



# APPENDIX G1: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMENT TRACKER

Cultivate Hopkins Comprehensive Plan

11/17/20 DRAFT



## Comprehensive Plan Comments

Notifications were sent to the following affected jurisdictions for the required comprehensive plan six-month comment period, which ran from **September 12, 2018 to March 12, 2019**. This matches the list of jurisdictions provided by the Metropolitan Council through the Local Planning Handbook website. Comments received, and responses to those comments, are attached. If no comment is provided, it is because the jurisdiction did not respond within the six-month comment period.

The following summary also includes comments and responses from the Metropolitan Council’s preliminary review of the draft plan, which was initiated during the six-month review period, as well as comments from the August 28, 2018 public hearing.

Agency/Jurisdiction	Contact Name	Response Received?
City of Edina	Cary Teague	No
City of Minnetonka	Julie Wischnack	No
City of St. Louis Park	Karen Barton	No
Hennepin County	Katie Walker	No
Hopkins School District #270	Rhoda Mhiripiri-Reed	No
Edina School District #273	John Schultz	No
St. Louis Park School District #283	Astein Osei	No
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	James Wisker	Yes
Nine Mile Creek Watershed District	Randy Anhorn	Yes
Three Rivers Park District	Ann Rexine	Yes
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR)	Martha Vickery	Yes
Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)	Development Reviews Coordinator	Yes

In addition to the responses noted above, the City of Hopkins received comments from:

- Great Plains Institute
- Center for Economic Inclusion
- Several residents who commented via the City’s online comment portal

These are included in the following summary.

Following the completion of the interjurisdictional review, the plan was updated based on comments received. The plan was brought before a Planning Commission public hearing on **May 28, 2019**, and a resolution for plan submittal was approved by the City Council on **June 18, 2019**. See **Appendix H1** for documentation of those meetings.

## City of Hopkins Comprehensive Plan Comment Tracker

Comments from six-month interjurisdictional review, Metropolitan Council preliminary review, agency review, and 8/28/18 public hearing

<b>Introduction</b>			
Advisory Comments			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Response</b>
1.	<p>Page 6 describes the public engagement tools and strategies that informed the comprehensive plan. The Center supports the City for designing a process intended to engage all segments of the community. In particular the “Take It To Them” meetings were focused on reaching people who are usually underrepresented in public engagement processes. The Center encourages the City to go beyond the descriptions of the strategies and their intent by reporting --in the plan’s narrative» how effective these efforts were at engaging all segments of the community. Appendix A2 notes that only 10% of respondents to the Cultivate Hopkins survey were POC, while 27% of respondents to the Race &amp; Equity survey were non-white. In both cases, the participation falls short of the City’s 40% share of People of Color. Also, what is the significance of the demographics of the survey samples and the other engagement activities? How might it have affected the themes identified in the plan?</p> <p>The Center applauds the plan’s assertion (on page 9) that the City’s diversity “isn’t just a change in composition — it’s driving growth.” This statement is followed by a discussion of demographics, recognizing that population growth in Hopkins is driven by People of Color. The Center urges the City to expand this discussion of growth beyond population to economic growth: including everyone in the economy is the path to prosperity for all.</p>	Center for Economic Inclusion	Added preface to Appendix A2 to describe city’s approach to engagement, identifying current shortcomings and clarifying that the city has a commitment to ongoing progress in this area.
2.	Molly Van Avery is a friend/neighbor of mine – I love the poetry wagon!	Great Plains Institute	Comment acknowledged
3.	Include numbers in table of contents	8/28/18 Planning	Numbers have been added

		Commission public input	
4.	Let's keep calling out that this is the land of indigenous people. The phrasing at the top of the plan can be read as if the treaties establishing US settlement were fair. In telling the history we have got to call out the war on native Americans and the conquest of America.	Nathan Miller, online comment portal	The plan currently acknowledges that this is originally the land of indigenous people

Forecasts																																													
Advisory Comments																																													
Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response																																										
1.	<p>Council staff find that recent population and employment growth have significantly exceeded what was expected in the current decade. Council staff recommends making the following immediate adjustment to the population and employment forecasts, as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2">Census 2010</th> <th rowspan="2">Estimates 2017</th> <th colspan="3">City Preliminary Plan Forecasts</th> <th colspan="3">Council Staff Recommended Forecasts</th> </tr> <tr> <th>2020</th> <th>2030</th> <th>2040</th> <th>2020</th> <th>2030</th> <th>2040</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Population</td> <td>17,591</td> <td>19,079</td> <td>18,900</td> <td>19,600</td> <td>20,100</td> <td>20,100</td> <td>21,000</td> <td>21,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Households</td> <td>8,366</td> <td>8,765</td> <td>9,300</td> <td>9,800</td> <td>10,100</td> <td>9,300</td> <td>9,800</td> <td>10,100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Employment</td> <td>11,009</td> <td>16,825</td> <td>14,700</td> <td>15,500</td> <td>16,200</td> <td>17,000</td> <td>18,000</td> <td>19,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Census 2010	Estimates 2017	City Preliminary Plan Forecasts			Council Staff Recommended Forecasts			2020	2030	2040	2020	2030	2040	Population	17,591	19,079	18,900	19,600	20,100	20,100	21,000	21,800	Households	8,366	8,765	9,300	9,800	10,100	9,300	9,800	10,100	Employment	11,009	16,825	14,700	15,500	16,200	17,000	18,000	19,000	Met Council	Forecasts adjusted in Appendix B2 and throughout plan to be consistent with recommended values
	Census 2010				Estimates 2017	City Preliminary Plan Forecasts			Council Staff Recommended Forecasts																																				
		2020	2030	2040		2020	2030	2040																																					
Population	17,591	19,079	18,900	19,600	20,100	20,100	21,000	21,800																																					
Households	8,366	8,765	9,300	9,800	10,100	9,300	9,800	10,100																																					
Employment	11,009	16,825	14,700	15,500	16,200	17,000	18,000	19,000																																					

## BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Land Use			
Incomplete Comments			
Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response
1.	On pages 32 and B1-20, the Plan states that the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) recommends higher minimum residential densities of 50 units/acre in transit station areas. This is incorrect. It is not a recommendation, but rather a minimum requirement related to the regional transportation system for cities with the community designation of Urban Center. The areas identified in the Plan for redevelopment within the City's three station areas are guided with ranges of 20–100 units/acre for the Downtown Hopkins station area (Downtown Center guiding	Met Council	Modified text to describe that sites adjacent to station platform areas are guided for higher densities (50-120 units/acre) as opposed to the periphery (25-50 u/a)

<b>Land Use</b>			
	<p>land use) and a range of 20—60 units/acre in the Shady Oak Road and Blake Road station areas (Activity Center guiding land use).</p> <p>On pages 32 and B1-20, the Plan suggests that the density range is lower and broader than otherwise would be because of its application city-wide. The Plan also states that there is an “expectation that densities like these are achievable and encouraged on redevelopment parcels in the station area, and that the City will work to support this.” However, figures in the Plan that identify redevelopment areas and guiding land use (Figures 81.7, 81.8, 81.9, and B1 .11) indicate that most of these areas fall within the 1/2 mile station area. Our records show that most recent development in Hopkins’ station areas meet the minimum 50 units/acre; and in some cases, recent projects likely exceed the maximum density of 100 units/acre, such as the Gallery Flats project at 135 units/acre.</p> <p>On pages 32 and B1-20, the Plan states that it will “work to support” higher density development. While the City has clearly demonstrated this, such a statement is not sufficient to ensure that sites near the region’s transit system are preserved by the comprehensive plan for projects at densities that are consistent with the regional investment, market context, and the minimum density required by the TPP.</p> <p>Staff offer some suggestions for rectifying these inconsistencies. Please keep in mind that the minimum density is an average of the minimum density of planned land uses for areas guided for development and redevelopment. The City could guide some locations at higher minimum densities (e.g., 75 units/acre) and some with lower (e.g., 40 units/acre). Aside from creating a new land use category, the Plan could differentiate among minimum densities based on location (eg, within 1/4 mile of the station or along certain corridors).</p>		
<b>Advisory Comments</b>			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	On page B1-36, and in Table B1.13, the Plan describes zoning that is inconsistent with the policies related to densities that are proposed in the Plan. The zoning indicates that less dense development (as low as 10 units/acre in the Downtown Center, Activity Center, and Neighborhood Center) is possible under these	Met Council	Clarified that zoning will be updated to match future land use guidance after plan completion

<b>Land Use</b>			
	regulations, but that higher densities “could be approved” through the City’s planned unit development and conditional use permit processes. This contradicts the policy intent of the guiding land use, creates an inconsistency between the comprehensive plan and official controls, and appears to contradict the Recommendations section on page F1-5, which relates to implementation of zoning changes.		B1pg 7 and F1pg 5
2.	Based on recent housing market analysis for the three transit station areas, the Plan suggests (Page B1-4) that a forecast increase may be warranted through a comprehensive plan amendment. We encourage the City to propose a forecast adjustment now as part of the formal Plan submittal, and to consult staff before doing so. The 2014 Marquette Advisor’s study that the Plan cites suggests a market-driven capacity of 2,424 units for the three station areas combined. This is much higher than the forecasted growth, which can be accommodated by the Plan at minimum guided densities (notwithstanding the inconsistency of guiding densities being lower than minimum requirements of the TPP).	Met Council	Incorporate forecast adjustment in the plan as recommended
3.	On page B1-40, the Plan states that the aspiration for density in station areas is “closer to 75-100 units per acre.” This statement conforms to and supports land use policy in the TPP, but it does not align with the guiding densities in two of the station areas (Activity Center 20—60du/acre.)	Met Council	Modified text to clarify that areas closer to station will be guided for higher densities
4.	On page B1-40, Table B1.17 identifies incorrect time ranges. Presumably, the timeframes should be 2015-2020, 2021—2030, and 2031-2040. Please clarify and note related comments under Housing.	Met Council	Made corrections to time ranges where appropriate
5.	On page 28, include reference to the fact that the land use approach is different than in other communities, and add percentages of land use acreages.	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Made changes as suggested
6.	On page 31, du/ac should be spelled out “dwelling units per acre”	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Made change as suggested Table B.17 and B1.5
7.	On page 36, clarify policy on preserving and enhancing existing housing units to make it clear it is not intended to imply direct subsidy	8/28/18 Planning	Made change as suggested

Land Use			
		Commission public input	
8.	<p>I work for Cargill at Excelsior Crossings and live in The Moline. Graduated college in 2015 with a Business &amp; Technology degree. I'm from Wichita, Kansas originally. High-level thoughts: I love increasing density and diversity. I wish my home town planned like this. This makes me want to invest in Hopkins.</p> <p>General rule: Kill the golf courses! Kill the parking lots! Love seeings this as a transformational plan in terms of zoning Side note: I want to see rooftop patios and incredible green spaces. For inspiration of making the arts community work with small businesses: See Douglas Design District in Wichita How do we attract a Spyhouse coffee location to Hopkins? I think that we have to consider many of the ways this plan could fail. How do we prevent implementation of the plan under delivering? How do we protect from Developers taking advantage of Hopkins? How do we ensure ethics and accountability?</p>	Nathan Miller, online comment portal	Comment acknowledged

Transportation			
Incomplete Comments			
Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response
1.	Identify the future number of lanes for principal and A—minor arterial roadways.	Met Council	Included in Figure B2.1
2.	Map current heavy commercial traffic volumes on principal and A-minor arterials.	Met Council	Volumes are already shown on Figure B2-11
3.	Identify any local roadway issues or problem areas for goods movement, such as weight—restricted roads or bridges, bridges with insufficient height or width clearances, locations with unprotected road crossings of active rail lines, or intersections with inadequate turning radii.	Met Council	Provided information as requested
Advisory Comments			
Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response
1.	Page 197, paragraph 3, consider the following replacement language The station area includes the platform, passenger drop-off, and a large surface park-and-ride facility with parking options north and south of the station platform with up to 1070 stalls. In coordination with the Shady Oak Station Area	Met Council	Updated language as suggested

