A Governor’s veto

PPERRIA is puzzled by the Governor’s recent action vetoing state funding for the Twin Cities’ Central Corridor Light Rail Project. PPERRIA commonly approves projects, public or private, based on the promised intentions of the applicant. For example, the University of Minnesota’s proposed new, on-campus football stadium came with great potential for negatively affecting our neighborhood. PPERRIA’s subsequent approval was based on, among other things, an understanding that light rail transit (LRT) on University Avenue would be a major mitigating factor in the event of any adverse consequence. In fact, PPERRIA then went on to do extensive land-use planning in anticipation of LRT running on University Avenue.

The Governor, once a staunch supporter of Central Corridor LRT, must’ve had his reasons – fiscal, political, whatever – for a line-item veto of the funding. (His action has also embarrassed some of his loyal supporters.) However, until he is more forthcoming, we must learn to become more skeptical of promises – fiscal, political, whatever – from those who “want” something from us. This tends to weaken the social fabric, especially when skepticism is allowed to descend into cynicism.

............Joe Ring, Past President of PPERRIA
Notes from the president – A look back

It has been an eventful year in Prospect Park. While there’s always a steady flow of issues for PPERRIA, this year it seems we have been inundated. For example:

• After fearing the closing of Pratt, we learned that it would expand suddenly with the closing of Tuttle School and the transfer of Tuttle’s primary grades to Pratt

• The University planned to buy the property behind KSTP-TV studios for student parking, creating a potential traffic problem at Bedford and SE University. That project fell through, but it raised awareness about the unsettled land-use issues north of University Avenue.

• We saw new, high-density condo development on University Avenue at Arthur, and proposals for more such developments are on the way.

• The LRT seems to be making unsteady progress with uncertainties about its routing through the University campus, and new realizations about the planned station at 29th Avenue.

• The Park Board’s plans for the Missing Link of the Grand Round include making 27th Avenue SE into a parkway and connecting it to the proposed Granary Road.

• Social Services at Glendale were threatened by a disagreement between the Park Board and MPHA over the rental of space at Luxton for East Side Neighborhood Services. This was temporarily settled by interim funding from Hennepin Co, but it will be an issue again after June 30, 2008.

• The City of Minneapolis is undergoing a major review and revision of its citizen engagement policies and structure. The organization and funding for NRP are still being discussed, and the outcome could have a major effect on the manner in which the city views the role of neighborhood organizations such as PPERRIA.

• The I-35W bridge collapse had repercussions in Prospect Park with the increased traffic on I-94 and on SE Franklin Avenue.

• The Prospect Park E-list has continued to be a valuable bulletin board for the neighborhood, keeping us abreast of local events and issues ranging from environmental concerns to crime statistics.

At my first meeting as president last May, we set up the PPERRIA committees adding several new standing committees. And they have been busy.

The Bylaws Task Group worked hard over the summer and fall to make a comprehensive proposal for the revision and renewal of the PPERRIA bylaws. While the process of adopting changes is not finished, it has resulted in an important new and inclusive set of eligibility criteria for membership. The recommendation to reduce the number of board members did not, however, receive sufficient support to be adopted. I hope this signals a renewed desire for participation and signals future full attendance at board meetings.
The Housing Committee put in place the new loan program described in our NRP action plan in partnership with the Center for Energy and Environment. Funding is already available to two neighbors for rehab and fix-up work. More applications are now pending.

The Livability Committee continued to work with the State Historic Commission on Prospect Park’s application for National Historic District status. The proposed Historic District application is still pending, but the importance of having been in the process was illustrated when we obtained renewed promises from MNDot for an expanded sound wall along I-94. The pending Historic District application is also likely to help in mitigating any negative effects from the new Central Corridor LRT, such as expected needs in increased traffic and parking.

The Transit Committee has worked hard to clarify issues around the proposed Central Corridor LRT, and to recommend position statements and courses of action for PPERRIA. They continue to closely track the issues as the politics and plans for the Central Corridor rapidly evolve.

The Zoning and Land Use Committee had busy monthly meetings with a record number of proposals for development and zoning changes or variances. The committee held a Zoning and Planning Workshop in December. They decided that it was important to become proactive regarding development. The reactive mode of waiting for developers to bring their ideas to PPERRIA is not likely to bring about the best or most desirable result. This committee is now pursuing new initiatives in that direction.

