

MINUTES
Prospect Park East River Road NRP - 2 Steering Committee
Meeting of April 4, 2005 at Luxton Park

1. The meeting was called to order by Dick Poppele, co-chair of the Steering Committee, at 7:35 p.m. in the multi-purpose room at Luxton Park Community Center. There were 11 adults present. (See attached sign in sheet and Item 7 of this agenda).
2. The minutes from the March 21, 2005 meeting were approved.
3. **ADVERTISING:** Dick Poppele asked about the ad he was proposing to put in the South East Angle newspaper to advertise the public meeting to discuss NRP funds on April 20, 2005. It was discussed that perhaps the actual proposals should be listed on the PPERRIA website so that people have time to look at them before the meeting. We want to try to cut down on the time spent explaining the proposals at the April 20 meeting. Dean Lund asked if there would be copies of the "NRP Phase 2 Action Plan Proposals" (Exhibit A) sheet passed out at the public meeting. This sheet lists all of the proposals that were custom written for the Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood, but does not include the funds that are already established by the City of Minneapolis. Many people at the meeting thought this Exhibit A should be present at the April 20 meeting so that people have descriptions in their hands. It was mentioned that there are other options for getting the info - calling PPERRIA, looking at the web site - so we don't want to spend a lot of money on making lots of copies. Kari Simonson pointed out that many people do not have internet access, however, so some copies should be made.

Steve Cross noted that some of the proposals have been withdrawn - his two scholar proposals and the Somali Literacy program have all been withdrawn. It was decided that there should just be a list of all the remaining proposals, with each having a short, 2 sentence description. Then, if people want more details, they can call or go online for more details. This way, there will only be single sheet copies to be made, instead of huge packets of information that will waste money and paper if not used.

Dick raised the translation issue for the April 20 meeting. Can there be a written translation of this Exhibit A at the meeting? Ann Munt said she could have that done.

3. **APRIL 20 PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA:** The outline for the April 20 meeting was the next topic of discussion. Dick had drafted a "Proposed meeting outline for April 20 meeting" (Exhibit B) that he passed out to the steering committee. The first section was an Introduction (20 minutes) that would discuss the purpose of the meeting, review NRP-1 and describe NRP-2. Betts Zerby has pictures of NRP-1 that could be used. At this point, the issue of how to implement the meeting was raised. Should the sections of

the meeting be divided up between steering committee members? That way, no one person is responsible. And, there should be big overhead printouts of the information to show the crowd.

Dean went back to discussing the Introduction and said that it should include a paragraph on how people will eventually be able to vote and indicate their preferences for different proposals later in the meeting. Otherwise, he thought the early part of the meeting would be bogged down with the crowd asking so many questions. He said we need to make it clear that this is not a details decision process, but rather, it is just a general process of prioritizing where the money from NRP-2 will be spent. Dean thinks the first 4 items on the proposed meeting agenda should only take 1 hour - those items are 1) Intro 2) Description of Process 3) Basic parameters (rules regarding NRP funds) and 4) Proposals submitted. This will leave LOTS of time for questions. Dick's proposed outline (Exhibit B) had the first four items taking up 1 hour 20 minutes with only 30 minutes for questions. Dean thought this was too short of a time frame for questions. Dean also pointed out that we need a translator for questions during the process, and the translation process slows things down even more.

Then the discussion switched back to the allocation of duties at the meeting. Dick thought that he and Steve should do the introduction and remind people of how NRP-1 worked. Dean said it should be made clear that there is a lot less money in NRP-2 than in NRP-1. It is one tenth of the funding in NRP-2. Betts said that she could easily describe NRP-1.

Steve C. volunteered to cover item 3 "Basic parameters" that discusses how the money can be used. Dick said he could do item 2 "Description of Process" that discusses the first neighborhood meeting that choose the steering committee, what the steering committee has been doing, the purpose of this meeting, how final neighborhood approval will occur. Kari pointed out that she works late that evening and isn't sure when she can be at the meeting, so doesn't want to be responsible for an item and then not be able to show up. Ginia Klamecki is unavailable that night because of out of town guests. Betts thought that maybe the individual proposal authors could do item 4 "Proposals submitted", but others thought this might not work. Not all the proposal authors are available on April 20, and they may not want to speak in front of a big crowd, and they may take too long to describe their personal proposal.

4. HOW TO PRESENT THE DOT-MOCRACY VOTING OPTIONS: Then the discussion turned to the "Prospect Park NRP-2 Dot-mocracy Voting Option" (Exhibit C) prepared by Steve Cross. This flyer outlines what categories would be available for people at the April 20 meeting to put their dots next to for support. Dick also had prepared a draft "Prospect Park Dot-mocracy Voting Options" (Exhibit D) that is similar to Steve's except there are two additional voting categories - First, there is an "Overall Priorities" category for people to choose between 4 options and Second, there is a "Terms

and Conditions for Housing" category that would detail how housing money should be spent. This outline is based on the presentation given by Don Snyder at the March 7, 2005 steering committee meeting.

