicycling/	Consider bike lane removal during the winter when there is 1% use. Stop ðŸ™€ if they build it, they will come ðŸ™€ Bike lane policies. Re-examine vehicle traffic impacts and bike lane usage- what is an appropriate impact to remove a bike lane?	5/13/2018 13:51

Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

406	/policies/bicycling/	<p>I'm all for bike lanes. They make it safer for everyone. But putting those lanes on main arteries rather than side streets appears to be counter productive in every way. For starters, there's no way a bus, stuck in the now single lanes of traffic on major arteries, due to the existence of bike lanes, can go fast, even if it's an express bus of some type, as proposed in Policy #20. Not only that, but also in order to let passengers on and off at the curb, buses are forced to either cross the bike lanes or stop in the middle of traffic so passengers can walk across the bike lanes. This creates a danger for both those who bus and those who bike.</p> <p>I propose making the dedicated lanes on major arteries for buses, rather than bikes and building the bike lanes on side streets rather than main arteries whenever possible. A significant case in point is the creation of bike lanes on 26/28th Streets given the well traveled dedicated bike path on the Greenway, a mere block and a half away. When CM Bender justified this decision by stating that the Greenway was "too far away" I was hard pressed to see the logic, given the fact that we're talking about able bodied people who are encouraged to use biking as their major form of transportation and that, certainly for some large portion of the bikers, the Greenway would actually be closer. Furthermore, the resulting congestion on 26th and 28th Streets have caused significant problems for the emergency vehicles that use these straight shot routes to and from the hospital.</p> <p>My proposed change in the plan would have several advantages. First, the bikers could have safer, quieter, less polluted, and more pleasant routes. So they might actually use them. Furthermore, a look at the effect of the current bike lanes is informative. As one who travels many of the corridors that have bike lanes (26/28 Streets, Portland, 36th Street to name a few) I can safely report, as can every other person I have spoken to, that there is rarely a bike in these lanes, even in the warm months of the year. And bikers to whom I've asked the question consistently report that they would prefer to ride their bikes on side streets. Nonetheless, the current plan "starting this summer" is to add two 6 foot bike lanes to Hennepin Avenue and, as I understand it, ultimately to extend these lanes for the length of the avenue. I hear that there is ALSO going to be an experiment to have dedicated bus lanes during rush hour. Great plan, but would you then also have bike lanes that--as in many areas--are blocked in such a way that neither cars nor buses can use them at any time?</p> <p>Second, the buses could actually move faster, again, a major source of concern for those who commented on the site.</p> <p>And third, by giving the cars a space to go, albeit a more limited one than they previously enjoyed, without the buses stopping traffic every few blocks, things will be a bit easier for those who need to use them and pollution from idling might be reduced at least somewhat.</p>	5/13/2018 19:36
407	/policies/bicycling/	<p>Biking is a great idea, but it's not a major mode of transportation for most people. I am retired and in good physical health, but I need my car to get groceries, run errands and get just about anywhere. Biking for me is strictly recreational.</p> <p>The bike lane situation is overkill. The car culture is not going away but is more encouraged by our lifestyles and car technology.</p> <p>I was driving along Blaisdell from downtown yesterday. The street was congested with traffic, there is limited parking, and I saw exactly 2 people using the bike lane.</p> <p>Minneapolis needs to work with the majority. We enjoy getting out to restaurants, shopping, etc. but I won't be biking to go out for dinner. I think this is just another way to chase seniors out of the city.</p>	5/14/2018 12:00
408	/policies/bicycling/	<p>keep up the great work on bike lanes. make sure that construction projects consider bikes and have a safe well signed detour as we do for cars</p>	5/14/2018 23:49

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

409	/policies/bicycling/	<p>Prioritize grade &amp; concrete protected bike lanes that connect to other protected bikeways to complete the build-out of an entire bike network.</p> <p>Eliminate the use of sharrows and bike lanes wedged between parked cars and vehicular traffic lanes.</p> <p>Add Leading Pedestrian/Biking intervals to all major intersections in which bikeways intersect.</p> <p>Convert existing bike lanes (between parked cars and vehicular lanes) to protected/grade separated bike lanes.</p> <p>Pilot district-bike parking solutions in downtown/uptown and at major transit stations.</p>	5/16/2018 18:00
410	/policies/bicycling/	<p>Please consider and budget permanent and protected bicycle lanes. Using curbs, raised paths, planters, etc.</p> <p>The "sticks" and painted lines seems temporary (with some in place for many years) and not committed to the increased biking transportation goal. With the permanent and protected bicycle lanes, people would feel more comfortable biking, increasing ridership throughout the city.</p>	5/19/2018 19:15
411	/policies/bicycling/	Please continue expanding protected bikeways. I truly appreciate the Greenway and the paths around the lakes, but for biking to work, there's still a paucity of protected avenues for regular commuting. I have talked to friends who are uncomfortable biking regularly without protected lanes -- I believe that more protected lanes would make a huge impact in promoting regular biking in Minneapolis; not just for fun on Saturdays.	5/21/2018 2:41
412	/policies/bicycling/	Allow motorized 2 wheel vehicles on bikeways...max speed 15 mph	5/21/2018 16:04
413	/policies/bicycling/	Protected bikeways are key. Either concrete barriers to separate cars from bicycles or elevating the bike lanes to the same level as the pedestrian paths are good options. Barriers between cars and bikes can provide opportunities for adding greenery to the street scapes as well.	5/24/2018 2:30
414	/policies/bicycling/	Bike lanes make the city more accessible and friendlier. I decided to move here for work after visiting and seeing just how easy it was to commute by bike. Great work, keep it up and keep expanding and adding more bikeways!	5/24/2018 2:32
415	/policies/bicycling/	I support continued improvements to bikeways that would make them visible and safer. However, I believe the city has done a lot with adding bike lanes in the past years and should consider it mission accomplished. Therefore, less focus on expansion and more focus on the many other important goals of the city. Also, due to the added bike lanes on 26th and 28th street, I no longer consider visiting uptown businesses from my residence in Longfellow due to the traffic congestion.	5/24/2018 15:49
416	/policies/bicycling/	<p>Increasing numbers of bikes on our roads fosters heated dialogue.</p> <p>I agree with this goal and the action steps; that said, I think you should reframe the argument slightly. Most residents do not ride (much, if at all), so they see this issue as us vs. them - the tortured and shamed majority who are not being consulted about changes to their city streets vs. the entitled few on bikes.</p> <p>I saw a statement on a recently-created webpage (minneapolisforeveryone.org) that read, "In practical terms, the City has been making it harder to drive." This is typical me-centric thinking.</p> <p>I think the best way to achieve your goal is to tell people how their children will benefit. Ask them how they want the city streets to look in 2040, when their children and grandchildren live, work and commute in Minneapolis. Present a chart (if one exists) "a visual" that shows how traffic has increased, and if no changes are made, how it will look in 2040. Same with air quality, etc.</p> <p>Reimagined as, "what do you want for your kids, and how do we get there?" will shift thinking from "me, today" to "grandson, tomorrow." This is also an honest approach, as the plan is long-term!</p> <p>Dave Moore</p>	5/25/2018 19:42

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

417	/policies/bicycling/	These are just general statements and do not create a plan. Where are the actual measures of success? That is, what specific things will you measure and what goals will be set for each one? We are paying for a plan not some pedestrian list wonderful thoughts - get to work and give us a real plan!	5/25/2018 22:45
418	/policies/bicycling/	As someone who gets around mainly by biking and walking, I could not agree more with these policies. I know there is opposition to investing in active transportation, but it's so important. It helps everyone become more active and more connected with their communities. Driving is dangerous and expensive, many folks can't afford to maintain a car. Biking and walking are the great equalizers, and we need to invest in those modes much more than we are now. Combined with the increased density in our city, I see an encouraging future. A future where we all have safe, affordable housing. A future where we can easily get from our home to our workplace and errands without getting in a car. A future where I don't get almost run over or yelled at for biking or walking. A better future.	5/26/2018 0:18
419	/policies/bicycling/	Too many bike lanes with no bicycles. 28th St to Hiawatha. And Blaisdell from Lake to 36th for several years, hardly ever see any bicycles, at most one, over several years. A waste of scarce resources. How about doing need studies before setting up these lanes.	5/26/2018 3:25
420	/policies/bicycling/	As a homeowner, I'm really excited about having more bike lanes! It's such a great way to run errands and commute. It really makes me feel more a part of my community. Having such a great bike system has made it a lot easier for my family to minimize our use of cars. Fewer cars, less traffic makes my family feel safer out in our yard, and more connected to our neighbors. Keep it up!	5/30/2018 15:58
421	/policies/bicycling/	Support existing organization like Cycle for change, Grease Rags who provide Free workshop for community (specially women and trans) to work on their cycles	5/30/2018 18:33
422	/policies/bicycling/	I applaud the cities efforts so far. Going forward I recommend a focus on a smaller amount of more protected bike ways vs lots of unprotected bike lanes with simple sharrows. This will promote use by less experienced riders and families. Think Copenhagen!	6/2/2018 2:44
423	/policies/bicycling/	in my neighborhood there were no measurements taken before putting in bike lanes . any measures after do not tell you about change, just a point in time. the numbers and discussion on this topic are cooked up - fake news. most under utilized infrastructure in town. did number of cars in Minneapolis decrease because of bike lanes? rhetorical. guess were not a numbers based government after all.	6/3/2018 17:16
424	/policies/bicycling/	I do not think the current biking approach is equitable or good. I would like to see us prioritize protected lanes (as in raised to sidewalk height) and going to and from every K-12 school and park. This allows for the framework to really change culture and lifelong transit habits.	6/3/2018 17:55
425	/policies/bicycling/	Biking lanes do not belong on city streets! If bikers want their own lanes their should be bike taxes to pay for the lanes	6/5/2018 0:15
426	/policies/bicycling/	You can paint all the bike lanes you want, you'll only be able to get so many people biking if you don't open up zoning to allow more practical destinations within short, easy biking distance to where people live. That being said, yeah, go ahead with the biking infrastructure, because even if there is a limit to how many new people you'll get on bikes that way, you'll still be able to get more people on bikes. I do have a comments on what kind of infrastructure gets built though. "Parking protected" bike lanes hide cyclists from view of motorists, making intersections dangerous. Cycle tracks that put both directions of bike traffic over on the same side of the street is dangerous, because motorists won't think to look out for cyclists coming from the wrong direction to what they'd expect. Protected bike kanes that have a continuous, unbroken wall of protection, like a curb, or a concrete wall (like the Franklin ave bridge) remove freedom of choice to cycist making a left turn, who'd prefer to make a left merge and then turn left, rather than take more time waiting for two lights to make a box turn. A protection with breaks in it provides that "feel safe" quality, without removing options from more confident cyclists. "Door zone" bike lanes should never even be considered, and existing ones should perhaps even be removed, as biking in the door zone is really unsafe.	6/6/2018 3:09
427	/policies/bicycling/	encourage bikers to bike to the airport! to union depot! to major hubs like that so that it is EASIEST to bike or lightrail there.  protected bikeways are okay but I think park/portland style bikelanes work really well and are much cheaper/easier to plow.	6/6/2018 19:36



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

428	/policies/bicycling/	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Katherine and I've been living and biking in Minneapolis since 2013. Recently I've become a full time bike commuter since we have so many wonderful bike lines and greenways in Minneapolis. However with the advancement of the physical infrastructure, I continue to notice drivers completely oblivious to the threat they pose to bikers and pedestrians alike.</p> <p>Is there a way we can help to shift the driving culture of Minneapolis to be more embracing of this alternative transportation? I know you can find information on how bikes operate on the road if you look for it, but can we make it DEFAULT that drivers learn how to navigate bicycle traffic in Drivers Exams. Even a quick informational pamphlet/ quiz when renewing drivers licences. If knowledge is power, I think an explanation of how we can successfully co habitat is key.</p> <p>How can we expect bicyclists to increase to 15% if the vehicles we share the road with continue to respond aggressively to this alternative transportation?</p> <p>Let's educate our citizens so we can keep leading the nation in bicycling as a progressive alternative transportation method.</p>	6/7/2018 15:47
429	/policies/bicycling/	<p>I am a regular cyclist, but I think you need to better balance the needs of cyclists and other types of transportation. At 62 I imply cannot ride in the winter or for long distances. There is only one bus route through my neighborhood. So a car is still necessary, and will probably be more so as I age (Do any of the policies take seniors into account). It does not make sense to me to take out lanes of heavily traveled roads to create bike lanes, particularly where other bike routes are available (like 28th street, which is 2 blocks from the greenway). It also seems all of the money is going into new bike routes and none toward maintaining existing routes that actually get heavy use.</p>	6/12/2018 16:24
430	/policies/bicycling/	<p>I would really like to see the bicycle trail extended from columbia park at Central avenue, along the tracks all the way to 37th Ave at the border of the city limits included.</p>	6/14/2018 12:47
431	/policies/bicycling/	<p>I feel like I'm getting bicycled right out of my home in Uptown. I love to bike and do so regularly, but I also need to drive for work, school and more and with the changes to 28th and 26th streets and proposals to make Hennepin more narrow, I am incredibly frustrated at how difficult is getting to get in and out of our neighborhood. This should be a place for everyone - not just young people who bus and bike, but families, older people and others who also use personal vehicles for transportation.</p>	6/14/2018 15:45
432	/policies/bicycling/	<p>We need more protected bikeways to encourage less courageous cyclists to use their bicycle as a mode of transportation.</p>	6/14/2018 22:34
433	/policies/bicycling/	<p>Please connect existing bike networks that abruptly start/end at dangerous intersections such as the intersection of Broadway Ave and Johnson Street.</p>	6/15/2018 15:49
434	/policies/bicycling/	<p>The City is going in the right direction with its bike infrastructure plan! The implementation of "emerging best practices" is encouraging. I would like to see more curb- or grade-separated bikeways such as what is found on Washington Ave and what is standard in modern infrastructure-leading Copenhagen.</p>	6/15/2018 19:56
435	/policies/bicycling/	<p>The bike lanes are causing problems with traffic flow through out the city. We don't need a bike lane on every street. Keep in mind - there are a large number of commuters that need to drive in the city to get to work, etc. and that won't change.</p>	6/17/2018 3:53
436	/policies/bicycling/	<p>I think that the choice of routes for some of the bike lanes added has not been well thought out. For example, 28th street. There have been many letters to the editor regarding congestion in that area as a result. Also I don't think that automobile use should be de-emphasized as much as it seems to have been in this plan, but rather, included as necessary for many people as one of the options. Not eliminated as an option.</p>	6/19/2018 10:23
437	/policies/bicycling/	<p>Be sure that when expanding bikeway access - which is important and good - you remember that not all residents are able to bike or use transit, due to age, family size or physical ability. Ensuring equal access to multiple modes (bike, walk, transit and car) will mean people from all backgrounds can use the mode that works for them. For example, a family with small children may need to use a car, a person with a broken arm or leg may need to use a car, an elderly person may need to use a car. Others can access the more environmentally friendly options.</p>	6/19/2018 22:38
438	/policies/bicycling/	<p>19a. Build bicycle highways and make them physically separated and partitioned from car traffic. The rule should be to make the routes 30 minute nodal points if possible, where you can get from one congested hub to another in no more than 30 minutes on a bike. It will connect communities and release cars from some of the burdens of bicycle share stress. It's a real thing. Driving next to bicycles is stressful.</p> <p><a href="https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2016/01/germany-launches-its-national-bike-autobahn-cycle-network/422451/">https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2016/01/germany-launches-its-national-bike-autobahn-cycle-network/422451/</a></p>	6/21/2018 4:06
439	/policies/business-districts-and-corridors/	<p>What about branding and marketing actual neighborhoods too, through funding metal street signs, street banners, public art, signs at major entrance points.</p>	3/28/2018 4:43

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

440	/policies/business-districts-and-corridors/	Please add: reinforce local access to business districts and corridors by integrating them into the bicycle plan and ensuring direct bike and walk access to and through them.	4/2/2018 20:04
441	/policies/business-districts-and-corridors/	Add G: Support Mpls' existing neighborhood organizations and fully fund them, since they have been key partners in this sort of work, including allocating funds to such projects. The city fails to recognize the importance of its neighborhood organizations on many front, such as this one.	5/11/2018 22:31
442	/policies/business-districts-and-corridors/	I do not think Latino and Somali business fronts are ugly or need to be improved by gentrifying white-led facaded businesses. Keep Lake Street vibrant and colorful. That is "midtown," - too late for the other side of 35 and "downtown Longfellow."	5/22/2018 22:23
443	/policies/business-districts-and-corridors/	Can we get a North Minneapolis Greenway Corridor like the Midtown Greenway. It would do much to increase housing, business and small business construction and investment, community building and interaction between more communities across cultural, racial and economic divides.  Produce a video of the history of, development of and the success of the Midtown Greenway and make it accessible to everyone in Minneapolis. Schools, doctors' offices, malls, parks, at the Airport, everywhere.  Encourage farmer's markets in North Minneapolis, Cedar-Riverside, NE Minneapolis and all areas along the new Greenways.	5/29/2018 19:03
444	/policies/business-districts-and-corridors/	How about creating flexibility when it comes to current Available commercial buildings to allow for a different use & To adapt to different demands	6/10/2018 5:00
445	/policies/business-innovation-and-expansion/	Yes AND....let's do this in a focused manner. We don't need tiny businesses like little shops etc. etc. We need to foster small and mid-sized companies that will become our region's future economic engines. We sit on a few tremendous economic clusters in food/ag and medical devices. Let's foster those-If SF is the center of all things technology, why can't we lead the charge nationally in changing our nation's food supply (profitably)? Get entrepreneurs and companies from outside (AHEM THE COASTS) to set up shop here.	5/29/2018 22:49
446	/policies/business-innovation-and-expansion/	EVERYONE knows that Minneapolis does not support small business, let alone small businesses of color. This comp plan does not change this.  At the pending 1400 Nicollet Ave. development alone, we see the city negating everything this policy and it's action steps state. In one development alone, the city is allowing for the displacement of at least 7 businesses all of which employ a large number of people. Of these seven businesses, 4 are POC, 4 are Immigrant owned, one is a Somali daycare servicing numerous families, and one is a 35 year old Minneapolis theater institution. The economic and or cultural significance/viability of these businesses is great and their connection to the community obvious.  The actions of the city in real life completely contradict the words laid out in this developer driven plan.	5/31/2018 19:12
447	/policies/business-innovation-and-expansion/	Connect entrepreneurs, with a focus on LGBTQ youth and trans youth	6/6/2018 3:11
448	/policies/business-innovation-and-expansion/	How about stopping over regulation, where it makes it harder to established business to survive & thrive! And makes it impossible to new business to start.	6/10/2018 4:51
449	/policies/business-innovation-and-expansion/	The line: "Explore zoning modifications that reduce or eliminate barriers to innovative and alternative uses of space, especially for smaller-scale entrepreneurs" concerns me. I am wary of the 2040 plan that seems to want to rezone the whole city for business and multi-family dwellings. Is this the end of peaceful single-family home neighborhoods in our city?	6/15/2018 1:09
450	/policies/climate-resilient-communities/	The City should include electric grid resiliency as a core component of this objective and develop a strategy for encouraging community-scale micro-grids that can provide stable essential islandable power when severe weather disrupts the broader grid.	3/28/2018 4:17
451	/policies/climate-resilient-communities/	rain gardens for pollinators too	4/22/2018 0:01
452	/policies/climate-resilient-communities/	Minneapolis has a winter climate. Why doesn't the City then make sure it is safe, convenient, and desirable to walk in the winter? The sidewalk network remains covered in snow, ice, and water for months out of the year, while every effort is made to clear streets for motorists. There is a huge gap in logic with this Policy.	5/9/2018 16:06
453	/policies/climate-resilient-communities/	provide incentive so that each household has solar panels	5/30/2018 19:17

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

454	/policies/climate-resilient-communities/	Connectivity! Create functional ecological networks that conserve biodiversity and provide for sustainable use of natural resources. Enhance ecological habitat connectivity by creating a network of wildlife corridors, connected natural areas, resilient to environmental challenges. Wildlife need to move. They need to access resources, ensure gene flow, shift their ranges, and establish new territories, among other things. Connected landscapes allow for the movement of plants and wildlife and facilitate ecological processes. As climate change and other stressors act on the landscape, connectivity is critical to allowing wildlife to adapt to changing conditions.	6/5/2018 16:03
455	/policies/climate-resilient-communities/	-move rapidly toward distributed energy generation (rather than large-scale, central power plant model that is currently used by utility companies across the country). These are very vulnerable to disasters of the environmental and political sort.	6/6/2018 20:34
456	/policies/climate-resilient-communities/	-look allow for permanent, secure spaces for community gardening that is not threatened by development or fluctuating taxation status.	6/6/2018 20:35
457	/policies/cluster-strategy/	Businesses need parking spaces - lots of businesses close because loss of customers who can't find anyplace to park - are you going to have park and ride locations for people to take mass transit to restaurants and other shopping areas that are crammed in already in locations with inadequate parking?	4/13/2018 22:42
458	/policies/cluster-strategy/	The City will seek to accomplish the following action steps to promote business clusters using through focusing resources and regulatory policies  Above seems to have a typo, "using through" doesn't make sense	5/18/2018 0:11
459	/policies/cluster-strategy/	YES. and please hire a legit consulting firm for this! McKinsey can help you do this. (I don't work for them btw)	5/29/2018 22:50
460	/policies/cluster-strategy/	Focus one area in Minneapolis for LGBTQ community's need..Like Castro in San Fran, Powderhorn or Loring park could be a area for LGBTQ community	6/6/2018 3:19
461	/policies/cluster-strategy/	The above doesn't make sense to me: "Promote business clusters using through focusing resources and regulatory policies toward developing and retaining businesses in a number of discrete sectors that demonstrate opportunity to advance City goals and enhance the region's economic strength." What is through focusing? I don't understand what the goal is. Please explain.	6/15/2018 1:06
462	/policies/complete-streets/	Could we add something about traffic calming on certain streets? I think complete streets are great, but many street could also be further improved by additional traffic calming measures.	3/23/2018 2:14
463	/policies/complete-streets/	This is a great policy, and I am happy to see the City continuing to work towards equity across all modes of transportation.	3/23/2018 14:38
464	/policies/complete-streets/	Preserving parking should never be a justification for implementing a sub-par (unprotected) bike lane.	3/24/2018 0:41
465	/policies/complete-streets/	great!	3/27/2018 16:33
466	/policies/complete-streets/	Hennepin County and MNDOT control some of the worst streets in the City like Lake, Franklin, Central, Hiawatha Ave. Something more significant needs to happen to force them to make these roadways humane.	3/29/2018 15:31
467	/policies/complete-streets/	Sidewalk snow & ice clearance is a maintenance issue that needs to be called out in this document. Minneapolis is a winter City, but does a terrible job ensuring sidewalks are clear. This winter has been terrible!	3/29/2018 15:39
468	/policies/complete-streets/	Take a poll, few people want to bike to work in the Minnesota winter. The conversion of vehicle lanes to bike lanes has increased congestion and pollution. This makes the environment worse for people walking and slows our bus transit system down. On-street bike lanes are not the solution.	4/7/2018 13:48
469	/policies/complete-streets/	Take a poll, few people want to bike to work in the Minnesota winter. The conversion of vehicle lanes to bike lanes has increased congestion and pollution. This makes the environment worse for people walking and slows our bus transit system down. On-street bike lanes are not the solution.	4/7/2018 13:48
470	/policies/complete-streets/	While walking and biking are nice alternatives, they shouldn't be the priority over the transportation that the vast majority of the city has chosen. We should look for ways to make vehicle transit faster, more efficient and less carbon intensive not make it worse for everyone so that a small handful of people can bike on every street in the city.	4/7/2018 13:57
471	/policies/complete-streets/	Fantastic!	4/8/2018 15:49
472	/policies/complete-streets/	As I've gotten older, I can no longer walk any distance unaided. I have had to cease biking and use my car for shopping, going to meetings or entertainment or dining. But the city has been constantly making it harder to drive on city streets. Now in this policy you flatly come out and admit that this neglect is intentional! Looks like you only want young, non-disabled urban professionals in the city, and expect the rest of us to move out.	4/12/2018 7:27

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

473	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>I love seeing the fact that Minneapolis will be prioritizing street use in this way. Thank you! This example of progressive, forward-thinking is a huge reason why I keep my family in Minneapolis.</p> <p>I live in south Minneapolis and ride my bike year-round for 85% or more of my travels. I can tell you as an absolute fact I have found small businesses that I now support only because I was riding by them on my bike. Riding a bike allows one to explore their surroundings more easily.</p> <p>“Cities get the cyclists they deserve. If you have good infrastructure, you will get good cyclists.”</p> <p>No one ever looked at a city and its traffic / transportation issues and determined that more cars on the streets will solve their problems.</p>	4/13/2018 18:21
474	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>During a Minneapolis Snow Emergency, the first priority is clearing streets to move and store cars. The lowest priority appears to be ensuring that sidewalks, pedestrian ramps, and bus stops are clear of snow. In fact plows make the corners and bus stops worse after they go by creating giant mounds.</p>	4/19/2018 16:04
475	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>I prefer to walk, but most of us need cars. Please do not cut off street parking. When one spouse works in the city and can walk to work, but the other needs to commute a long distance out of town where there is no public transportation it is not practical to not have a car. There is stress in long commutes across town too. A lot of things that used to be a few blocks away or downtown are now located in the suburbs.</p>	4/21/2018 22:40
476	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>I am strongly in favor of this policy!</p>	4/23/2018 18:59
477	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>I love the idea of a Complete Streets policy, but it will need a huge mind-shift to really make this happen. Parks and Public Works prioritize clearing streets for cars, not pedestrians, when the snow falls. Green Line stops are inaccessible from the sidewalks, cars park in the bike lanes. Almost every action belies this heirarchy.</p>	4/24/2018 16:47
478	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>Complete streets need to include things like marked crosswalks. Bumpouts without crosswalks are a waste of money and cement. They may get cars to slow down slightly but they don't tell them that they need to let pedestrians cross the street. This is especially important on busy streets like 38th or Bloomington/Chicago/Nicollet.</p>	4/25/2018 16:21
479	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>Please consider that not everyone feels comfortable biking in the city. Also, as a 62 year old woman with arthritis in my knees, I am just not able to walk or bike all the time (I do try to sometimes, but as I get older, I think that will become less and less possible.) For many elderly residents, a car represents freedom and independence for as long as we can safely drive. Please do not take away our parking places. Also, my experience is that the park and rides have parking that is really far away from where you need to get to get on the train.</p>	4/26/2018 17:22
480	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>if biking and transit are "second," it appears they are listed as equal priorities. However, public transit is clearly not a priority for the city, despite being a more feasible year-round option than biking.</p>	5/3/2018 15:49
481	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>I have spoken with my counsel member, Ms. Palmisano about reducing all city street speed limits.</p> <p>People drive too fast adjacent to where pedestrians and bikers are. If somebody drives 30mph, the chances of them killing somebody much greater than at 20mph. There is no reason somebody needs to drive 30mph on the 5200 block of Girard Ave S., let alone on W. 54th St. or Penn Ave S or Xerxes Ave S even if they are feeder streets.</p> <p>A maximum speed limit of 25mph please, other streets should be 20mph or less.</p> <p>I'd like to live to see another day if an inattentive driver hits me.</p>	5/7/2018 20:49
482	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>I am very proud of the city's Complete Streets policy and am excited to see it implemented. All street projects throughout our city must consider optimal use for future generations. I love the prioritization triangle - and I hope it is upheld in the redesign of Hennepin Ave through South Minneapolis by giving Hennepin 24 hour bus-only lanes and protected bicycle facilities with a strong connection between downtown and uptown.</p>	5/10/2018 17:03
483	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>This is Minnesota. We have a winter. We have newborns and senior citizens, families and disabled people. It is not realistic to think that people are going to walk or bike everywhere.</p> <p>Get real.</p>	5/12/2018 3:12
484	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>"Complete Streets" should NEVER have become city policy. If put to a vote, I'm sure it would never pass.</p>	5/12/2018 3:19

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

485	/policies/complete-streets/	As someone approaching being a Senior, I find this policy discriminatory. Living in Southwest Minneapolis, WALKING to downtown is not an option. Walking virtually ANYWHERE isn't possible for half the year. Bicycling? Absurd. How are 60 year olds supposed to bicycle downtown or to Uptown or ANYWHERE in the winter? And we have NO REAL MASS TRANSIT. To go to anywhere to appreciate what Minneapolis has to offer, there is no way to do that without a car. Oh, you can take the bus downtown to dinner and a show but by the time it's over, it would take 1-2 transfers and 1-2 hours (minimum) to get back home. This whole policy should be geared to ALL residents, not the younger, urban professionals willing to live in box-like apartments around town. This policy CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES contempt for people who have lived their lives in the city.	5/12/2018 16:11
486	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>CM Lisa Bender has explicitly stated that the goal is to make the congestion so bad that people will finally give up and stop driving. Another theory is that by building density next to public transit, more people will start using it. The Council is certainly reaching its goal of creating enormous unpleasant and unhealthy congestion. Whether a significant number of people will be able to now start walking, biking or busing instead remains to be seen. A University of Minnesota study that found that making even dramatic changes in land use, such as density actually doesn't affect peoples' transit decisions <a href="http://www.cts.umn.edu/Publications/ResearchReports/reportdetail.html?id=627">http://www.cts.umn.edu/Publications/ResearchReports/reportdetail.html?id=627</a>. So, as laudable as the attempt might be, I'm afraid that cars are far from going the way of the Dodo Bird in a 3000 square mile metro area, where people often commute a long way to work, where the weather is extremely cold and icy several months of the year, where we have disabled and elderly who can't use other forms of transportation effectively, where young families may have to transport kids to daycare and schools that are not conveniently located next to either work or home. A more practical goal than that of eliminating cars would be to encourage the development and widespread use of electric cars and to bring back the car- sharing program that we briefly enjoyed in the city.</p> <p>It's worth noting, with not a little bit of irony, that CM Bender recently confessed that, now that she has the job of City Council President, she had to reluctantly buy a car because she needs to travel around for her job! One might ask why her situation is suddenly important enough to warrant the need for a car while so many others' transportation needs are scorned and dismissed by her and her supporters.</p>	5/13/2018 18:53
487	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>What, exactly, is the goal here? To make functional, environmentally friendly forms of transportation available to the greatest number of people or to make a politically charged, ideologically-based decision that satisfies a small section of the population while (seemingly purposefully) causing the majority to suffer unnecessary consequences? There are ways to accommodate all of these forms of transportation without pitting bikers and walkers against those who must take their cars and those who use mass transit.</p> <p>CM Lisa Bender has explicitly stated that the goal is to make the congestion so bad that people will finally give up and stop driving. Another theory is that by building density next to public transit, more people will start using it. The Council is certainly reaching its goal of creating enormous unpleasant and unhealthy congestion. Whether a significant number of people will be able to now start walking, biking or busing instead remains to be seen. A University of Minnesota study that found that making even dramatic changes in land use, such as density actually doesn't affect peoples' transit decisions <a href="http://www.cts.umn.edu/Publications/ResearchReports/reportdetail.html?id=627">http://www.cts.umn.edu/Publications/ResearchReports/reportdetail.html?id=627</a>. So, as laudable as the attempt might be, I'm afraid that cars are far from going the way of the Dodo Bird in a 3000 square mile metro area, where people often commute a long way to work, where the weather is extremely cold and icy several months of the year, where we have disabled and elderly who can't use other forms of transportation effectively, where young families may have to transport kids to daycare and schools that are not conveniently located next to either work or home. A more practical goal than that of eliminating cars would be to encourage the development and widespread use of electric cars and to bring back the car- sharing program that we briefly enjoyed in the city.</p> <p>It's worth noting, with not a little bit of irony, that CM Bender recently confessed that, now that she has the job of City Council President, she had to reluctantly buy a car because she needs to travel around for her job! One might ask why her situation is suddenly important enough to warrant the need for a car while so many others' transportation needs are scorned and dismissed by her and her supporters.</p>	5/13/2018 19:28

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

488	/policies/complete-streets/	The city needs to guard against becoming "family unfriendly" by over-emphasizing transportation (and zoning/land use) policies that are disproportionately based on accommodating the desires of some outspoken healthy younger people--e.gs. bicycle riders, those realistically able to conveniently access and rely on mass transit for all their transportation needs, et al--at the expense of the needs of families with children with far-flung activities, seniors, those with health-related mobility limitations and others who, realistically, will be highly dependent on private cars for the foreseeable future. Among other things, this means requirements for adequate off-street parking for all new buildings--and multiple occupancies--should be retained, particularly in view of the amount of snow and the 5-month duration of winter here, something inescapably without parallel in Seattle, Portland or Denver. Policies to encourage greater use of mass transit and other car alternatives--particularly while the current very limited mass transit system is improved and expanded-- should be based solely on the "carrot" of low-pricing, convenient schedules, attractive facilities, etc., rather than the "stick" of increasing the inconvenience of those reliant on cars.	5/14/2018 1:01
489	/policies/complete-streets/	IS it possible to identify where a complete streets policy is already in effect. While I understand what is being said, I am having a difficult time visualizing it.	5/14/2018 2:05
490	/policies/complete-streets/	I would like the city to have a non-partisan traffic engineer to oversee, plan and then communicate why to the public. This ensures transparency and choice made that are sustainable and hopefully address everyone. Currently it doesn't seem or feel that way	5/15/2018 11:58
491	/policies/complete-streets/	Paving the potholes would be a good start.	5/18/2018 18:42
492	/policies/complete-streets/	The Complete Streets policy is great. If it is to be taken seriously, the city should plan to vastly improve walkability of sidewalks during the winter. I support exploring whether the city can take responsibility for clearing snow from sidewalks in the winter. I would happily pay more taxes/an assessment for this, and it may be the only way to truly make good on the Complete Streets plan.	5/21/2018 2:31
493	/policies/complete-streets/	A thousand times yes.	5/23/2018 22:19
494	/policies/complete-streets/	Please more clearly explain what this means: "Develop strong curbside management policies to take full advantage of a dynamic urban environment." Sounds like an internal memo explaining Applebee's To Go parking.	5/23/2018 22:21
495	/policies/complete-streets/	Complete Streets is a great policy! Keep working to build streets that prioritize people over cars.	5/24/2018 2:22
496	/policies/complete-streets/	This is insane. It's cold in winter and we can't be out very much. Did you forget about that?	5/26/2018 3:30
497	/policies/complete-streets/	The priority accorded to bicycle transportation is foolish and short-sighted. As a walking commuter, coming from Southeast Minneapolis across the 3rd Avenue bridge to downtown, I can attest that there are very few bicyclists using the bike lanes in clement weather and none in the snow months. The doctrinaire notion that bike lanes are good and necessary is simply ill-suited to Minneapolis.	5/29/2018 19:57
498	/policies/complete-streets/	please have a non partisan traffic engineer review these plan and advise. make the recommendations public. We also need to have a clear timeline for evaluating success and failure and how to change course if things are having unintended effects. As in we cannot get around of the city- we have made things worse.	6/3/2018 17:52
499	/policies/complete-streets/	I am in total support of prioritizing pedestrians first, and cars last. If you are serious about this, than slowing down cars should be a priority. Traffic calming measures such as narrow lanes, curb extensions, (single lane) roundabouts, chicanes, and street trees should all become commonplace. This goes hand-in-hand with complete neighborhoods, and having local inner-neighborhood businesses, and enough density to support those businesses. One reason people feel the need to go so fast in their cars, is because they have such a long distance to travel from where they live to get anywhere useful.	6/6/2018 2:42
500	/policies/complete-streets/	permeable sidewalk for rainwater management and it is easier on joints for people who walk/bus a lot.  yes! I love the order walking/rolling, then biking, then bussing, then cars.	6/6/2018 19:31
501	/policies/complete-streets/	No mention of parking.	6/7/2018 16:17

Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

502	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li><li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li><li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li></ol> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	6/7/2018 20:45
-----	-----------------------------	---	----------------

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

503	/policies/complete-streets/	<p>I believe it is important to keep in mind walking, biking and transit during this planning phase but let's be realistic here - streets are designed and built for the purpose of automobile usage. I love to bike, and do so whenever it is possible. I also would take public transportation more often if it was efficient, but I live in Minneapolis and work east of St. Paul so there really isn't a possibility to either bike or ride public transit to work. I am not alone based on how many people there are on the on-ramp every day. Additionally, we need to keep in mind that we live in Minnesota and it gets brutally cold out for multiple months. Riding a bike just isn't practical for most. Nor is sitting out on a bench waiting for a bus. Let's not go crazy with our desire to make everything bike-friendly at the expense of being able to quickly get through town. A perfect example is what has been done on 26th and 28th avenues. I believe these streets were designed to: first, funnel drivers onto certain main streets and get them off neighborhood streets, second, enable drivers to quickly and efficiently get from point a to point b, and third, provide a corridor for emergency vehicles to quickly get where they need to go. With the recent change, all of these things are now gone. Additionally, the very few bikers that take advantage of these streets are now less safe than if they were to ride on the greenway - which is right there! Example, if I am traveling in a car eastbound on 28th street and approach Lyndale Avenue and need to turn right there is a turn-lane for the car that crosses over the bike lane (danger #1). Most drivers will look left to see if there are cars going south on Lyndale and if there is space they will turn right on red (legally). If a bike approaches behind the car and slides in on the right side (which I have repeatedly seen happen) and out of the drivers vision it will only be a matter of time before a biker is hit by a right-turning vehicle (danger #2). The greenway is a car-free zone and very safe because of that. We should be encouraging bikers to use that rather than mingle in with cars on busy streets.</p> <p>I have heard there is a plan to make Hennepin into a two lane road while replacing a lane and parking with a bike lane and rapid transit. I could not be more opposed to this idea. First, it will severely impact businesses on the street in a negative way. They rely on their customers being able to park in front, and removing parking will drive down business. Second, with the increased density into Uptown, more and more cars need to come in and out of this area, whether we want this or not. Creating a bottle-neck on one of the busiest roads will only drive cars onto the neighborhood streets, resulting in less-safe neighborhoods (and driving down property values and tax revenue). Despite some people's best efforts to force cars off the road, many people NEED to drive. Making it harder for them will only have negative impacts. The freeways were created years ago to help people get from one point to another efficiently. This same thought needs to be kept in mind regarding city streets. We need ways to efficiently move through the city, don't take away streets that were designed specifically for that purpose.</p>	6/13/2018 15:30
504	/policies/complete-streets/	I am very happy to see that bicycles are a priority to the city.	6/15/2018 1:20
505	/policies/complete-streets/	It's wrong to squeeze out cars. Parking is still needed and will still be needed. People over 56 start to feel muscles aging and riding a bike becomes more difficult. Hey a healthy minded 70 year old is NOT able to ride a bike 10 miles in the city. Our bus system doesn't serve Northeast and North the way it works in South Minneapolis. Long walks to catch a bus and irregular service! Baby boomers still live and will need to use their cars to get around.	6/15/2018 21:56
506	/policies/complete-streets/	Please consider dropping the word "walking", which people in wheelchairs cannot do. The word pedestrian is inclusive and does not discriminate.	6/18/2018 21:07
507	/policies/complete-streets/	I am against this policy as stated. In this time of equity, this policy is inequitable. The vast majority of transportation is by motor vehicle. Rewrite the policy to take into account ALL modes of transportation equally rather than allowing the minority to dictate how the majority live. This simply causes more congestion and frustration for the majority. Put bike paths on secondary roads, not primary, with a change of signing to make them a thruway. Give back the lanes removed on main roads to the vehicles to alleviate the congestion caused. The walkers already have sidewalks and walking paths so they are unaffected.	6/20/2018 18:02
508	/policies/complete-streets/	By prioritizing walkers have you analyzed the impact on commuter traffic, particularly with regard to extra carbon emissions from standing traffic? Will this be a result? I am in favor of a plan that recognizes just how weak your public transit is and doesn't attempt to use its weakness as its advantage by touting room for growth. If you want public transit build it! You can't regulate your way to clean travel. cj	6/21/2018 3:52
509	/policies/complete-streets/	Pertaining to Action Step H: Encourage double-parking, especially in areas with (Parking) Protected bike lanes. Abolish the notion that idling cars (delivery drivers) need to be parked at the curb.	6/22/2018 18:27
510	/policies/comprehensive-investments/	Great!	3/27/2018 20:33
511	/policies/comprehensive-investments/	The voice of residents needs to drive this comprehensive approach. Enlist neighborhood organizations to poll residents and generate a specific set of goals and actions that they see will benefit them.	5/13/2018 0:20



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

512	/policies/comprehensive-investments/	The city's dollars can only go so far, and we need to pressure Hennepin County to put in their fair share towards alleviating this housing crisis.	6/8/2018 14:05
513	/policies/contaminated-sites/	Great. Also, make sure that industrial polluters continue to pay the full costs of the negative impacts they create to enable effective remediation of these sites.	3/27/2018 21:08
514	/policies/contaminated-sites/	Sites should be identified and remediated immediately with no need to wait for a development opportunity	5/14/2018 13:33
515	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	Focus on North Minneapolis. You have a large swath of the city with many vacant lots, empty homes - fill them! City seems so focused on pushing high density into stable parts of the city instead of fixing the unstable parts of the city.	4/19/2018 18:11
516	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	f? Ask neighborhoods before you decide to destroy them. Better to transform an unused or decrepit problem area into an amenity for the community. A full service grocery? A cultural museum? A nature preserve with an educational element? Library? CoOp? A public magnet school? Try a better bus root before tearing down housing. Give amenities the Community would like an incentive.	4/21/2018 23:13
517	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	This is a bunch of Planning jargon that means little. Not clear what this means.	5/9/2018 15:29
518	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	Include community residents in any planning and development strategy by generating a community benefits agreement.	5/13/2018 0:06
519	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	The city needs to guard against becoming "family unfriendly" by over-emphasizing transportation (and zoning/land use) policies that are disproportionately based on accommodating the desires of some outspoken healthy younger people--e.gs. bicycle riders, those realistically able to conveniently access and rely on mass transit for all their transportation needs, et al--at the expense of the needs of families with children with far-flung activities, seniors, those with health-related mobility limitations and others who, realistically, will be highly dependent on private cars for the foreseeable future. Among other things, this means requirements for adequate off-street parking for all new buildings--and multiple occupancies--should be retained, particularly in view of the amount of snow and the 5-month duration of winter here, something inescapably without parallel in Seattle, Portland or Denver. Policies to encourage greater use of mass transit and other car alternatives--particularly while the current very limited mass transit system is improved and expanded-- should be based solely on the "carrot" of low-pricing, convenient schedules, attractive facilities, etc., rather than the "stick" of increasing the inconvenience of those reliant on cars.	5/14/2018 1:04
520	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	Listen to the citizenry!  Time after time, neighborhood councils will oppose a given development or request a change to more appropriate scale.  Rubber stamp from the city planning commission! Every time!  Where's our democracy?	5/15/2018 19:18
521	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	Youâ€™ve been throwing money at these areas for decades. Is this something new? Continue to help revitalize north. But donâ€™t destroy the neighborhoods that donâ€™t need revitalization by putting up a bunch of government housing.	5/26/2018 3:38
522	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	Mpls is not a bubble, existing without influence from suburbs. Ensure builders are either mpls incorporated and/or hire a majority of mpls residents - these policies are a windfall for builders and they take their earnings back out to the suburbs or rural.	5/30/2018 13:55
523	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	We need a LGBTQ center and we need a center for trans people.	6/5/2018 21:36
524	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	I dont understand what the term "coordinated district wide development plans" exactly means. Could you dumb down the language?	6/6/2018 2:13

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

525	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li> <li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li> <li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li> </ol> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	6/7/2018 20:49
526	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	If the city levied a 2% construction excise tax on all development permits (exempting non-profits, public investment, schools/universities, churches, etc.), we could collect \$20 million a year in funding to invest in affordable housing.	6/8/2018 14:06
527	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	This feels like it is paternalistic, a top-down, city-driven process to reinvest in communities that have historically been harmed by those kinds of planning processes. Whether that is the intent is irrelevant; how can this be rearticulated to clarify that it's a community-driven partnership with the City to chart those historically disinvested neighborhoods' futures?	6/14/2018 19:30
528	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	we live in powderhorn, certainly one of the areas you talk about. please make sure you consider resident input, and hold meetings that are well-publicized. when we moved into our home, i called the planning department to find what was planned for our area. they sent me to a guy who never got back to me, and in this market, there was no time to make a trip downtown to city hall. please provide info about development plans, including zoning, online!	6/14/2018 21:13
529	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	This is a vague description to me. It is unclear what "district-wide development plan" is. Is this another point in 2040 to say that there should be a city wide re-zoning? If so, why? Why the rush to push out single family home neighborhoods that are within walking distance of apartments, multi-plexes, and businesses? Why does EVERY neighborhood have to be zoned for business and multi-family structures?!!!!!!	6/15/2018 1:19

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

530	/policies/coordinated-development-strategy/	You're missing the workforce in this coordination, which includes labor and education. Between today and 2040, an entire generation of workers will have passed into retirement and those who are yet to be born will be just entering that workforce. Those two decades of opportunity will be lost if there is no coordination. It would be truly disastrous if the workforce created does not complement the needs of the labor market. A vision ~ beyond 20th century impulses to aim low with manufacturing and production to bridge the gap between races and economic strata ~ is required that inspires people with a 2040 that has prosperity and a quality of life that everyone enjoys. Not simply something "affordable"...	6/21/2018 20:30
531	/policies/creative-sector-economy/	Need more affordable creation/work space for artists in all neighborhoods - not just NE (which is not all that affordable). All neighborhoods benefit from having artists live and do their creating in the same place. Need more art places in all neighborhoods - farther from downtown, the less arts-related spaces and businesses. Build up arts corridors such as Broadway and Chicago Avenues. In short, more ARTS in Minneapolis.	4/12/2018 23:14
532	/policies/creative-sector-economy/	It is not the city's job to make sure that a set quota of non-whites become creative people. Enough with race being mentioned in every policy that spews from the council's mouth.	5/4/2018 12:05
533	/policies/creative-sector-economy/	Help Maintain affordable studio arts space by creating a Land Trust (low property tax advantage) for arts buildings.	5/8/2018 20:20
534	/policies/creative-sector-economy/	More money, contracts and money for Pillsbury House, Juxta, etc. to train artists to become part of the creative economy. More maker spaces in south, southeast and north.	5/22/2018 22:19
535	/policies/creative-sector-economy/	This is already happening. You do not need another policy for this.	5/26/2018 3:45
536	/policies/creative-sector-economy/	Yes, I like these goals. Someone needs to make the connections to the philanthropic community. The built environment needs to be planned with the real estate sector.	6/15/2018 22:15
537	/policies/creative-sector-economy/	Performance houses and restaurants and bars that offer live music need to be named. Our part time/on-the-side gigging community makes up a great deal of our amazing city. Having incentives for businesses to have stages, book performances, and share the arts is vital. It can't just be about the business owner being an artist or creative, it has to be about encouraging and supporting the owner in bringing in the arts as well.	6/20/2018 23:28
538	/policies/creative-workers/	h. We can ALL benefit from more diverse teachers and master crafters of all kinds. However it is important to integrate such programs. How can anyone thrive in a multicultural society if they only know people just like them? We all need to learn about all cultures to foster understanding.	4/21/2018 23:31
539	/policies/creative-workers/	Fund young POC and native artists. Not crusty old hippy white artists past their prime.	5/22/2018 22:20
540	/policies/creative-workers/	The City of Minneapolis should discourage the use of affordable housing funding to subsidize artist housing. If the City decides that artist housing is an important public goal, then it should establish a separate fund, rather than directing money from housing that would otherwise be more likely to serve people of color, families, and those living in poverty.	5/24/2018 17:04
541	/policies/creative-workers/	Mpls needs to address affordable art studio space. Once the artists move in an area it becomes attractive to development and building owners are driven to converting affordable art space to profit. The city could help the owners by providing property tax breaks, low cost redevelopment loans / grants, forgoing permit fees, etc.	6/14/2018 18:09
542	/policies/creative-workers/	Provide support/guidance/funding for apprenticeship programs for all people. Jewelry, painting, sculpture, fiber, metalsmithing, glasswork, all of these need assistants, but artists find it hard to pay them. A great way to learn trades/crafts and build a resume in the arts and crafts!	6/15/2018 12:21
543	/policies/creative-workers/	I like all of these action steps. We need to provide a paycheck for artists doing this work. Too much of it is now volunteer.	6/15/2018 22:20
544	/policies/data-driven-decisions/	Data should be used to support decisions across the city to a much greater extent. City leaders should be making decisions that help the many over the few. Some decisions like adding bike lanes to downtown streets clearly lacked any kind of analysis to estimate things like cost per biker of establishing and maintaining those lanes or the impact on downtown traffic or pollution.	4/7/2018 14:30
545	/policies/data-driven-decisions/	I support this policy and action items. The discourse and policy proposals around housing are very often driven by how they make us feel, not how much positive impact they are likely to have. Inclusionary Zoning makes activists and electeds feel better, but has proven to ultimately slow the pace of new housing construction. Insisting on Mixed income projects (50/50) would be logical if the city had a monopoly on buildable lots, but in reality Minneapolis is competing with other, more wealthy cities for projects, especially outside of downtown. Whether it makes us feel good or not, affordable developers know affordable housing (and the 17 funding sources required) and market rate developers know market rate, so forcing one to do the other plays to their weaknesses, is inefficient and not necessarily best for the end user. Lots of people are being shut out of good housing choices, not just poor people, and we need to build all types of housing as fast as we can.	4/24/2018 19:22

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

546	/policies/data-driven-decisions/	How about you use the DATA that this document sights several times that the majority of residents are using cars for transport. Let that sink in. If that's the DATA why are you not looking for ways to better accommodate cars? By 2040 driver less vehicles and lower polluting cars will be the norm. But all resolutions are to increase biking and trains. We need streets for Cars and Buses. You Can't socially engineer transport. Use data and recognize that automobile transport is the Norm and Majority. Now channel efforts and monies to the norm and majority.	6/3/2018 18:49
547	/policies/data-driven-decisions/	Reach out to trans community while doing data analysis and housing research	6/6/2018 3:07
548	/policies/data-driven-decisions/	Thank you for using a smart, data-driven approach to this. It's the only way it can be done effectively.	6/22/2018 17:59
549	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	This is a great plan, especially like the minimum density requirements.	3/22/2018 22:30
550	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Hiawatha Ave is an awful highway and needs to be severely calmed to make the Blue line through south Minneapolis a walkable and pleasant place. Transit "plazas" are awful, dead places that should be discouraged.	3/23/2018 0:00
551	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Consider parking maximums near light rail stations.	3/26/2018 23:31
552	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Hiawatha Avenue is a highway that cuts off my neighborhood adjacent to many LRT stations. No vision to break it up and turn that car sewer into a real street? It's scary and uncomfortable to cross.	4/2/2018 1:13
553	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Something feels a little wrong when development is prioritized near BRT stations. This also means you are prioritizing development near freeways, which cut through the city and tear areas of the city apart. Usually historically undesirable places to live. More needs to be done to connect different sides of the freeways apart if development is going to prioritized there.	4/5/2018 14:20
554	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	This is a great policy. Additional density makes sense near transit stations, where it is less likely to have a negative impact on traffic congestion and were new, walkable neighborhoods can be created. This is a much better plan than trying to add density throughout the city by changing zoning restrictions.	4/7/2018 13:38
555	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Minimum land use requirements is key along with the focus on walkability/biking over car use.	4/8/2018 22:21
556	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	(sorry just testing: my Dad is having trouble commenting and I'm trying to reproduce his problem.)	4/24/2018 21:49
557	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	The existing Blue Line is adjacent to an awful, divided highway- Hiawatha Avenue. It is designed solely to move lots of cars at high speeds and needs to be completely rebuilt to make stations comfortable for human beings. The Blue Line extension continues this awful situation by locating LRT down the middle of Olson Highway. There is a complete disconnect from this policy and reality on the ground.	4/26/2018 15:28
558	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	The proposed Blue and Green Line extensions literally run through parkland serving few Minneapolis citizens on their way to un-walkable places in the suburbs. Perhaps, we should locate Metro lines where people already live rather than places they might go to in the future?	4/26/2018 15:33
559	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	This is great. We should promote the most dense development next to our greatest transit investments. We should also restrict parking by limiting the number of spaces allowed so that our transit stations are welcoming to people more than to cars.	5/1/2018 19:52
560	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Please don't ruin our beautiful city this way. This is so short sighted. Our lakes and parks will not be able to sustain the pollution and water use that these buildings will produce. We already have issues with a building polluting the Isles canal. This makes me want to run back to the suburbs.	5/9/2018 13:38
561	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	There are no "strengths" to having Blue Line stations next to Hiawatha Avenue. Traffic moves fast creating a noisy and polluted environment, as well as makes it unsafe and undesirable to cross the highway. Add an Action Step where the City will look into de-commissioning Hiawatha as a highway making it a place for people. Plus, Hiawatha doesn't even function well for motorists because of all the traffic lights.	5/9/2018 16:15
562	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Why was this picture of the massive development concept near Lake and Excelsior not shown at any of the Open Houses?!? Plenty of pictures of buses and bikes and trees, but the only picture of this towering monstrosity is a tiny thumbnail on Policy 80 on the website.  Why are the city planners hiding this from the public??  This whole process seems to be full of subterfuge. Why?  Why not allow a true open debate?  What are you afraid of?	5/15/2018 18:22

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

563	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	The whole concept of concrete towers over our beautiful lakes has not been publicized.	
		Please allow and extension of the deadline before you scar the landscape over our parks.	5/15/2018 18:25
564	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	The goal of the 2040 zoning plans for the area north of Bde Maka Ska -- "to encourage a dense mix of housing, employment and commercial goods and services" - is unrealistic and irresponsible. The inevitable increased traffic, congestion, overcrowding and unsightliness of numerous large buildings near a relatively small lake - in an area that is ALREADY plagued by traffic and congestion - would be a nightmare for current residents as well as visitors alike. Why would anyone on a "planning" commission take a jewel like the recently renamed Bde Maka Ska, honoring its Native American history, and turn it into an overbuilt, congested area of urban blight?	5/15/2018 19:11
565	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	OMG!  This area is already gridlock. Thousands of new apartments, thousands of more cars. This plan is supposed to help global warming?	5/15/2018 19:16
566	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I just saw the plans for the SW LRT rail station development over Bde Maka Ska. I am appalled. Imagine how the Dakota descendants must feel with their Lake desecrated by massive development along the shoreline and sightlines of their sacred lake.	5/16/2018 18:47
567	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	The picture above saddens me.	5/16/2018 21:09
568	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	The prohibition of park and ride stations seems unrealistic to the goal of having more blue and green line use. There are many people who wouldn't or don't take the bus but would drive (ex east/West to a blue line stop) and take the train dt or elsewhere. I understand the premise behind the ban, but I believe it's counter productive. Plus an option for park and ride would help eliminate the neighbors near stations having cars parked on their street.	5/17/2018 1:23
569	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I live in the SW Mpls and like to bike to work at North Memorial. But I'm getting older (54 now) and can't bike unless the weather is good. Looking at this picture, I can't imagine trying to drive through all this planned density as shown in the picture. This already one of the busiest intersections in the city with gridlock every rush hour. What is going to happen when you add all of these apartments? These people will still have cars. Not every destination is on the light rail. Not everyone can bike or walk. I think your plan is naive and will have the unintended consequence of extreme gridlock, worse quality of life and increased global warming.	5/17/2018 14:58
570	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	We don't need a second downtown smack in the middle of our lakes!	5/17/2018 15:53
571	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I don't like the plan in the picture above. It feels oppressive to me.	5/17/2018 16:16
572	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Why even bother with wakes if we are going to surround them with skyscrapers? Just pave them over and build fouxplexes. That will solve our housing shortage. Cheaper too, since no one will want to live in Minneapolis again.	5/18/2018 18:19
573	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	What are you thinking!?!  Stop the development madness!  No second downtown in the middle of our lakes!	5/18/2018 21:34
574	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Buildings look waaaaaayyyy too tall	5/20/2018 2:45
575	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Huh?!? Are you trying to destroy our lakes?	5/20/2018 2:46
576	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Why wasn't this picture shown at the open house? Why no open house in SW Mpls? Wouldn't you agree that the whole 2040 process is invalid?	5/20/2018 4:11
577	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	too much housing in an area that is already over populated.	5/20/2018 7:29
578	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	The SW LRT area is already plenty dense and is always full of traffic. Why not limit development to 6 stories and save the views from our lakes?	5/20/2018 12:03
579	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Too much development in any already packed space seems pretty dense already.	5/20/2018 13:53
580	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I live a few blocks from the 38th Street Blue Line station, and I strongly support constructing dense commercial and residential development in this area. The industrial-ish uses there are an unfortunate waste of this valuable transit corridor.	5/21/2018 0:59

