

Naming Policy Comments 11.4.2025

Resp	IP Address	Method	What ideas or concerns would you like to share about the draft Naming Policy?	Theme	Theme ID	Theme Impact	Response
1	24.118.224.62	online survey	This policy is just so out of touch with public opinion, and given the board's poor record of public engagement it's not surprising but there's no way you can claim this is going to be a good representation of your constituents. My neighborhood conducted a thorough community survey on a name change several years ago, and dozens of people responded unprompted to an open-ended question that no names of any people should be considered. When are we going to stop putting ourselves in the position of weighing every name of a person that's put forward and wonder how long it will be until it's judged inappropriate and has to be removed? ... Has the Native Partnership Council been involved and consulted on this entire policy or only the limited aspects deemed relevant? Because they will tell you too that using the names of people has never been how places are named here.	no naming after people	Th001	High	The draft policy and the current policy provide direction on how to name or rename a park or park asset after a person. Removing this option would be a significant policy change. If this is recommended by the Board, staff recommend additional community engagement.
3	170.159.4.1	online survey	Public spaces should never be named after a person. Just stick to Indigenous or descriptive names to avoid an possible issues.	no naming after people	Th001	High	The draft policy and the current policy provide direction on how to name or rename a park or park asset after a person. Removing this option would be a significant policy change. If this is recommended by the Board, staff recommend additional community engagement.
1	24.118.224.62	online survey	The policy includes considerations for using Dakota names - but it has no mention of the traditions or values used in designating place names by the original and ongoing stewards of this land.	designating names by original and/or ongoing stewards	Th002	Low	The draft policy establishes procedure for Dakota or Indigenous naming to be Dakota or Indigenous led.
1	24.118.224.62	online survey	Granting naming rights based on large donations is also completely contrary to public sentiment, and raises even more concerns about names being chosen that will cause controversy and real harm, and put the board and the community in the position of having to relitigate them over and over, instead of doing the things that we should actually be doing in service of the parks.	concern about naming for donations	Th003	High	A primary focus of the draft policy was to provide direction on naming rights in regard to donations. This is a concept that has been supported in citywide statistically valid community surveys. Removing this option would be a significant policy change. If this is recommended by the Board, staff recommend additional community engagement.
3	170.159.4.1	online survey	Minneapolis parks should NEVER be named after a business or corporation, no matter how much they donate. The donation could be acknowledged on a small plaque but should not be part of any park or park asset name. Do not corporatize out public parks.	concern about naming for donations	Th003	High	A primary focus of the draft policy was to provide direction on naming rights in regard to donations. This is a concept that has been supported in citywide statistically valid community surveys. Removing this option would be a significant policy change. If this is recommended by the Board, staff recommend additional community engagement.
5	45.8.19.175	online survey	No naming policy should be based on money, period.	concern about naming for donations	Th003	High	A primary focus of the draft policy was to provide direction on naming rights in regard to donations. This is a concept that has been supported in citywide statistically valid community surveys. Removing this option would be a significant policy change. If this is recommended by the Board, staff recommend additional community engagement.
2	207.153.20.214	online survey	I think this is an important step for MPRB to undertake and support the intent of the proposed policy. I think the policy would be stronger if it took into account the unique circumstances when MPRB enters into a fundraising agreement with a 3rd party or partner organization. In those cases the donor recognition levels may need to be different than the standard policy that is proposed. To address this, I suggest that an language should be added to the policy that when the Park Board enters into a fundraising partnership/agreement, that agreement can include opportunities for naming specific park features are different than the standard proposed policy. The partner can suggest names and set fundraising goals for each feature, as long as those goals meet or exceed the Park Board's minimum standards. In some cases, smaller parts of a feature can be named at lower giving levels. I think it's important that this separate naming/recognition agreement be approved by the MPRB commissioners and that all naming recommendations must align with existing MPRB policies.	third party fundraising agreement donation levels for naming	Th004	Moderate	Language added regarding approvals the Board may make as part of Fundraising Agreements. <b>Proposed policy edits highlighted in purple on the draft policy.</b>
4	68.50.96.254	online survey	Everything should be in English.	survey should only be in English	Th005	No Impact	
5	45.8.19.175	online survey	Every park should be named accordingly by the Indigenous leaders of this land. If you do this without allowing indigenous people to name the parks, you must cease and desist from doing a land acknowledgement, because it is worth nothing.	all parks named by Indigenous leaders of the land	Th006	High	Providing an Indigenous name for every park was considered in the early development of the draft policy. It ultimately was not included in the draft policy. Adding this to the policy be a significant policy change. If this is recommended by the Board, staff recommend additional community engagement.

