

DRAFT

Board of Directors Meeting

Citizens for a Loring Park Community (CLPC)

Monday, October 8th, 2007; 6:30-8:15 p.m.

Loring Park Community Center

Board members present: John Van Heel, Bob Hansen, Dick Sandberg, Terry Thompson, Pat Hafvenstein, Gullickson, Robert Cook

Board members absent: Neil Carlson, Richard Gardell

Guest: Jan Sandberg, Michelle Bruch (Downtown Journal), Senator Scott Dibble, and Joe Horan

Staff: Jana Metge, CLPC Coordinator

I. Call to Order -- John Van Heel

Motion by Terry Thompson to approve agenda for the board of directors meeting. Seconded by Robert Cook.

Passed unanimously

Motion by Terry Thompson to approve the September 10, 2007 minutes. Seconded by Richard Sandberg.

Passed unanimously.

II. Announcements

- **Downtown Streetcar Study and City-wide Transportation Action Plan** Public Meeting October 15th 4:00-6:00pm at the Central Library that will focus more on the streetcar study.
- **Community Engagement Meetings** (see dates on the city's Web site at http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/communications/communityengagement.asp#P10_1738)
 - The closest meeting is set for Tuesday, Oct. 16 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. (open house format) Central Library board room 300 Nicollet Mall
- **Holiday Party** – at the World Mission Prayer League. The date will probably be December 6, 2007. There will be a stronger effort to promote the event.
- **Land Use Committee** meeting date change: due to Christmas holiday, move the meeting from December 24th to December 17th
- **Livability Committee** meeting date change: due to Thanksgiving, move the meeting from November 21st to November 14th

Land Use Committee Report – Dick Sandberg

Action Items:

- *Katie Hatt offered to facilitate a brainstorming session with interested folks and committee members sometime in the next couple of weeks, if this would be helpful. Dick offered to work with her. The Board recommended that they coordinate this with an existing meeting*
- *The chair will work with Jana to get an update from the City on the status of maintenance of the Grant Street streetscape project such as the banners. What is the status of the proposal to enlarge the district? Jana will get back to Dick on this.*
- *Check on City's plan to assess properties for street lighting. Jana thought that there were hearings in September with some contesting of additional fees. This would be a good topic for our Councilmember Goodman or Doug Kress to address.*

DRAFT

Motion from Land Use Committee:

Motion by Robert Copeland, seconded by Katie Hatt, that representatives from the Eitel Hospital Task Force work with staff to prepare a letter for Board approval concerning options for addressing the bricked-up windows. The letter is to be sent to our Councilmember, the city, the National Historical Society and the developer.

Motion passed, John van Heel abstained

The Board took action on this item in an agenda item below.

B. Livability Report: Robert Hansen

Action Items:

- *Invite management of AccessWorks to a Livability meeting to discuss resident concerns and possible solutions.*
- *The chair will work with Neil and Luther to invite John DeJung to a future meeting.*
- *Check other resources for neighborhood organizations: Des Moines Iowa neighborhood-based model directs state and local resources; NRP Web site for Phase II plans (Stevens Square, possibly Elliot Park).*
- *Include Phase II Planning for the October meeting. Jana will put together a draft—committee members should send ideas to Jana.*

Motions: none

There were no reports from any other committees or task forces.

III. 6:45-7:00 Discussion with State Senator Scott Dibble

Former CLPC Coordinator, now Senator Dibble gave the Board an overview of the most recent legislative session including the transportation bill (which had strong bipartisan support) and the attempt to override the Governor's veto. There may be an additional attempt to override the veto in the coming session. Senator Dibble feels that there were accomplishments as outlined in a newsletter distributed to the Board. A key issue is that there are too many things being pushed onto the property tax and this may change in the next session.