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

581	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I'm terribly saddened by this plan. The chain of lakes are becoming more and more important to the health of the people of Minneapolis as urban density increases and multifamily housing becomes the standard. The chain of lakes should be preserved as an oasis of calm where people can reconnect with nature -- this is essential to our health and well being. The lakes should not become a high rise haven...this will increase the traffic substantially and also decrease the feeling of calm that people need to counter urban living. Consider how to keep lakes accessible and relaxed. Not Miami.	5/21/2018 1:49
582	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	What happened to the Shoreland overlay district building restrictions?? This image shows plenty of buildings in violation of the height restrictions!!	5/21/2018 2:19
583	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Stop. Listen to your citizens. Not developers. Not city planners who have an agenda.  Eventually you will have to listen to the voters.	5/21/2018 3:36
584	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I am afraid that you are wrecking what is good about this city. We don't need a second downtown. Especially not in the middle of the lakes.	5/21/2018 3:37
585	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	While presented as a favorable asset to our neighborhoods, this plan would actually do the complete opposite. We are not Chicago, Seattle, New York City etc., not should we be. Don't allow plans that make an already crunched parking area worse, take away tree cover (which is an unique asset that Minneapolis has compared to other similar cities) and destroy the character of the very asset of the lakes that you claim to be utilizing. Plans like this will be devastating to what makes the area great!	5/21/2018 4:38
586	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	What in the world are you people thinking about putting so many high rises in and around the lakes? I thought the shoreland ordinance prohibited this? On top of that, you think this will decrease traffic?? Are you kidding me? One can bare navigate around uptown now as it is... If this passes - the view will be gone, who knows what the untended consequences will be to the lakes , the surrounding area and wildlife. These lakes are some of Minneapolis's precious assets. Enough is enough. Please abide by the shoreland ordinance and kill this development - I'd like my kids to be able to enjoy the beauty that is, not the beauty that won't be.	5/21/2018 15:06
587	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Walk-able, bike-friendly neighborhoods connected by transit is exactly the kind of development I would like to see over the next 20 years. I do think that Minneapolis needs continue to work to improve that transit system all across the city to make this kind of development possible in many areas.	5/22/2018 18:01
588	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Are you kidding..how outrageous to build all this. Cement city..shit..ill be at meeting to oppose this crazy plan 2040	5/23/2018 1:31
589	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Traffic is horrible without all these additional buildings.The chain of lakes is popular because it is the way it is.Why ruin an asset for all of us.This isn't Lake Michigan!The only people that profit are the developers and the people in their pocket.SWLR route is a bad and expensive money pit.	5/23/2018 15:47
590	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	It seems there should be an action step about public safety/social wellbeing since these areas will have increased activity, population, etc.	5/24/2018 15:27
591	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Housing near light rail is probably the most environmentally efficient location for housing in the entire state. The draft policy is great - we should discourage auto uses and permit significant density near all light rail stations.	5/24/2018 17:07
592	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Please, please, please, please, don't screw up our lakes.	5/25/2018 22:49
593	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Saws this plan on TV news, Kare 11 it think. Hate it!!!!	5/25/2018 22:50
594	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I saw Kare 11 news last night. What an eye opener!! Why didn't we see this earlier.  Horrible. What are you people thinking! Please don't wreck the best part of the city. Use some common sense.	5/25/2018 23:45
595	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Regarding the tall concrete jungle at Lake and Excelsior:  No.  Just No.	5/25/2018 23:45
596	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I think this is a good plan for developing and managing density. I particularly like the Wall ability and bike focuses.	5/26/2018 13:52
597	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	This is the right thing to do. Add density near transit stations, support modes of transportation other than car, and increase the stock of housing to drive down costs.	5/28/2018 14:54
598	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	We need a big focus on affordable housing near lightrail and rapid bus stations	5/30/2018 17:19

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

599	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	As a resident of 3200 West Calhoun Pkwy, I am VERY concerned about the congestion that will result from increasing the high rises planned for the areas surrounding the proposed metro stop. Lake Street is a major east- west through fare. Traffic is heavy at all times of the day but especially during rush hour. Pedestrians trying to cross Lake at Market Plaza face fast moving and turning cars. Adding high rise apartments will make things even worse. People living there will have cars and not all will be able to use light rail transit. I urge you to consider the impact on traffic and pedestrian walk ability.	5/31/2018 0:04
600	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Regarding the tall concrete jungle at Lake and Excelsior:  No.  Just No.	5/31/2018 2:29
601	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I look at this picture and just cry. Save our lakes!!	5/31/2018 2:30
602	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	No concrete jungles near our best natural resources! Stop going after bigger tax base at the expense of the citizenry!	5/31/2018 2:31
603	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Iâ€™m extremely disappointed to see plans for such a high density area near the lakes. This is the last thing this area needs. It cannot absorb any more traffic and the lakes should be an area of peace and nature, not ridiculous high rise buildings. It is already unsafe to walk in this area due to the number of cars speeding through with no regards for pedestrians. This plan needs to be changed for the sake of all Minneapolis residents.	5/31/2018 2:57
604	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I donâ€™t like the buildings on the photograph near the lakes	5/31/2018 12:13
605	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	The city has failed to rezone the Blue and Green Line extension areas and we have been forced to approve storage facilities that don't support the transit investment because the land is zoned Industrial. This must stop. Land around all future and current METRO LRT stations needs to be guided for 10 + stories. The current Build Form Map does NOT represent this, esp. west of Hiawatha Ave at the current Blue Line stations. We must take advantage of the large public investment in LRT, - Kronzer	6/2/2018 17:03
606	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	We live in this area right by Cedar Lake. I do not support this plan AT ALL. It does nothing to respect the current residents who live here specifically because it IS a walkable, drivable (yes, we do own cars because we cannot walk or bike everywhere in Minneapolis towing our kids with us to soccer practices scattered all over the city). We like the look and feel of this part of the city the way it is. I feel like this plan is completely serving the developers who want to build these monstrously tall buildings, it does nothing to alleviate the already horrendous traffic congestion (there is ONLY ONE road along the north side of Lake Calhoun/BdeMakaSKa) and provides housing that is NOT affordable for the vast majority of people.  The rest of Uptown, i.e. the Hennepin/Lake area, has changed dramatically, and not in a good way. We never go to Uptown anymore because it is full of living and eating establishments that cater only to single people or young couples without kids. We feel excluded by that development that has occurred and have thanked our stars that it hasn't encroached to where we live. I will do everything I can to block this.	6/2/2018 22:14
607	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	We live in this area right by Cedar Lake. I do not support this plan AT ALL. It does nothing to respect the current residents who live here specifically because it IS a walkable, drivable (yes, we do own cars because we cannot walk or bike everywhere in Minneapolis towing our kids with us to soccer practices scattered all over the city). We like the look and feel of this part of the city the way it is. I feel like this plan is completely serving the developers who want to build these monstrously tall buildings, it does nothing to alleviate the already horrendous traffic congestion (there is ONLY ONE road along the north side of Lake Calhoun/BdeMakaSKa) and provides housing that is NOT affordable for the vast majority of people.  The rest of Uptown, i.e. the Hennepin/Lake area, has changed dramatically, and not in a good way. We never go to Uptown anymore because it is full of living and eating establishments that cater only to single people or young couples without kids. We feel excluded by that development that has occurred and have thanked our stars that it hasn't encroached to where we live. I will do everything I can to block this.	6/2/2018 22:14

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

608	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I believe we should start to require "liner apartments" for every new development that wants setback variances. People build really large buildings and then they orient all the apartments to exit into a central hallway and funnel them into their cars or out one door in the building (or whatever is required by fire code). This results in diminished public realm because people rarely get to leave out their front door, they don't have the ability to use patio space in front of their apartment and their windows literally create the barrier between public and private.. who the fuck wants that? I'd close my blinds too. Lets move beyond liner apartments for parking structures and put them on every massive new development!	6/3/2018 3:42
609	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I agree with all the points in this policy. Our built environment should support transit and transit users as much as possible, to make life as a transit user as easy and attractive as possible. Having a minimum height for buildings near main transit stops to maximise the amount of people who can benefit from car-free transportation, and also having businesses at the sidewalk level nearby so people going to and from transit stops can take care of daily needs on the way home. I also really agree with no more park and rides. We need homes for people, and shops and other things to do to service those people living there, not storage for a few people's cars! And having small blocks is really great for walkability, and should be a thing in more places than just near transit stops.	6/6/2018 2:11
610	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I support this policy. We need density to have an effective transit system, and we need it in areas where there are the highest number of transit dependent people.	6/6/2018 2:24
611	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li> <li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li> <li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you, Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416</p>	6/7/2018 20:38
612	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Yes to small blocks, plazas and open spaces!	6/8/2018 14:00



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

613	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Please consider the facts about SWLRT: It was routed through a unique urban green space in order to save time for suburban commuters. This is baked into the cost-effectiveness formula used to select the route (please refer to SWLRT documents from 2008-10 for details). This routing means that development opportunities in Minneapolis are very limited. The Penn Ave/Bryn Mawr station is in a valley, accessible by a very long skyway and elevator, with limited access for emergency vehicles. The 21st Street station is adjacent to a park and in a neighborhood of historic homes. Development here would come at the cost of green space used daily by hundreds of people, as well as and historic preservation. The West Lake area already has terrible traffic congestion and people absolutely will continue to need these streets to get from St. Louis Park and points west to many parts of Minneapolis. Please proceed with great caution in considering development around the proposed SWLRT stations.	6/8/2018 15:53
614	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Without taking immediate steps to better connect metro stations to other forms of mass transit this will not work. some proposed metro stations are already situated in extremely congested areas. Increasing the housing density, e.g., by the SWLRT Lake Street station, will be disastrous unless the housing deliberately provides absolutely minimal parking spots, *and* unless mass transit along Lake Street is dramatically increased. I live in CIDNA and the congestion by Lake St., Exc. Blvd., Dean Parkway is becoming horrendous not to mention dangerous. Density is good. Density without specific plans for reducing car ownership and increasing mass transit is stupid. Mpls. Resident of 55416	6/8/2018 16:57
615	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	I generally agree with the policy, however, i do not agree with the introduction of high-rise buildings to increase housing density near all metro stops. i live near Lake of the Isles/Lake Calhoun --- and the plan seems to create a wall of high rise development that changes the character of the neighborhood. I do not support such development	6/9/2018 10:54
616	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Development near the Lake Str/Calhoun metro station includes the introduction of several high rise buildings that are not in the character of the area. 20 to 30 story buildings dramatically change density of the area and the character of the area -- traffic, views, property value --- do not surround the lakes with high rise buildings	6/9/2018 11:15
617	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	prohibiting the establishment of park-and-ride facilities. How do you expect people to get to the nearest METRO station when it is raining/snowing or over 1 mile away? If you prohibit park ride facilities you will encourage single occupancy trips.	6/13/2018 17:59
618	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Some good ideas here and I am glad to see actionable steps.	6/14/2018 20:23
619	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	Until we have an integrated transit system that has busses connected to neighborhoods serving stops as frequently as the light rail serves stations, people will continue to drive to a stop to access the light rail. Note how popular the Fort Snelling park and ride lot is. There would be less impact on neighborhoods if park and ride lots were planned near certain key stations. I live close to two stations but they are both a 20 minute walk away if there is no snow and in my current health situation. Bus service is only every 30 minutes and is ill-timed with train service. It just doesn't work. I drive to a neighborhood and park on the street if I can't walk to the station. As I age that walk will become more of an issue. We live in Minnesota and walking/biking isn't always an option. A few park and rides will help neighborhoods with transit parkers.	6/19/2018 16:38
620	/policies/development-near-metro-stations/	DO NOT prohibit park and ride facilities!!!	6/21/2018 1:33
621	/policies/downtown/	This list is underwhelming. We need to bring back retail somehow, add student/ artist housing in the CBD, attract a museum, local arts groups to Nicollet Mall. Downtown is kind of boring outside of sports and theaters.	3/22/2018 23:55
622	/policies/downtown/	The City and Downtown Council have created a downtown that appeals to office workers and tourists. It isn't a place I want to go unless there is a special event. Shopping is mostly gone.	3/29/2018 16:13
623	/policies/downtown/	Tear down some of those horrible parking ramps and don't replace them.	4/2/2018 1:07
624	/policies/downtown/	Encourage retail businesses and restaurants to remain open on the weekends to attract tourists. All are going to MOA now with the lack of downtown amenities on the weekends.	4/4/2018 16:36
625	/policies/downtown/	Most of the older, more affordable retail buildings have been torn down, and it appears small businesses cannot afford to go into new buildings replacing them.	4/11/2018 17:10
626	/policies/downtown/	Bring back book stores and shopping destinations. Make the new YMCA also YWCA a healthy hub. How about a healthy family food establishment with a daytime dance floor for all ages?	4/21/2018 23:55
627	/policies/downtown/	j. Encourage the planting and nurturing of trees along streets in the downtown corridor.	4/25/2018 20:38

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

628	/policies/downtown/	Downtown streets are generally awful places to spend time because traffic moves very quickly, there's almost no retail anymore, and the City keeps promoting expansion of the skyway system. Stop allowing the Downtown Council & BOMA to perpetuate that situation. Narrow streets, plant some trees, and tear down skyways and parking ramps.	4/26/2018 15:14
629	/policies/downtown/	The areas around MCTC and St. Thomas are deserted and bleak outside of daytime hours. Promote the construction of student housing to liven it up and keep people downtown.	4/26/2018 15:18
630	/policies/downtown/	Downtown's biggest problem is that the entertainment district becomes dangerous as the evening wears on. A more obvious police presence is needed to assure the law-abiding that they will not become victims or observers of urban mayhem. An earlier closing time for the bars wouldn't hurt either. Is the final hour for a bar really profitable?	5/29/2018 20:38
631	/policies/downtown/	Make sure we are holding on to retail in downtown, and not letting it flock to downtown.	5/30/2018 17:21
632	/policies/downtown/	The intro to this section exaggerates the success of Minneapolis' downtown. It had the same (or more) workers and far more retail when I moved to the city in 1992. This Policy ignores that street frontages downtown are bleak and dominated by empty retail, blank walls, and/or parking lots/ parking ramp entrances. Unlike other major cities, there are no museums, movie theaters, or student housing bringing in younger residents. It's all about sports ball facilities, bars,/strip clubs, and office towers. All the new residents don't seem to make the CBD any more interesting. I find downtown pretty depressing.	6/15/2018 15:45
633	/policies/downtown/	Enforce laws and ordinances, don't eliminate them because too many minorities are disproportionately affected.	6/21/2018 0:46
634	/policies/downtown/	Eliminate street parking downtown, or at least have the rate be decided as 10% more than adjacent ramps. Street parking is a luxury. Price it as such.	6/22/2018 18:44
635	/policies/downtown-transportation/	Transit is painfully slow downtown & a transit tunnel is needed. Plus traffic speeds are too high and streets too wide making them unpleasant.	3/22/2018 23:42
636	/policies/downtown-transportation/	More dedicated bus lanes are needed downtown.	3/24/2018 0:53
637	/policies/downtown-transportation/	Policy 22a should be altered to call for encouraging transit-only lanes in downtown. This will make great strides to increase transit ridership and speed up travel times in a very congested area.	3/26/2018 13:03
638	/policies/downtown-transportation/	"Encourage" walking, biking, & transit? How? The streets are soul-suckingly bleak, too wide, and dominated by fast moving traffic. Stop allowing curb-cuts downtown and tear down more awful parking ramps.	3/29/2018 15:56
639	/policies/downtown-transportation/	What about getting rid of traffic lanes for cars, making some streets bike & Pedestrian only, tearing down parking ramps, and/or tearing down the 3rd & 4th St. viaducts?	4/2/2018 0:55
640	/policies/downtown-transportation/	Ban cars downtown.	4/5/2018 14:17
641	/policies/downtown-transportation/	A walkable downtown is a great goal but if you restrict parking, people that come in from the suburbs to enjoy the city (and spend money at the businesses and restaurants) will stop coming. Stop trying to make life worse for the 95% of the city that uses a car.	4/7/2018 14:04
642	/policies/downtown-transportation/	Urban should not mean no trees or plants. There is too much concrete. Yet people going to a show downtown or having dinner may need to park. WE like Theatre in the Round and used to park in the nearby ramp. When I volunteer there I take the bus, but not at night. Because the adjacent new housing didn't include enough additional off street parking, people attending a show at TRP or the Southern are often out of luck.	4/21/2018 23:06
643	/policies/downtown-transportation/	Narrowing streets and improving the public realm/sidewalks would go a long way towards making downtown more walkable. As is, it feels like you're supposed to drive there. More cross-downtown protected bike lanes are needed too.	4/25/2018 16:31
644	/policies/downtown-transportation/	Downtown streets are awful places to walk and bike because the streets are mostly one ways and very wide, which promotes fast moving and noisy traffic. Outside of Nicollet Mall, the streets lack boulevards trees and streetscape to make them interesting. Narrow streets and convert them to two-ways, and work towards a bus tunnel to get buses out of traffic.	5/9/2018 15:26

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

645	/policies/downtown-transportation/	The city needs to guard against becoming "family unfriendly" by over-emphasizing transportation (and zoning/land use) policies that are disproportionately based on accommodating the desires of some outspoken healthy younger people--e.gs. bicycle riders, those realistically able to conveniently access and rely on mass transit for all their transportation needs, et al--at the expense of the needs of families with children with far-flung activities, seniors, those with health-related mobility limitations and others who, realistically, will be highly dependent on private cars for the foreseeable future. Among other things, this means requirements for adequate off-street parking for all new buildings--and multiple occupancies--should be retained, particularly in view of the amount of snow and the 5-month duration of winter here, something inescapably without parallel in Seattle, Portland or Denver. Policies to encourage greater use of mass transit and other car alternatives--particularly while the current very limited mass transit system is improved and expanded-- should be based solely on the "carrot" of low-pricing, convenient schedules, attractive facilities, etc., rather than the "stick" of increasing the inconvenience of those reliant on cars.	5/14/2018 1:03
646	/policies/downtown-transportation/	Explore a downtown subway. There will only be more growth and density in the future, and the buses on Nicollet are extremely slow.	5/21/2018 2:45
647	/policies/downtown-transportation/	create downtown as no-car zone. reduce the overall parking space city-wide and in downtown.	6/6/2018 19:44
648	/policies/downtown-transportation/	The city should be thinking of added taxes and fees for personal automobiles in downtown and other dense areas such as uptown and others. This could follow other cities such as London that is trying to reduce the amount of cars on its roads. This policy could do that while getting more people to walk, bike, or use other means of transit getting us closer to our climate goals and making our streets more lively and friendly to cyclist and pedestrians	6/10/2018 22:49
649	/policies/downtown-transportation/	The \$50 million reconstruction of Nicollet Mall is a huge disappointment. Public Works and the Downtown Council mismanaged the project resulting in an underwhelming and bleak street, while managing to kill off the Barnes & Noble, Macy's, and other retailers. All this plus the street remains painfully slow for local buses. Yet, we need to reserve both Marquette and 2nd Avenues for suburban people riding coach buses into downtown? The old, white men making these decisions should be fired.	6/15/2018 15:58
650	/policies/downtown-transportation/	The Action Steps above are more of the same stuff that isn't working now. The only way to make downtown streets comfortable for people walking is to reduce the amount of space dedicated to moving cars. The streets/ crossings are too wide, traffic moves too fast, and there is hardly retail left at street level. If retail does exist, it gets located on the skyway level and closes by 5pm. Parking facilities and entrances are located on nearly every block face, which makes for a poor pedestrian experience. This Plan should propose more bold things like eliminating new parking in the CBD, creating pedestrian or bus-only streets, and removing the one-way street pattern. This vision for 2040 is underwhelming.	6/15/2018 16:17
651	/policies/downtown-transportation/	Encourage use of a heavy downtown parking tax. This only works if paired with adequate public transportation. Congestion fees and pricing are good for the air and environment and promote use of public transportation.	6/21/2018 4:22
652	/policies/ecology-and-habitat/	What about working to create habitats for other animals besides pollinators?	3/26/2018 0:53
653	/policies/ecology-and-habitat/	Very important. This should also address and clarify City regulatory policy around yards. The City currently has somewhat contradictory policies supporting pollinator habitat but still has inspectors enforcing landscaping with lawns in mind.	3/28/2018 4:24
654	/policies/ecology-and-habitat/	These policies sound like great efforts to start taking the protection of our environment and natural resources more seriously. But the phrasing of the introductory paragraph here mistakenly makes it seem as if the protection of biodiversity in Minneapolis is a goal separate and apart from improving the city "from a human perspective." Language and presentation matters, and even if the policies here are sound it's CRITICAL that residents reading this page understand that supporting biodiversity is not just about being kind to other species for their sake and as an afterthought...The health of every human being in the city is thoroughly intertwined with the health of the city's plants and animal life. Trees, plants, birds, insects, etc. support US in so many ways that we are only just starting to understand as these species are becoming endangered. Every patch of grass helps collect storm water and prevent runoff. Trees on the street cool our houses down in the summer and save us money. The list goes on. Both our actions AND our words should reflect how central our natural resources are in our lives as urban residents. Educating people about this should be a priority, starting with how we frame and write about our ecology and habitat. Thank you for reading.	4/19/2018 18:11
655	/policies/ecology-and-habitat/	Reduce the area of lawns in public parks and boulevards by encouraging the use of native plants and rain gardens. A park that is moistly ball fields could have a nature path around it with native plants.	4/22/2018 0:04

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

656	/policies/ecology-and-habitat/	Sorry, but you just cannot have a healthy ecosystem in an overly populated, dense environment. There is nothing healthy about increasing the density of Minneapolis. I already notice the serious degradation of natural areas due to the sheer amount of people using them. People are deleterious and adding more of them automatically increases: foot traffic, disturbance via presence and noise, light pollution, smog (via transit, stupid bonfires, smoking) less permeable space due to all the buildings and pavement, dirtier water, loss of light due to the ridiculous heights and density of new buildings. What's going to grow when all our neighborhoods are dominated by 6+ story buildings that also crowd the entire lot alley to sidewalk? Wild areas need to be left wild, not 'managed' by some expert.	5/4/2018 11:17
657	/policies/ecology-and-habitat/	Any reason why we can't be doing all of these things now?! If we're not, we should be!	6/12/2018 19:25
658	/policies/ecology-and-habitat/	You build too much, love concrete (gross) and destroy natural areas, and then beg for money saying you don't have money to do maintenance on parks and trails. People go to parks to feel that they are away from the city and not in a parking lot. You've totally destroyed Wirth Park, taken a peaceful natural area and turned it into a four season race track and then put an extremely noisy volleyball court across from beautiful pond setting. You should really call yourselves the "Park Destruction Board".	6/16/2018 1:48
659	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	I work in employment training, and a significant barrier for job-seekers is child care. There MUST be an increase in affordable childcare options and childcare assistance in Minneapolis.	3/29/2018 20:54
660	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	Sounds great! Another significant aspect of this will be encouraging employers to change their hiring practices (through incentives? other means?).	3/29/2018 20:58
661	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	Some employers take months to hire, some are unwilling to train on the job (which eliminates many candidates), and some are unwilling to hire people with criminal backgrounds, who need a second chance in order to reintegrate into society.	3/29/2018 20:59
662	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	1) if someone loves wood shop class and wants to maybe spend a couple summers as an intern, they should get a certificate to find a career in wood making 2) how do we get unions and employers to invest in said certificate training to their own vitality and helps their bottom line and future projections? 3) racial disparities in school start at home, why aren't their parents home reading to them starting young? because they're working 3 jobs or have an addiction? don't know that's what they should do because their own upbringing is lacking? if the parents don't care we need to have access to early childhood development for children and parents to learn. education starts at home, how to keep families together, with their kids, creating childhoods that create productive adults.	4/3/2018 16:42
663	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	This is KEY to the success of any other goals of Minneapolis.	4/4/2018 16:33
664	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	Expand free public school preschool. Use public magnet schools to help integrate communities. Free two year college or trade schools	4/21/2018 23:46
665	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	I have heard these strategies for the past 40 years and the results remain the same. What will be different this time to obtain the outcome you desire?	5/6/2018 16:18
666	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	POLICY 49: Educational and Economic Access  NRRC's proposed action steps:  1. The City will develop and engage with a support group that will engage and foster dialogue with the school board and the schools. 2. The City will repurpose or reopen closed schools. 3. The City will repurpose the 44th precinct to a community space.	5/8/2018 19:47
667	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	Since the transit system in Minneapolis is so mediocre, people are disadvantaged by not having access to jobs if they can't drive or cannot afford a car. People are forced to have cars at a cost of thousands of dollars a year. The City's existing policies continue this situation.	5/9/2018 15:47
668	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	Is this anything new or different from past policy? I believe that the Minneapolis Schools have been working on "c" for many, many years.	5/14/2018 15:26
669	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	It isn't enough to "Recruit and retain a diverse City workforce that reflects the demographics of the city." You have to tie that to the qualifications required for the job, and make it a requirement that the best skilled are hired. This policy doesn't address competency for the job.	5/14/2018 22:05
670	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	We would like to see the reemergence of our local schools that stand vacant turned into community run schools that would not be regulated by the school board. Please embark on initiatives to promote community run schools on the Northside of Minneapolis.	5/16/2018 20:16

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

671	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	<p>1. City will develop and engage with a support group that will engage and foster dialogue with the school board and the schools.</p> <p>2. The City will repurpose or reopen closed schools.</p> <p>3. The City will repurpose the 4th precinct to a community space.</p>	5/16/2018 20:16
672	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	<p>All 4 action plans are good.</p> <p>b. I think the challenge with b. is to figure out how to communicate with young people, young adults and the under employed about the programs that are available and help them with transportation to get there.</p> <p>c. This is the critical focus point in Minneapolis for sure. Getting enough programs, support staff and resources on site and in the hands of African American, Hispanic, Asian and Somali students is very important. I think recruiting and hiring multicultural teachers and staff is essential; it is still very white overall.</p> <p>The behavioral issues are becoming more visible and beginning to be addressed. I'd suggest teacher workshops on minority communication styles, cultural issues and learning styles would be important. African American students are more verbal and emotive in their faces, bodies and energy. The white culture is much more reserved within the general teenage verbal social context. Find white teachers and teachers of color who can talk about behavior in the classroom, the variety of norms within the main norm. This might be difficult at first, but it is essential.</p>	5/29/2018 18:39
673	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	I appreciate this work, this is something that my family has discussed. We are concerned about our youth who are not within the Pre-K educational system. The children who are in the 6th to 12th grade have no educational support, or and no resources that allow them to extend their education after school and on weekends.	5/30/2018 23:55
674	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	Work with Minneapolis Public Schools to make sure that the district offerings reflect the needs of the residents and are held in some way accountable for retaining students in the district. Encourage the district to be original in programming to retain and attract families who continue to stay in the city. Work with the district to prevent the continued departure of families to other districts.	5/31/2018 1:18
675	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	<p>a. How will you do this? What does supporting businesses in providing fair wages and worker protections mean?</p> <p>b. How about increase long term employment opportunities. How about making a municipal fair employment policy. This issue is lack of access to good employment and honest careers for POC.</p> <p>c. How about supporting MPLS public schools by pushing back against the defunding of these schools?</p> <p>d. It is more important to recruit and retain a diverse population to the various boards and committees inside city government. There are basically no POC currently on the land use committee--a place where POC as well as artists and business professionals such as architects should be serving.</p> <p>The city is continuing to socially and economically (racially) red-line POC and Indigenous out of Minneapolis. This comp plan does not address the real issues at all.</p>	5/31/2018 19:01
676	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	<p>Mentorship starting early in Elementary School in Mpls Public Schools is an important needed program to encourage children of all races to envision themselves in successful careers</p> <p>Submitted by a Vocational Technical Instructor also a Tutor in Minneapolis Public Schools We have great kids</p>	5/31/2018 22:54
677	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	Everybody knows the Minneapolis Public School system is in trouble. It is losing students, facilities are closing, and too many students are failing. But "aside from health" there is no more fundamental component to community success than education, because both address the capacity of the people to be healthy and productive. Still, the plan gives short shrift "that is to say, almost no attention at all to education. The Twin Cities are rich with higher education institutions that could help. Why is there no real plan? Saying it is the responsibility of the School Board is NOT a responsible answer.	6/6/2018 14:28

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

678	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	<p>Every item in the Living-wage jobs portion of the comprehensive plan is a platitude with absolutely no substance. While many of the goals may be laudable, the means to get their are very important, and I'm concerned many with think the end will justify any means. There is no talk of funding, no talk of actual laws and regulations, and so on.</p> <p>Much is made of race; little is made of poverty, those with disabilities, or veterans.</p> <p>The plan seems bent on making it clear trucks, roads, blue collar work, and freedom from regulation are unwanted in the Minneapolis of the future. I'm for many progressive goals, but there must be moderation and a centric view so everyone feels welcome and supported and free to pursue goals.</p>	6/9/2018 3:07
679	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	Provide channels to build awareness on the programme, support and training available to the community. Also provide specific demographic targeting to make sure that the ones that need helps get the needed support and opportunities available to them.	6/10/2018 14:47
680	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	The City needs to facilitate in collaboration with county and state offices, an educational center/program specifically designed for people who are formerly incarcerated to learn about entrepreneurship, cooperative economics and cooperative housing models. This could be offered through the City's already existing B-TAP and C-TAP programs: <a href="http://www.minneapolismn.gov/business/C-TAP?utm_content=&amp;utm_medium=email&amp;utm_name=&amp;utm_source=govdelivery&amp;utm_term=">http://www.minneapolismn.gov/business/C-TAP?utm_content=&amp;utm_medium=email&amp;utm_name=&amp;utm_source=govdelivery&amp;utm_term=</a>	6/19/2018 14:10
681	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	The City should work with the Minneapolis Public School System to enhance global interconnectedness through technology that enables Minneapolis students and teachers to be in communication with students and teachers in other sister cities. Also, the City should work with Minneapolis Public schools to create/enhance a curriculum that enables schools to be model green schools devoted to sustainable development. The City needs to work with Minneapolis Public Schools to supplement this hands-on curriculum with a historical curriculum that illustrates the contributions that communities of color and indigenous communities have made to environmental awareness and sustainable development.	6/19/2018 14:40
682	/policies/educational-and-economic-access/	Living in the fulton/linden hills area, I see a lot of families that open-enroll their children to Edina public schools rather than send them here. I would like to see more specific details on avoiding "white flight". I know it's not an easy solution, but I think that it will continue to be a problem in this area.	6/22/2018 15:10
683	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	What about requiring buildings to to designed so they are "solar ready". Meaning the electrical system is made to accommodate future solar power and the structure is sized for solar panels.	3/24/2018 1:34
684	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	Why not make the entire city a green zone? Why are only certain areas green zones.	3/24/2018 1:36
685	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	What about encouraging district energy systems or infrastructures, such as what is being explored at Towerside.	3/24/2018 1:38
686	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	240 volt wiring conduit should be required for all off-street parking spaces, especially in multi-family developments, to make it easier to adopt electric vehicles.	3/24/2018 18:20
687	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	These are good goals. They are missing some pieces around developing a better system for financing energy retrofits that is not dependent on user debt and an approach at an appropriate scale. Engage EVAC/ clean energy partnership around this.	3/28/2018 4:20
688	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	changes needed to building codes - potable water usage, WHY WHY WHY do we flush our toilets at 1.3g/flush of drinkable water when other people can't even drink from tap? water should go from sink (potable), to clothes/dish washer, to toilet, to irrigation. that cuts our use 4x right there! i want to see solar panels or solar hot water on every roof in downtown! buildings create so much heat (energy) and we just let it escape through the roof. fines for people who don't upkeep their systems and hence have lights on at 2am or irrigating in the rain.	4/3/2018 16:58
689	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	<p>1. Action-step 68-d could go much further in codifying environmental stewardship of the built environment. Buildings receiving city financing should be *required* (rather than encouraged) to meet energy efficiency standards exceeding those of privately-financed projects (akin to what is already being done in Saint Paul with B3 and SB2030).</p> <p>2. In addition to the existing goal of 80% CO2 reduction by 2050 - the City should establish a goal for complete carbon-neutrality (net zero). This cannot be achieved by energy efficient design alone, and would accelerate the implementation of on-site renewable energy production in order to meet reduction milestones.</p>	4/19/2018 19:47
690	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	rather than "encouraging" sustainable design (which, if not cost effective or profitable, will not be used) it should be a requirement of new construction. formal regulations without variances should be enacted.	5/3/2018 15:56

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

691	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	Policy #6 (c) and (d) require windows instead of blank walls. Windows reduce the R-value of a building, requiring added levels of heating and cooling.	5/22/2018 14:44
692	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	Please include policy and financing to make sure that apartment buildings and other multi-family housing units have equitable access to energy efficiency improvements.	6/5/2018 16:17
693	/policies/energy-efficient-buildings/	-Adopt Inclusive Financing mechanisms to ensure equitable access to utilities' CIP dollars -Require all new buildings to have efficient buildings with passive solar design, which saves the cost of retrofitting AFTER the building is built -Multi-family e	6/6/2018 20:42
694	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	The City should dis-invest in parking structures and let the private sector take on that role. In downtown, there should be an effort to make property owners share parking structures rather than each new development having their own ingress and egress.	3/22/2018 23:25
695	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	Yes! We must do our best to disincentivize people using cars and other personal automobiles. They are destroying our city and our environment. Aggressively pursue this!	3/23/2018 20:04
696	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	So much of what upholds auto dependency is pricing (or a lack thereof). When roads and parking are free, and gasoline is lightly taxed, people will choose to drive. Please push aggressive pricing schemes to discourage driving--our climate depends it.	3/24/2018 0:36
697	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	Consider decking over freeways to both limit exhaust in the areas around the freeway but also provide new green space to act as a carbon sink.	3/26/2018 23:34
698	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	In addition to addressing how to increase the convenience of non-car options, it would be helpful to identify the focused city strategies to reduce the convenience of car-based options (parking availability, lane reductions, speed restrictions, etc.)	3/27/2018 16:33
699	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	Don't allow more parking ramps downtown- especially in every development. Count and then make a goal to reduce the number of parking spaces in the City.	3/29/2018 15:28
700	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	all of the above, for the commercial industry. i somewhat agree with privatized roads, the big trucks are the ones that destroy them, maybe they should pay to fix them. gas tax will decrease use. self driving taxis or a bus/monorail are the next step. strategic land bridges maybe be useful in preventing animal collisions.	4/3/2018 17:04
701	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	I highly support the goal to reduce Minneapolis's impact on climate change and to continue to develop low-cost transit and electric car options. Bike commuting on the other hand is not a reasonable solution for a climate like ours. Spending money on bike lanes that rarely get used is a waste of resources.	4/7/2018 13:45
702	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	Continue building more public transportation routes and infrastructure! In addition to 30 day bike challenges, have 30 day public transportation challenges (with a celebratory feel to them). Create a culture of cool surrounding use of public transportation. "By taking the bus and light rail you are doing your part in reducing carbon emissions and creating a cleaner, safer world for us all!"	4/8/2018 15:48
703	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	What is the climate impact of the City actually owning and operating thousands of car parking stalls in big, ugly parking rmaps? Sell them or tear them down and use tax dollars for better places to walk, bike, or take transit.	4/17/2018 22:59
704	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	A quick question on letter "E" above - just wondering if there is more information on what type of fee or incentive would induce more people to use public transit and zero-emissions vehicles. Is there some type of policy in the works regarding this?	4/18/2018 0:20

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

705	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	<p>Please remember issues of equity and safety when disincentivizing driving and driving alone, especially for women with children, and use a less punitive word/approach. Development intensity needs to come first, before there's an emphasis on punishing people who already struggle with mobility. Job hours and day care/school hours don't align, and the burden of transporting children to school, doctor appointments, and to places that meet other needs (grocery stores, pharmacies, etc.) falls disproportionately on women. For women who need to do all of this, and work, and be at work for specific amounts of time, pick children up at different times at different schools and daycares, and don't want to be waiting at multiple bus stops with unpredictable children after dark or during winter months, driving can help them be successful, get better jobs, and be independent (if they have access to driving in the first place, which is a big assumption). Lugging groceries and multiple children and strollers on buses or via bikes is also difficult, especially during winter months, in a medium-to-low-density winter city like ours. Planners are informed people, and I am sure you know success and mobility are intertwined, and that mobility using a car cannot be dismissed completely. But the way this is phrased suggests making life harder for people who already struggle. I hope you will think of using words that represent the real needs people have, that balancing--or whatever word or approach fits--instead of disincentivizing, could be a more inclusive and equitable way to address the need to rely less on autos. Maybe people should buy less so there are fewer large polluting trucks on the road instead? I know it's outside the purview of the comp plan, but my point is there are so many other ways.</p> <p>For context, I am a privileged woman with children who lives near my workplace and uses alternative transportation for much of the year. Without access to a car I would lose my job, and I actually have options that so many people, especially women with children, don't. Thank you for considering a broader perspective on your word choice and approach.</p>	4/18/2018 15:26
706	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	<p>Please remember issues of equity and safety when disincentivizing driving and driving alone, especially for women with children, and use a less punitive word/approach. Development intensity needs to come first, before there's an emphasis on punishing people who already struggle with mobility. Job hours and day care/school hours don't align, and the burden of transporting children to school, doctor appointments, and to places that meet other needs (grocery stores, pharmacies, etc.) falls disproportionately on women. For women who need to do all of this, and work, and be at work for specific amounts of time, pick children up at different times at different schools and daycares, and don't want to be waiting at multiple bus stops with unpredictable children after dark or during winter months, driving can help them be successful, get better jobs, and be independent (if they have access to driving in the first place, which is a big assumption). Lugging groceries and multiple children and strollers on buses or via bikes is also difficult, especially during winter months, in a medium-to-low-density winter city like ours. Planners are informed people, and I am sure you know success and mobility are intertwined, and that mobility using a car cannot be dismissed completely. But the way this is phrased suggests making life harder for people who already struggle. I hope you will think of using words that represent the real needs people have, that balancing--or whatever word or approach fits--instead of disincentivizing, could be a more inclusive and equitable way to address the need to rely less on autos. Maybe people should buy less so there are fewer large polluting trucks on the road instead? I know it's outside the purview of the comp plan, but my point is there are so many other ways.</p> <p>For context, I am a privileged woman with children who lives near my workplace and uses alternative transportation for much of the year. Without access to a car I would lose my job, and I actually have options that so many people, especially women with children, don't. Thank you for considering a broader perspective on your word choice and approach.</p>	4/18/2018 15:26
707	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	I don't have car - I use mass transit - but I am surrounded by homes where residents in one house own 3 or 4 vehicles per household and they are not going to give up their vehicles! Is mayor and city council members going to give up their vehicles?	5/11/2018 22:43
708	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	It's OK to try to encourage people to use public transit or non-motorized means of getting around, but you should not be penalized for using a car. Seniors and family's need to use cars. Almost EVERYONE needs to use cars in bad weather, which in Minnesota means most of the time!	5/12/2018 3:06
709	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	Looking at the chart provided, natural gas and electricity made up 70% of greenhouse gas emissions citywide in 2015. If we want to reduce emissions, this seems like the ideal target. The city should encourage energy-efficient buildings that retain heat (natural gas) and prioritize eco-friendly electricity generation. The hydro plant at St. Anthony Falls should be expanded to power more of our city, and solar should be encouraged when roofing is replaced.	5/14/2018 16:58
710	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	I know this is not the city's jurisdiction, but can we work to get rid of (or to offset) the state's license tab surcharge on electric cars? Also, be sure to consider older people and people with mobility issues who may need to rely on motorized transportation.	5/17/2018 15:14



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

711	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	I love biking, but cars are still necessary. The city seems to be encouraging gridlock to force people to just give up on driving. Sometimes it may work, but for those who can't bike, they will need to sit in traffic and spew carbon into the air. Minneapolis City Planner-induced global warming. Nice!	5/18/2018 18:45
712	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	Great ideas. I was looking for "eliminate parking minimums" on this list. Like the items listed, that would encourage the adoption of sustainable forms of transit.	5/21/2018 2:23
713	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	Carbon emissions reductions is a critical goal, but you have completely missed a major local impact of transportation -- airport noise. This affects tens of thousands of Minneapolis residents at levels considered by most of the rest of the world as having a significant impact. Multiple studies show that airport noise can have serious effects on human health and the ability of children to learn. Minneapolis should be taking a strong stand on this and defending its citizens from these health risks, exactly as you do with regulations on chemical air pollution, contaminated water and lead paint. Elsewhere you tout the benefit of having a nearby major airport, but totally ignore the cost for that paid by all the residents who get to hear the commercial jets every day. And your push to increase population density in the city neighborhoods under the flight paths is going to increase the number of people afflicted by this noise pollution.  You should have some concrete goals for airplane noise in this vision for Minneapolis in 2040: 1 Publish the data showing the 55dB DNL contours and the number of Minneapolis residents subject to it. (MAC collects this data but refuses to publish it.) 2 Reduce MSP airplane noise by 50% by 2025 -- make the Noise Oversight Committee a Noise Reduction Committee 3 Get more Minneapolis citizen representation on the Noise Oversight Committee, which is currently dominated by industry, MAC, FAA and suburban representatives.	5/23/2018 16:41
714	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	All of this! Along with these steps there needs to more education and outreach about the city's adopted climate change goals and why these steps are needed to meet the goals. I think more people will agree with these changes when they understand WHY the changes are needed.	5/24/2018 2:21
715	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	I think it's great that more light rail lines are being added to the public transportation network. Some considerations: lines need to become more interwoven or it does not make sense to use this mode for most trips. As it is now, and as it will be with the expansion of blue and green line, if I want to take the light rail to work, there is no convenient route. If I want to take the light rail to work and then to get groceries, and then back home, this is impossible to do. The light rail needs to be a way I can get all over town, even if I have to walk for a few minutes to/from a stop. People don't want to have to walk a long ways, then take a bus, then hop on the light rail, etc. Public transportation needs to become the most convenient option, and we are nowhere near that goal. Additionally, light rail and bus stops, as well as the actual trains and bused themselves need to be places people feel safe. There needs to be a way for patrons to receive quick help if an issue arises. I live in North Minneapolis and am excited about the updates to Penn and the future light rail expansion into north, but I've had so many issues on bused that I am extremely hesitant to utilize public transportation, especially in areas with higher crime, because I can not guarantee my safety	5/25/2018 15:58
716	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	The majority of the people use cars. Aren't you supposed to help the majority? Our cars are idling because the city continues to reduce road capacity for cars. This is DISCRIMINATION against the majority of people who need to get to work or school or else	5/26/2018 3:29
717	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	Let's make public transit free! And much more plentiful. I agree with disincentivizing single occupancy vehicles- they make our city dangerous and ugly!	5/31/2018 22:14
718	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	create "no car zones" in downtown create fees for the freeways for non-HOV, return fees to Green Zones communities and communities displaced by the original freeway construction. include police vehicles in the City's idling ordinance and prioritize their switch to electric vehicles. They idle most in highly-policed neighborhoods, including during youth outdoor sports games. Possibility of creating signs about Green Zones that inform commuters to consider walking, rolling, bicycling, bussing, or a minimum carpooling when traveling through these neighborhoods lower bus fare for Green Zones communities	6/6/2018 19:27
719	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	No mention of parking.	6/7/2018 16:13

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

720	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li> <li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li> <li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li> </ol> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	6/7/2018 20:43
721	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	<p>I believe we are at the point of sub-optimization when it comes to concentrating human activity in Minneapolis; time to use transportation to move people to the exurbs. By 2040, the build out of satellite communities, as they did all over California, Seattle, Washington, DC, Philadelphia, Atlanta, etc. will undoubtedly accelerate. Containing all this population in such close proximity (by going up and stuffing more people into single family lots) brings social ills, which regional transportation systems to the exurbs can solve. High concentrations of people result in high concentrations of byproducts (such as pollution), crime, economic disparity, etc... Time for the transportation plan to create arteries for people to live beyond the exurbs, and not be so close to each other.</p>	6/18/2018 13:28
722	/policies/environmental-impacts-of-transportation/	<p>Pertaining to Action Step A, on the part about "market-based parking".</p> <p>Continuing on that, I would like to see all street parking in front of ANY commercial space to be pay-parking.</p> <p>I would also like to see a flat-rate "service charge" of at least \$2 imposed on all parking "sessions", with that fee going towards a goal of Municipal Transit Passes, where every single resident has access to riding transit for free. Could also be paired with Municipal ID</p>	6/22/2018 18:23
723	/policies/environmental-justice/	<p>This is very important. Given the significance of energy utilities in impacting EJ communities, the comprehensive plan should also address how the Minneapolis Clean Energy Partnership can push energy utilities to advance EJ protections as well.</p>	3/27/2018 21:07
724	/policies/environmental-justice/	<p>Do this in schools too. When kids have a conflict have a class meeting to discuss what they could have done different to avoid conflict. If someone destroys property they have to clean it up.</p>	4/21/2018 23:58

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

725	/policies/environmental-justice/	What is the timeline to start the cleanup in the known contaminated sites? Is there a list of organizations who will a part of this strategies? Is this list diverse with various ethnic and age groups? Are the various trade organizations involved in this strategy? They are needed for mentoring and informing students of job opportunities. This can be initiated in elementary school. Reinstate trade information for students in middle as well as high school. Advertisement on the television during the day and not just late at night.	5/6/2018 18:07
726	/policies/environmental-justice/	Environmental injustice? WTF?	5/26/2018 4:24
727	/policies/environmental-justice/	Education about environment (hands-on) in primary and high schools	5/30/2018 18:44
728	/policies/environmental-justice/	Work with native leaders and communities to determine which portion of city lands Minneapolis will return to indigenous people and/or put all of Minneapolis into a land trust that is directed by a board of directors that consists of a majority of native members, with representation by multi-generational black american, hmong, latino, east african members.  If this is not politically feasible by 2040, find (in partnership) another way to meaningfully return significant decision-making power to native tribes around land use.	6/6/2018 20:50
729	/policies/expand-homeownership/	This is great. It should align with discussions mentioned in other priorities around cooperative housing to equip groups of low-income families to pool capital and income to qualify for home buying.	3/27/2018 20:28
730	/policies/expand-homeownership/	This is great!	4/3/2018 19:36
731	/policies/expand-homeownership/	The city, will you be sitting next to me when I go in to ask for a mortgage? No, you won't  Can you specifically state which banks you plan to broker deals with to ensure this new mindset? No, you can't.  Can you offer strategies to new homebuyers on how to review loan types? Is this even possible?  Are you planning to introduce expanded homebuying cost share partnerships like you did in the Jordan neighborhood in North Minneapolis is other places?	4/3/2018 19:36
732	/policies/expand-homeownership/	Improving homeownership efforts should be exclusively focused on low-income, POCl residents.	4/5/2018 14:32
733	/policies/expand-homeownership/	What can the city do to increase the supply of condo and multi-family ownership options? Despite demand, regulations and laws have limited new options from being built. How can we help meet the demand for condos?	5/1/2018 19:55
734	/policies/expand-homeownership/	What are these "current racially restrictive housing policies"? You say it like there's still something out there on the books - what is it? The barriers are not racial, they are financial. Quit pretending they are the same thing. Policies should not be specific to different races; that's the very definition of racism.	5/4/2018 10:26
735	/policies/expand-homeownership/	Home ownership is suffering due to ever increasing property taxes and home prices. Add to that how Minneapolis is making it less attractive to buy here. I already my suburban flight because I am afraid to buy a home that will lose its zoning protection. By that, I mean, I am now afraid of what the city will allow to be built next to me. Not sure what is safe from high rise buildings with multiple units any more. Apparently nothing, as the city consistently disregards its own zoning laws and is now looking to loosen it legally. I am not going to invest in a property that is later going to lose its value (both monetarily and personally) due to the later addition of tall buildings, renters, density/crowding, noise, lack of parking.  And again, quit playing the politically correct race card. Home ownership among non-whites is about income. You aren't going to solve it by treating symptoms, you need to address the cause, which is low income.	5/4/2018 11:27
736	/policies/expand-homeownership/	Removing some hurdles such as minimum square footage of housing, requiring single family housing (R1 zoned) as opposed to multi-family housing, only allowing one structure on a single lot unless there is an unit owner occupied with an ADU, and requiring basements all greatly increase the cost of housing.  Detroit, Denver, and Portland have tiny house villages. Cost per unit is much less when you share city resources such a lot, water, and sewer.  The city can decrease the cost of housing by getting rid of this laws.	5/7/2018 20:40

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

737	/policies/expand-homeownership/	For me the issue is moving people of color and low income households into housing that is affordable and they can remain in the house over time. Action steps need to describe solutions. One solution is to support land trusts. Another solution is to monitor and evaluate bank performance on home loans. My experience and the experience of others shows that discriminatory lending still occurs. The city, through ordinances and financial leverage can influence banks to do better.	5/14/2018 20:20
738	/policies/expand-homeownership/	SW Mpls has lost so many single family homes that were once affordable to developers that are now priced well over \$600000. This also bumps up property taxes for those preserving the original housing stock I see no concrete steps here to preserve and don't understand why more wasn't done previously. All these lots are now lost to folks who would benefit from the great schools in SW Mpls.	5/16/2018 0:33
739	/policies/expand-homeownership/	The habitat for humanity program works well. Continue supporting that. Also condos or town houses which will require less investment.	5/26/2018 4:14
740	/policies/expand-homeownership/	Create owner occupied housing rather than facilitating rich builders creating housing	5/30/2018 13:57
741	/policies/expand-homeownership/	If POCI and Indigenous can hardly find work, and hardly afford rent (which your graphs so colorfully demonstrate) how the hell are POCI and I going to be able to afford buying a home?  Honestly!	5/31/2018 19:30
742	/policies/expand-homeownership/	provide financial counseling and homebuyer education to LGBTQ community..	6/6/2018 3:02
743	/policies/expand-homeownership/	Thank you for specifically addressing the racial wealth gap through (b).	6/8/2018 14:03
744	/policies/expand-homeownership/	The city should create some intensives to revive the building of for sale condominiums. Like making it a priority to lobby at the legislature to remove barriers for this type of construction and subsidizing builder warranty insurance	6/13/2018 20:30
745	/policies/expand-homeownership/	Good ideas, exactly how can they be implemented? What specifically are the current barriers? What specifically are the plans to overcome those barriers? The intro states: " These actions are not just investments in filling the financial gap between the cost of a home and what buyer can afford". Sorry, cash handouts are not acceptable. Education and counseling and removal of identifiable barriers are important. Sweat equity and personal financial equity is critical to long term wealth building. Handouts solve nothing long term.	6/14/2018 20:58
746	/policies/expand-homeownership/	please make info about home buyer classes and low-income housing programs more widely available. there is no central place we could find while buying a home.	6/14/2018 21:09

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		<p>of support for financial counseling and pre-purchase education are critical but must be paired with reliable DPA and affordability assistance along with an inventory of starter homes. Too often, counseling and education succeeds in getting households of color mortgage ready only to have consumers thwarted by a lack of inventory or the unavailability of DPA.</p> <p>b) Particularly in low-income, community of color neighborhoods, the emphasis ought to be on asset building (income gets you out of poverty but assets are what keeps you out). To the extent that shared equity models are used in these communities, they should be done so to 1) assist a homebuyer who could not own but for the added assistance, and 2) to ensure the future availability of affordable, entry level homes. The critical question here is “who benefits”? Any strategies employed in this effort should provide asset building opportunities for existing residents rather than relying on in-migration.</p> <p>c) This has been a significant source of frustration for the non-profit housing counseling and development community. For example, Minneapolis DPA has consistently served low numbers of households of color, despite the non-profits advice to the city as how to effectively reach households of color while still meeting fair housing requirements. Similarly, the non-profit development community outperforms the private market by seven times in selling homes to households of color, yet the city opened up its development subsidy programs a few years ago to private developers, and without any transparency on how they are performing on equity measures (contracting and sales), and has continued to do so. This is an area where we know what works and just need to invest more into the work to bring it to scale.</p> <p>d) Despite the fact that we are reaching historic low levels of default and foreclosure, capacity needs to be maintained as low-income and communities of color are often the victims of predatory practices and employment instability and as a result have higher rates than the population as whole.</p> <p>e) . A distinction between what is referred to in the draft comprehensive plan as “market failure” versus “affordable housing need” and policy makers need to support the appropriate tools to address these two important issues. And, while there may be some overlap in appropriate strategies, these are complex problems that require multi-faceted solutions. To the degree that the city is investing in its affordable housing need, there absolutely should be an emphasis on shared equity models (placed-based long-term affordability) and recapture models (recycling of assistance to buyers). I would argue the shared-equity models should be located primarily, though not exclusively, in what is referred to as “high-opportunity” areas.</p> <p>Finally, inventory needs to be addressed. The city has an estimated 500 vacant lots, mostly in areas experiencing “market failure” i.e. the cost to develop the lots exceeds the fair market value upon redevelopment, resulting in a development/appraisal gap. Current strategies to address this inventory optimistically project addressing up to 35 properties a year. Correcting “market failure” should be a priority of city government and there are tools in the municipal toolbox to do so. These include bonding (using newly generated property taxes and</p>	
747	/policies/expand-homeownership/		6/20/2018 18:26
748	/policies/fair-housing/	Sounds good. It would be good to ID how a rigorous evaluation/ licensing process will ensure compliance.	3/27/2018 20:22
749	/policies/fair-housing/	I would encourage the city to look at the fair housing guidance from HUD in the waning days of the Obama administration. They consider blanket criminal history screening to be a fair housing issue. I would like the city to look at enforcing a ban on landlords using background checks to screen for tenants. This screening has a disproportionate impact on poor people of color and is a driver of housing instability.	4/16/2018 19:19
750	/policies/fair-housing/	The Federal Fair Housing Act is over 50 years old and this is still a critical issue. Since developers and landlords practices will necessarily exclude people of color and low income families, the city must create a culture of vigilance and be prepared to aggressively enforce the law. To do this, the city needs to be actively engaged with this process and reinforce actions for affordable housing, Land Trusts and nondiscriminatory lending.	5/14/2018 20:43
751	/policies/fair-housing/	I would love to see more diversity in my neighborhood but not at the expense of encouraging cheap multi-unit buildings that destroy the character of the neighborhood. I have observed the older neighborhoods, such as Kingfield, which has a lot of mixture of housing types, and, at least to me, it still has the character of neighborhoods that have all single family homes. If done carefully, this diversity of peoples and housing types can make a more creative community, such as Kingfield. They recently created "Porchfest" where on one spring/summer evening musicians organize to play on their front porches as neighbors come by to listen and visit!	5/23/2018 14:42
752	/policies/fair-housing/	The City should continue to further fair housing by incentivizing (not penalizing) proposals from developers who add affordable units in unaffordable areas.	5/24/2018 17:24

