

APPENDIX H:
Reviews and Responses

Adjacent Jurisdictional Review*Brooklyn Center 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update*

<i>Agency</i>	<i>Status</i>
City of Brooklyn Park	Responded - No comments
City of Crystal	
City of Fridley	Responded - Comments incorporated
City of Minneapolis	
City of Robbinsdale	Responded - No comments
Anoka County	
Hennepin County	
ISD 11: Anoka Hennepin	
ISD 279: Osseo	Responded - No comments
ISD 281: Robbinsdale	
ISD 286: Brooklyn Center	
Mississippi River WMO	
Shingle Creek WMO	
West Mississippi WMO	
Three Rivers Parks	Responded - Comments Incorporated
MnDOT	Responded - Comments Incorporated
MnDNR	Responded - Comments Incorporated
MAC	
ACER	Responded - Comments Incorporated
NPS MNRRA	

City of Brooklyn Center 2040 Comprehensive Plan – Affected Jurisdiction Review

Adjacent or Affected Jurisdiction Name: City of Fridley

Please check the appropriate box:

We have reviewed the proposed Comprehensive Plan update, do not have any comments, and are therefore waiving further review.

We have reviewed the proposed Comprehensive Plan update and offer the following comments (attach additional sheets if necessary)

I'm glad to see that the BC Plan recognizes that there is a trail gap between 66th & 252 intersection to the MRT. However, I think the plan misses where the dangerous disconnect in that area is located. Biking in the street on Willow is not problematic. What is difficult and dangerous is the disjointed trail connection from Willow to the east side of 252. Also, the free, high-speed, right turn lane off 252 to 66th is very dangerous to cross.

Most importantly, the map on p. 20 fails to recognize that the MRT also goes up and along 694 and east over the River. This is an important job access connection for people without a car or who chose to bike to work in Fridley or other areas east of Brooklyn Center.

I would suggest adding another bullet to the list on p. 32 that states something about creating linkages to job centers in neighboring communities and another bullet about links to trails over barriers like the Mississippi River.

Northstar
Train
access

Nice, concise plan!

Signature of Reviewer: Julie Jones

Name of Reviewer: Julie Jones

Date: 2-28-19



March 5, 2019

**Three Rivers
Park District
Board of
Commissioners**

Meg Beekman, AICP
Community Development Director
6301 Shingle Creek Parkway
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430

Penny Steele
District 1

RE: City of Brooklyn Center, 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

Dear Meg:

Jennifer DeJournett
District 2

Three Rivers Park District (Park District) submits the following comments regarding your 2040 Comprehensive Plan. If you have further questions or comments, please contact Ann Rexine, Principal Planner at ann.rexine@threeriversparks.org or by phone at 763-694-1103.

Daniel Freeman
Vice Chair
District 3

General Comment

The Transportation Chapter, at time of release for jurisdiction review, was not included. The Park District's regional trail network is often included within this Chapter. The Park District requests copy of this chapter prior to Comp Plan completion so comments and feedback can be provided as appropriate.

John Gunyou
Chair
District 4

Vision, Goals & Strategies, Chapter 2

The City may wish to include within their strategies language that describes the positive working relationship the Park District and City share towards creating a vibrant regional park and trail system. This relationship could be mentioned within the Parks, Trails & Open Space Goals and then again within the Transportation, Transit, Bikeway and Walkability Goals.

John Gibbs
District 5

Map modification requested, Chapter 3

North Mississippi Regional Park appears to have been omitted from Map 3-2, Future Land Use and Map 3-3, Areas Planned For Change. This may also directly affect the acreage calculations in Table 3-3.

Page(s)

14 (Map 3-2)
21 (Map 3-3)

Steven Antolak
Appointed
At Large

Text modification requested.

- "The primary access to the Regional Park....for the Mississippi River Trail (MRT)—a **dually designated state and** regional trail—which runs north/south through the park adjacent to the Mississippi River. **The trail's regional naming designation, provided by Three Rivers Park District, is West Mississippi River Regional Trail."**
- "Map ~~5~~6-2 shows the Regional Park Map developed by Three Rivers Park District."

Page(s)

Chapter 6,
Page 4

Gene Kay
Appointed
At Large

NOTE: If the City prefers, further along in Chapter 6 (page 16) the trail is referred to as the MRT/West Mississippi River Regional Trail - which may alleviate confusion.