<b>Transportation</b>			
	Development Strategy, the parking lot north of the station has been designed to accommodate future development and a potential future parking structure.		
2.	Page 201 of pdf, paragraph 1, make the following correction: "Figure 81.8 shows the location of the <del>Blake Road</del> <u>Downtown Hopkins</u> LRT station."	Met Council	Made correction
3.	Page 204, make the following correction: The station area, located along the south side of the Cedar Lake LRT Regional Trail, includes the platform, bus stop, <del>an 89-stall park-and-ride lot...</del>	Met Council	Made correction
4.	Page 234 / Appendix 82, Blake Road Station, make the following correction: The SWLRT project includes an <u>89-stall park and ride lot.</u>	Met Council	Made correction
5.	Page 234 / Appendix 82, Shady Oak Station, consider the following language: A large surface park-and-ride facility with parking options north and south of the station platform with up to 1,070 stalls is planned for opening clay. In coordination with the Shady Oak Station Area Development Strategy, the parking lot north of the station has been designed to accommodate future development and a potential future parking structure. A Wayfinding will guide users to the variety of uses in the station area.	Met Council	Added language; needed to clarify "Wayfinding" suggestion
6.	Page 266, the Bus Route 12 paragraph, add the following: Bus Route 12 is a regular local route operated by Metro Transit. It travels between Minnetonka, Hopkins, St. Louis Park, and Minneapolis. In Hopkins, it travels mainly along Excelsior Boulevard, Mainstreet, and 11 <sup>th</sup> Avenue south of Mainstreet. This route runs on weekdays primarily during peak hours.	Met Council	Updated language as suggested
7.	Page 266 the Bus Route 612 paragraph make the following changes. This route runs on weekdays off-peak and, <del>primarily during peak hours, with more limited hours</del> on weekends and holidays	Met Council	Updated language as suggested
8.	Page 266, the <b>Bus Route 615</b> paragraph make the following change: <b>Bus Route 615</b> is a regular local route <del>operated by Metro Transit.</del>	Met Council	Updated language as suggested
9.	Page 266, add a paragraph for Bus Route 667 as follows: <b>Bus Route 667</b> is an express bus route operated by Metro Transit. The route runs east/west connecting Minnetonka, Hopkins, St. Louis Park, and Minneapolis. In Hopkins, it travels on CSAH 7. This route runs eastbound in morning peak hours and westbound in afternoon peak hours on weekdays.	Met Council	Updated language as suggested
10.	Page 266, the <b>Bus Route 670</b> paragraph, make the following changes: <b>Bus Route 670</b> is an express bus route <del>operated by Metro Transit.</del> The route runs	Met Council	Updated language as suggested



<b>Transportation</b>			
	east/west connecting Excelsior, Minnetonka, Hopkins, <del>St Louis Park</del> , and Minneapolis. In Hopkins, it travels primarily on <del>CSAH 7</del> , Excelsior Boulevard and Mainstreet.		
11.	Page 266, add a paragraph for Bus Route 671 as follows: <b>Bus Route 671</b> is an express bus route. The route runs east/west connecting Orono, Excelsior, Minnetonka, Hopkins and Minneapolis. In Hopkins, it travels on Minnetonka Boulevard. This route runs eastbound in morning peak hours and westbound in afternoon peak hours on weekdays.	Met Council	Updated language as suggested
12.	Page 266 under Transit Facilities The park-ride at 10201 Excelsior Boulevard is a 52 vehicle lot, not 300.	Met Council	Made correction
13.	On page 45, add transit policy language that supports the development of a bus circulator between LRT stations and Downtown; also clarify the definition of demand responsive transit and include examples	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Made changes as suggested
14.	I love the shift to complete communities and getting rid of the automobile. How do we move Hopkins towards being a dutch-style car-free community? <a href="https://www.forbes.com/sites/carltonreid/2019/02/21/wealth-guru-plans-dutch-style-car-free-bicycle-friendly-city-near-boulder-colorado/#54488e9ed91d">https://www.forbes.com/sites/carltonreid/2019/02/21/wealth-guru-plans-dutch-style-car-free-bicycle-friendly-city-near-boulder-colorado/#54488e9ed91d</a> Could we get sponsorship and support from organizations exploring new urban design in America? Are there streets where we would entirely remove automobiles and just turn in to walkways enabling entirely new development and use? Trees, green spaces, pop-up shops, parkways.  Happy to see ridesharing design called out. More bike lanes! Make sure the shopping and attractions are bike friendly - pull people in to Hopkins on their bikes. Trailheads concept - how can we make the whole town of Hopkins a trailhead. Bike shops, gear outfitters, art, coffee, beer, healthy food. Hopkins is here to encourage you to bike from your downtown apartment to lake Wayzata. Or from your suburban home into the city. As we look at transit - could we make it simpler and ask: How could this plan help to encourage more people o ride the bus? For buses - where do people who live in Hopkins work?	Online comment portal	The plan currently addresses a range of multimodal options, including how to encourage more nonmotorized travel

<b>Housing</b>			
<b>Incomplete Comments</b>			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	As described in under the Land Use comments above, there are inconsistencies between the minimum densities described in zoning (Table B1.13) and other elements of the Plan, which describe a higher minimum density.	Met Council	Updated Table B1.13 to make consistent with rest of plan
2.	in Table B1.17, decades overlap by using rounded years (e.g., 2020-2030 and 2030-2040). Please differentiate the decades as 2021-2030 and 2031-2040.	Met Council	Made change to date ranges on Table B1.17 as requested
3.	The City’s allocation of affordable housing need is forecasted for the 2021-2030 decade. The Plan needs to identify how many high density units are possible in that exact time range.	Met Council	Added clarifying language regarding unit counts to affordable housing section on page 20
3.	On page B3-20, Table B3.9 includes numerical recommendations for new rental housing by affordability for each LRT station area (from the “SWLRT Housing Study”). The preceding text states that the LRT station areas can “accommodate a significant amount of affordable units...” While this possibility exists, the Council does not consider a “recommendation” by station area to meet the need. The Council evaluates the accommodation of affordable housing need by the amount of land the Plan guides for development or redevelopment at minimum densities. Council staff recommend a modified version of Table B1.17 that includes the 2021-2030 decade.	Met Council	These are just results from a study, not a response to the affordable housing allocation. Added language to clarify this to page 20 of appendix.
4.	The Housing Implementation Plan on pages 20-22 of Appendix B3 does not include circumstances and sequence in which tools would be used. The narrative that precedes the table refers to a range of approaches by which the City can meet the goals. However the Plan needs to include a description of what roles the City can play (eg, apply, promote, refer, administer, fund) and under what circumstances the City would consider doing so (eg, near transit, serving large families, etc). An example is shown in the Local Planning Handbook -	Met Council	Added more detail on pages 20-22 of appendix regarding roles, circumstances, and sequences for housing implementation
5.	On page 16 of Appendix B3, the Plan states on “a case-by-case basis, Hopkins will consider financial participation in housing redevelopment projects when projects provide demonstrable public benefits consistent with this Comprehensive Plan and City redevelopment policies.” The purpose of the implementation plan is to lay out	Met Council	Added language on page 16 of appendix regarding what criteria the city uses to determine appropriate

<b>Housing</b>			
	what types of projects the City would prioritize when considering those tools so that community members and developers know what projects to explore in the City.		financial participation in redevelopment projects
6.	<p>Housing tools that are mentioned, but are not paired with a description of circumstance and situation of use include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tax Abatement (include circumstances of use and AMI)</li> <li>• Tax increment financing (include circumstances of use and AMI)</li> <li>• Opportunities for partnership with Hennepin County to use HOME or CDBG funds (include circumstances of use and AMI)</li> <li>• Livable Community Act programs (include circumstances of use and AMI)</li> <li>• Site Assembly, including partnership with Land Bank Twin Cities (include when site assembly might be used, AMI of developments that site assembly is preferred to support, and when partnership with Land Bank Twin Cities would be considered)</li> <li>• Date/sequence of zoning and subdivision ordinance adoption (e.g., 2020 or within 2 years after comprehensive plan adoption)</li> <li>• Preservation strategies, like community land trusts, low-interest rehab programs, and tools that preserve private unsubsidized housing (4d) (include circumstances of use and AMI)</li> </ul>	Met Council	Added more detail regarding circumstances and situation of use for each tool
7.	<p>Implementation Plan</p> <p>Table 83.11 successfully links tools to needs, but does not consistently link to household AMI/levels of affordability or mention all widely accepted tools, which are required to be considered consistent. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tax abatement</li> <li>• TIF</li> <li>• First-time homebuyer programs</li> <li>• Livable Community Act programs</li> <li>• Site Assembly</li> <li>• Community land trusts</li> <li>• Low-interest rehab programs</li> </ul>	Met Council	Added detail on applicable levels of affordability in relation to housing tools
8.	To be consistent, all widely used tools must be acknowledged. Some widely used tools to address housing needs aren't included:	Met Council	Added details on all widely used housing tools

<b>Housing</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for or application of various funding sources within Minnesota Housing’s Consolidated RFP</li> <li>• Partnership with Hennepin County to use Affordable Housing Incentive Fund (AHIF)</li> <li>• Housing Bond Issuance</li> <li>• <a href="https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Municipal-Bond-Issuance.aspx">https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Municipal-Bond-Issuance.aspx</a></li> <li>• Partnership, possibly with Land Bank Twin Cities for site assembly and vacant and abandoned property control through First Look. <a href="https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Site-Assembly.aspx">https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Site-Assembly.aspx</a></li> <li>• Participation in housing-related organizations, partnerships, and initiatives <a href="https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Collaborating-on-Housing-Strategies.aspx">https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Collaborating-on-Housing-Strategies.aspx</a></li> <li>• Encourage or advocate for the creation of a community land trust to increase affordable homeownership option</li> <li>• Preservation tools, including monitoring expiration of LIHTC properties, and preserving public housing.</li> <li>• A local Fair Housing policy (more info provided below)</li> <li>• All widely used tools are included in Housing Tools <a href="https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Recognized-Tools-and-Resources.aspx">https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Recognized-Tools-and-Resources.aspx</a></li> </ul>		
9.	All housing tools described should be linked clearly and consistently to stated housing needs. An example is shown in the Local Planning Handbook <a href="https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Linking-Tools-to-Needs.aspx">https://metro council.org/Handbook/Files/Resources/Fact-Sheet/HOUSING/Linking-Tools-to-Needs.aspx</a>	Met Council	Added detail linking housing tools to stated housing needs
<b>Advisory Comments</b>			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	This Plan would be stronger if there was a clearer connection between data and policies. Staff appreciates a Plan where the main body is very readable and supplemented by data in the appendices. However, there are very few connections between the appendix and the policies in the body of the Plan. For instance, how	Met Council	Added reference on page 50 to link to Appendix B2

