

Minutes of June 23 Monthly Meeting

The 6/23/97 PPERRIA monthly Board/Membership/Neighborhood meeting was called to order by Alison Katagiri, Executive Committee member, at 7:00 PM at the Prospect Park United Methodist Church. A quorum was present.

Motion to accept meeting agenda as published in the 6/97 PPERRIA mailing and available at this meeting was passed without noes.

The minutes of the 5/19/97 PPERRIA Board/Membership/Neighborhood meeting as published in the 6/97 PPERRIA mailing were amended by changing page 14, the last paragraph, first sentence, the word "Environment" to "Business." The amended minutes were then accepted without noes.

Ruth Fen, Neighborhood Directory project, reported that directory was on schedule and that individuals in the neighborhood should contact her using the PPERRIA voice mail (331-2970.)

Jerry Stein, Education and Human Services Committee member, reported that the 5/22/97 Special Proposed Public School at Pratt meeting held at Luxton was well attended. There is not yet a done deal with the Minneapolis Public Schools and the neighborhood may need to increase the pressure. Watch for further developments.

Lois Willand, Community Events Committee Chair, reported that at the 6/16/97 concert by Macha Tri at Minnich Triangle, a number of neighborhood residents were there but a whole bunch of neighborhood residents were not. Inquiring throughout the neighborhood days after the concert, many said they did not know about the concert. A questionnaire will be circulated throughout the neighborhood, to determine how neighborhood announcements are looked for and found. Any thoughts on this, please contact Lois at 378-9697. NRP/PPERRIA funds cannot be used for event costs other than publication, therefore events need to be self-supporting. Only one third of the funds for the 6/16/97 concert were collected. Copies of a sample Support Our Community Concerts appeal were circulated. Also available were copies of the 1997 Summer Events Prospect Park Neighborhood schedule.

Cheryl Volhaber has organized two community events. Announcements were circulated for the 6/21/97 Sidewalk Sale, and Arts and Crafts Sale, and the 7/12-13/97 Garden Walk. Watch for further handouts at your favorite information pick up place.

Mary Legris, Environmental Chair, circulated information about the 6/25/97 Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) hearing at the Prospect Park United Methodist Church, regarding the American National Can request to amend its air pollution permit. American National Can plans to add a third shift (good), but continues to be the single largest air polluter in Minneapolis (bad). Earlier efforts by the neighborhood concerning the air pollution have failed (bad). This hearing will look at the current permit, not just the amendment request. This is a long ongoing saga of an issue larger than the neighborhood. Watch for articles in the newspapers and in neighborhood mailings.

It was ruled by parliamentarian, Jerry Stein, that anyone can speak to issues and/or motions, but only individuals whose signatures are on the sign-up sheet can vote on the motions.

Information on release of NRP/PPERRIA sidewalk lighting funds was presented by Pam Wollum and Harrison Nelson, Safety and Security NRP/PPERRIA Committee co-chairs (two of three.) NRP rules require that any motions specific to a committee be presented by that committee's chair. Available at the sign-in table is a thirteen page PPERRIA handout about the Sidewalk Lighting Project. Due to the birth of Susan Zarling's child two days ago, the Minneapolis Lighting Engineer who has been working with the Safety and Security Committee was unable to attend this meeting. On pages 12 and 13 of the PPERRIA handout are questions and answers that she expected would be brought up at this meeting. The two motions to allocate NRP/PPERRIA funds for the Sidewalk Lighting project are on page 2 of the PPERRIA Sidewalk Lighting handout. If the first motion is not accepted, then there will be no second motion and there will not be sidewalk lights installed in the neighborhood. The second motion indicates how additional individual financial assistance for sidewalk lighting assessments will be determined.

The first motion was moved and seconded and after much discussion was passed with noes. The NRP/PPERRIA Safety and Security Committee moves that PPERRIA allocate the entire \$372,500 reserved in our NRP/PPERRIA Plan (Section A, 4.b, pages 24 and 25) to be used to fund as many safety and security sidewalk lights within our neighborhood as financially feasible. Clarifying statement: this motion simply releases the funds allocated in our NRP/PPERRIA Plan to assist those property owners who want safety and security sidewalk lights and are located on a street with support above the minimum required by our city council.

