

Minutes from the Prospect Park/East River Road Neighborhood meeting held on Oct 13, 2004.

1. A special meeting of the Prospect Park/East River Road neighborhood was held at Luxton Park Community Center Gym on October 14, 2004 and was called to order at 7:07 pm by the temporary chairperson, Steve Cross. Temporary secretary was Joyce Barta. The meeting was convened at shortly after 7 pm. The chair stated that he delayed the beginning of the meeting past 7 pm to allow extra time for people to arrive due to other events taking place at the same time, notably a presidential debate, 2 major sporting events and a citizen engagement group. Steve pointed out the microphones available for participants and explained the purpose of the meeting, to formally start the process of allocating NRP Phase 2 funds to neighborhood, and the procedure for the meeting. He noted that both the purpose and procedure were described in meeting notices sent to every residence in the neighborhood. The Somali translator had not yet arrived. Attendees were instructed to register and pick up voter cards at the registration table if they had not yet done so. Also available at the table were forms to propose a program for NRP Phase 2 (see attachment A) and copies of a motion (see attachment B) to be put forward at the meeting. The published agenda (see attachment C) was displayed on an overhead projector.

2. Michael Atherton made a motion, seconded by Steve Ficker, that the meeting be postponed until all subgroups have attendants in proportion to their population in the neighborhood. He stated that this is necessary according to state law. Discussion followed, noting that there was one student in attendance, that fliers had been distributed at every residence including the 3 major student housing complexes in the neighborhood, that one person thought the notice looked like junk mail, and that state law requires that organizations try to get attendance from the subgroups but does not require meetings be cancelled if people do not actually attend. A request was made of the motion maker to state what he thought should be done differently. A vote was taken by show of hands and the motion was defeated.

3. Dean Lund nominated Steve Cross to be the permanent chair and Joyce Barta to be the permanent secretary for the meeting. An explanation was given that the meeting was started with a temporary chair and secretary. There were no other nominations. Dean Lund moved that the nominations be closed and the secretary be instructed to show a unanimous ballot cast for Steve Cross for permanent chairperson and Joyce Barta for permanent secretary. It was noted that a 2/3 majority was needed. A vote was taken by show of hands and the motion was adopted.

4. It was brought to attention that translation was necessary because a number of attendants were unable to understand the proceedings. A Somali translator came forward. The motions already voted on were re-explained and re-voted with translation. The motion to postpone the meeting to get more student participation was again defeated and the motion to appoint the permanent chair and secretary was again approved. All proceedings after this point were translated into Somali.

5. Dean Lund moved that *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*, latest edition, be adopted as the parliamentary authority for the meeting. A vote was taken by show of hands and the motion was adopted.

6. The chair gave an explanation of the published agenda with time limits and Dean Lund moved that the agenda be adopted. A vote was taken by show of hands and the motion was adopted.

7. A motion was made by Dean Lund to approve the Phase I Plan Review. Joe Ring explained that NRP required a review of NRP Phase I in order to begin Phase 2. A committee was formed and a lengthy report was written. The report is intended to tell NRP officials how well the neighborhood did in outreach and in carrying out the plan. A four page summary of the Plan Review was printed in the meeting announcement which was delivered to every residence. He also pointed out a story board on display that he

said gave a good idea of what was done. Chair stated that a motion to amend the Phase I Plan Review had been received by the Oct 6 deadline and that copies of the motion were available at the registration table. Steve Ficker made the motion, seconded by Michael Atherton, that Mr. Ficker's 29 page commentary be attached to the Plan Review. Mr. Ficker stated that he felt the plan review as written was inaccurate and "heavy on misrepresentation and omission" and he explained one of the items where he felt the plan review was untrue (sidewalk lighting grievances). He asked that his commentary be included with the plan review whenever the review was made available and that it be posted on the PPERRIA website with a notice that it is available and how to access it. The chair asked if there were any more speakers. The question were asked if any of the reviewers had seen the commentary and the chair answered not to his knowledge. A clarification was asked for, if the motion is to adopt something no one has seen. Mr. Ficker stated that he was not asking for approval of his commentary but that his comments be included with the review. He suggested a disclaimer could be added stating that the commentary was not approved or adopted. It was noted that Mr. Ficker did not make the July 2 deadline for comments to be appended to the review, as approved in the 5/24/04 PPERRIA board meeting and it was suggested that Mr. Ficker could send his comment directly to NRP and a no vote was urged. Mr. Ficker replied that the plan review was written over a time period of 10 years and the five weeks between the 5/24/04 meeting and the 7/2/04 deadline was insufficient. A comment was made that in 35 years of attendance at PPERRIA meetings, operations have been carried out with high ethics. Harrison Nelson moved to call the question and vote, seconded by Paul Zerby. A vote was taken by show of hands on a motion to add Steve Ficker's personal commentary to the Plan Review. The amendment was rejected. A motion was made by Dean Lund (?) to approve the report as it stands and forward it to NRP. A vote was taken by show of hands and the motion was adopted.