Boe Carlson
Superintendent

<p>Text modification requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The three regional trails include: 1) Shingle Creek Regional Trail, 2) Twin Lakes Regional Trail, and the West Mississippi River Regional Trail (WMRRT). Map 6-5 illustrates the regional trails in the City.” • “This regional trail travels through Brooklyn Center and Robbinsdale as it connects the West Mississippi River Regional Trail (WMRRT)...” • “Its alignment utilizes a combination of paved road-separated trail and sidewalk. {confirm}” 	<p>Page(s) Chapter 6, Page 12</p>
<p>Clarification and/or text modification requested.</p> <p>As the text states, “The City of Brooklyn Center’s Pedestrian Bicycle and Trail Plan identifies proposed improvements to the trail to eventually complete a connection between the Crystal Lake Regional Trail and WMRRT.”</p> <p>The Park District notes that the Twin Lake Regional Trail connection between Crystal Lake Regional Trail and WMRRT is substantially complete, with the exception of a 0.1 mile segment north of Twin Lake Park.</p>	<p>Page Chapter 6, Page 12</p>
<p>Map modification requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map 6-4, Brooklyn Center Trails identifies regional trails operated and maintained by the Park District. To avoid confusion, please label the red trail “Mississippi River Trail/West Mississippi River Regional Trail” if the City wishes to recognize the designated shared corridor. • Please modify the following to recognize the name change for the following park, “Coon Rapids Dam Mississippi Gateway Regional Park.” 	<p>Page Chapter 6, Page 13 (Map 6-4)</p>
<p>Map modifications requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twin Lakes Regional Trail from Highway 100 to North Mississippi Regional Park along 57th Ave. N is complete. The mapping shows this as planned. • While outside of the Brooklyn Center jurisdictional boundary, Crystal Lake Regional Trail is substantially complete within the mapping boundaries in Robbinsdale and Crystal (to 62nd Ave. N near the Crystal Airport). The mapping shows this as planned. 	<p>Page Chapter 6, Page 14 (Map 6-5)</p>
<p>Map modifications requested.</p> <p>Map 6-6. Twin Lake Regional Trail improvements depicts a map pulled from the master plan which dates to 2012. Similar to the comment above, the Twin Lakes Regional Trail is complete from Highway 100 to North Mississippi Regional Park along 57th Ave. N.</p>	<p>Page Chapter 6, Page 15 (Map 6-6)</p>
<p>Text modifications requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A regional trail search corridor for the West Mississippi River Regional Trail is included in the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan....Coon Rapids Dam Mississippi Gateway Regional Park.....” • Building on the planning process of the search corridor, the Three Rivers Park District Board of Commissioners is in the process of finalizing A master plan for the West Mississippi River Regional Trail at the time this Plan was complete was adopted in May of 2018. • The West Mississippi River Regional Trail will link Coon Rapids Dam Mississippi Gateway and North Mississippi Regional Parks, and the Rush Creek, Medicine Lake and Twin Lakes Regional Trails. 	<p>Page Chapter 6, Page 16</p>

<p>Map modifications requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted previously, the Twin Lakes Regional Trail is complete along 57th Ave. N from Highway 100 to North Mississippi Regional Park. Map 6-9 is depicting this stretch as planned. Also noted previously, the Mississippi River Trail is dually named with the West Mississippi River Regional Trail and the legend should reflect this. 	<p>Page Chapter 6, Page 19 (Map 6-9)</p>
<p>Map modifications requested.</p> <p>The Twin Lakes Regional Trail is showing as a trail gap along 57th Ave. N from Highway 100 to North Mississippi Regional Park – which is complete.</p>	<p>Page Chapter 6, Page 20 (Map 6-10)</p>
<p>Text modifications requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The Mississippi River Trail (MRT)/<u>West Mississippi River Regional Trail</u> runs through this corridor and is managed in this stretch by Three Rivers Park District.” 	<p>Page Appendix A, Page 19</p>
<p>Map modifications requested.</p> <p>Figure A-10 appears to overlap text.</p>	<p>Page Appendix A, Page 23</p>
<p>Text modifications requested.</p> <p>“The Mississippi River Trail (MRT)/<u>West Mississippi River Regional Trail</u> runs as <u>an off-road-separated</u> paved trail along most of the river corridor in the City.”</p>	<p>Page Appendix A, Page 26</p>
<p>Text modifications requested.</p> <p>The 57th Avenue extension can be removed from the list of Current Development Activities. In turn, the Park District is actively coordinating the funding and implementation of the missing West Mississippi River Regional Trail gap along Willow Avenue – which could be added to this list.</p>	<p>Page Background Report, Page 47</p>