Kari pointed out that both of these dot-mocracy outlines have no place to vote for the established NRP funds 1-9 that are run by the City of Mpls. But those 9 funds are listed as Item 3C on Dick's proposed agenda, so if we introduce these items but don't have a place to vote for them, people might be upset. Also, Kari pointed out that the description of these 9 funds would make more sense being categorized under Item 4 "Proposals submitted" on the proposed agenda, since they are proposals for how to spend the money just like the individual proposals submitted by people in the neighborhood.

Dean said he sees two goals for this meeting - 1) Do people want a 70/30 split of the money between housing/other programs, or do people want MORE than 70% spent on housing and 2) Do we just want to have general housing projects? Or specific housing projects limited by whether rental, homesteaded, etc. Dean stressed that we just need to establish the interest level of putting money into housing. Dick said that maybe as part of the voting, there should just be one short list of priorities - housing, education, human services. Then, say the highest vote is for education, then we say, o.k. the SWIM proposal gets their money, and then the remaining gets spent on housing per NRP rules.

Someone brought up that maybe we need to simplify the description and emphasize the fact that it is the Legislature that dictates the 70% being spent on housing. That part is NOT our choice. Dean wants it clearly understood that if people vote that 100% of the money be spent on housing, then that automatically wipes out the other options i.e. livability. Dick noted that the ad in the South East Angle mentions that there are still openings for other proposals.

Betts asked what needs to be accomplished at the May 24 meeting. Do we need to have a developed action plan to submit to the City by the end of this 2nd public meeting? Yes, we do need to have that done by May 24 meeting, so the April 20 meeting does need to get a lot of decision making accomplished. Dean asked if the action plan will need to define the major housing proposals. No one really knew, except it was pointed out that Barb Lickness was steering us away from being super precise in the action plan. Steve said the April 20 meeting vote needs to indicate to the Steering Committee what we should do with the money. It may be that one of the options is to pick one of the 9 funds provided by the City. Then there was lots of discussion about how to make sure that people understand that voting for 100% housing means other proposals will be knocked out.

Dick summarized that the purpose of the April 20 meeting is

- 1) Get budget division
- 2) Give people an idea of what housing means, give descriptions of housing - should we

just eliminate affordable housing because it is unrealistic with the small amount of money available? Explain that the steering committee discussed it, or even just leave it out of the meeting but if someone brings it up, then just say we discussed it and it wasn't realistic because of cost.

At this point, Steve offered to withdraw his "Affordable Housing" proposal to take this issue out of the April 20 meeting. He noted that we could put money into a city fund that goes to other neighborhoods' affordable housing. Steve said that, on Exhibit C, under "Other Options" there should be 'none', in addition to the 3 choices already listed. This would make it easier for those people who want 100% of the money to go toward housing to understand that, if they vote 100% housing, then their other option choice has to be 'none'. Dick said these should be presented as examples of the categories and people can make additional suggestions at the April 20 meeting as well. Steve suggested getting rid of the "Overall Priorities" category on Exhibit D and just have the details of the housing.

5. APRIL 20 MEETING RESPONSIBILITIES: Discussion turned back to who would be responsible for which portions of the meeting agenda. The following people agreed to the following items

Item 1 - "Introduction" - Betts Zerby

Item 2 - "Description of Process" - Dick Poppele

Item 3 - "Basic Parameters" - Steve Cross NOTE Item 3c "NRP housing fund and guidelines was moved to be listed under Item 4 "Proposals Submitted".

Item 4 - "Proposals Submitted". There are really two categories here - the 9 funds already established by the City of Minneapolis, and the individual proposals submitted by people in the neighborhood. Of the latter category, Ann Munt said she would present the SWIM proposal and SE Seniors. It was asked if maybe Joe Ring could present the Historic District proposal. No one volunteered to describe the 9 funds.

Item 5 - "Questions and Comments" - no volunteer

Item 6 - "Voting" - no volunteer.

As a final note, it was pointed out that someone should contact an NRP representative to attend the meeting to help answer questions about NRP specific guidelines. Maybe that person can handle describing the 9 funds in Item 4? Then individuals can describe their own proposals, which would only leave Item 5 and Item 6 to be covered by someone.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

7. The meeting attendees were:

Kari Simonson

Betts Zerby

Steve Cross

Ann Munt

Ginia Klamecki
Dean Lund
Dick Poppele (chair of this meeting)
Shukri Dirie
Shamso Ahmed
Halimo Yusaf
Hawa Gedi