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

753	/policies/fair-housing/	This should already be happening. We have a number of departments that do this. Including hud. How about putting timeline on how long able bodied people can live for free and on government assistance. We have created generations of people who live for free. Move them off welfare and put them to work so they have money to pay fair rent.	5/26/2018 4:04
754	/policies/fair-housing/	Definition of "affordable housing" has to be changed to include ownership. If we don't, whatever housing it is, wherever it is, does not build equity (and I mean that in the financial as well as the social justice definition) nor does it remain affordable.	6/7/2018 4:12
755	/policies/fair-housing/	I would really like to see exactly what has been identified as CURRENT barriers, we are well aware of research into previous barriers. I believe I have also seen that inroads have been made with lenders/banks to locate strategically in our city to make progress on that specific barrier. But I do think most of us need clear and transparent information on these barriers and proposed actions in order to lend more support to this initiative specifically.	6/14/2018 20:35
756	/policies/food-access/	looks good	3/28/2018 4:12
757	/policies/food-access/	Minneapolis is the center of the food coop movement in the United States. These stores are community owned and build wealth here in Minneapolis. The city should build on this knowledge and energy to support start up food coops in low-income communities instead of attracting big chains to them that are less economically sustainable. Food coops traditionally focus on expensive organic food but they can just as easily stock cheaper staples for lower-income communities.	4/25/2018 16:42
758	/policies/food-access/	The Minneapolis Healthy Living Community Leadership Team (an advisory group of community-based organizations working together with Minneapolis Health Department staff to reduce obesity and tobacco use) strongly supports the inclusion of policy language that increases access to healthy foods for all Minneapolis residents, especially those in low-income areas and communities of color. Access to healthy foods not only impacts individual nutrition and health outcomes, but also intersects with climate change, transportation, and many other areas included in the comprehensive plan. Where there is a role for the City, the CLT would like to see Comp Plan language that supports nutrition education and skill-building opportunities (such as a policy statement encouraging Minneapolis Public Schools to offer basic nutrition education and food skills starting from an early age). In addition, the City should look for ways to incentivize healthy food purchases such as through financial incentives for customers who purchase fruits and vegetables at corner stores (similar to the successful model of Market Bucks incentives at farmers markets). Finally, the CLT would like the Food Access policy (and other related policies) to require or strongly encourage connections to local growers in order to strengthen the local food economy and improve healthy food access.	6/4/2018 19:35
759	/policies/food-access/	How are suggest building constrave relationship with current store owners when the city is constantly target these establishment with over regulation, annual increase of license fees, adoption ordinance that takes away available products for sale, restricting some esblesmet & from the sale of products with creating unrealistic requirements whether in building, proximity requirements, crazy zoning requirements???	6/10/2018 5:08
760	/policies/food-access/	It's a good idea to work to increase mobile food markets/pantries, folks that are under-resourced may be busy and have transportation issues so bringing it to them seems like it would be helpful.	6/19/2018 20:55
761	/policies/food-access/	Offer incentives, not regulations, for stores to offer healthy items over unhealthy items.	6/21/2018 0:52
762	/policies/food-businesses/	This makes a lot of sense! Financing programs should be taxpayer neutral. I would add had odor control may be necessary as neighbors may not want to live near a sauerkraut facility.	4/22/2018 5:13
763	/policies/food-businesses/	Let's explore additional food hubs, food processing and freezing capacity (metro wide) for small growers can supply for institutions? Build upon past food hub studies and the Good Acre. Thanks Sean gosiewski 612-250-0389 Sean@afors.org	5/24/2018 0:02
764	/policies/food-businesses/	reduce fees so that local people could sell healthy food at lower rate and also make some money during local events like porchfest or powderhorn art fair or may day. encourage different ethnic food stools	5/25/2018 20:10
765	/policies/freight/	Very excited about an increase in freight. One thing the city should be explicit about is its policy around freight carrying explosive hydrocarbons (eg. bitumen from tar sands) through urban neighborhoods (we should oppose it).	3/27/2018 16:39
766	/policies/freight/	Safety is very important. Keep speeds to a limit through our neighborhoods, and provide safety fences and no trespassing signs to keep people off tracks except at official safety crossings.	4/21/2018 23:00
767	/policies/freight/	This whole section flies in the face of the Rail Safety Resolution passed by the city council in November 2015. You need to get that out, read it, and incorporate the language and intent of that resolution into the comp plan. The language here in this draft actually serves to negate that entire resolution. So you are wanting to go on record of doing that?	6/6/2018 21:36

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

768	/policies/freight/	Add similar efforts you are undertaking for airport noise (per other language in this comp plan) and other negative impacts on the surrounding community to this section regarding rail and rail yards. See: Shoreham Yards, Northtown Yards, NE Minneapolis. Address the impacts of air, land, soil and noise pollution stemming from rail and railyards. Why only do so for airport communities? Ensure equity, don't just mouth it.	6/6/2018 21:46
769	/policies/freight/	Step up the enforcement of illegal parking of semi trucks and other large commercial vehicles in North Mpls. Parking enforcement should automatically tag those vehicles rather than waiting for a 311 complaint.	6/17/2018 22:10
770	/policies/freight/	Regarding (C) Crossing improvements along active corridors - There is plenty of opportunity at the Humboldt Crossing in Webber-Camden for improvement. Since this is not only an active corridor, but an active railyard, activity is extremely high, with trains coming to actual halts almost daily. At these times, trains can sit idle anywhere from 2-20 minutes. I live at the intersection of Humboldt and Victory, and my alley/garage faces this intersection. Cars often race through our alley out of frustration, in order to get to Irving, and back on the parkway. I've counted an average of about 25 trains a day that cross Humboldt. That averages to at least one train every hour, although truth be told its more active in the late evenings and weekends. I94 and Osseo Road are the only two arteries in North MPLS that can cross the railroad track unimpeded, thanks to bridges. Humboldt, Fremont, and Lyndale are all crossings with arms. Due to the proximity of the railcrossing on Humboldt with the 4-way stop at Victory, this intersection can get backed up in all four directions when the train is idle. I have witnessed people illegally pass other cars on the drive when this happens, and seen several near accidents caused by frustrated drivers. Unfortunately I don't have any solutions, but this seemed like the proper forum to call attention to it at the very least. I don't know if its as simple a fix as beginning to document when it happens and fine the railroad when they block traffic for extended periods of time, or if it can be solved by making the crossing at Fremont a bridge, allowing a smaller side street to connect Webber and Bohanan neighborhoods without the need for cross-arms, allowing traffic to flow better in the neighborhood.	6/20/2018 20:18
771	/policies/freight/	47d. One thing you can do is ban tractor trailers within 10 miles of the city center. Save our roads, prevent traffic and encourage rail use by mandating train or small truck transport of goods into town. Large trucks destroy our roads which then have to be repaired which has an enormous economic and environmental and stress impact on residents.	6/21/2018 4:09
772	/policies/healthy-food-in-institutions/	Encourage local restaurant to be near the park, so that we can enjoy park and have breakfast or evening dinner next to the park. For example, in Powderhorn we have Out in the Backyard every Monday and Wednesday evening. Many of us, want to have healthy dinner sometime after our class or just like to hang out near the park and have some food...just like Lake Harriet or Calhoun or Minnehaha falls.	5/25/2018 19:52
773	/policies/healthy-housing/	Very important. The City should also link home health programs and utility energy efficiency programs and opportunities for weatherization. These actions have impact both directly on human health and household disposable income.	3/27/2018 20:38
774	/policies/healthy-housing/	i know the statistics are greatly improved when a nurse visit to a home after pregnancy is required to ensure a safe space, answer any questions from the family, and provide general support and resources.	4/9/2018 15:16
775	/policies/healthy-housing/	I would love to see the city put resources and pursue federal/state money in order to put in place an aggressive lead abatement program in the city. Lead contamination is highest in the poorest areas of the city, and lead abatement is a great bang-for-buck way to reduce disparities.	4/16/2018 19:35
776	/policies/healthy-housing/	Educate on pollution concerns like radon and other vapors. Discourage use of scented products. Encourage use of house plants for air quality.	4/21/2018 23:41
777	/policies/healthy-housing/	Again how is the paid for? I like having bike storage onsite. Maybe help with ordinance waivers for bike storage areas.	4/22/2018 5:10
778	/policies/healthy-housing/	For healthier living spaces, the public spaces need to be green spaces -- exposure to nature (trees, plants, etc.) is increasingly proving to be key to mental and physical health, so every new housing development or improvement should be guided by a policy to INCREASE, and never decrease, green space.	6/12/2018 19:22
779	/policies/healthy-housing/	consider programs to help remediate radon	6/14/2018 21:14
780	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	Please work towards paid family leave as well.	3/23/2018 17:12
781	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	i agree with all of these things, how do we make this a priority for parents? find out what their current priorities are if not their kids.	4/3/2018 16:50
782	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	Teach new parents how to encourage learning and creativity in their little ones. If parents cannot read they can tell stories and talk to babies about the world around them.	4/21/2018 23:50

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

783	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	Please spend wisely. Some places like WI have had 4 year K for 34 years. There is no data I am aware of that it has had any positive impact vs MN that did not have a similar program in place. That is we are not looking at MKE has a economic success story.	4/22/2018 5:07
784	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	I encourage grand parents and other support persons be involved in these strategies.	5/8/2018 16:52
785	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	The Perry School Project has been known for many years. Who will pay for and implement quality preK and day care?	5/14/2018 17:16
786	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	MN lacks a comprehensive, compensatory, and consistent evaluation process to determine if children are READY for K. Minneapolis could lobby aggressively on behalf of its citizens, and to mitigate the pernicious achievement gap, to push the state legislature to adopt policies where we can accurately test for readiness, and have data/informational goals to reach for. It is a pell mell mess right now. Use the weight of your population to create change. In the meantime, continue to support Mayor Hodges' language/reading initiatives and support small daycares and businesses that provide quality, early learning to ALL our citizens.	5/14/2018 23:43
787	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	This is an excellent priority and should be bundled with a commitment to free birth control for all city residents and a commitment to supporting babies from cradle to grade, and then from grade to graduation through an excellent public education system. There isn't enough focus on putting money into excellence. Less talk about equity and more about excellence across the city. Thank you.	5/23/2018 18:42
788	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	Singing, talking, and reading to toddlers is so important. Could the city sponsor tutoring programs from the public school students into homes or community centers. Additional support to library programs and resources for early childhood and mother groups.  More openings in high-quality child care in low-income neighborhoods -- grants from business and corporate giving.  I'd love to see Minneapolis rent billboard space right along I35 on those boards that change frequently and have some of the powerful statistics about reading aloud to children and success in school, on the job and in life. What ever happened to colorful, creative Public Service Announcements?  Organize Neighborhood reading aloud and talking about books -- with perhaps a Library Truck that comes along like the Ice Cream Truck....gather 4 or 5 kids and read aloud to them.....  Access....accesss. Of course, needs money and resources	5/29/2018 18:51
789	/policies/healthy-pre-k-development/	This sounds good, but what is the vision for public education beyond preschool? Where do neighborhood schools fit in? I don't see anything beyond birth-age 5.	5/30/2018 17:21
790	/policies/healthy-youth-development/	Sounds really good. Its pretty vague - would like to see in the strategies more about how the city will do these things.	3/28/2018 4:34
791	/policies/healthy-youth-development/	i support high schools integrating tech school certificates into their programs like wood shop, mechanics, agriculture etc to get students lined up with work when they graduate.	4/9/2018 15:11
792	/policies/healthy-youth-development/	This site is very aesthetically pleasing; however, I think the text should be added to continuously as conversations develop. These policies are really hard to judge because they're so vague and broad as stated. This applies not just to this category of policies but to most others on the site as well. I'd like to know roughly what a specific piece of policy would actually look like, or at least have some more details in the "action steps" section.	4/14/2018 5:21
793	/policies/healthy-youth-development/	Much of this work is being done in neighborhoods and communities across Minneapolis with little acknowledgement and funding opportunities. This policy area should incorporate the voice of youth development program leaders to develop collaborative strategies that promote positive and healthy development for youth, young, adults, and their families. Furthermore many of the programs that support this work across Minneapolis have been experiencing increased financial hardship due to the changing landscape of philanthropy in the non-profit sector and limited funding provided through government grants which is a barrier to providing safe and stable opportunities for youth, their families, and support systems across Minneapolis. It is time that the City create a financial agenda to support out-of-school time programs with demonstrated success on achieving the goals outlined in this policy. This work cannot solely be left to the Youth Coordinating Board, Ignite After school, and the many partners they collaborate with. Funding is key!	4/25/2018 19:50
794	/policies/healthy-youth-development/	Sexually transmitted infections and unintended pregnancy are listed as negative outcomes in the topic area of healthy youth development, but there isn't an action step listed here. I feel that there should be one, especially related to STI/HIV prevention/reduction as this is an issue faced by many youth in our City, and especially disproportionately by youth of color.	5/23/2018 0:25



## Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

795	/policies/healthy-youth-development/	from Paul Pentel MD, Ward 7 representative to Public Health Advisory Committee. I find no specific mention of family planning or goals related to that. This is a critical factor in the health of youth, with impacts in many other areas singled out in this Plan such as economic development. I do appreciate that this is a controversial topic but so are many others mentioned in this Plan. I think it would be unwise to keep this issue under the radar. That strategy has not protected aggressive challenges to effective public health approaches to family planning at the national or state levels. It is better to take this on and be proactive.	5/23/2018 21:13
796	/policies/healthy-youth-development/	There needs to be increased support for out of school time programming that addresses a range of issues and needs young people have. The policy mentions sexually transmitted infections, there is limited funding right now for programming that supports young people's ability to make informed decisions about their sexual health.	6/19/2018 20:42
797	/policies/heritage-preservation-financial-incentives/	This is a good start. How about adding financial assistance to community members/groups too small to tackle the onerous federal process of historic designation when a bad property owner stands in the way and bring about demolition by neglect? This ultimately would be a carrot at the end of a stick for a potential redeveloper, too (having federal designation, that is). Also, there should be consequences for companies that purposely work towards demolition of their historically designated buildings by neglecting them. For example, fine Company X for failure to maintain their buildings much as you do with homeowners. You are NOT doing this now, and you know where. (Learn that you too, Mpls, can stand up to a railroad -- other cities are doing it in certain circumstances. Join us in the 21st century.)	5/11/2018 22:27
798	/policies/heritage-preservation-financial-incentives/	While this policy to establish financial incentives for designated properties is much needed, none of the three action steps do so for designated properties. I suggest a fourth action step that reads like this. "Establish and promote financial incentives for historically designated properties to encourage local designation and to ensure the citizens responsible for maintaining tangible remnants of our city's shared heritage receive assistance to do so."	5/17/2018 18:55
799	/policies/heritage-preservation-legislative-advocacy/	ok	5/11/2018 22:29

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

800	/policies/heritage-preservation-legislative-advocacy/	<p>Current historic preservation policies are a tool that some private property owners are able to use to control the city at the expense of the greater good. Most historic preservation efforts that I am aware of are residential and focus less on historic importance and more on preserving in situ the built landscape of wealthy white property owners of Minneapolis' past.</p> <p>I would like to see the city include public good as a marker of historic designation--if a property or a street is worthy of the city enshrining it legally, it should provide a public benefit and a public use. Ideally, any structure designated "historic" should be open to the public for a minimum number of hours each week. When a structure is declared "historic," it generally denies that parcel the potential to contribute to the public good in the future; therefore, historic designation should be applied sparingly, and keeping in mind whose history is being preserved, in what context, what the impacts will be on increasing racial and economic equity in a given area, and who has access to benefit from what the city has determined is a resource worth protecting.</p> <p>There is a need locally to highlight and educate white Minneapolitans in particular about the long presence of people of color in our communities. As a POC whose family has been in the city for over a century, I/my family are constantly "welcomed" by white Minneapolitans. We have a dismal record of providing active and engaging historic preservation outside of whiteness.</p> <p>Additionally, I see historic preservation used as a crude tool to try to reduce construction waste and encourage material reuse. We need a different way to encourage reuse and reclaiming materials without limiting our urban landscape to unsustainable and unaffordable low-density mansions in a housing and climate crisis. We need to do this in a way that doesn't place the burden on those individuals and associations who are trying to increase housing and retail in our city, but instead figure out how to incentivize reuse/reduce waste city-wide.</p> <p>One related trend I see in the wealthy neighborhoods I have lived on the margins of is that remodels of mansions are frequent, with a lot of waste. I've been at neighborhood association meetings where members who are also real estate agents have talked strategically about avoiding historic designations for their mansions and the properties they flip because it would reduce their ability to gut/remodel/build large additions.</p> <p>In my observation, some exclusionary property owners fight for historic preservation as a means of keeping out renters (who're more likely POC) in areas that are zoned to allow higher density housing, and co-opt these tools and this language for personal goals that are at odds with the city's efforts. Other exclusionary property owners who are in areas where housing has already been reduced (like Lowry Hill) fight these designations because they don't need them to keep lower-income renters out.</p>	5/30/2018 16:51
801	/policies/heritage-preservation-outreach/	<p>Have specific ethnic groups, owners of designated historic properties notified of this policy?</p> <p>How will this goal be evaluated? Counting numbers of persons? Action results of preserved historical information?</p>	5/8/2018 17:28
802	/policies/heritage-preservation-outreach/	<p>This is nice, but you haven't been able to handle what you've already got! Deal with what's on your table already before you spread yourselves even thinner. The city is a prime partner (could even consider it criminally negligent) with multi-national corporate scammers Canadian Pacific Railway in the planned neglect of the city-designated Historic Shoreham Roundhouse. Also (and this applies to many portions of this draft and to city activities): Stop dividing people by calling out certain groups for special attention at the exclusion of others. Bring us together, don't keep separating us! (For this policy, the history lies in the history, not in the person who happens to notice it and talk about it in 2018. Tell people: "It's not all about ME ME ME.") We have lost sight of the civic good, the over-all wellbeing of everyone (not just certain "group-thinks") in Mpls as we rush to make amends for past mistakes. In this rush, the city has become racist in its efforts to be anti-racist. The city has become exclusionary in its efforts to become non-exclusive. The city is divisive in its efforts instead of understanding what One Minneapolis really means! We've swung around so far we have come full circle in being divisive, racist, and unfair. Just replaced one target with another.</p>	5/11/2018 22:01
803	/policies/heritage-preservation-outreach/	Expand outreach around heritage preservation activities and resources on trans community of Minnesota	6/6/2018 4:08
804	/policies/heritage-preservation-recognition/	The city should be proactive in nominating relevant properties for national level registers.	3/26/2018 22:59
805	/policies/heritage-preservation-recognition/	OK	5/11/2018 22:28

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

806	/policies/heritage-preservation-recognition/	<p>I'd like to see less of a focus on preserving the private built environment of wealthy white Minneapolitans and more efforts and attention towards sharing and amplifying the history of BIPOC in our city.</p> <p>I'm interested in seeing this play out in public spaces and in broader spaces. For example, in the course of ten years, we are redoing Hennepin Avenue basically from the Falls to Cloud Man Village, yet there is no active engagement of our Native communities to share how they have used and continue to use these places and the route connecting them.</p> <p>As far as I know, there are only a handful of landmarks recognizing the history of BIPOC in Minneapolis. Additionally, when private residences receive historic designation either individually or as part of a corridor, it seems to primarily serve to lift up the choices and structures of the wealthy white people whose faces and names are already common in our city, but without giving context or access to these private residences.</p> <p>I'd like to see historic preservation efforts working in tandem with our city's goals, rather than working against/undermining them. If historic designation is a tool for the public good, we need to make sure these designations support our city, rather than undermine its tax base (by locking in lower density, single use structures) for private "benefit" (reducing housing stock available and decreasing affordability) and without public access.</p> <p>In my view, as a POC, racial equity needs to be a focus of historic preservation. We need to publicly acknowledge and talk about Minneapolis' Native communities and history. We need to educate people on Minneapolis' history as a center of anti-semitism. We need to look at the historical figures we laud and who we erase--why we still have a "West Calhoun Parkway" and a "Patrick Henry" school and streets named after eugenicists.</p> <p>Right now, historic preservation in Minneapolis often seems like a way to replicate and reinforce white privilege and white supremacy without being explicit about it. It seems a response to an increasingly diverse population.</p> <p>The city needs to be actively seeking out BIPOC history to highlight, and limiting the use of historic preservation as a tool of exclusion. And the city needs to be part of the push-back to the assumption of BPOC residents as newcomers and Indigenous residents as historic relics, not focusing just on the "changing" city but on its historical diversity and the lived experiences of BIPOC here for decades and centuries.</p>	5/30/2018 17:29
807	/policies/heritage-preservation-regulation/	Making sure that historic buildings/districts can be creatively repurposed and updated to be sustainable and fit a currently valuable purpose while retaining their historic nature if vital.	3/28/2018 4:42
808	/policies/heritage-preservation-regulation/	Minneapolis often does not honor its own Historic Preservation Commission decisions. I don't understand this. If the city council wants development to increase density they overrule or ignore the HPC's positions. Having moved to Mpls. five years ago and lived in cities which respect their historic heritage and neighborhood guidelines, I feel I have moved to a backward city. Once these historic treasures are lost, they are gone.	4/13/2018 22:19
809	/policies/heritage-preservation-regulation/	A through E are too vague to know what you are trying to get at here. Need clearer language. This current verbage could be weaseled around. Revise guidelines HOW? Modify zoning HOW? Make them easier to ignore by bad owners/developers? Stronger? Shouldn't you be following the fed guidelines ... or even stronger? This almost reads as anti-preservation. Fix this.	5/11/2018 22:21
810	/policies/homelessness/	This is very important. The City should include as a strategy provisions for providing stable housing for homeless families in city-owned vacant property, preferably through a model that leads to long-term stable occupancy of those homes.	3/27/2018 20:25
811	/policies/homelessness/	Homelessness is a direct measure of systems failures for the individuals and families affected. The demographic composition of people who are homeless is a measure of racism. The proportion of households with children where the parents work is a measure of how the minimum wage and entry level jobs cannot cover the cost of staying alive. The number of mentally ill individuals is a measure of failure in that system. If we want to have an impact on homelessness, we need to fix all the systems that impact families and individuals.	5/14/2018 20:35
812	/policies/homelessness/	Create group home options for mentally ill and chronically chemically dependent people. Get them off the streets and into institutions to provide help and safety to them.	5/26/2018 4:08
813	/policies/homelessness/	We are in the middle of a homelessness crisis assisted by the affordable housing crisis. What are you really going to do?	5/31/2018 19:28

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

814	/policies/homelessness/	provide separate safe shelter for LGBTQ youth	6/6/2018 2:53
815	/policies/homelessness/	There needs to be some kind of funding source connected to all of this.	6/8/2018 14:01
816	/policies/homelessness/	Clearly funding will be required, what is the proposed source? I personally monetarily support youth facilities but of course the need is great. Employment and training efforts are critical as a long term solution for the able bodied.	6/14/2018 20:51
817	/policies/housing-displacement/	The City should consider models that provide rent control for the life of the resident, and potentially over a longer/ongoing timeframe. I definitely support legal binding limits on rent increases where needed to avoid displacement.	3/27/2018 20:32
818	/policies/housing-displacement/	Let's hope you actually come through with this, rather than forcing minorities out to the suburbs and letting young white couples buy up all the houses and gain all the equity.	4/3/2018 19:27
819	/policies/housing-displacement/	One way to keep housing affordable is to keep taxes from rising faster than incomes. This could be helped by halting the rapid rise in assessed valuation of owner-occupied and rental housing that has occurred the past few years, which is pricing lower and middle income people out of their homes.	4/5/2018 18:06
820	/policies/housing-displacement/	It's very telling that this policy explicitly excludes communities that the city doesn't care about - specifically those boring, white, middle class single family homes who would be disrupted by the aggressive upzoning to large multi-family buildings against their neighborhoods. The city leaders makes it clear in what they say verbally and in this document that disrupting these neighborhoods, these families, is a "feature, not a bug" of the plan, and their discomfort or disadvantage is of no consequence. I find that very offensive. I find it offensive how the city thinks their concerns don't matter and and if they complain they should be criticized for racial bias, or anti density, or soemthing. Yet, when the North side neighbors raise these concern they get the following 6 points above.	4/19/2018 18:09
821	/policies/housing-displacement/	Please remember that homeowners have sacrificed to be able to get their homes, and continue to sacrifice in order to keep them. Many homeowners' incomes have decreased in recent years and property taxes have not decreased, but instead have increased dramatically. Relief is needed or residents who are homeowners at this time will be displaced.	4/29/2018 23:16
822	/policies/housing-displacement/	The city is home to a great many vacant lots, unused former industrial land, parking lots, crumbling single-story storefronts, and other underutilized space that currently has no residential use. One way to preclude housing displacement is to allow and incentive the building of new housing where no housing currently exists.	5/1/2018 2:52
823	/policies/housing-displacement/	<p>POLICY 43: Housing Displacement</p> <p>NRRC's proposed action steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.The City will increase available down payment assistance for home purchasers of low-and-moderate-income home buyers.</li><li>2.The City will increase available down payment assistance for home purchasers of peoples of color, indigenous people, vulnerable populations, the elderly and people with disabilities.</li><li>3.The City will collaborate with legal services to pass stricter rule to protect vulnerable home purchasers from toxic contract for deed contracts.</li><li>4.The City will improve the housing standards of new builds to promote longer quality and sustainability.</li><li>5.The City will use State emergency assistance funding to help residents pay delinquent property taxes.</li><li>6.The City will provide legal resource materials to residents receiving code violations from the City of Minneapolis to protect against excessive violations and fees.</li><li>7.The City will provide rehab resources, available with neighborhood organizations, to residents receiving code violations.</li></ol>	5/8/2018 19:47
824	/policies/housing-displacement/	In my community, gentrification is the single biggest concern. The "action steps" need concrete behaviors attached to them. These concrete behaviors begin and are centered around the current residents and their involvement with development and investment decisions. To me, the way to ensure residents' involvement is through a door knocking campaign and community meetings. Neighborhood organizations can do this. CANDO did an excellent resident campaign which led to a community benefits agreement that was directed at the Seward Coop. This process should be required for any development and enforced through permitting and zoning processes.	5/13/2018 17:18
825	/policies/housing-displacement/	Shouldn't this be spelled out already as opposed to calling it an ACTION STEP for the future....how can anyone be expected to support this is they don't know what the details are....that is where the devil lives after-all d.Expand programs that support existing homeowners in affording and maintaining their home, with a focus on people of color, indigenous people and vulnerable populations, such as low-income households, the elderly and people with disabilities.	5/15/2018 19:50

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

826	/policies/housing-displacement/	We need more rental inspectors to enforce rental codes to avoid debacles such as what happened with the Mahmoud Kahn properties.	5/16/2018 20:09
827	/policies/housing-displacement/	These are great ideas. In addition, we should be zoning to permit as much construction of new housing as possible, so as to increase supply, raise the vacancy rate, and lessen landlords' power to raise rent.	5/21/2018 1:11
828	/policies/housing-displacement/	<p>I am TOTALLY in favor of this policy. But there needs to be a strong plan of action now, the sooner the better, because the affordable units are going away fast (and not just in "low-income" neighborhoods). Even in my SW neighborhood, there is a form of "gentrification" occurring (that I never new existed!) where seemingly adequate but possibly needing refurbishing small houses, are snarfed up before you know it, torn down, and replaced with a \$ million + poorly built home! Frankly, I've been traumatized by this in the last few years! So while the price is going way up, the quality is going down. I was talking to a neighbor the other day who happens to do tile work, and he said he is replacing a lot of the tile work that was not done correctly in these new poorly built houses! IMO, this needs to stop, and fast!</p> <p>I've also been shocked recently when an investor (often out-of-state) swoops in and buys an apartment complex full of low income renters, often for many years, and including lots of children in schools. Then the occupants get kicked out, the apartments get "re-habed" and the rent gets raised (2 recent examples in Richfield, one successful, one not - which was saved for the current renters).</p>	5/23/2018 20:21
829	/policies/housing-displacement/	<p>How?</p> <p>Why is this not already happening and, if it is why is it not successful.</p> <p>Also, what we are witnessing in real time, is a city that appears interested in displacement ie: removal of persons that do not fit the "market".</p>	5/31/2018 19:37
830	/policies/housing-displacement/	It's interesting but not surprising the plan does not worry at all about displacing anyone else. How about the families who's homes may be surrounded by 6 story apartment buildings due to transit corridor massing if large scale housing projects?	6/1/2018 20:15
831	/policies/housing-displacement/	I think we should sever the homestead exemption from rising property taxes. it is ridiculous we're paying more in property taxes and getting a lesser homestead exemption simply because home values are hyper inflated beyond common sense right now. it's not like we bought a fancier home. the homestead exemption should stay the same.	6/14/2018 21:11
832	/policies/housing-displacement/	I think this is a narrow view if who all will be impacted by this plan. People will loose their homes because of this plan.	6/18/2018 1:11
833	/policies/housing-maintenance/	This policy is linked under the Heritage Preservation section but none of the action items directly relate to preservation. Recommend adding an action item or a more detailed explanation in the narrative about how this directly relates to heritage preservation policies.	4/18/2018 16:38
834	/policies/housing-maintenance/	This policy is linked under the Heritage Preservation section but none of the action items directly relate to preservation. Recommend adding an action item or a more detailed explanation in the narrative about how this directly relates to heritage preservation policies.	4/18/2018 16:38
835	/policies/housing-maintenance/	This policy is linked under the Heritage Preservation section but none of the action items directly relate to preservation. Recommend adding an action item or a more detailed explanation in the narrative about how this directly relates to heritage preservation policies.	4/18/2018 16:38
836	/policies/housing-maintenance/	Convert rentals to owner occupied houses and duplexes.	4/21/2018 23:42
837	/policies/housing-maintenance/	Your action steps sound like code for even more housing regulation. We are so ridiculously over-regulated as it is. Feel like a permit is required to do anything. Pretty soon we'll need one to wash our windows or paint. Your permit requirements and their costs drive homeowners to do work under the table. Your goal of safety (or is it really about more money?) is backfiring.	5/4/2018 10:30
838	/policies/housing-maintenance/	<p>please do c.</p> <p>city classes on home maintenance would be excellent.</p>	6/14/2018 21:15
839	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	Generally, this is very good. I am a bit concerned that the training being considered may include/ prioritize economic sectors that may not be a good fit for the long-term sustainability of Minneapolis.	3/27/2018 20:49
840	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	how to get unions to invest in training the next generation? most of labor industry needs workers right now, trades like masons are aging out and need people fast. how to teach kids to take pride in hard work, pays well, don't need to be a basketball superstar to have a place in this world.	4/3/2018 16:52
841	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	This is an excellent, important policy. Continue investing in nonprofits like PPL, Emerge, Resource, Twin Cities Rise, and Hired!	4/4/2018 16:35

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

842	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	Early learning will be THE way Minneapolis reduces its opportunity/achievement gap. Let's make it easy for small daycares to operate. Let's partner with agencies like Minneminds and Think Small to scale what NAZ is doing in more promise neighborhoods across Minneapolis. This is the workforce of the future, and Minneapolis needs a population who has had the benefits of the best early learning experiences possible. That includes safe and affordable housing, clean air and water, access to transit, good schools, food security, plenty of play places and greenspaces, and access to affordable early learning (daycare and preschool) so all our littlest learners are ready for kindergarten, high school, higher ed and beyond.	5/15/2018 0:03
843	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	As a small business employer, I have never heard about these programs. What kind of skills are being taught and what are the benefits for a small business owner to help out?  Also, I have been following the discussions on the \$15 living wage. Sounds great, but honestly, there are some jobs that ARE NOT WORTH \$15. There are some people out there with advanced education and are working in skilled industries for \$15. And I'm supposed to pay somebody \$15 for doing simple work like filing charts or shredding files? It's insulting to those who have real skills that somebody selling popsicles can make the same amount of money.	5/20/2018 18:38
844	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	As a small business employer, I have never heard about these programs. What kind of skills are being taught and what are the benefits for a small business owner to help out?  Also, I have been following the discussions on the \$15 living wage. Sounds great, but honestly, there are some jobs that ARE NOT WORTH \$15. There are some people out there with advanced education and are working in skilled industries for \$15. And I'm supposed to pay somebody \$15 for doing simple work like filing charts or shredding files? It's insulting to those who have real skills that somebody selling popsicles can make the same amount of money.	5/20/2018 18:38
845	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	What does healthy safe and equitable workplaces mean? Is this a way to shoehorn the working families agenda back onto the table where the city tries to take over the operations of businesses within it's limit? Scheduling hiring and the like? Tread carefully here that topic the last time almost accelerated the exodus from Mpls.	5/23/2018 17:38
846	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	What do you mean by "creative sector workers"? theater, music, art, dance, visual arts, graphic design? Just curious  How can we get skilled craftsmen and craftswomen to get the training and apprenticeships that are needed and crying for new employees and skilled apprentices? They are all over Minnesota, and certainly her in the TC. Every contractor we've worked with in the last 3 years says that the shortages of men and women going into the trades is a real problem right now. How do we get the Community Colleges to increase these apprenticeships, mentoring and training in all of the trades?  Incentive for private contractors and designers to put video recruiting films together and get copies to all community colleges and private institutions and again...into libraries and community centers. Job Night, Skilled Trades Night, Practical Nurses Jobs night...etc.	5/29/2018 18:57
847	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	Equity is great but equity in a world without growth is.....Vermont. We can't lose sight of the fundamental economic competitiveness of the region as we pursue equitable outcomes. (SHIT...i sound like a Republican) but we need GROWTH-FOCUSED Policies as well as access to high quality jobs for people of color and others who face economic exclusion.	5/29/2018 22:47
848	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	Should add Design workforce development programs and create partnerships that work to eliminate GENDER based disparities. Support trans youth and educate city, state employees and all employers about how to deal with trans people.	6/5/2018 16:03
849	/policies/human-capital-and-a-trained-workforce/	Small businesses owned by one person will become the future of our work world. These businesses must have small store fronts or a shop area to produce their products. The arts buildings in NE Minneapolis already have that space and the people in those businesses should be allowed to live closer to their work space.	6/22/2018 15:31
850	/policies/identify-and-evaluate-historic-resources/	This is half right. But the other half, for many historic resources, is to work to make them viable in some way, if not already so, not to just study/evaluate, identify them. For instance, you've studied the city-designated and federally eligible Historic Shoreham Roundhouse. Then you dropped the ball by not being more proactive and assertive here in bringing about much-needed community revitalization on a key corridor where the collateral blight is a true growing embarrassment to the city of Mpls. Worse every year. Instead, this could be historic preservation AND economic revitalization on 18 acres - many jobs could be created here. Where is CPED?? But you have neglected this for decades and missed many opportunities. Talk about an underrepresented community!	5/11/2018 22:09
851	/policies/identify-and-evaluate-historic-resources/	Do not rename schools and lakes that have historical references. By removing history we will not learn from it.	5/26/2018 4:32

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

852	/policies/identify-and-evaluate-historic-resources/	There a number of small stone, brick and sometimes wood homes in south Minneapolis between Cedar and Bloomington Avenues south of Lake Street. They are largely identical and were all built in the late 1800s for the mill workers who worked at the flour mills along Hiawatha Avenue. I live in one of them (1705 East 31st Street, Mpls.) and think some consideration should be given to their historic significance. Many of these homes have been largely upgraded over the decades while many others are in very dilapidated condition.	5/31/2018 20:37
853	/policies/identify-and-evaluate-historic-resources/	Expand outreach around heritage preservation activities and resources on trans community of Minnesota	6/6/2018 4:09
854	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	Look at decking over the freeways, for space for parks and/or housing!	3/26/2018 23:30
855	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	The city should definitely be following/thinking proactively about these technologies, but the city should also be cautious about rushing into them. Also, requirements that autonomous vehicles be electric would be helpful.	3/27/2018 16:43
856	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	What about walking? How about tech that benefits people crossing the street? Cars, cars, cars!!!	3/29/2018 16:02
857	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	Use technology to get rid of "beg buttons" where pedestrians have to ask permission to cross the street.	5/3/2018 15:39
858	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	The city needs to guard against becoming "family unfriendly" by over-emphasizing transportation (and zoning/land use) policies that are disproportionately based on accommodating the desires of some outspoken healthy younger people--e.g.s. bicycle riders, those realistically able to conveniently access and rely on mass transit for all their transportation needs, et al--at the expense of the needs of families with children with far-flung activities, seniors, those with health-related mobility limitations and others who, realistically, will be highly dependent on private cars for the foreseeable future. Among other things, this means requirements for adequate off-street parking for all new buildings--and multiple occupancies--should be retained, particularly in view of the amount of snow and the 5-month duration of winter here, something inescapably without parallel in Seattle, Portland or Denver. Policies to encourage greater use of mass transit and other car alternatives--particularly while the current very limited mass transit system is improved and expanded-- should be based solely on the "carrot" of low-pricing, convenient schedules, attractive facilities, etc., rather than the "stick" of increasing the inconvenience of those reliant on cars.	5/14/2018 1:05
859	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	How about some longer lasting roads? In Germany, roads are built to last 60 years. Contractors are on the hook to repair them for free if they fall below a standard. Our roads and parkways barely make it 4-5 years before they become pockmarked with potholes. Do it right the first time. Listen to your mother.	5/17/2018 18:22
860	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	Innovations in transportation and infrastructure Great strategies! A few additional comments. 1. Are you looking at how shared mobility - car to go, nice ride, uber/ lyft, along with bike parking can reduce the number of cars per household as density is being added to neighborhood nodes? 2. Make sure to work with other cities to develop policies for cities to be able to charge autonomous vehcile provider fleets to pay for street up keep. 3. work with other cities to find policies to prevent individual ownership and use of autonomous vehicles, much better to have them in shared fleets to reduce VMT. 4. Are you linking up with the Twin Cities Shared Use mobility Plan. Sean Gosiewski, Executive Director Alliance for Sustainability, 612-250-0389 sean@afors.org www.allianceforsustainability.com/mpls2040comments	5/22/2018 22:16
861	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	Innovations in transportation and infrastructure Great strategies! A few additional comments. 1. Are you looking at how shared mobility - car to go, nice ride, uber/ lyft, along with bike parking can reduce the number of cars per household as density is being added to neighborhood nodes? 2. Make sure to work with other cities to develop policies for cities to be able to charge autonomous vehcile provider fleets to pay for street up keep. 3. work with other cities to find policies to prevent individual ownership and use of autonomous vehicles, much better to have them in shared fleets to reduce VMT. 4. Are you linking up with the Twin Cities Shared Use mobility Plan. Sean Gosiewski, Executive Director Alliance for Sustainability, 612-250-0389 sean@afors.org www.allianceforsustainability.com/mpls2040comments	5/22/2018 22:16

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

862	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li> <li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li> <li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li> </ol> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	6/7/2018 20:50
863	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	Use technology to improve traffic light coordination and to reduce vehicle idling in internal combustion engines. This technology exists now.	6/8/2018 16:02
864	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	I am happy to have a city that is more bike friendly. Whole lanes, not just bike lanes, reserved for bikes would be great.	6/15/2018 1:12
865	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	Nice ideas, but for the drones. The cost complications to using them in an urban setting do not justify the advantages. And in fact, having skimmed through the previous 24 policies, I have seen marked departure from realities from many of them. These are aspirational. But which is more important, which less, and on which axis of comparison? You're using birdshot, and aiming at far too many birds. We'd be better off with greater concentration, accompanied by some analysis, on fewer subjects,	6/17/2018 21:30
866	/policies/innovations-in-transportation-and-infrastructure/	How about giving incentives for developers to install EV charging systems in the garages or parking areas?	6/17/2018 22:12
867	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	Policies should promote owner occupied housing. There is little or nothing in this plan to promote that.	3/27/2018 18:55
868	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	The goal is great. Not much specificity as to how the city will pursue it.	3/27/2018 20:19
869	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	Please identify at least ONE specific new action that the City will undertake.	4/3/2018 14:44
870	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	relax laws and increase incentives for people to invest in sober housing, with transit oriented development. we need more sober housing	4/9/2018 15:01
871	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	What kind of tools are you talking about? some examples? How would regional dialogue and collaboration help expand affordable housing?	4/18/2018 20:43
872	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	These are just words that have been stated before with no changes. How will this be different this time? I do not see any substantial action in the above strategies.	5/6/2018 16:51



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

873	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	The city should avoid becoming perceived as "family unfriendly" if it were to adopt multiple-occupancy policies--in the name of "density"--which would impair the character of long-established single-family neighborhoods. The location of such neighborhoods--relatively near the downtown center, the lakes and elsewhere--has traditionally been one of the distinctive features of the City, and a major draw for families relocating here from elsewhere. It is often overlooked that these single-family neighborhoods existed during the years when the population of the City was much higher than it is today. That additional population--much of it occupying much more affordable housing--was accommodated by apartment buildings (largely since torn down) located in appropriately zoned, denser neighborhoods. Rather than accommodating developers' understandable commercial desire to build in areas that are already attractive--regardless on the impact on current residents--they should be given incentives to build in the truly underdeveloped areas of the City.	5/14/2018 1:51
874	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	I support these goals, with a qualification. I have seen proposals to build more and denser housing in Minneapolis opposed on the grounds that they somehow conflict with the goal to preserve affordable housing. This argument is backwards. The steps outlined in Policy 1 would directly and indirectly support the preservation and creation of naturally occurring affordable housing in Minneapolis.	5/21/2018 0:41
875	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	I live in the Fulton neighborhood and we worked very hard to get Monster Tear Down houses under control. Now it seems that all of the work is going to be thrown away and allow 4-plexes to be built anywhere. If Monster Homes were found to be incongruous with these established single family neighborhoods, then how do 4-plexes get a pass? Are we going to keep drastically changing the rules every mayoral election?  If we wanted to live in Uptown, we would! We want to live in Minneapolis in a Single Family neighborhood! The residential streets in Uptown are a public safety disaster, due to the rampant use of on-street parking. Developers should have been required to pay into a fund for the establishment of off-street parking areas - or heaven forbid, provide it for themselves. Neither of those options have been successfully implemented in Uptown; and so we should expect more of the same - streets that are unpassable to emergency vehicles or the average sedan!!!	5/21/2018 18:56
876	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	Create a STRONG action plan to stop the tear-downs of small more affordable homes so that enormous single family homes (many poorly built boxes) can be built in their place! These smaller homes can be good starter homes for young people who may also be interested in refurbishing them. Also, they provide homes for seniors who are downsizing and would like to stay in their neighborhood.	5/23/2018 14:27
877	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	This is the same as point 34 and 35. Redundant.	5/26/2018 3:57
878	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	Allow ADU's to be built by both owner occupied and non owner occupied landlord/owners. This will lower the cost of ADU's which allows for more affordable rents and is a strategy to put housing in desired areas on an infill basis without tearing down current housing.	5/27/2018 12:32
879	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	This is great! I own a home in Minneapolis, but that's just not an option for so many working families. I'd love to have more dense housing in my area. Everyone should have the option for safe, affordable housing - and there just isn't enough space for a single family home for every 2 people! I think we should incorporate more dense housing options in our neighborhoods, make the city more walkable, safer and more livable.	5/31/2018 19:24
880	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	Possible affordable housing revenue sources: construction excise tax (see Portland), linkage fees (see Denver), AirBnb tax (see Portland). The money is there, we just need political will. If we want to increase property taxes, we should only do so for the top 20% of house values. According to this report, while property taxes are fairly progressive, the top 20% income-wise still pay a bit less than everyone else: <a href="https://itep.org/whopays/">https://itep.org/whopays/</a>	6/8/2018 13:58
881	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	Absolutely, now again the how? What kind of strategies, tools and opportunities have been discussed. Many of us would like to support initiatives to increase affordable housing but we do want to see what your actual ideas are first. Dreaming is easy, putting together workable plans should already be here.	6/14/2018 16:54

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

882	/policies/innovative-housing-strategies/	I love our city. I was born and raised in _____ neighborhood, went to the U, worked in downtown and now live in Page. Except for a year and a half in graduate school, I have never lived nor wanted to live anywhere else. We have the best parks; empowering schools (I am a proud MPS grad and my children are amazing Millers); thriving downtown; and a fabulous art scene. My neighborhood is wonderful for various reasons, but the most important reason is being threatened by Proposal 2040. The quiet peace we find in our little 'hood is a respite from the bustle we know and love in the other parts of the city, only a stone's throw away. The streets of our neighborhood have taught my children how to drive and parallel park, something I think would not be nearly as pleasant with increased traffic and street parking. I also love the stability of our neighborhood. We know every single person on our block and almost everyone on the other handful of blocks in our little community. I would love to see more affordable housing. I worked hard to support the building of Creekside Commons just a half mile from my home. It would be wonderful to find more fourplexes along bus routes such as Nicollet or Portland Ave, both shouting distance from me, but to have them in amongst the quiet of our neighborhood would just all but ruin it for me. Seriously. Please do not allow these fourplexes to be built within peaceful, quiet neighborhoods. Thank you.	6/14/2018 21:08
883	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	This is good	3/22/2018 22:27
884	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	ADUs have been great. Removing the owner-occupancy requirement would be even greater. An innovative funding mechanism to encourage ADU development on alleys would be incredible.	3/24/2018 14:45
885	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	They city should hire a chief design officer, like Los Angeles did with Christopher Hawthorne. There needs to be more oversight of design, so that we can ensure high quality design with all this new growth.	3/25/2018 14:45
886	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	Very excited about this idea, especially cooperative housing (focusing on larger cooperatives that control multiple properties and allow members to transition between properties). This proposal seems not very specific on how to achieve this.	3/27/2018 20:17
887	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	pre fabricated houses that two people can put together with minimal environmental impact. Hex House, A-frame houses, Coodo 64. Get people out of underpasses and into homes, there are 10 vacant homes to every homeless person in america. We need to work with banks and cities to get families in these homes that will improve the neighborhood and be economical over all. Why is habitat building houses when they can renovate existing houses for cheaper. 1) increases neighborhood property values 2) deals with unsightly vacant houses 3) gets people off the street 4) more sober houses, st paul is the sober capital of the US!	4/3/2018 16:35
888	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	We don't need dorms for adults here. We do need taller apartment buildings (6-10 floors instead of 5-6).	4/3/2018 19:21
889	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	Diversity of housing options helps meet the needs of a diverse population; however, market forces may promote certain types of housing over others. Policies need to adaptable to changes in the market in order to grow types of housing that may not be naturally occurring in the marketplace.	4/8/2018 22:13
890	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	We live next to a house owned by The City of Minneapolis. What are you going to do to ensure housing fits the neighborhood? The city told our block that the house they planned to build will fit in architecturally. It does not. Further, the property is not maintained. This decreases our home value. Additionally, whatever process the city uses to screen renters does not work as they have had to evict numerous tenants in the past. Please do not repeat these mistakes!	4/11/2018 18:35
891	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	The City currently has rules that require a basement on new housing. This greatly increases the cost of housing. I personally don't like having a basement and they typically have issues: Flooding, mold, etc....  The City also requires an off street parking spot on the property for single family housing. They should get rid of this requirements since this also adds to the cost of housing and not everybody drives a car.	5/7/2018 20:33
892	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	Right now the city require surveys and variances just to do replacement work on my street Up to \$4000 to get a no. I hope the new policies revise most of this. New buildings should not dump water on their neighbors (from drains etc) and should have parking or a pledge that they not drive a car. A fourplex, like a large single family home, should be designed to be an asset to the block, and respect surrounding buildings. Have the city remove barriers for all landowners and not just fourplex owners.  Here a way to increase affordability-lower property taxes! This whole city plan did not take into account cost. My big problem with this plan, thoughts were good but process very flawed. Ask people what they want, they give you a dream list. Then ask what they will trade for it or pay it- you get a different answer. You did not ask the payers in the system. Property tax, state and sales tax are already high enough. I know retiring here will be impossible. It would be nice to have affordable housing set up with a priority for people who paid in the system and can no longer afford their Mpls homes. Sign me up.	5/9/2018 18:14

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

893	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	I recommend looking into the Nightingale model of innovative housing development. <a href="http://nightingalehousing.org/">http://nightingalehousing.org/</a> . It would also be a good to explicitly promote (and perhaps subsidize) edible landscapes and edible rooftop gardens to be included in development projects with food deserts - like North Minneapolis.	5/12/2018 12:26
894	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	The city should avoid becoming perceived as "family unfriendly" if it were to adopt multiple-occupancy policies--in the name of "density"--which would impair the character of long-established single-family neighborhoods. The location of such neighborhoods--relatively near the downtown center, the lakes and elsewhere--has traditionally been one of the distinctive features of the City, and a major draw for families relocating here from elsewhere. It is often overlooked that these single-family neighborhoods existed during the years when the population of the City was much higher than it is today. That additional population--much of it occupying much more affordable housing--was accommodated by apartment buildings (largely since torn down) located in appropriately zoned, denser neighborhoods. Rather than accommodating developers' understandable commercial desire to build in areas that are already attractive--regardless on the impact on current residents--they should be given incentives to build in the truly underdeveloped areas of the City.	5/14/2018 1:49
895	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	How many units will this create? How many will affordable? How will you measure this?	5/16/2018 0:30
896	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	Great action steps. Co-ops and other innovative housing types are one of several ways that the city should be helping existing Minneapolis communities remain where they have roots, rather than being displaced.	5/21/2018 0:20
897	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	Please consider allowing landlords and investors build ADU's but remove the requirement of living in the ADU or in the property.	5/22/2018 14:55
898	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	There are already departments of Minneapolis government that should be able to do this along with hud.	5/26/2018 3:56
899	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	Expand who can build an ADU to include non owner occupied rentals like Portland. They are building over 600 ADU/year now, we permitted about 35/year. Take away the owner/occupy restriction and hundreds of ADU's would be built	5/27/2018 13:20
900	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	If i sell my house, and it is on a double corner lot, what type of housing could be built there?	5/29/2018 18:09
901	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	As a homeowner, I think it's great that the city wants to expand options for housing. I'd love to have more rental units in my South Minneapolis neighborhood. I know that I'm incredibly privileged to be able to have bought a home - there just isn't enough affordable housing for working families! Frankly, we need to get rid of our racist housing policy past and move forward. More density means a more livable city for everyone!	5/31/2018 19:20
902	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	An emerging trend we keep hearing about is ADU's in Portland where they have hundreds of them being built where the city co-op's costs and both home owners and landlords can build them.	6/2/2018 12:50
903	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	This sounds like the "To-do" list you made that you never got around to doing. So when it came time to hand in your paper, you just submitted your plans to write the paper. Give me a break! Do some fucking research, promote innovative housing type right now! Put in a provision that allows for exceptions to every rule we have ever made so people with "innovative" ideas can stand in front of your podium and beg for forgiveness.	6/3/2018 3:36
904	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	I support this policy. We need innovative models for seniors!	6/6/2018 2:10
905	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	adopt right of first refusal to allow residents who are currently renters to implement some of these innovative housing strategies through the purchase of their home from the property manager.	6/6/2018 20:16
906	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	This is awesome! As a homeowner, I love the plan's flexibility to adapt to changing demographics. Not everyone needs, wants or can afford a single family home. Removing barriers to create more housing is a great idea.	6/7/2018 21:37
907	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	Many of the barriers to innovative housing solutions are related to the speculative market making land/housing impossibly expensive to buy and preserve. Land trusts should be a key piece of removing land from the speculative market.	6/8/2018 13:55
908	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	In other cities around the world, there is system in which one can buy ones apartment. This may sound like a condo type thing, but it's not. The city should see if this is replicable in the states and attempt to do it to expand housing types.	6/10/2018 23:34
909	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	What exactly are the policies that pose barriers? Changes need to proposed in a plan in order to support the plan. As an important and workable policy I would have expected to see definitive action steps.	6/14/2018 16:51
910	/policies/innovative-housing-types/	Please do not allow a blanket multi-plex zoning all over the city. please please please. i love our quiet neighborhood. i understand the need for more housing but do we have to ruin quiet areas? there are plenty of areas that are already bustling. keep the multi-plexes to those areas and allow the quiet SINGLE FAMILY HOME areas to STAY single family home. It would keep DIVERSITY of housing throughout the city. People would be able to have a CHOICE of how they want to live. Making the blanket zoning would, in my opinion, ruin it. please don't.	6/14/2018 20:53

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

911	/policies/integration-of-water-management-into-development/	<p>Add specific language allowing boulevard conversion from sod/grass to rain catchment areas (rain gardens), and other ecologically beneficial habitats (for pollinators, etc). (also, rooftop sod?).</p> <p>My neighborhood (whole city?) implemented an additional storm drain fee for % of building area on the city lot (ie overbuilt lots pay some additional storm/sewer fee due to excess rainwater production). Allow offsets/allowances for rainwater mitigation, if applicable.</p>	4/4/2018 11:05
912	/policies/integration-of-water-management-into-development/	<p>where possible return land that was previously wetland to wetland - this eliminates cost of ground-waterpumping, damage done during significant rain events, and restores the soils ability to catch rainfall. These areas can be returned to foraging space for community members, trails, and meaningful natural stormwater areas.</p> <p>Ban pesticide use within the city, but especially in parks and at schools</p> <p>All new plantings should match this ecosystem - prairie. Meaning naturally drought-tolerant. There are many beautiful flowers that grow in prairie.</p> <p>Reduce non-permeable land coverings (roadways, parking, etc)</p> <p>encourage and facilitate grey water use</p> <p>follow the advice of this expert and bill "distributed water infrastructure" improvements (e.g. low-flow toilets, green roofs, rain gardens, permeable pavement, smart meters, etc) as CAPITAL not operating expenses. This will open up capital access to do these improvements en masse without having to significantly raise municipal water rates. You can also use tools like on-bill repayment (Inclusive financing) for water-related improvements that are cost effective to further reduce barriers to making these improvements: <a href="https://waternow.org/financing-the-future-of-water-infrastructure-just-got-a-whole-lot-easier-part-2-what-is-distributed-infrastructure-and-why-should-you-care-about-it/">https://waternow.org/financing-the-future-of-water-infrastructure-just-got-a-whole-lot-easier-part-2-what-is-distributed-infrastructure-and-why-should-you-care-about-it/</a></p>	6/6/2018 21:05
913	/policies/integration-of-water-management-into-development/	Bioswales that are required on private development need to have signage indicating what they are, and posted prohibition the use of pesticides, weed killers, and fertilizers. The average Joe hired to maintain these areas immediately sees weeds and douses them with chemicals to kill the very vegetation installed to stop the chemicals from reaching the river or groundwater. This scenario eventually plays out in every Bioswale in the city.	6/16/2018 19:05
914	/policies/integration-of-water-management-into-development/	We are seeing lots of variances for setbacks around the city. This is clearly bad for water and air quality as well as for the human environment. We really, really need to enforce setbacks, require that developments include greenspace, and maximize permeable surfaces.	6/17/2018 0:25
915	/policies/intrinsic-value-of-properties/	<p>I think this is a slippery slope for a city to designate "intrinsically" valuable property. If its not quantifiable, then its just a fight about opinions.</p> <p>I do not support this policy.</p>	3/23/2018 15:25
916	/policies/intrinsic-value-of-properties/	It is very important to preserve these buildings. This should be done in a way that is also flexible for appropriate re-use so that existing buildings can be effectively adapted for new purposes without restrictions that make that unduly costly.	3/27/2018 21:04
917	/policies/intrinsic-value-of-properties/	Make sure this policy includes residential houses. I live in a house built in 1909. We are an undeclared heritage site!	5/14/2018 22:32
918	/policies/intrinsic-value-of-properties/	These are good steps to take but actions to increase density proposed as solutions for other goals will negatively impact historic housing stock in neighborhoods close to downtown	6/17/2018 22:34
919	/policies/landscaping/	For all street-level parking plazas, require high and dense perimeter plant growth to obscure cars and open space (within safety limits).	3/26/2018 14:32
920	/policies/landscaping/	Species diversity of landscaping is also important. We've had too long a history of planting all the same types of plants in one location.	3/27/2018 16:29
921	/policies/landscaping/	Encourage unmowed areas on public and private land.	4/6/2018 23:10
922	/policies/landscaping/	Landscaping is also an important tool for attracting and supporting native species higher up in the food chain (insects, birds, etc.). The impacts of landscaping on native wildlife should also be a concern/priority. Thanks!	4/13/2018 15:27
923	/policies/landscaping/	Yes, please. We need rain gardens and native plants and trees along with organic practices.	4/21/2018 18:52
924	/policies/landscaping/	Developments should get some level of credit to Site Plan review standards for plantings (trees) in the public realm. Policy should allow for using trees in stormwater control - Evapotranspiration. Green walls have not lived up their promise, only a few successful examples in the last 8 years - Kronzer	4/28/2018 17:07