CC: File
Metropolitan Council
Danny McCullough, Park District Regional Trails System Manager

February 5, 2019

Meg Beekman, AICP, Community Development Director
City of Brooklyn Center
6301 Shingle Creek Parkway
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430

SUBJECT: Brooklyn Center 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update
MnDOT Review # CPA19-005
City of Brooklyn Center, Hennepin County

Dear Ms. Beekman:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Transportation Chapter of the Brooklyn Center 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update, which we received 1/14/19. MnDOT offers the following comments:

MN 252/I-94 Improvements

At the top of page 8, the plan update states: “The planned improvements of this corridor are not currently identified in the current Revenue Scenario for Highways in the Metropolitan Council’s 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (2040 TPP), however study of the corridor will continue within this planning period [...] While a project is not identified in the 2040 TPP, a project to convert TH 252 to a freeway, add capacity and add MnPASS lanes on TH 252 and I-94 was funded by the state legislature in 2023 through the Corridors of Commerce funding program.”

However, the October 24, 2018 Update of the regional [Transportation Policy Plan](#) (TPP) states in [Chapter 5](#) on page 42: “Parts of the MnPASS vision on MN 252/I-94 from MN 610 to Dowling Avenue, I-494 from US 169 to MN 5 and I-35W from Ramsey County Road C to downtown Minneapolis are funded in this plan and so these corridors are shown as both Tier I as part of the Current Revenue Scenario and Tier II as part of the Increased Revenue Scenario.” This project is shown on Figure 5-14 “MnPASS System under Current Revenue Scenario.”

Also, [Appendix C](#) of the TPP, which identifies Long-Range Highway Capital Projects for 2018-2040, states: “The Minnesota Department of Transportation provided the list of projects to be included in the Current Revenue Scenario for the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan” and page 43 of [Appendix C](#) identifies the Regional Mobility project on MN 252 and I-94 “Freeway conversion of MN 252 and MnPASS from 610 to Dowling along I-94” in the 2022-2027 Timeframe.

MnDOT recommends that the city’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update Transportation Chapter be made consistent with the 2040 regional TPP.

Safe Routes to School

MnDOT notes that the city received a Safe Routes to School planning grant in 2012 for the Earle Brown Elementary School at 59th Ave N and Humbolt Ave N. The school is immediately adjacent to MN 100 and a pedestrian bridge over the highway, which connects to a limited local sidewalk network.

The city’s comprehensive plan update could benefit from the inclusion of relevant recommendations of SRTS planning. Additional information about Safe Routes to Schools programs and funding is available

at: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/saferoutes/>. For questions, please contact Dave Cowan, MnDOT Safe Routes to Schools Coordinator, at 651-366-4180 or Dave.Cowan@state.mn.us.

Review Submittal Options

MnDOT's goal is to review proposed development plans and documents within 30 days of receipt. Electronic file submittals are typically processed more rapidly. There are four submittal options:

1. Email documents and plans in .pdf format to metrodevreviews.dot@state.mn.us. Attachments may not exceed 20 megabytes per email. If multiple emails are necessary, number each message.
2. Upload .pdf file(s) to MnDOT's external shared internet workspace site at: <https://mft.dot.state.mn.us>. Contact MnDOT Planning development review staff at metrodevreviews.dot@state.mn.us for access instructions and send an email listing the file name(s) after the documents have been uploaded.
3. Mail, courier, or hand deliver documents and plans in .pdf format on a CD-ROM compact disc to:
MnDOT – Metro District Planning Section
Development Reviews Coordinator
1500 West County Road B-2
Roseville, MN 55113
4. Submit printed documents via U.S. Mail, courier, or hand delivery to the address above. Include one set of full size plans.

You are welcome to contact me with questions at 651-234-7795.