Naming Policy Comments 11.4.2025

Resp	IP Address	Method	What ideas or concerns would you like to share about the draft Naming Policy?	Theme	Theme ID	Theme Impact	Response
6	199.249.109.13	online survey	I appreciate that Dakota names are explicitly mentioned as a consideration, I wonder if there is a way to show that they hold weight.	concern Dakota names will not be upheld	Th007	No Impact	The policy requires consideration of original Dakota names and Dakota site of significance when considering the nomination to rename a park and when considering naming a park asset for a donation.
6	199.249.109.13	online survey	Depending on how MPRB plans to execute this policy and the hierarchy, is there a plan for contesting names? For instance if a Dakota site of significance also had a significant donor looking to name the site?	process for addressing contested names and/or considering original Dakota names or Dakota sites of significance	Th008	Moderate	Yes, the policy and procedure address the identification and removal of names that do not align with MPRB mission and values. It also indicates that a known Dakota site of significance or original Dakota name would make a park asset ineligible for a donation-related naming. The draft policy did not include consideration of original Dakota names or Dakota sites of significance in non-monetary nominations. <b>Proposed policy edits highlighted in light green on draft policy.</b>
7	117.216.106.6	online survey	M.P. R BOARD. THE SUGGESTED NAME CAN BE. MOPAR BOARD. (USA).	unknown	Th009	No Impact	
7	117.216.106.6	online survey	MP/ I AM COMING FROM COIMBATORE TN INDIA. NAME [name redacted] COPORATE PROFESSIONAL	unknown	Th009	No Impact	
5	45.8.19.175	online survey	It's ridiculous... [names redacted], and the downtown shakers and movers will simply use this as a way to further gentrify our area by honoring colonizers	concern policy will result in gentrification	Th010	High	Comment potentially aligns with those that would not support naming after individuals. Removing this option would be a significant policy change. If this is recommended by the Board, staff recommend additional community engagement.
6	199.249.109.13	online survey	I think having a clear policy such as this is a good step for procedural change. I think the second step is communications and outreach. For instance, I grew up around Bde Maka Ska and was still living there during the name change the comments I heard displayed a ton of push back, but mostly because of fear of it being hard to say and remember. In the end it wasn't hard to say, but it took a while for the correct pronunciation to get to people, and if they hadn't heard it they were unwilling to attempt to say it. I know there will always be resistance to change, but I do believe this is important work and I would like to see people receptive to it, and I think that comes with interactive, multifaceted communications and outreach campaigns that share not just what changed, but why it changed and how to use that moving forward in your day-to-day life as a park-goer and resident.	need for education and outreach with changing to an Indigenous name	Th011	No Impact	Comment is more aligned with a communications or interpretive strategy versus a naming policy and would be addressed in project management for a naming.
8		staff notes from community	Along with renaming a park for Dakota recognition, what about broader Indigenous recognition? Many Indigenous communities, especially Ojibwe, have been here for centuries and even though they are not the "original inhabitants" in Minneapolis like the Dakota, they should be recognized and be able to name a park in honor of their culture, past or present	recognizing non-Dakota Indigenous communities in naming	Th012	Moderate	Added language to expand policy to include non-Dakota Indigenous naming/describing for parks and park assets that do not have an original Dakota name and are not Dakota sites of significance. <b>Proposed policy edits highlighted in orange on draft policy.</b>
10		staff notes from community	Acknowledgement there is a hierarchy with Dakota heritage, but believes Indigenous cultures should also be included within the policy	recognizing non-Dakota Indigenous communities in naming	Th012	Moderate	Added language to expand policy to include non-Dakota Indigenous naming/describing for parks and park assets that do not have an original Dakota name and are not Dakota sites of significance. <b>Proposed policy edits highlighted in orange on draft policy.</b>
9		staff notes from community	Formal Indigenous name (ie the Indigenous/Ojibwe name of [name redacted] should *not* have to go through the same two-year timeframe that a non-Indigenous name does. These names were names that were here before the colonizers. This is different from Dakota naming process since culturally the Dakota would not choose a formal name for a park, whereas other Indigenous cultures may choose to.	Indigenous naming should include names of people without 2 year wait	Th013	High	Added language that would direct the time dedicated to determining a name would count toward the two-year wait. <b>Proposed policy edits highlighted in orange on draft policy.</b>
11		staff notes from community	Naming of a plaza or building at a park like Cedar Field should be allowed without the need for financial contribution	don't require financial contribution to name a park asset	Th014	no impact	The policy does not require a donation for a naming of a park asset.
12		staff notes from community	There needs to be a consideration about how to balance the call for name changes – who is our audience when renaming a park?	balance of engagement on the nomination of a name change	Th015	High	The draft policy allows for nominations to be made by any individual. The nomination is then considered by the board prior to initiating next steps. This consideration is designed to ensure the nomination is complete and aligns with the mission and values of the MPRB. To require community engagement at the nomination step would be a significant change in the draft policy. If this is recommended by the Board, staff recommend additional community engagement.
13		staff notes from community	Consider adding language about how elders or spiritual leaders should participate or lead the process?	indigenous led naming	Th016	no impact	The policy specifies that determining a Dakota or Indigenous name for a park or park asset would be Dakota or Indigenous led.
14	174.20.141.9	online survey	I am pleased with what seems to me to be thoughtful changes to the current policy. Clarity could be the most important factor in smooth and even joyful naming practices.	supports clarity in process	Th017	no impact	