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

925	/policies/landscaping/	The raw data of comments collected so far include many references to green spaces. Citizens clearly see the need for them, not just in parks and at the lakes but on individual properties. This is important, in light of the new zoning proposals for increased high rises near and around downtown and activity centers as well as for the ability to build fourplexes on every block in the city. I am happy to report that the plan includes policies for preserving old and planting new trees as well as for creating attractive, larger and environmentally sound landscapes (Policy #13). The accompanying pictures for this policy, however, show buildings with only a few feet of landscaping and no boulevard. To date, my observation of new structures that have gone up around the city in general and in my neighborhood in particular, the developers are granted any possible variance from the current regulations for set backs, allowing them to use pretty much the entire plot of land for their structures. Should the policies listed in this plan be adopted, I expect to see an end to the current tendency of both the Planning Commission and the City Council to grant variances that significantly reduce setbacks. (I witnessed one meeting in which setbacks for a structure were reduced from several feet to 6 inches). Furthermore, in a recent interview with Kerry Miller, Lisa Bender specifically mentioned that she thinks current setbacks are too big, thus indicating that , whereas this policy seems to support setbacks, the goal, or at least CM Bender's goal, appears to be to reduce them. How will the City be accountable to this ideal when our CM President seems to object to it and when faced with pressures from developers to use every space for their structures?	5/13/2018 17:45
926	/policies/landscaping/	Grow vegetables for food shelves in these spaces.	5/26/2018 3:19
927	/policies/landscaping/	While larger, more contiguous planting areas are valuable, it should be remembered that much of the environmental benefits of vegetation - for example on urban heat-island effects or air-quality are highly localized. There is a risk to concentrating benefits in a few places, and leaving many areas without them	6/8/2018 0:48
928	/policies/landscaping/	More housing = more people  More people = more pollution and more cars ... How is this going to work?	6/13/2018 14:19
929	/policies/landscaping/	Take a serious look at irrigation systems - don't they just waste water? Or could their use be permitted only if they use grey water or redistribute rain water? Plant species used should be the type that don't require watering. Also, herbicides and pesticides harmful to pollinators should be banned. Go door to door collecting up all the bad stuff, replace with organics that are acceptable. Like a one-time amnesty with lots of education.	6/16/2018 19:51
930	/policies/landscaping/	All fine to expect landscaping with new developments but history has proven that landscaping needs constant attention and that is NOT required. Not only is it not required it is often forgotten or ripped out.	6/17/2018 21:23
931	/policies/landscaping/	Establish direct connections between those who pollute and the remediation that can be accomplished through environmentally beneficial landscaping. This can be accomplished by having the polluters fund urban landscaping initiatives and giving tradable credits to landscapers, who can sell those credits to builders, homeowners, etc., who would like to increase the pollution load on our environment.	6/17/2018 22:36
932	/policies/leverage-housing-programs-to-benefit-community/	The intent here is good. I think that these "priorities" need to have teeth. For example, re: hiring etc. and local businesses owned by people of color - make these requirements to receive the permits and zoning approvals for development projects. Require any development project to have a community benefits agreement attached to its applications.	5/13/2018 0:00

Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

933	/policies/leverage-housing-programs-to-benefit-community/	<p>An article in <i>Colliers Magazine</i>, a publication for real estate investors, considers Minneapolis an area that is ripe for speculation. It shows that the cost of housing in Minneapolis (income to housing cost ratio) is identical to the national average and significantly lower than large cities such as Denver, San Fransisco, Phoenix and Seattle, indicating that there is room to come in and buy and flip properties to raise rents. <a href="https://www2.colliers.com/-/media/Files/UnitedStates/Markets/Minnesota/Minneapolis-St-Paul/Research/2017-Year-End-Apartment-Minneapolis-St-Paul-Market-Report-Colliers.ashx?la=en&amp;hash=3246F8973FDB1FB91567AC9DE56A1A12B24C9563&amp;la=en&amp;hash=3246F8973FDB1FB91567AC9DE56A1A12B24C9563">https://www2.colliers.com/-/media/Files/UnitedStates/Markets/Minnesota/Minneapolis-St-Paul/Research/2017-Year-End-Apartment-Minneapolis-St-Paul-Market-Report-Colliers.ashx?la=en&amp;hash=3246F8973FDB1FB91567AC9DE56A1A12B24C9563&amp;la=en&amp;hash=3246F8973FDB1FB91567AC9DE56A1A12B24C9563</a></p> <p>See below a direct quote from the article:</p> <p>“As the market continues to mature into a more desirable and monitored national investment buyer marketplace, we will likely see sales volume remaining high in coming years, irrespective of macro market conditions. This will likely partially be a result of shorter hold periods for many national buyers, versus the long-term buy and hold strategy of local buyers.</p> <p>Because of the increase in shorter hold periods, product will have a faster turn-over rate, which will keep market prices competitive and investment bidding active. The overall surge in demand for all classes of multifamily product in the Twin Cities market should continue to drive an increasing volume of sales.”</p> <p>These people do not have our city’s best interest in mind. Not only does this speculative activity make housing more expensive, it also goes against the desires expressed on the 2040 site by many who complained about having outsiders making decisions about the character of the city and, in particular, absentee landlords who have no investment in his or her own building, much less in the larger community. As an example of very current practice, whereas the Sons of Norway Development was designed by a local firm (Ryan), the project is financially backed by Weidner Apartment Homes, a national and international speculator that often buys up properties before they even go on the market, squeezing out local developers who might be interested.</p>	5/13/2018 18:33
-----	---	--	-----------------

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		<p>This policy refers to City-funded housing programs but I haven't found a policy that states that the City should in fact fund some. The idea of expanding affordable housing by granting tax subsidies and other benefits to developers who devote 20% of their structures to affordable housing is being proposed by CM Cam Gordon's affordable housing committee <a href="https://lims.minneapolismn.gov/RCA/2301">https://lims.minneapolismn.gov/RCA/2301</a>. Whereas this idea could be quite beneficial, it also has some problems. First, building owners are only required to keep those prices low for 10 years. What happens after that? Why not make it permanent? Second, given that speculators are targeting these same properties, it's hard to know whether this gift from the City is enough of an incentive, compared to the high prices the developers currently can charge for rent, especially in desirable areas of town. Finally, I object to the City using taxpayers' money to encourage big money developers, many of whom are both national and international speculators, to build in our city. If these benefits are to be granted, there should be a way to make sure those who get them are local and committed to the community.</p> <p>Some have mentioned the idea of introducing something like the old Urban Homestead program, where the City sold homes for \$1 to people who can then get help and resources to renovate them. When the City did this before, back in the 70's, those who bought the houses were required to live in them for 10 years. This ensures a commitment to the community and to the wellbeing of the house they were fixing up. It also gave new owners support to learn skills that could benefit them and the community over the long haul. I saw comments on the 2040 site about helping the people in the neighborhood develop their own communities, helping people with access to jobs (skills in renovation are transferable), and not giving the city's resources to corporate interests. Such a program would meet all of those goals. And with regard to mitigating against the effects of the racist policies listed above, it would give people who otherwise would have no ability to own a house and begin to accumulate wealth that way to do so.</p>	
934	/policies/leverage-housing-programs-to-benefit-community/		5/13/2018 18:43
935	/policies/leverage-housing-programs-to-benefit-community/	This already exists.	5/26/2018 4:17
936	/policies/leverage-housing-programs-to-benefit-community/	Prioritize local businesses owned by LGBTQ community	6/6/2018 3:04
937	/policies/leverage-housing-programs-to-benefit-community/	<p>a) Of the CPED-funded projects undertaken during the foreclosure crisis, the non-profit development community awarded construction contracts to minority owned and operated firms six times more often than the City's single family homes compliance requires. Further, Section 3 businesses were awarded 60% of these contracts and people of color comprised 66% of the workforce on these jobs (more than double the lauded participation on the Viking's Stadium).</p> <p>b)1.Outreach to contractors to promote benefits of certification programs; ensure compliance requirements are commensurate with the size of the organization; provide incentives to entities that demonstrate exemplary performance contracting with companies of color.</p> <p>c) resident councils, nonprofit boards and advisory groups, incentivize neighborhood associations who increase under-represented population's participation, etc.</p>	6/20/2018 18:31
938	/policies/lighting/	Please stick to one uniform lighting style for pedestrian lighting in a given area - i.e. there are multiple styles of pedestrian lights in the Mill District and it looks tacky.	3/23/2018 21:41
939	/policies/lighting/	Part a is confusingly worded "but minimize glare and dark sky conditions" - I think this is supposed to be "but minimize glare and ensure dark sky conditions". Also, use of LEDs as a highly efficient and directional lighting source seems worth mentioning.	3/27/2018 16:28
940	/policies/lighting/	make sure safety is first, good goals.	4/22/2018 5:29
941	/policies/lighting/	While LED's may be efficient, they are also very harmful to nature because of the light spectrum. I am dismayed that they are being used more for street lighting. They are also very harsh and increase night blindness. The new ones I've seen at south Minneapolis intersections are way too bright! They need to be considerably dimmer. This is very rude and unnecessary to all the homes they shine into.	5/4/2018 11:36
942	/policies/lighting/	I like it!	5/12/2018 2:48
943	/policies/lighting/	I live across the street from Lake Harriet upper campus public school. The security lighting at night is over the top. There are way too many high intensity lights on, and the school could cut those in half and still have adequate lighting. Plus they could save money. There are also classroom lights on all night which seems so wasteful. In my home I have all the shades pulled and still wear eyeshades. I would love the city to work with all schools and businesses to reduce night lighting. Everything doesn't have to look like a car dealership. Night lights also upset biological rhythms of animals. I raise Monarchs and bring them inside and make sure that they have a dark place to sleep.	5/12/2018 12:50
944	/policies/lighting/	Require lighting on private land (existing strip and shopping malls) to upgrade their lighting while providing them with financial assistance	5/14/2018 13:04

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

945	/policies/lighting/	there should be no city facility that is replacing or creating new light fixtures that are not highly energy efficient.	6/6/2018 19:15
946	/policies/lighting/	Don't forget the effects of light pollution. More is not necessarily better. <a href="https://www.globeatnight.org/light-pollution.php">https://www.globeatnight.org/light-pollution.php</a> . Light pollution affects the migratory patterns of birds, circadian rhythmic cycles, and even affects the quality of the air that we breathe. It would be helpful to recognize that there is a cost, as well as a benefit, to lighting up the skies.	6/17/2018 22:39
947	/policies/lighting/	I am all for elimination of wasteful light and light pollution. The transition to LED lighting should be used to both reduce lighting energy consumption, improve lighting effectiveness, and reducing night sky light pollution. -Dan Burbank, 3940 41st Ave S	6/19/2018 18:55
948	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	This is very important. The strategies are not very specific.	3/27/2018 20:20
949	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	Mixed income housing needs to be viewed both in medium to large scale developments but also within other contexts like neighborhoods. Our neighborhoods need more diversity of income (affordable housing options need to be throughout the city).	4/8/2018 22:18
950	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	Yes, build more affordable housing throughout the city, and integrate affordable units into all new apartment and condo buildings. If lower income people can buy their units it gives them more sustainable housing security. There are a lot of people who eventually want their own home where they can garden or raise kids or feel a part of a community. Given the shortage of starter homes, I suggest that the city buy up some rental houses and convert them back into owner-occupied houses and duplexes. That would stabilize neighborhoods that were hurt by the recession.	4/21/2018 18:11
951	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	Just as the city must have tools to promote affordable housing in amenity-rich areas, the city must also have tools to incentivize the creation of market-rate housing in areas of concentrated poverty and low-income housing, so as to not further concentrate poverty.	5/1/2018 2:46
952	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	Action step (c) is the best of the lot, in my opinion. Through CPED and the city's interactions with developers, the city has some ability to push for positive models of housing like this.	5/21/2018 0:50
953	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	The City should continue to study inclusionary zoning, but be careful in its implementation. Putting the full burden to provide affordable housing on new residents (by increasing the cost of new housing) is not an equitable way to provide affordable housing. Funding affordable housing with increased property taxes would be more equitable.	5/24/2018 17:10
954	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	Please do not do anything that further restricts supply of any type of housing. Market rate or affordable. Take care in adopting policies that add regulation without also incentives.	6/6/2018 2:11
955	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	I'm honestly unsure what mixed income housing even looks like, but I like the idea of it and look forward to learning more.	6/7/2018 20:59
956	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	If private developers do create mixed-income housing, we should make sure that they do not have different screening practices for residents at different income levels.	6/8/2018 13:59
957	/policies/mixed-income-housing/	Again, I think we are back to how and where to develop and support affordable housing. I can't see that it is possible to put lower income housing in high property tax areas. Those who have worked and scraped and saved and renovated and sold to buy up and did it again to buy up and can FINALLY afford the property tax to live in certain areas are ALL welcome to live where they wish. But how does one who has not been through all that, improved financially through hard work and sweat equity afford the property tax? So what exactly is being proposed here? Again, slim on the details which makes it hard to support the proposal.	6/14/2018 20:11
958	/policies/msp-airport/	As positive as these steps are, extensive air travel is not environmentally sound. Minneapolis should also contribute to reducing volume of air traffic for local noise/pollution as well as climate reasons.	3/27/2018 16:47
959	/policies/msp-airport/	I support the Minneapolis Airport Policy for 2040 and will make my comments at one of the May Open Houses planned for the neighborhoods.	5/1/2018 11:29
960	/policies/msp-airport/	It's important to make MSP green, but it's also important to make MSP quiet. Tens of thousands of Minneapolis residents are afflicted by excessive noise from MSP operations, which is a health risk and a general quality of life problem. MSP operations are not just an economic issue, and it's insulting to people in the neighborhoods dealing with MSP noise that the only mention of this noise is the rather weak action step in this section (f) and there is no strong set of action steps in Environmental Impacts of Transportation (see comments under that section on this topic) Also please realize that noise mitigation in homes, enabling people who wish to stay inside during the nice weather months as well as the cold months to do so, is a Band Aid program, not a solution at the source of the problem. People affected with MSP airport noise want their backyards, playgrounds, parks and other outdoor amenities to be the pleasant, unpolluted experiences others enjoy. Sound mitigation for homes is equivalent to offering people with polluted water systems a supply of bottled water, or those with severe air pollution some face mask filters.	5/23/2018 16:55
961	/policies/msp-airport/	The airport is a good asset, ably managed. It is much better-run than Minneapolis, so keep the local pols out of the airport.	5/29/2018 20:14



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

962	/policies/msp-airport/	<p>if the city has authority OR push Hennepin County and utility relationships to remove all language related the trash incinerator being a "green initiative." This is green-washing, certainly, but is no better for people or the environment.</p> <p>encourage/promote partnerships with amtrak to encourage city residents to use rail and bus transportation in place of air travel.</p> <p>do not actively promote/encourage MSP to expand its operations. In fact do everything you can to keep it as is or reduce its size.</p>	6/6/2018 19:56
963	/policies/msp-airport/	<p>In addition to your MSP International Airport action points,please add the following. I live in Kingfield and fall underneath departures tracks</p> <p>Measurement and publication of noise contours and number of people impacted maps at 55dB DNL, the international standard</p> <p>Â· Noise reduction goalsâ€”50% reduction by 2025</p> <p>Â· Citizen representatives from Minneapolis on the NOC</p>	6/22/2018 17:11
964	/policies/new-parks/	I love the idea of expanding parks and green spaces for ALL residents within a 10 minute walk. Yes!	3/22/2018 22:29
965	/policies/new-parks/	Can the city be more proactive about developing and managing greenway connections between parks. For example, there is not entity that can develop and manage the Midtown Greenway properly.	3/23/2018 1:50
966	/policies/new-parks/	Look at decking over the freeways, for space for parks!	3/26/2018 23:32
967	/policies/new-parks/	What about greenways? What are they, parks or city streets?	3/28/2018 4:32
968	/policies/new-parks/	the SEMI (currently BNSF railyard between UMN to the south, and Como Ave to the north) has been slated for parkland redevelopment by the city of minneapolis in the past, it should continue to be in the conversation for parkland to fill in the Grand Rounds Missing Link, and serve under-parked areas in the surrounding communities.	4/4/2018 10:45
969	/policies/new-parks/	Yes, please! Nature is renewing and would take the edge off our industrial stress.	4/22/2018 0:08
970	/policies/new-parks/	Would the city take out badly needed housing stock to achieve this last 3% of the population reaching a park in 10 minutes? This seems like an out of order priority.	5/23/2018 17:40
971	/policies/new-parks/	Unstructured , chaotic wild spaces are more important to me than groomed parks. Mowed grass and manicured fields cannot fulfill the human need to be part of nature on a regular basis. Structured playgrounds, and organized activities simply bring inside outside, they do not provide the freedom to experience and discover nature. Please leave some spaces alone and unplanned.	5/24/2018 3:01
972	/policies/new-parks/	Stop mowing significant portions of Minneapolis public spaces and use planned burns to control boundaries. For example, Bancroft Meadows, not currently controlled by the Park Board, should be. And half should be allowed to go wild. Connect to Sibley and Powderhorn by strategically aquiring current vacant and underutilized lots. Allow wild public spaces to connect neighborhoods using bridges and underpasses.	5/24/2018 6:44
973	/policies/new-parks/	Donâ€™t close Hiawatha Golf course.	5/26/2018 4:26
974	/policies/new-parks/	The existing greenways/linear parks in Minneapolis provide incredible recreational opportunities as well as particularly safe and pleasant bicycle commuting routes. The newer Midtown Greenway has demonstrated what an incredible amenity and development focus a greenway can provide. I would like to see items (a) and (b) above specifically include greenways/trails as well as parks per se, so that opportunities to create new greenways in parts of the City that do not have them are actively pursued.	5/29/2018 16:28
975	/policies/new-parks/	Theodore Wirth never advocated this.	6/1/2018 22:52
976	/policies/new-parks/	I'm unsure we need new parks. Can we enhance the parks we have. Especially in underserved areas rather than looking at new parks.	6/6/2018 2:16
977	/policies/new-parks/	Being within a 10 minute walk of a park is a huge asset. Another huge asset is being a 10 minute bike ride from a park. With safe infrastructure a bicycle significantly increases your range. Consider making safer off-street riding options for youth and adults to gain confidence on their bike so they can gain independence and reduce their dependence on their car.	6/15/2018 3:36
978	/policies/new-parks/	I love this, everyone should be 10 minutes from a park no matter what part of town they live. Better yet 10 minute walk or bike to a bike park or bike playground. We should embrace our image as a top bike community and begin to use our bikeable city to access bike parks, which teach young riders valuable skills and build confident riders who in turn become drivers who think and see commuters.	6/15/2018 12:09
979	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	Its really important to make sure that these sorts of public spaces feel welcoming for non-commercial use by actively providing clear seating/other amenities. Otherwise they just become well-manicured places to pass through.	3/27/2018 16:23

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

980	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	Dont wreck the Post Office building! A lot of jobs would be lost if they moved. Leave as it is, a beautiful art deco example. A concerned citizen.	4/3/2018 0:52
981	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	Yes, please include these amenities. Adding rain gardens and trees is better for the environment too. Whenever you add hard surfaces you need to consider storm water management. Native plants and pollinator gardens help.	4/21/2018 18:43
982	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	They have to be safe and designed to reduce crime.	4/22/2018 5:20
983	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	The relationship of these publicly accessible private spaces to the larger street, sidewalk, and alley system is important - where these spaces are and where they are not. The connectivity of these spaces (eg the Midtown Greenway Promenade) are maybe the most important aspect of these spaces. Plaza for plaza sake should be avoided. Should also look into requiring public easements for these spaces depending on development details, maybe through PUD - Kronzer	4/28/2018 16:52
984	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	I am concerned that there is much talk of "improvement" and "encouragement of design" all of which implies man-made "nature", hardscapes with nothing close to natural open spaces but instead manipulated, Bachman-ized plantings. Thousands of mature trees all over the city will be/are being taken down with at best, small starter-trees replacing them along with "designed environments." Minneapolis is revered for its natural, open spaces, Minneapolis 2040 seems to be all about removing or manipulating those spaces.	5/21/2018 0:11
985	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	YES! Trees (that can remain healthy!) and green space very important. Indentations, including courtyards, can break up a boxy building as well as creating open natural spaces. I would suggest a requirement of the builder to include some spaces like these on the lot. Setbacks from the street and heights consistent with neighboring houses or buildings is very important to maintain the character of the neighborhood	5/22/2018 13:24
986	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	I do not know what laws or ordinances govern public access to what are apparently privately owned plazas. However, given the disparate treatment of people of color, people with disabilities and people with mental health problems in public, it seems that if Minneapolis is to count on privately owned plazas to function as non-park open spaces, it may be important to include policies regarding non-discriminatory access in agreements with property owners.	5/29/2018 16:42
987	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	You say this principle contributes to meeting the goal on climate resilience yet you show a picture of a plaza that is adding impermeable surface to the city. To the extent possible, we need to increase permeable surface to prevent the 500-year floods that result from the 500-year rains and snowfalls that are now occurring with much greater frequency.	6/12/2018 19:14
988	/policies/open-spaces-in-new-development/	I wish "requirements" was stricken from this policy.  Some of my favorite places to spend time are simply a bench surrounded by massive buildings. Incentives are nice, but as an aspiring developer myself, Requirements will definitely scare me away, especially since there are so many other fees such as the Park Board fee.	6/22/2018 18:15
989	/policies/park-access/	How about transit access to parks? Many people with disabilities use transit to get around, and many parks do not have adequate transit access.	3/23/2018 1:52
990	/policies/park-access/	What about transit access to our park system? Why are buses/streetcars not allowed on the parkways?	3/26/2018 3:29
991	/policies/park-access/	Another important way to improve access to parks is to use a "built form" category that is one more populous than the surrounding neighborhood, allowing in-demand park-facing locations to have space for more families and people. This is also an important equity opportunity, because apartment-building dwellers have less access to green space, they tend to be lower-income, and they tend to be people of color and indigenous people. Suggestion: allow more housing on parcels facing neighborhood and regional parks throughout the city.	4/21/2018 18:28
992	/policies/park-access/	Need Nature trails.	4/22/2018 0:09
993	/policies/park-access/	Fantastic!	4/26/2018 15:21
994	/policies/park-access/	Great ideas for parks. Let's do artist and community lead wayfinding all over the city. Starting with making it easier for people to paint the pavement to encourage neighborhood culturally relevant community painted crosswalks on heavily traveled streets. Open Streets removes traffic from these streets for a day that would give time to safely paint the crosswalks. Designs could be worked out and approved ahead of each event.	6/7/2018 4:35

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

995	/policies/park-access/	You are correct, improving on street and bike path infrastructure are very important, but something that is equally important and often over looked is the places the youth in Mpls learn to ride their bikes. They have the street, sidewalks and an occasional empty parking lot to ride. That isn't nearly enough space and it definitely isn't safe or exciting. We need to create a network of off-road trails and bike parks throughout our city to give the 70,000 kids under the age of 14 places to learn and explore on their bikes. If we do that we engage that population and their parents to become bike advocates. We also promote active transportation and provide exciting outlets for kids to connect with nature.	6/15/2018 3:44
996	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	I think the city should work to implement innovative programming and design into the architecture and landscape architecture at parks. Too many of our park buildings and landscapes are ugly and do not reflect out design culture in Minneapolis.	3/26/2018 3:27
997	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	Really appreciate the references to education around ecology and climate change. In general, I'd like to see more here around the role of parks as ecological spaces that facilitate ecological resilience.	3/28/2018 4:33
998	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	Have you read the MPRB 2007 community survey results? The results could inform the 2040 plan.	4/14/2018 12:33
999	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	I would love the addition of Nature Play areas and nature trails to parks that are only ball parks. We like circular seating for gathering as a community or for cultural events. I'd like to see more all-ages programing like dance or creative collaborations.	4/22/2018 0:13
1000	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	Don't ruin our parks. They are meant to be a respite from urban living. Don't ruin them under the guise of 'being inclusive'. It's a green space; there's nothing biased about nature. Have already been disappointed by the allowance of amplified music outside of bandstand areas. It's not peaceful and has driven me away on more than one account.	5/4/2018 10:40
1001	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	The Commons so far is a bust. The fact that the City chose a night time picture of the park COMPLETELY EMPTY is exactly how it has been conceived and (not) used since its opening in 2016. To revitalize The Commons - our city's shared backyard - we need consistent funding and public/private partnerships to program the daylight hours out of the place: ping pong tables, chess tables, dancing, music, a restaurant, a snack bar, BATHROOMS with running water, better, pollinator-friendly gardens, MORE CHAIRS and TABLES, jugglers, acrobats, indigenous language classes, men's knitting circles, art and story hours, a skating rink with food and hot beverages in the winter, ice sculptures, walking history tours, a pow wow, bird watching, volunteer gardening, a futsal court, a better playground, maker markets, theater, all in the park, all day long, every day. The Commons could be loved and used like NYC's Bryant Park, or London's Gaiety Square, or Houston's Discovery Green, or Chicago's Millennium Park. Secure funding and make it so, Minneapolis! And get the Vikings to pay for their use, engage more partners (HCMC, Hennepin County, MN United, Target, Arctic Cat, Ojibwe and Dakota tribes, veterans, AARP, U of M, etc), and get a GREAT restaurant to set up shop in the park so people come, stay longer, spend their money, and come back, again and again.	5/14/2018 23:39
1002	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	The MPRB has used so many resources and time on their master planning processes. The city should use it for better or worse.	5/22/2018 22:24
1003	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	does the overweight focus on equity outcomes mean that if I live in an area with predominantly white residents, I deserve less programming at my local park? do my kids get less opportunities than a distressed neighborhood would? And isn't it true that the majority of tax revenue come from these boring, predominately white SF home neighborhoods you are hoping to scale back investment in in the name of equity?	5/23/2018 17:44
1004	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	As an older adult, one thing I have found limiting in taking winter walks in the park system is that some park buildings don't open til 3 pm. That seems to focus on children, which as you say are decreasing in number, and not retirees, who are increasing in numbers. At a minimum having the bathrooms open (or having portable toilets), and ideally having someplace warm to sit for a break, would help to encourage winter walking.	5/29/2018 18:38
1005	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	Given that there are an increasing number of one person households, and that social isolation is a major cultural phenomenon (see, for example, "Bowling Alone"), I think it would be important to have an action step that encourages programming aimed at reducing social isolation. This could be programming that simply allows people to engage in open-ended socializing/networking. It would be great if this could also facilitate socializing among people from diverse communities.	5/29/2018 19:13
1006	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	There is no mention of the Park Board in this policy, therefore it is pointless. This is not the City Council's domain and I hope it never is. Manage well what you are supposed to manage, which does NOT include parks. If parks had been left up to the City Council and Mayor, Minneapolis would have no parks. Back off.	6/1/2018 22:56

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1007	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	<p>Please add an equity category.</p> <p>We live in Powderhorn, and I'm always shocked by the disparities between our city parks. Have you seen the water quality in the pond there? We don't have working drinking fountains on the path around the pond in mid-June.</p> <p>Compare that to Lake Harriet, which has a bird sanctuary, a real warming house, and a snack shop/beer shop, and a full stage. Our walking paths aren't maintained like those around Nokomis in the winter.</p> <p>The staff and programs are excellent, but people in more affluent areas of the city should not have more resources in their parks!</p>	6/14/2018 21:19
1008	/policies/park-design-and-programming/	<p>It's time we start treating the bicycle like the powerful tool it is. If we create space for people to learn and explore on their bikes we create opportunities for programming to occur and we bring bicycle advocacy to the forefront and to the residents who don't currently think bicycling impacts them. Bike parks equal improved opportunities and access for all walks of life.</p>	6/15/2018 3:39
1009	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>Yes! Eliminate off-street parking minimums throughout the city! This is one of the most progressive moves the city can make toward discouraging single occupant vehicle use for the majority of trips. This is great! Please implement.</p>	3/23/2018 16:11
1010	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>item k. Stupid, absolutely stupid.....</p>	3/23/2018 17:31
1011	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>Please no more drive thrus! But also, what can be done to try and get rid of existing drive thrus?</p>	3/24/2018 0:56
1012	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>Strongly support this policy, especially 6(o) re: banning drive thrus and 6(k) re: eliminating parking minimums. These are tremendous policies which should be adopted into the city's zoning code as soon as possible.</p>	3/26/2018 13:07
1013	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>Where financially and legally possible, the City should also explore closing driveways at surface lots with several access points for autos, for even if this triggers a partial taking it will greatly improve the pedestrian environment.</p>	3/26/2018 13:07
1014	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>The city should consider how the value in point f. can be advanced in combination with design techniques that optimize passive heating and cooling techniques for buildings, which can include design that encourages helpful air flow through a building.</p>	3/27/2018 15:52
1015	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>What about the cities own streets, and improving their design through neighborhood signs, pedestrian level lighting, pedestrian level directional signs.</p>	3/28/2018 4:40
1016	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>Can you add a tax, fee or regulation to encourage businesses to remove existing drive thrus?</p>	4/4/2018 4:15
1017	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>Eliminating parking minimums is the most crucially important part of this section. It absolutely MUST be done if our city is going to move forward.</p> <p>In theory I approve of prohibiting new drive-throughs and gas stations, but I wonder if what this does is make existing gas stations in inappropriate places more "treasured" as they cannot be replaced. Gas stations like the three on Hennepin Ave in Uptown or on Lake and Aldrich where transit-oriented development would be more appropriate may be less likely to be replaced. There are much more appropriate spots in our city for gas stations than some of the spots they currently lie. I would worry a bit about this. Definitely no more drive-ins, though.</p>	4/5/2018 14:13
1018	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>I fully support this goal. I am a disabled user of public transit and believe the city is much too car friendly, to the detriment of other modes of transportation.</p>	4/6/2018 23:22
1019	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>There is simply far too much of an anti-automobile bias in the goals and action steps. While a world without cars and where everyone walks or takes public transportation sounds excellent, the reality is that we (the United States, State of Minnesota, and the Minneapolis metro area) are simply not built for this and healthy neighborhoods and commercial zones (even neighborhood center commercial zones) will require places for cars to park so that there is access. This access will be important for people when they visit the city or want to come into the city to work or eat.</p> <p>The mandate that new construction has parking needs to stay. Streets simply cannot absorb increased numbers of cars because that in itself creates a safety and quality of life hazard.</p> <p>If you build, you need to include parking either below surface or on the surface or above the surface.</p> <p>Auto repair businesses are important and they are a neighborhood resource. Whether a gas station or a garage, we need not to target them as a bad thing. They simply are a necessity.</p>	4/8/2018 18:56

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1020	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>There is simply far too much of an anti-automobile bias in the goals and action steps. While a world without cars and where everyone walks or takes public transportation sounds excellent, the reality is that we (the United States, State of Minnesota, and the Minneapolis metro area) are simply not built for this and healthy neighborhoods and commercial zones (even neighborhood center commercial zones) will require places for cars to park so that there is access. This access will be important for people when they visit the city or want to come into the city to work or eat.</p> <p>The mandate that new construction has parking needs to stay. Streets simply cannot absorb increased numbers of cars because that in itself creates a safety and quality of life hazard.</p> <p>If you build, you need to include parking either below surface or on the surface or above the surface.</p> <p>Auto repair businesses are important and they are a neighborhood resource. Whether a gas station or a garage, we need not to target them as a bad thing. They simply are a necessity.</p>	4/8/2018 18:56
1021	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	I love that this is in the plan. I walk a lot in places like Uptown but also Downtown St Paul. The varied storefronts butting up to the sidewalk in Uptown make for great walking. The blank concrete walls in StP are horrible. It really has an effect on how far I'm willing to walk. I would aim for little to no setback along commercial corridors. I've found that setting the building back isolates it from pedestrians in an unfortunate way. Encouraging sidewalk seating is also a great idea, and goes along well with creating nice and wide sidewalks. Also, in so far as there has to be surface parking, trying to tuck it behind buildings really helps. Nobody likes walking past a parking lot.	4/16/2018 19:15
1022	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	There should be a more nuanced means of dealing with off-street parking minimums (k). Maybe some neighborhoods can handle the street-parking demand that can create, but not all of them.	4/18/2018 19:25
1023	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	K: Do not eliminate minimal requirements for off street parking. I do prefer to walk or take public transportation, but it is not always possible. Daughter works in Minneapolis and takes public transportation to three jobs, but her husband commutes to Rodgers MN. Other daughter used to walk to work till her company merged with one in Lakeville while her husbands work is in the other direction. When I was young you could buy furniture, fabric, hardware and books downtown. Now you need to travel to the burbs for them. We no longer have a nearby grocery and the corner store sells only snacks and grab-and-go.	4/21/2018 18:35
1024	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>k) Keep parking at least one space per unit</p> <p>n) so little parking at grocery stores?</p> <p>o) for sick people, drive thru pharmacy help us all. When I had the flu, I wished one was nearby as there were babies in line with me. gas stations should not be signaled out.</p> <p>P/Q) is this legal?</p> <p>Why does the city hate cars? For families with multiple daycare drop offs, people who work on homes and need tools, they need cars. Please do not make it harder to work and pay taxes.</p>	4/22/2018 5:28
1025	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>Please also work to reduce the number of curb cuts as sites are redeveloped and/or set maximum number of cuts per block (or standards accord to land use, zoning, etc.). A maximum of 2 cuts per block, in the spirit of alleyways, is appropriate and could even be marketed as historic for the NIMBY crowd.</p> <p>I am EXTREMELY excited to see a plan to eliminate off-street parking requirements city-wide. This is the #1 best thing we can do to help make our city more people friendly and to encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use. This can also make our land use more efficient and our new buildings more affordable. Eliminate parking requirements now!! Prioritize people!!!</p>	5/2/2018 17:49
1026	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	"prioritizes walking first, followed by bicycling and transit use, and lastly motor vehicle use". This is an unrealistic policy and should be removed from the city's priority completely. This is Minnesota, with bad weather for over half the year! Pretending that cars are not the dominant form of transportation is just plain ignorant. Making it more difficult to get around in a car will force everyone but young, single people out of the city! This is from someone who used to bike over 5 miles to work downtown when I was younger.	5/12/2018 2:38

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1027	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>I like the fact that plan includes several policies related to architecture, that would create regulations and requirements designed to lead to a variety of architectural styles, interesting structures, attractive use of materials. Most of this is all positive, at least in theory. I am concerned, however, about the implications of strategy #G: "apply design standards" regardless of market conditions and community characteristics. I like the idea of holding builders to a high standard in spite of market demand. This policy, as well as policy #13 on landscaping, would appear to be different from the way things seem to operate currently, in that developers are given leeway to do what works for them financially in spite of its potential negative impact, both visual and otherwise, on the community. So I wonder about whether the City will hold itself to this standard. And I worry about a policy that will ignore community characteristics. Currently, a large portion of the many many new buildings already created, for example, on Lake Street and Excelsior Boulevard, look very similar and have drastically changed the look of the area, often, if not usually, for the worse.</p> <p>To my eye, most of the new and planned structures are very unattractive. Beauty, of course, is in the eye of the beholder (though I've never met a single architect who actually thinks blocky buildings with a cheap looking variety of materials that don't really go together is attractive), but I think one would have difficulty debunking the idea that having a city filled with buildings all with the same general look built around the same general time is not as compelling as buildings that vary in both period and style and that reflect the unique character of a city. One way to mitigate this, mentioned in the plan (Policy #95), is to preserve beautiful old structures and use them to meet current needs. As with the policy regarding green spaces, implementing this policy would require a huge change from current and past practices in Minneapolis. One group works tirelessly to preserve some of the old, historical and often beautiful buildings from being destroyed in the name of progress. And often they lose that battle, in one case because the City Council knowingly allowed the developers to lie about the condition of the building in order to get permission to destroy it. Here are two links to articles describing this situation: <a href="http://healyproject.org/the-truth-will-out-ii-more-lies-that-brought-down-2320-colfax-avenue-south">http://healyproject.org/the-truth-will-out-ii-more-lies-that-brought-down-2320-colfax-avenue-south</a>. <a href="https://healyproject.org/an-open-letter-to-minneapolis-city-council-regarding-the-orth-house-demolition/">https://healyproject.org/an-open-letter-to-minneapolis-city-council-regarding-the-orth-house-demolition/</a></p>	5/13/2018 17:48
1028	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>The city needs to guard against becoming "family unfriendly" by over-emphasizing transportation (and zoning/land use) policies that are disproportionately based on accommodating the desires of some outspoken healthy younger people--e.g. bicycle riders, those realistically able to conveniently access and rely on mass transit for all their transportation needs, et al--at the expense of the needs of families with children with far-flung activities, seniors, those with health-related mobility limitations and others who, realistically, will be highly dependent on private cars for the foreseeable future. Among other things, this means requirements for adequate off-street parking for all new buildings--and multiple occupancies--should be retained, particularly in view of the amount of snow and the 5-month duration of winter here, something inescapably without parallel in Seattle, Portland or Denver. Policies to encourage greater use of mass transit and other car alternatives--particularly while the current very limited mass transit system is improved and expanded-- should be based solely on the "carrot" of low-pricing, convenient schedules, attractive facilities, etc., rather than the "stick" of increasing the inconvenience of those reliant on cars.</p>	5/14/2018 1:02
1029	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>Pedestrian experience, at human scale, should determine and drive ALL design in Minneapolis. We need to STOP designing for and around the automobile. Density, greening, interesting gathering spots, enhancing the public realm, assuring that shop keepers can afford to open shops (shoe stores, catering/incubator kitchens, tutoring services, tax preparers, daycares centers, eyeglass stores, specialty shops, art, etc) and can stay. Gentrification has become a bad word. We need to consider rent control so established commercial and residential owners can afford to stay, even if the neighborhood "improves." This city can and should lead the way nationally for neighborhoods and built environments that support human connectivity, movement, freedom from violence and pollution, add interest and joy, and articulate the value of the human experience. Flowers, trees, public art, access to toilets, water, local food, interesting shops, places to sit down (and lie down if need be), gather and congregate with others will support health, alleviate hostility, highlight difference, generate wealth, nurture civic pride, and encourage all ages, lived experiences, abilities and persuasions to interact. The built environment matters. Let's use it for good, not evil!</p>	5/14/2018 23:57
1030	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	<p>I would like the city to have a non-partisan traffic engineer to oversee, plan and then communicate why to the public. This ensures transparency and choice made that are sustainable and hopefully address everyone.</p>	5/15/2018 11:57

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1031	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	Can't support these action steps strongly enough. Lake Street should be one of the city's prime pedestrian destinations; instead, all the drive-throughs and car entrances/exits make walking on it like playing Frogger, with constantly vigilance required.  Eliminate parking minimums! Please! Let developers build parking if they deem it necessary. If they don't, don't force it on us! This would be a huge help to keep housing costs affordable.  "Require active uses on the ground floor of new buildings, with direct connections to the sidewalk." Yes! I work in the IDS Center, and I can hardly find a place to eat at street level after 6 pm. A healthy city should have plenty of activity after hours.	5/21/2018 1:45
1032	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	After you eliminate on-street parking, flat parking lots, and drive-throughs, how will someone who relies on a car or truck for transportation patronize businesses in Minneapolis.	5/22/2018 14:32
1033	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	(p) and (q), what about repair facilities for the electric and autonomous cars of the future? Will owners have to drive to the suburbs to have these vehicles serviced? The existing facilities may not be able to handle the new technology. Tesla has their own service centers, but would be unable to build in Minneapolis.	5/22/2018 15:13
1034	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	Good ideas! Encourage street retail also, please.	5/24/2018 16:24
1035	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	good	5/24/2018 19:38
1036	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	Stop discrimination against cars. We need them to get to our jobs in the burbs. To get around in winter. To safely travel with out fear of vagrants, thugs and pan handlers violating us. Add parking to ALL developments for Cars. Reduce bike lanes. Use gas tax funds ONLY on gas powered transportation. Kill the SW light rail plans.	5/26/2018 3:00
1037	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	While this plan sounds fantastic for a more temperate climate we Minnesotans deal with ice, snow and below zero temperatures which makes biking and walking unappealing for most of the winter. Our public transportation is also limited and for those of us who work nights not very safe. Additionally for those of us in our 60s, the idea of walking, biking or taking public transportation to the grocery store or doctors office, etc is incredibly unappealing.  This plan is not taking our extreme winter climate or aging population into consideration. It will be equally challenging for parents with young children.	6/3/2018 19:13
1038	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	The public transit in Minneapolis needs massive improvements. In order to support all those that will live in a dense city, the public transit system needs to be more efficient! to take a bus from the lakes region to downtown can take an hour!  Not all of us can physically walk and ride a bike downtown. There needs to be more express buses. The subway above ground!	6/12/2018 22:15
1039	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	I love this. So important to encourage development that values walkability, bike and transit, as well as channels a welcoming spirit.	6/15/2018 13:53
1040	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	Please develop programs to encourage safe bicycling by following existing traffic laws. Bicyclists who disregard and disrespect traffic laws are delaying the acceptance of bicycles as a legitimate form of transportation.	6/17/2018 21:48
1041	/policies/pedestrian-oriented-building-and-site-design/	Relating "e)", the Fairview Hiawatha Clinic building at 38th St and 42nd Ave was required to remove a rather nice awning because of a complaint of ice falling on pedestrians from the awning. The policy will have to address this issue. -Dan Burbank, 3940 41st Av S	6/19/2018 18:19
1042	/policies/people-with-disabilities/	The City's current CIP plan looks to replace pedestrian ramps on an 80-year time frame. Just an example of how much priority this is for Public Works staff.	3/23/2018 0:05
1043	/policies/people-with-disabilities/	ADA compliance. No exceptions. I saw a new café put in a new floor that required a step up instead of a ramp. I hate this new fad of tall tables which discriminates against people in wheelchairs. All new busses should accommodate walkers and wheelchairs.	4/22/2018 0:20
1044	/policies/people-with-disabilities/	Reducing parking has a negative impact on our disabled neighbors. Please make sure future greenways plans still provide people with access to their homes.	4/22/2018 5:02
1045	/policies/people-with-disabilities/	The City needs to ensure sidewalks are clear of ice and snow in the winter if people with disabilities are going to live independently.	4/26/2018 15:42
1046	/policies/people-with-disabilities/	Get rid of those awful talking street crossing things. They are way too loud. No one should be able to hear that in their yard, and currently I can hear some of them half a block away. More noise pollution for the city. They are obnoxious and talk whether someone is even there, let alone a blind person.	5/4/2018 11:48
1047	/policies/people-with-disabilities/	Currently, Public Works does the bare minimum to ensure public facilities like streets are accessible for people with disabilities. For example, it will take 80 years for Minneapolis to replace pedestrian ramps, and there is little effort made to remove barriers in the sidewalk, widen non-compliant sidewalks, or ensure sidewalks are clear of ice and snow.	5/9/2018 16:20
1048	/policies/production-and-processing/	Like the idea. The policy does not make it clear what business activities are considered "low-impact" or "environmentally friendly". More clarity on how that will be assessed would be helpful.	3/27/2018 15:44

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1049	/policies/production-and-processing/	The city presently discourages industry through multiple, uncoordinated departments, regulations and inspections and multiple fees not common in other jurisdictions. Some manufacturers within the city think that Mpls wants to drive them out.	3/27/2018 18:42
1050	/policies/production-and-processing/	Distribution: people are not going to make major purchases (new cars, furniture, appliances, etc.) in the city when they can go to a nearby suburb and save a lot of money by not paying the excess Minneapolis sales tax for the damn stadiums.	4/12/2018 7:10
1051	/policies/production-and-processing/	Good ideas	5/14/2018 17:24
1052	/policies/production-and-processing/	The policy seems to start from the notion that production and processing jobs would be readily available to citizens without academic credentials, if only there were suitable locations for entities that make or distribute something. In fact, the reason those jobs pay more is that they require skills learned in schools or on the job. The persons holding those jobs have put in the effort to gain those skills. I would counsel you to talk to employers in those entities already doing business in the city to see what they think the city can do to help educate or train the workforce. Merely making land available for the construction of a new factory or warehouse will not cause high wage jobs to bloom there.	5/29/2018 20:29
1053	/policies/production-and-processing/	Production and Processing zoning can not be isolated single use zoned areas. Many of the currently areas are VERY auto dependent since many uses are not allowed. I'd like to explore Com. Rockwell's and Com Lupke Pier's ideas about allowing other uses along corridors through these areas or by req. a min FAR for P and P uses and allowing other uses in addition. P and P area also need a stronger connect to transit, today half of these areas are not near existing transit -Kronzer	6/2/2018 16:41
1054	/policies/production-and-processing/	We should rename this comprehensive plan to BLACK only 2040.	6/10/2018 4:57
1055	/policies/production-and-processing/	The Plan for 2040 seems to accept that educational attainment for minorities will remain static for the next 20 years, concluding that "setting aside space for production and processing businesses will help ensure that living-wage jobs in industries with minimal environmental impacts will be available to Minneapolis residents, especially people of color and those without a college degree." If the Plan assumes that the educational attainment of minorities will remain static over time and that there will be satisfaction in "living wages", then the economic gap at the regional, national, and international levels will widen, with Minneapolis tethered to manufacturing, while the rest of the world migrates to the knowledge economy. Twenty years offers an opportunity to inspire loftier goals than production and processing. How about re-calibrating the strategy, so that the 20 year goal is to have a highly-educated, HIGH wage knowledge workforce?	6/11/2018 23:03
1056	/policies/production-and-processing/	We need to keep commercial areas of NE Minneapolis now designated for art production as production areas! These areas are now marked commercial, but they need protection and diminished tax because an artist sells \$2000. and pays \$7000. in rent. NOT profitable, but that's how slow the art market goes. It takes TIME in hours to make art. TIME in thinking, time in gathering, time in making. WE need the space!	6/22/2018 15:18
1057	/policies/public-realm/	Can the city work to improve it own standards for typical items throughout the city? Such as trash cans, streets lights, tree grates, benches. I think working to create a consistent palette through the city would be great!	3/23/2018 1:55
1058	/policies/public-realm/	Can the city work to improve the identity of different neighborhoods through small neighborhood street signs and banners for commercial districts?	3/23/2018 1:57
1059	/policies/public-realm/	This is an important priority.	4/7/2018 13:54
1060	/policies/public-realm/	Add more boulevards with trees and native plantings along sidewalks and developed areas. These create a buffer from the street and make areas more inviting.	4/21/2018 18:38
1061	/policies/public-realm/	Public Works relies on Special Services Districts (SSD) to maintain upgraded public realm improvements. However, SSD are viable only in areas with lots of commercial properties. So, there is not a way to implement streetscape improvements elsewhere in the city including benches, trash cans, banners, sidewalk snow clearance, etc.	4/26/2018 14:36
1062	/policies/public-realm/	This is really vague! I want that framework in part a. to exist already!	4/30/2018 21:02
1063	/policies/public-realm/	But don't forget public safety while doing so. Some of these "public realm enhancements" are dangerous to peds and drivers alike -- i.e., seating boxes in the street out of the blue, or blocking sidewalks so people can't get by. Maybe it will require additional staff to actual patrol and enforce. Right now seems sort of willy-nilly, and you can't tell is the "enhancement" is legal or just someone feeling "it ain't illegal unless you get caught."	5/11/2018 22:35



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1064	/policies/public-realm/	An active, interesting, programmed, accessible and safe public realm is one of the things that will set us apart from other cities - if designed, protected, nurtured it will draw tourism, attract and retain businesses, increase civic pride, stimulate the economy, and engage citizens to walk, amble, connect, gossip, enjoy each other's company and the great outdoors, and look out for each other. These all lead to better economic, personal and mental health. The public realm RULES and must be prioritized in our city's goals and programming.	5/14/2018 23:31
1065	/policies/public-realm/	I'm glad placemaking is a part of this goal and I want to amplify its importance. The nodes of Minneapolis that are emerging are WONDERFUL. Minnehaha Ave being a shopping/antiquing area, Northeast being known for art and breweries, Eat Street, etc. I would love to see efforts to define and enhance neighborhood identities continue. I'd love to see fewer chains and more local businesses filling market needs. I think this is good for local neighbors as well as visitors (including commuters from suburbs, outstate and elsewhere).	5/23/2018 18:35
1066	/policies/public-realm/	If you're gonna spend more of our tax \$\$ on public spaces can you please implement some kind of safety measures. Walking the new Nicollet mall after dark is scary because of the unseamly people hanging around, begging and pan handling.	5/26/2018 3:05
1067	/policies/public-realm/	<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li> <li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li> <li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li> </ol> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	6/7/2018 20:47
1068	/policies/public-realm/	Please think more human-scale (rather than as watercolor street art projects) and focus on "activity spaces". The current concept lacks an understanding of how social interactions are what drives the creation of common spaces; they are not simply meant to be pretty renderings.	6/15/2018 13:06
1069	/policies/public-realm/	Greenspace should be included in the understanding of public realm and "placemaking." The City Planning Commission has been allowing reduced setbacks (though variances) that all but eliminate permeable surfaces and space for plants and trees.	6/18/2018 20:55

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1070	/policies/public-safety/	Move to "Civilian Led Policing" by adding the model to the city charter. <a href="http://civilianledpolicing.org/plan/">http://civilianledpolicing.org/plan/</a>	3/23/2018 17:47
1071	/policies/public-safety/	By taking a close look at the police station—the architectural space of policing—the project offers ideas that can help transform urban police stations into neighborhood investments that strengthen their communities in return.	3/24/2018 1:47
1072	/policies/public-safety/	Check out Polis Station by Studio Gang, and rethink the role police stations can play in communities.	3/24/2018 1:48
1073	/policies/public-safety/	Would like to see a defined role for restorative justice as a crime prevention/mitigation tool and other community safety strategies.	3/28/2018 4:37
1074	/policies/public-safety/	Many of the city's public buildings are quite ugly. Why not create a program to improve the architecture of the cities public buildings.	3/28/2018 4:38
1075	/policies/public-safety/	Please mandate that the police force increases the number of hours spent on unconscious bias and de-escalation training. The use of excessive force has drastically reduced trust in first responders.	3/29/2018 21:34
1076	/policies/public-safety/	first responders need more mental health training, the police should know before they arrive that someone there has a mental health issue. text to 911 is great and needs to be publicized. we need officers to reflect their communities, live in their communities, and send their kids to the schools in their communities.	4/3/2018 17:37
1077	/policies/public-safety/	Ban bump stocks and assault style weapons. Universal background checks with wait times. People who have been violent or abusive should lose the right to guns. Gun registry. Ask why if the want to buy a lot of guns. Guns for hunting only. Use of stun guns rather than bullets if possible.	4/22/2018 0:26
1078	/policies/public-safety/	We need to do something different, no violence is acceptable.	4/22/2018 5:18
1079	/policies/public-safety/	Does "first responders" include police? It may be helpful to write out police here especially for letter "c" to say something about improving police and community relations.  I'm not sure if "f" fits here???	5/23/2018 0:30
1080	/policies/public-safety/	3 places I feel most unsafe in the cities:  1. The skyway. 2. Alleys 3. The lakes after dark (surrounding sidewalks etc)  All 3 are places I've personally been harrassed, followed, or threatened at one time over 30 years of life in Minneapolis. Make the secluded public areas more protected. Integrate planning, technology, and police presence.	6/12/2018 14:08
1081	/policies/public-safety/	MPD policies are missing here. Highlight deescalation training, requirements and accountability for failing to use deescalation techniques. Name reducing racial disparities in MPD interactions, whether it's quality of life crimes or traffic stops or anything else.  Also, this policy should be listed as supporting the "reduce disparities" goal.	6/14/2018 21:59
1082	/policies/public-safety/	Enforce the existing laws, don't eliminate them!	6/21/2018 1:46
1083	/policies/public-safety-through-environmental-design/	I am concerned that the well intentioned emphasis on clear sight lines has resulted in over-mowed neighbourhood parks. Most neighborhood parks have no natural landscapes at all. I wonder if we could balance the quest for public safety with the inclusion of some more natural, unmowed areas in our neighborhood parks.	4/6/2018 23:29
1084	/policies/public-safety-through-environmental-design/	Good.	4/21/2018 18:39
1085	/policies/public-safety-through-environmental-design/	I like it	5/12/2018 2:43
1086	/policies/public-safety-through-environmental-design/	Keeping neighborhoods owner occupied provides the safety features of pride and vigilance in ownership. Throwing rentals in between reduces that.	5/26/2018 3:11

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1087	/policies/public-safety-through-environmental-design/	It's wonderful to have a sense of what you can do for future designs, which is always sexy for urban designers. However, please don't lose sight of the existing infrastructure of public spaces that are NOT conforming to CPTED guidelines. Simply lightening and placing cameras, which no one's watching until after ~ post hoc ~ a crime is committed, in hopes of finding the perpetrator. Please consider some of the techniques employed in Europe to slow streets down, such as: <a href="https://www.pps.org/article/livememtraffic">https://www.pps.org/article/livememtraffic</a> . These can be implemented in existing streets, particularly those in residential neighborhoods. Transportation planners used to be praised for the volume of traffic they could get through the transportation arteries; today they would be scorned for driving so much traffic through residential neighborhoods where children play, the elderly use crosswalks, and parallel parking unfortunately transforms halcyon neighborhood streets into gauntlets for escaping car thieves, drug dealers, and burglars trying to get to the Interstates, where they can escape apprehension.	6/15/2018 12:57
1088	/policies/public-safety-through-environmental-design/	I am concerned about light pollution and excess lighting. Most people seem to FEEL the are safer from property crimes and assault in brilliantly lit areas. In reality, over-illumination offers very little security. -Dan Burbank, 3940 41st Av S	6/19/2018 18:41
1089	/policies/public-services-policy/	What about looking for creative ways to rethink the services our different public buildings can provide? For example, libraries and affordable housing in Chicago.	3/28/2018 4:36
1090	/policies/public-services-policy/	Mpls. has traditionally provided responsive public services. Hooray!	6/1/2018 20:25
1091	/policies/public-services-policy/	In regards to the goal of increasing our city's population, the action step of streamlining development review should not involve shutting neighborhoods out of the review process. When planning for close proximities and high densities, the need for coordination and cooperation increases significantly. I can accept greater heights and densities, but only if I as resident can have a place in the planning and review process. I've seen it time and again - community input makes for better development projects. John VH	6/5/2018 19:29
1092	/policies/public-services-policy/	Streamlined development review should not be understood to involve shrinking the role of neighborhood organizations in the City's development review process.	6/8/2018 18:43
1093	/policies/quality-of-life/	Add nature parks and trails to neglected industrial areas.	4/21/2018 23:52
1094	/policies/quality-of-life/	My neighborhood association is the reason my community has lots of events and interesting place-making improvements. The City currently funds these organizations and should continue to do so in the future.	4/26/2018 14:55
1095	/policies/quality-of-life/	Minneapolis is ruining its quality of life aspect with its determination to increase density exponentially. Years ago I visited Chicago and thought it was a fun city - to visit. I recognized right away what made me never want to live there: It was way too crowded and congested. Congested with people and buildings. All buildings that, even in residential areas, were too crowded and close to each other and the streets. The whole place seemed dark and cavernous. Minneapolis is hell bent on becoming a big, cosmopolitan city. Always trying to be like the cool cities. That line of thinking is embarrassing and immature. We have a special city that has done an excellent job of balancing big city life with nature and feeling personable. Why is the city council trying so hard to ruin a good thing?	5/4/2018 12:01
1096	/policies/quality-of-life/	This policy seems to ignore the fact that Minneapolis has 70+ neighborhood associations, which are heavily responsible for making the quality of life better through events, art activities, and community-based improvements.	5/9/2018 15:52
1097	/policies/quality-of-life/	Delete "D". That's already done by many other private entities; taxpayers don't need to pay the city to do it too. Also, it's very cheesy, boring and "junior high school-ish." Grow up, Mpls. And stop trying to be Portland or Seattle. Be Minneapolis.  Also, so far I see a theme in this draft: The city neglects an aging population. Age-ist policies on no parking, cutting down on cars, etc. Being told to ride your bike or take transit when you are an elder or taking care of elders is unrealistic and age-ist. This is driving people out of Mpls to suburbs that are now cashing in on Mpls' anti-car tunnel vision. Look around! They are more welcoming to certain groups, such as elders. I am one now -- I notice this issue daily and will need to make decisions soon on whether I really want to remain in an unwelcoming, unbalanced city that is too gritty and difficult to be in. Mpls does not respect its elders at all!	5/11/2018 22:43
1098	/policies/quality-of-life/	What is the value of having our beautiful Chain of Lakes if you line them with development?	5/16/2018 17:16
1099	/policies/quality-of-life/	More funding and support for smaller arts orgs and those led by POC and indigenous leaders. Less support, bc it is not needed, for the Gutheries and Walkers of the city.	5/22/2018 22:21
1100	/policies/quality-of-life/	Protecting and ensuring public green space should be part of the very FIRST steps in any planning process. Current Green space should be protected and nurtured; and green space should be expanded in proportion to increased density. Definition of green space should be clearly articulated.	6/9/2018 13:57