<b>Housing</b>			
	does the information about housing and transportation costs inform Hopkins' policy? Staff suggests referring to the housing implementation appendix in the housing chapter.		
2.	<p>With respect to a Fair Housing policy, local housing policies do not mean that cities should or can manage or administer Fair Housing complaints. A local fair housing policy rather ensures the City is aware of fair housing requirements with regard to housing decisions and provides sufficient resources to educate and refer residents who feel their fair housing rights have been violated. This can be as simple as having links to resources on the City's website. The Metropolitan Council will require a local Fair Housing policy as a requirement to draw upon Livable Communities Act (LCA) awards beginning in 2019. To learn more, and review a template local fair housing policy, please refer to the following resources:</p> <p>Creating a Local Fair Housing Policy webinar  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=38JY4pNGnZ8&amp;feature=youtu.be">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=38JY4pNGnZ8&amp;feature=youtu.be</a>            Best Practices  <a href="https://metrocouncil.org/Handbook/PlanIt/Files/Webinar-Fair-Housing-Handout2.aspx">https://metrocouncil.org/Handbook/PlanIt/Files/Webinar-Fair-Housing-Handout2.aspx</a>            Policy Template (Click on Handout 1 under the implementing A Local Fair Housing Policy at the bottom of the screen)  <a href="https://metrocouncil.org/Handbook/Training/Webinars.aspx">https://metrocouncil.org/Handbook/Training/Webinars.aspx</a></p>	Met Council	<p>Clarified City's intention and policy direction on fair housing</p> <p>Table B13.14</p>
3.	Council staff encourages the City to consider an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) policy or allow them as a permitted use. This is a unique way to diversify housing choices within existing single-family neighborhoods.	Met Council	Included language that says the city will evaluate the potential to incorporate ADUs
4.	Council staff encourages the City to consider a formal Inclusionary Housing policy, which have recently been adopted in Brooklyn Park, Golden Valley, and Richfield.	Met Council	Included language that the city will evaluate the potential to adopt a formal inclusionary zoning policy
5.	Council staff encourages the City to consider tenant protection policies to support efforts to preserve naturally occurring affordable housing.	Met Council	Added language regarding city's ongoing work on developing tenant protection policies

<b>Housing</b>			
6.	All of the existing housing data (including the map of ownership units above and below the price affordable to households earning 80% AMI) sourced from the Metropolitan Council have been updated with 2016 data. Consider reviewing the updated Existing Housing Assessment on Hopkins' community page in the Local Planning Handbook and updating any relevant data. <a href="https://metrocouncil.org/Handbook/Files/Existing-Housing-Assessment/02394417HopkinsExistingHsg.aspx">https://metrocouncil.org/Handbook/Files/Existing-Housing-Assessment/02394417HopkinsExistingHsg.aspx</a>	Met Council	There have not been any significant changes to the data since then. No change.
7.	On page 4 of Appendix B3, text refers to "the table above," but there is no table above that text.	Met Council	Made correction
8.	On page 19 of Appendix B3, because the Plan defines household income at AMI with descriptions on page 19, these terms can be used in the Implementation Plan to be consistent,	Met Council	Made suggested language change
9.	On page 19 of Appendix BS, text refers to the allocation of affordable housing need as a goal. The allocation is a forecast of actual households expected to come to the region at various income levels. Cities must plan for that allocation per the Metropolitan Land Planning Act, but are not responsible for creating those units. Since the Council negotiates affordable housing goals with cities that participate in Livable Communities Act programs, we prefer that the allocation of need not be referred to as a goal, which can confuse the different purposes of the two measures.	Met Council	Made suggested language changes
10.	Council staff recommend generalizing the columns in Table 83.11 (implementation Opportunity, Policy and Fiscal) into a single "Tools" category. Since the table needs more detail as to how and when the City might use these tools, further differentiating the type of tool is not necessarily helpful and can make the information seem more complicated than it needs to be.	Met Council	Made suggested formatting changes
11.	The City of Hopkins 2040 Comprehensive provides a solid framework to guide the community for years come. The community is strong, diverse and ripe for investment because of the local economy, sound decisions made by local leaders and the approved METRO Green Line Extension. At the same time, Hopkins experiences many of the same racial and economic disparities as the rest of the region. The disparities in our region are not by accident. They are the result of deliberate actions by policy-makers, private citizens and business leaders. Two examples are the use of racial housing covenants and redlining used to preserve	Larry Hiscock	Comment Acknowledged

<b>Housing</b>			
	<p>and build white wealth while denying opportunity and disinvesting in communities of color.</p> <p>It is vital that the City of Hopkin’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan incorporates stronger language related to racial equity, and include explicit actions and indicators to ensure Hopkins is an inclusive community in the future.</p> <p><b>Bold Action Required</b>  City of Hopkins is at 100% risk of gentrifying according to a 2019 study published by the Center for Urban and Regional (CURA) at the University of Minnesota. In the study all three census tracts were considered vulnerable in 2000. Since 2000, the census tract for downtown Hopkins has already begun the process of gentrification. The other two vulnerable census tracts are at greater risk of gentrification “given the demonstrated impact of transit investment on gentrification, the rate of conversion of vulnerable neighborhoods into gentrified neighborhoods may accelerate in the future (Goets and Damiano, 2019).”</p> <p>It is vital that the stronger policy language be included in the Comprehensive Plan to provide latitude for the City Council and City Staff to approve ordinances, policies, and development agreements that will preserve existing naturally occurring affordable housing units, require long-term affordable housing units in new construction, protect the rights of renters and mitigate the harm to people renting caused by displacement.</p>		
12.	On page 55, clarify that enforcing housing and yard maintenance is not intended to represent a change in practice that is more proactive than the current system; also clarify what it means to protect single family neighborhoods from “encroachment” – ensure that new description references specifically development	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Made clarifications and provide descriptions as suggested
13.	There is an intersection between affordability in Hopkins and keeping older buildings up to date. Renovated properties may increase in value/rent, making them less affordable. Plan should acknowledge the challenge in balancing these priorities.	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Language added to assure the plan reflects the need to balance priorities
14.	The plan addresses both ownership and rental housing. From experience with the community, it seems that renters are typically here because they are committed to	8/28/18 Planning	Comment acknowledged

<b>Housing</b>			
	this community and want to stay here. Some have rented in the area for many years.	Commission public input	
15.	<p>The region has entrenched racial and economic disparities, which reflect past actions by cities – which in turn have a responsibility to address them</p> <p>The comprehensive plan generally reflects values around equity and disparities, though it may need stronger language in terms of policies and more clarification as to roles and responsibilities. Policies should reflect that 66% of housing is currently rental, so rental-related policies benefit the majority of the community. Need more clarification in terms of new public sources for preserving existing housing stock and policies for new housing such as inclusionary zoning and right of first refusal. (note: individual indicated afterwards that more specific comments to this effect will be forwarded to the City during the comment period – these comments are included here as well)</p>	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Language added to ensure the plan reflects a range of housing tools to benefit renters
16.	<p>Thanks for this opportunity. As a member of the Blake Road Corridor Collaborative and the director of a local non-profit (ICA Food Shelf) I am pleased with the overall Comprehensive Plan. This is hard work and I commend all the community members, city council and city staff on the work that went into this. Thank you. As housing is part of this plan (Section 4), and especially as it relates to Hopkins large number of naturally occurring affordable housing units, the fact that the SWLRT will be coming through is a huge factor in the housing of Hopkins. In section 4 there is mention of "Continue to explore public policy that provides protection against tenant displacement.". It really sounds like a "plan to plan" which typically is something to steer clear of in strategic planning (or in this case Comprehensive Planning). There is no mention of tracking this or a goal knowing if this has been done. How will you know how many people have been displaced but found other housing in Hopkins? How will you know if people had to move to other communities? How will you know if those displaced are our low-income residents? What indicator will be used - a policy was created or not? Or a policy was created and this is the number/% of residents displaced. A starting point might be to change "Continue to explore public policy that provides protection against tenant displacement." to "Create a public policy that provides protection against tenant displacement." and then a</p>	Peg Keenan, online comment portal	At this time, the City is considering a tenant protection policy. The specific policy will help determine the appropriate indicators to track.



<b>Housing</b>			
	corresponding indicator that tracks displacement. Not easy, but in my opinion the item has no depth without some actionable item.		
17.	Thank you for the work on this plan. Here are a few thoughts: The narrative section of the update to the plan notes the potential for displacement and gentrification to occur in the city, and the importance of steps to prevent this. For example, in Section 4 Housing, a policy listed under Goal 2 (on page 53) is to "Continue to explore public policy that provides protection against tenant displacement." Could this be carried through and reflected in the implementation section of the plan as well? To this end, add an action step reflecting the desire to protect against displacement and gentrification, and create a way to track whether (and to what extent) displacement is occurring in the city in order to have a corresponding indicator.	Online comment portal	At this time, the City is considering a tenant protection policy. The specific policy will help determine the appropriate indicators to track.
18.	How we will we make the townhome south of Excelsior boulevard into a complete neighborhood that meets the aesthetic standards laid out in the plan? Should there be more in this plan that encourages development of additional units on single family lots? See the Minneapolis Plan - building and renting back house and additional units is an affordable wealth building strategy and enables senior living and affordable housing options.	Nathan Miller, online comment portal	The future land use plan includes new mixed use districts that may help contribute to complete communities

## SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

<b>Quality of Life</b>			
Advisory Comments			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	On page 69, do not specifically call out affordable housing for artists; artist housing is not consistent with racial equity goals due to typical tenant mix; if it is included emphasize the need for diverse residents; in general, focus should be on affordable housing for everyone; counterpoint: artists bring vibrancy and unique perspectives that add value to the community and so should still encourage artists to live here	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Updated policy to include focus on encouraging diversity in artist housing, with a goal of affordable options for all
2.	55% of ICA Food Shelf participants come from Hopkins. ICA also serves multiple communities between Hopkins and Shorewood. This means that around 17.8% of	8/28/18 Planning	Acknowledged the need for food security and assistance in narrative.

<b>Quality of Life</b>			
	Hopkins residents at least occasionally use the food shelf – though not all are regulars.	Commission public input	
3.	<p>As we discuss Equity and Inclusion: Can we promote new means of ownership? Community financed and owned projects? How do we enable the diverse citizens we bring in to invest in and become wealthy in Hopkins? I want more co-op community owned apartments. I want more co-op employee owned businesses. This plan will make developers rich. How could it grow the stable wealth of our diverse citizens?</p> <p>How could we learn how to organize civic life from new residents? Lets learn from citizens who were born or educated elsewhere how they would provide city services, lay out the physical environment, or ensure accountability. We need to build a new Hopkins community of everyone who has found their way to living here. We need to define new ways to celebrate together, mourn together, and progress towards a shared vision of the future. What holidays do we need to add to the public calendar to celebrate with our whole community? How could mainstream Hopkins reflect all of these? Could the city of Hopkins be a pioneer in community policing? Radically change the role of police in the community. Hold the police accountable to community boards. Educate police officers as social workers and treat community health issues as health issues that we can help heal. Do we need to pay our police officers more and then hold them to higher standards and expect more education, community engagement, and working together to make a stronger community?</p>	Nathan Miller, online comment portal	This plan provides a policy framework for exploring options for affordable housing and commercial space

<b>Sense of Community</b>			
Advisory Comments			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	The Center applauds the City for incorporating racial equity and economic inclusion into several of the plan’s foundational statements, including: 1. “Race and Equity” was identified through the planning process as one of the eight focus areas (priorities for policy and plan implementation): “Proactively identify and address racial disparities in the community and promote equity for everyone.”	Center for Economic Inclusion	Comment acknowledged