In response to questions from the Board:

- Response to polls and the willingness of the public to pay for infrastructure--Senator Dibble believes that people are willing to pay taxes if they can be shown that the expenditures will give value.
- The direction that the state is going--Senator Dibble said that Minnesotans are more positive about the state than the nation. He feels that Minnesotans are often ahead of the curve.
- Attempts to cut back on transit--Senator Dibble thinks that there will not be an effort to cut back on transit in the transportation bill. He added that there has been a noticeable lessening of the division between rural and urban districts on this and other issues.
- Whether streetcars are too local to be funded regionally--Senator Dibble thought that streetcars are a local issue.
- Interactions between the Governor and legislators and voter approval—Senator Dibble noted that ratings for the Legislature are unusually high currently.
- Insight into NRP challenges-- Senator Dibble said that the funding source is likely not repeatable. The source included funds from TIF districts that are expiring and became of less value in recent years due to the tax reform bill. No one at the Legislature is actively promoting the same funding

DRAFT

source. Board members suggested that funding sources could include local options taxes or a charter amendment to require 1% of city revenues dedicated to neighborhoods. The Board expressed concerns about the continued operation of NRP and asked how the program can die after winning so many awards. Senator Dibble agreed that the organizations couldn't run on volunteers alone. However, he thought that funding for staffing was a small part – bigger issue is interacting with the city and getting funds to support projects. Senator Dibble doubted that bonding requests could be tied to neighborhood projects since bonding is mostly just for projects of statewide or regional significance. Any legislative initiatives for this session need to come together now. It will help that there were discussions last session. A big part is constituent contact and coordination (time and dollars).

- Likelihood of serious political repercussions if NRP dies--Senator Dibble thought that the early promise of NRP was assumption that City agencies would go to a consultative model and this has not happened across the board. Some years ago there was a feeling that working together sometimes became a dollar chase by city departments for NRP dollars—but now there will be no dollars and possibly much less collaboration.

IV. 7:00-7:20 CLPC fundraising strategy, review & approval of CLPC brochure - Terry Thompson and Jan/Dick Sandberg, Bob Hansen, and John Van Heel

Terry Thompson described recent fundraising development activities including a brochure and insert of quotes. Quotes are still coming in from Lisa Goodman and Sen. Scott Dibble among others. A large number of important people support CLPC and this is as important as brochures. Dick Sandberg described the work to develop poster boards for community meetings.

Jana gave an overview of the entire process: board members are identifying association-meeting dates to solicit funding from condo associations. CLPC will also request that materials be included in mailings to homeowners through management letters generally sent quarterly or so. The goal now is for \$25,000 - \$50,000 for 2008. The funding would support an office and some staff time. There are also opportunities for presentations to the business owners association. Other CLPC events should be used as an opportunity for requests, such as the Holiday Party.

Motion by Dick Sandberg, to approve the content of the brochure as distributed for this meeting subject to minor formatting changes. Seconded by Robert Hansen.

Motion passed unanimously

V. 7:20-7:45 Discussion on the future of NRP with Joe Horan, NRP staff

Joe Horan discussed the underpinnings of the current program. Access to certain funding was enabled by state legislation. The current funding sunsets in 2009 with no decision to date for other funding sources. The "\$20 million for 20 years" commitment was hit hard by the major tax law changes in 2001, which changed the revenue generation and projections for the NRP program. NRP reached an agreement with city council on the use of revenues including NRP but the formula for Phase II funds set at that time has not held and there have been fewer funds than anticipated. Neighborhoods are being told that they have about 38% of what was planned at that time.

In response to questions from the Board:

- The source of political resistance to NRP – Joe distributed some comments from James Heltzer and the 1991 State of the City comments from the mayor. NRP was not a grass roots effort from the neighborhoods although some neighborhoods were working in coalitions to try to work with the city and county. The initiative came out of the mayor's office, shifting emphasis from an urban renewal model. The focus was on people as a resource, developing a citywide feeling of connection among neighborhoods and creating projects to serve a diverse population.

