

Minutes

Prospect Park East River Road NRP - 2 Steering Committee Meeting of December 6, 2004

1. The meeting was called to order by Dick Poppele, co-chair of the steering committee, at 7:30 pm in the multi-purpose room at Luxton Park Community Center. It was noted that the agenda stated that the start time would be 7 pm, but many people did not notice the change from the two previous meetings. There were approximately 14 steering committee members in attendance. Dick proposed the printed agenda. There were no objections and a consensus was assumed. (see attached copy)
2. Dick proposed that the minutes of the last meeting be adopted. There were no objections and a consensus was assumed. (see attached copy)
3. Copies of the proposed budget were passed out. (see attached copy) Excluding money budgeted for paying the secretary/NRP Implementation Coordinator (Joyce Barta), there is about \$2800 left for Phase II start up costs.

Joyce noted that the money allocated to particular budget lines was just a suggestion which was made before the planning had begun and that the money can be shifted around to different lines or to additional items as the committee deems it necessary.

Steve Cross noted that the mailings, including printing and postage, for the Phase II Kick-Off meeting were very expensive. Perhaps for the preliminary and final meetings to approve a Phase II Plan, it would be best to mail a short, one page notice to all households, referring them to a website for more information. This would decrease the cost substantially. The plan itself is likely to be 10-15 pages long, so to mail a copy to each household would be prohibitively expensive. Notices would also be placed in the SE Angle. Money could be saved by using smaller ads.

At this point there was translation into Somali. It was noted that the time from 7 pm to 7:30 pm was well spent. Dick took the time to explain what had transpired in the last few meetings to the Somali members of the Steering Committee, who had not attended those meetings. The translator provided translation at that time.

It was noted that the amounts budgeted for childcare, graphic design and SE Angle ads is probably higher than necessary while the amount for printing is too low. It is a tight budget. Members were encouraged to use e-mail as much as possible to save on copying costs.

Joe asked that the chairs monitor the budget and alert the committee if necessary, and they agreed.

4. The U of M interns gave a brief summary. It is the end of their semester and they have completed their work for the neighborhood. They will be giving their report to their class on Thursday (Dec 9) at 1:30 pm and all were invited to attend. Each student was required to write an individual paper as well as participate in the group presentation. They were asked to give a short summary of their presentation.

Keith: It appeared that there was good participation in the process by neighborhood residents, even though sporting events, a presidential debate, and cold weather conflicted with the kick-off meeting.

Although not many students participated, there was a lot of effort directed at trying to gain their participation, and in a democracy, participation cannot be forced. Also, democracy is not getting what you want. There was communication with all kinds of people in the neighborhood and the neighborhood must continue to work at that. After the first meeting, there was a falloff in participation, probably partly due to Ramadan, but the committee had to continue its work. There was a lot more money in Phase I; the big issue now is how to get the most out of a much smaller amount of money and how to identify the needs. The neighborhood has a good process.

Matt: It is clear that this is an open and welcoming organization. The people who have been historically most involved do not want to do it alone, and encourage people to get involved. The difficult reality is that the homeowners who have always participated are still the ones who participate most. This may change.

Chair asked if he could have a copy of the paper and was told yes. Both co-chairs thanked the interns for their work.

5. A question was asked to clarify whether the minutes had been adopted (yes) and how much money there is to work with for Phase II. Dick clarified that there is approximately \$347,000, 70% of which must be used for housing. The committee is currently asking for proposals on how to spend this money, and waiting for clarification from the city and NRP on the exact requirements. This was translated into Somali and it was again noted that the main issues were explained to the Somali women before the meeting began.

6. Steve Cross and Dick Poppele provided statistical information they had gathered on the neighborhood from a variety of sources including, NRP and census data. (see attached copy)

Steve's information consisted of 23 pages of handouts. He said the one titled, "Prospect Park East River Road – General Demographic Characteristics" was the most helpful. It contains data from the 1990 and 2000 censuses. Prospect Park contains 2 census tracts. The division is at 27th Ave – west of 27th is the University area, including the 3 large student housing units. East of 27th contains 90% of Prospect Park, including Glendale. It was noted that statistical data on housing occupancy from NRP does not exactly match this data; the NRP data probably does not include the new units in the university area census tract.

Next helpful would be "Minneapolis 2000 Census, Family Income Category." Prospect Park is on the 3rd page. The handout titled, "2000 Census City of Minneapolis contains maps showing the boundaries of the census tracts.

A discussion followed on the difference between median household income, which includes the income of everyone living in the household regardless of relationship, and median family income, which includes only a husband, wife and children. The difference will be important because we will be asked to deal with "affordable housing" and will need to know which figure it is based on. Barb Lickness (NRP) said that the city's definition of affordable housing will probably be 80% of the Metro Median Income, which is \$62,400 (80% of 78,000). Barb did not specify if that is household or family income. Kari noted that we could specify a different income to qualify for programs.

A question was asked about the number of students and the size of the units, but the effect of student occupancy is unknown. It was noted that Prospect Park is expensive. Another question asked was how

does this apply to renting (vs. owning)? It is assumed that 30% of income goes to rent, so \$1,800 would fall into that category.

It was emphasized that we are using statistics to try to get a snapshot of the neighborhood.

Dick's had e-mailed his 5 pages of handout to the distribution list. The data for the table titled, "Analysis of residential properties by current property tax evaluations (2004)" came from NRP and follows the exact neighborhood boundaries. Dick subtracted out the business and did the statistics. The bar chart shows market values of rental vs. owner occupied properties. The 3 maps show the locations of properties valued at under \$200,000 and under \$150,000. They are all single family dwellings or contain 4 units or less.

Noted: There are about 700 residential properties in the neighborhood. Most of these (nearly 80%) were valued at over \$200,000 for the 2004 tax assessment.

Noted: Of approximately 150 properties valued at \$200,000 or less, over 40% of those are non-homesteaded (rental) and about 85% of these rental units are located in the Motley neighborhood.

Noted: The lower valued properties are located in clumps, and are not evenly distributed in the neighborhood.

Question – can we stabilize the owner occupied portions and keep the rental units from becoming run down?

7. A general discussion on housing possibilities followed.

Possibility: Provide low interest loans for renters who want to own.

We need a clarification of "income". It is hard to specify a dollar amount, because it should depend on family size.

Possibility: Put our NRP money into the NRP proposed funds and let them manage it, and then publicize it in the areas where it applies.

Possibility: Put the money into loan programs so it comes back to be used again. This will be discussed at future meetings.

A question was asked about the project proposals. It was explained that these are not applications, but proposals for what kind of programs we should have – Loans? Grants? Fix-ups? Buying? The committee is currently getting input from the neighborhood. The amount not mandated for housing could go to other projects.

Possibility: Provide an incentive for rental owners to upgrade their properties, or at least stop the downward trend.

8. Future meetings will generally be held on the 1st and 3rd Mondays of the month at 7 pm; however there will be no more meetings in December. The next meeting will be Jan 3 or later, and members will be notified.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 9 pm.