<b>Sense of Community</b>			
	<p>2. The Cultivate Hopkins vision statement includes “equity” as one of the three guiding principles (together with sustainability and resilience).</p> <p>3. The Economic Competitiveness section provides “direction for a healthy, robust and equitable economy,” including a goal to “promote economic equity in Hopkins, to benefit residents regardless of identity or background.”</p> <p>4. The Sense of Community section provides “direction for community connections, equity and inclusiveness, and culture and identity,” including a goal to “proactively support the development and maintenance of an equitable and inclusive community.”</p> <p>Equity and accessibility are also addressed in a goal within “Parks and Trails.”</p> <p>Additionally, a theme of openness to change pervades the plan, which can support the achievement of racial equity goals.</p>		
2.	<p>The Center supports the data disaggregation by race in many of the plan’s appendices. Examples include: poverty, unemployment, labor force participation, household income, health insurance and homeownership. Similarly, the Race and Equity Survey data are disaggregated by race, illuminating differences in the lived experience among whites and People of Color. The Center encourages this type of data analysis because it enables the City to identify where racial disparities exist, a necessary step towards closing them. Opportunities exist to disaggregate other data in the plan by race; one example is housing cost burden. Also, by disaggregating the Cultivate Hopkins Survey data and Online Issues Mapping by race, the City could identify any specific needs and opportunities expressed by People of Color. The City might also consider including data on vehicle-free households in the plan and disaggregating it by race. The plan’s appendices include spatial analyses such as a dot map showing the residences of People of Color, and a map of the City’s Area of Concentrated Poverty. Also included is a map that shows job access (low-wage jobs and low-wage workers in 2010) and a map of regional transit accessibility. The Center supports these spatial analyses by race and income and encourages the City to replicate this approach on a local basis. For example, the City could map People of Color and the ACP in relation to community assets, investments and challenges. This would enable the City to identify opportunities to advance equity and evaluate past efforts.</p>	Center for Economic Inclusion	<p>Disaggregation of data was done where possible. In some cases, the data sets were too small to make meaningful distinctions by race and geography, or data were not complete enough.</p> <p>Added implementation step to Page 123 regarding spatial analysis recommendation and other analysis.</p>

<b>Sense of Community</b>			
3.	The plan contains several policies and action steps to promote racial equity and economic inclusion, most notably within the Sense of Community, Economic Competitiveness and Implementation sections. The Center supports these policies and strategies and offers suggestions to strengthen them in the “Additional Comments” section below. In general, the Center encourages more specificity in language, leveraging existing resources for more efficient implementation, and an asset—based approach to economic inclusion.	Center for Economic Inclusion	Comment acknowledged
4.	Several parts of the plan state the City’s intent to evaluate the impact of policies and strategies on People of Color in Hopkins. For example, Goal 2 under Sense of Community contains a policy about using a racial equity toolkit, and the Implementation section includes an action step to “assess equity impact of specific City policies and regulations.” The Center supports these evaluation plans and encourages the City to feature them more prominently in the plan. One way to do this would be to add an additional section in the “Implementation Tools” section under the “Public Program and Tools” with the subtitle “Racial Equity Evaluation.” This section could describe in detail how a racial equity tool will be applied to decisions and investments within the City. By doing so, the City would demonstrate that racial equity evaluation is a high priority and that it will apply across everything the City does, not only in the predictable areas such as workforce diversity. Racial equity evaluation works best when a diverse set of stakeholders provide input into criteria and goals. These processes can provide learning opportunities for community members, staff members and others. Therefore, the Center encourages the City to commit resources to form strong, collaborative partnerships with the community and regional partners to ensure the most effective evaluation of its investments.	Center for Economic Inclusion	Added language to implementation step on page 123 regarding investigating potential to use a racial equity toolkit as a next step on the City’s Race and Equity Initiative.
5.	Goal 2 under “Sense of Community” outlines four policies intended to “proactively support the development and maintenance of an equitable and inclusive community.” The first policy under this goal is “celebrate, respect, and represent the diverse social and cultural backgrounds of the community and its members and seek to address any disparities in outcomes.” Recognizing that this policy contains a multiplicity of related but distinct actions, the Center suggests that the City break this policy into two: one policy focused on process (celebrate, respect and	Center for Economic Inclusion	Clarified and strengthen language of policies on Page 66 as recommended. Divided the first policy statement into two parts, and reworded the second to be stronger.

<b>Sense of Community</b>			
	<p>represent) and the other focused on outcomes (address disparities in outcomes). Also, the Center suggests that the outcomes-focused policy should refer to the racial disparities that the plan has already uncovered and describe how it will address them. For example, a revised outcomes-based policy could read: “close racial disparities in outcomes [link to appendix] through dedicated resources, partnership, ongoing evaluation and continuous improvement.”</p> <p>The second policy under this goal is “explore the development of a race and equity toolkit to evaluate public and private projects.” Rather than developing a new toolkit, the Center encourages the City to move more quickly by leveraging one or more of the many existing high-quality tools, such as GARE’s Racial Equity Toolkit and the Equitable Development Principles and Scorecard. Also, the Center encourages the City to apply the tool to ongoing programs and investments as well as discrete projects. Finally, these tools are most effective when used by a group with diverse perspectives, that includes staff, residents and other partners. A revised policy might read: “systematically and collaboratively apply a racial equity tool to public and private investments at multiple decision points, transparently report the results, and make adjustments accordingly.”</p>		
6.	<p>Second, in the Quality of Life Goal # 6, it uses the phrase "residents as empowered partners". I love that phrase!!! While this was used while talking about crime/safety, it would be great to use that phrase in other community engagement areas that occur in the Sense of Community Goal 1 area. And of course ensuring residents are empowered partners is not an easy thing to do, I think you can see it done in the Blake Road Corridor Collaborative work. It can be done. It has been done in Hopkins. But even in this feedback form, have you made this easy for all residents to respond to? You may have and congratulations if you have been able to ensure a diverse group could respond. Like senior residents without computers or technology expertise, or those whose primary language is not English, but have lived in this community for years or decades and are part of the amazing quilted fabric that makes Hopkins what it is. I did not see where if this form was able to be online in the other major languages used by Hopkins residents. Was the plan translated into different languages. So even now you may not be getting the feedback from the plan you need. With adding "residents as empowered partners" to this part of the plan, it means not only gathering the ideas and empowering of</p>	<p>Peg Keenan, online comment portal</p>	<p>The plan documents a range of community engagement opportunities that were provided throughout the planning process in addition to the online comment portal.</p>

<b>Sense of Community</b>			
	some of the community, but all segments of the community. Then, not only getting ideas, but using them! It is so easy for those in positions of power to say, "oh, but that won't work because..." How do those of us in power move outside our boxes and utilize the collective wisdom of all our residents? Then not only using ideas from different parts of the community, but having an indicator in this area - ex. outcomes, processes, programs, plans, projects, etc. that reflect the needs and interests of all residents. Thank you for this opportunity to respond.		
7.	In the implementation section of the plan, Quality of Life Goal #6 describes collaborating with "residents as empowered partners" to prevent and reduce crime and increase perceptions of safety (page 122). I would suggest adding this description of collaborating with "residents as empowered partners" to other areas of the implementation section as well - particularly the areas that discuss community engagement. One example would be Sense of Community Goal 1 - expand the idea of "everyone participating" as currently stated in this goal to include collaborating with "residents as empowered partners." In turn, in addition to "level of involvement in community events and programs", add a potential indicator to include "outcomes, processes, programs, plans, projects, etc. that reflect the needs and interests of all residents."	Online comment portal	Added reference to residents as empowered partners to Sense of Community Goal 1, and amend potential indicators as noted.

## NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

<b>Sustainability and Natural Resources</b>			
Advisory Comments			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	Overall, the resilience and solar access protection and development components are quite impressive. Staff recommend including policies that quantitatively link solar energy protection and development with greenhouse gas emissions. The following policies from the City of Farmington's draft 2040 plan may be helpful: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 4.1: Follow the state energy goal guidelines of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 20% of the City's 2015 baseline levels by the year 2050.</li> <li>• Policy 4.2: Establish interim goals every 5 to 10 years.</li> </ul>	Met Council	Added language to Appendix D1 page 18 to clarify plans to develop more specific metrics already addressed in implementation plan.

<b>Sustainability and Natural Resources</b>			
2.	<p>Land Use. We encourage you to discuss the importance of enhancing access to nature for your city’s residents. As the city intensifies development, the quality of public and private green spaces becomes especially important. We recommend including policies that encourage private and public developments to be planted with native flowers, grasses, shrubs and tree species. Species such as monarchs rely on these plants, and it does not take many plants to attract butterflies, other beneficial pollinators as well as migrating and resident birds. Adding more native plants into landscaping, not only enhances the health and diversity of pollinators and wildlife populations, these plants can also help filter and store storm water, a policy that is consistent with other goals in your plan. For more information consult DNR’s pollinator page.</p> <p>Plant lists and suggestions for native plants can be incorporated into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape guidelines to improve the aesthetics in for commercial and industrial areas</li> <li>• Street tree planting plans</li> <li>• City gateway features</li> <li>• Along ponds and waterways.</li> <li>• Small nature play areas in children’s parks</li> <li>• Along the edges of ballfield complexes.</li> <li>• o Riparian areas</li> </ul>	DNR	Added reference on Page 79 to encouraging use of native plants in public and private development
3.	<p>Development / Transportation Policies to Protect wildlife. Consider adding policies that take wildlife into consideration as transportation and redevelopment projects occur on private as well as public lands. To enhance the health and diversity of wildlife populations, encourage developers of lands to retain natural areas or restore them with native species after construction. One larger area is better than several small “islands” or patches; and connectivity of habitat is important. Animals such as frogs and turtles need to travel between wetlands and uplands throughout their life cycle. Consult DNR’s Best Practices for protection of species and Roadways and Turtles Flyer for self-mitigating measures to incorporate into design and construction plans. Examples of more specific measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preventing entrapment and death of small animals especially reptiles and amphibians, by specifying biodegradable erosion control netting (“bio-</li> </ul>	DNR	Added language to policy on Page 79 regarding considering wildlife in transportation and development projects.

<b>Sustainability and Natural Resources</b>			
	<p>netting’ or ‘natural netting’ types (category 3N or 4N)), and specifically not allow plastic mesh netting. (p. 25)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing wider culverts or other passageways under paths, driveways and roads while still considering impacts to the floodplain.</li> <li>• Including a passage bench under bridge water crossings. (p. 17) because typical bridge riprap can be a barrier to animal movement along streambanks.</li> <li>• Use curb and storm water inlet designs that don’t inadvertently direct small mammals and reptiles into the storm sewer. (p. 24). Installing “surmountable curbs” (Type D or S curbs) allows animals (e.g., turtles) to climb over and exit roadways. Traditional curbs/gutters tend to trap animals on the roadway. Another option is to install/create curb breaks every, say, 100 feet (especially important near wetlands).</li> <li>• Using smart salting practices to reduce impacts to downstream aquatic species.</li> <li>• Fencing could be installed near wetlands to help keep turtles off the road (fences that have a j-hook at each end are more effective than those that don’t).</li> </ul>		
4.	<p>Open Spaces and Natural Resources. A map of the city’s natural resources would help illustrate the concept that cities with significant urban development also contain natural resources – some of which may not be as visible. Such a map could include and label Minnehaha and Nine Mile Creeks, watershed boundaries, remaining wetlands and could also show tree canopy density using a data source such as the National Land Cover Database. The DNR’s data layer Pollution Sensitivity of Near-Surface Materials on the MN Geospatial Commons would show the areas in Hopkins with high sensitivity (a large band in the middle of the city).</p>	DNR	<p>Many of these features are mapped in the Natural Environment element, particularly the local water management plan.</p>
5.	<p>Personal Autonomous Vehicles have the potential to increase emissions, where shared vehicles would result in few emissions. I think it is important to connect this back to climate and ensure the city (and other cities) doesn’t enable unintended consequences w/ AVs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EVs &amp; EV infrastructure are not mentioned until much later and only very briefly – they would fit in here; I don’t see any implementation strategies related either</li> </ul>	Great Plains Institute	<p>Added implementation strategy on Page 109 regarding tracking development of EVs and AVs.</p>