This motion does not decide how much support is required to obtain safety and security sidewalk lights (that is a decision our city council member makes.) A question was asked about what is the minimum required support for sidewalk lighting? Council Member Joan Campbell has said 51%. Peter La Sha read a statement signed by him and passed out to those in attendance, about unexpected results from an examination of St. Paul's boulevard decorative lights and overhead lighting. As there is a question and answer time, a discussion of this handout will take place at that time.

(See page 4 of PPERRIA handout) In addition to this information, current pole lights are 100 to 130 feet apart and are aimed for street traffic. The proposed sidewalk lights are 30 feet apart and aimed at the sidewalk. The fixture style is the same as recently installed on Tower Hill and was chosen as the preferred style by 2/3rds of those who voted on the fixture style. (See page 5 of PPERRIA handout.) Once the goal of safety and security was established as a goal of the NRP plan, after much discussion it seemed that providing more light on the sidewalk was the single best criteria.

(See page 6 of PPERRIA handout) Tonight, Item 11 of 21 items, will be decided. If the vote is negative, the process will end. If the vote is positive, the City of Minneapolis will complete the remaining ten items: verification of petitions, final estimates of assessments, public hearings, bids let, applications for supplemental financial assistance, and installation of lighting (est. Summer 1988.) If the vote is negative, there will need to be discussions on the City's proposal to add short block and mid block lights onto existing poles (refer to earlier mailing by Joan Campbell, Council Member.) The number of lights is dependent upon how many the city can get from the fixed dollars they have for this citywide project. It is estimated that the \$325,500 will reduce the individual assessment from 35 cents to 26.25 cents per square foot. The City, in 1989, decided that square foot assessment is fairer than running foot assessment. It was mentioned that in a call to Joan Campbell's Council office, the caller was told that the neighborhood has final say if there will be sidewalk lights rather than street lights. "Not so," said Joan Campbell, Council Member, who was present at this meeting, the city ordinance says the city will decide.

Additional financial assistance will be determined by the amount of the bid, the amount remaining after the initial square foot assistance and a ratio of monthly assessment to total monthly income starting with the individual with the highest ratio and reducing it to the individual with the next highest ratio until the funds are reduced to \$0. Discussed was why eliminate the existing street lighting? The operating costs are about the same for sidewalk lighting as for street lighting and the city will not operate both in the same area. It is also felt that as the light falls on the sidewalk and not the street, the amount of light at school bus stops would be at least the same as the current amount. A person stated, it was their feeling that individual property owner lighting is of less cost and better than the proposed sidewalk lighting. The proposal is to light public spaces not private spaces. Several published sources are of the opinion that with the light on the sidewalk and not the street, individuals should be able to see sixty feet behind and ahead of them as well as to both sides of the sidewalk. What tends to go into dark spaces are things we usually don't want there.

The proposed lighting is not included in the Glendale community as at the start of the process, the Minneapolis Housing Authority was not willing to be assessed since they are the property owners. Since then this issue has been reopened. The East River Road is not included, as the boulevards are Minneapolis Park Board property. The Motley neighborhood was not included, as there are less than ten percent individual property owners in that neighborhood. The large amount of nonhousing square footage could use a large percentage of the \$325,000 NRP/ PPERRIA funds and there probably would not be the 51% approval of lighting due to most of the remaining land being owned by nonresidents. The earlier handout by Peter La Sha was now discussed. Also discussed was the method of assessment and areas of assessment. (See page 8 of the PPERRIA handout.) Opinion was expressed that the current method is not the way to handle this issue. Why tonight and what's the hurry? Who's included? What about misinformation? and what will be the actual individual cost? (See page 5 and 6 of the PPERRIA handout.) Also mentioned was that there probably will be no additional NRP funds of this size to help reduce individual assessments and that the city only funds city-wide projects and no longer funds individual neighborhood projects.

Motion to table the issue of sidewalk lighting was made and seconded. Did not pass: nineteen yeases and at least 50 noes.

Question was called. It was ruled that anyone listed as a PPERRIA member as of 6/22/97 (list available at sign-in table) is eligible to vote on the motions; i.e., if there are two names for one address, each can vote.