DRAFT

- Concerns about the current community engagement effort—Board members labeled this a convoluted process generating opaque papers neutering the collaborative process. There were other comments that the city is slipping, downtown is deteriorating, and people are angry.
- Loss of focus – Joe thought that there might be a feeling that things are not as bad now as they were in the 1970s and most city leadership did not experience the bigger problems that existed during the 1970s. Are there no burning issues? There are still many issues such as mortgage crisis, Northside shootings, and middle class flight.
- The present and future of CLPC--Joe said that a neighborhood needs to have a physical presence even if there is no NRP. The neighborhood should look to its own resources to raise the base funding for an office presence. Staffing would be extra. The problem with using grants for project funding is that the projects become less about the neighborhood's priorities and more about the grantor's priorities.
- Possible funding sources--Joe described the legacy fund (from the sale of the Hilton) that expires around the end of 2009. The value of this fund has risen lately and there is discussion to stop borrowing from the fund, which might help NRP. Otherwise, there are small pieces scattered around but no big pot of dollars and a small possibility of extension of current TIF districts. Just getting people to the table to discuss projects would help. There appear to be no champions at the city level for community involvement.
- State support--There is little or no support at the state level for NRP in part because the elected officials do not support it. Joe suggested CLPC invite Rep. Clark who supported legislation last year.

VI. 7:45 – 8:05 p.m. NRP Phase II – Jana and John

There is still Phase II funding available but accessing it will require a Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan. (How much money depends of several factors --If the city does not act on the legacy fund money, the funds available for NRP decrease. NRP is planning to have available less than half of the funding first envisioned. Also, 70% of NRP dollars must be directed to housing. Jana thinks that CLPC will get \$350,000 for ten years).

Jana said that NRP approved CLPC's Citizen Participation Plan. (The CLPC board minutes from September 13th 2006 state that: "CP Plan has been sent off to NRP offices—"). The 1995 Phase I plan is available from <http://www.nrp.org/R2/Neighborhoods/Plans/LoringParkPhaseIPlan.pdf>.

Jana suggested that there are many variations of plans and that the CLPC Phase II plan should be broad enough to allow for community input to finalize specific projects. There are a number of plans developed over the past few years (Nicollet Avenue Plan, Loring Hill Plan) with parts that could be incorporated into the Phase II plan. To save time, Jana and John suggest minimizing some of the community outreach at this point, and instead use it during implementation. The Phase II plan would still require 45 days of intense effort. Part of the plan requires digging out old records to verify what was done with Phase I funding not just working on new priorities. (For the future, Jana recommends that every time a section in the plan is completed there be a timely evaluation.) However, there has been some communication to the office suggesting that planning start with a clean slate.

There was some discussion about the need for a clearly delineated process and milestones including the possibility of separate meetings to brainstorm ideas. Some elements could be very general such as developing two more small area plans. Jana listed some of the plan's sections including land use, transportation, public safety, and environmental.

Dick requested that John and Jana put together, for the board, an outline in writing of the basis for the Phase II plan and a set of milestones and tasks.

VII. 8:05-8:15 p.m. Eitel Letter from Land Use for Board review and approval – Robert Cook, Dick Sandberg

DRAFT

Dick described the letter drafted by Katie Hatt that was sent to the Board.

Motion by Dick Sandberg, to send a letter (to be modified by Robert Cook and reviewed by Dick Sandberg) to Village Green apprising them of concerns with the bricked-over windows on the restored section of Eitel Hospital. Seconded Becky Gullickson,

Motion passed, John van Heel abstained

The Board discussed convening the Eitel Task Force to discuss other issues with the project. Representatives from Village Green will be at the October Land Use meeting, offering an opportunity to discuss these issues with them and to decide about the need for another meeting.

This highlights a broader need to follow up development projects after the neighborhood has approved plans but while the project is being developed.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Invite Rep. Clark who supported NRP legislation last year to an upcoming Board meeting.
- John and Jana will put together an outline in writing of the basis for the Phase II plan and a set of milestones and tasks for the next Board meeting.
- Approach Village Green at the October Land Use meeting to discuss the need for another meeting of the Eitel Hospital Task Force.

Adjourned 9:15 p.m.