8. A motion was made by Dean Lund, seconded by Bill Kahn, to approve the published Phase 2 Participation Agreement (see attachment D) which was printed in the meeting announcement which was delivered to every residence. Chair explained that this document would be a legal contract between NRP and PPERRIA and that PPERRIA would be the official fiscal agent/implementer for Phase 2 projects. Discussion followed in which a suggestion was made to add the Minnesota Daily as a means of publicizing NRP issues to attempt to reach more students. It was said that the Minnesota Daily is expensive and suggested leaving that decision to the steering committee. A question was raised on the grievance procedure, specifically the impartiality of the grievance committee, and whether it complied with NRP rules. The chair gave information on the existing PPERRIA rules for filing grievances, in addition to the grievance procedure at issue here and stated his belief that this procedure meets the requirements. It was noted that Bob Miller, Director of NRP was in attendance and could be asked. There was no further discussion. The motion was repeated to approve the participation agreement, to instruct PPERRIA to sign it (it was already approved by the PPERRIA board at its meeting on 5/24/04) and to forward it to NRP. A vote was taken by show of hands and the motion was adopted.

9. Bob Miller, Director of NRP, gave a 30 minute informal presentation. He explained that due to changes made by the 2201 Minnesota legislature, amounts taken for other initiatives and to pay NRP administrative expenses, there is a much smaller amount of money available for NRP Phase 2 compared with Phase 1. Also, since the legislature required that 52.5% of the NRP resources be used for "housing and housing related activities" and since less than that amount was so used in Phase 1, it would be necessary to allocate 70% of Phase 2 resources to housing. Also, after the approval of the Phase 2 plan, only 70% of the money can be expended over the first three years to avoid a budget shortfall. This neighborhood was allocated a total of \$347,866, of which \$243,506 must be for housing. Not a lot is left for other projects.

NRP has devised a number of housing funds that neighborhoods could allocate housing funds to if they so desire. One of the reasons to establish these funds would be to lessen the administrative costs to participating neighborhoods through economy of scale. These funds are currently up for comment. Mr. Miller stated that there is a conflict between the city of Minneapolis and the NRP on how the "housing or housing related" funds must be used. The city adopted a "Unified Housing Policy" in June 2004 and the city is interpreting the items described by that policy to be the only ways NRP housing funds may be used. NRP does not agree and it remains to be seen how this will be resolved. He anticipates the issue will come to the forefront within a month as the completed Phase 2 Action Plans of three neighborhoods are discussed. He suggests that the neighborhood go ahead and allocate the NRP dollars to programs that the neighborhood feels are priorities to this neighborhood. He said that Action Plans allocating less than 70% of funds to housing are unlikely to be recommended for approval. He strongly recommended loan programs, rather than grant programs, to provide ongoing income to the neighborhood. He noted that one neighborhood recently spent \$1 million to subsidize housing for only five families.

10. There were no early access requests and therefore that agenda item was passed over.

11. There were a total of 44 registered meeting attendees. Seats on the steering committee were allocated to the eight areas of the neighborhood according to the number of attendees from that area. Seats were allocated as follows: Motley 2; Glendale 7; 4th Street 3; Tower Hill North of Franklin 9, Tower Hill South of Franklin 1; River Road/Terrace/Bridal Veil Falls/ 1; University Avenue and university Residences 2. Initially, no seat was allotted to the Industrial Area. It was pointed out that the Participation Agreement states that each area would have at least one member. Rather than re-calculate, the chair asked the group if they would be in agreement to add one more seat to the steering committee, making it a total of 26, so that the Industrial Area could have one seat. There were no objections. The attendees were told that the first meeting of the steering committee would be on Wednesday, Oct 20 at 7 pm, in the Luxton Park multi-purpose room, subsequent meetings would be decided by the steering committee. The attendees were then asked to split into their respective sub-caucuses to elect their steering committee members and to give the name, address and phone number of the elected members to the chair.

12. A motion was made to adjourn at approximately 9 pm. The motion passed.

Submitted by Joyce Barta
October 14, 2004