<b>Sustainability and Natural Resources</b>			
6.	Consider adding resilience policies to Emergency Response: micro-grid, back-up power to critical infrastructure, etc. This could fit better under hazard management and mitigation	Great Plains Institute	Added policy to Page 85 emergency response section regarding resilience.
7.	Add stormwater management, vegetation to Greener Development – addressed nicely in stormwater management.	Great Plains Institute	Added policy to Page 74 regarding stormwater and landscaping
8.	Strong building section	Great Plains Institute	Comment acknowledged
9.	Wind is probably not a good resource w/in Hopkins, might be careful about including it here	Great Plains Institute	Removed reference to encouraging wind energy use in policy on Page 75
10.	In addition to renewable energy targets – consider carbon emissions reduction targets	Great Plains Institute	Added policy statement to Page 75 that city will follow the state energy guide to work towards reducing emissions.
11.	On page 74, need to define how “environmentally sensitive” areas are determined	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Added reference to information in Appendix D1 to page 74
12.	Can we commit to having an organic recycling option in place? Language on that goal is pretty loose.	Nathan Miller, online comment portal	At this time, the city is still exploring options as to how this could be provided

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
<b>Incomplete Comments</b>			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	The Plan needs to include drainage areas, volumes, rates, and paths of stormwater runoff. This information is required for a local water resources management plan and can be incorporated by reference if available from another source, but the source needs to be clearly stated.	Met Council	Added information in Section 5.3 and on Figure SW-10

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
2.	The stormwater runoff from the City drains to Minnehaha Creek and Nine Mile Creek, which are impaired for chloride, dissolved oxygen, and fish and aquatic invertebrate bioassessments. The Plan should discuss how the City's surface runoff affects those impaired waters and what the City's role is or will be in fulfilling current and future TMDL allocations, including related implementation projects and funding sources needed to address these impairments.	Met Council	Section 7.2, Policy 2.8 has been added to address this comment
3.	Finally, the Plan referred to a few figures, but all figures numbered as "WRX.X" are not found either in the Water Resources Management Plan or in the City's Comprehensive Plan. Please update or indicate where those figures can be found,	Met Council	The plan figure numbers have been updated
4.	Regulatory Authority. There are references in the SWMP to application of NMCWD regulatory criteria, but the SWMP also appears to rely on implementation of unspecified city ordinances to protect water resources and mitigate flood risk. The draft SWMP includes a reference to updating city ordinances "to stay compliant with the NPDES and MS4 permits, "but otherwise, the draft SWMP observes that the city, watershed districts, state agencies, Hennepin County and the US. Corps of Engineers "hav[e] some level of administration responsibility. "At the same time, under the heading "Permitting," the draft SWMP incorrectly summarizes the existing relationship between NMCWD and the city with regard to exercise of regulatory authority, stating that NMCWD serves to advise the city as to regulation. (NMCWD recognizes the SWMP's clear affirmation, in the Goal 4: Wetlands section, that NMCWD will continue to serve as the Wetland Conservation Act Local Government Unit for that portion of the city within NMCWD's jurisdiction.) Other than with regard to the exercise of WCA jurisdiction, the SWMP does not include a clear statement of the city's intent with regard to exercise of regulatory jurisdiction to protect water resources and mitigate flood risk, as required to ensure consistency with section 6.2 of the NMCWD Plan. Further, if the city intends to exercise sole regulatory authority itself, the draft SWMP lacks the detailed, specific updates to the city's ordinances that would be necessary for NMCWD to find that the city will protect water resources and prevent flooding to the same degree that the NMCWD rules do. <u>At a minimum, the SWMP must be revised to include a clear statement of the city's intent with regard to the exercise of regulatory jurisdiction to protect water resources from degradation and mitigate flood risk.</u> (See Minnesota Rules 8410.0160, subpart 3(4), and the NMCWD Plan, subsection 6.2.1.)	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Added language to Section 3.4 Permitting, that includes a statement that the City defers its permitting authority over to NMCWD. Also, a sentence was added to this section that states "MCWD and NMCWD will continue to exercise regulatory authority in accordance with Minnesota Statue 103B.211, Subd. 1 (a) (3) (ii)."

## Surface Water Management

	<p>In making revisions to clarify its intent, the city needs to consider subsection 6.2.1 of the NMCWD Plan, which provides a very specific framework to ensure implementation of a cohesive and protective regulatory program, as well as specifics on local-water—plan elements needed for NMCWD approval, if the city intends to exercise sole regulatory authority. The SWMP must not only commit to submitting ordinances for a determination by NMCWD that they are at least as protective as NMCWD rules, but also that they will be amended within six months of notice of amendment of the NMCWD rules. The SWMP would also have to note that the plan and ordinances would have to provide that variances from standards adopted to achieve consistency with watershed organization rules will be provided to NMCWD for review (when applicable to land within NMCWD’s jurisdiction). (Minnesota Statutes section 103B.211, subdivision 1(a)(3)(ii).) Alternatively, if the city intends to re-authorize NMCWD to continue to exercise regulatory authority, the SWMP should specify how the city will direct potentially regulated parties to NMCWD to proceed through the permitting process. It is not for NMCWD to direct the city as to what its decision on this point should be. But the SWMP must be clear and complete on this point. NMCWD recommends that the city revise the SWMP to state that NMCWD will continue to exercise regulatory authority in accordance with Minnesota Statutes section 103B.211, subd. 1(a)(3)(ii). Hopkins always has the option to amend the plan later and provide for exercise of sole regulatory jurisdiction by the city if it later determines that such an approach is best.</p>		
5.	<p>The draft SWMP includes no information on the Nine Mile Creek Bank Stabilization and Habitat Enhancement Project and the cooperative agreement between the city and NMCWD that provided the legal framework for its completion. The amended and restated agreement was fully executed by the parties on December 7, 2011. Most important, section 3.2.7 of the agreement makes Hopkins responsible for the ongoing ordinary maintenance of the project; <u>this commitment should be reflected in this section and must be shown in Table WR-6 with designation of a funding source for the work.</u></p>	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	This agreement has expired and is no longer valid and is therefore no included in the plan. However, the table has been updated to plan for ongoing channel maintenance.
6.	<p>The water-quality goal for the SWMP is stated, “Achieve water quality standards in lakes, creeks, and wetlands consistent with their intended use and established classification,” which appears to be a reference to state-set goals. <u>But the SWMP</u></p>	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Section 7.2, Policy 2.8 has been added to address this comment.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	<u>should address how the city will work to achieve NMCWD standards for lakes, wetlands and the creek with the Nine Mile Creek watershed in the city.</u>		
7.	Goal 5: Groundwater. The Goal 5 section on groundwater management policies could be greatly improved by the specification of specific groundwater-conservation steps the city will take in implementing its new plan. (NMCWD Plan subsection 7.1.1.) This section also includes discussion of the city’s continued implementation of its wellhead protection plan, though <u>the most recent update is not included as an appendix to the plan as it should be.</u> Also, in accordance with the relevant requirement in subsection 7.1.1 of the NMCWD Plan, the city needs to commit to providing NMCWD with any future updates of its wellhead protection plan.	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	The WHPP is included in the Appendix. Section 7.5, Policy 5.6 has been added to address this comment.
8.	<u>As noted above with regard to water resource management-related agreements, Hopkins' commitment to and funding for maintenance of the Nine Mile Creek Bank Stabilization and Habitat Enhancement Project must be shown in Table WR-6.</u>	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	This agreement has expired and is no longer valid and is therefore no included in the plan. However, the table has been updated to plan for ongoing channel maintenance.
9.	<u>Table WR-6 must be revised to include prioritization of the city’s implementation work, as required by Minnesota Rules 8410.0106. subpart 2E.</u>	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Prioritization has been added to Table 9.4: Proposed Implementation Program.
10.	Identify MCWD data systems in the local plan and describe their application to LGU activity in order for the District to ensure that the LGU is aware of these systems and that they are being used for common intended purposes. <b>Partially meets requirements.</b> The Summary (Page 2) indicates the City will utilize MCWD’s updated Plan and notes the City will continue to work to ensure that its goals, policies and development standards are consistent with MCWD’s Plan and rules. Functional assessment of wetlands (FAW) is not mentioned in the Plan nor is the District’s H&H study, although several water resources studies carried out as feasibility reports are listed in Table WR1.2.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	FAW and H & H study have been included in Table 5.3
11.	Maps of current land use and land use at the LGU planning horizon. <b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Figure SW—OS provides a land cover map and Figure SW-O8 provides existing land use. A future land use map is not provided in the Water Resources Management Plan. A future land use plan is included in the Comprehensive Plan. Please include or reference in the Water Resources Plan.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	The future land use map has been referenced on Pg. 7, Section 3.1.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
12.	Maps of drainage areas under current and future planned land use with paths, rates and volumes of stormwater runoff. <b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Figure SW-01 depict HHPLS subwatersheds and City “drainage districts,” but does not indicate subwatershed flow direction. On page 7 the Plan notes that the City has been delineated into 60 subwatersheds, but none are depicted on a figure. Figure SW—OZ depicts drainage districts and storm sewers with sewer flow direction. The District’s HHPLS study, which encompasses about a third of the City, is not referenced. Some small areas have been modeled. Please provide stormwater rate and volume information. Please provide a map of major watershed boundaries and written description of their geographical and physical characteristics	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Subwatershed flow direction is shown on Figure SW-01. The City’s subwatersheds are shown on Figure SW-08. The HHPLS study is referenced in Table 5.3. Rate and volume information has been included in Section 5.3 and Figure SW-10.
13.	A stormwater conveyance map meeting standards of the current MS4 general permit and indicating an outfall or a connection at the LGU boundary. <b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Figure 5W-02 depicts storm sewers with flow direction. M54 permit requires stormwater flow direction in the pipes, outfalls with unique ID numbers and geographic coordinates, structural stormwater BMPs and receiving waters. These details are not included in Figure 5W—02. City's M54 Permit indicates the storm sewer system map and inventory are in compliance with M54 requirements — figure from M54 permit should be included in the Water Resources Plan or at a minimum be referenced; Figure 5W-02 could also be updated.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	NPDES Inventory Map, Figure SW-08 has been added.
14.	An inventory of public and private stormwater management facilities including the location, facility type and party responsible for maintenance (e.g., landowner, homeowner’s association, LGU, other third party). <b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Table WR1.6 on Page 22 indicates a storm sewer maintenance program and storm sewer pond maintenance & cleanout as being funded by a stormwater utility fund — these are assumed to be for public facilities. Policy 1.3 on Page 12 notes that the City will maintain and inspect stormwater management facilities to assure they function as designed. Page 20 indicates the stormwater utility fund is used for expenses associated with maintaining and improving the stormwater system. However, private stormwater facilities are not mentioned, and an actual inventory of public and private stormwater facilities is not presented.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Section 7.1.1., Policy 1.3 has been added regarding private pond management. A pond inventory table has been included in Figure SW-08.
15.	A listing and summary of existing or potential water resource—related problems wholly or partly within LGU corporate limits. A problem assessment consistent with	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	The Proposed Implementation Program, Table 9.4 has been prioritized.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	<p>Minnesota Rules 8410.0045, subpart 7, is to be completed for each. This includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas of present or potential future local flooding.</li> <li>• Landlocked areas.</li> <li>• Regional storage needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Partially meets requirements.</b> An Assessment of Problems that addresses water resource-related problems begins on Page 17. Water quantity and water quality issues are the first two problems listed. Per MN Rules 8410.0045 subpart 7, problems are identified, and funding levels addressed in Table WR1.6 (Page22), but prioritization of problems to be addressed is not addressed. A specific flooding area is described on Page 9, and flood control is the stated purpose of the Stormwater Management Goal (Page11). Page7 states that there are several landlocked areas in the City that need to be addressed. Storage needs are touched on in the floodplain management policies (Page16) and with the Stormwater Management Goal on an on-site basis (Page11).</p>		
16.	<p>Inventory of real property owned by the LGU, including discussion of (i) water resource issues and opportunities associated with its properties, and (ii) potential opportunities to coordinate with the District or other partners. <b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Water resource issues are presented beginning Page 17 — the Assessment of Problems. However, an inventory of real property (municipal buildings, lots, etc.) owned by the City is not provided and the water resource issues within the context of City properties are not addressed. Coordination with MCWD is included in several portions of the Plan.</p>	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Section 8.8 - NPDES MS4 Permit was added, along with a copy of the City's SWPPP in the appendix.
17.	<p>Incorporates the inventory and description of practices from its SWPPP regarding facilities that it owns or operates and municipal operations that may contribute pollutants to groundwater or surface waters. <b>Does not meet requirements.</b> City's M54 Permit states that the City will complete a facilities inventory within 12 months of permit extension. An inventory is not provided in the Plan.</p>	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Figure SW-08: NPDES Inventory and Figure SW-09: City Owned Property were added.
18.	<p>Include map and inventory of stormwater management facilities, including responsible party and maintenance condition and schedule. See #7 above.</p>	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Figure SW-08: NPDES Inventory and a copy of the SWPPP were added.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
19.	A description of the LGU's approach to maintenance of stormwater management practices constructed in conjunction with private development. <b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Policy 1.3 on Page 12 states the City shall maintain and periodically inspect stormwater management facilities and structures. Page 20 states the stormwater utility fund is used for expenses associated with maintaining the City's stormwater system, and Table WR1.6 addresses maintenance. However, the Plan does not describe how the City approaches maintenance of stormwater management practices in conjunction with private development.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Section 7.1, Policy 1.3 was added to address private stormwater facilities.
20.	Information related to the issue of deferred maintenance of public and private stormwater management practices, to inform a cooperative approach to addressing the issue (optional). Not addressed. Land Use Planning and Development Regulation	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged
21.	Identify those areas within or adjacent to the LGU that the LGU has designated in its CLUP for potential development or redevelopment within the CLUP planning horizon. This includes planned rezoning, land assembly, and infrastructure extension or expansion. <b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Summary on Page 2 and Future Land Use paragraph on Page 4 both indicate that the City is fully developed and land use changes will be a result of redevelopment. City's emphasis on permitting (Page 5), design criteria (Page 10), stormwater management (Page 11), and wetlands (Page 14) as they pertain to development and redevelopment are clear. However, the Plan discusses development and redevelopment in general terms and does not discuss the areas in which these activities are anticipated. The City's Comp Plan indicates that redevelopment plans "focus on several key opportunity areas in the city, namely the Green Line Extension station areas, including adjacent areas in Downtown Hopkins and the Blake Road Corridor." These too could be called out in this Plan and indicate that those are stormwater management opportunities.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Redevelopment opportunities have been called out in Section 3.1 Future Land Use.
22.	Describe the procedures by which the LGU plans, programs and implements each of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation infrastructure</li> <li>• Sewer and water infrastructure</li> <li>• Park and recreation land acquisition and management</li> <li>• Conservation land acquisition and management</li> </ul>	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Section 9.3, addressing the City's Capital Improvement Program has been added.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The description should include the date of the most recent approved capital implementation or land acquisition and management program, the frequency of program updating, the internal procedures to develop and approve the implementation program and to implement specific actions, and how programming and implementation is coordinated with other LGU activities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Partially meets requirements.</b> A Transportation Plan is included as Chapter 8 of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, and park and recreation planning are outlined in Chapter 7 of the same document — Plan should reference these chapters/plans specifically. The example of 13th Ave N (Page 9) provides a glimpse into how sewer and water infrastructure are planned and implemented; Page 10 addresses how future storm sewer collection systems are evaluated and designed. Conservation land acquisition is not addressed and no existing conservation lands are mentioned — with the City being fully developed, acquisition would not be expected. The date of the most recently—approved implementation plan is not provided, and no hyperlink is provided. Table WR1.6 suggests that the City’s stormwater utility fund has provided and will continue to provide the majority of funding for implementation.</p>		
23.	Provide links to small area/redevelopment plans, capital implementation programs, and land acquisition and management plans listed pursuant to item 17. <b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Whereas redevelopment is addressed in several areas of the plan, links for capital implementation programs and land acquisition/management plans are not provided.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	A hyperlink to the City’s current CIP has been added in Section 9.3.
24.	<p>Evaluation of LGU’s official controls with respect to the integration of water resource and conservation protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain regulatory tools that create incentives to consolidate development footprint to protect resources (e.g., conservation development, clustering, density credit, transfer of development rights) –</li> <li>Dedication or development fees applied to support acquisition or consolidation of public park, recreation or conservation land, particularly as directed toward acquiring or protecting priority water resource areas-</li> </ul>	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Table 9.1 -Ordinances and Official Controls has been added that show City ordinances that deal with wetlands and tree retention. Being that the City is fully developed, they do not have incentives to consolidate development footprints or park dedication fees.