Motion one passed with some noes: The NRP/PPERRIA Safety and Security Committee moves that PPERRIA allocate the entire \$325,500 reserved in our NRP/PPERRIA Plan (Section A. 4.b. pages 24 and 25) to be used to fund as many safety and security sidewalk lights within our neighborhood as financially possible.

Friendly amendment accepted to motion 2 to replace "the" with "any". Motion 2 Passed with some noes: The NRP/PPERRIA Safety and Security Committee moves to Allocate any unused portion of the NRP/PPERRIA \$325,500 (budgeted for Safety and Security sidewalk lighting) to assist those residents whose Safety and Security Sidewalk Lighting assessment imposes a financial hardship.

After the votes on the motions, a number of individuals left the meeting. A quorum was present for the remainder of the meeting.

Dan Cross, Transportation Committee Chair, presented the following motion that was passed without noes: The NRP/PPERRIA Transportation Committee moves that PPERRIA reallocate the unspent \$35,000 NRP/PPERRIA Transportation funds previously allocated for the development of a Neighborhood Transportation Plan to the implementation of the East River Road/Franklin Avenue SE/27th Avenue SE intersection reconstruction per the attached revised redesign. Proposed friendly amendments, saying it is not sure that the NRP/PPERRIA Transportation Committee has the authority to make adjustments on earlier accepted plans, did not pass. Concern was that if the NRP/PPERRIA Transportation Committee could not make changes that did not alter the design goals and had to go back and have the PPERRIA Executive Committee and the PPERRIA Board/Membership approve any changes, the whole project could be canceled. The committee identified 32 design goals with special concern about safety

for all users, the recreation use of the River Road and improved crossing of the intersections by walkers, bikers and handicapped users. Of special concern was the east Franklin/River Road crossing by handicapped users and especially residents of University Good Samaritan Center. Suggested areas to look at were the islands and the timing of the traffic lights. Concern also was with the general timing of all intersection traffic lights.

Harrison Nelson, for the Executive Committee, circulated a start on a long-range (master) plan for the neighborhood. Individuals were asked to list thoughts/concerns/ideas/preferences/etc. on the reverse of the paper. All feedback will be gathered and a summary will be available at the 9/97 Board/Membership/Neighborhood meeting.

Florence Littman, Zoning Committee Chair, reviewed several requests reviewed by the Zoning Committee. Dinnaken has proposed a 14-townhouse rental project at 605/609 Ontario (Fulton and Ontario SE.) Currently on the site are the Architecture fraternity house and a vacant lot. Several changes were recommended. A conditional use permit is required. More information at the 7/97 Board/Membership/Neighborhood meeting. A wine and beer license is requested for the southeast corner of Oak and Washington SE by Tortillaria, a Mexican order and pick up restaurant. Brueggers was the last tenant. It is estimated that there is seating for 50. There are at least two other Tortillaria restaurants in the metro area. The committee recommended that the Stadium Business Association review the proposed project. If there is not opposition, then the committee will not oppose the license. This is being treated by the City as a new license, as it has been several years since an earlier wine and beer license was issued for the site.

Dean Lund, Motley Area Task Force cochair, reported that the process continues on development of a Shared Vision for the Motley Area that addresses the future livability of the Motley area over the long term. (See page 13 of the PPERRIA 6/97 mailing.) Also being reviewed is the decision by the University of Minnesota to dispose of their 15 residential properties and one church building in the area and how this may be involved in the Shared Vision. The NRP/PPERRIA Housing Improvement Committee is involved in the issue of the sale of the University properties. Much more on this to follow. Peter McLaughlin, Hennepin County Commissioner for this area, mailed out an announcement of a 6/30/97 ground breaking, the first for this side of the tracks, at the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial Area. This is the formerly polluted Metal Coatings/Lewis Nut and Bolt site at Malcom and Fifth Avenue SE. Also there was a mailing from Joan Campbell, Minneapolis Council Member for this area, of the City Transportation Division's final recommendation on the Malcolm/Orlin SE intersection. She said "I do not expect that this decision will make everyone happy. I do believe it strikes a reasonable balance. And I thank each of you for your participation in this process. Soon to be enjoyed is the Pratt Village Green."

Motion to adjourn passed without nos.

Respectfully
submitted. Daniel
Patenaude,
PPERRIA Secretary.