Sincerely,

David Elvin, Senior Planner

Copy sent via E-Mail:

Buck Craig, Permits
Chris Hoberg, Area Engineer
Jason Junge, Traffic
Brian Kelly, Water Resources
Cameron Muhic, Multimodal Planning
Dave Cowan, Safe Routes to Schools
Douglas Nelson, Right of Way
Jeff Rones, Design
Brad Larsen, MnPASS
Russell Owen, Metropolitan Council

Correspondence Received from:

African Career, Education and Resource (ACER)

RE: Brooklyn Center 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

Under the Metropolitan Land Planning Act (the Act), Min. Stat. §§473.841-473.869, and the Metropolitan Council's 2040 Housing Policy Plan, the housing elements of comprehensive plans must include:

1. Standards, plans, programs, fiscal devices, and other specific actions, to be undertaken in stated sequence, which "will" meet existing local and regional housing needs. Minn. Stat. § 473.859 Subd. 4; 2040 Housing Policy at 109, 113.
2. Acknowledgement of the community's share of the region's need for low and moderate income housing. 2040 Housing Policy at 109.
3. Promotion of the availability of land for development of low and moderate income housing. 2040 Housing Policy at 109.
4. A description of the tools the City will employ to address housing needs and the sequence for their implementation. 2040 Housing Policy at 113.

The council's Planning Handbook adds the following requirements:

1. An assessment of existing needs including specific required data.
2. A narrative analysis of existing housing needs clearly identifying existing needs and priorities. The Handbook adds that this analysis should address potential barriers to meeting those needs.

3. A clear and direct linkage between needs identified and tools to be employed, focusing on different levels of affordability. Plans consistent with Council policy will consider all widely accepted tools to address their housing needs.

The plan is lacking very much in comprehensiveness especially when it comes to identifying important issues such as barriers and how to address them. The Housing section broadly names some very important issues that impact housing, but yet, by its own admittance (Housing, pg. 8) fails to go the length that is needed to explain the barriers and how to address them. In this memo, we will address the important issues in housing in Brooklyn Center that have been vaguely mentioned, but not adequately addressed as required by statute, and also address one that has been completely left out that plays a critical role. The plan also fails to incorporate the recommendations of the Fair Housing Implementation Council especially the addendum to the Regional Analysis to Impediments in Fair Housing.

The analysis misses important issues important to housing in Brooklyn Center

The document names and states in very general terms some of the housing challenges the city faces, but does not provide a clear analysis of the situation. We aim to focus on the three issues the city raises of evictions, housing cost burden and problems experienced by tenants. The latter two issues disproportionately impact low wealth people of color. We will also focus on what the document fails to point out which are the racial gap in homeownership and issues of displacement connected to high risk of much cheaper NOAH apartments. The last point is also correlated to the fact that most of the city's apartments are currently owned by a single investor who is intent on converting more NOAH units.

- a) Evictions

According to a 2016 Minnesota Housing Partnership report, the City of Brooklyn Center ranked 9th in number of evictions for cities in Minnesota, and was 5th in eviction rates.¹

The eviction problem is mentioned in this plan but unjustly glossed over. The report indicates that the problem is serious and understood, but no effort is made to expound on it and analyze it. The problem should not just be limited to residents' feelings as implied by the report. The real cause and consequences need to be named and analyzed and solutions developed. Due to the approach taken by the report, no action steps are provided for how this serious problem that has a significant impact is going to be addressed.

b) Housing cost burden

The plan points out that the Metropolitan Council considers housing affordable when people are not spending more than 30% of their income on housing costs. And further indicates that according to the Metropolitan Council 93% of housing units in 2017 in Brooklyn Center were considered affordable. (Housing, pg 12). These statements are deficient and lack a real analysis and are therefore misleading about the real state of housing affordability for the actual residents of Brooklyn Center. Over 45% of residents in Brooklyn Center are actually spending well over 30%, of their income on housing, so it is impossible that 93% of housing in the City would be affordable to them. Another part of the report very vaguely raises the issue of housing cost burden and how it is significantly higher compared to the rest of the metro area. It attributes this to younger wage earners, lower jobs and senior age income earners. (Housing, pg. 17) However it fails to point out that this issue disproportionately impacts people of color as well as low