<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Setbacks and/or other vegetated buffer requirements with respect to wetland or other surface waters, reconciled with other terms of its development code that restrict development footprint</li> <li>• Tree preservation policy</li> </ul> <p><b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Page 5 states the City reviews, approves and permits stormwater management plans on projects that meet the City’s ordinance requirements and that watershed permits are required for projects that meet district requirements. Policy 2.1 on Page12 states developments must meet City erosion control ordinance and Policy 3.2 on Page 13 refers to the same erosion control ordinance. Goal 6 on Page 15 refers to the City’s ordinance as it pertains to floodplain management. A summary/table of all the City’s official controls would be helpful. Policy 4.4 on Page 15 refers to the City’s Engineering Design Guidelines, which provide standards for protective vegetative buffers around wetlands. However, details on regulatory tools that create incentives to consolidate development footprints to protect resources, dedication of fees for park or conservation land, and tree preservation are not covered in the Plan.</p>		
25.	<p>Identify other regulatory mandates concerning water resources under which the LGU operates, including LGU's role, responsibility, and compliance status. Include procedures for enforcement. Specifically addressing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPDES MS4 stormwater program</li> <li>• TMDL program impaired waters referend and TMDL framework incorporated</li> <li>• State and Federal anti-degradation requirements</li> <li>• Safe drinking water act/wellhead protection program</li> <li>• NFIP, State floodplain management law</li> <li>• State Shoreland Management Law</li> <li>• WCA</li> </ul> <p><b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Water resource management related agreements and agencies with administrative responsibility in the City are presented on Page2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page2 lists the M54 permit as one with which the City must comply.</li> </ul>	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Information about nondegradation was added in Section 8.2.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pages 19&amp;20 provide information on TMDLs and impaired waters within the City; Page 20 underscores the City’s willingness to work with MPCA and MCWD in the TMDL process.</li> <li>• State and Federal anti-degradation requirements are not referenced in the Plan.</li> <li>• Page15 refers to the City’s Wellhead Protection Plan and outlines the purpose, goal and policies.</li> <li>• Pages 4&amp;5 outline the City’s floodplain ordinance and indicate MCWD’s role in regulation as well.</li> <li>• Page4 indicates the City does not have a shoreland ordinance; the Summary on Page 2 suggests this is because the City has no lakes.</li> <li>• Policy 4.1 on Page 14 indicates the MCWD shall administer wetland protection and mitigation in accordance with WCA—no changes to that structure proposed.</li> </ul>		
26.	<p>Describe how regulatory activities are coordinated with the District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are potential permit applicants made aware of District permitting requirements</li> <li>• Provide department(s) and positional contact information for regulatory coordination and how this coordination will be initiated by LGU</li> </ul> <p><b>Partially meets requirements.</b> Page 5 states that MCWD serves in an advisory role on development/redevelopment and holds permitting authority—District staff review development proposals and make recommendations—MCWD permits are required for projects that meet the district’s rule criteria. Department and positional contact information is not provided, and notation on how coordination will be initiated is not stated.</p>	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Information was added in Section 3.4 about the permitting process and Table 3.1 was added listing City Contact Information.
27.	<p>Sets forth a coordination plan that connects the LGU and District in ways that efficiently provide for timely coordination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual meeting to review SWMP implementation</li> <li>• Transmittal of M54 report</li> <li>• Describes how the District can receive notice of and consult with the LGU on its land use planning, infrastructure, park and recreation, and CIP efforts</li> </ul>	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Policies 7.5, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 have been added to address these comments.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes when and how LGU will provide notice on small area plans and other focused development or redevelopment actions</li> <li>• Regulatory coordination — describe how LGU will share information and coordinate on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pre—application and permit reviews</li> <li>○ Construction site inspection and compliance</li> <li>○ WCA where LGU is WCA authority</li> <li>○ Implementation of District Rules where LGU is rule authority for any of MCWD rules</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Discussion of coordination opportunities now, on the horizon and/or requested in the future</li> </ul> <p><b>Does not meet requirements.</b> MCWD Water Resources Plan, Appendix A, Paragraph 5 details an outline for the required, stand-alone, coordination plan. MCWD staff are available to assist the City in creating this framework. Goals and Policies of the Plan start on Page 11; Assessment of Problems starts on Page 17; both sections outline several opportunities for coordination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An annual meeting with the District is not proposed.</li> <li>• Goal 7 (Page 16) discusses holding at least one public meeting per year to address the SWPPP annual report, but transmittal of the M54 report to MCWD is not discussed.</li> <li>• Coordination efforts with MCWD regarding potential projects are set forth in several areas throughout the Plan. However, the Plan does not provide details on how the District will receive notice regarding planning, infrastructure, park and rec, and CIP efforts.</li> <li>• The Plan does not specifically address when and how notice will be provided on small area plans and other development/redevelopment actions.</li> </ul> <p>As stated in previous bullet, the Plan either states or suggests that coordination for the listed elements will occur, but it does not cover how that coordination will look</p>		
28.	For each element in 24 above, describe when and how the communication will occur and indicate the department and position for proposed communication plan.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Language was added to Section 3.4 Permitting. Policy 7.8 was added.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	<b>Does not meet requirements.</b> While coordination with MCWD is referenced throughout the Plan, it does not cover when and how communication will occur regarding points in #24 above. The Plan does not provide the department or position responsible for the communication plan.		
29.	P. 18, Impaired Waters section The description “Minnehaha Creek, from Porter Creek to the Minnesota River” is incorrect. Minnehaha Creek flows from Grey’s Bay to the Mississippi River.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	This was corrected in Section 8.2., Impaired Waters.
30.	Throughout Plan. In a number of locations text referring to figures in the Water Resources Plan do not match numbering on the figures themselves. There are also figures (such as SW—03) that are not described or called out in the Plan.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	The figures have been renumbered and referenced accordingly in the text.
31.	30. 1. The Plan needs to include drainage areas, volumes, rates, and paths of stormwater runoff. This information is required for a local water resources management plan and can be incorporated by reference if available from another source but needs to be clearly stated 2. The stormwater runoff from the City drains to Minnehaha Creek and Nine Mile Creek which are impaired for chloride, dissolved oxygen, and fish and aquatic invertebrate bioassessments. The Plan should discuss how the City’s surface runoff affects those impaired waters and what the City’s role is or will be in fulfilling current and future TMDL allocations, including related implementation projects and funding sources needed to address these impairments. 3. Finally, the Plan referred to a few figures, but all figures numbered as “WRx.x” are not found either in the Water Resources Management Plan or in the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Please update or indicate where those figures can be found. November 8, 2018	Met Council	1. Subwatershed flow direction is shown on Figure SW-01. The City’s subwatersheds are shown on Figure SW-08. The HHPLS study is referenced in Table 5.3. Rate and volume information has been included in Section 5.3 and Figure SW-10. 2. Addressed in Section 7.2, Policy 2.8 3. The figures have been renumbered and referenced accordingly in the text.
Advisory Comments			
Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response
1.	if available at the time the City formally submits its Plan for review, we request the City provide the final LWMP in an Appendix with a summary in the body of the Plan, incorporating any recommended revisions from the Council and two Watershed Districts’ reviews of the draft LWMP. if available at the time the Plan is formally submitted, we also request that the City provide the dates that the two Watershed Districts approved the final LWMP, and the date the City adopted the final LWMP.	Met Council	Comment acknowledged