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1101	/policies/quality-of-life/	The density you are promoting will erode the natural amenities the city boast. We already do not maintain the parks and lakes that make the city distinctive and livable. Adding high rise apartments along the lake will just add more stress to an already heavily used park system	6/12/2018 16:17
1102	/policies/quality-of-life/	Mpls needs to embrace a quality of life similar to Bentonville Arkansas. If we are able to blend the arts with cycling and the other amazing parts of our city we will be able to attract and maintain a talented workforce for years to come.  Take a look at this site, it will give you an idea of what Mpls should do to follow their lead. <a href="https://becausebentonville.com/">https://becausebentonville.com/</a>	6/15/2018 3:47
1103	/policies/quality-of-life/	I do not see anything on this plan that addresses safety in the downtown districts? With all the shootings and other things happening, I will not, nor will a lot of people I know visit after dark.	6/18/2018 17:04
1104	/policies/renewable-and-carbon-free-energy/	The city should establish a citywide bulk purchasing program for rooftop solar to decrease costs.	3/24/2018 18:13
1105	/policies/renewable-and-carbon-free-energy/	This is great. EVAC (Energy Vision Advisory Committee) should be engaged to provide more detail on additional key innovations around shared renewable energy, shifting utility rate structures, and advancing new ways to buy and sell energy.	3/28/2018 4:22
1106	/policies/renewable-and-carbon-free-energy/	i agree with all of these, solar is the future. power to the people. smart grid technology to cut the power peak, burn our trash! 1 ton of coal to 4 tons of trash for the same amount of energy created, and we have a lot of trash! carbon tax credits to building that have a building automation system to decrease energy use from wasted energy. should not be against the law to be off-grid. Xcel Renewable Connect program is a great start.	4/3/2018 17:11
1107	/policies/renewable-and-carbon-free-energy/	Closing of HERC should be embedded into the Comp Plan. Over half of what we burn could be recycled or composted, and its location within the city has glaring environmental justice implications for the neighborhoods of Glenwood and Near North. A truly sustainable Zero Waste Policy cannon include garbage burning - and we need to think of better solutions for municipal waste.	6/11/2018 15:28
1108	/policies/renewable-and-carbon-free-energy/	These are good, but 10% renewables by 2025 is too low, and I don't see a number mentioned at all for 2040. If it's not 100%, we need to work out a better plan. There are entire countries in Europe that are there already!	6/12/2018 19:30
1109	/policies/renewable-and-carbon-free-energy/	Density is only going to bring more people in, then more cars. Even on transit routes, still very few will use transit	6/13/2018 13:46
1110	/policies/shared-mobility/	What about Paddle Share?	3/23/2018 2:18
1111	/policies/shared-mobility/	How about ensuring sidewalks are clear of ice and snow in the winter? Why does the City own parking ramps?	3/29/2018 15:58
1112	/policies/shared-mobility/	We like to bike and walk, but still need to drive. Do not assume everyone can get around without a car. Some people have limited mobility, need to travel longer distances to work or carry more than they could on public transportation. All through grades 1-12 my Mom got up at 4:00 am to catch a bus to work and returned tired for dinner time. So I was on my own, made my own breakfast and walked to school. Forget any homework help or school conferences. She fell asleep.	4/21/2018 23:20
1113	/policies/shared-mobility/	The city needs to guard against becoming "family unfriendly" by over-emphasizing transportation (and zoning/land use) policies that are disproportionately based on accommodating the desires of some outspoken healthy younger people--e.gs. bicycle riders, those realistically able to conveniently access and rely on mass transit for all their transportation needs, et al--at the expense of the needs of families with children with far-flung activities, seniors, those with health-related mobility limitations and others who, realistically, will be highly dependent on private cars for the foreseeable future. Among other things, this means requirements for adequate off-street parking for all new buildings--and multiple occupancies--should be retained, particularly in view of the amount of snow and the 5-month duration of winter here, something inescapably without parallel in Seattle, Portland or Denver. Policies to encourage greater use of mass transit and other car alternatives--particularly while the current very limited mass transit system is improved and expanded-- should be based solely on the "carrot" of low-pricing, convenient schedules, attractive facilities, etc., rather than the "stick" of increasing the inconvenience of those reliant on cars.	5/14/2018 1:04

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		<p>Comments on 24 “ Shared mobility and 25 - Innovations in transportation and infrastructure</p> <p>Great strategies! A few additional comments.</p> <p>1. Thanks for working for accelerate equitable, city wide access for Shared mobility, innovations in transportation and adoption of electric vehicles</p> <p>2. Important for Minneapolis collaborate with other metro cities when developing ways to proactively regulate automated vehicles in Minneapolis while ensuring equitable access. Including developing policies</p> <p>- for cities to charge autonomous vehicle provider fleets to pay for street up keep.</p> <p>Ensure access for people with disabilities and seniors</p> <p>Discourage individual ownership and use of autonomous vehicles, much better to have them in shared fleets to reduce VMT.</p> <p>3. Look for synergies when adding density in neighborhoods to reduce the average numbers of cars per household (TOD, car to go, nice ride, uber/ lyft, bike parking, walkable sidewalks and crossings)</p> <p>4. Work for county and state investment in transit infrastructure, bus, LRT, BRT, with shared mobility and FAVES helping with the last ¼ mile</p> <p>5. Participate with other cities in implementing and continuing to strengthen the Twin Cities Shared Use mobility Plan</p> <p>Sean Gosiewski, Executive Director Alliance for Sustainability, 612-250-0389 sean@afors.org</p> <p>Mpls 2040 Comments <a href="http://www.allianceforsustainability.com/mps2040comments">www.allianceforsustainability.com/mps2040comments</a></p> <p>Resilient Cities Coalition (starting summer 2018) <a href="http://www.allianceforsustainability.com/resilientcities">www.allianceforsustainability.com/resilientcities</a></p>	
1114	/policies/shared-mobility/		5/22/2018 22:36
1115	/policies/shared-mobility/	This is the future. I support this policy. Let's be leaders in the nation on this issue.	6/6/2018 2:25
1116	/policies/shared-mobility/	Please bring back Car-To-Go!!! Unlike other vehicle sharing services, cars were available in many more locations throughout the city, meaning that many more people could take advantage of this transportation option. This was a fantastic model. The company said that it discontinued because of an inappropriate tax structure. Maybe that's not the whole story, but if it is, that should be an easy fix!	6/8/2018 15:57
1117	/policies/skyways/	I love this plan! I wish that it did more to bring people to the street but I think this is a great first step.	3/23/2018 15:22
1118	/policies/skyways/	The Skyway network is essential and something that makes Minneapolis livable. I support measures that make them safer and more accessible.	3/24/2018 20:13
1119	/policies/skyways/	Its important to think about skyway energy efficiency. Skyways (largely glass, which is great for visibility) are a major site of heat loss.	3/27/2018 16:26
1120	/policies/skyways/	Tear down the skyways.	4/5/2018 14:14
1121	/policies/skyways/	Improving skyways makes sense, limiting them does not. Its cold, skyways are great and allow for downtown expansion, don't try to restrict new skyway development.	4/7/2018 14:00
1122	/policies/skyways/	Don't let the skyways expand any further! Tweaking what we already know is bad won't bring people back to our bleak, downtown streets.	4/17/2018 22:44
1123	/policies/skyways/	The City doesn't own the vast majority of skyways and cannot force standard signs or hours. Start tearing them down because they've wrecked downtown.	4/17/2018 22:47
1124	/policies/skyways/	Stop wasting tax dollars on skyway expansion to City-owned buildings like the new office building. Don't allow any more retail on skyway level anywhere.	4/17/2018 22:49
1125	/policies/skyways/	Skyways are an amenity in downtown. They allow comfortable navigation from store to store in winter and a view of the street during events like parades or other downtown events.	4/21/2018 18:46
1126	/policies/skyways/	No new skyways. No skyway expansion. No new connections except from existing skyways to the street level. Prioritize directions to street level over directions through skyway system. No new commercial spaces at skyway level. Make the streets great by moving retail and people to the street level!	5/10/2018 17:16

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1127	/policies/skyways/	<p>Ban the expansion of the skyway system rather than simply confining it.</p> <p>Ban new retail space on the skyway level and require it to be at the street level.</p> <p>Mandate expansion of retail space at the street level and elimination of retail space at the skyway level if buildings complete a renovation/reconstruction over a certain dollar amount.</p> <p>If a building is torn down that is skyway connected - ban the reconstruction of the skyway.</p> <p>Identify action strategy to eliminate skyways downtown.</p>	5/16/2018 18:04
1128	/policies/skyways/	<p>"Direct newly-established retail uses in buildings connected by skyways to be located primarily on the ground floor with an entrance facing the street." Change this to "exclusively" on the ground floor! Leaving the skyways as is, while moving retail to the ground to facilitate more commercial success and a safer environment is the best solution.</p> <p>"Limit skyway expansion to the downtown core and at other key sites..." Prohibit skyway expansion full stop! The skyways continue to ossify downtown, and we should be done with them.</p>	5/21/2018 2:13
1129	/policies/skyways/	I understand why we have skyways, but the impact on the street level is unfortunate. More access points to the skyways from the street are a good start, and ensuring that skyways connect to open spaces that encourage transitions from skyway to street level and vice versa	5/24/2018 2:35
1130	/policies/skyways/	We need retail on the ground floor downtown. I have no problem with skyways connecting buildings as long as all new retail is on the ground floor. Our downtown streetscape is dead. It's very depressing.	5/26/2018 0:21
1131	/policies/skyways/	Keep the skyways. Put a bike lane in them.	5/26/2018 3:16
1132	/policies/skyways/	Make skyways homeless shelters after 9 pm to 6am.	5/26/2018 3:18
1133	/policies/skyways/	The number and variety of independent small businesses in the skyway system is impressive and will never be replicated on the street. A vibrant street life is not possible for some months in the winter. Consider the skyway system an asset to be developed, not an enemy of a dreamed for street life.	5/26/2018 3:39
1134	/policies/skyways/	Love the idea of street level retail with connections to the sky-way, it provides better access and pedestrian street activity.	5/30/2018 17:08
1135	/policies/skyways/	I think we could be much more strict with building owners who want a skyway. If these are for people then they should be just as easy to navigate, access and hang out in as streets. Require them to prioritize ground floor and for christ's sake, eliminate off-street parking requirements!	6/3/2018 3:21
1136	/policies/skyways/	This policy does not appear to be properly labeled. Consider revising to say something like "support street level retail?"	6/6/2018 2:26
1137	/policies/skyways/	<p>The skyway are too confusing to use for anyone who doesn't use them everyday. And they take foot traffic off the street, so businesses in street level don't survive well. Together, this makes downtown a completely boring place to be.</p> <p>I would prefer that they be closed, but the people who use them everyday love them, so who am I to try and take that away from them?</p> <p>To make them work well, I think there needs to be stairs and or elevators to get to them on the edge of the buildings, where people can see them from the sidewalk.</p> <p>Also, I think that any new buildings constructed that want to be connected to the skyway, should have the skyway level retail wrap around the outside edge of the builing, facing outward, with the foot path in between the storefront and the outter glass of the building, mimicking the sidewalk, to be more intuitive to visitors. People in the skyway could look out the glass and easily be able to tell where they are, and people on the street would be able to look up through the glass to see what businesses are up there. Perhaps skyway bridges also ought to be near street corners, also to better mimic sidewalk travel, so as to be more intuitive.</p>	6/6/2018 3:44
1138	/policies/skyways/	The skyways need to be safer. Consider this in your redesign. There are long corridors where vagrants linger, also homeless and gangs. I suggest more interactivity with the street below. Windows, exits, entrances, was to communicate if being attacked in the skyway. There are sections which are very isolated and unsafe. Add intercoms and security to ensure this wonderful skyway system is welcoming to all. Design with less crime in mind.	6/12/2018 14:04

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1139	/policies/skyways/	Sensible plan, especially regarding the retail use being on ground level. Skyways may make sense for transportation, not for retail and community building.	6/15/2018 13:55
1140	/policies/skyways/	Either downtown will be lively and walkable at street level or we'll continue to promote and expand the skyway system. Stop pretending that both can exist with positive results. Also, whoever wrote Action Steps C-E has no idea how the skyway system works now. They are mostly owned and maintained by PRIVATE property owners who do not have to open their skyways, put in standard signage, or rebuild their lobbies to make skyway access visible from the street. Stop allowing more skyways and start tearing others down. Finally, the City allows the Downtown Council to coordinate the skyway system including by staffing and influencing the Skyway Advisory Committee. Every other City commission or advisory committee has City staff coordinating their work not a business organization.	6/15/2018 16:35
1141	/policies/skyways/	I fully support this policy. The skyways are really beneficial when working downtown. I especially agree we need new signage and maps so I'm excited to see that include in point D. I even have an idea to use subway style maps for the skyway. Those thoughts are outlined here: <a href="http://www.citypages.com/news/minneapolis-lovehate-relationship-with-the-skyway-and-how-to-make-it-suck-a-lot-less/414065113">http://www.citypages.com/news/minneapolis-lovehate-relationship-with-the-skyway-and-how-to-make-it-suck-a-lot-less/414065113</a>  Thank you!	6/15/2018 21:59
1142	/policies/skyways/	You need to include improved provisions for public toilets. Accessibility Trying to find public toilets is a nightmare downtown and almost impossible on the skyway. Stop for food and you can't even wash your hands. Ask where a toilet can be found and the staff will give you vague directions with little hope of finding one. Toilet locations need to be on every skyway map and signage should be uniform.	6/16/2018 18:30
1143	/policies/skyways/	Get rid of them. They contribute to the lifelessness of your downtowns. I was astounded by the lack of people on the streets on coming here; I knew nothing of the skyways. A few weeks after disembarking on the SS Minneapolis, I happened to look up - naked mole rats! That's what one sees, rather than a vibrant, engaged life on the streets.	6/16/2018 19:34
1144	/policies/skyways/	I think skyways have actually contributed to the deterioration of downtown. There is a lack of foot traffic on the street level which contributes to an increase in crime on the streets. Businesses in the skyway are also only open for a few hours over the lunch hour which makes it hard for restaurants to be successful in downtown. There isn't much of a draw to bring people into downtown and our downtown lacks vibrance like other major cities as a result of having all business on 2nd floor skyway level and not having street level access.	6/17/2018 3:59
1145	/policies/social-connectedness/	I know this is referenced in item E - but Please include more funding for community centers. Many existing centers need upgrades and more staffing, especially.	4/5/2018 1:37
1146	/policies/social-connectedness/	Seniors in North Mpls deserve their own community of affordable housing choices developed around the Cora McCorvey Community Center. We deserves services developed in our community that serves our specific needs & desires. We'll be close enough to the community groups, but we need our own community developed for our convenience,helps to develop a stronger community for 62+ only. I welcome your response. Thanks, Leon Wallace (leon01@q.com) 612-521-5581	5/5/2018 16:57
1147	/policies/social-connectedness/	An affordable senior housing community would help to strengthen & expand the healthy life style for seniors, 62+. This is way a community set aside in Heritage Park, south of Olson Hwy to Glenwood Ave N would give seniors the opportunity to transition from one type of housing to the next, as our needs continue to change. I welcome your response. Thanks, Leon Wallace (leon01@q.com) 612-521-5581	5/5/2018 17:02
1148	/policies/social-connectedness/	I like the idea of physical innovative art events to bring diverse people together to experience the city. open streets minnesota, minnesota lights (the one that creates art exhibits with light and new technology and goes from 9 p to sunrise.  I think we are missing thinking about cross generational activities, supported (i\$) mentoring relationships between adults and teens, even something along the lines of a street doing boulevard free gardens for harvest by everyone on the street or lasting art projects (stepping stones, handprints of neighbors, story telling booths). Also new media connections in addition to actual physical connections	5/10/2018 22:55
1149	/policies/social-connectedness/	D, E, and F actions steps seem the most important to me. Creating green spaces for people to congregate, community centers for teenagers especially, and community events like Open Streets or in Seward the King's Fair where people get out and meet each other.	5/11/2018 0:05

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1150	/policies/social-connectedness/	Great strategy. Also strengthen ways to build neighbor to neighbor connections, with farmers markets, community building spaces in multi-family buildings and block clubs strengthened by neighborhood associations and many departments. Thanks Sean gosiewski 612-250-0389 Sean@afors.org	5/23/2018 0:09
1151	/policies/social-connectedness/	a. How will you facilitate engagement and input? b. What new avenues do you have in mind? c. Mentoring will require a staff person to facilitate/coordinate.	6/1/2018 20:20
1152	/policies/social-connectedness/	Technology should be mentioned (and harnessed) for social interaction. Seniors need to be better connected with technology (sharing economy) and how much it can benefit them	6/6/2018 2:29
1153	/policies/social-connectedness/	make permanent open streets through "no-car" zones in several parts of the city. national night out 2x per year? create neighbor challenges (do X things with your neighbor this month and get a prize! etc). support orgs like PPNA who are providing equipment libraries, and Hosmer library that has a seed library, and the Hack Factory that provides access to tools. These are social spaces!  Biggest isolators: cars, phones/computers (depending on their use).  encourage people to get off phones/computers and have real conversations. Approach tech-based solutions to community building with caution - tech addiction is a growing field of study. Tech should be a tool not a given or a requirement.	6/6/2018 21:11
1154	/policies/social-connectedness/	Action step "a" needs to include voices other than residents, business owners and property owners; for example, renters, unions, youth and youth program workers, persons with disabilities, teachers, churches, persons who are formerly incarcerated, etc. Also, this action step needs to facilitate democratic processes of participation among the citizen stakeholders in a neighborhood. ie neighborhood associations including voices of teachers, nurses, youth program leaders, social service providers, etc. This would provide a way for people to share their ideas about what they need in their communities for affordability and livability, and would inspire them to believe in the democratic process and to participate in it.	6/17/2018 22:54
1155	/policies/social-connectedness/	I like point "e", I think integrated spaces that are multifunctional are helpful in increasing access. I'd recommend bringing in community partners to provide services, so people increase their awareness of different organizations and connectedness to community resources.	6/19/2018 20:53
1156	/policies/soil-health/	The City should specify the goals for construction fill more clearly. Depending on the purpose of fill/ depth, more or less organic material may be helpful.	3/28/2018 4:26
1157	/policies/soil-health/	Work with residents to educate and encourage the use of sustainable, non-chemical options to maintain healthy soils, gardens, and minimize run-off.	5/31/2018 1:22
1158	/policies/soil-health/	ban pesticides in park spaces, and fine residents who use them. and educate them of course about why!	6/6/2018 20:44
1159	/policies/soil-health/	Make Minneapolis permeable! Also, restore and mitigate damaged soil microbiome with compost/mycorrhizal fungi. And leave the leaves.	6/7/2018 4:28
1160	/policies/stewarding-historic-properties/	Point e. is indicative of a broader integration needed - historic preservation needs to retain the character and history of a place without preventing retrofits/ reuse that allow it to function sustainably as part of the current community.	3/28/2018 4:41
1161	/policies/stewarding-historic-properties/	This is so important and so correct! Do it! Break the city staff's (and city council's) habit of neglecting historic properties, allowing too much demolition, having low-brow visions for certain communities like Northeast, and being the weakling patsy for large multi-national corporations like Canadian Pacific Railway. Wake up, city of Mpls -- CP Rail does us no favors and brings no benefit to the city -- no employment at Shoreham, no property taxes, nothing but blight, haz-mat danger, noise, decreased property values, and arrogance. This policy needs to be strong enough to "encourage" (require!) CPED to grow a pair. Before it's too late.	5/11/2018 22:16



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1162	/policies/stewarding-historic-properties/	"Require new construction in historic districts to be compatible with the historic fabric," is an existing comprehensive plan policy that has proven ineffective in preventing 26-40 story buildings (grossly exceeding design guideline height maximums) from being recommended for approval by city staff in the St Anthony Falls Historic District. Get more specific. For example, "Strictly require new construction in historic districts to be compatible with the historic fabric, especially in terms of compliance with established height maximums. When demands for density, affordable housing, or other demonstrated community needs increase pressure to ignore this action item in favor of other worthy comprehensive plan action items, facilitate transfers of development rights, rezonings, conditional use permits, and related entitlements to shift incompatible building size, bulk, and scale to parcels outside of historic district and landmark boundaries."	5/17/2018 18:47
1163	/policies/stewarding-historic-properties/	"Ensure maintenance of properties through regulatory enforcement of City code, specifically as it relates to historic resources," is an existing comprehensive plan policy that has not prevented extreme, human life-threatening deterioration of landmark and historic district properties, like the First Church of Christ Scientist, much less potential historic resources. Focus, and reduce the scope of, this action step until political will and/or regulatory fortitude improve. I suggest this. "Ensure maintenance of properties designated as historic by the city, state, and federal governments through regulatory enforcement of City code requiring maintenance of designated properties immediately upon properties being vacant, boarded, and condemned. Use fines to strongly encourage compliance or change of ownership to a more responsible party. Pause fines when new owners purchase properties. Eliminate fines when new owners abate all issues within three years of the date of purchase, to permit adequate time for utilization of federal and state preservation tax credits, which bring money into Minneapolis's economy.	5/17/2018 19:54
1164	/policies/stormwater-management/	Could the city explore a street edge alternative program, similar to Seattle? Or green streets such as what they are doing in Portland? I think both "blue streets" and "green streets" would be great to introduce in Minneapolis.	3/23/2018 2:05
1165	/policies/stormwater-management/	Metro Blooms, a local landscape firm, has done really interesting work with blooming alleys and blooming boulevards to help reduce stormwater runoff. Implemented citywide, this could make a big different.	3/23/2018 2:08
1166	/policies/stormwater-management/	Can the city work with the school and park systems to implement larger stormwater management projects beneath large parking lots or fields?	3/23/2018 2:09
1167	/policies/stormwater-management/	Looks good	3/28/2018 4:29
1168	/policies/stormwater-management/	Convert lawns and cement areas to natural areas wherever possible with rain gardens, pollinator gardens and native plants.	4/22/2018 0:06
1169	/policies/stormwater-management/	The goal of reducing impervious surfaces is directly in conflict with the massive density increases proposed for many neighborhoods including those close to the lakes and rivers creeks and streams. If your goal is to remove single family homes, with families in them, and replace them with lot line-to-lot-line high rises you will have less green space and more runoff issues. Couple that with all the cars in the street since no parking is preferred, and now you have the automotive contaminants running into the storm sewers much more than if they were parked in a garage.	5/23/2018 17:42
1170	/policies/stormwater-management/	There is no reference to cost or sources of funding.	5/26/2018 4:23
1171	/policies/stormwater-management/	To improve the water quality of the chain of lakes, The City needs to discourage pesticides, herbicides, excessive fertilization, and leaf litter raked into streets from private property MUCH more aggressively. I have lived in SW Minneapolis for 26 years. I don't recall ever receiving anything from the City about herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers. We don't choose to use ChemLawn or similar products, and there are literally one or two others on our block who don't but it is clear that a key cultural value among people who live in this area is to have an immaculate monoculture lawn. Ironically that is not true in other parts of the city that don't drain to the lakes. The City needs to work to change the cultural value system, much as it did with recycling, to get people to feel more embarrassed about using these chemicals than they are about having weeds in their lawn. Similarly, although people are not supposed to rake leaves into the street and (I think) are supposed to rake up the leaves that do fall in the street in front of their houses, in practice many tons of leaves get run over in the parking area of streets, pulverized, and introduced into the storm sewer system and thereby into the lakes. I think people who live in this part of the City care enough about lake water quality that they could gradually be persuaded to think differently about which yard maintenance practices are "culturally approved of," but it will take a lot more interaction than anything I've seen so far, and sustained over a long period of time.	5/29/2018 19:35
1172	/policies/stormwater-management/	Include comprehensive hands on education that results in knowledge and awareness of the impacts of litter, lawn chemicals, and road runoff on our lakes and rivers. Use amounts of trash in water bodies as a part of lake health and include it in the TDML profile of pollutants. This will entail going to higher levels of government, I assume, but should be done.	6/5/2018 16:21

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1173	/policies/street-grid/	The policy should specifically mention freeway caps as a potential way to restore the traditional street grids that were destroyed by the construction of I94 and I35W in Minneapolis	3/22/2018 22:33
1174	/policies/street-grid/	Wonderful idea! Cities are about connection and that starts with the street grid which is the platform for building the wealth of our city.	3/23/2018 1:33
1175	/policies/street-grid/	Item D is not written in plain language understandable to most people.	3/24/2018 0:50
1176	/policies/street-grid/	When you restore the street grid it should be like it was before, not suburbanized. The new connection between 22nd st and Cedar looks terrible - too wide, large turn radii, and why is it curved? Just put it back like it was before.	3/26/2018 13:59
1177	/policies/street-grid/	What about freeway lides, more pedestrian bridges, & closing/ downsizing freeways?	3/29/2018 15:19
1178	/policies/street-grid/	Put in freeway lids and take back the awful infrastructure around highways. Do something to make Hiawatha Avenue not a freeway through my neighborhood. I'm scared to cross it!	3/29/2018 16:17
1179	/policies/street-grid/	Interstates 94, 394, & 35 create huge barriers and wreck the street grid. Something more proactive needs to be done to fix connections because MNDOT apparently doesn't car about it.	4/2/2018 0:23
1180	/policies/street-grid/	Cap all trenched freeways and build over them. Until this is done, build pedestrian bridges over 94.	4/5/2018 14:16
1181	/policies/street-grid/	What is meant by vacations?  Consider relinquishing the City's ownership over "vacations" as a last resort, in order to preserve the network of city streets and arterials.	4/12/2018 22:54
1182	/policies/street-grid/	Why do all streets, especially in lower-density residential areas need to be built exactly the same way with room for parking on both sides of the street + two driving lanes? They could be narrower, have parking bump outs with rain gardens, and more space for boulevard trees... They could also curve or angle to make them less quare and perhaps slow traffic.	5/10/2018 21:39
1183	/policies/street-grid/	I like it!	5/12/2018 2:45
1184	/policies/street-grid/	The biggest detractor from the street grid is the freeway systems that have divided our city. Minneapolis should deprioritize interstates and improve connections between neighborhoods that have previously been divided.	5/14/2018 17:00
1185	/policies/street-grid/	"Improve local transportation across freeways, including improving pedestrian, bicycle and transit accommodations across existing bridges and promoting adequate spacing and connectivity of local streets crossing the freeways."  To take this a step further, consider exploring plans to terminate freeway entrances into the city. This is a huge and unnecessary disturbance to the street grid and to the functioning of the city for people who live here, full stop.	5/21/2018 2:05
1186	/policies/street-grid/	I hope this means that the KMart lot on Nicollet and Lake will be adjusted!	5/23/2018 14:47
1187	/policies/street-grid/	Yes - the grid provides predictability for all modes of transportation. I like the idea of when restoring portions of the grid only allowing access by walking, biking or transit.	5/24/2018 2:32
1188	/policies/street-grid/	Tear down Kmart and reopen Nicollet.	5/26/2018 3:14
1189	/policies/street-grid/	Why in a climate that regularly gets to below zero and can get major snows and ice would we think it's a good idea to promote so much biking and walking? Are you considering people's safety, or only envisioning a city filled with athletic 20 and 30 year olds?	6/3/2018 19:16
1190	/policies/street-grid/	No mention of parking.	6/7/2018 16:14

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1191	/policies/street-grid/	<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li> <li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li> <li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li> </ol> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	6/7/2018 20:48
1192	/policies/street-grid/	This policy seems very weak when referring to freeways. I94, I394, I35W, Hiawatha Avenue, Olson Highway, and countless freeway access ramps and viaducts make Minneapolis disconnected and create barriers for people walking and biking. freeway lids and de-commssioning of these roadways should be on the table.	6/9/2018 1:20
1193	/policies/street-grid/	Consider our urban wildlife. Squirrels, birds, rabbits, bats etc. make a home in mpls as well. They are part of the urban ecosystem. They don't just live in parks. They live on boulevards in trees and in back yards. Make budget for grass, trees. Minneapolis city planing has a rich history of making our city feel like a giant park. More trees on streets. Don't cut the big trees down, work with them. More beds for flowers and safe spaces for our urban wildlife to thrive.	6/12/2018 13:57
1194	/policies/street-grid/	Does this mean the street grid will be restored in places like the Lyndale and Linden Hills neighborhoods where diverters were put in to cut off traffic?	6/15/2018 15:28
1195	/policies/street-grid/	What is meant by "relinquishing the City's ownership over vacations as a last resort, in order to preserve the network of city streets and arterials?" Is there a typo here? I can't understand the sentence at all.	6/15/2018 20:46
1196	/policies/street-grid/	Please explore the benefits of slowing traffic down and using more natural curvilinear forms when laying out transportation lines. Just as rip-rap is oftentimes prescribed to solve problems when water moves too quickly through linear passages, find ways to avoid straight lines for streets. They will reduce the creation of wind tunnels, slow traffic down, reduce straightaways for speeders and escaping criminals, and reduce vistas to more human scales.	6/17/2018 22:44
1197	/policies/supporting-economic-growth/	I'd love to see more detail in terms of how the City proposed to support the expansion of the green economy. This is a very important piece of the comprehensive plan, and would be great to have more detail.	3/27/2018 20:55

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1198	/policies/supporting-economic-growth/	As an abashed capitalist and a Wharton MBA, I worry about the economic future of Minneapolis. Many of our areas largest employers face tenuous futures (chief among them Best Buy, Target, General Mills). I was appalled by our noncompetitive response to the Amazon bid. We need to work harder to attract growing businesses to the CITY itself (including TAX ABATEMENTS and a willingness to overcome NIMBY-like neighbors whining about congestion). We need tech incubators, major companies, access to capital etc. I would very much like to avoid us becoming a 'cold Omaha' as Hubert Humphrey said and our continued dependence on failing corporations (including my employer) could lead to just that.	5/29/2018 22:45
1199	/policies/supporting-economic-growth/	Obviously, the wealth of a community depends on its economy. While M2040 gets down into nitty-gritty details of housing, its plan for economic development is virtually non-existent except to mouthe a few truisms about making it easier to do business in Minneapolis. That in no way constitutes a plan. If we had a successful path to economic development, then more residents people would have money to spend on housing. Why is there no real economic development plan in M2040?	6/6/2018 14:18
1200	/policies/supporting-economic-growth/	I am hoping that the minimum wage law does not detract large businesses from coming to Minneapolis. I worry they may be concerned about an anti-business climate. Letâ€™s get as many jobs as possible in the city!	6/6/2018 21:21
1201	/policies/supporting-economic-growth/	You can make it better for business in the city by not sticking your fingers unnecessarily in all aspects of a business. For example, what legal items a business can sell, who they can sell them to, what they must pay their employees, how much sick time and vacation time they must give, how they schedule them, etc, etc. These things are not for the city to control. There are state and federal laws covering this. Not to mention all the money it will cost for the city to monitor and enforce all these ordinances.	6/21/2018 0:41
1202	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	A stronger focus on cooperative business development, and particularly models that help a broader community benefit from enterprise is important. Minneapolis already has a C-TAP program to support co-ops; how can this be expanded and be more robust?	3/27/2018 21:00
1203	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	Elsewhere in this document there is a focus on creating new development incentivizing replacing older buildings with larger, denser structures. However, small business owners generally don't appear able to afford locating in brand new buildings.	4/26/2018 15:03
1204	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	<p>POLICY 56: Supporting Small Businesses</p> <p>NRRCâ€™s proposed action steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The City will research and evaluate the availability of land and unused buildings in North Minneapolis that could be developed into a boutique commercial corridor for businesses such as coffee shops, flower shops, small grocery stores, and book stores.</li> <li>2.The City will evaluate current zoning policies and design standards that make redevelopment in North Minneapolis overly burdensome.</li> <li>3.The City will evaluate current zoning and design standards that support boutique commercial corridors and encourages walking.</li> <li>4.The City will provide technical assistance to neighborhood organizations to help said organization balance costs and benefits of development policies and proposals.</li> <li>5.The City enhances funding to support redevelopment and repurposing abandoned buildings and industrial sites; and blighted buildings for economic development.</li> </ol>	5/8/2018 19:48
1205	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	I couldn't agree more with the sentiment behind this goal. However. I notice that what's REALLY happening is a proliferation of big-chain stores and restaurants in place of local ones. Uptown is a case in point. where density is currently (not including buildings now or soon to be under construction) at 12000 people per square mile <a href="http://www.southwestjournal.com/news/biz-buzz/2018/02/victorias-secret-closes-landlord-seeks-unique-retail/">http://www.southwestjournal.com/news/biz-buzz/2018/02/victorias-secret-closes-landlord-seeks-unique-retail/</a> . This should be good for business. However, the same article states that small businesses can no longer afford to stay there due to the fact that the rent is \$2 more per square foot than elsewhere in the city. A visual analysis of the area will tell you that the businesses that are benefitting from all this density are the large corporate chains. Whoâ€™s to say that those same chains wonâ€™t move into other more dense areas, pushing out local businesses? Nothing in the plan speaks to actively prioritizing small business over corporations. What will the City do to actually protect small businesses?	5/13/2018 18:51
1206	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	The City will research and evaluate the availability of land and unused buildings in North Minneapolis that could be developed into a boutique commercial corridor for businesses such as coffee shops, flower shops, small grocery stores, and book stores. Plymouth Avenue would be ideal for this.	5/16/2018 20:17
1207	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	The city has so far to go to just get out of the way of business owners. You have added navigators to help the people find their way through the systems the city has made so complicated.	5/23/2018 17:37

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1208	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	This policy is extremely important and probably needs more than 5 action steps. Consider reducing regulation burden, reducing barriers to entry for small business entrepreneurs. Also, consider the city's competitive environment with other cities to make Minneapolis a preferred city to open a small business.	5/24/2018 16:16
1209	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	It would be nice to see a plan that is more pro-business and innovation. North Minneapolis has a lot of potential in terms of growth. Why not lower business taxes in the 4th Precinct and revitalize the area with new businesses, job opportunities and money pouring into the community? Small businesses city wide have been inundated with high taxes, high minimum wage and regulations. Your ideas are heavily focused on improving the lives of your residents, while lending no relief to small business. On the one hand you mention how important small businesses are, yet offer no suggestions of enabling innovation or growth through private investment. How are you going to create opportunities? Let people create their own opportunities - using their own capital and ability, and having a bit of relief from regulation and high taxes. It appears your plan favors certain chosen individuals - who receive subsidies and government "help", while the rest of the business owners shell out more and more to barely make it. How is that helping all residents?	5/25/2018 13:50
1210	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	Please prioritize businesses owned by trans people	6/6/2018 3:14
1211	/policies/supporting-small-businesses/	SO basically, if youâ€™re not a black owned business or a woman. Youâ€™re on your own. Time to get out of Minneapolis	6/10/2018 4:54
1212	/policies/sustainable-water-system-management/	Would like to see policies and practices to advance gray water reuse added. Also appreciate the references to specific linked policies/standards, and would like to see these referred to more widely throughout the plan, not just this section.	3/28/2018 4:28
1213	/policies/sustainable-water-system-management/	water catchment systems for high-use facilities like brewerys etc, upgrade cleanup programs for the stormwater grates - clean out trash out of the water ways, filter water through infiltration landscape before it goes to open water sources.	4/3/2018 17:14
1214	/policies/sustainable-water-system-management/	RE: Policy 72, Action Steps i and j.: I suggest dropping "continue" in "i" and making specific reference to at least this key example: "need to remove dead-end water mains" These substandard mains create a water supply that is not currently high quality, that is damaging to home plumbing and laundry, and is less safe. A current remedy of installing automatic hydrant flushers at some dead-ends is costly, wastes water, is only partially effective at best and totally ineffective in the winter. The existing language of i and j is:  I Continue providing safe high-quality drinking water while being a steward of public resources and infrastructure.  J.Minimize drinking water waste through infrastructure improvements.	5/16/2018 16:15
1215	/policies/sustainable-water-system-management/	encourage people to have rain gardens and rain harvesting	6/6/2018 3:47
1216	/policies/technology-in-the-city-enterprise/	Create a municipal broadband system that connects all homes to a city run, free and open internet system. #NetNeutrality	3/23/2018 17:51
1217	/policies/technology-in-the-city-enterprise/	Technology: citizens should be able to request a voucher for the South transfer facility by email 24/7, instead of ONLY by phone during limited hours.	4/12/2018 7:04

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1218	/policies/technology-in-the-city-enterprise/	<p>Comments on #89 Technology in the City Enterprise:</p> <p>Initiate a shared volunteer sign up portal for the city of Mpls (hopefully synched up with the Park Board, School Board and Libraries, etc.) in partnership with neighborhoods and block clubs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Use a system like the govdelivery “ for signing up for the different Minneapolis email newsletters</li> <li>-One place to sign up for “ block club, NNO, adopt a drain, school tutoring, walk/ bike to school mentor, etc.</li> <li>-Check box to share name with neighborhood association and block club</li> </ul> <p>Re-frame block clubs and block captain lists to be “eco-owned” with neighborhood associations along with the Police Department, CCP safe and other interested departments i.e., Forestry (adopt a tree) Public Works (adopt a drain) Solid Waste (adopt a block, organics recycling, Fire Dept, Emergency Preparedness</p> <p>Enable Each community/neighborhood to have their own neighborhood dash board to track their neighborhoods progress on helping to meet city wide goals with neighborhoods and block clubs, i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Climate goals “ total number of homes/ apartments, and number that are weatherized</li> <li>-Households signing up for renewable power</li> <li>-High school graduation rates</li> <li>-Neighbors with chronic disease participating in support groups</li> <li>-Blocks with block clubs, national night out parties, reduction of crime</li> <li>-Storm drains adopted “ adopt a drain</li> <li>-Forestry “ adopt a tree</li> <li>-Clean City “ litter be gone</li> </ul> <p>Sean Gosiewski, Executive Director Alliance for Sustainability, 612-250-0389 sean@afors.org Mpls 2040 Comments www.allianceforsustainability.com/mps2040comments Resilient Cities Coalition (starting summer 2018) www.allianceforsustainability.com/resilientcities</p>	5/22/2018 22:53
1219	/policies/technology-in-the-city-enterprise/	Collect and use data for trans community needs; gather, generate, analyze, interpret, visualize and distribute data across jurisdictions for use in decision-making by policymakers and the public including but not limited to interactive maps of trans businesses and resources, and ability to publicly display trans community data online for use by members of the public.	6/6/2018 14:42
1220	/policies/technology-in-the-economy/	<p>Under this plan tech investment should never be groveled to, or sought after at the cost of affordable housing, existing resident retention, city culture and connectedness, and equity .</p> <p>Tech should not be used as a panacea, but be engaged with and used in a thoughtful manner. More is not always better, and just because tech makes something "possible" does not mean it should be done. Tech requires a significant amount of energy use, precious minerals (which are extracted from somewhere and if we're not willing or able to extract it from our backyard we should reconsider how much of that tech we actually NEED), and as an increasing amount of studies show increase anxiety/isolation.</p>	6/6/2018 20:57
1221	/policies/tenant-protections/	Very important. We should add a tenant/ cooperative of tenants right of first refusal to purchase with appropriate time frames whenever a landlord (voluntarily or due to City action due to violations) wishes to transfer ownership of rental property.	3/27/2018 20:27
1222	/policies/tenant-protections/	Please ensure emergency rental assistance is easier to access and can be received in a timely manner.	3/29/2018 21:04
1223	/policies/tenant-protections/	I would like to see increased funding for volunteer legal services to help tenants facing evictions/unlawful detainers	4/3/2018 19:37

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		<p>I think it would help some advocates get on board to hear specifics here. I love the Comp Plan, and I want to see tenant advocacy concerns addressed from the get-go. Just a few ideas. I am aware that some of these might be underway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Remove occupancy limits from being defined twice by the city: in the zoning code and in the building code</li> <li>* Rentersâ€™ first right of refusal: in the event that landlords opt to sell the land, renters should be given the opportunity to purchase or lease</li> <li>* Dedicating more funds for preserving naturally occurring affordable housing if a landlord opts to sell the land</li> <li>* Explore local inclusionary zoning policy, with the caveat that inclusionary zoning policies have not had impressive results nationally. We must be careful to do this in a way, possibly incentive-based, that does not counterproductively discourage the creation of more housing.</li> <li>* Guaranteed housing if kicked out for redevelopment</li> <li>* Relocation fee assistance</li> <li>* Stronger regulations &amp; enforcement of building code</li> <li>* â€œJust Causeâ€ eviction ordinance</li> <li>* Establish a means to ensure landlords engage in equitable renting practices (See: housing discrimination against same-sex couples and trans people)</li> <li>* Removal of cisheteronormative â€˜familyâ€™ language in occupancy restrictions</li> <li>* Creation of a Renter Advisory Committee to the City Council</li> <li>* Redo processes for involvement: as part of the Neighborhood Revitalization Program, the city has funded a system of neighborhood associations (that primarily function as homeowners associations), many of which presently use city money to organize opposition to new housing. This process is overwhelmingly white, rich, and populated by landowners, leaving out the voices of everyone else. This is a power structure that reinforces the existing inequities in our society, and it must be dismantled.</li> </ul> <p>Rent increase caps as an emergency stop-gap measure to protect against displacement (see: Whittier neighborhood &amp; CPM), while recognizing rent increase caps alone are not the solution. If this becomes a primary strategy to prevent displacement and keep rents low: it will stifle housing investment, lead to discrimination against long-term residents, disadvantage new residents or existing residents looking for a shrinking pool of available housing.,. Itâ€™s also important to note: rent control is prohibited by state law, which requires municipalities to pass rent control by ballot measure.</p>	
1224	/policies/tenant-protections/		4/15/2018 19:07
1225	/policies/tenant-protections/	How can we guarantee someone free representation in court if they are facing eviction?	4/15/2018 19:14
1226	/policies/tenant-protections/	Limit the amount a landlord can raise rent in one year. Require affordable units in developments with increases only as much as inflation of wages. Help low income people buy an apartment or part of a duplex for housing and community stability.	4/21/2018 23:38
1227	/policies/tenant-protections/	Do not force landlords to accept Sectiion8 or you will have nothing but large corporate landlords.	5/12/2018 4:00
1228	/policies/tenant-protections/	The city can and should be the most powerful advocate for tenants' rights. The city, therefore, needs a vehicle that keeps its fingers on the pulse of tenants' issues. This means stepped up house inspections and quick response to tenant generated complaints. The city can actively solicit these issues and then work to resolve them.	5/14/2018 20:26
1229	/policies/tenant-protections/	<p>A very meaningful policy chance would be to require advance notice of building sales so that nonprofits might be able to have time to put together an offer to purchase units that are going to be sold.</p> <p>I have heard landlords complain about the difficulties of the section 8 voucher program. Perhaps the city could create a new sort of housing coupon that would be simpler to use and attractive to landlords. At the same time, I would like to see greater restriction on abuses by landlords, especially when properties are sold so that fewer tenants are displaced and do not have to face additional screening and/or are eligible for meaningful relocation assistance. Today's Strib had an article about the same tenants being displaced at Normandale Lakes who had already been displaced at Crosstown. We should not allow this to happen in Minneapolis!</p>	5/18/2018 20:37

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1230	/policies/tenant-protections/	Collaboration with Hennepin County is KEY. The City of Minneapolis must bring Hennepin County to the table especially Emergency Assistance which is denying close to 2/3 of its applicants a majority of whom are renters seeking rental relief and assistance with damage deposits. In our research we found that very few have anything positive to say about their experiences seeking emergency assistance to the contrary many feel less than human in the process. When most other resources require a denial letter from Hennepin County to receive their services which often takes 30 days or more to receive you have hundreds of disgruntled renters and families in crisis looking for support where none exist.	5/23/2018 11:33
1231	/policies/tenant-protections/	The City should fund additional inspectors to investigate slumlords. It should adopt just cause eviction laws and be more aggressive about revoking rental licenses from landlords who fail to meet the criteria laid out by the City.	5/24/2018 17:27
1232	/policies/tenant-protections/	Implement protection for landlords that have their property destroyed by renters and from renter abuse.	5/26/2018 4:11
1233	/policies/tenant-protections/	We need just cause evictions, 60-day notice of rent increase, 90-day advance notice of sale, right of first refusal, and rent relocation assistance in the case of no cause or economic evictions. Tenant protections go a long way in protecting our most vulnerable populations.	6/8/2018 14:03
1234	/policies/tenant-protections/	I worked the majority of my life serving g and supporting families living in poverty, from all my experience I have rarely seen Tennant get the support they need to stand up to sub standard housing issues. Many times when they take the brave step to report health and safety issues they loose their housing and the unit is condemned.Let make sure that theses issues are dealt with my upping inspections, training inspectors and holding g slum landlords account table for their egregious lack of humanity!!! Barbara Olson	6/8/2018 15:42
1235	/policies/tenant-protections/	I lived in Chicago a number of years, and while there is not much I'd suggest we look to as a model, the tenant rights policy is MUCH stronger than in Minneapolis. We rented from a terrible slumlord and were shocked to find out how poor our options were.	6/14/2018 21:08
1236	/policies/tenant-protections/	Please understand that rent control has never worked in American cities and will, over time, actually decrease the amount of affordable housing. Learn from other cities mistakes.	6/17/2018 22:35
1237	/policies/transit/	Traveling through downtown Minneapolis, especially at rush hour, is painfully slow because of general traffic. The City should be advocating for a transit tunnel to improve capacity and speed in the densest part of the metro.	3/22/2018 23:38
1238	/policies/transit/	Can we work to create better transit connections between key park destinations?	3/23/2018 2:16
1239	/policies/transit/	Please also add that the city shall support the placement of transit-only lanes wherever possible to ensure a reliable and frequent transit system.	3/23/2018 3:17
1240	/policies/transit/	We need, need, need to have useful aBRT on all the high-frequency routes. Building the streetcar line in the Greenway trench would also be fantastic.	3/23/2018 20:05
1241	/policies/transit/	The city needs more dedicated bus lanes. These can be implemented on many arterials by removing parking for cars.	3/24/2018 0:46
1242	/policies/transit/	Nicollet bus tunnel NOW!	3/24/2018 18:20
1243	/policies/transit/	Heavy rail line through city center to core suburbs. Policy should support development along these rail lines. I suggest looking at Copenhagen's Transit oriented development plans.	3/25/2018 21:13
1244	/policies/transit/	Expanding the light rail and adding street cars would put Minneapolis' transit up there with the best in the United States.	3/27/2018 16:08
1245	/policies/transit/	All good. This raises important questions as to how Minneapolis's plan aligns with other cities, because road construction and transit planning will depend highly on how this all fits together.	3/27/2018 16:37
1246	/policies/transit/	The City already does this stuff, but Metro Transit doesn't have funding to make things better. This "vision" for 2040transit in Minneapolis is underwhelming.	3/29/2018 15:52
1247	/policies/transit/	The city should invest in high quality rail lines through the denser parts of the city as they are more efficient at connecting the city and moving people than busses, also people don't like busses so there is that also.	3/31/2018 2:04
1248	/policies/transit/	Riding the bus through downtown Minneapolis, especially at rush hour, is painfully slow. The lights for LRT need to be fixed, and buses should have their own lanes so they can go faster. The long-term goal should be for a transit tunnel like Seattle.	4/2/2018 0:31
1249	/policies/transit/	encourage companies to give worker incentives for walking/transit to work. it saves everyone money but it takes a lot of time and sometimes you get soaked on the way home.	4/3/2018 17:07
1250	/policies/transit/	In order to keep mass transit effective, all future mass transit needs its own dedicated lanes. Busses may be fine for a city of 300,000 or less, but the city is past that and is growing. Adding more bus service just creates bus bunching which increases traffic and serves no one well, so the city should focus on rail modes of transport that travel in their own dedicated lanes and through high density areas to better connect the city.	4/6/2018 19:25



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1251	/policies/transit/	There is an assumption in this plan that higher densities magically result in better bus service. Uptown and the North Loop have added thousands of residents, but Metro Transit hasn't improved bus service in any meaningful way. Rather, they are putting resources into expensive LRT and BRT to un-walkable places.	4/11/2018 16:54
1252	/policies/transit/	New funding to maintain the transit shelters - need to keep them clean and safe for users of the transit system	4/13/2018 22:29
1253	/policies/transit/	Need more transit police or street outreach workers and more homeless shelters to deal with the problems caused by homeless taking up residence in the bus shelters - transit users should not have to run the gauntlet of beggars etc in order to use the transit system	4/13/2018 22:32
1254	/policies/transit/	Need more transit police or street outreach workers and more homeless shelters to deal with the problems caused by homeless taking up residence in the bus shelters - transit users should not have to run the gauntlet of beggars etc in order to use the transit system	4/13/2018 22:33
1255	/policies/transit/	Need more transit police or street outreach workers and more homeless shelters to deal with the problems caused by homeless taking up residence in the bus shelters - transit users should not have to run the gauntlet of beggars etc in order to use the transit system	4/13/2018 22:33
1256	/policies/transit/	Mass transit needs to run on time and the connections routes need to be better timed so they actually connect as scheduled	4/13/2018 22:34
1257	/policies/transit/	Please do not use Bryant Ave. as a major transportation route, Lyndale is for that. It's a mere 2 blocks away, is already designed to be motorized vehicle friendly. Bryant should be a bike route only.	4/17/2018 15:41
1258	/policies/transit/	Build out the Rapid Bus system and a streetcar system across the city. Especially the Midtown greenway rail project to connect people fast from the chain of lakes to hiawatha between SWLRT and Hiawatha LRT.	4/17/2018 21:10
1259	/policies/transit/	We need transit that is actually faster and more convenient than driving, and Metro Transit only wants to provide that to people in the suburbs. We need subways, bus tennels, and dedicated transit lanes- not more LRT to un-walkable places in the suburbs.	4/17/2018 23:10
1260	/policies/transit/	What about winter? Minneapolis does almost nothing now to ensure sidewalks and bus stops are shoveled. It is April 19, and I can hardly walk to my bus stop or climb over 3-foot snow mounds to get on the bus. Roads are clear, though.	4/19/2018 15:53
1261	/policies/transit/	Metro Transit apparently doesn't have \$ to increase frequencies, improve bus stops, or remove snow at bus stops. Until that service gets upgraded, riding buses will remain undesirable.	4/19/2018 15:58
1262	/policies/transit/	I use public transportation, but stopped going to Rosedale when I had to transfer in a area with very little foot traffic and evening service was cut. The more I have to transfer, the less I want to go. Please minimize transfers on by highway ramps and extend hours.	4/21/2018 22:56
1263	/policies/transit/	Public transit is the future. However, if we want people to move from their cars and start using buses and light rail, we must make sure that the public transit is reliable, fast and safe.	4/23/2018 19:05
1264	/policies/transit/	City should work more with Metro Transit on basic stuff like bus stop design (making sure no parking zones are big enough, there are signs and trash cans and benches at stops, making sure sidewalks are wide enough). This basic stuff makes the difference in whether or not a bus system is usable day to day.	4/25/2018 16:24
1265	/policies/transit/	No on-street parking should be free unless all transit service is comprehensive and free. Our transit system needs a lot more investment and there isn't any incentive to do that as long as driving is easy and (perceived as) cheap. If you have to pay to park everywhere, driving becomes less attractive and more pressure is put on improving the transit system. Let's make that happen. It's a travesty that we didn't get rail to run through Uptown. We can't change that now, but we can still make the most of our transit system everywhere in Minneapolis and help move towards our climate goals by not making driving an attractive option. Part of me wants to have a car fee to enter the city, similar to London. Another big picture goal would be that I would love to have Minneapolis somehow annex the first tier suburbs (St Louis Park, Plymouth, Hopkins, Edina, Minnetonka). The tax incentives that they can offer to lure business out of the city just continues to cause sprawl and regional planning issues. Bring them under the Minneapolis umbrella and we can actually have a solid regional planning group that isn't hamstrung.	4/26/2018 21:59
1266	/policies/transit/	Please work to give transit vehicles priority over private autos. A bus with 50 people should never be delayed by a car with only 1 or 2 people. I envision buses skipping traffic at intersections via a priority signaling system and transit only lanes on main corridors (like Hennepin Ave from Douglas to Lake, please). Transit only lanes should be 24 hours so as to lessen speeding and reckless driving during non-rush periods and reduce confusion.	5/2/2018 17:56

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1267	/policies/transit/	<p>You need to create good public transportation BEFORE you restrict cars. Your current plan (thanks lisa fender bender)of choking cars out of streets by creating dead lanes and bike lanes is asinine. Making our commutes miserable is not going to change my use of a car. Why you ask? Because of the following:</p> <p>Public transit is currently not very reliable, fast or safe. I am not going anywhere remote or sketchy via rail or bus because I don't want to put my safety at risk, especially at night.</p> <p>Despite traffic congestion, it is still easily 2-3 times faster to go by car. And, there are many places the bus doesn't even get close enough to. As it is now, I've already curbed a fair amount of activities due to the headache of parking and unwillingness to use public transport. That won't change with more restrictions; I'll just do less in Minneapolis.</p> <p>And just remind yourself of how much more smog is now being produced by all those cars that sit idling on one lane streets because they have been reduced by an entire lane for a handful of bikers. These stupid protected lanes are way wider than necessary and create problems for: people trying to parallel park on one lane roads (but you don't care about drivers at all, I forgot), delivery drivers trying to park briefly, pedestrians crossing the street over the newly created snow hump where the sticks are, and emergency vehicles who are now trapped by all that traffic.</p>	5/4/2018 11:10
1268	/policies/transit/	<p>Ditch all ideas about adding street cars. If they had been left in place that would be one thing, but they are gone. Don't get on the nostalgia trend train. I've sat in on the committees trying to bring them back. It's a stupid idea. Street cars are completely inflexible. When an accident happens they cannot go around. The tracks are a safety hazard for bikers and walkers. They are ludicrously expensive. Their required platform for loading is invasive. It would wipe out a lot of boulevard space (ie, personal landowner property) just to meet ADA requirements. They will be louder than rubber on asphalt. This city doesn't need any more noise.</p>	5/4/2018 11:54
1269	/policies/transit/	<p>We need to give local transit routes more priority and greater frequency on our city streets. We should have more bus-only lanes (both 24 hour bus-only and peak-time bus-only) on streets like Hennepin and Central. For transit to be a viable option for more people, buses cannot be held up by single-occupancy (or possible future zero-occupancy) vehicles. Give transit full priority! The city should lobby the Met Council for streetcar on the Midtown Greenway and really start to think big picture by planning a transit tunnel through downtown (eventually rerouting downtown LRT through the CBD at least). Multiple lanes on both 94 and 35W should convert to full-time MNPass lanes, and revenue should be used to help mitigate freeway impacts on the neighborhoods it cuts through.</p>	5/10/2018 17:09
1270	/policies/transit/	<p>Policies and action steps need to be more explicit that the city will play a role in financially supporting transit capital investment and operations. The city currently spends in excess of \$100 million every year in capital and operating budgets maintaining streets, traffic lights, police operations, plowing, and more - the vast majority of which benefits drivers in personal vehicles. This amount includes spending on projects where ownership and finances are spread across multiple jurisdictions (ex Hennepin County, MnDOT) - proving we can partner with larger government entities from a management and budget perspective. The city should spend a justifiable amount on transit as well.</p>	5/11/2018 0:32