The 4th Street Task Force worked with the University of Minnesota to develop guidelines for proposed parking behind KSTP-TV, to minimize the added traffic burden that would have resulted. Eventually the negotiations between the University and Hubbard (owner of the KSTP-TV property) broke down over an impasse on the use of the vacated part of 4th Street behind KSTP as an access to the parking from Territorial Road.

PPERRIA’s representatives on the District Councils Collaborative for the Central Corridor and on the Southeast Economic Development committee for the SE Minneapolis Industrial area and the Southeast Minneapolis Committee on Learning have all been busy with many of the above issues.

PPERRIA is now a member organization in the University District Partnership Alliance. The Alliance came about because of a legislative mandate that the University of Minnesota, the City of Minneapolis and the Southeast neighborhoods, including Cedar Riverside, work together “to facilitate, initiate or manage projects that are intended to maintain the district as a viable place to study, research and live” We will learn more about this at the annual meeting.

........Dick Poppele
Minutes of PPERRIA Membership and Board of Directors Meeting
Monday, March 24th, 2008, 7 pm, Prospect Park United Methodist Church

President Dick Poppele called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. following a social gathering. President Poppele welcomed visitors and new members.

1. A motion to approve the amended agenda was made by Dick Kain. Passed without noes.

2. A motion to approve the February minutes, as amended, made by Mary Alice Kopf, passed without noes.

3. **By Laws Proposed Changes:** President Poppele reviewed the past discussions and reports of the By Laws Committee and outlined the process to be used in voting on the proposed changes in three main categories: membership, board of directors, and voting.

   Paul Zerby moved the adoption of proposed Articles I through III. Deletion of the “AND” in proposed Article 1 was passed without discussion.

   President Poppele determined that before any further vote was taken on Articles II and III, a vote would be taken on a Dean Lund-proposed change to proposed Article IV; that only residents of the area be eligible to be directors. After discussion, the proposal was amended to include the language by majority vote of the membership.

   After discussion, with Steve Ficker urging that there be no delay between an application for membership and the right to vote at a meeting, a vote was taken on Zerby’s motion to adopt proposed Articles II and III. A roll call vote was taken, and the proposed amendments to Articles II and III were passed by 24 votes.

   President Poppele presented the proposed changes to Article IV-A. Three versions were presented, and a majority of the membership voted in favor of Version 2, with Poppele’s amendment, which provided that the number of directors (at least 20) be determined by the membership at an annual meeting. This version also provided that 10 directors be elected to replace 20 board members in 2008, and 10 directors be elected to replace 20 board members in 2009.

   After the membership vote changing the proposal was taken, a board roll call vote on Article IV-A version 2, as amended by Poppele, was taken. The adoption failed with 15 aye’s recorded and 24 ayes needed to pass.

   Finally, a roll call vote was taken on Article IV-A, including the Lund proposal regarding residents as directors, which also failed with 22 affirmative votes.

   Time being short, the issue of the by laws was continued to a later meeting.

4. **LRT Proposed Position:** John DeWitt presented a power point explanation of the development of a Central Corridor Light Rail Line on University Avenue, including PPERRIA’s support of such plan in 2002, the development of the 29th St. Station area plan, and the design guidelines therefore. Current issues regarding the 29th street station alignment were discussed, with considerable discomfort with the impact of such station on the Prospect Park Business Center and Overflow Café and pond and fountain on that corner. The neighborhood was asked by the Central Corridor Committee to present its position on three LRT issues, and DeWitt presented the options that the committee had on those issues. Recommendations that the Transportation Committee had adopted at its meeting were: (l) locate the station on 29th Avenue at University with a center platform and one traffic lane on each side; (2) Move the alignment north of the University Ave. centerline to preserve trees on the south side of the street, and provide parking along with landscaped bump-outs on the
north side (or modified option C), bury or otherwise remove overhead power lines and ensure adequate access and parking for businesses during construction and afterward; and (3) Conduct a comprehensive parking study to include: What’s going on today; What are some likely future scenarios; What is Hiawatha Light Rail experience (are they seeing a reduction in residential, retail, and commercial demand for parking); An analysis of the potential for shared parking; An analysis of the potential for non-residential permit parking; An analysis for the need for municipal parking, either structured or surface, in the center of a block; Any analysis should include both University Ave. and nearby residential areas; Any analysis should include both short term and long term parking needs.