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
2.	<p>Compliance with state rule. The SWMP briefly touches on the basic requirements of Minnesota Rules 8410.016, but needs to be expanded in several areas; this memo describes both required and suggested additions, revisions and clarifications to will be needed for the SWMP to comply with the state rule and achieve consistency with the NMCWD Plan. The SWMP is short on details, and addresses several requirements in a very minimalistic manner, and would be improved by the addition of detail on several points noted below. Performance standards and, areas and elevations for stormwater storage adequate to meet them are needed. (Indeed, the SWMP lacks performance standards throughout.) Drainage areas and volume, rates and paths of stormwater have not been defined; the SWMP notes<sup>2</sup> that the city has been delineated into roughly 60 subwatersheds, but no map or figure showing these areas or description of their features is provided. Water quality protection methods adequate to meet performance standards are not identified. NMCWD finds that while the SWMP's goal and policy statement are generally consistent with the NMCWD Plan (with certain specific changes noted below), the city should consider referencing and/or incorporating policies and goals from relevant watershed district plans, including the NMCWD Plan, to bolster the scope and comprehensiveness of the city's goals and policies. Further, the city can significantly improve the comprehensiveness and implementation effectiveness of the SWMP by clarifying its deference to the exercise of regulatory authority by NMCWD for the portion of the city within the Nine Mile Creek watershed, as discussed in more detail below.</p>	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged
3.	<p><i>Mechanical, typographical specifics.</i> A table of contents and section numbering would make the SWMP more readily navigated and would facilitate future reference by city staff and partners in water-resources protection and flood-mitigation efforts. In light of the lack of such reference points in the draft SWMP, NMCWD supplements the significant issues identified in this memo with comments and suggested (Roman text) or required (underlined) revisions as notes in the attached Adobe Acrobat file.<sup>0</sup> Also, the SWMP as presented in draft form has confusing and seemingly disconnected references and cross-references to tables and figures (e.g., there is a reference on page 16 to "Table 1.0," but it appears that</p>	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	A Table of Contents and section numbering has been added. References have been updated.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	instead, perhaps, the reference should be to Table WR—4; there are references to Figure SW—01 in a few places in the draft plan but no such figure is readily found). <sup>0</sup> The SWMP notes that because the city is effectively completely developed, “future land[—]use changes will be a result of redevelopment activities,” which strikes NMCWD as a sound statement of an important background fact. From here, though, the SWMP often incongruously refers to how “development” will affect stormwater and flood-flow management. The SWMP should generally address water resource issues in redevelopment, consistent with the characterization of future land-use early in the SWMP.		
4.	<i>Baseline data update needed.</i> The City should consider updating its hydrologic hydraulic modeling.	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Rate and volume information has been included in Section 5.3 and Figure SW-10. Updating the model has been added as an implementation item.
5.	<i>Land-Use Planning Coordination.</i> Section 1.4 of the NMCWD Plan discusses NMCWD’s interests in coordinating closely with not only city water—resource and public works staffs, but with individuals and departments focused on planning and economic development as well. The stated goal and continued intention is to ensure integration of water-resource management and protection into city redevelopment initiatives. The draft SWMP does not address this opportunity, but NMCWD encourages Hopkins to consider at least a general commitment in the SWMP that would reflect projects such as the effort to coordinate integration of stormwater-management features into the construction of and redevelopment along the Southwest Light Rail corridor.	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Added language in Section 3.1 – Future Land Use
6.	NMCWD’s flood-management elevations along the creek should be referenced.	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	The flood panel hyperlink is included in Section 3.3.
7.	<b>Modeling &amp; Studies.</b> A brief description of stormwater issues in the 13th Avenue area is presented. Other problem areas within the Hopkins, if any, should be identified and described here as well.	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged. The 13 <sup>th</sup> Ave summary is provided in Table 5.3, because it was the only study with results not fully implemented.

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
8.	<b>Rain Gages.</b> The draft SWMP states that Hopkins has a precipitation gage located at the city public works facility. It should be noted that this gage is operated and maintained by NMCWD.	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Section 6.2 has been updated to recognize this comment.
9.	<i>Goal 2: Water Quality.</i> Policy 2.7 states Hopkins' intent to adopt policies to minimize chloride contamination through attention to road-maintenance practices. The SWMP notes that Nine Mile Creek is impaired for chloride and that a Total Maximum Daily Load study has been approved for chloride reduction/management. No further discussion is provided for the implementation of chloride reduction in Hopkins. The language in the draft SWMP should be expanded to state awareness of NMCWD's chloride—management education and training efforts, as well as the chloride-reduction requirement added to NMCWD's rules in 2018.	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Section 7.2, Policy 2.9 has been added to address this comment.
10.	<i>Goal 4: Wetlands.</i> The SWMP mentions that a protective buffer strip must be retained arounds wetlands. But no specific buffer—width requirements or standards are identified and no reference to the standards establish in NMCWD Rule 3.0: Wetland Management.	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Policy 4.4 has been updated in Section 7.4.
11.	<i>Goal 6: Floodplain Management.</i> As required to harmonize the SWMP with the NMCWD Plan (subsection 7.1.1), the city must commit to coordinating with NMCWD to develop floodplain information and set consistent flood elevations, as well as maintaining critical 100-year flood-storage volumes. The SWMP states that city ordinance will regulate development adjacent to the floodplain districts, but should reference regulation of land-uses allowed by the city to ensure no encroachment in or into the floodplain, to ensure no loss of floodplain storage, and to ensure no structures are built without adequate freeboard. (The policy statements do address these requirements.) This section of the draft SWMP does not reference or discuss NMCWD's floodplain-protection rule or the role of NMCWD in regulating to mitigate flood risk.	Nine Mile Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged
12.	An executive summary stating highlights of the local water plan. <b>Meets requirements.</b> Plan is organized according to MR 8410 and includes the general requirements.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged
13.	A summary of water resource management—related agreements, including joint powers agreements, into which the LGU has entered with watershed management organizations, adjoining LGUs, private parties or others. <b>Meets requirements.</b> Page	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged

<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	2 lists the agencies that have some level of administrative responsibility in the City, including MCWD.		
14.	A statement of the process to amend the local plan, consistent with Minnesota Statutes §1038.23S. <b>Meets requirements.</b> The amendment process is covered in a section that begins on Page 4. This paragraph should clearly set forth the types of amendments that would be considered minor and would not require WMO review and approval, and those that would adhere to the statutory amendment process.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged
15.	List and describe completed or programmed small area plans and similar planning activities to assess the LGU's role with respect to defined—area redevelopment. <b>Meets requirements.</b> No small area plans are listed. However, the Design Criteria section that starts on Page 9 notes the rate control requirements for redevelopment. Page 10 states that redevelopment must include facilities to provide water quality treatment and runoff control. Page 5 notes that MCWD will serve in an advisory role and permitting authority for redevelopment.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged
16.	21. Identify District assistance or coordination that would benefit any of these programs. <b>Meets requirements.</b> Coordination with MCWD is stated and implied throughout the Plan.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged
17.	Contains an implementation program, consistent with MN Rules 8410.0160. <b>Meets requirements.</b> Table WR 1.6 on Page 22 provides an implementation plan with estimated costs and funding sources. Please include priorities.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged
18.	Identify any District rules for which the LGU wishes to assume sole regulatory authority, and provide the supplementary information required under Section 3.6.4 of the WMP. <b>Meets requirements.</b> Policy 4.1 on Page 14 indicates the MCWD shall administer wetland protection and mitigation in accordance with WCA—no changes to that structure proposed—no changes to that structure or to any MCWD authority proposed.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged
19.	State whether the LGU intends to assume the role of "local government unit" responsible to implement the Minnesota Wetlands Conservation Act (WCA) or whether it chooses for the District to assume that role.	Minnehaha Creek Watershed	Comment acknowledged



<b>Surface Water Management</b>			
	<b>Meets requirements.</b> Policy 4.1 on Page 14 indicates the MCWD shall administer wetland protection and mitigation as LGU in accordance with WCA—no changes to that structure proposed.		

<b>Water Supply</b>			
<b>Incomplete Comments</b>			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	The Council has not yet reviewed the City’s Water Supply Plan that was submitted to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) on March 19., 2018. if changes are made to the water supply plan resulting from the DNR's review of the plan or from changes as a result of revisions to the full comprehensive plan, such as changes to forecasts, the City will need to provide the Council and DNR with the updated information when it submits its final Plan.  In the meantime, Council staff recommend that the City develop and include cooperative agreements for emergency water supply service.	Met Council	Comments from the MnDNR have yet to be received. The water supply plan has been revised and will be resubmitted based on revised population forecasts provided by the Met Council.
2.	Please also note that Appendix WR2.’ Water Supply, Treatment, and Distribution uses outdated forecasts that are inconsistent with the forecasts used in the rest of the Plan. Forecasts must be used consistently across plan elements.	Met Council	The water supply plan has been revised and will be resubmitted based on revised population forecasts provided by the Met Council.

<b>Wastewater</b>			
<b>Incomplete Comments</b>			
<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Proposed Response</b>
1.	Table that details adopted community sewered forecasts in 10-year increments to 2040 for households and employment.	Met Council	The table has been revised as requested. Text has been

<b>Wastewater</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This should be broken down by the four (4) discharge points to the Metropolitan Disposal System:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M123</li> <li>M122</li> <li>Westerly to Minnetonka</li> <li>Northernly to Minnetonka</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		added to detail the methodology for splitting these sewer forecasts in lieu of completing a system wide sanitary sewer model.
2.	<p>An electronic map or maps (GIS shape files or equivalent) showing the following information regarding the existing sanitary sewer system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lift stations.</li> <li>Existing connections points to the metropolitan disposal system.</li> <li>Future connection points for new growth if needed.</li> <li>Local sewer service districts by connection point.</li> <li>Intercommunity connections.</li> </ul>	Met Council	Figure has been modified to illustrate this information.
3.	Copy of Intercommunity service agreements entered into with an adjoining community, including a map of areas covered by the agreement.	Met Council	Reference to any intercommunity service agreements has been added.
4.	<p>Table or tables that provide the following local system information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity and design flows for existing trunk sewers</li> <li>Assignment of 2040 growth forecasts by Metropolitan interceptor.</li> </ul>	Met Council	<p>Table WR3.4 lists the data for the City's only trunk sanitary sewer.</p> <p>2040 growth forecasts have been assigned by Metropolitan Council interceptor / lift station.</p>
5.	<p>Describe the sources, extent, and significance of existing inflow and infiltration in both the municipal and private sewer systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a copy of the local ordinance or resolution requiring the disconnection of existing foundation drains, sump pumps, and roof leaders from the sanitary sewer system.</li> </ul>	Met Council	<p>City Ordinance 705.09 is included and discussed in the Infiltration and Inflow section.</p> <p>For added clarity, a hyperlink to City ordinance 705.09 has now been added.</p>
6.	Describe the sources, extent, and significance of existing inflow and infiltration in both the municipal and private sewer systems.	Met Council	An estimate of costs of I&I based on the sanitary sewer

