

Citizens for a Loring Park Community (CLPC)
Board Meeting, September 19, 2005

Board Members Present: Jim Bullock, Robert Cook, Joshua Callington, Liz Hutter, Pat Hafrenstein, Mary Turner, John VanHeel, Diane Woelem, and Sid Guthrie

Executive Staff Present: Jana Metge

Also Present: Jerry Seehusa, Facilities Manager for the building which CLPC leases from

Absent: Katie Hatt and Neil Carlson

Introductions and Announcements

- 1) Several handouts available for pickup.
- 2) Neighborhood USA conference will likely be held in Minneapolis in 2008.
- 3) NRP Program Income meeting is being planned on Thursday night at the NRP office from 7 p.m. – 9 p.m. In the Crowne Roller Mill at 105 5th Avenue S, in Minneapolis, on the second floor.

CLPC Funding

There are three specific programs that have funding left in them, which is the smaller portion of what is left in our budget. The larger portion of the budget consists of the proceeds from our investment in the two percent loan program. This does not include the allocation that has been made of \$15 thousand to fulfill the remaining expenditures of the year, which include office expenses and staff salary. Thereafter, we will have in excess of \$100 thousand remaining.

-We will be spending \$20 thousand on the Small Area Plan.

-\$130,316.46 of available NRP Phase One funding is remaining.

-At the strategy planning meeting it was agreed that remaining funding in the phase one allocation would not be used at this time and would be set aside.

-Non-contracted monies need to be brought within CLPC and then either allocated to the appropriate expenses or contracted so that it cannot be re-allocated to other organizations.

Once brought within the organization they can then either be held or allocated per the board's directives. The goal is to get "money out of the city bank into your bank and then the second step is how do you want to spend it?"

-Up to \$25 thousand can be taken from transferred from the city's bank to our bank each month, per board demand.

-Mr. Bullock raises the concern that we are requesting funding which was not appropriately budgeted and reflected in documents that were distributed to the board for approval. Without the appropriate disclosure of this information, Mr. Bullock feels that we are not balancing our budget ahead of time as we should be and rather periodically and only in response to demands for additional funds.

-Ms. Metge states that there have been funding sources that we have applied to that we have not received funding from. Had those funds been made available we would have likely met our budget and would not be seeking additional funds. Because it has not worked out per our forecast, we have had to seek out additional funds to balance the budget.

-Ms. Hatt states that out of the strategy session it was decided that a goal of the organization will be to plan ahead for future years as far as the budget is concerned so that we would not be scrambling for funding later in the year as we are now.

-Mr. VanHeel stated: “This is not a do nothing organization, we’ve done a number of incredible things over the last year that the neighborhood recognizes.”

-Ms. Metge allocates her efforts as follows:

- 1) Small Area Plan
- 2) Downtown bus fare zone
- 3) Organizing business support for the Nicollet Avenue Housing Corridor issue
- 4) Engagement letter for the State Auditor, which takes up at least 20 hours a week and is expected to go on for the next five weeks.
- 5) Administrative activities: bills and invoices, Land Use meetings, Executive Board meetings, Livability meetings, Eitel Task Force partnership follow-through, and staff support.

Motion by Robert Cook, second by Sid Guthrie that CLPC approve a NRP plan modification in the amount of \$25,000 from the 2% commercial loan line item into the administration line item, 15k to be allocated to administration and 10k to be allocated for NRP Phase I Review. Motion passed, no nays, one abstention by Jim Bulluck

This will be the only NRP action that the organization will be able to take this month, per NRP guidelines.

Loring Hill – Small Area Plan

The Loring Hill Task Force is requesting additional funding beyond the \$20 thousand that they have already been provided. They’d like an additional \$10 thousand to support the consultant in further research of the historic nature of the Loring Hill through the Historic Inventory, which without the additional funding may be incomplete and therefore insufficient for the community to go forward. The proposal is currently focused primarily on past development and historic preservation and does not incorporate enough reference to new developments and furthering the image of the community through future development proposals.

Other miscellaneous thoughts regarding Loring Hill Small Area Plan:

-\$20 thousand has only purchased an inventory, nothing to do with design guidelines.

This information may not be sufficient for the Task Force to make a recommendation to the City in turn for the moratorium that the research has been conducted under the pretext of.

-The consultant is now and had been very resistant to participating in meetings and dialog with the Task Force and the CLPC board.

-A Small Area Plan consists of items such as citizen participation that the current consultant’s report does not consist of. Without key items, it may not be considered a Small Area Plan and we will either have to settle for something less or locate the funds to support further research that would rise to the level of the research that we had originally sought to receive.

-Mr. Bullock, if we don’t have the additional funds the contract is done and we withdraw altogether.

-Pat: Would like to see us provide additional funding. If we want to get this plan in place so that we don’t have to fight every developer along the way through our committees.

“We’ve got to do something in this year or we’ve lost our year.” Its very discouraging

that we can't get any funding through NRP, though we should fight to do what we can.

-Liz: Still not sure why none of the time that has already been invested has not been used to investigate preservation. She thinks that the current report is inadequate and very narrow as it does not address all that we'd like for it to. She'd like to further negotiate with the consultant to see if a better agreement can be reached with the existing funds or at a lesser price.

-Katie: It's important that something comes out of this that can help guide development in the future. In terms of NRP expenditures, being that the Loring Hill is not the only part of the Loring Park neighborhood, perhaps what we've already gained from the consultant could be used toward other development in the community as a whole, therefore we may not have lost anything in the process. She is disappointed with the consultant that has been selected and prefers that we select another developer that will focus on A & C (public process and planning and urban design), or Monique McKenzie that can work with us to get design guidelines in place.

-Mary: Is concerned about the strong focus on the preservation planning. There is not enough about community input. We knew from day one that there would be a certain amount of money that we have and that it would need to be worked within. Certainly the Board can have suggestions to the task force, though Mary suggests that we add another \$10 thousand and that the task force attempt to match funding based on that additional contribution.

-Joshua: All or nothing. It doesn't seem prudent to go forward if we can't come up with the funds that we knew from the outset that we'd need to develop a complete study for the city in turn for the moratorium. Our credibility would suffer greater damage if we were to go forward empty handed than if we backed out now and picked up the pieces at a later time when we are able to fulfill the nature and scope of the study that we set out to obtain.

-Robert: Go for the whole thing. Anything less would be unsatisfactory.

-Sid: The whole idea was to shape development and if we can hone in with the consultant on that, in lieu of focus on the historic preservation aspect, we may be left with a better product. When we reach the point of strategic planning, we may get more community involvement. If those options do not work then it may be best that we pull out.

-Diane: Would like to stay focused on our ultimate goal. If we think that the product is important and would like for it to be done, and for our whole image, she's just not sure that it is worth it. Go back and ask that the consultant do what she can for the \$20 thousand. If she is unable to produce what we'd like, perhaps we could try someone else. Perhaps we'd be better off focusing on other projects.

-John: consult with other consultants to see if it would be possible to get something along the lines of what we are looking for for a cost of about \$40 thousand, \$30 thousand of NRP funding and \$10 thousand of fundraising. The goal is to get a complete product for less.

Motion by Sid Guthrie, seconded by Robert Cook that CLPC delay the finalization of the contract with Landscape Research LLC pending further consideration until the October board meeting.

Motion passed, no nays, no abstentions

Documented and transcribed by Board Secretary Joshua Callington.

Draft Revision by John Van Heel 4-30-06