

Minutes
Prospect Park East River Road NRP - 2 Steering Committee
Meeting of March 21, 2005 at Luxton Park

1. The meeting was called to order by Steve Cross, co-chair of the Steering Committee, at 7:38 pm in the multi-purpose room at Luxton Park Community Center. There were 11 adults present. (See attached sign in sheet and item 10.) Steve said that both Dick Poppele and Joe Ring had schedule conflicts and would not be present.

2. Steve said that the goal of the meeting would be to get details from the committee on the goals to be accomplished at the community meeting scheduled for April 20. Steve was not present at the last meeting but said he had read the minutes and found that the meeting was mostly informational. The question now is what we must get from the upcoming neighborhood meeting.

Dean Lund felt it would be necessary to present the attendees with a way of collectively indicating areas of strong interest (or disinterest). He mentioned a survey form that Dick had handed out 2 meetings ago. The idea was to get some sense of whether we should entertain both housing and non-housing proposals or not. How much should be spent on housing – 100%, the required 70% or something in between. Some categories of alternatives to housing could be presented. We have a couple of specific housing proposals – SWIM and the Historic District. Together they total about \$78,000, so (if they were funded) there would be about \$150 – 175,000 left for housing with no specific proposals. The experts told the committee that that is enough money for a loan or a grant program, but probably not both. Translation followed.

Chair asked if there were any other thoughts on goals to be accomplished. Dean said that in addition to decisions on how much of the money to spend on housing, we could present three options in housing and have people indicate their priorities: home improvement, SWIM and historic district. Betts Zerby added the option of enabling home ownership (not necessarily affordable) with down payments or closing costs. There was some discussion on whether the home must be in the neighborhood or not.

Steve asked how people would vote – a show of hands or with dots (“dotocracy”). The general feeling was that dots, while not sophisticated, are a good way of registering the sentiment of a group. Also, there should be ideas for non-housing programs, maybe 4-5 of them, giving descriptions of general categories, such as schools, transportation, housing and livability, rather than specific proposals since more proposals may come in that could fit into general categories. However, examples of specific programs should be given.

It was suggested that there be separate questions for funding and for categories of programs. Translation followed. After more discussion with translation, the following voting options were proposed, using three colors of dots:

	Money Options	Give people one colored dot to put on one of the options.
	Housing	Other
1.	100%	0%

2. **In between**
3. **70% 30%**

Housing Options Give people five dots of another color.

1. **Home improvements, including affordable**
2. **SWIM**
3. **Historic District/Neighborhood preservation**
4. **Housing purchase assistance**

Other Options Give people five dots of another color.

1. **Education**
2. **Livability**
3. **Other**

It was noted that it would be best to vote on the amount of money allocated to housing after giving people an idea of what other types of programs are possible, however voting on specific programs would not take place at this meeting. It was concluded that building new affordable housing would not be on the list of possibilities, since the neighborhood does not have enough money available and it seems counter-productive to have people consider an idea that is not feasible.

For the committee's information, the general categories this neighborhood used in the NRP Phase I Action Plan were listed: Housing, Transportation, Environment, Education and Human Services, Safety and Security, Livability, Business, Jobs and Employment, PARC. Administration is an automatic category. There was some discussion that perhaps traffic management or traffic calming would be a better category at this time, but it appears that such programs would fall under "Other" in the current draft of the voting process.

Translation followed. Amina Mohamed, the translator, asked that she get advance copies of the materials to be used and voted on so that she could translate them into Somali. Steve agreed. He will work on the materials with Dick as soon as possible. Joyce Barta will make sure Amina gets the minutes of this meeting right away so she can begin.

It was noted that it will be necessary at the meeting to give people a good understanding of what they are voting about. Some people may vote for "all of the above". If, however, the vote is 90% for putting all the money into housing, the votes for other programs won't mean much. Interpretation of the vote will not necessarily be easy. The hope is to get the sense of the neighborhood. It can not be looked at as a scientific survey – it is not a random sample, but a small part of the neighborhood. Weight should be given to all the available information – proposals that come in, voting results, etc.

Suggestion: Enlarge the list of proposals and give a short description of each. This could be on a handout or a large copy on the wall, or both.

Steve had a document with information on housing and education. The question was asked whether the

dollar amounts should be included, since they add up to more money than we have. The amounts are those estimated by the authors of the proposals, not an indication of existing resources.

Suggestion: Have the authors give a short explanation of their proposals. The committee must be prepared to explain the proposal if the author or their designee is not present. Each proposal could be given only 2-3 minutes. This would add up to one hour or more.

The voting procedure must be explained and additional proposals should be invited. It should be explained that the Steering Committee may combine proposals.

Suggestion: A stopwatch must be available and someone must time the presenters. Probably Steve and Dick will co-chair the meeting.

The following meeting schedule was proposed:

**1st Hour – explanation of programs – housing and non-housing, 2 minutes/proposal
explanation of money available
15 minutes for questions
15 minutes for an explanation on how to vote
30 minutes to vote**

It was noted that the meeting would probably go over the allotted time. People would be free to remain and see how the vote comes out. Voting would be on large sheets of paper that we would take away with us. It was clarified that the community meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 20.

3. The next meeting will be on Monday, April 4 at 7:30 pm. Joyce Barta will not be present; Kari Simonson will take the minutes. After that, there will only be one more meeting (April 18) before the community meeting. Since that meeting is 2 days before the community meeting, most of the planning must be completed at the April 4 meeting.
4. Chair asked if there were any changes or corrections to the minutes of the last meeting. There were none. Dean Lund moved to accept the minutes as written. The motion passed with no opposition.
5. The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.
6. The meeting attendees were:

Shukri Dirie
Dean Lund
Betts Zerby
Ginia Klamecki
Steve Cross
Joyce Barta
Amina Mohamed
Ambara Barre
Khadija Sheikh
Halimo Yusaf