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1271	/policies/transit/	<p>Minneapolis needs to get this right before anything else. And the city is NOT on the right track. Mass transit is virtually non-existent in most of the city.</p> <p>The "Action Steps" listed above do not constitute a "plan." A "plan" would have concrete actions. Not "partner with," "Actively Shape and Define," "Support." These are NOT real plans. They are "feel good" verbs that provide NO REAL plan on how to move forward.</p> <p>The current bus system is unusable for residents in Southwest Minneapolis outside of daytime work hours. It doesn't go where we need it to go, WHEN we need to get there. Going to downtown isn't bad during the day, but to go anywhere else in the city is impossible. And coming back from downtown after work hours, or any activity in the evening is almost impossible. It requires hours on buses, switching buses, etc. Late at night. That is nuts.</p> <p>A large part of the Southwest Minneapolis is a mile or more from either Crosstown, Hwy 100, or 35W. Walking to those major thoroughfares is not viable. It's too far and you may have heard there is the winter season here.</p> <p>The metro area can't even get it together to get a light rail built in the Southwest Metro. The lawsuits are ridiculous. So, hopes of light rail around the city are 30-50 years away at the rate this is going.</p> <p>NONE of your other housing or transportation plans will work until you implement a better mass transit system.</p> <p>There are NO real plans to improve the system. You say "it's prioritized." What does that mean? That is not a PLAN. "Build more shelters by bus stops." Really? That's the answer? SMH.</p> <p>You just seem to want to shove more people on buses, spending hours and hours getting to and from destinations. That is not a great plan.</p>	5/12/2018 16:34
1272	/policies/transit/	<p>This all sounds great I really like the idea of making more dedicated bus lanes BUT. But my observation to date is that, in the effort to make the city better for bikers, it has made it much much worse for those who take mass transit. A major reason that people resort to using their cars is the lack of a functional mass transit system. The inclusion of bike lanes on major arteries make the already inadequate system far worse. There's no way a bus, stuck in the now single lanes of traffic on major arteries, due to the existence of bike lanes, can go fast, in spite of goals, listed above, to create high frequency bus routes. I see action step #d calls for dedicated bus lanes, which I wholly support. But the current practice and, as far as i know, the future plan, is to continue to build bus lanes along major arteries rather than creating bus lanes for those streets and putting the bus lanes on side streets.</p> <p>Changing this plan would have several advantages. First, the bikers could have safer, quieter, less polluted, and more pleasant routes. Second, the buses could actually move faster, again, a major source of concern for those who commented on the site. And third, by giving the cars a space to go, albeit a more limited one than they previously enjoyed, without the buses stopping traffic every few blocks, things will be a bit easier for those who need to use them and pollution from idling might be reduced at least somewhat.</p>	5/13/2018 19:10
1273	/policies/transit/	<p>I'm not sure where I saw this--it doesn't seem to be listed here, but somewhere I heard that actions to discourage car use include such things as eliminating the requirement for on-site parking on new buildings, prohibitions against building new gas stations, auto repair businesses and park and ride lots. I applaud the effort to move the culture of the city away from over dependence on cars, given their contribution to pollution. I do, however, find it baffling that one would prohibit ways for people to park and ride. If the goal is to get people onto transit, isn't it better to make the transit easier to get to for all commuters, especially those who would otherwise drive their cars further??</p>	5/13/2018 19:22

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1274	/policies/transit/	The city needs to guard against becoming "family unfriendly" by over-emphasizing transportation (and zoning/land use) policies that are disproportionately based on accommodating the desires of some outspoken healthy younger people--e.gs. bicycle riders, those realistically able to conveniently access and rely on mass transit for all their transportation needs, et al--at the expense of the needs of families with children with far-flung activities, seniors, those with health-related mobility limitations and others who, realistically, will be highly dependent on private cars for the foreseeable future. Among other things, this means requirements for adequate off-street parking for all new buildings--and multiple occupancies--should be retained, particularly in view of the amount of snow and the 5-month duration of winter here, something inescapably without parallel in Seattle, Portland or Denver. Policies to encourage greater use of mass transit and other car alternatives--particularly while the current very limited mass transit system is improved and expanded-- should be based solely on the "carrot" of low-pricing, convenient schedules, attractive facilities, etc., rather than the "stick" of increasing the inconvenience of those reliant on cars.	5/14/2018 1:02
1275	/policies/transit/	I was recently travelling in Ieland. As I was waiting for a bus, I could see on a monitor exactly which bus was coming, where it was going, and what time it will arrive. Minneapolis needs to help people navigate the bus system.	5/14/2018 11:46
1276	/policies/transit/	More light rail (or subway), speed up end-to-end travel time.	5/14/2018 23:48
1277	/policies/transit/	Before you start laying down railroad tracks in people's back yards, why not offer incentives for people who carpool? Special lanes? Special parking?  Public transportation is great, but when it's slower than driving, what is the incentive? Great public transportation is found in the bigger cities of the world, but they are normally in the form of subways and monorails. They are also FAST!	5/20/2018 18:29
1278	/policies/transit/	More aBRT! Fund aBRT! It's so cheap compared to light rail, with such good results!	5/21/2018 2:44
1279	/policies/transit/	More dedicated bus lanes please!	5/24/2018 2:35
1280	/policies/transit/	Make bus only lanes permanent, like the Hennepin trial. More trials on more streets too!	5/25/2018 19:04
1281	/policies/transit/	We need better transit! I support all these policies and more to make our transit more reliable, affordable, and accessible.	5/26/2018 0:21
1282	/policies/transit/	The substantial buildup of apartments and condominiums in and around the downtown area suggests that the transit of choice for those reside in these buildings is none of the above. They prefer to walk.	5/26/2018 3:58
1283	/policies/transit/	My family very much supports bringing back a large modern streetcar grid to connect the city, in place of buses.	5/29/2018 0:04
1284	/policies/transit/	I'd like to see the City advocate for more secure transit funding at the County and State level. Transit is essential to 15%+ of the city's population and could be a significant tool in the battle against climate change. We need to make sure transit is available in the future!	5/30/2018 16:00
1285	/policies/transit/	what does focus on outcomes mean? please clearly define both he focus and the outcomes and what will be done, in response, with information	6/3/2018 18:30
1286	/policies/transit/	While more light rail would be really awesome, I understand that's a huge expense. But one faster, cheaper way to increase bus reliability, especially in and near downtown, and along busier corridors, would be to have bus-only lanes. Also, having more transit oriented development, that puts more homes near transit, and allows businesses at the sidewalk level surrounding transit stops, would make mass transit more practical, because after stepping off the bus or train, there could be a small grocery store, or bank, or post office, or whatever, where people could take care of their practical daily needs on the way between home and work. There should be things to do near transit stops. Higher frequency, real-time information at major stops, and priority lanes would all be welcome improvements. I am an all year around cyclist, but when I can't, or just don't feel like biking, I always take the bus instead, but I'm never happy about it, because most routes are just plain unreliable. And that's mostly just because they just get stuck behind cars. Arterials like Lake st, Franklin, Hennepin, etc, would be served wonderfully by bus-only lanes now, and maybe light rail or modern streetcar in the future.	6/6/2018 3:28
1287	/policies/transit/	no more freeway expansion. full stop. only maintainance of existing roads (including returning them to surface streets when politically possible), and ramping up carpool incentives, bussing, etc. We cannot afford (in any sense of the word) more traffic lanes of cars.  Electric vehicles are not a cure all - batteries have a lifespan, batteries require precious minerals that come out of places that undisturbed protect groundwater and maintain native nations' access to treaty rights (like wild ricing, fishing, drinking water, etc). EVs, again, should not be viewed as a net zero impact nor something to continually expand use of instead of combustion engine vehicles.	6/6/2018 19:42

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1288	/policies/transit/	<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li> <li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li> <li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li> </ol> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	6/7/2018 20:46
1289	/policies/transit/	<p>this all sounds great but the devil is in the details. without a commitment to estimate the real-life routing needs of mass transit passengers, and then fund the needed transit, how can we achieve these goals?</p> <p>Resident, Mpls. 55416</p>	6/8/2018 16:49
1290	/policies/transit/	<p>The city needs to build and maintain more rail based transit with dedicated lanes. It is proven through studies that Americans hate buses (including me, a lover of transit!), so the best way to get people to use transit it to build the type they are willing to use. The system the city uses should shy away from a hub and spoke system and more of a integrated system that doesn't make people go out of their way to ensure people can get around the city in an efficient manner. It is imperative that the city gets this system its own right of way to increase frequency and to ensure that there aren't any unnecessary delays due to freight or car traffic.</p>	6/10/2018 22:43
1291	/policies/transit/	<p>The city needs to get Metro Transit on board with more frequency of our transit system at night. In order for the city to be more lively and livable, our transit systems shouldn't become unusable after 9pm. Busses and trains should remain on their 10-15 minute schedule until two hours after bar close to ensure that our city can become more of a world class city. This would also take cars off the road so we could reach our climate goals.</p>	6/10/2018 22:46
1292	/policies/transit/	<p>Transit has seen a steady decline since I moved to my current home 15 years ago, and there is now only one bus route with limited service. Why not work towards improving transit and see how development occurs organically rather than imposing zoning changes and hope that transit partners will come along.</p>	6/12/2018 16:27
1293	/policies/transit/	<p>I would love an increased investment in transit! I would use it more often.</p>	6/14/2018 13:38

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1294	/policies/transit/	Transit: I love this. Thank you for putting such an emphasis on this in the plan. My only concern is that there isn't enough emphasis on this! If we want more density in our city (I do!!!) this must be a priority. I worry that we will promote density as a city (because we can) and we won't have the control we need to create better transit. These run hand in glove and must be promoted together. Thanks!!!	6/22/2018 2:40
1295	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Yes! I love that the City is promoting equity in transportation. Keep up the good work!	3/23/2018 14:36
1296	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	I love that the priority is on sustainable modes: walking, biking and transit. I hope that aspiration is reflected in street design throughout the city, even when street reconfigurations face opposition from people who prefer an auto-oriented environment.	3/24/2018 0:33
1297	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Sounds good.	3/27/2018 16:30
1298	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Public Works only looks at the condition of road pavement when determining a street project. By that method, automobiles remain the the top priority- not pedestrians.	3/29/2018 15:23
1299	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	For equitable outcomes the city should reconsider routing rail transit through north Minneapolis because planning a bus route that will not be as fast nor as effective as the planned rail lines to the mostly white burbs is not equal treatment	4/6/2018 19:30
1300	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Continue to invest in bicycle infrastructure, possibly even creating a more robust tourism industry centered around biking.	4/8/2018 15:42
1301	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	The City doesn't enforce their own sidewalk clearance ordinance requiring them to be clear of ice and snow within 24 hours of a snowfall. Yet, they declare "Snow Emergencies" to ensure that cars can move and get stored quickly. Is that equitable?	4/17/2018 22:53
1302	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	This online format of the comp plan is innovative yet incomprehensible. A for effort, but I can't tell what's even happening without seeing a good old-fashioned PDF.	5/4/2018 19:22
1303	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Not sure what these action items entail.	5/12/2018 2:57
1304	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	There is virtually NO effective Mass Transit options in Minneapolis. Besides the light rail lines (just 2) the bus options are horrible. There is no effective way to get from a home in Southwest Minneapolis to anywhere in the metro area. We are almost seniors. It is absurd to think that we should WALK downtown, or BIKE downtown (this is MINNEAPOLIS, NOT MIAMI). So, at least in Southwest Minneapolis, we do not have any REAL access to transit.	5/12/2018 16:04
1305	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	The city needs to guard against becoming "family unfriendly" by over-emphasizing transportation (and zoning/land use) policies that are disproportionately based on accommodating the desires of some outspoken healthy younger people--e.gs. bicycle riders, those realistically able to conveniently access and rely on mass transit for all their transportation needs, et al--at the expense of the needs of families with children with far-flung activities, seniors, those with health-related mobility limitations and others who, realistically, will be highly dependent on private cars for the foreseeable future. Among other things, this means requirements for adequate off-street parking for all new buildings--and multiple occupancies--should be retained, particularly in view of the amount of snow and the 5-month duration of winter here, something inescapably without parallel in Seattle, Portland or Denver. Policies to encourage greater use of mass transit and other car alternatives--particularly while the current very limited mass transit system is improved and expanded-- should be based solely on the "carrot" of low-pricing, convenient schedules, attractive facilities, etc., rather than the "stick" of increasing the inconvenience of those reliant on cars.	5/14/2018 0:59
1306	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Access to lakes in SW Minneapolis is abysmal, especially to Harriet. This is an equity issue. Cycling is a preferred and economically necessary mode for many low income people. Let's make it safe, accessible, and abundant in the city. Let's support women, young people, elders and people of color to ride and walk. Our public health, and social health, depend on it. Light rail is AWESOME. We need more of it. Be patient and persistent - the new generations demand it, and business is beginning to love it. The old farts who hate anything but their cars will die (probably fro heart disease from not enough walking!). We are getting there - steady on, planners, steady on!	5/15/2018 0:00
1307	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	The city has made driving and parking FAR, FAR more difficult! As a result I do not go to Uptown any more. I suggest that if you want businesses to thrive in Minneapolis that you stop making it difficult for people to drive and park. . . .this is aside from the fact that I find the City's recent actions to add bike lanes and eliminate car lanes and park extremely discriminatory!	5/16/2018 13:10
1308	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Work with transportation officials to work out a light rail plan where the train would go down Broadway in North Minneapolis. Broadway Ave should be a commercially viable high density street that would benefit greatly from these transportation investments. Ideally the redevelopment of this street would decrease slum lord occupants and increase owner occupied businesses and developments.	5/16/2018 20:29
1309	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Our streets are in horrible shape. I've suffered \$1200 damage from one of your monster potholes. Please fix the streets. I'm too old to bike or walk safely. I need a car. I need to drive to live a useful life.	5/16/2018 22:04

## Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1310	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	It is embarrassing to the city that the North Side continues to have no light rail and insufficient aBRT service. I support these equity goals and I believe they should start with a significant investment in transit in North Minneapolis.	5/21/2018 2:22
1311	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	I assume you are including the needs to people with disabilities as part of your criteria for what is "equitable." I think snow and ice removal from city sidewalks is remarkably inconsistent when put in the hands of citizens and property owners. It seems to me that one way to ensure people using devices to aid mobility are able to get around during snowy/icy months would be to have the city take responsibility for clearing all sidewalks, with particular emphasis on sidewalks that connect major public transportation routes (Chicago Ave sidewalks that would help folks who ride the 5 bus line, for example).	5/23/2018 14:11
1312	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	These "Action Steps" are too vague. What specifically will you do to make transportation more equitable? I think a solid first step would be funding the proposed streetcar or BRT servicing North Minneapolis and Downtown.	5/24/2018 15:39
1313	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Put efforts into improving roads for cars and buses. Stop building trains.	5/26/2018 3:23
1314	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	We need to invest in more rapid buses with DEDICATED lanes throughout the city!	5/30/2018 16:58
1315	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	We need to invest in Midtown Green-way rail project to connect the Blue Line and future SWLRT project to provide better mobility to uptown.	5/30/2018 17:00
1316	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Do not prioritize cars and parking over transit, take risks, people will take transit to businesses. Or can park on a side street, our major arterial streets should prioritize transit.	5/30/2018 17:02
1317	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	please have a non partisan traffic engineer review these plan and advise. make the recommendations public. We also need to have a clear timeline for evaluating success and failure and how to change course if things are having unintended effects. (less equity/less fair/less affordable)	6/3/2018 17:51
1318	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	Prioritize walking, biking. Expand sidewalks, plazas, gardens, parks, no-car zones. Cars should not define our communities in 2040 as they do now.	6/6/2018 19:28

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1319	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</li> <li>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</li> <li>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</li> </ol> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	6/7/2018 20:39
1320	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	I don't understand how eliminating driving and/or parking lanes (Emerson N, Fremont N, etc) in residential areas improves "equity" for anyone. Especially when the new, seldom used bicycle lanes are used as passing lanes by cars!	6/17/2018 22:07
1321	/policies/transportation-and-equity/	I think it is time we consider a subway system in addition to our commitment to light rail expansion. We have the Sky Way for pedestrian traffic, the greenway for cycling, but a truly great and connected city should commit to rapid, clean, and reliable transportation. Subterranean rail transit has proven to connect people to their metros. The Twin Cities have a good start but are far behind Cities like Seattle, LA, Chicago, San Francisco, and New York. While we may not be as populous now, I can imagine 700,000 more cars throughout our metro!	6/20/2018 20:30
1322	/policies/transportation-partnerships/	This language says very little. Minneapolis needs to stand up to Hennepin County & MNDOT when they create awful roadways. Metro Transit doesn't have any money, so may be the City could pay for heated shelters and benches?	3/29/2018 16:08
1323	/policies/transportation-partnerships/	some cities in arizona are allow their transit agencies to have a car rental or uber type system. why compete with the taxi/uber system when it needs to be embraced as the way of the future. they basically do it for Metro Mobility, this would just expand to the larger population and make their service more valuable as a part of a complete system. Transit agencies need to embrace the 'first mile, last mile" gap by bike share, uber options, shared riding vans based on consumer demand.	4/3/2018 17:35
1324	/policies/transportation-partnerships/	Hennepin County controls the most dangerous streets in Minneapolis for walkers and bikers, but the City allows them to design awful roadways. Forget about the funding and decommission Hiawatha Avenue as a ineffective freeway. Get MNDOT out of having control over awful streets like Central and University Avenues NE. Cover the freeways.	5/9/2018 15:40



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		On topic	
		b. Provide education and training on tree care for private landowners.	
1325	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	This should be written as all residents. Renters and property owners are both interested in how to care for trees around the city.	3/22/2018 21:53
1326	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Could the city make better requirements for soil volume for boulevard trees? And also develop more standard to improve the health of boulevard trees?	3/23/2018 1:59
1327	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	This is very encouraging! We need to grow our urban forest drastically, and all of these action items are appropriate and meaningful. Love it!	3/23/2018 19:30
1328	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Ideally, this policy should address the alignment between tree canopy and solar access. Tree canopy should be maintained and increased, but also roof areas with good solar access currently should be maintained as an energy generating resource.	3/27/2018 16:30
1329	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Good Policy. Now, extend the canopy into residential areas like North Loop and Mill District. Just because they are "historic" areas that didn't have tree cover in the past, doesn't mean they shouldn't have trees today. (After all, they weren't residential neighborhoods in the past, either.) Despite the fact that there are a lot of new restaurants and retail, it is a dismal area to walk in, especially during hot days in Summer. More trees would greatly soften the neighborhoods and mitigate the windswept nature of some blocks.	4/3/2018 18:14
1330	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Great ideas	4/7/2018 14:19
1331	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Yes, but also consider plant diversity. Then whole blocks of trees were lost to Dutch Elm and later Ash Borers. We should plant a diversity of trees along with gently scooped out boulevards for rain gardens or native plants.	4/21/2018 18:56
1332	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	e. Encourage downtown businesses to "adopt a sidewalk" and plant and nurture trees throughout downtown.	4/25/2018 20:33
1333	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	You should start by discontinuing the plan to wipe out every ash tree in the city, regardless of whether or not it has EAB. Parks should do their homework on what happened with the American chestnut and not follow the exact same plan, which was realized to be a huge mistake.  And why waste money on downtown trees? Where is there even a mature boulevard downtown tree? Practically no where because they will all die or get ripped out for the next new construction. Quit deluding and patting yourselves on the back for planting new trees there.	5/4/2018 10:50
1334	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	I'd recommend that the city is faster to replant boulevard trees that are taken out.  It takes a long time for a boulevard tree to get big and provide a benefit to the neighborhood, so replanting within a year should be the goal.	5/7/2018 20:58
1335	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	e. Ensure that city tree-trimmers are professionally trained and sensitive to aesthetic issues. For instance, tree-trimmers should avoid "lolly-popping" trees. f. When maintaining sidewalks in older neighborhoods such as South Mpls, care will be taken to minimize cutting of major tree roots. If needed, side walks will be routed around major tree roots rather than endangering the tree itself.	5/13/2018 3:04
1336	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	What good is a tree canopy if there is a concrete canopy of apartment towers above it???	5/18/2018 18:41
1337	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	This seems like a very cool and good idea.	5/21/2018 2:14
1338	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	YES! Retain healthy old trees and add new trees in places they can have a chance to remain healthy.	5/22/2018 13:27
1339	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Less side walks and plazas. More trees.	5/26/2018 3:21
1340	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Strengthen the Citizen Pruner program. The MPRB Forestry Dept started a Citizen Pruner program to take some of the burden of easy pruning off the foresters. Such programs have been widely used elsewhere. I was in the initial group of trainees. From my perspective this program has not been achieving its potential. The volunteers are very interested and many are quite knowledgeable, but the program is run by interns who are not there long term and have competing priorities. Not enough work days are scheduled to accommodate volunteers' busy schedules. Last year they started allowing people to do work on their own but have not provided a map of areas that need pruning. This program could be much more successful if it had better staff support.	5/29/2018 18:51

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1341	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Infill houses in SW Minneapolis are drastically reducing mature trees on city lots. Retaining mature trees is a great action step on paper, but current incentives are decidedly insufficient. Builders plunk a standard design on the lot and if a tree is in the footprint, it gets cut. Trees on boundary lines between properties die when half of their roots are cut out. Given that we're simultaneously losing a lot of mature ash trees, this is making 100 year old neighborhoods look more like new subdivisions in terms of tree cover.	5/29/2018 18:54
1342	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	I'm glad the city is taking this into consideration. Having an urban canopy makes the city more welcoming and more liveable. I hope they work in partnership with the "Plant for the Future" campaign by Mississippi Park Connection, which advocates for healthy, climate-conscious tree diversity. Diversifying tree species in anticipation of changing climate and on-coming invasive pests like Emerald Ash Borer is so important - otherwise the city will sink money into tree planting and maintenance and just see trees die.	5/30/2018 16:03
1343	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	1. We need to plant extensively on our heaviest car use corridors. Do you want to slow down cars on Lake street? Fill that bitch with trees. I notice this all the time. Our side streets are cute and full of trees but then you get to a 4-lane road and all the trees disappear. 31st ave is my favorite examples. 2. Trees are great, but they are far from the most effective things at managing stormwater runoff, reducing the heat island effect or providing habitat for creatures. They are just a really easy thing to "measure" because they are simple to count. Why not eliminate the "lawn restrictions" we have that pretty much mandate grass or full landscaping. Lets require each new property to handle its stormwater on site! Even those pesky single family homes.	6/3/2018 3:29
1344	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Connectivity! Create functional ecological networks that conserve biodiversity and provide for sustainable use of natural resources. Enhance ecological habitat connectivity by creating a network of wildlife corridors, connected natural areas, resilient to environmental challenges. Wildlife need to move. They need to access resources, ensure gene flow, shift their ranges, and establish new territories, among other things. Connected landscapes allow for the movement of plants and wildlife and facilitate ecological processes. As climate change and other stressors act on the landscape, connectivity is critical to allowing wildlife to adapt to changing conditions.	6/5/2018 16:04
1345	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Good action steps! We should be doing these well before 2040!	6/12/2018 19:17
1346	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Density where I live in south Minneapolis would make many residents, myself included, very unhappy, as there is not enough parking for dense neighborhoods, and density and apartments would ruin the neighborhood feel that draws so many people here.	6/13/2018 14:14
1347	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	I agree with the above points, but wanted to add a note regarding retaining mature trees: There needs to be some sort of tree treating program where if a homeowner gets a tree treated by a contracted-with-the-city arborist at a discounted rate, it will prevent that tree from being cut down just for disease prevention.	6/15/2018 18:32
1348	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Sounds good. I also strongly suggest you support the planting of prairie plants and native forbs in public places; get rid of the boring monoculture that is Kentucky Blue Grass! Birds and bugs would thank you, that's fore sure.	6/16/2018 19:36
1349	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Make sure you diversify tree species, especially given the damage done to Ash trees and others....	6/17/2018 18:24
1350	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Having lived in Mpls long enough to see the Dutch Elm Blight, the Gypsy Moths, and now the Emerald Ash Borer, has Mpls Forestry finally figured it out? Do not plant an entire block or neighborhood with the same species!! In fact, there should be a very large portfolio of good urban trees that can be planted so that there are never large groups vulnerable again. And if one single tree gets sick and must be removed, isn't one better than the entire block?	6/17/2018 22:01
1351	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	The connection between carbon emissions (the cause of environmental degradation) and tree planting (a remedy for environmental degradation) should be identified and built into public policy. As a source seeks to emit more pollution, they should be willing to contribute to an offset program of tree plantings. Similarly, when anyone chooses to cover absorbent ground with concrete or asphalt, they should be contributing to an offset program that remediates the pollution of water that results from excessive runoff. When the connection between cause and effect is so easily quantified, public policy should make sure that those who pollute, give a hoot.	6/17/2018 22:33
1352	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	If, when time for reconstruction, a street does not have a boulevard with trees- make sure that is priority #1 when evaluating the new layout, even if it means removing street parking. Free storage of Private Property on Public Ways should not be more important than the ecosystems which we all directly and indirectly depend on.  Also, consider bulb-outs with trees planted in commercial areas that do not have trees already. The "bulb-outs" could be spaced to allow 2 parallel parked cars with a tree planted between them along the whole block. Perhaps stagger the bulbs for aesthetic purposes.	6/22/2018 14:45
1353	/policies/tree-canopy-and-urban-forest/	Fulfill a survey of trees through out the City, and write an ordinance to penalize the destruction and removals of trees, in order to discourage "willy-nilly" tree chopping, and to encourage more unique building design.	6/22/2018 14:56

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1354	/policies/urban-agriculture-and-food-production/	Can we close the loop on our composting and provide soil for residents to grow food with?	3/26/2018 0:54
1355	/policies/urban-agriculture-and-food-production/	Looks good. It would be great to have more clarity about how equity in access and ownership will be ensured, and also how will the city evaluate the balance between self-consumption/ volunteer management urban farming and urban ag businesses.	3/28/2018 4:15
1356	/policies/urban-agriculture-and-food-production/	Agriculture in the City is a waste of land. Farms should go in rural areas with higher densities in Minneapolis	4/11/2018 17:15
1357	/policies/urban-agriculture-and-food-production/	Odor control may be important for livability for neighbors depending what is make. no to H- develop the land for tax base. Use schools parks libraries and backyards for community gardens. We have public space already.	4/22/2018 5:16
1358	/policies/urban-agriculture-and-food-production/	provide big freezer or refrigerator to Urban gardens, support organizations like (seed savers, plant-grow- share), organize events to provide free community meal through organization like Out in the Backyard and donate some fresh farm vegetables. Collaborate different organization who produce lots of vegetables to organization who provide free events to the community, so that they could provide more free meals to the community	5/25/2018 20:15
1359	/policies/urban-agriculture-and-food-production/	Support urban agriculture and healthy food incentive and innovation zones.	5/31/2018 2:40
1360	/policies/vision-zero/	Reinstate the Traffic Unit! MPD simply no longer enforces traffic laws, and it's making our streets incredibly dangerous. We need to let drivers know that they cannot just tear around town being dangers to society. ENFORCE THE TRAFFIC LAWS!	3/23/2018 20:07
1361	/policies/vision-zero/	Balance safety with the needs of the 95%+ of people in the city who rely on the transit network to get around. Reducing speed limits to 5mph on every street would probably lower accidents but the city would grind to a halt. Changing the streets to make them safer for pedestrians always comes at a cost, don't forget to consider those costs when making changes to streets.	4/7/2018 14:12
1362	/policies/vision-zero/	I just want to really emphasize letter (i) here. Enforcement of existing traffic laws would really help. I see drivers blow through red lights on a regular basis, which is incredibly dangerous for pedestrians. I understand that there's a state-level issue with using red light cameras, but I would like the city to really crack down on that sort of dangerous behavior from drivers.  On another note, I think the city should get a lot more aggressive with using no turn on red at intersections. Drivers turning right on red do not pay attention to pedestrians, and cutting down on the places that this is allowed would improve pedestrian safety.	4/16/2018 19:11
1363	/policies/vision-zero/	More cross walks and pedestrian crossing signs. When people renew their drivers licenses educate them on new rules or give them a refresher. No driving while using medical pot. Limit alcohol consumption for drivers.	4/21/2018 23:25
1364	/policies/vision-zero/	Never want to see anyone hurt. Please make sure only accidents are counted in the statistics, suicides should be separate. I think they are lumped together now (There should be another goal to have suicides zero in Mpls also.) g. People in vehicles are dying more than other groups so having them last via Complete streets policies is strange-more lives can be saved if that group saftey is worked on first.	4/22/2018 5:36
1365	/policies/vision-zero/	Motor vehicles are the only mode killing and inuring people, and this Policy should state that obvious fact. People walking don't hurt any other road users.	5/9/2018 15:35
1366	/policies/vision-zero/	Pedestrians should be encouraged to use common sense before attempting to cross the street with a lot of vehicles coming.	5/12/2018 3:52
1367	/policies/vision-zero/	Create "no parking" areas near street corners where vision is limited i.e. the corner of 14th Ave and Fremont Ave N. If you're traveling west on 14th Ave N and come to the Fremont intersection and cars are parked up to the corner on Fremont Ave N, your vision to bus and other traffic on Fremont Ave N (it goes south) is impaired and there are many other corners that have the same challenge.	5/14/2018 13:13
1368	/policies/vision-zero/	The task force is fine, but this is the key: "Protect pedestrians and bicyclists through speed limits, design decisions, and design speeds that eliminate fatalities and serious injuries." Currently, our speed limits, street widths, and multiple lanes encourage drivers to drive recklessly. The only way to truly address this is by changing the way we design streets.	5/21/2018 2:48
1369	/policies/vision-zero/	Don't put bike lanes on streets with parking and high car usage. Build bike ways with bike money. Not gas tax money-that money should be used for roads.	5/26/2018 3:42
1370	/policies/vision-zero/	The data you cite for traffic accidents and injuries in recent years is surprisingly heartening. Enforcing the laws relative to speeding could probably reduce injuries and death, but we are doing pretty well already. With all the other items you want to work on, I'd counsel you not to waste a lot of time on this one.	5/29/2018 20:11

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1371	/policies/vision-zero/	Any Vision Zero Task Force should INCLUDE members from Minneapolis communities, especially those communities most impacted by traffic fatalities and those communities in which our lack of investment in infrastructure leads to dangerous intersections and accidents. Or there should be a community advisory board with CONCRETE power on Vision Zero action plans.	6/5/2018 15:00
1372	/policies/vision-zero/	Also - ENFORCEMENT should not be a part of any Vision Zero plan. Police enforcement has a demonstrated history of unfairly policing Black and indigenous residents. We need to acknowledge that even with best intentions, white supremacy is institutionalized within the Minneapolis police force with the deadly results that it inequitably serves some people more than others.	6/6/2018 2:30
1373	/policies/vision-zero/	This is very important work. I support this policy!	
		prioritize pedestrians through seeking to shrink overall landuse dedicated to cars.	
		Road traffic accidents are the Ranked 3rd in top causes of death for Minnesotans between the ages of 15 and 44. The only reason we are still using them is because we've wrapped our whole way of life around them. Between now and 2040 we have to make some serious steps towards changing that. People > cars. And driving in cars when you look at the numbers is one of the most dangerous things we do.	
		<a href="http://www.worldlifeexpectancy.com/minnesota-cause-of-death-by-age-and-gender">http://www.worldlifeexpectancy.com/minnesota-cause-of-death-by-age-and-gender</a>	6/6/2018 19:51
1374	/policies/vision-zero/	One simple solution that addresses all of the Vision Zero areas of interest is the elimination (or near elimination) of stop signs and stop lights in neighborhoods. Everything from public safety to criminal justice equity to environmental concerns would be addressed by doing this. See the following article for supporting notes:  <a href="https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/adaptive-behavior/201605/death-stop-sign">https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/adaptive-behavior/201605/death-stop-sign</a>  Replacing stop signs with yield signs and stop lights with roundabouts will reduce driver error, reduce carbon emissions wasted on unnecessary braking and shorten travel times, and reduce traffic citations which unfairly penalize the poor. Pedestrians and cyclists would be better protected because there is a no incentive to race lights or to take your eyes off the road looking for instructions from stop signs with additional information, rather than a simple warning sign that lets you know an intersection is ahead and to plan accordingly. Countries that follow this road design plan have half the fatality rate of the United States. If you're serious about planning for the future you should initiate this plan immediately across the city rather than roll it out slowly over the coming many years. It will save lives and comports with the 2040 plan.  Thanks, fgj	6/8/2018 2:57
1375	/policies/vision-zero/	Eliminate all references to enforcement until the MPD has eliminated all racial disparities in their data.	6/14/2018 22:00
1376	/policies/vision-zero/	I would like to see more responsive traffic signals and enforcement of stopping for pedestrians at crosswalks. The walk signal across Lyndale Ave S at 48th St W is so brief I can barely get across before it changes (and I'm a fast walker!) - even after pressing the walk button, it takes a couple of minutes for the light to change.	6/18/2018 14:50
1377	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Taller buildings!	3/24/2018 1:22
1378	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	don't restrict design standards and regulations to limit good architect	3/25/2018 3:19
1379	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	OH MY GOD YES YEEEEEEEESSSSSS!!!! This is making me very giddy.	3/25/2018 23:06
1380	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	1. Avoid large, feature-less, window-less concrete, cinder block, metal and other street level wall sections. 2. Seek and encourage color, including vibrant and atypical colors, on facades and design elements whenever possible.	3/26/2018 14:27
1381	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	From the perspective of enabling effective renewable energy development in the city, the goal of splitting up buildings within a block is a problem. Maintaining large contiguous roof areas is important for the cost-effective development of solar energy.	3/27/2018 15:48
1382	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Include and require green space setback and storm water management in the form of rain gardens. Trees and native plants are better than just grass. Encourage the inclusion of coffee shops or retail at the front of the bottom floor or a common space with large windows to make the building feel like a part of the community and increase safety.	4/21/2018 18:25

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1383	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Point g (apply design standards...consistently across city) is very important, as we want all areas of the city to be build in a way that demonstrates pride in the community. Too many homes and buildings in areas of town with less income are built with shoddy design and materials.	5/1/2018 2:56
1384	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Related to point c. (durable materials), in addition to durability, the city should promote materials that are sustainably manufactured and/or harvested. Both ensure our city is built in a way that reduces our impact on our earth's resources.	5/1/2018 2:59
1385	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	So far the city has done an awful job with their building requirements. Everything is the same boring box clad in multiple sidings, which makes them all look the same and all look awful. Get your fingers out of the design process! Also, almost all of these horrible structures have windows that don't open at all, or only a very small portion opens. Way to add to climate change by requiring everyone to use air conditioning when it's warm.	5/4/2018 10:10
1386	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	<p>Please include an affordable senior housing retirement community in your development choices:</p> <p>Welcome to the Cora McCorvey Community Center for older adults, located at 1015 4th Ave N, Mpls. 55405. I am Leon Wallace, a retired real estate broker with over 30 years of real estate experience serving North Mpls. I am retire &amp; 76 years of age. I am currently a member of Redeemer Lutheran Church on 1800 Glenwood Ave N, Mpls.</p> <p>It is my intention to organize a community based non profit organization to represent seniors in contacting our Minneapolis City Leaders to designate a Senior Retirement Community @ the South end of the Heritage Park Community between Olson Hwy, Van White Blvd &amp; Glenwood Ave N.</p> <p>I would propose that we seniors (62+ &amp; our representatives organize a non profit development Corp. to develop affordable senior Hsg in the proposed Heritage Park Senior Community. It is my belief that a cooperative ownership of senior housing would provide for the most affordable housing for seniors in North Mpls. This is not about profit or capitalization, this would be a ministry of providing desirable housing choices for seniors in North Mpls.</p> <p>I have presented the concept to Council Person Ellison &amp; to our Mayor Frey. They have expressed their interest, but not offered any assistance. I would suggest that we seniors need to advocate for our own housing needs. The only two residential senior housing in the proposed Heritage Park Community is the Commons &amp; the Feeney Manor (independent living &amp; assisted living owned by Mpls. Public Hsg.) Both units have over 5 years waiting lists for seniors who need immediate housing. This is totally unacceptable, since our seniors are forced to seek housing in other surrounding cities away from their community.</p> <p>Providing affordable housing choices for our seniors must become a priority. I welcome your response &amp; communications. God Bless you, Leon Wallace(leon01@q.com) 612-521-5581/2323 26th Ave N,#318, Mpls,MN 55411</p>	5/5/2018 17:08
1387	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Much of the new development in Minneapolis is quite ugly and often looks the same. These "Action Steps" are already in place and don't seem to have much effect. Design standards need to be put in place.	5/9/2018 15:18
1388	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Rear and side wall consistency is counter to the more impactful goal of housing affordability. Please remove.	5/13/2018 13:43
1389	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Although some items already exist as standards, I'd like to see more emphasis on the types of building materials used, especially in areas where people of color live and that the materials are ecologically and environmentally safe	5/14/2018 13:00
1390	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	It seems like too many high-rise apartments are going up. I think they should be limited to the downtown area.	5/15/2018 19:37
1391	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Please, please, please limit the height of development around the Lakes. The Mosaic building in uptown is an eyesore. It looks like a cruise ship looming over Lake of the Isles. Why do you allow such tall buildings and why do you allow them to be lit so brightly at night?	5/16/2018 17:14

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1392	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	We support these actions steps and would love to see them implemented on the Northside where many unappealing buildings have gone up in the last few years. Please avoid building new properties too high, as these block out natural light in the community. Along with maintaining the design integrity in a neighborhood, please maintain the quality control for new builds as far as materials so as to make new properties look like other period homes in neighborhoods. We want quality homes built that will stand the test of time.	5/16/2018 20:25
1393	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	How about following the height restrictions that have already been established by the citizenry?	5/18/2018 21:36
1394	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	No more rubber stamp variances by the city planning commission! They are ruining the character of Minneapolis.	5/21/2018 1:52
1395	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	These steps are fine, but if the choice is whether to build new housing that doesn't conform to these aesthetic preferences, these suggestions should yield.	5/22/2018 13:18
1396	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Very important when building in primarily single family house neighborhoods. Visual and actual heights and volumes (footprints) should not overwhelm adjacent SF houses. Front and side setbacks should be similar to adjacent SF houses.	5/22/2018 21:39
1397	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Not bad, but in addition to these "letter of the law" requirements, I suggest you have a design review committee staffed by planners, artists, and architects. Our external facades are too often mediocre, developers are cheap, the Twin Cities sometimes look as if they have a lock on ugly buildings (alas, some other cities are worse ... Denver!) A lively visual environment is essential, and Minneapolis should actively encourage such. Your above suggestions are a minimum, however, they are a good start.	5/26/2018 2:54
1398	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Please require aesthetic standards on new buildings that coordinate with neighboring buildings. Require adequate building size to space ratios. The multi material boxes of buildings going up all over are ugly. Will quickly be dated and do not coordinate with existing neighborhood buildings.	6/9/2018 10:57
1399	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Development around metro stops seems to rely on the introduction of high rise buildings that can block the views and the value of surrounding properties. i believe more consideration and limitation should be practiced to identify areas for high rise development	6/12/2018 14:13
1400	/policies/visual-quality-of-new-development/	Offer grants or tax rebates for new buildings that incorporate public art. Large scale sculpture, gallery spaces, murals etc. should be incorporated to these new spaces. Minneapolis is known nationwide as a city of the arts. We mustn't let greedy developers take that away from our architectural landscape. Let's ensure mpls is still a national Arts City in 2040	6/15/2018 18:35
1401	/policies/walking/	love it	3/22/2018 22:20
1402	/policies/walking/	ENFORCE TRAFFIC LAWS THAT ALREADY EXIST.	3/22/2018 23:34
1403	/policies/walking/	What about snow and ice clearance on sidewalks? The City does a terrible job of ensuring that sidewalks are clear.	3/24/2018 0:41
1404	/policies/walking/	Automated speed and red light enforcement would help hold drivers accountable for unsafe behavior and improve the pedestrian experience in the city.	3/26/2018 13:10
1405	/policies/walking/	Support greater enforcement of snow clearing laws for sidewalks, as this is a major mobility issue for walkers. Consider feasibility of city providing sidewalk snow clearing services across city.	3/27/2018 16:34
1406	/policies/walking/	great!	3/29/2018 15:35
1407	/policies/walking/	What about actively widening sidewalks that don't meet current standards? Public Works only does this when a street is fully reconstructed, which takes place every 50-60 years.	3/29/2018 15:37
1408	/policies/walking/	Hennepin County maintains non-compliant sidewalks along their dangerous streets like at Franklin & Portland Ave. Force them to do something about this!	3/29/2018 15:42
1409	/policies/walking/	Will the City allocate more funding to improve the pedestrian network because very little of the resources go to it now. The priority remains moving and storing cars based on the City budget.	4/2/2018 0:50
1410	/policies/walking/	Sidewalks this winter have been consistently covered in ice and snow making them impassible for months of the year. The City needs to enforce their sidewalk snow & ice clearance ordinance and/or take a more active role in clearing sidewalks.	4/3/2018 17:06
1411	/policies/walking/	i take the skyway to work everyday, why don't we have a better mapping system for the skyway, businesses in the skyway, hours of those businesses. if i could know i could get there and the business was open, i'd probably come downtown more on weekends in the winter.	4/5/2018 14:26
1412	/policies/walking/	In the entire transportation section I do not see the need to prioritize accessibility for people who are disabled explicitly stated anywhere. I would think about winter, especially - what can we do to make our sidewalks and streets accessible?	4/6/2018 23:32

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1413	/policies/walking/	I strongly oppose "traffic calming" which only causes congestion and pollution. It slows our bus transit systems making the commutes to work longer. While safe sidewalks is a good goal, "traffic calming" is not the right solution.	4/7/2018 13:51
1414	/policies/walking/	It is April 11 and there are still sidewalks covered in snow and ice. Perhaps, Minneapolis should put as much energy into clearing sidewalks as they do roads?	4/11/2018 16:59
1415	/policies/walking/	I left a similar comment under Policy 17, but this deserves a huge THANK YOU! as well. It is so refreshing to see that Minneapolis is prioritizing walking, biking, and public transit over cars. These decisions exponentially increase livability of our great city!	4/13/2018 18:24
1416	/policies/walking/	My wife and I walk everywhere here, and have lived in a number of truly wonderful walkable cities, and while the action steps above are useful (although very abstract) Minneapolis is very very far from being a pedestrian oriented city. Unlike pedestrian oriented cities like Boston, New York, San Francisco, being a pedestrian here is seen as a third-class citizen and thus pedestrian-friendly policies and designs are not integrated into the overall scheme of the city. For example, sidewalks are allowed to be built of inappropriate materials for rain or snow, building overhangs are not considered, traffic lights are timed for cars, lighting is overlooked, commercial design focuses on parking garages, and street safety is ignored, etc. The first step in trying to improve the situation is to frankly admit how dreadfully poor the current situation is and then begin to tackle the (interrelated) problems head-on instead of all the hand waving.	4/13/2018 18:33
1417	/policies/walking/	I think it would be in the spirit of the complete streets policy if the city could study the feasibility of some form of municipal snow removal for SIDEWALKS. This winter has been a rough one for snow, and relying on homeowners to clear their sidewalks results in spotty sidewalks. It is rare to find a full block in CARAG that would be accessible to someone who isn't able-bodied. I understand that it is a large ask, but perhaps the city could start by clearing along bus lines during snow emergencies. Encouraging people to take transit and walk and stay off roads makes the city better for everyone. I'm fortunate in that I can just strap on a pair of Sorels and climb over and through snowbanks, but we are trapping the elderly and disabled in their homes, and encouraging people to drive when we prioritize roads over pedestrians.	4/16/2018 18:54
1418	/policies/walking/	Do something about unshoveled sidewalks!!!	4/17/2018 23:03
1419	/policies/walking/	1) Would like to see equity called out more specifically to ensure that policies/activities occur in north Minneapolis with the greatest health disparities and walking amenities compared to other parts of the City. 2) Need more walking amenities and "destinations" in north Minneapolis. 3) Support more buffers and curb extensions in Minneapolis. 4) Would like policy/activity that addresses the pedestrian challenge caused by tree roots that upend sidewalks making travel difficult for pedestrians and people with disabilities. 5) Would like specific policies/activities related to increasing non-motorized greenways in Minneapolis such as a north Minneapolis greenway and others in NE and north-south greenway(s) in south Minneapolis.	4/18/2018 22:59
1420	/policies/walking/	Winter sidewalk maintenance needs to be a city priority. We don't expect individual property owners to plow the streets. If we want Minneapolis to be a walkable city we need to make sure that sidewalks are usable during the winter too.	4/25/2018 16:29
1421	/policies/walking/	We need municipal snow removal for pedestrian routes! Snow removed at the same time as streets are plowed with attention to all crossings! Let's work on this - involve all parties like residents who want to be part of the solution, property management companies, city public works, businesses and local organizations, etc.  As ride services continue to grow and people choose multiple modes over individual ownership, there should be a greater focus on safe and legal drop-off and pick-up zones. Such zones should be considered and possibly required for new developments over a certain size.	5/2/2018 19:03
1422	/policies/walking/	Make walking comfortable and desirable. It generally sin't now because Minneapolis streets are awful places with fast-moving cars, boring street frontages, and left up to property owners to maintain. Cars remain the top priority.	5/3/2018 15:47
1423	/policies/walking/	The city should consider clearing public sidewalks, just like it clears streets for cars. Too many residents do not clear snow from public sidewalks and the city is not doing enough to punish them. Higher, faster fines if you aren't going to do it.	5/4/2018 10:14
1424	/policies/walking/	You need to do something about the overall poor clearing of public sidewalks. Too many residents and businesses do not do a timely or complete clearing (some nothing at all). Either the city needs to take care of it like they do streets, or much swifter and stiffer penalties/enforcement need to be enacted. I continue to be disgusted by the city's ability to troll around dolling out citations for unmowed grass, peeling paint, broken windows, junk cars and other cosmetic issues; but to get a sidewalk cleared, some citizen needs to report it. None of the first infractions are in any way a safety or mobility issue, but snow is. That is ridiculous and I think it's because it's easy to generate money via the previous infractions, but the city actually spends money clearing snow.	5/4/2018 11:43

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		POLICY 18: Walking	
		NRRC's proposed action steps:	
1425	/policies/walking/	1. Enforce development standards that encourage walking such as curbside store fronts. Minimize or eliminate development policies and proposals that encourage driving and parking, and parking lots.	5/8/2018 19:46
1426	/policies/walking/	It's fine to enhance safety for pedestrians, but don't do it in ways that make it more dangerous for cars, like narrowing traffic lanes and creating more traffic jams by eliminating traffic lanes.	5/12/2018 3:23
1427	/policies/walking/	Your policies can sometimes be mutually exclusive. On the one hand you are proposing to increase density of housing along 50th St and the Avenues along it. That increases the need for MORE street width and MORE lanes for traffic. However, in this policy you call for narrowing of streets to slow traffic. How in the world do you propose for us to get out of our houses? Traffic on 50th already seems at capacity, especially during morning and afternoon rush hours. What in the world will you do if multiple family homes start popping up, increasing density even more? Sidewalks along 50th are horrible and are one step from traffic in the street. The city has not shown it is capable of keeping what we currently have up to the standards it should be. I can only imagine how bad it will become with more and more people living along the route.	5/12/2018 16:16
1428	/policies/walking/	I would like the city to have a non-partisan traffic engineer to oversee, plan and then communicate why to the public. This ensures transparency and choice made that are sustainable and hopefully address everyone. Additionally, I favor walking then trains as priorities first (trains and walking are partners) then bikes then cars.	5/15/2018 12:01
1429	/policies/walking/	Let's make Plymouth Avenue a walk-able commercial corridor where local residents can purchase goods such as groceries, do dry cleaning, buy plants, get coffee or beer and socialize with neighbors. We would like to see decorative storm water capture systems consisting of well designed permeable pavers and rain gardens. Please focus on thoughtful little initiatives like walk-able community-centric historic markers and shaded rest stops with greenery. We really need garbage cans and recycling bins on every corner possible. Drinking fountains where feasible would be nice. Please plant trees along the sidewalk for sidewalk shade. Allow for vendors with vendor carts. Please raise funding for community watch walking patrols.	5/16/2018 20:06
1430	/policies/walking/	The bumpout that was recently installed on 38th St and 19th Ave S. is fantastic -- I walk across this intersection all the time with my dog and it feels much safer now.	5/21/2018 2:34
1431	/policies/walking/	No one has ever been run over by a car - in a skyway.	5/22/2018 15:20
1432	/policies/walking/	As part of Complete Streets, the city needs to look at clearing sidewalks in winter or enforcing existing ordinances more aggressively. I'm an able bodied person and just one home or business that hasn't adequately (or even attempted) to remove snow makes for a dangerous situation. I can't image that elderly persons, people with strollers, or people who have more limited mobility or use a device to assist their mobility would be inclined to use sidewalks in winter without more consistent clearing, especially in the winter months.	5/24/2018 2:28
1433	/policies/walking/	These policies are a good start, but here's another policy that needs to be seriously considered: "Shorten traffic signal cycles to create a better walking environment citywide." Minneapolis has very long wait times for pedestrians at crosswalks. NACTO recommends signal lengths of 60-90 seconds as preferred to enhance the vibrancy of urban environments. Signal cycles at typical Minneapolis intersections are easily double that recommended time, which makes walking frustrating and makes it take longer than it should.	5/26/2018 0:26
1434	/policies/walking/	Less sidewalks. More streets.	5/26/2018 3:32
1435	/policies/walking/	Ensuring safety for pedestrians has to include protection from bikers not giving the right-of-way at street crossings and bikers using the sidewalks instead of the streets.	5/27/2018 18:37
1436	/policies/walking/	In regard to policy 18 a, serious consideration should be given to eliminating right turns at red lights throughout the city. Drivers paying attention to only cross traffic, very frequently turn directly in front of pedestrians trying to cross the street.	5/27/2018 18:41
1437	/policies/walking/	provide maps for various city trails	5/30/2018 18:30
1438	/policies/walking/	I think we need to prioritize making walking beautiful. Landscape architects can help with that. this policy feels like that will be pushed off to make private enterprise do that and we as a city should be leading that charge. also we need to support and encourage small business so we have places to walk to	6/3/2018 18:03



Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1439	/policies/walking/	<p>Yes yes yes! Plenty of people I know say Minneapolis is very "walkable" but what they mean is "nice for a pleasant afternoon stroll." But "pretty to take a stroll along" is not the same thing as being able to get to practical destinations on foot. In many neighborhoods, you can walk for a mile and only get to more single-family-housing.</p> <p>We need for our zoning to allow for practical destinations within walking distance to where people live. And it needs to be safe for people to get there, meaning cars definitely need to be slowed down, using traffic calming measures like narrow lanes, single lane roundabouts, street trees, chicanes, and curb extensions.</p> <p>We need more multi family housing options in all neighborhoods, to have more people around to support a variety of small local businesses, and to provide a tax base to be able to collectively afford things like having the city plow sidewalks in the winter.</p> <p>Community gathering spaces, like small squares lined with mixed-use live/work development, to create a magnet to draw locals to the spot, would be an amazing addition, to encourage community networking.</p> <p>Making it easier for businesses to have sidewalk seating would be great for street life, too.</p> <p>Parklets are a great way to take back street space for people, without going through the expense of redoing a street and curb line as well, so making it easier for parklets to appear more places would be excellent as well. Also bike parking corals taking up one or two street parking spaces, in places where the sidewalk is too narrow for good bicycle parking.</p>	6/6/2018 2:56
1440	/policies/walking/	<p>permeable asphalt, short prairie grass, or other walkable surface that is easier on joints, catches rainfall, etc.</p> <p>encourage artists/community orgs/ to set up and influence the space on sidewalks.</p> <p>create no-car zones in the city to make breathing easier, less concern for safety.</p> <p>imagine one lane of traffic for busses and the few cars that are still used, and wide sidewalks like on milwaukee ave...</p>	6/6/2018 19:35

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

		<p>I currently live in a high rise near the Lake Street/Excelsior Blvd split just north of Lake Calhoun. I am not opposed to increased density. I am in favor of walking, biking, and mass transit. However, the drawing that shows multiple high rise buildings intended to house thousands of more residents around the Lake/Excelsior Blvd scares me. There does not seem to be any additional infrastructure (besides the potential for SWLRT) to accommodate this level of density. The SWLRT (if it is ever completed) will only relieve certain commuters and residents who are going to either downtown Mpls. or towards the SW suburbs.</p> <p>Without additional plans to manage commuter and new resident vehicles, I am opposed to the build-up envisioned in the plan for this area for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. CURRENT traffic congestion along these corridors between Hennepin and France Avenue is problematic because of the limited number of East-West transportation options caused by the Chain of Lakes. Right now, between 50th Street South and 394 there are only a few East-West options available for cars: 50th St. S. is narrow and can't handle more than 1 lane of traffic in either direction in most areas. Lake St./Excelsior Blvd is already jam-packed with cars with long back-ups during Rush Hours. Then 394 is also very backed up during many hours of the day. Frustrated commuters will end up clogging residential streets in their attempts to avoid long delays in the arterial streets.</p> <p>2. The need for cars as a transportation option will not disappear even with SWLRT. Most residents need cars because their workplace and homes do not conveniently line up with mass transit. Cars are needed by most people to shop for bulky, heavy groceries. Families need cars to get kids to daycare, schools (if bus service is not available), after hours sports and activities, etc... Minneapolis MUST continue to plan for increased vehicle traffic associated with thousands of new city residents. Wishful thinking that everybody will work and live and shop and go to school within walking/biking distance all 12 months of the year would be foolish and a disservice to the reality most residents experience.</p> <p>3. Thousands of new residents and cars along already overcrowded streets will frustrate commuters and residents alike. Frustrated and delayed drivers run red lights, make dangerous turns, and do not yield to pedestrians or bikes. The future safety issues caused by overloading already congested roadways with thousands of new cars, pedestrians, and bikers around the Lakes is frightful and dangerous.</p> <p>Maria Henly 3151 Dean Court #304 Minneapolis, MN 55416 mariahenly@gmail.com</p>	
1441	/policies/walking/		6/7/2018 20:45
1442	/policies/walking/	Conflicts with your policy on skyways, right?	6/16/2018 19:37

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1443	/policies/walking/	<p>My main issue with this policy, and the Comp. plan in general, is it is looking 20 years in the future but many of the policies focus on things the city is implementing right now, particularly when it comes to pedestrian improvements.</p> <p>This policy goes into crosswalks, lighting, and visibility, buffers from the street, amenity zones, bump outs, narrowing street widths etc. but doesn't go beyond that for improvements. The city is already making these improvements now and maintaining them will be important but this document should reflect the future and improvements that go past the reactive pedestrian safety things we've been doing for 20+ years already.</p> <p>Policy 18 is still centered around a car-centered city which supposedly from the Complete Streets policy (adopted in 2016) pedestrians should be the first mode of transit addressed when adopting a new plan. Policy 18 focuses on reactive measures to protect pedestrians from cars which would be unnecessary if roads were built as they are supposed to be in the Complete Streets policy with pedestrians first.</p> <p>Things to add to Policy 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Mention of WINTER and winter sidewalk maintenance - Not sure why I haven't seen winter, ice, and snow mentioned at all in the comp. plan when we live in Minnesota.</li> <li>-Leading pedestrian intervals</li> <li>-Longer pedestrian cycles</li> <li>-Eliminating beg buttons</li> <li>-Eliminating lanes rather than just narrowing street widths</li> <li>-Repairing sidewalks based on the condition of the sidewalk rather than the condition of the road it is adjacent to</li> <li>-Reduce car speed to reduce pedestrian death</li> </ul>	6/19/2018 17:45
1444	/policies/walking/	<p>These things are already being done by the City, but at a slow pace and in an unorganized manner.</p> <p>A. What about focusing on what makes streets dangerous- cars? Start reducing the number of lanes and space dedicated to them.</p> <p>B. This step sounds like jargon and lacks meaning and detail.</p> <p>C. How about comfortable places to walk where people do interact with the street rather than being protected from it?</p> <p>D. Why not eliminate curb cuts- especially in high-pedestrian corridors like downtown, Uptown, etc.? Make cars park on the street or use an alley.</p> <p>E. There have got to be other traffic calming methods that can be implemented like speed bumps, bump-outs, and speed tables.</p> <p>F. Cover the freeways with lids and de-commission awful highways like Hiawatha Ave. No one wants to walk across them.</p> <p>G. The City doesn't count pedestrians unless they are going to reconstruct a street. There is little useful data to make this step logical or useful. Why not make sidewalks wide enough to feel comfortable?</p> <p>H. This means that streetscape improvements are only possible on roads where there is a high concentration of commercial property and a Special Services District can be established. The City should also put this stuff in in other places with lots of pedestrians, high transit use, etc.</p> <p>I. Where are "appropriate" places to add sidewalks? The City only budgets \$150,000 per year in the CIP to fill gaps, which means it will take one million years to fill all the sidewalk gaps.</p> <p>It snows in Minneapolis and sidewalks are nearly impassible for months at a time and construction closes sidewalks at the time.</p> <p>Why not make the CBD "pedestrian, bike, and transit only?"</p>	6/20/2018 22:31
1445	/policies/walking/	As to 18b. There should be more pedestrian and cyclist only malls and promenades in the city. This entails closing some streets and possibly creating some permanent street bazaars.	6/21/2018 4:01
1446	/policies/walking/	We need more street trees for shade!	6/22/2018 15:08
1447	/policies/walking/	In order for people to walk more, the city needs to zone most of the city for mixed use so that people can walk to their jobs, food, retail, and other commercial uses of land. Without this the city will never get more people to walk or use transit.	6/22/2018 15:10
1448	/policies/waste-reduction/	This section should also address the City's approach to the HERC and how this City will pursue developing alternatives and fostering the retirement of HERC. Also a little vague on how the city will encourage several items on this list.	3/28/2018 4:31

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1449	/policies/waste-reduction/	we have a trash problem, i pick up trash in my 3 block area just south of 94 and it takes about 4 hours a week if i did the whole area- about 10 plastic bags of trash (reusing) for my Neighborhood Community Organization. how can we incentivize our neighbors to do the same, or encourage the community that leaves the trash to find value it in. I'm proposing a system of 'recycling' where one bag of litter is like \$2 off city parking or something, can be done through 311 app potentially. States that have high recycle rates have less litter and most of what i pick up is 1) cigarettes (all parts) WHY ARENT THESE BIODEGRADABLE YET 2) fast food plastic and wrappers WHY ARENT THESE BIODEGRADABLE YET 3) recycleable bottles/cans. having a clean environment brings pride to a diverse neighborhood and decreases crime is what we've found in Steven's Square.	4/3/2018 17:23
1450	/policies/waste-reduction/	Please ban plastic bags in grocery stores, at least in the large chains like Target and Walmart.	5/19/2018 20:19
1451	/policies/waste-reduction/	I like this a lot. I particularly like the L to encourage innovation and use of recycled materials. Make MPLS a recycling mecca, supporting inventive ideas to take care of our own trash. Require all businesses to recycle and provide organic recycling too.	5/31/2018 1:26
1452	/policies/waste-reduction/	Ban onetime use plastic and styrofoam products like spoons, straws or plastic bags.	6/6/2018 3:55
1453	/policies/waste-reduction/	Begin Minneapolis Fix-It Clinic like Hennepin county does that also trains young people and possibly adults to fix, repair, or in the worse case scenario dispose of well this time and buy smart for the long haul next time.	6/6/2018 20:38
1454	/policies/waste-reduction/	education on the "refuse" part of refuse, reduce, reuse, recycle is not taking, needing, using as much as we currently do.	6/13/2018 14:34
1455	/small-area-plans/	We should turn our task into energy in a clean way, then nothing is wasted	3/22/2018 21:32
1456	/small-area-plans/	It would be very useful to have a map-based index of these Small Area Plans instead of just the text list on the right. It would show where they fit into the city, where they overlap in scope, where Small Area Plans may be needed in the future, etc.	3/23/2018 16:36
1457	/small-area-plans/	It would be nice to see a map of the neighborhoods.	3/28/2018 4:20
1458	/small-area-plans/	How will the city market and sell the vision for different key areas throughout our city?	3/28/2018 4:22
1459	/small-area-plans/	For larger parcels (eg. Hi Lake Target), how will the city set the vision for how this large site will be developed?	3/28/2018 4:23
1460	/small-area-plans/	How will the city force or pressure development on parcel that are horrible uses of land (eg. Hi Lake Target).	4/4/2018 4:09
		We need to find a way to get rid of the massive parking lots around Hiawatha and Lake Street. Particularly the Target and old Rainbow Foods sites.	