¹ Norton, Gabriela. MHP Connect. How does Minnesota stack up? Newly released data on evictions. 4/18/2018. <https://www.mhponline.org/blog/connect/832-evictions-lab>

wealth renters. This is important in identifying solutions that can really solve the problem. Page 15 of the plan also ignores the issue of housing cost burden when it indicates that despite a high rate of affordability, the Metropolitan Council still identifies a need for additional affordability. This ignores the perilous situation that housing cost burden places on many residents in the city and its threat to people's prosperity. The report lacks an in depth analysis of the issue of housing affordability and also a coherent sequence, and this plays a role in these contradicting statements. As a result, once again, there is no clear statement on the issue, its impact and how it will be addressed and how the solutions will be implemented to resolve this issue.

c) Challenges faced by low income tenants

The report vaguely voices that NOAH properties are old and not well maintained and this is what makes them affordable. However, it still goes further to decry the additional units that are assigned to the city. It should be noted that if the units were repaired, then they would not be affordable. The section also really downplays the real challenges that low income tenants face. The impact of unrepaired unhealthy housing such as impact on health, unnecessary financial burden that this places on already low wealth tenants and how destabilizing this can be, lack of tenant protections from bad actor landlords, are not indicated here, and once again due to the lack of analysis of the issue, there are no clear solutions as to how this problem will be addressed.

d) Racial gap in homeownership

The city of Brooklyn Center has the second highest gap in homeownership between white people and people of color in Minnesota. This is not indicated anywhere in the report and therefore not analyzed and no solutions offered. Homeownership is the most common

way that Americans use to build wealth. If this is not readily available to residents of color of Brooklyn Center who are a majority in the city, then it behooves the city to prioritize his issue. This issue is not even named, thus lacking an analysis of the situation and once again there is no plan to address this important issue.

- e) Issues of displacement and gentrification and eminent high risk of continued loss of affordable housing

The City of Brooklyn Center has very few units that are publicly subsidized. The vast majority of its multi unit housing stock that houses most of its low wealth community members is only cheaper than market rate housing because of their physical state. The few units that are project based with public investment are nearing their term. In 2017 Victoria Townhomes lost its affordability when the owner did not opt back in when the term expired and since then the current residents still continue to face numerous challenges and a good number of the original tenants who were forced by circumstances to move out, ended up losing their housing vouchers. The plan also very vaguely mentions the potential of losing the current Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing which makes up the bulk of affordable housing in Brooklyn Center. It is lacking a comprehensive conversation on the real danger that these units are in. In 2018, the region was losing these units at a rate of 100 units a week and the city of Brooklyn Center is no exception. The City lost Brooks Landing, and despite investing in the units, does not place a requirement for the preservation of affordability. This is detrimental to the preservation of affordable housing which is much cheaper than production. Also, the current data on affordable housing in the city is drawn from 2016 data and most of the

activity on loss of these units occurred in 2017 and 2018 and is still ongoing. This means that the affordable housing requirement of 268 units is much lower than what the real projected need should be. This is not reflected in the plan, because this issue has not been analyzed. There is also no clear commitment as required by the statute to meeting the affordable housing need requirement and what steps the city will take to do this. Another significant piece of information missing from the plan is that majority of the rental units in Brooklyn Center are owned by an individual investor. This individual is also speculating on additional NOAH units and is intent on converting them to lose their affordability. This issue should be noted as a high risk factor for affordability and community stability and the city needs to address how they can counter the effect this investor's actions.

A new policy specifically addressing housing affordable to households at or below 30% of AMI is required, along with specific action steps implementing that policy.

As described above, addressing extremely low-income housing, the city's most pressing existing housing need and the largest single need for new affordable housing, requires operating and rent subsidies. Addressing the city's most serious and pressing housing needs requires a new policy, prioritizing assistance for extremely low-income households and providing actions steps to implement it.

These action steps should include the following:

The city needs to create tools such as rent subsidies for their most vulnerable populations.

Ensuring that the city's use of LIHTC housing to provide a real and meaningful priority for selecting projects serving extremely low-income households.

Adding to the City's legislative agenda, statutory changes allowing Tax Increment funds to be used to provide rent and operating subsidies.

There are no clearly laid out policy statements, and the Housing Goals, Tools and Descriptions lack the specificity required by the Act, the Metropolitan Council's Housing Policy, and the Planning Handbook.