Paul Zerby moved that PPERRIA adopt the Committee’s Proposed position:

• Locate a center platform station on 29th Avenue as planned
• On University Avenue, shift the light rail alignment north of the centerline, and configure rail alignment to maximize opportunity for boulevard trees and green space
• Ensure access to businesses and parking during and after construction
• Conduct a parking study to inform future planning and development. Passed.

5. NRP: Dick Poppele presented a report on the City’s NRP Work Group. That group, consisting of four city councilpersons, Robert Miller of NRP, and Cara Letofsky of the Mayor’s office, prepared a “Framework for the Future” (on www.nrp.org website) which suggested among others that the City provide at least $2,000 to neighborhood groups for administrative support; that there be a neighborhood fund controlled by neighborhoods, and that there be a citywide fund open to all neighborhoods on an RFP basis. A PPERRIA position paper was drafted and presented for approval by the Executive Committee. Approval by the body was moved by Paul Zerby, and passed. (A copy appears on the following p.6 of this newsletter.) It was suggested that the position be sent to council members and the mayor’s office, as well as state legislators.

6. Housing Report: Roger Kiemele reported that five applications for funds for housing improvement had been approved by the contractor, with four contracts in place. The Committee sent a notice about the availability of funds for such loans to all residents with the hope that more applicants would come forward.

7. Zoning Report: Florence Littman reported that property east of Oak Street on University Avenue, including the Oak Street Theatre, had been sold. Plans are for a CVS Pharmacy of 14,000 square feet, and for commercial with student housing above it. This will not affect Chipotle or the Recruiting station. She also reported that there is a dry cleaning business that would like to locate in the M Flats property, and that U Garden is applying for a full liquor license.

8. Staff Report appears in the March newsletter.

A motion to adjourn was made by Peter La Sha. Passed without noes.

Respectfully submitted,

__________________________  _______________________
Betts Zerby, Secretary        Richard Poppele, President

March 14, 2008
This is the text of PPERRIA’s response to the conclusions of the recent work group on the future of the Neighborhood Revitalization Project (NRP) for Minneapolis

March 14, 2008

To: Jennifer Lastoka, Community Engagement Coordinator
From: PPERRIA Executive Committee

The proposed reorganization of NRP that moves the current NRP administration into the Office of the City Coordinator and combines it with other centralized citizen participation efforts sends the wrong signal to the communities of Minneapolis. It appears that the bottom-up model of citizen engagement is to be replaced by a top-down model, managed from City Hall. In fact, much of the City’s recent efforts in community engagement have focused on the mechanisms whereby citizens can approach and engage City Hall and much less on how the City can reach out to engage the citizens. A sincere effort to engage the fullest potential of citizen participation must also make it perfectly clear – through actions and words – that citizen input is welcome and a real part of the governance process. We believe that NRP, with an identity somewhat separate from City Hall, has provided the action and words that have effectively engaged Minneapolis citizens in recent years. It would therefore be wise to somehow preserve the important elements of this award-winning model in any new reorganization.

In general the 5 broad themes addressed in the report of the NRP Work Group identify and address important components of the NRP program. They seem to recognize that NRP has been an enormously successful program for Minneapolis to achieve neighborhood revitalization and stabilization.

The principles outlined in the Work Group Report for neighborhood administrative and discretionary funding are welcome and realistic. Community engagement must flow from informed and engaged citizens. Volunteer efforts are important but insufficient to assure timely, informed and meaningful engagement. Administrative funding to the neighborhoods for administrative support is therefore essential to augment and support volunteer efforts.

There must also be a mechanism to provide neighborhood resources for neighborhood identified priorities. The City must encourage and facilitate the development of these priorities through a combination of direct non-competitive funding and opportunities to leverage the public support through other partners. The NRP model of providing such resources to each neighborhood assures that all neighborhoods have a fair chance to improve and develop. This component should therefore be the larger part of the proposed NIF. The second component that would allocate funds competitively for specific projects should be a smaller part of the NIF. While the competitively allocated funding can reflect overall City priorities, it also carries the real danger of shifting priorities from neighborhoods to a winner-take-all use of resources. Finally, while availability of funds will certainly govern, the City must not sacrifice the real potential of local initiatives for the sake of a perceived efficiency through centralization.