Naming Policy Comments 11.4.2025

Resp	IP Address	Method	What ideas or concerns would you like to share about the draft Naming Policy?	Theme	Theme ID	Theme Impact	Response
15	72.50.212.26	online survey	In the face of a family or community's immediate grief, it is understandably difficult for Commissioners to vote no on a naming or renaming request. So please consider adding a requirement that MPRB will not consider naming or renaming a park and/or trail for a deceased person until at least 20 years after their death. This would allow the MPRB to have a more accurate assessment of the person's lasting impact or contribution to the Minneapolis park system and give Commissioners some breathing room.	longer wait time for naming after an individual passes	Th018	High	A 20 year wait would be a significant difference from the two year wait identified within the draft policy. If the Board recommends increasing the wait time, staff recommend additional community engagement.
14	174.20.141.9	online survey	Perhaps I missed this information in the draft policy, but will there be opportunities for the public to comment on pending renaming? I'm thinking about the desire expressed in the document to guard against unintended negative consequences. It might be helpful to hear a range of voices. Renaming, vs naming a new asset, seems like a more difficult process to work through successfully.	provide opportunities for public to comment on renaming or naming	Th019	Low	Public comment can occur at several stages. For a typical naming or renaming, there will be two public hearings and at least three additional board meetings where the naming would be considered and individuals could speak during open time. For Indigenous naming or renaming, there would be consultation to determine the name and at least three additional board meetings where the naming would be considered and individuals could speak during open time. Naming rights would only apply to naming park assets. The public could speak to the name during open time of the board meetings was considered.