Action steps proposed with housing related policies are almost entirely lacking in the specificity, and connection to stated needs that is required by the Act and Council policy. The plan has 'Housing Goals' but does not have any policies. The lack of specificity substantially limits meaningful response from citizens. Worse, many of them are phrased in terms of "exploring," "developing," or "considering" policies. The 'Description' of these goals are also filled with the same non actionable terms. Development of a Comprehensive Plan meeting the statutory requirements cited above is the time for exploring, developing, and creating policies. The draft plan's purported "action steps" instead put these critical steps off for some future time over the next 10 years. Here are specific action steps the City should adopt.

The city should take advantage of the future development of new market rate housing in two ways: 1) the city should designate areas with this housing is developing as housing TIF districts, with TIF which can then be used city wide for up to 25 years. 2) The city should impose inclusionary housing policies, permitted by Minn. Stat. §462.358 Subd. 11 and mandated by the implementation plan provisions of the Act, requiring 15%-20% of new units to be affordable at 50% of AMI. TIF districts and inclusionary districts could be linked and the program mutually supportive. The City has given a developer – Alatis, exclusive development rights to over 30 acres of land in a prime area. This is a great area that is ready for development, where the city could implement this. This should be an action item instead of the city "Exploring opportunities

to incorporate new affordable housing into redevelopment areas”. The market is already showing signs of strengthening and it will continue to grow.

The City should require a 30-year affordability requirement for LIHTC property and any property with any public investment.

Tool HRA/CDA/EDA of “Housing Goal 1” is redundant. There are already numerous market studies from the County, and other research entities that have named the dire need for affordable housing and the opportunities that exist. This must be replaced with a series of specific action steps designed to address preservation of naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH) and protect residents of these properties. All the tools should be acted upon, and not just considered, and as stated above when any public investment in the form of direct dollars, TIF or Tax Abatement, it should be coupled with a requirement for below 30% AMI and a 30-year affordability.

Instead of just “Exploring opportunities to improve City housing policies and ordinances to make more responsive”, the city needs to act on the proposed stated ‘descriptions’ stated in the plan. The City should also act to protect residents from exploitation and displacement. The city can enact the following policies:

Require advance notice, prior to closing on any purchase agreement, to City and residents of sale of such properties. Such advance notice requirements have been instrumental in preserving federally subsidized properties locally and nationally.

Require relocation assistance provided by the developer, at Uniform Relocation Act levels, for low income (80% of AMI or less) households displaced through loss of NOAH housing.

Prohibit additional screening of tenants in place when NOAH properties are purchased.

Require 1:1 replacement by developer of NOAH units lost through redevelopment.

Enact a right of first refusal for preservation buyers.

Enact rent restrictions on assisted preservation buyers to assure long term affordability.

Implement a program of modest City loans, coupled with 4(d) property tax treatment in return for extended affordability commitments from rental owners.

Take steps necessary to adopt a rent stabilization ordinance.

Develop a strategy allowing preservation purchases of smaller buildings.

The City must develop a policy for monitoring all projects with City funding to prepare for possible opt out situations like that which occurred with Victoria Townhomes and Brooks Landing and caused displacement of all residents.

Financially support organizations that proactively help tenants understand and enforce their rights.

Amend licensing ordinance so that loss of a rental license does not require residents to move, prohibits rent collections, but continues to impose maintenance duties on owner.

Make expanded City use of Tenant Remedies actions, cooperate with residents bringing such actions, and provide City funds to correct code violations.

Adopt Just Cause only eviction ordinance.

Adopt ordinances limiting excessive tenant screening for credit scores, minimum incomes, and criminal histories.

Research the Evictions issue and come up with policies and steps that clearly address evictions.

City of Brooklyn Center 2040 Comprehensive Plan – Affected Jurisdiction Review

Adjacent or Affected Jurisdiction Name: ISD 279: Osseo School District

Please check the appropriate box:

We have reviewed the proposed Comprehensive Plan update, do not have any comments, and are therefore waiving further review.

We have reviewed the proposed Comprehensive Plan update and offer the following comments (attach additional sheets if necessary)

Multiple horizontal lines for writing comments.

Signature of Reviewer: *Ronald Meyer*

Name of Reviewer: _____

Date: 3/8/19

Ronald Meyer
Executive Director of
Finance & Operations
ISD 279 - Osseo Area Schools