Sincerely,

Richard Poppele
PPERRIA President
This month, part of the contractor’s services was paid by PPERRIA as per the 2007-2008 budget. Total budgeted: $1040. Previously billed: $750. Billed this month: $288. which is payment for 12 hours. The remainder of contractor’s services was paid by PPERRIA NRP funds, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supported PPERRIA activities, NRP I, and NRP II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractors’ services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/08 – 04/10/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/95 to 03/03/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/95 to 04/10/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total revised PPERRIA NRP Phase 1 budget for independent contractor services = $192,661.45. $2173.15 remains, plus an additional $9000 in NRP 2 funds.
**Prospect Park East River Road Neighborhood Calendar**

To include items in PPERRIA calendar, contact Joyce Barta at bartajm@yahoo.com by Thursday, April 4th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Event and Location</th>
<th>Whom to contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, April 19</td>
<td><strong>Mississippi River Cleanup</strong> Meet on E River Parkway near the Franklin Bridge.</td>
<td>Tom Kilton 339-3064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 23</td>
<td><strong>Garden Club</strong> at the home of Amy Shellabarger and Jean Bauer, 238 Emerald St SE, 379-1142</td>
<td>Kent Petterson 332-1821, Mary Alice Kopf 379-7436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 28</td>
<td><strong>PPERRIA Annual Board of Directors &amp; Membership Meeting</strong> at Prospect Park United Methodist Church. Come at 6:30 for refreshments and conversation.</td>
<td>Dick Poppele 378-9242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, May 5</td>
<td><strong>PPERRIA Executive Committee meeting</strong> at Prospect Park United Methodist Church</td>
<td>Dick Poppele 378-9242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 7</td>
<td><strong>Luxton Park Council meeting</strong> at Luxton Park</td>
<td>Jim Widder 331-6129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, May 12</td>
<td><strong>JOY Potluck</strong> at Pratt. Bring some food to share or $3.</td>
<td>Roberta Mark 331-6621, Luxton Park 370-4925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 14</td>
<td><strong>Glendale Resident Organization (GRO) meeting</strong> at 92 St. Mary’s Ave.</td>
<td>Latrisha Collins 342-1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 15</td>
<td><strong>Pratt Council meeting</strong> at Pratt.</td>
<td>Mary Alice Kopf 379-7436, Pratt Office 668-1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, May 19</td>
<td><strong>PPERRIA Board of Directors &amp; Membership Meeting</strong> at Prospect Park United Methodist Church. Come at 6:30 for refreshments and conversation.</td>
<td>Dick Poppele 378-9242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 28</td>
<td><strong>Garden Club</strong> at the home of Gratia Reynolds, 70 Olin Ave SE, 331-5312</td>
<td>Kent Petterson 332-1821, Mary Alice Kopf 379-7436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, May 30</td>
<td><strong>Pratt Ice Cream Social</strong> at Pratt. Food, games, and music for the whole family. The only chance all year to climb the tower!</td>
<td>Deb Clark 668-1108, Community Ed 668-1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 20</td>
<td><strong>(Tentative) Zoning &amp; Planning Committee meeting</strong> at Prospect Park United Methodist Church.</td>
<td>Florence Littman 331-2970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annual Meeting .......... Annual Election

The annual meeting this month includes the election of PPERRIA board members and officers who will serve for the term 2008-2009. Your nominating committee chaired by Gratia Reynolds has developed a list of geographically-dispersed candidates who have agreed to stand for election. Nominations will be accepted from the floor, and you may nominate yourself. Keep in mind that any nominee from the floor must be a member, be present at the meeting, and declare a willingness to serve if elected; or, if not present, must provide a written statement confirming these qualifications.

Each nominee will rise and be introduced before the vote. Names on the ballot may include a one-line statement of the nominee’s primary neighborhood concern(s). The results of the board election will be announced before the end of meeting when the ballot count is complete. Then, those elected board members will meet to choose the officers.

............................ The path to the future is chosen by those who show up