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1461	/small-area-plans/	<p><a href="http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/planning/cped_industrial-landuse">http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/planning/cped_industrial-landuse</a></p> <p>The Industrial Land Use plan for the SEMI (currently BNSF railyard between UMN and Como) had previously centered about a main goal of converting the core of SEMI into park, surrounded by industrial/tech companies incubated and spun-off from the UMN.</p> <p>The plan also involved the rehabilitation of the SEMI superfund site to remove the creosote as well as legacy industrial waste, rehabilitation of the derelect underground stream which empties into the mississippi ('Bridal Veil'), and rehabilitation of the surface area and the creation of surface water also.</p> <p>Furthermore, the creation of this park-surrounded-by-tech/manufacturing-spin-offs would (if I recall correctly) place a large park into an under-parked region of the city (I don't think there's much east of Van Cleve Park) in order to meet long-term Minneapolis/MetCouncil park accessibility goals, as well as fill in the "Missing Link" to the Grand Rounds circuit.</p> <p>This plan (that was on the Minneapolis website) was the reason that Surly chose their destination brewery location (only place in the city with land + (future) water at the right price), and was much of the impetus for the Dinkytown Greenway to connect this future park with West River Parkway.</p> <p>The 2040 Small Area Plan for the area should not simply designate the entire SEMI as an industrial zone with million square foot industrial buildings and service roads, rather it should be designated as a job creation zone in a desirable location [(centrally located, near a large park (with views!), adjacent to the UMN (innovation hub) and transit (existing rail ROWs)] with the potential to create lots of desirable jobs (again, UMN spin-offs). This location is uniquely situated to achieve this in Minneapolis, and the plan should support this vision (high tech hub, job creation zone, park, good future transit potential, on the Grand Rounds for bike commuters, etc).</p> <p>I don't see BNSF abandoning the property any time soon, but the small area plan for the SEMI should reflect the sites unique potential.</p>	4/4/2018 10:22
1462	/small-area-plans/	<p>We live in the Midtown Greenway Land Use and Development Plan Small Area Plan on Lake Street and Excelsior Boulevard. There was recently approved a new development on this intersection by Brickstone Development. It was controversial, but with the assistance of Lisa Goodwin, a compromise on the height of the new apartment building was worked out that everyone can live with. It is 8 stories of housing. Your new Comp Plan would allow for buildings up to 30 stories high in this area. That height is in violation of the current Shoreland Overlay Policy. It is also contrary to all of the efforts done over the years, especially most recently by Lisa Goodwin, CIDNA, and others, to work collaboratively with the Developers of new housing projects to build new housing projects that work for all of those stakeholders in the area where new developments are being built.</p> <p>This is a very sensitive area with its location immediately next to Bde Maka Ska (Lake Calhoun). Yes, it is close to the new Lake Street LRT Station that will be built (hopefully). That said, there are already many developments being built and proposed in this immediate area that will add a significant number of new housing units. This area already has significant transportation issues, especially during rush hour. These transportation issues will not go away and will soon get worse with as all of the new developments being planned. There have been studies on how to remedy this problem and there are simply not solutions because of the geography of the area – there is no land to add another east-west street. Funding for major improvements needed, or even funding for small improvements is not available because Hennepin County must buy in to this problem (and help fund it), and from what I was told this fall, they won't even talk to the City about this issue.</p> <p>In conclusion, this small area you are proposing to change to Transit 30 simply cannot accommodate a Transit 30 designation. I strongly oppose your proposed designation of Transit 30 for this area. Mark Beltz.</p>	4/4/2018 14:03

## Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1463	/small-area-plans/	Why is Heritage Park, south of Olson Hwy to Glenwood Ave N, not included in your small area plans? We seniors need an affordable senior housing retirement community to added to your small area plans. There are 4+ blocks of vacant land & this area must be set aside to provide affordable senior housing choices, for the transition that most seniors experienced during our latter years of life. I welcome your response. Thanks, Leon Wallace (leon01@q.com) 612-521-5581/2323 26th Ave N,#318/Mpls, MN 55411	5/5/2018 17:26
1464	/small-area-plans/	Where is the Shoreland Overlay District included? Seems like who ever wrote this plan has decided to eliminate what is a major environmental protection and State Law from this Comp Plan.	5/11/2018 4:12
1465	/small-area-plans/	I would like to see NACDI development plan for franklin ave featured and used for comp plan. thanks	5/14/2018 18:06
1466	/small-area-plans/	People will still own cars, to expect them not to and allow for no off-street parking is just insane....the whole plan is just insane	5/15/2018 10:33
1467	/small-area-plans/	Your ideas are not very clear and lack real life examples. I do not want you to rezone my single home lot into a lot that will have a 40 unit 3 story apartment next to.	5/20/2018 23:04
1468	/small-area-plans/	You should have a tool where someone can put their address in, and a map would show of their area. I have found it hard to find my neighborhood map.	5/23/2018 2:59
1469	/small-area-plans/	Small area plans don't seem to be effective tools for a number of reasons: the plans are formed without some of the expertise of city staff, they are not updated as frequently as the comp plan, and are not created based on the shared goals of this comp plan. While I believe visions for neighborhoods and small areas are important, they need to revisited just as often as the comp plan and perhaps in conjunction with or after the city wide plan is adopted in order to work within the framework of the city plan to develop the neighborhood vision for the next decade. Small area plans should have an expiration date, requiring regular updates to adapt to changing city policies and demographics,	5/24/2018 2:14
1470	/small-area-plans/	Small area plans, like neighborhood groups, tend to be directed by a small group of wealthy homeowners who are not representative of the small area they serve. It would be better for land use decisions to be made at the City level and do away with small area plans as guiding documents for land use decisions.	5/24/2018 16:59

Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1471	/small-area-plans/	<p>The writing of this Plan is disingenuous and written in such a way to not communicate what is true in simple terms, but to hide the true agenda of CPED by twisting language into statements that do not accurately reflect what is actually going to be realized by the committees that follow and the new zoning which will be based on it.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>"How Minneapolis 2040 updates Small Area Plans in general:</p> <p>Future land use and built form guidance: Minneapolis 2040 updates this guidance for the entire city in service to the Minneapolis 2040 goals."</p> <p>What this means: The Small Area Plans are being removed and will not be attached to the 2040 Comp Plan.</p> <p>"This new guidance is informed by the guidance of the small area plans, and updated where necessary to be consistent with the application of Minneapolis 2040 goals and policies citywide."</p> <p>The word "Informed" is of no distinct character in terms of what the result will actually be positive or negative or substantive relationship to the content of the Small Area Plan guidance. It says nothing concrete. "Inform" does not mean follow, is based on or is supported by.</p> <p>" Minneapolis 2040 will be used to guide future land use and built form guidance in areas covered by past small area plans."</p> <p>What this actually means: The Minneapolis 2040 Plan will totally replace and govern where in the past the Small Area Plans guided development in the areas they were designed to cover.</p> <p>"Urban design policies: Minneapolis 2040 includes urban design policies intended to shape the design of new buildings. This guidance is informed by the design guidance of small area plans, and applies to all new development in the city."</p> <p>This again has the meaningless word "informed" which means nothing substantive or factual.</p>	5/24/2018 20:48
------	--------------------	--	-----------------

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1472	/small-area-plans/	<p>The language used to communicate what the policy does with to the guidance of the Linden Hills Small Area Plan is disingenuous and makes blatantly incorrect statements to create a false impression that the LHSAP is being included and it guidance followed - Neither which is true.</p> <p>"The Linden Hills Neighborhood Council and the Community Development and Economic Development Department of the City of Minneapolis collaborated on the development of a small area plan for a portion of Linden Hills."</p> <p>This idea that the creation of the final plan was a "collaboration" is FALSE statement. It was not a collaborative process in that the final result was mandated and executed solely by CPED in opposition to the, the LHINC board and the LHSAP steering committee which participated in good faith, but was ultimately ignored. This final and total control was inputted into the contracts by CPED staff that they had the Neighborhood Council's Board chairs sign, without representation of consul, nd had them transfer 60,000 community dollars to CEPD's control. CPED solely controlled the writing and adoption of the LHSAP in spite of the neighborhood, steering committee, and neighborhood council's opposition to the disingenuous "3 or 4" story addition to the plan and the elimination of preferred heights in terms of feet.</p> <p>"A consulting team led by (SEH) Inc. led a broadly inclusive community engagement process to develop the small area plan, which creates a shared longrange vision for portions of Linden Hills."</p> <p>CPED staff Brian Schaffer and Jack Byers led, wrote and manipulated the outcome of the Linden Hills Small Are Plan from its inception to it finalization and City Council vote on the crucial changes on an amendment put forth by Council Member Goodman from a completely different Ward. The behind closed doors agreements, non specific but damaging language and vilification of neighbor participants by these particular CPED representatives clearly violated open and transparent community engagement in favor of CPED control. I just saw a video where these two players ran a community meeting using the say tactics of misinformation, which this 2040 plan is replete with. I expect the same outcome, from the same process, by the same individuals.</p> <p>"The land use recommendations from the Linden Hills Small Area Plan are kept almost entirely intact in Minneapolis 2040."</p> <p>This is a Lie. The C-4 and Interior 3 up zone the guidance of the LHSAP and as well the specific direction that its guidance is for the commercial Nodes and NOT the surrounding area of influence. A total reversal by the major change that this area of influence IS included and changed to be called a URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD. Already this week developers with projects in Linden Hills are citing that Linden Hills and properties within the Shoreland Overlay are in a defined area of Urban Neighborhood and should be allowed variance to superceed the</p>	5/24/2018 21:48
1473	/small-area-plans/	<p>Small area plans represent privilege and wealth and were developed by a very small subset of (privileged and wealthy) Minneapolis residents. The city should be clear in stating this. Small area plans, and the people who shout about them being ruined, are not interested in eliminating disparities or ensuring that arbitrary rules do not prevent enough housing from being built in all neighborhoods.</p>	5/31/2018 14:20
1474	/small-area-plans/	<p>The purpose of a small area plan is to supplement the overall comp plan with a finer level of detail on a particular part of the City. The above statements say that the urban design policies of the City's small area plans have been incorporated into updated comp plan, AND, that the Comp Plan will be used for this guidance. It does not however, confirm the role of small area plans, which is to provide greater detail. This section needs to explicitly say that small area plans will continue to be used by City staff and developers for any development process. John VH</p>	6/5/2018 17:00
1475	/small-area-plans/	<p>I am commenting on the Seward Longfellow Greenway area plan. I am a resident of the 2600 block of 34th ave S. Specifically a homeowner and I am in strong opposition of any buildings going up around my home over 2 to 3 stories. Specifically apartment buildings or condos. Driving businesses out of the neighborhood seems like really bad idea. Also the thought of a towering 6 story building in my back yard is something me or my neighbors do not want to see. Seward is one of the oldest neighborhoods in the city, it has great charm and is a great place to live with a great sense of community. This would change dramatically with this plan. Not to mention affect mine and my neighbors property values immensely. I am sensitive to the need for housing in the city but I don't think 6 story downtown style buildings is the neighborhood. I have yet to talk to one of my neighbors who thinks this is a good idea. Single family homes or duplex's sure. NOT 6 STORY Buildings.....</p>	6/13/2018 20:30



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1476	/small-area-plans/	<p>First of all, I don't even know where half these areas are. How are we supposed to comment on these? Here's what I do know.</p> <p>UPTOWN AREA. This area is very congested and difficult to drive through. I live 3 miles from this area, but never go there because there's NO PLACE TO PARK! Parking ramps are a MUST because driving around trying to find a place to park creates a lot of excess carbon emissions in the air. Businesses are losing money. No parking ramps keep people out of the Uptown area. Look to 50th and France in Edina. They have parking ramps and surface parking to accommodate all the businesses in their area. So guess what? My business goes to Edina NOT Mpls.</p>	6/20/2018 3:16
1477	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I love the fact that there are height minimums in certain corridors, especially high density areas. Too many underdeveloped lots in and around downtown. Great work.	3/22/2018 22:24
1478	/topics/land-use-built-form/	This is not transformational or innovative or even interesting, you have just recorded the current uses and called it a plan.	3/22/2018 22:29
1479	/topics/land-use-built-form/	You cannot even fill in the gaps in corridors like Franklin or Lake with similar uses, you just kept non-conforming uses as exceptions.	3/22/2018 22:29
1480	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The exemption you've granted the Kenwood area is classist garbage, they should be able to accommodate increased density just like the rest of the city.	3/22/2018 22:31
1481	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Transit 20 is too short. You need to allow taller buildings by right in these areas.	3/22/2018 22:35
1482	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Love this! These plans will allow our city to adapt and thrive. I can't wait to see what new housing options will be built in the near future.	3/22/2018 22:37
1483	/topics/land-use-built-form/	300 Washington Ave S should most definitely not be Corridor 6, it should rather fall under either Core 50, Transit 30, or Transit 20.	3/23/2018 3:05
1484	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Look up passivehouseminnesota.org and connect with their team. We should implement the Passive House building standard directly into the building energy efficiency policy! New York and Philly have had lots of success with Passive House.	3/23/2018 4:31
1485	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The built form guidance for Lowry Hill is unacceptably low. It should be encouraged to be at least as dense as the Wedge.	3/23/2018 16:09
1486	/topics/land-use-built-form/	There should be more interior 3. It should extend down to at least 38th St.	3/23/2018 16:56
1487	/topics/land-use-built-form/	This is incredible! I am so impressed.	3/24/2018 1:55
1488	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Looks great. Add more density and mixed use around the 46th Street station to compliment the plans for the Ford Site.	3/25/2018 23:58
1489	/topics/land-use-built-form/	TEAR DOWN KMART	3/27/2018 21:37
1490	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>4810 OSSEO RD</p> <p>I believe this address and the one east are Victory Prairie and dog park. <a href="https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/parks__destinations/dog_parks/victory_prairie_off-leash_dog_park/">https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/parks__destinations/dog_parks/victory_prairie_off-leash_dog_park/</a></p> <p>Coded incorrectly on map.</p>	3/27/2018 22:28
1491	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>We don't need quad housing built in our neighborhood. We are trying to build neighbors who know each other not rentals. I don't believe it is a good idea for ward 13!</p> <p>Gary Dahl, 4825 Zenith Ave South, 612-940-7620</p>	3/29/2018 21:31
1492	/topics/land-use-built-form/	This plan puts lots along Corridor 4 routes at risk of being acquired via eminent domain to allow for the streets to widen and make room for parking. I would discourage the widening of any streets in the name of development.	4/2/2018 17:38
1493	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am 100% in favor of these proposals to increase density throughout the city.	4/3/2018 6:10
1494	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Four-plex zoning is interesting but should be done as a PILOT based on a time period or number of permits per Ward to see effects prior to out-of-control issuance of wrecking/new construction permits. Let's learn from recent history and avoid another screeching-halt moratorium!!	4/3/2018 16:23

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1495	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Regarding the proposal to allow four-plex buildings on any residential lot ... I think it would be wiser to allow duplex buildings, rather than 4s, on any residential lot. They would fit better on the 45 foot lots, particularly in regard to parking, they would be less of an economic detriment to the adjacent single-family houses, and they would be more visually compatible with the singles. I think that this four-plex proposal as it stands is the lazy way to address the need for more housing.</p> <p>Instead, the City ought to set a policy that would allow four-plexes on certain streets, such as bus routes and other selected higher-volume streets, and around designated commercial nodes.</p>	4/3/2018 22:57
1496	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Regarding the proposal to allow four-plex buildings on any residential lot ... I think it would be wiser to allow duplex buildings, rather than 4s, on any residential lot. They would fit better on the 45 foot lots, particularly in regard to parking, they would be less of an economic detriment to the adjacent single-family houses, and they would be more visually compatible with the singles. I think that this four-plex proposal as it stands is the lazy way to address the need for more housing.</p> <p>Instead, the City ought to set a policy that would allow four-plexes on certain streets, such as bus routes and other selected higher-volume streets, and around designated commercial nodes.</p>	4/3/2018 23:00
1497	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I think that the proposal to allow apartment buildings in the midst of single-family blocks on the Interior 2 land use districts would cause harm to the nearby singles. I think the City should write more nuanced criteria for where and how such buildings will be allowed. Look at the harm that was done in the past when those "garden apartment" buildings were dropped into the middle of detached-housing blocks.	4/3/2018 23:04
1498	/topics/land-use-built-form/	HUGE steps forward for the City of Minneapolis. The city must keep up with the rising population and demand, and the only way to do that is to create more housing density, otherwise rental prices will cause many people to leave the city for more affordable ones. Myself and other people in the tech field who prefer renting to buying (for a shorter commute and freedom to move with job changes) will absolutely leave if rental prices become too high, and being a tech worker in Minneapolis will lose one of its main appeals: affordability.	4/3/2018 23:11
1499	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am opposed. Protect the beautiful historic homes of this neighborhood.	4/4/2018 0:28
1500	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The land use and built form should respond to more than just transportation routes. What happens when you overlay critical watershed areas? Or how do you plan around different civic assets? How does it respond to greenways and different proposed park connections?	4/4/2018 4:05
1501	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Looks at Civic Commons by Studio Gang or Liquid Planning by Made Studio. Why does our land use and built form not respond to other influences beyond transportation.	4/4/2018 4:07
1502	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Why doesn't the built form step down or change as it approaches the Mississippi River or Minnehaha Parkway?	4/4/2018 4:12
1503	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Why doesn't the city create overlay districts for critical watershed areas, parks, and civic institutions and then develop a set of guidelines for developments in each of these overlay districts. For example, the watershed overlay could suggest permeable pavers, rain gardens, bios Wales, and blue streets and green roofs.	4/4/2018 4:19
1504	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I greatly support adding density to our city, through mixed use zoning. I am also very supportive of allowing up to 4 dwelling units, like in interior 1 zones! Thank you!	4/6/2018 14:59
1505	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Buildings should be required to be taller than 8 stories in the Core 50 districts. Buildings in the CBD should really all be 20+ stories	4/6/2018 15:24
1506	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The built form map is almost ridiculously simplistic - applying blanket policies with little regard for historical development patterns or physical realities of the built environment, and seems to give little thought to the impact on existing residents or the qualities that make Minneapolis neighborhoods great places to live in the first place. This is planning for the maximization of developer profits at the expense of communities, pure and simple, with little reflection of citizen feedback. This is no way for a supposedly "progressive" city to plan in the 21st century.	4/7/2018 17:37
1507	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The built form map is almost ridiculously simplistic - applying blanket policies with little regard for historical development patterns or physical realities of the built environment, and seems to give little thought to the impact on existing residents or the qualities that make Minneapolis neighborhoods great places to live in the first place. This is planning for the maximization of developer profits at the expense of communities, pure and simple, with little reflection of citizen feedback. This is no way for a supposedly "progressive" city to plan in the 21st century.	4/7/2018 17:37

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1508	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The built form map is almost ridiculously simplistic - applying blanket policies with little regard for historical development patterns or physical realities of the built environment, and seems to give little thought to the impact on existing residents or the qualities that make Minneapolis neighborhoods great places to live in the first place. This is planning for the maximization of developer profits at the expense of communities, pure and simple, with little reflection of citizen feedback. This is no way for a supposedly "progressive" city to plan in the 21st century.	4/7/2018 17:37
1509	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The built form map is almost ridiculously simplistic - applying blanket policies with little regard for historical development patterns or physical realities of the built environment, and seems to give little thought to the impact on existing residents or the qualities that make Minneapolis neighborhoods great places to live in the first place. This is planning for the maximization of developer profits at the expense of communities, pure and simple, with little reflection of citizen feedback. This is no way for a supposedly "progressive" city to plan in the 21st century.	4/7/2018 17:37
1510	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The built form map is almost ridiculously simplistic - applying blanket policies with little regard for historical development patterns or physical realities of the built environment, and seems to give little thought to the impact on existing residents or the qualities that make Minneapolis neighborhoods great places to live in the first place. This is planning for the maximization of developer profits at the expense of communities, pure and simple, with little reflection of citizen feedback. This is no way for a supposedly "progressive" city to plan in the 21st century.	4/7/2018 17:37
1511	/topics/land-use-built-form/	This comment relates to the Built Form Corridor 4 and is specific to Southwest Minneapolis. Upton St from 36th South to 44th. 44th Street from Upton west to France; and Xerxes south from 44th to 62d. While the designations of the corridors of the built-forms (for the sake of simplicity) make sense in the when looked it on a map it a a clean picture, the reality is that the designations of the built forms does not align with reality today, the historic nature of neighborhoods and quality of life in terms of the ability to walk, site lines for pedestrians and drivers, adequate on street parking, etc. The reality of the plan makes no sense compared to what I consider is a fairly balanced current set of zoning rules for the area today.	4/8/2018 18:42
1512	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The built form map is very disturbing. the map essentially extends what we think of as uptown-level density today (4+story apartments) down residential streets like Bryant, 50th, 46th street etc... and treats them like west Lake street. It's inappropriate to be pushing massive tall housing buildings down all these streets and then pushing 3+ story to the adjacent blocks. You are proposing to divide and tear up stable single family neighborhoods with these massive arteries of streets that today are just another neighborhood block. The proposal for these so called transit routes far from downtown should be no more aggressive than 3 story multi-family, the type of buildings found today in the city. look at the massive building on 36th and Bryant northeast corner. It casts a shadow that keeps the block in darkness much of the day. You'd propose that Bryant could be lined with such buildings? Because that's what the plan suggests. And of course, all these plans with no parking accomodations is an invitation for uptown like gridlock to be spread all through the city instead of just the really dense neighborhoods.	4/8/2018 22:42
1513	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The built form map is very disturbing. the map essentially extends what we think of as uptown-level density today (4+story apartments) down residential streets like Bryant, 50th, 46th street etc... and treats them like west Lake street. It's inappropriate to be pushing massive tall housing buildings down all these streets and then pushing 3+ story to the adjacent blocks. You are proposing to divide and tear up stable single family neighborhoods with these massive arteries of streets that today are just another neighborhood block. The proposal for these so called transit routes far from downtown should be no more aggressive than 3 story multi-family, the type of buildings found today in the city. look at the massive building on 36th and Bryant northeast corner. It casts a shadow that keeps the block in darkness much of the day. You'd propose that Bryant could be lined with such buildings? Because that's what the plan suggests. And of course, all these plans with no parking accomodations is an invitation for uptown like gridlock to be spread all through the city instead of just the really dense neighborhoods.	4/8/2018 22:43
1514	/topics/land-use-built-form/	As a resident of South Minneapolis, I am strongly opposed to this proposed land use plan. The corridors along Bryant Ave. S., 46th, and 50th (Corridor 4, Interior 3) are predominantly residential, single family homes without commercial properties. This was the primary reason many families chose to move there. In addition, Bryant, along with Interior streets are quite small as it is, to make a change like this will not only negatively change the neighborhood, it will create unbearable congestion due to additional residents parking vehicles on the streets. There is no way to widen the streets without removing the tree lined boulevards. Removing trees, some of which are 100 years old, would negatively impact the neighborhood as well as the environment. After thorough review of how this could be done well, there simply isn't a good answer. Therefore, I urge the city leaders to reconsider this plan.	4/10/2018 15:22

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1515	/topics/land-use-built-form/	As a resident of South Minneapolis, I am strongly opposed to this proposed land use plan. The corridors along Bryant Ave. S., 46th, and 50th (Corridor 4, Interior 3) are predominantly residential, single family homes without commercial properties. This was the primary reason many families chose to move there. In addition, Bryant, along with Interior streets are quite small as it is, to make a change like this will not only negatively change the neighborhood, it will create unbearable congestion due to additional residents parking vehicles on the streets. There is no way to widen the streets without removing the tree lined boulevards. Removing trees, some of which are 100 years old, would negatively impact the neighborhood as well as the environment. After thorough review of how this could be done well, there simply isn't a good answer. Therefore, I urge the city leaders to reconsider this plan.	4/10/2018 15:22
1516	/topics/land-use-built-form/	By allowing 4 units on city lots, you are getting away from individual ownership. There will be less green (trees, plants) on the blocks. Its sad that you are bowing to developers, instead of preserving individual ownership in the communities.	4/14/2018 20:54
1517	/topics/land-use-built-form/	In general, it is a good plan that is long overdue. My comment is: Looking at 12th ave SE between 4th St SE and 6th St SE under Land Use Categories, the east side of 12th ave se is student apartments which will be zoned as Community Mixed Use. On the west side, the buildings on 1127 4th SE and 411 12th ave SE will also be zoned as Community Mixed Use, while 1125 5th st SE will be zoned as Neighborhood mixed Use. I do not know what is the logic to leave the houses (417 12th ave se, 425 12th ave se and 1126 5th st se) to be categorized as Unban Neighborhood? In the future, if the property owners on these buildings which are categorized as Community Mixed Use develop stores, restaurants etc in these building, the activities will greatly affect people's life living in the houses:417 12th ave se; 425 12th ave se; 1126 5th st se; and 1126 6th st se! These houses should also be categorized as Community Mixed Use which is the same as the ones on the east side of 12th ave se.	4/14/2018 22:46
1518	/topics/land-use-built-form/	In general, it is a good plan that is long overdue. My comment is: Looking at 12th ave SE between 4th St SE and 6th St SE under Land Use Categories, the east side of 12th ave se is student apartments which will be zoned as Community Mixed Use. On the west side, the buildings on 1127 4th SE and 411 12th ave SE will also be zoned as Community Mixed Use, while 1125 5th st SE will be zoned as Neighborhood mixed Use. I do not know what is the logic to leave the houses (417 12th ave se, 425 12th ave se and 1126 5th st se) to be categorized as Unban Neighborhood? In the future, if the property owners on these buildings which are categorized as Community Mixed Use develop stores, restaurants etc in these building, the activities will greatly affect people's life living in the houses:417 12th ave se; 425 12th ave se; 1126 5th st se; and 1126 6th st se! These houses should also be categorized as Community Mixed Use which is the same as the ones on the east side of 12th ave se.	4/14/2018 22:46
1519	/topics/land-use-built-form/	It doesn't seem like the built form map meshes with the built form map. For example, on the land use map, E 46st starting west of Hiawatha is an urban neighborhood, but on the built form map it is treated like a goods and services corridor. Similarly, on the land use map, Nicolet Ave has a big break in the goods corridor, but the break is not there in the built form map.  In general, the built form map suggests a much more dense Minneapolis than the land use map. Minneapolis should clarify the vision and correct the maps. Personally I think that the solution is somewhere in the middle, skewed towards the land use map. I think 20 years is too short of a timeframe to get to the built form map.	4/16/2018 21:49
1520	/topics/land-use-built-form/	It doesn't seem like the built form map meshes with the built form map. For example, on the land use map, E 46st starting west of Hiawatha is an urban neighborhood, but on the built form map it is treated like a goods and services corridor. Similarly, on the land use map, Nicolet Ave has a big break in the goods corridor, but the break is not there in the built form map.  In general, the built form map suggests a much more dense Minneapolis than the land use map. Minneapolis should clarify the vision and correct the maps. Personally I think that the solution is somewhere in the middle, skewed towards the land use map. I think 20 years is too short of a timeframe to get to the built form map.	4/16/2018 21:49
1521	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Tagging streets that are adjacent to transit routes with Interior 3 and Corridor 4 proposals is unfair and should be removed from this plan. This will open up a developer feeding frenzy and significantly degrade the neighborhoods. There is plenty of potential multi-lot development on the transit routes themselves.	4/17/2018 15:34

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1522	/topics/land-use-built-form/	This is Brian Crotteau 4605 Aldrich Av S, owner single family home. I appreciate the work being done to better plan for future development in the city, but have to vigorously object to your plans to turn my block from single family homes into small apartment developments. The 4600 block of Aldrich is single family homes, and your images of zone 3 show it as entirely covered with apartments. This is a direct threat to my property, which I have invested in significantly in over the years and we do not want our block turned into apartments and condos. You should go back to the plans and eliminate changes that would kick residents out of their homes, this is unacceptable.	4/17/2018 17:41
1523	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I'm writing in opposition to my block, 4600 Aldrich So., being included as an Interior 3 Built Form area. It is very upsetting that the city would encourage destruction of blocks of single family homes to make way for condos and apartments. This is a threat to the stability of Minneapolis and to the personal investments we on the block have made to our homes and to the health of our neighborhood. I plan to attend the meetings and to persuade you to alter the plans. This is unacceptable.	4/17/2018 18:30
1524	/topics/land-use-built-form/	These Interior 3 districts, when used as transition zones as shown here, are the most problematic of all the proposed changes. They turn quiet single family blocks into potential blocks dominated by apartments and condos, wiping out the investment people have made when they purchased and improved homes on these quiet blocks. 3 story, multi-lot apartment buildings are not a transition to smaller single family homes, which people spent more to purchase on these blocks given that they were not on transit routes or commercial streets. Changing the zoning on these streets will cost homeowners hundreds of thousands of dollars in lost value and drive disinvestment. Homeowners have a reasonable assumption that their investment will not be jeopardized by a radical rezoning such as this using the past 100 years as precedent.	4/17/2018 18:58
1525	/topics/land-use-built-form/	These Interior 3 districts, when used as transition zones as shown here, are the most problematic of all the proposed changes. They turn quiet single family blocks into potential blocks dominated by apartments and condos, wiping out the investment people have made when they purchased and improved homes on these quiet blocks. 3 story, multi-lot apartment buildings are not a transition to smaller single family homes, which people spent more to purchase on these blocks given that they were not on transit routes or commercial streets. Changing the zoning on these streets will cost homeowners hundreds of thousands of dollars in lost value and drive disinvestment. Homeowners have a reasonable assumption that their investment will not be jeopardized by a radical rezoning such as this using the past 100 years as precedent.	4/17/2018 19:05
1526	/topics/land-use-built-form/	These Interior 3 districts, when used as transition zones as shown here, are the most problematic of all the proposed changes. They turn quiet single family blocks into potential blocks dominated by apartments and condos, wiping out the investment people have made when they purchased and improved homes on these quiet blocks. 3 story, multi-lot apartment buildings are not a transition to smaller single family homes, which people spent more to purchase on these blocks given that they were not on transit routes or commercial streets. Changing the zoning on these streets will cost homeowners hundreds of thousands of dollars in lost value and drive disinvestment. Homeowners have a reasonable assumption that their investment will not be jeopardized by a radical rezoning such as this using the past 100 years as precedent.	4/17/2018 19:06
1527	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The interior 3 transition districts are the most damaging part of the plan as they can completely change blocks that are not on existing transit or commercial streets. We never would have purchased and renovated our home had it been on a street with this type of zoning.	4/17/2018 19:11
1528	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am horrified at the proposal to turn my house and block into an apartment complex. My house is proposed to be corridor 4. I live on a block of 1920's craftsman bunglo or 2 story homes. An apartment building would ruin my homes access to sun as the lots are small and I appreciate having homes similar size to mine. We bought our home in this area to have a single family Home close to the city, but quiet neighborhoods. Please do not endorse this plan. I'm at 4605 Aldrich Ave S. Please.	4/18/2018 0:13
1529	/topics/land-use-built-form/	A look at the built form map makes it look like the neighborhoods on Lowry Hill and west of Hennepin are getting special treatment relative to the east side of the street. Why doesn't the route 25 bus merit Corridor treatment? I think it's less frequent service, but nonetheless, the expensive, exclusive neighborhoods are exactly where adding unit to share land costs can increase accessibility.	4/18/2018 20:35
1530	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Further guidance on the massing of buildings allowed in the residential categories could help reduce concerns. I see lots of people jumping to conclusions about building size based on the allowed number of units. "Small-scale residential structure" sounds like buildings in keeping with existing structures to me, but it seems not to be enough to reassure people they aren't getting something massive next door to their house just because it would now be allowed to be more than one unit.	4/18/2018 20:35

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1531	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>While I support the idea of density, there needs to be a deeper assessment about the houses that could be torn down in support of this. I would be interested in a larger question about the value of in-tact neighborhoods, and neighborhoods are usually built block by block. I live at 46th and Aldrich and my block could be completely torn apart by this. The value of our property would make it impossible for the apartments built to be affordable and would not address the issue of racial and economic disparity at all. Rather, it would destroy beautiful homes and tight-knit blocks. I have just moved my parents across the street because of how incredible our neighborhood and the neighbors are. I think that the housing stock and the investment in these homes is worth a larger conversation about the quality of Minneapolis. Finally, with school cuts, the idea of driving more density and cutting public school budgets is not understandable at all.</p>	4/18/2018 21:22
1532	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The treatment of what the city considers "transit corridors" is way too aggressive. This is in two dimensions. Firstly these streets today mostly have single family, small multi-family, and 3 story buildings with some commercial. Going taller than that is not compatible with the neighborhoods away from downtown (e.g. south of 36th). So 3 story multi-family fine, but the 4+ with a wink to even taller is very concerning.</p> <p>secondly, these streets are going through neighborhoods. they have healthy corner intersections, where development should be prioritized. For example 50th street has a density bump at Bryant, Penn, Xerxes - but between them mostly not. Treat those intersections differently than the in-betweens, where your 4-plex zoning would be fine.</p> <p>thirdly, these corner nodes as drawn out are too big, For example 50th and Bryant, the plan threatens the livability of Aldrich, Colfax, south to 51st and north to 49th. This should be a much more localized impact, so limited to 1 side of the block facing the corner...</p> <p>lastly - where is the retail? It's not clear at all you have thought about the critical commercial role of these nodes - we need grocery stores, hardware stores, coffee shops, restaurants, dentists, hair salons - I don't see any recognition of that along these streets.</p>	4/19/2018 18:19
1533	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The treatment of what the city considers "transit corridors" is way too aggressive. This is in two dimensions. Firstly these streets today mostly have single family, small multi-family, and 3 story buildings with some commercial. Going taller than that is not compatible with the neighborhoods away from downtown (e.g. south of 36th). So 3 story multi-family fine, but the 4+ with a wink to even taller is very concerning.</p> <p>secondly, these streets are going through neighborhoods. they have healthy corner intersections, where development should be prioritized. For example 50th street has a density bump at Bryant, Penn, Xerxes - but between them mostly not. Treat those intersections differently than the in-betweens, where your 4-plex zoning would be fine.</p> <p>thirdly, these corner nodes as drawn out are too big, For example 50th and Bryant, the plan threatens the livability of Aldrich, Colfax, south to 51st and north to 49th. This should be a much more localized impact, so limited to 1 side of the block facing the corner...</p> <p>lastly - where is the retail? It's not clear at all you have thought about the critical commercial role of these nodes - we need grocery stores, hardware stores, coffee shops, restaurants, dentists, hair salons - I don't see any recognition of that along these streets.</p>	4/19/2018 18:20

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1534	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The treatment of what the city considers "transit corridors" is way too aggressive. This is in two dimensions. Firstly these streets today mostly have single family, small multi-family, and 3 story buildings with some commercial. Going taller than that is not compatible with the neighborhoods away from downtown (e.g. south of 36th). So 3 story multi-family fine, but the 4+ with a wink to even taller is very concerning.</p> <p>secondly, these streets are going through neighborhoods. they have healthy corner intersections, where development should be prioritized. For example 50th street has a density bump at Bryant, Penn, Xerxes - but between them mostly not. Treat those intersections differently than the in-betweens, where your 4-plex zoning would be fine.</p> <p>thirdly, these corner nodes as drawn out are too big, For example 50th and Bryant, the plan threatens the livability of Aldrich, Colfax, south to 51st and north to 49th. This should be a much more localized impact, so limited to 1 side of the block facing the corner...</p> <p>lastly - where is the retail? It's not clear at all you have thought about the critical commercial role of these nodes - we need grocery stores, hardware stores, coffee shops, restaurants, dentists, hair salons - I don't see any recognition of that along these streets.</p>	4/19/2018 18:20
1535	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The idea of having combined lot apartment buildings on Interior 3 transitional streets is a terrible one. These are quiet, small, non-transit or commercial streets and should remain zoned Interior 1. Multi-lot apartment buildings on the streets would completely change the character of block after block, and even the potential to build them would drastically lower property values and discourage additional investment.	4/20/2018 22:37
1536	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The idea of having combined lot apartment buildings on Interior 3 transitional streets is a terrible one. These are quiet, small, non-transit or commercial streets and should remain zoned Interior 1. Multi-lot apartment buildings on the streets would completely change the character of block after block, and even the potential to build them would drastically lower property values and discourage additional investment.	4/20/2018 22:44
1537	/topics/land-use-built-form/	We purchased a home and invested substantially in a large renovation specifically because the home was not on a transit route or near larger multi-family dwellings. To now change zoning on a small side street such as Aldrich and jeopardize our investment is unconscionable. Interior 3 zoning has no place 47 blocks away from downtown on quiet residential streets.	4/23/2018 20:03
1538	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The building size and style for the roads south of 36th st that the city considers transit ways are much too aggressive. Linden hills Parkwaay for example has a long stately procession of beautiful single family homes reminiscent of Summit avenue or other notable residential streets - and the plan calls for 1 side of the street to be taken over by 3 story apartment buildings! The plan should not be pushing taller than 3 story buildings that far from downtown and not outside very tightly defined corridors and intersections where we have a bit of commerce and multi-family development now. Leave the uptown sized buildings in uptown.	4/23/2018 20:29
1539	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Interior 2 should support small infill housing off of the alley but with more square footage than currently allowed. Should allow home owners to subdivide their lot to allow an ADU type of unit to be owned by someone else. Look at Seattle. The small ADUs and townhouses are almost all individually owned units.	4/24/2018 4:37
1540	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Allow for more density near 50th and France. East side of Ewing should be Interior 2 or 3.	4/24/2018 4:39
1541	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Interior 2 in CARAG and ECCO seems too low. It's so close to major urban nodes with groceries, restaurants, etc. Also, allow lots to be subdivided into townhouses or rear ADUs without having to condo the site. Townhouses = easier.	4/24/2018 4:40
1542	/topics/land-use-built-form/	PLEASE convert these maps to PDF so we can download and/or print them. They are impossible to use for group discussion and good analysis. NOT good citizen access.	4/26/2018 22:58

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1543	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am concerned about the urban neighborhood zoning. I'm mostly concerned because the definition does not really sound urban to me, but more suburban. I would like to see more mixed used zoning throughout the city, at the very least 50% of the city should be zoned for mixed use. This would create walkable neighborhoods and a city that everyone can enjoy. Limiting mixed use to certain areas of the city will hurt the city and our ability to meet our equity, environment, and transit goals because so many people in the city will be unable to walk or bike to work, the grocery store, or to just get a coffee or something. In the final form of this plan, I would like to see much more mixed use in the city. I too would like to see more zoning for 10-20 story buildings. We often, as a species, cannot contextualize the future very well, nor do we like to think of negative things. This combined really limits our view of climate change as a serious matter, even though I know the city views it as such. Anyway, climate change is about 150 years ahead of schedule as the ocean current that creates our weather is slowing down and may even stop before 2040. This would be disastrous and cause rapid arctic melt, increasing sea levels and creating even more climate refugees. This is the reason I want to see more 10-20 story zoning because I fear that the 4plex proposal (which is great!) is not going to be enough in the future as people flee the coasts as the sea rises.	4/28/2018 0:57
1544	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Neighbors have told me that our area along Bryant Ave by 50th street is targeted for high density apartment buildings. If I wanted to live in Uptown, I'd move there. Bryant Ave, despite having a bus, is not a high transit street, it's where we live.	4/30/2018 17:23
1545	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>This is overall great. A few spot concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The transit corridor districting doesn't look to the future where the blue and green lines will be extended. Probably that also applies to the BRT lines, but I haven't looked.</li> <li>2) You're asking for buildings to have smaller upper floors than lower ones and discouraging overhanging balconies. I disagree with both of these, they are part of vibrant cities.</li> <li>3) Interior 2 doesn't really have a reason to exist. it's basically interior 1, as written.</li> <li>4) Corridor 6 should be at least 2.5 stories.</li> <li>5) Urban Neighborhood should welcome small mixed use options.</li> <li>6) Production and Processing neighborhoods should allow housing, targeted to workers of those fields. Why prohibit housing?</li> <li>7) Kenwood needs to be interior 3 at the very least, given transit access on Hennepin, amenities on Hennepin, and access to the lakes. This should be an neighborhood for car-free or car-light, and more people should be able to enjoy.</li> <li>8) Even in Interior 1 areas in the far north or south, there need to be places where large multifamily buildings can be built to house people, particularly seniors, who want to leave their single family homes but still live in their familiar neighborhood. Corridor 4 could extend a block further into the neighborhoods. Accessibility may be an issue with triplexes and fourplexes.</li> </ol> <p>* My biggest dream: replace the 4 square blocks of highway from 16th st to 10th st in the heart of the city with housing, allowing Elliot Park to be reconnected.</p> <p>I do like wording of the guidance for increasing height limit. Overall this is a good plan and don't let the people who oppose everything get you down.</p>	4/30/2018 20:22
1546	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am very enthusiastic about the change of zoning that will allow greater density on most residential parcels by right. Yes, our city will look different in 2040 than it does now, but it MUST look different in order for it to be a city full of diversity. Fears of full street parking must be addressed with better transit, biking and walking infrastructure. No homeowners will/should be forced to sell their homes, fears of large developers Manhattanizing the city can be addressed with programs that allow individual homeowners to consider opportunities to add units to their properties.	5/1/2018 3:16
1547	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I own a single family home in the Seward neighborhood. Next door is a duplex built in the 1800s, and it is much smaller than many single family homes now being built throughout the city. Several doors down the other direction is an apartment building built in the 60s or 70s. I LOVE the diversity of the built form on my street, and throughout the neighborhood. Old houses mingle with homes built in the 1970s, with some new modern style homes in the mix. Duplexes, triplexes, single family homes, old storefronts that are now homes, etc. I am completely for a built form that allows for greater density, and which allows for a diversity of types of buildings throughout our neighborhoods.	5/1/2018 3:21
1548	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Love this. Our zoning is in real need of simplification, and more people must be allowed to call Minneapolis home. By increasing use and the number of neighbors, our city will become more walkable and livable for everyone. This is great!	5/1/2018 21:21



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1549	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I think increasing density on these major feeder road, W 50th St, W 46th St., Lyndale Ave S, Bryant Ave. S, Penn Ave. S, Xerxes Ave S. makes a lot of sense. And the step down in density makes sense on the adjacent blocks on either side. I'm excited to have more neighbors in the Lynnhurst neighborhood.	5/7/2018 21:07
1550	/topics/land-use-built-form/	With regard to 1800 Fremont Avenue North... Why has the North High School Football Field been added to the proposed "Corridor 6" whereas North High School stays at "Corridor 2"? It does not seem logical to encourage future development on a community asset "that asset being the North High School Football Field." Ian Alexander (1601 Irving Ave N.)	5/8/2018 15:16
1551	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Please consider changing Irving to incorporate the North Minneapolis Greenway into this proposal: <a href="https://www.google.com/search?q=city+of+minneapolis+north+greenway&amp;rlz=1C9BKJA_enUS731US731&amp;hl=en-US&amp;prmd=nmiv&amp;source=lnms&amp;tbn=isch&amp;sa=X&amp;ved=0ahUKEWj187SQufbaAhVEyYMKHQaHBigQ_AUIEygD&amp;biw=1366&amp;bih=909#imgsrc=tA7ZVPjwzzlbnM">https://www.google.com/search?q=city+of+minneapolis+north+greenway&amp;rlz=1C9BKJA_enUS731US731&amp;hl=en-US&amp;prmd=nmiv&amp;source=lnms&amp;tbn=isch&amp;sa=X&amp;ved=0ahUKEWj187SQufbaAhVEyYMKHQaHBigQ_AUIEygD&amp;biw=1366&amp;bih=909#imgsrc=tA7ZVPjwzzlbnM</a> :	5/8/2018 15:41
1552	/topics/land-use-built-form/	One thing that keeps coming up in conversations I'm having around land use is the loss of neighborhood retail over the past several decades, and potential for displacement of small neighborhood businesses and services. It would be good to see more land use of the type of "Neighborhood Mixed Use" to account for this: providing places for businesses to move around in neighborhoods, and allow new businesses for vital services to move in.  In Prospect Park I can think of a couple examples: we didn't have a grocery store for the longest time, and we do now. A local daycare agency moved out of the building that was reconstructed for that, and was fortunate to find a place in the area. There aren't many spaces for them if they need to move again (fortunately for them, future land use designations include mixed use in the area).  In CARAG, I'm aware of an instance where something is designated with "Interior 2", but there is a small convenience store in the basement of an apartment building: when I lived in the area I went there all the time when I needed miscellaneous small things. It would be great if more neighborhoods like this had that opportunity, and I think a way toward this is maybe allowing some types of businesses by right in Interior 2.	5/9/2018 23:40
1553	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The 2040 plan would call for some rather dramatic zoning changes on my block and the surrounding area -- potentially dramatically changing the character of my residential block by allowing large 3-story multifamily complexes on the 4500 block of Aldrich, and 4 stories to the west on Bryant. This kind of density just isn't appropriate for this neighborhood.  The single family homes and duplexes on my block come alive each spring with beautiful gardens and trees and kids playing in front and back yards. I can't imagine a sprawling condo or apartment complex next door. It doesn't make sense. I'm concerned this zoning change to Interior 3 could damage what people love most about our quiet, family-oriented neighborhood. I believe it should be zoned Interior 1 to maintain the assets that drew my family and my neighbors to this (terrific!) block.  Sincerely, Erin Burns	5/10/2018 1:39

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1554	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>General comments on both the land use and built form map proposals:</p> <p>Built form guidelines for neighborhood interiors (1 &amp; 2 - the vast majority of the city still in this proposal) speak of 1-4 units structures, but typically only on a standard lots (or a small number of combined lots), and only up to 2.5 stories. While this is a broad policy and built form proposal, it is still very limiting. 4 units on a standard lot, given our standard narrow/deep format, very much limits housing typologies. Row houses, townhomes (of varying styles, including - yes - Seattle's four- and six-pack style, Houston styles, and more), small buildings with 5-12 units of smaller size (ex. micro-units, studios, and small 1BR units) all are ruled out by this definition, as is anything larger than 2.5 stories. The Comprehensive Plan Draft does nothing to justify why 4 units or 2.5 stories is acceptable whereas 5 is not backed by research, data, national and international peer-reviews, economics, or otherwise. We can do better.</p> <p>The Interior 1 &amp; 2 designation also pays no attention to economic feasibility of different lot types in different parts of the city. By nature this proposal picks easily-drawn lines (ex. A block off a transit corridor, south or north of a given street, etc) to designate different intensity levels. But existing structures, conditions, uses, and demand (given proximity to anything but a transit corridor) all factor into what is possible for a lot's redevelopment. In many parts of the city, even Interior 1 &amp; 2 will still guarantee that most lots only option for redevelopment is a larger, more expensive single family home.</p> <p>Intensity "transition" is still a wrongheaded goal in this Comprehensive Plan draft as it was in the last one. A person in a single family home is no more deserving of the light and air provided by a more "compatible" (or similar) structure than a person on the ground level of an apartment building. By intentionally choosing to designate larger structures to go next to larger structures, we guarantee people in multi-family housing have worse views, less sunlight, and less air than people who can already afford to have 4 detached walls with windows, a backyard, and more interior space per resident. That's wrong.</p> <p>Land use separation and segregation continues to be a struggle in the proposal. While it is true that demand for retail or other commercial uses may not exceed current commercial structure capacity in many parts of town, it is also true that small, locally-owned businesses are being priced out of many nodes and corridors. This proposal should be at least as bold regarding commercial uses as it is regarding residential intensity expansion: allow more types of low-impact commercial uses in every district in the city. Germany and Japan have excellent models - limiting the allowed commercial gross floor area in residential zones, as well as putting limits around use based on daily needs of residents, which can still include restaurants, shops, and small offices.</p>	5/11/2018 0:32
1555	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>WE DO NOT WANT FOURPLEXES IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD!</p> <p>As homeowners that have paid their taxes on time for nearly two decades and have spent time and money to improve our house and to keep up the neighborhood, we feel under siege and unfairly treated by this self judging tone about our city's past and know-it all plan for the city's future. Since when has it become a bad thing to own a single family home in Minneapolis? We have lived for the last eight years next to a rental property, which was rented mostly by young,often low income people (the folks you so desperately want to have more of) , which more often than not did not respect their neighbors and did not help the quality of life. We could hardly stand it, living next to a house with four renters and we fail to see how a multi family dwelling is supposed to improve the situation. And if your plan is just to create more living space, there is no guarantee that it will be more affordable. All it would do would be to degrade the quality of life for everybody but not make things more affordable. Maybe you should stop feeling guilty about the past and start caring about the people that already live here and that pay your bills through their taxes. Keep up the roads, parks, schools, fire and police and don't spent all your time dreaming up ideas how to make life more complicated for everybody else. This plan will ultimately hurt the low to middle income homeowners, as their houses will become targets for speculators to buy up and replace with your multi family dwellings! STOP IT!</p>	5/11/2018 2:18
1556	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The purposeful elimination of single family housing will be destructive to raising families in Minneapolis. 4 family units on one 40 foot wide lot is not a better quality of life. The illustration provided looks much worse then what exists on the blocks they want to upzone.</p>	5/11/2018 4:55

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1557	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>It is absurd that the 49th block of Aldrich Ave S. is considered for Corridor 6, this is a very quiet street with no mass transit. Dropping 6 story apartment buildings on this block will destroy the community on this block. The minute this street is rezoned there will be developers building high end condos that will increase traffic along this street while still out-pricing any other people who could not afford to live in the area anyway.</p> <p>There are already high density housing along 50th street in the form of apartments above ground shops. If anything there should be more of this built around the high capacity streets of 50th, Bryant and Lyndale.</p> <p>Bus stops are easily accessible from any spot on Bryant and Lyndale via 50th street. Residents of rental properties above retail will be within several stops for a minutes walk.</p> <p>Adding Aldrich to become high density is beyond incompetent planning.</p>	5/11/2018 21:16
1558	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Having very clear well enforced policy will be key to success. I agree will creating and maintaining affordable housing in sw Mpls but I fear that more of the same monster housing will be the end result. Builders in Fulton will be looking for profit so will tear down a home that maybe small but affordable. Replacing it with a four plea of luxury rentals. This is just another way to redline and create disparities. The inspector of plans and building donâ€™t seem to be able to keep up with the building currently so policy isnâ€™t enforced. I am not in favor of the current plans for density building and land use due to the disparities they will create.</p>	5/13/2018 14:31
1559	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>This is ridiculous. I live on a street of all single family homes. You're going to rezone my street so you can build a bunch of 4 story buildings? This is total and complete BS. I will be attending the open houses and doing everything I can to ensure that this plan is defeated.</p>	5/13/2018 19:56
1560	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I love the idea of allowing 4 Unit infill housing development in residential areas.</p>	5/14/2018 13:23
1561	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I own a 2 story town home in an area where you are requiring a minimum of 8 story buildings. My property and quality of life will be severely impacted by the density being proposed. There is already a severe and dangerous shortage of parking in this area around 32nd St W. Even if people do not use theirs cars to get to work, they will still own cars and they must park them. The rents are so high that at 2 or more adults with cars will live in each unit. Developers must be required to provide a minimum of 2 off street parking spots per unit. This is not Manhattan, NY! Furthermore, I worry about my middle and low income neighbors in older buildings that will be displaced by new, high density, and high rent developments.</p>	5/15/2018 3:35
1562	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The massive buildup of density so far from downtown because itâ€™s on a â€œtransitâ€ line is unacceptable. These changes to 50th, penn, Bryant would devastate desireable neighborhoods for families.</p>	5/15/2018 11:41
1563	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>NO, if the image is anything like you really want NO! the homes in this area are almost 100 years old and are what we moved to on purpose, we didn't move here to have it become another Uptown!</p>	5/15/2018 13:46
1564	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I am opposed to any changes on Franklin or 21st Street west of Fremont. The proposed changes would be detrimental to the character and quality of living of the area</p> <p>thanks</p> <p>Jack Levi</p> <p>2631 Newton Av S</p> <p>Mpls</p>	5/15/2018 15:35
1565	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>So you want to have a 4 plex on a 5000' lot without off street parking? That is completely stupid. Thanks for clogging our streets even more.</p>	5/15/2018 18:29
1566	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I am in support of changing our current ADU ordinance as part of the MPLS 2040 comprehensive plan guideline to allow up to 4 plexes throughout the city. It would be beneficial for both owners and renters to allow non owner occupants the ability to add an ADU to their current 1-4 unit properties. I am an owner of a triplex in Hiawatha and if allowed I would build an ADU on my property that would provide affordable rental housing and off street parking.</p>	5/15/2018 19:53
1567	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Referring to 19 and 25 E Minnehaha Parkway. These properties are noted to be Corridor 6. Point being made is why not make them Corridor 3. Reason; the property to the immediate East is 35 E Minnehaha Parkway - and that is Corridor 3 and to the west of 19 E is a natural divisor - the alley between 3 East Minnehaha Parkway and the single family homes on the remainder of the block. Especially when viewed in person (or Google maps), it is easy to see the the alley is the obvious break-point for the "Corridor" designations.</p>	5/16/2018 15:25