<b>Wastewater</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a breakdown of residential housing stock age within the community into pre- and post-1970 era, and what percentage of pre-1970 era private services have been evaluated for I/I susceptibility and repair.</li> <li>• Include a cost summary for remediating the Hi sources identified in the community. If previous I/I mitigation work has occurred in the community, include a summary of flow reductions and investments completed. If costs for mitigating I/I have not been analyzed, include the anticipated wastewater service rates or other costs attributed to inflow and infiltration.</li> </ul>		<p>rate is included on page 8 of Appendix WR3: Sanitary Sewer.</p> <p>A breakdown of housing stock age pre/post 1970 has been added. A narrative regarding inspection of sewer service pipes during reconstruction projects has been expanded.</p>
7.	<p>Describe the implementation plan for preventing and eliminating excessive inflow and infiltration from entering both the municipal and private sewer systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include the strategy for implementing projects, activities, or programs planned to mitigate excessive I/I from entering the municipal and private sewer systems.</li> <li>• Include a list of priorities for I/I mitigation projects based on flow reduction, budget, schedule, or other criteria.</li> <li>• Include a schedule and the related financial mechanisms planned or needed to implement the I/I mitigation strategy.</li> </ul>	Met Council	Narratives on this subject have been expanded to respond more specifically to these comments.
Advisory Comments			
Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response
1.	Please review the <a href="http://www.metrocouncil.org/iandi">www.metrocouncil.org/iandi</a> website for current I/I policies and additional information.	Met Council	Comment acknowledged

<b>Parks and Trails</b>			
Advisory Comments			
Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response
1.	Appendix B2, Page 21 - 17 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Bicycle Facility Study: The City may wish to update their text regarding the 17 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Bicycle Facility Study to reflect its status, as it currently reads that the study was anticipated to be complete by Fall 2018. In addition, please continue to keep the Park District engaged as the study evolves.	Three Rivers Park District	Update with current study status

2.	Appendix D2, page 12 – Text modification requested: The mileage for the following is confirmed as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cedar Lake LRT Regional Trail: 3.8 miles</li> <li>• North Cedar Lake Regional Trail: 4.4. miles</li> <li>• Lake Minnetonka LRT Regional Trail: 15.8 miles</li> </ul>	Three Rivers Park District	Update mileage as indicated
----	--	----------------------------	-----------------------------

## ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

<b>Economic Competitiveness</b>			
Advisory Comments			
Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response
1.	<p>The Economic Competitiveness section provides “direction for a healthy, robust, and equitable economy.” Racial equity and economic inclusion are weaved throughout the goals and policies. Rightly, the discussion highlights the racial disparities in the economy and strategies to close those gaps. The Center encourages the City to also include language about the economic opportunities of racial equity throughout this section. If racial disparities in workforce, business ownership, income and other areas were closed, the overall economy in Hopkins (and the region) would be noticeably more prosperous. By focusing on the positive economic opportunity of equity, the community can better value its diversity and be optimistic about the future. For resources on the benefits of inclusive growth, see the Center's website.</p> <p>Goal 2 in this section is: “Support a healthy, diverse mix of businesses in Hopkins.” The Center supports the policies under this goal and suggests the addition of a goal to promote the development of business start-ups by People of Color. Minority owned businesses grew at 3.5 times the rate of all Minnesota companies in 2014; therefore, a targeted approach to support the development of minority-owned businesses is a smart public investment.</p> <p>Goal 3 in this section is: “support the development of a well prepared, diverse workforce.” The Center supports the policies under this goal and suggests the City provide more specificity. For example, one of the six policies is “Educate about what jobs are available at the city.” Educate whom? The Center encourages the City to focus its workforce outreach efforts on communities that are currently under-</p>	Center for Economic Inclusion	<p>Add policy to Page 98 related to encouraging business ownership by disadvantaged groups, including people of color, through partnerships.</p> <p>Revise policy statement on Page 99 regarding educating about jobs in the city to reflect that underrepresented groups will be encouraged.</p> <p>Add language to policy on Page 99 regarding encouraging the ability to live and work nearby.</p> <p>Add policy on Page 99 regarding exploring potential for using Community Wealth Building.</p>

<b>Economic Competitiveness</b>			
	<p>represented in government staff roles. By creating a more diverse city workforce, Hopkins can advance several goals at the same time.</p> <p>Goal 4 in this section is: “promote economic equity in Hopkins, to benefit residents regardless of identity or background.” The Center suggests the addition of a policy to “explore the application of Community Wealth Building to build a more equitable economy.” This framework, which includes strategies such as business conversions to worker ownership, is a proven driver of racial equity.</p>		
2.	<p>On page 94 and others, since the city does not directly benefit from adding jobs, need more emphasis in this section on tax base, including specific goals around creating sufficient value to sustain public infrastructure and system. In addition to growing the tax base, should also emphasize using limited resources and infrastructure more efficiently; also ensure this is reflected as possible benchmark value in the implementation element.</p>	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Added statement on importance of tax base to Page 94, and add corresponding policy language around tax base and resource allocation to Page 97, as suggested
3.	<p>The Economic environment is missing economic inequality - the rich are getting richer How do we ensure we are not shifting wealth out of Hopkins? How do we turn this plan in to a call for action from every different persona of citizen of Hopkins?</p> <p>Identifying tech infrastructure investment as something the city can control to help with economic development is important. 5G is coming. In three or so years there will be opportunities to enable high-speed broadband wireless across the whole city. That’s the investment to make. We don’t want VC-backed startups in Hopkins. We want bootstrapped growth companies. Yes to coworkings spaces. Great equity points. Overall this plan is incredible and excited me. I think we need to move quickly to create the community.</p> <p>The only challenges I have to this already holistic and aspirational plan is how can this be more comprehensive, inclusive, and aspirational?</p>	Nathan Miller, online comment portal	The social environment element covers disparities more directly. Additional content added regarding encouraging diverse business development and entrepreneurs

<b>Downtown</b>
Advisory Comments

Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response
1.	On page 100, move “remaining unique” to the top of the list; this is very important and a key differentiator for Hopkins; central social district is also very important. Should indicate that the unique downtown is an important marketing tool for Hopkins – and it keeps getting nicer.	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Reordered points and added statement on marketing tool and getting better on Page 100

## IMPLEMENTATION

<b>Implementation</b>			
Advisory Comments			
Number	Comment	From	Proposed Response
1.	<p>The Center supports the plan’s implementation section, which identifies action steps, timelines and potential indicators for every plan goal. The following are suggestions for strengthening this section in regard to racial equity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 123 suggests “social and economic disparities” as potential indicators. The Center encourages the City to identify specific racial disparity indicators that might be used from the data included in plan (e.g. poverty, unemployment, labor force participation, household income, health insurance and homeownership).</li> <li>• Page 123 also states “Pursue next steps on Hopkins Race and Equity Initiative, including implementing GARE recommendations.” This is the first time that GARE is mentioned in the plan; the Center suggests including the GARE recommendations in an appendix as a reference.</li> </ul>	Center for Economic Inclusion	<p>Add more information on potential indicators on Page 125.</p> <p>Also on Page 125, add link to more information on GARE, and revise language regarding who this and other tools will be used.</p>
2.	<p>Page 113 Goal Alternative Language H #1 Indicator Language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of preserved unites of Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing Units (NOAH) – A specific goal % or numeric goals could be developed based on current availability of affordable housing.</li> <li>• Increase the number of units of affordable housing that are either permanently affordable or long-term housing</li> </ul>	Larry Hiscock	<p>Goal H #2 Page 115</p> <p>Add action step: Explore opportunities to preserve NOAH properties and communicate this goal to existing NOAH owners.</p> <p>Recognizing that some NOAH properties will lose their affordable status due to gentrification, attempt to</p>

Implementation			
			increase the number of affordable housing units that have legally-binding affordability requirements.
3.	<p>113 H #1, 2 Actions:</p> <p>Utilize innovative mechanism to fund or encourage affordable housing. This could include tax abatement, establishing a scatter site Tax Increment Finance District or other value capture method to fund acquisition or create an incentive for landlords to sell their rental property to a preservation buyer.</p>	Larry Hiscock	The City of Hopkins has limited resources to establish a funding stream for acquisition or preservation of affordable housing while still maintaining a reasonable tax rate for all properties. The City will pursue new funding sources for affordable housing development and preservation through grants, partnerships and creative solutions as identified in H#2.
4.	<p>121 QL#3 Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partner directly with culturally based organization (including funding) to build ties with immigrant and refugee communities in Hopkins.</li> <li>• Hire community cultural liaisons to engage community members.</li> </ul>	Larry Hiscock	<p>Aligns better with QL#2.</p> <p>Add action step to Page 121: Look for opportunities to partner with culturally-based organizations to build ties with immigrant communities in Hopkins.</p> <p>Continue the work of building relationships with all residents of the community but especially with those who are new to the community or have not found a meaningful way to make their voices heard.</p>

<b>Implementation</b>			
5.	110 T#3 Actions: The market is already being impacted by the METRO Green Line Extension. The \$2 billion infrastructure improvement is creating private value for property owners. The increased value should be captured to ensure a broader public benefit beyond property owners and infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize a value capture tool to redirect revenue to develop a grant/loan pool to fund equitable development projects.</li> </ul>	Larry Hiscock	The City of Hopkins has a responsibility to all property owners (and renters) to keep our tax rate reasonable and affordable. In order to do this, the City must grow its tax base. The City will use value capture tools when it is deemed necessary to achieve City goals, on a case by case basis.
6.	106 LU#1 Actions: All development agreements should include clear benefits for the community: affordable housing, local hiring, space for small/disadvantaged business, etc.	Larry Hiscock	Each development project has their own set of community benefits and every project is reviewed through that lens. The City of Hopkins ability to require certain community benefits varies greatly depending on the City's role and level of financial and/or land use approvals.
7.	106 LU#1,2 Indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number/Percentage of preserved NOAH units</li> <li>Development agreements requiring new long-term/permanent affordable</li> </ul>	Larry Hiscock	Add indicators to Housing Policy section page 113, H#2
8.	126 EC#4 Actions: It is very positive that the City of Hopkins will be proactively applying an equity lens to its procurement and hiring practices. The City of Hopkins is also home to and borders by large corporate entities. The City of Hopkins should proactively engage and partner with corporations in the area to make the same changes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City of Hopkins will convene and engage local businesses in an effort to advance racial and economic equity.</li> </ul>	Larry Hiscock	The City of Hopkins has no oversight in the hiring practices of private businesses and cannot claim to have proven methods in place around equitable hiring and procurement.
9.	The Hopkins City Council can take immediate action to encourage the production of new affordable housing and protect our neighbors who are renting and vulnerable to being displaced. The Council should act to approve the following:	Larry Hiscock	1. The current draft of the Comp Plan identifies pursuing inclusionary



<b>Implementation</b>			
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inclusionary Zoning Policy</li> <li>2. Just Cause Eviction Requirement</li> <li>3. Advanced Notice of Sale Requirement</li> <li>4. Section 8 Protection Ordinance</li> </ol> <p>Please see the attached fact sheets (on Section 8 protection ordinance, inclusionary housing ordinance, extending just cause requirement, and advanced notice ordinance). Other communities have adopted these policies. It is time for Hopkins to do the same.</p>		<p>zoning standards under Housing Policy H#2 action steps.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. State Statute allows for no-fault nonrenewal of leases with only 30 days of written notice. Cities are prohibited from adopting regulations that give up this right.</li> <li>3. The proposed Tenant Protection Ordinance accomplishes many of the same goals as an Advanced Notice of Sale Requirement.</li> <li>4. The ability of cities to prohibit the denial of prospective tenants on the sole basis that they use the Section 8 program to pay rent is currently being challenged in the courts. The City of Hopkins will monitor the results of the court action and look for ways to encourage the acceptance of the Section 8 voucher program.</li> </ol>
10.	On page 106, move parking requirements study to short term; any zoning related items should be in the short term too	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Made changes as suggested on Pages 108

<b>Implementation</b>			
11.	On page 113, move affordable housing implementation steps into the short term timeframe, rather than medium term – these are high priorities	8/28/18 Planning Commission public input	Make changes as suggested to Page 115