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1568	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Referring to Properties 30 - 80 West Minnehaha Parkway. When coloring the map with essentially straight lines it makes sense for these properties to be designated as Interior 3. Practically speaking however, given the one way traffic on that part of Minnehaha Parkway, those properties have NO immediate access to Nicollet Ave. Therefore marking them as Interior 3 rather than Interior 1 makes no sense.	5/16/2018 15:39
1569	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Hi there, I am one of the homes on the 55xx block of Aldrich Ave. south. My neighbors are very concerned about the proposed changes to our zoning and I have many of the same reservations. However, I am curious to hear someone make a good case for why these changes would accomplish the goals that were presented. Is there anyway to guarantee that residential units built on this stretch will be more affordable than the surrounding single-family homes? If not, then why is this being proposed? I appreciate that density can be a way to accomplish greater accessibility, but that's not necessarily true if luxury condos or apartments are built that block all the sun from my yard, bring more noise, garbage and traffic.  Thanks, Ted Duepner 5501 Aldrich Ave. S.	5/16/2018 17:32
1570	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am strongly opposed to develop multi family units within our community where they don't currently exist. I am for diversity and inclusion, but building multifamily housing will disrupt the current environment that makes these neighborhoods great to begin with. The city needs to bolster the section 8 single family dwellings vs building multi units in these neighborhoods w this planned development. We live in these areas to avoid the "busy uptown" feel. Keep zoning consistent and make no changes!	5/16/2018 19:14
1571	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Block leaders for 55xx Aldrich Ave S and residents on both sides of the streets are not in favor of 6 stories on Lyndale Ave S on the corridor or connected to this block. Same block residents are not interested in their homes being rezoned on Aldrich Ave South. Max height for Lyndale corridor between 53 and 57 should be 3, in keeping with neighborhood current heights.	5/17/2018 2:11
1572	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Superfund cleanup should be considered at 54xx and 55xx Lyndale and Aldrich Ave S needs to be considered when making plans. Both blocks are already being mitigated.	5/17/2018 2:14
1573	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Strongly oppose the upper level, 6 story developments noted in the plan.	5/17/2018 2:15
1574	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Neighborhoods that have already had traffic calming lane changes are undergoing a siege of drivers using side streets to get to destinations faster and this is causing traffic problems on 1-2 street off traffic calmed streets. This is dangerous for residents in areas. Also, when City is contacted the answer is no changes unless a fatal accident is reported. Totally unacceptable.	5/17/2018 2:18
1575	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Disagree with whole plan.	5/17/2018 2:19
1576	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Large parts of the area near the Lake St. - Excelsior Blvd. split are designated Community Mixed Use and Transit 30. Neither description takes into account the geographical uniqueness of that area, as one of the few funnels for east-west traffic into and out of Minneapolis. Unlike downtown, which is the destination of most of the morning traffic there and the source of most of the evening traffic there, the Lake/Excelsior split is jammed mornings and evenings by traffic passing through the area. And unlike downtown, there is no bypass loop that removes the bulk of the through traffic from the interior streets. These facts make the Community Mixed Used description inappropriate for the area, and the considerably greater density advocated in the Transit 30 district an extreme aggravation to already over-congested rush hours.  Also, the plan makes no distinction between property facing on major streets and those facing on parkland and parkways, specifically the east and west sides of Dean Green between the east and west branches of Dean Parkway.  Rodgers Adams rodgea@comcast.net 2950 Dean Pkwy. #1005	5/17/2018 18:33

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1577	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>1. The proposed monthly rent of \$1,700 is not affordable for low income families.</p> <p>2. Stating that the rent will go down as the buildings age and become less attractive to the well-off is absurd and offensive.</p> <p>3. Wrecking a nice neighborhood by putting in 6 story buildings that don't fit is also absurd.</p> <p>4. Planning to ruin Minnehaha Creek with more run off is wrong.</p> <p>This looks like a recipe for failure in so many ways.</p>	5/17/2018 19:25
1578	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>This is such an extreme change. It serves only to further segregate the city. There is plenty of affordable housing in Minneapolis. The affordable housing is traditionally located in areas where people of color live. So to keep the city segregated you have released large parcels of land to bring in housing/apartments into the more affluent area. The new dwellings will still be above most people's earnings, which in turn will keep the city separate. We need to encourage people to move to places like Near north Mpls and the likes - not discourage them by putting more slightly less expensive housing in predominantly white neighborhoods.</p>	5/17/2018 20:16
1579	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I'm an East Isles resident and from my perspective, there isn't a tremendous difference between the neighborhoods on the east and west sides of Hennepin in regards to transit access, proximity to Downtown, walkability, etc. I think more of East Isles and Lowry Hill could be zoned as interior 3 and I think there is quite a bit of existing housing that would reflect that zoning already. I'd love a plan that would finally acknowledge that existing housing stock while making it possible for more housing like that to exist in the future.</p>	5/18/2018 14:12
1580	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I am vigorously opposed to the designation of Bryant Avenue as a Corridor 4 area. The draft allows 4+ story structures on Bryant and 3 story structures on adjacent half blocks (Aldrich/Colfax). Most of the homes in this area are over 100 years old and are well maintained. The character of the area is vibrant and livable precisely because it is not too crowded. The area schools are full. Parking is still manageable. The draft plan envisions a radically different vision of this area which would negatively affect those long term residents who have invested heavily in their homes. Issues such as parking, sunlight, snow removal, noise, underground infrastructure to name just a few will all be negatively impacted. The actual residents in this area are overwhelmingly opposed to this plan as it would alter the very livability we expect. Further, people who want to stay may not be able to afford their taxes once the assessors start assessing based on "highest and best use" for their properties.</p>	5/18/2018 18:20
1581	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I live on Belmont Ave. in Tangletown. This plan could destroy the nature of my neighborhood and my reason for living in the city. We moved here because we like the idea of living in a neighborhood of well-maintained older homes with sunny lots. We enjoy the proximity to cultural events, and we're proud to part of a diverse and open community.</p> <p>It would be a shame to see houses on Belmont razed and replaced with three-story apartment buildings and faced by 6-story buildings to the east. The sunlight, green space and privacy we are accustomed to would no longer be ours. We currently grow a good portion of our food as well as many bee-friendly flowers, and unpaved ground is good for drainage (to prevent flooding). We've considered putting solar panels on our garage to fuel our electric car, but we wouldn't risk it if the plan is approved.</p> <p>The fact that the plan has four Harry Jones houses rezoned for 6 stories leads me to believe that the character of the actual buildings the map represents was not considered, and it seems a pity to subject solid, beautiful structures to the power of developers. Plus, I don't see a plan to make the potential new housing affordable.</p> <p>I wouldn't mind 2- or 3-story structures on Nicollet - not 6-stories, but the rest of the neighborhood should stay small.</p>	5/19/2018 17:40

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1582	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I live on Belmont Ave. in Tangletown. This plan could destroy the nature of my neighborhood and my reason for living in the city. We moved here because we like the idea of living in a neighborhood of well-maintained older homes with sunny lots. We enjoy the proximity to cultural events, and we're proud to part of a diverse and open community.</p> <p>It would be a shame to see houses on Belmont razed and replaced with three-story apartment buildings and faced by 6-story buildings to the east. The sunlight, green space and privacy we are accustomed to would no longer be ours. We currently grow a good portion of our food as well as many bee-friendly flowers, and unpaved ground is good for drainage (to prevent flooding). We've considered putting solar panels on our garage to fuel our electric car, but we wouldn't risk it if the plan is approved.</p> <p>The fact that the plan has four Harry Jones houses rezoned for 6 stories leads me to believe that the character of the actual buildings the map represents was not considered, and it seems a pity to subject solid, beautiful structures to the power of developers. Plus, I don't see a plan to make the potential new housing affordable.</p> <p>I wouldn't mind 2- or 3-story structures on Nicollet -- not 6-stories, but the rest of the neighborhood should stay small.</p>	5/19/2018 17:40
1583	/topics/land-use-built-form/	NO NO NO....You are crazy! I work outside Mpls but live inside. We don't need to develop all this land in one of the biggest giveaways to developers.	5/21/2018 13:18
1584	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I feel that if 4-plex housing is allowed in the innermost part of our precious neighborhoods, it would take away from the character and Family friendly feel. Adding 4-plex buildings to the main transit routes makes sense, building in the heart of our neighborhoods does not. Put condensed housing closer to the city, not neighborhoods like a Kenny and Armatage, to name a few.	5/21/2018 16:33
1585	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I love our city. I was born and raised in Camden, went to the University of Minnesota, worked for the County and now live in Page. Except for a year and a half in graduate school, I have never lived nor wanted to live anywhere else. We have the best parks; empowering schools (I am a proud Patriot and my children are amazing Millers); thriving downtown; and a fabulous art scene. My neighborhood is wonderful for various reasons, but the most important reason is being threatened by Proposal 2040. The quiet peace we find in our little 'hood is a respite from the bustle we know and love in the other parts of the city, only a stone's throw away. The streets of our neighborhood have taught my children how to drive and parallel park, something I think would not be nearly as pleasant with increased traffic and street parking. I also love the stability of our neighborhood. We know every single person on our block and almost everyone on the other eight blocks in our little community. I would love to see more affordable housing. I worked hard to support the building of Creekside Commons just a half mile from my home. It would be wonderful to find more fourplexes along bus routes such as Nicollet (just on the other side of the highway from me) or Portland Ave (just across the park from me) but to have them in amongst the quiet of our neighborhood would just all but ruin it for me. Seriously. Please do not allow these fourplexes to be built within peaceful, quiet neighborhoods. Thank you.</p>	5/21/2018 16:50
1586	/topics/land-use-built-form/	HELL NO ARE YOU FUCKING CRAZY!!!!!!	5/21/2018 17:15
1587	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Portland, Seattle, San Fran, Chicago, Atlanta all protect their single family establish communities. You want an Uptown in your hood fine.....STAY THE FUCK AWAY FROM MINE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>NO FUCKING WAY!</p>	
1588	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The base parcel maps for Future Land Use and Built Form do not reflect existing conditions in many recently-changed locations, for example Oak/Huron/University, TCF Bank Stadium, US Bank Stadium, etc.	5/21/2018 22:31
1589	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I don't Agree with this policy at all. You're turning a single-family home neighborhood into the one that has three and four stories on it where there are none today. It will create congestion disruption decrease the quality of life for the individuals currently living here. Likewise, this policy makes it unaffordable for individuals to purchase property when having to compete with contractors.	5/22/2018 0:00
1590	/topics/land-use-built-form/	NO....I don't want my house to be rezoned for large scale Apartments. Are you Nuts?	5/22/2018 17:24
1591	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Your web site here won't allow comments on particular parcels as it says it does. I DO NOT WANT THIS. Rezoning Huge swaths of single family homes and quiet beautiful streets is ridiculous.	5/22/2018 17:35
1592	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Would like to see the ADU ordinance changed to include owner/landlords in adding ADU's as part of the comprehensive plan	5/23/2018 13:16

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1593	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The small area plans created by citizens/resident input are not adequately reflected in the proposed Built Form Districts. To override the small area plans is to ignore a broad swath of constituency.</p> <p>Reviewing Tweeter history, it seems that many of the proposed land use ideas have come from progressive tweeter users. That is one valid source of input but is incomplete.</p> <p>The garnering of input from Open Street Festivals is novel, but does not an adequate cross section of priorities and concerns.</p>	5/23/2018 14:17
1594	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I'm concerned that the way feedback works, city staff is going to disproportionately hear complaints and not support, so I wanted to write in support generally.</p> <p>In particular, I'd like to applaud any attempts to leaving how much parking is needed up to the market in most/all of the city. The basic truth is that parking is plentiful across the vast majority of the city, and will be even if we add a few more residents. Off-street parking will still get built, because property owners will want to offer that amenity, and should parking get tight in some neighborhoods, those incentives will just be strengthened. The only thing that parking minimums can do is require more parking be built than the market demands.</p> <p>Next, I'd like to applaud the thoughtful balance that went into how, where and how much density we're going to allow across the city. Small multi-unit buildings in neighborhood interiors in buildings that mimic the existing built form is a great way to gently add density and enhance access to amenity-rich neighborhoods. The concept is the right approach.</p> <p>That said, I'm concerned that we aren't apply the concept correctly on the west side of Hennepin, where we're allowing less density than just on the other side of the street. These high land value neighborhoods are exactly where more units can increase access for people who have traditionally been excluded from them. In particular, I'd like to see corridor treatment along the route of the 25 bus and greater density around the planned 21st stop on the SWLRT. For the latter, it's especially important to leverage the costly investment we're making in high quality and high frequency transit.</p> <p>One of the primary positives I see in the overall plan is that it allows each neighborhood to take the next step up in density and therefore hopefully add more neighbors to support local businesses and retail and allow more people to be able to meet their needs in their neighborhood, perhaps without driving. It makes for more appealing neighborhoods, reduces congestion and, most importantly, makes it easier for those who face challenges that prevent them from driving. In that regard, I'd like to the more commercial land use allowed along 38th Street east of Minnehaha.</p> <p>Overall, I'm very happy with the plan and think it's a step in the right direction toward a city that my 17 month old daughter will be able to afford when she's ready to move out on her own.</p>	5/23/2018 14:54
1595	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I am appalled by the proposal to decimate the livability and use of the West Lake-Excelsior area by turning it into a highly dense concrete jungle filled with outrageously tall highrises that are totally out of scale with the area, will greatly undermine all Minneapolis residents well-being and enjoyment of the lakes and leisure activities that currently make the area not only beautiful but a highly desirable area to live/visit/work, and that will turn traffic in the area into a constant congested nightmare that will deter people from wanting to live in, make recreational/leisure use of the lakes, and patronize businesses/restaurants in that and the surrounding area. What is proposed is truly an abomination that defeats not only the proposal's professed objectives but shows outright disrespect for those who live in Minneapolis and may otherwise want to bring new business to the Twin Cities. I am outraged and fearful. It certainly seems that the plan is all about greed for money and pandering to big business, and forcing your plans through regardless of how residents feel and their extremely valid objections. I currently live in the area in question though I may flee Minneapolis if this is what the city becomes. Shame on you!</p>	5/23/2018 17:09

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1596	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Attended the LCC Open House. Heather did an excellent job presenting, explaining and keep the crowd calm.</p> <p>My take away - there is a push by the city to maintain or increase industrial base to create higher paying jobs. Good!</p> <p>But there will be leakage if there are new developers snatching up small properties in the interior of of neighborhoods, building multi-unit buildings and using management companies. Will this income stay in the city?</p> <p>I think companies like CityLine Homes will move into this market, like they have moved into the market of knocking down homes and building much larger single family homes in Longfellow, Standish-Ericsson and Nokomis East. This company, like many other developers in this niche, are not headquartered in Minneapolis.</p> <p>I think multi-unit buildings in the interior of neighborhoods should have an owner occupied condition. Then the rent from the additional units will stay in the city.</p>	5/23/2018 17:55
1597	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Attended the LCC Open House. Heather did an excellent job presenting, explaining and keep the crowd calm.</p> <p>My take away - there is a push by the city to maintain or increase industrial base to create higher paying jobs. Good!</p> <p>But there will be leakage if there are new developers snatching up small properties in the interior of of neighborhoods, building multi-unit buildings and using management companies. Will this income stay in the city?</p> <p>I think companies like CityLine Homes will move into this market, like they have moved into the market of knocking down homes and building much larger single family homes in Longfellow, Standish-Ericsson and Nokomis East. This company, like many other developers in this niche, are not headquartered in Minneapolis.</p> <p>I think multi-unit buildings in the interior of neighborhoods should have an owner occupied condition. Then the rent from the additional units will stay in the city.</p>	5/23/2018 17:57
1598	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Historic zoning rules post World War II that limit development to single family homes are what have led to the current housing shortage and insanely low vacancy rates. We need to allow for more building, more density, and more people. We live in a city, and this is what we should be focused on. Let the suburbs focus on easy, free, and ample parking.</p>	5/23/2018 20:55
1599	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The idea of turning side streets like Aldrich And Colfax into streets with multi-lot, multi-story apartment buildings 40 blocks from downtown is terrible. We moved to a quiet street from Uptown to escape the crush of apartments and invested heavily in our home, which is now jeopardized by this short-sighted idea.</p>	5/23/2018 20:59
1600	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I believe Corridor 4 should be completely eliminated and Corridor 6 be the primary "By-Right" for any parcel in this proximity to local bus transit. This is a matter of Allowing development vs Restricting development city-wide, and eliminating the historic redlining that was rampant throughout Minneapolis.</p>	5/24/2018 2:12
1601	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The color coded legend is difficult to track on the maps as some of the shades are very close to each other (i.e., Interior 1 and Interior 2 look very similar on the maps; Transit 10 and Transit 5 are also similar colors) which obfuscates the future use intended.</p>	5/24/2018 5:05
1602	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I know you will get a lot of comments about how density will ruin neighborhood character. I disagree but I am sympathetic to a concern that the massing of new multi family buildings might not "blend in" with surrounding houses in the interior 1-3 forms. But, I think the descriptions of the built forms is the right guidance to address that issue. New multi-family buildings in these areas need to have reasonable lot size restrictions so we don't end up with bulky, wall-like buildings. I encourage the City to set reasonable lot size restrictions for these built forms.</p>	5/24/2018 13:21



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1603	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The 4500 and 4600 South blocks of Aldrich need to be designated Interior 1. These are NOT commercial streets. The currently are made up of entirely single-family homes with 1-2 duplex buildings. The rendering for Interior 3 imagines a street that bares no resemblance to the one we all chose to purchase and build lives on.</p> <p>Thanks, Clark Starr 4628 Aldrich Ave. S. Minneapolis MN</p>	5/24/2018 14:21
1604	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The Corridor 6 designation for S Lyndale Ave. from south of Minnehaha Creek to MN62 does not appear to meet the intent of a Corridor 6 designation i.e. "applied along high frequency transit routes as well as in areas near METRO stations." Due to its proximity to the Crosstown, the area does see traffic but no more so than the areas north of Minnehaha Creek on Lyndale where R1 designation shows until Lyndale/50th crossing. Bus routes (currently) are limited in this area. The resulting Corridor 6 "œcul-de-sac" on S. Lyndale in both Kenny and Windom neighborhoods with the impinging Interior 3 designation on Aldrich and Garfield Avenues are not consistent with neighborhood character/historical use, traffic patterns/flow. The Lyndale Ave Corridor 6 designation in neighborhoods not dissimilar to those along Penn, Xerxes or France Avenues appears tone-deaf to the extant predominantly historical R1 nature of the neighborhoods. "œUpsizing" of S. Lyndale to Corridor 6 from its current zoning (which has resulted in no development south of 56th Street) would appear to be an effort to make the area more commercially enticing at the expense of the character of the neighborhoods involved. However, until the Lyndale/121/Lyndale Connector mess of oddly shaped lots abutting a freeway/highway access with no access is resolved, any commercial development will likely occur north of 56th St., which, if done to the full extent allowed by a Corridor 6 designation, would result in an odd "œurban island" in a sea of R1.</p> <p>Recommend changing the Corridor 6 designation for S Lyndale Ave. from south of Minnehaha Creek to MN62 and the impinging Interior 3 designation on Aldrich and Garfield Avenues to Interior 3 and Interior 2 respectively (consistent with those designations on those along Penn, Xerxes or France Avenues south of Minnehaha Creek.</p>	5/24/2018 14:38
1605	/topics/land-use-built-form/	We need to add housing in the neighborhoods west of Hennepin and in southwest in general to take displacement pressure off neighborhoods further east.	5/24/2018 14:48
1606	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I don't disagree with the corridor linear concept, but would also consider "hot spot" or more circular concepts to compliment the corridors. Specifically in the neighborhoods further away from downtown.	5/24/2018 15:37
1607	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Please consider limiting this to prevent a scenario with 2.5 floor dwellings on both sides of a 1 or 1.5 story single family home.	5/24/2018 16:09
1608	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Allowing small multifamily buildings in most of the city is great! Fourplexes are an elegant way to increase density in interior neighborhoods and help ameliorate a city-wide housing shortage. The lakes areas in southwest Minneapolis are especially important to accommodate more units because the existing exclusionary single-family zoning is designed specifically to separate Minneapolis by class. A very small increase in housing availability in this area is an important and necessary first step to begin undoing that segregation.	5/24/2018 16:57
1609	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I would like to know more than what is listed here	5/24/2018 21:00
1610	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The East and West sides of Hennepin should both be interior 3. The west side of Hennepin according to the draft plan is interior 2, which continues to reflect the redlining and racial covenants that still contribute to the disparities between neighboring neighborhoods. The areas along the future SWLRT should also be much denser, and give access to what will be an important transit line. There is no reason why areas along the green line in Kenwood should be treated differently than Longfellow.	5/24/2018 21:36

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1611	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am deeply concerned to the proposed rezoning of Nicollet Avenue and adjacent streets around 50th Street. This is a historic neighborhood with some of the oldest and most unique homes in the city. As a resident of this neighborhood, I would be absolutely devastated to see this area redeveloped as proposed by this plan. Many of the neighbors in this area have had their homes over many generations. Losing these homes or adjacent lots to developers for 6 story residential and commercial spaces would be a terrible mistake. In addition, this is a unique neighborhood in terms of its topography and proximity to the creek - it is extremely hilly and lots are irregular. It was designed and built around the creek, a critical part of our city's natural beauty. Construction projects like those proposed of this area could do serious damage to surrounding historic homes in this neighborhood as well as the creek and parkway. Please - those of us who live in this neighborhood have invested so much in it financially by purchasing and restoring these historic homes, as well as raising our families in the city, supporting local schools, parks and businesses. We are valuable contributors to the Minneapolis community. Please do not force us out of our neighborhood because of this plan. I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposed rezoning. Please omit this stretch of Nicollet (48th -54th) from the Corridor 6 rezoning.	5/25/2018 6:03
1612	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Area between 53rd and 57th streets on Lyndale should not be 6 or more stories. This does not fit with the neighborhood. This will also destroy home values on Aldrich.	5/25/2018 13:15
1613	/topics/land-use-built-form/	This designation should only be used for full block areas, corridor 6. Using this abutting corridor 3 destroys neighborhoods. It will cause people to leave and home values to decrease.	5/25/2018 13:18
1614	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am against the upzoning across the city and the push for higher density. I believe the development that has happened so far in Uptown has made the whole area much too congested. Not every neighborhood needs to be dense especially since we don't have the transportation funding to support density. I don't believe Minnesotans wil give up cars in winter unless there is light rail and that's years away at best.	5/25/2018 20:17
1615	/topics/land-use-built-form/	There should be a clear Orange Line station area at 46th & 35W. This area has major transit service, and should allow at least Corridor 6 density.	5/25/2018 21:54
1616	/topics/land-use-built-form/	This is absolutely devastating. You can be sure I will do everything I can to vote off every city council member possible. I have lived at 46th and Aldrich for almost 30 years. I have finished my upstairs and basement, redone the kitchen, landscaped my yard, added a porch, waterfall and privacy fence. Now, you've slated my house to be replaced by apartments with barely any tree cover. This block is a nice residential block and this plan destroys that. You were happy to jack up my property value earlier this year, now you've made my house unsellable. I am furious.	5/26/2018 23:37
1617	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Given virtually no involvement by the residents has been encouraged or enabled thus far, please postpone plans for this for a 12 month period to allow residents of Minneapolis (those for whom the city works for) to understand and involve themselves in the plans. My husband I and are highly considering leaving Minneapolis (which we love) because of the city, taxes and mismanagement of the authority with which we've entrusted in the leadership. If this goes through, it will make our decision that much easier.	5/27/2018 20:17
1618	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I'm very happy there is increased density around the lakes. Hopefully this will lead to housing that is more affordable. Living near a great park shouldn't be reserved for the wealthy and white. Hopefully denser uses will also mean less traffix. More people could walk or bike to the lakes instead of driving.	5/27/2018 21:28
1619	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I believe that ADUs should be able to be built on any city lot. Changes should be made so that they don't have to be owner-occupied to be built. This would be an easy way to add more housing without tearing anything down.	5/29/2018 18:18

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1620	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>The proposed 2040 PLAN is the very opposite of what should be used to guide the city towards a livable &amp; sustainable future. The simplistic notion that higher density built along virtually any bus route combined with new forced "zoning codes by right" is clearly a marriage of convenience between city planners and developers. This would eliminate the voices of neighborhood associations which have kept MPLS such a livable city. The use of the affordable housing crisis as leverage for driving support for this misguided new policy is specious. The current MPLS City Comprehensive Plan does create a struggle back and forth between all concerned in the process of development but that is what an active citizenry polis is supposed to be about. Better to be a bit messy and have all voices heard in the process than to have a smooth autocratic process rammed down the Cities neighborhoods.</p> <p>Encouraging more concentrated nodes of development (Built Forms) with enhanced walkability and modes of transport other than automobiles could better lead to more affordable housing stock mixed within the midst of such developed built up nodes. On the other hand the 2040 PLAN as written is a non-organic forced grid like development pattern which will likely lead to steep loss in property values of properties lying just adjacent to the newly granted zoning rights to develop four-plexes and higher density buildings "By Right of Ownership". Of course one might even wonder whether granting property developers such rights is by deign intended to have such an effect on single family dwellings.</p> <p>The proposed 2040 PLAN also makes no accommodation for limiting or encouraging more creative and healthier "Built Forms" in areas that are already overbuilt in terms of Building Structures &amp; Traffic. The area around the Northwest Corner of Lake Bde Maka Ska and the intersection of HWY 7 and Excelsior Blvd already has too much traffic volume, dangerous pedestrian crossings and unhealthy air quality. Location of a future LRT Transit station nearby this area will not by itself relieve these problems, and certainly will not have the desired positive effects on traffic mitigation if the area becomes zoned for even taller high rise buildings. Note if you will that this is the very same area that the City of MPLS and the MPLS Park Board have been trying to come up with a total redesign to mitigate these negative factors. The current draft CITY 2040 proposal would end up obliterating any future planned Park improvements.</p> <p>There are many areas in Minneapolis that lend themselves to further density but these require thoughtful guidance and planning that goes through a organic democratic process. large swaths of the city has absentee landowners that do little more than extract rents on decaying properties perhaps in hopes of future profits from sale of same property. Development of modern trolley lines strategically through parts of south Minneapolis for example could stimulate investment in new four-plexes and apartment buildings. More readily accessible mass transit and better neighborhood schools would help attract more families to whole areas of the city currently located near enough to downtown, the Mississippi river, or parks and lakes to be very attractive for mixed use housing, office and retail spaces. But this potential just sits there</p>	5/29/2018 23:08
1621	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Eliminate Interior 3 Transition Zones on Non-Transit Route Streets</p> <p>The most objections to the zoning proposal relate to the upzoning of adjacent blocks near transit routes. If a reasonably-scaled building (3-4 stories) is built on Bryant Avenue south of 38th Street, there should be no transition needed to the properties behind the new building. Alleys, yards, garages and trees act as a buffer. There are many buildings of this size on Bryant currently, and they work fine with the adjacent homes on Aldrich and Colfax Avenues. Zoning these quiet, non-transit side streets for 3-story, multi-lot developments actually erases the natural buffer that would exist and destroys the stability and character on hundreds of these quiet blocks throughout the city. Eliminate this and much opposition goes away.</p>	5/30/2018 13:54
1622	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The 1st and 2nd maps on this page do not line up. Why?	5/30/2018 14:19
1623	/topics/land-use-built-form/	53xx through 57xx Aldrich Ave South needs to be urban housing, not neighborhood mixed use. WHY! We do not want mixed use on these blocks.	5/30/2018 14:23
1624	/topics/land-use-built-form/	No place to comment on individual properties.	5/30/2018 14:24
1625	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Mixed information between maps and a lack of understanding of the corridor areas. I realize you talked to people but obviously not the area businesses and the residents to see what is wanted or needed.	5/30/2018 14:25
1626	/topics/land-use-built-form/	How can you explain areas designated as "urban neighborhood" in land use having "Interior 3" for an allowable building form? These seem to be in direct opposition to each other? This is wide spread on the suggested maps.	5/30/2018 14:26

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1627	/topics/land-use-built-form/	There are duplexes in the area of 54th and 43rd Ave S. They are not as well kept as the single family homes. There are a few four plexes also in the area. Again these are certainly not as well kept in terms outside appearances and off street parking areas. I would be very concerned if a single family home was torn down in favor of these types of multiple dwelling units owned by an investor. If they were owner occupied, I would be more willing to accept them.	5/31/2018 0:54
1628	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I would prefer that Lowry Hill have denser uses given the proximity to downtown. I am heartened by the emphasis in the comp plan of creating walkable areas with good transit. Parking is already limited in the neighborhood, and making it easier for residents to get around without driving will reduce the number parked cars as well as the amount of traffic. Good ideas!	5/31/2018 14:05
1629	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The city should really considering upping most of interior 2 to interior 3. The vacancy rate is around 2.5% now, and with projected population growth, the "upzoning" in the plan is probably not enough. If the population keeps increasing, which it will, and density is allowed as proposed, rents may not increase faster than they are now, but the also won't stabilize.	5/31/2018 17:28
1630	/topics/land-use-built-form/	There's been a lot of concern about teardowns of smaller homes that are replaced with McMansions, to the extent that some are concerned that we will allow larger structures to accommodate 2-4 unit structures and inadvertently just get much bigger single family homes. As a means of both addressing both concerns, what if in codifying the new zoning, there are stricter height, FAR, etc. restrictions for single family homes with bonuses allowing larger structures as units are added (up to the height and other limits in the proposed built form guidance)?  I think we do that with our existing zoning, but it's a feature we should roll forward.	5/31/2018 17:57
1631	/topics/land-use-built-form/	34th Avenue between 46th Street and 42nd Street is both only a few blocks from the 46th Street Station and served by the 46 bus. It should be designated as Corridor 4.  The block bounded by 44/45th Streets and 40th/41st Avenues is only a few block from the 46th Street Station and 46th Street, which carries the A line. That level of proximity to high quality transit should be designated for greater density than Interior 3. Perhaps Interior 3 would be more appropriate. Similarly, the northern half of the blocks of 42nd, 43rd, 44th and 45th Avenue between 46th and 45th Streets should also be Interior 3, being less than a block from the A line, 46 and 74.	6/1/2018 15:10
1632	/topics/land-use-built-form/	You are going to create a Hodge podge of Housing that is poorly planned out. You are way too loose on the rules and giving the city keys to the developer. FIRE HEATHER WORTHINGTON!!!!!! or you're fired FREY	6/1/2018 16:41
1633	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The height of housing in historic districts, like the Longfellow Community in South Minneapolis (especially near Minnehaha Falls Park) should be limited to 1.5 stories. The giant construction going up in our neighborhood is diminishing our character and draining the grid.  Thanks. Annie Welch anniemwelch@gmail.com	6/1/2018 19:59
1634	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Before the city spends one penny of my tax money on new "affordable" housing (at \$1,700 a month?! - what a joke.), it should spend whatever it takes to bring all of the housing run by slum landlords (i.e. Mahmood Khan and his ilk - why are they so untouchable?@!)into compliance with city codes and/or sue the pants off those slum landlords, confiscate their properties, and fix them up so that they are safe, secure, and livable to those families already living there. Stop forcing low income tenants to move from one awful place to another. It's disruptive to their lives and too expensive for them to bear.  In this, the greatest nation on earth (ha!), why can't we make housing safe and secure for everyone without making it a money-maker for the already rich?  <a href="http://www.startribune.com/minneapolis-mayor-meets-with-angry-tenants-facing-eviction/484364061/">http://www.startribune.com/minneapolis-mayor-meets-with-angry-tenants-facing-eviction/484364061/</a>  I'm angry as hell and I'm not even a tenant. City Council, enforce housing codes and repair housing for those families who work so hard to stay in our city.	6/2/2018 13:27

## Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1635	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I live in south Minneapolis right now, and my friend lives on 52nd and Penn, not far from my house. At this point, the area around my friends house is a very peaceful neighborhood with interior 1 low density housing mainly. His house is also very close to the famous newton ave sledding hill. On snow days, this hill/park is filled with people coming from as many as 10 blocks away! If the proposed built form guidelines as they are now were put into place, eventually this area would have dense apartment buildings, and many people. The newton hill park would be crazy! This would not be fun for anybody, as the crowds already make you wait to sled down the hill, with so many kids at the bottom, in fear of colliding with someone. Along this area of the Penn ave transit route, it would be much more ideal to have interior 2 or 3 buildings along Penn ave (interior 2 being far preferred), instead of the corridor 4 that is being proposed now. Corridor 4 would make this area far too populated. Thank you for considering my (and others) opinion.	6/3/2018 3:05
1636	/topics/land-use-built-form/	This area on James Avenue between Lake of The Isles Parkway and "Mall" is currently zoned R1. It should not be changed to Urban 3. It is one of the few remaining neighborhoods that represent "old uptown," or the way most of uptown looked prior to 2000. Many of the homes were built at the turn of the century and are currently still well maintained. This short street is also an important part of the park system. Pedestrians love to walk down it and see old uptown's classic homes. Please do not change this character. Also, consider making it a historic district or just vacate the street entirely and give it to the park board.	6/3/2018 16:46
1637	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I live at Emerson Ave South and 59th and am totally opposed to building large buildings with more than 3 stories " especially if they are not required to have off street parking for each unit built. Creating high density shopping and housing along Lyndale will create the type of congestion and crime that uptown is now experiencing rather than the quiet, homey residential neighborhood that we purchased our homes to enjoy. Small three story building with shops and parking would be fine, large, tall buildings would ruin the neighborhood.	6/3/2018 19:32
1638	/topics/land-use-built-form/	It is not clear to me how affordable housing will be accomplished. New construction is generally more expensive. Most increased density in other cities has not resulted in lower rents - show data that supports this plan.	6/4/2018 15:17
1639	/topics/land-use-built-form/	West Side of Nicollet Ave. between Valleyview Place and Minnehaha Parkway: Allowing higher density housing in this area would strain existing roads. Minnehaha Parkway is single lane with no direct access to main routes such as Nicollet Ave. Present day traffic must wind through the neighborhood in order to enter or exit. This would make a usable situation today into a traffic congested mess. Bigger questions: Do we really want the character of our neighborhood ruined by a high density land use plan? Who really benefits from such a situation? Land developers or residents?	6/4/2018 19:57

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1640	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>On the built-form map my 4600 block of Aldrich Av S is proposed to get rezoned to Interior 3 and Corridor 4. Currently my block of 4600 Aldrich Av S is composed of all single family homes. We do not approve of or agree with this block being rezoned to Interior 3 and Corridor 4. We would prefer to keep this block Interior 1 and or Interior 2.</p> <p>In the drawings for Interior 3 and Corridor 4, all of the buildings are built right up to the edge of the lot line. We request and require more green space mandated in Interior 2 - Corridor 4.</p> <p>There needs to be language in the plan that protects home owners from eminent domain, i.e. my single family home being taken from me by eminent domain for re-development purposes.</p> <p>For overall comments on the 2040 Plan, we would prefer to see major changes to currently single family home blocks delayed or phased in over time. Start re-development in areas of the city with abandoned or run down housing first and make those areas successful. In addition, concentrate the high density apartment buildings in areas that already have that kind of development potential. For example, do a more complete job of re-developing Nicollet Av S from Eat Street get rid of k_mart eye sore, re-open Nicollet and fully develop the potential along the Greenway, and along Nicollett, Blaisdell, Lyndale, Lake St. etc. before radically altering single family home blocks which are already in good shape and fully occupied by taxpaying owners.</p> <p>In addition, there are parts of the city in which land use is already terrible and wasted. Box box stores and businesses, single story suburban type development that should be changed to business on the ground floor and housing above. 56th and Lyndale is one example, the space could be better built and used. Walgreens operates a 1 story building that looks like it should be in Ham Lake.</p> <p>Lastly, I am highly concerned with loss of green space and lack of environmental standards in the new building and zoning proposal. Not enough green space, not enough mitigation for rainwater runoff. the plan should ensure green building including green rooftops, spaces for pollinators and wildlife and setbacks for green boulevards as well as some requirements for solar and renewable energy.</p> <p>Brian Crotteau 4605 Aldrich Av S. Minneapolis MN 55419 612-703-2375</p>	6/4/2018 21:06
1641	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Hi. The Proposed Built Form Corridor 4 running up Grand Street NE from Lowry is a bit of a dead end. This is a quiet neighborhood that happens to have a bus route on it (and maybe the bus route should be on Marshall Street NE anyway). It should not be a corridor similar to the illustration you have shown for Corridor 4. 4 stories is two stories higher than anything there now. Leave this type of building height for Lowry and Marshall Street, not in a small neighborhood with 40-foot lot widths. Please plan higher density projects in areas that are not already quite two story neighborhoods, just because there happens to be a bus route on it. thanks!</p>	6/5/2018 14:33
1642	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Connectivity! Create functional ecological networks that conserve biodiversity and provide for sustainable use of natural resources. Enhance ecological habitat connectivity by creating a network of wildlife corridors, connected natural areas, resilient to environmental challenges. Wildlife need to move. They need to access resources, ensure gene flow, shift their ranges, and establish new territories, among other things. Connected landscapes allow for the movement of plants and wildlife and facilitate ecological processes. As climate change and other stressors act on the landscape, connectivity is critical to allowing wildlife to adapt to changing conditions.</p>	6/5/2018 16:02
1643	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Corridor 4 - way too built up for neighborhoods. Totally inappropriate density. No limit on building height? Why is interior 3 protected at 3 stories but corridor 4 across the street could soar to 2 times that height? These are neighborhoods not warehouses to stack people like pallets.</p>	6/6/2018 15:21
1644	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>As a lifelong Minneapolis resident I oppose the plan to rezone my neighborhood. I can easily see large buildings built that are financially inaccessible to residents of this area, and I can't support a plan that doesn't guarantee the land will be used for the benefit of the people living here.</p>	6/7/2018 0:26
1645	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Why would you zone Justice Page middle school to be a Corridor 6 parcel? This suggests that a developer could purchase this property and turn it into an Apartment complex. On paper, this piece of land looks very appealing to a developer. Please remove the school from your plan. This does not align with the understanding that the school board and the city are two different entities, and suggests that everyone is OK with this. I live around the corner and expect my daughter to go to school here one day. NOT OK.</p>	6/7/2018 2:43

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1646	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Regarding the Kenilworth Corridor adjacent to Cedar Lake Park on the east side between the Kenilworth Channel and West Franklin Avenue: When the Met Council decided to locate electrified LRT within feet of ethanol-carrying freight rail, the City of Minneapolis negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding that requires any land not directly needed for the SWLRT project to remain in public ownership. Further, a Kenilworth Station Area Art and Landscape Committee -- part of the SWLRT project -- has invested many, many hours and thousands of dollars into designing the corridor with environmental protection (to the extent possible) and aesthetics in mind. My understanding is that this plan was approved by the City of Minneapolis and the Met Council. This plan does not include housing on the small bit of land that will be left when freight rail, passenger rail, and bicycle and pedestrian paths are built. I would refer you to the SWLRT design plans to understand how the Southwest Project Office expects the space to work.	6/8/2018 14:29
1647	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Franklin Avenue West of Hennepin is not a bus route. I don't believe it ever has been a bus route. During the many hours I spent in SWLRT committee meetings of various types, I asked the question, "What will future transit connections look like?" I was told that the only bus route would be a continuation of the #25 bus that currently runs along 21st to Penn then up to Douglas Ave. I have a traffic study memo from the SWLRT Section 106 committee to this effect if you're interested in seeing it. - Jeanette Colby	6/8/2018 14:38
1648	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Kenwood Parkway is a historic district, and part of the Historic Grand Rounds. It would be inappropriate, and conflict with your policies relating to Historic Preservation, to designate any part of the Parkway as Interior 3 or 4.	6/8/2018 14:45
1649	/topics/land-use-built-form/	“We all want progress, but if you're on the wrong road, progress means doing an about-turn and walking back to the right road; in that case, the man who turns back soonest is the most progressive.” C. S. Lewis You need to go back to the drawing board on this inequitable built form plan	6/10/2018 1:37
1650	/topics/land-use-built-form/	“We all want progress, but if you're on the wrong road, progress means doing an about-turn and walking back to the right road; in that case, the man who turns back soonest is the most progressive.” C. S. Lewis You need to go back to the drawing board on this inequitable built form plan	6/10/2018 1:38
1651	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I support the use of land-use and built form maps in tandem. I think the urban neighborhood land use should be more accomodating to different types of uses. There are many great corner stores in these areas already, including in my neighborhood. The land use map seems to imply that those types of stores would no longer be allowed. These are great community assets and we need to be more flexible about where retail and services are located. Don't specify what uses are allowed where, the planning commission shouldn't waste their time reviewing whether or not a barber shop can open on my neighborhood corner. let the market decide!	6/12/2018 2:01
1652	/topics/land-use-built-form/	We have many 80s buildings that have a long building face on the block, and half the lot is surface parking behind. Especially when these are on the end of a block, it creates a jarring gap in the building fabric. Allow infill housing on those rear surface parking lots that match the surrounding built form heights and massing. This mirrors the original built form of neighborhoods, where end-of-block lots were subdivided into thirds and 3 homes were built (instead of 1 as they were along the rest of the block). This essentially ensures ADUs-type infill is allowed on any site throughout the city.	6/12/2018 13:03
1653	/topics/land-use-built-form/	This is WAY TOO MUCH Re Zoning in SW Mpls. This is a plan for a million plus people. Give me a break don't give the keys to the developers.	6/12/2018 15:05
1654	/topics/land-use-built-form/	In the industrial area south of 24th street between Minnehaha and the LRT line, land use is production and processing but built form is Ransit 10 that doesn't allow single story. In Minneapolis, there is not going to be any production or warehouse facilities built that are more than one story. The economics just doesn't work.	6/12/2018 21:31
1655	/topics/land-use-built-form/	In the industrial area south of 24th street between Minnehaha and the LRT line, land use is production and processing but built form is Ransit 10 that doesn't allow single story. In Minneapolis, there is not going to be any production or warehouse facilities built that are more than one story. The economics just doesn't work.	6/12/2018 22:52

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1656	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Increasing density and destroying green spaces, the main goals of the 2040 proposal, along already housing-dense and traffic-jammed neighborhoods such as Nicollet Avenue are threats to the public health because they will damage the already fragile environment permanently. 2040 is in direct conflict with the 2013 "Minneapolis Climate Action Plan" to "Promote and strengthen green infrastructure and natural systems that can build resilience, sequester or reduce emissions, and improve our neighborhoods." (Page 23)</p> <p>The mayor and city council back then understood the facts that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Global warming "will have catastrophic impacts" on Minneapolis residents.(Page 1)</li> <li>2. That those impacts include "intense heat waves, increasingly common more prevalent water-and-insect-borne diseases and a greater number of days with low air quality." (Page 5)</li> <li>3. That these intense heat waves will result "in an increase in heat-related deaths and heat related illnesses" (Page 5) including asthma which, by the way is more common among children living in poverty.</li> <li>4. And, that all these public health catastrophes are made worse or caused by an increase in pavement and buildings in a neighborhood and a corresponding decrease in green spaces. (page 5)</li> </ol> <p>So, one of my questions to the writers and promoters of the 2040 proposal is who is supposed to benefit from this proposal? It certainly is not the current and future residents of already housing-dense and traffic-jammed neighborhoods like Nicollet Avenue unless those residents include property developers. It certainly is not those of us who live in these neighborhoods who care about the environment in which our children and grandchildren will live. It is not those of us who want to stop the effects of global warming on Minneapolis.</p> <p>So, ditch this plan and start again with real residents and the fragile environment as top priorities so that Minneapolis will remain a city we can breath in.</p>	6/13/2018 12:11
1657	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I wish I could state more eloquently...This is an awful plan! We currently live 2 doors in from 50th Street and can hardly drive down our street in the winter! We have a few rental properties on our street which adds to the congestion: 6 tenants - 6 cars, etc. Add to that our street is used for parking for the businesses on 50th. We would really like to have more time to be convinced that this plan is a livable one. Also would like to see some data that supports the assertion that more affordable housing would become available.</p>	6/14/2018 20:03
1658	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I live on the 3000 block of Colfax Ave S, a residential block that is all houses and this built form map calls for the unacceptable consolidation of lots to build larger buildings (interior 3). Did city staff visit each block before creating this map - seems unlikely. Also, this built form map is not in alignment with the Uptown Small Area plan that many neighbors spent over a year on. This has the potential to make my block an unpleasant place to live. This must change.</p>	6/15/2018 23:47
1659	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>We all tried this before, we built these terrible homes with the help of the city in the 70's and allowed whatever cheap design the developer wanted and put these right in the middle of bungalow's with out regards to neighborhood design or the style of the sorrounding homes..we still live with these eye sores today... thanks for destorying our beautiful bungalow community... I hope the first high density home goes next to yours...</p>	6/16/2018 14:56
1660	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>There is a need for housing at all levels of income, why are we picking winners and losers, I know a couple who lost their prospective home to a developer because the developer was assured they could build a building that would not adhere to the the current zoning laws. This young couple were going to invest and fix up the house, now values of homes around going down all around this property, instead of increasing which would have been the case with a couple willing to fix it up....</p>	6/16/2018 15:03
1661	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>What is the plan to help the people who have been great citizens of this community and now looking at a huge reduction in the value of their property when these huge terrible looking homes go next to them? Who are protesting these people?</p>	6/16/2018 15:07
1662	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Why are you having public input to this? You have already implemented it...we have seen the counsel zoning meetings and the always side with the development of these new high density houses..</p>	6/16/2018 15:11
1663	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>What's the plan to help reduce the property taxes for the great citizens who are now being forced to live next to these huge high density houses? We have seen it happen already, values are going down... don't kid yourself...</p>	6/16/2018 15:13



# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1664	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>"Excessive Heat Wave Warning Triple Digit Heat Indices June 15- June 16, 8PM, 2018" Kare 11 Meteorologist Laura Betker</p> <p>"Heat Indices 95-100 degrees until tomorrow" NPR's Ron Trendera, June 16, 2018</p> <p>"Heat Index of 95-100 degrees until tomorrow" KSTP's meteorologist Sam Ryan, June 16, 2018</p> <p>Summer hasn't even officially begun.</p> <p>Why are the City Council and the Mayor proposing an increase in the density of crowded neighborhoods like Nicollet Ave and a corresponding destruction of green space when we are already suffering the effects of global warming in Minneapolis caused, in great part, by those two things??? It seems that you are either ignorant of the catastrophic public health impacts of the destruction of green space and the environment or you don't care.</p> <p>STOP NOW!</p> <p>Begin Again and put the residents first in your proposal. Ignore the property developers or we will be another Los Angeles or just as bad, another Uptown.</p>	6/16/2018 17:48
1665	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Building monstrous fourplexes on single family home lots in the interior streets will not only take away from the neighborhood and destroy the most affordable single family homes in the city, it will also create a traffic nightmare during the winter. Why canâ€™t we discuss building more affordable housing on transit routes where it makes sense for people to not require cars, they can literally walk out the front door and step on the bus.</p> <p>We donâ€™t want to see the integrity of our neighborhood demolished along with the homes that are by far the most affordable for growing families, only to have a large apartment building which will inevitably charge rent that is not affordable.</p>	6/17/2018 2:06
1666	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Land Use: Need to allow commercial! All residents including those who move more slowly deserve at least the chance to live within a 5 minute walk of a cafe, bar, or other gathering space open most of the day.</p>	6/18/2018 20:48
1667	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>LANDUSE: Our parks are our public backyards -- we need to encourage higher density housing and mixed use spaces in &amp; around them, rather than limiting them to the wealthiest Minneapolitians. Beyond the racial &amp; economical equity implications allowing more people reasons to be in &amp; near our parks helps increase eyes on the parks &amp; public safety! And cafes adjacent can help bring more quasi-public restroom to the parks so that they are more accessible to the elderly, those with children, etc.</p>	6/18/2018 20:51
1668	/topics/land-use-built-form/	....	6/18/2018 20:56
1669	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>LAND USE: Climate change is real! We nee to build for resiliency by reducing care dependence &amp; the burden of maintaining roads for heavy vehicles that damage them exponentially more than bikes and walking. This zoning as proposed fails to allow us the flexibility we need to welcome displaced people, to keep gas price hikes from being a regressive tax on the already poor.</p>	6/18/2018 21:05
1670	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>I like that the Destination Mixed Use corridor designation extends down Nicollet and Chicago Avenues into the Loring and Elliot Park neighborhoods - n.hood resident</p>	6/19/2018 19:24
1671	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>In the Built Form District descriptions all of the districts from Transit 4 to Transit 30 include a final sentence that says â€œRequests to exceed x stories will be evaluated on the basis of whether or not a taller building is a reasonable means for further achieving Comprehensive Plan goals.â€ This to me suggests that Conditional Use can be a valuable tool for the City to encourage things like affordable housing and active ground floor space, etc.</p> <p>The draft Built Form Plan appears like it will reduce the use/need for Conditional Use permits by significantly increasing heights. Perhaps a different approach would be to keep allowable heights lower, and instead more clearly define for both developers and residents what the expectations of conditional use are. This way you might achieve both higher density and higher pay back to the community.</p>	6/19/2018 20:28

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1672	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am very concerned that this plan will lead to the wholesale demolition of single family homes to construct duplexes and 4-plexes in their place. This will destroy the fabric of our neighborhood and put untold numbers of houses in the shade of their giant new neighbors. People choose to live in a neighborhood for a reason, to change the nature of a neighborhood is to rob residents of their choice.	6/20/2018 0:30
1673	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I am a 30 year old woman currently living in the Stevens Square neighborhood and have lived in Minneapolis my entire life. Stevens Square is a dense neighborhood of condominiums and apartment buildings and it is an overcrowded, loud, incredibly stressful environment severely lacking in green space that I one day wish to escape. I grew up in a beautiful stucco single family home, with a yard, on a quiet tree lined street in Southwest Minneapolis and plan to one day move back to that peaceful environment. Minneapolis 2040 and the rezoning plans will destroy that. It will destroy our neighborhoods and their beauty that is so attractive to people. More density brings more noise, more stress, a destruction of green space. Bigger is NOT better. Most people do not want to live in an apartment their entire lives. Nobody wants to raise kids in an apartment, they want a house with a yard. This will NOT bring down housing costs, with the addition of all the housing in recent years housing costs have continued to rise. You are making this city unaffordable. If I wanted to live in an overpriced apartment in an overcrowded, loud, dirty city I would move to New York. You would sell our homes and our neighborhoods to developers in the name of human greed. Minneapolis 2040 will be the end of Minneapolis and must be changed.	6/20/2018 15:02
1674	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The specific plan to add 3-6 story zoning in Tangletown (and other single family home neighborhoods) is a disaster. As life long residents of Mpls and graduates of Washburn High School, we are growing increasingly tiresome of the city's apparent disregard (or lack of priority) in creating a family-friendly city. We have spent years advocating for our neighborhood schools, parks, and associations. It is becoming increasingly clear families are not the primary concern of either The Minneapolis School District, the Park Board, or the city at large. Unfortunately, it seems like The City would prefer we move to the suburbs, which is frustrating to Mpls-lifers like us. We're not LA or New York or Chicago; that's what is unique and great about Minneapolis, so don't make them your role model for urban development. Do we really need to have high rise condos and commercial space the entire Nicollet corridor? If this bulldozing of single family homes in our neighborhood is approved, we'll do all we can to un-elect the current mayor and our city representatives; then move to the 'burbs (but again, that's probably what you all want anyways).	6/20/2018 18:04
1675	/topics/land-use-built-form/	600 block of Queen Ave South, East side is proposed Corridor 4. This block is better suited for interior 2, because it is separated from Penn ave by a large vacant lot. The west side of 600 blk Queen ave south should be Interior 2 as well. Due to the surrounding mndot right of way, the proposed corridor 4 block would be too far from Penn to have the desired effect. I think if you view the site in person, you would see what i mean, I dont have the expertise to properly describe the issue correctly.	6/20/2018 19:48
1676	/topics/land-use-built-form/	Zoning lots at 47th and Aldrich the same as those on the edge of downtown for multi-lot apartment buildings is ridiculous. Destabilizing a great neighborhood, devaluing homes and driving people who want single family areas to the suburbs will be the net result. Cities should have areas for all types of homes - jamming apartments everywhere accomplishes nothing positive. Please listen to the people who have invested their life savings in their homes and place our wants above those of a potential renter in 2030 who needs a place to rent until he/she moves to the suburbs to start their family, since they want a house versus any apartment.	6/20/2018 23:27
1677	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The Nicollet Island Inn should be historically protected if it isn't already.	6/21/2018 18:03
1678	/topics/land-use-built-form/	The Nicollet Island Inn property should be historically protected if it isn't already.	6/21/2018 18:05
1679	/topics/land-use-built-form/	I would like to see this plot become an extension of Gateway Park to support plans for the renovation of the Post Office.	6/21/2018 18:06

# Minneapolis 2040 Website Comments (Phase 5: 3/22/18 - 6/22/18)

1680	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>50th Street South. This plan will wipe out entire tree lined neighborhoods that today are vibrant and wonderful to live in. The 50th street development built maps show 3 and 4 story building being built well into what are now wonderful neighborhood streets. The maps must be amended to only allow 2 story buildings along 50th to one lot size into the neighborhood streets. To allow 3 and 4 story (or more if approved) halfway down the current side streets on 50th would produce a crisis in traffic, overshadow single family homes with commercial and apt buildings is not the way to help our city grow. We want to grow and provide affordable housing but we must maintain our wonderful neighborhoods. There needs to be a more thoughtful approach to existing residents and homes. I am angry that you are so cavalier with people's homes and lives that you do not see the impact to those of us living on or close to the transit corridors.</p> <p>The residential 1 built map must also be amended to only include single family or at most, a duplex style home. Allowing a 4 plex to be built anywhere in the interior will lessen surrounding property values.</p> <p>Is there going to be a building code ensuring that any new buildings keep the historical look of the neighborhoods? If not, tall cheap modern boxes will be built alongside wonderful old single family homes.</p> <p>Allowing this plan to go forward as written is a terrible travesty and the people who will be hurt are the existing residents in the affected neighborhoods and the beneficiaries will be corporations who buy up old homes and turn them into 3 and 4 story ugly modern cheap looking boxes. The corporations have no stake in the community or neighborhoods thus higher rents will be demanded and affordable housing goals will not be met. People who live here have a stake and ensure a wonderful vibrant neighborhood. Please do not tear our neighborhoods apart. Existing residents deserve better than this.</p>	6/21/2018 18:15
1681	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Councilmember Schroeder, Are you seriously thinking about the closing of Justice Page Middle School? Education should be the priority here, not dense, low"er" income housing! You are doing a disservice to the beautiful, historical areas of Minneapolis and should be ashamed of yourself for being a sheep! Education is the answer to get rid of the need for more low"er" income housing (disguised in this plan as "Population Shifts").</p> <p>I am 100% opposed to this 2040 plan as the future of Minneapolis. This will force out people who are proud of Minneapolis, and are willing to put up with the insane taxation for very few city services to begin with. I grew up here and have lived here for the majority of my life. With this sort of "threat" in the name of progress, I can say...the suburbs are looking better and better! I hope there is a plan to double the budget for the Police and Fire Departments as well.</p> <p>Sir, Please reconsider this plan.</p> <p>Michael P. Kuehn W. Minnehaha Pkwy</p>	6/21/2018 20:35
1682	/topics/land-use-built-form/	<p>Can I just say what a relief to seek out someone who actually knows what theyre talking about on the internet. You undoubtedly know how one can bring a problem to mild and make it important. More people have to read this and perceive this aspect of the story. I cant believe youre no more common because you undoubtedly have the gift.</p> <p>Fitflops Sale <a href="http://www.fitflopssaleclearanceuk.com">http://www.fitflopssaleclearanceuk.com</a></p>	6/22/2018 4:21