

To: NRP Policy Board Delegates and Alternates

From: Robert D. Miller, Director

Date: Monday, May 15, 2006

Subject: Cedar Riverside Neighborhood First Step Plan

The West Bank Community Coalition has submitted the Cedar Riverside NRP First Step Plan for your approval. The Cedar Riverside NRP Steering Committee has developed this First Step plan over a three-year period from 2003 to 2006, while holding numerous focus groups and widely-publicized meetings. The Plan was approved by a neighborhood ballot on April 6 and April 8, and was electronically sent to City staff for review on December 22, 2005 and again on May 2, 2006. City and NRP staff comments have been addressed in this version of their plan.

The Cedar Riverside NRP First Step Plan allocates \$350,000 of the neighborhood's NRP allocation in accordance with the NRP "First Step Program" Policy approved by the Policy Board on October 18, 1993. The neighborhood's Phase I median is \$3,156,377.

In 1998, the NRP Policy Board and the City approved an early access request by the Cedar Riverside neighborhood for \$1,550,000 for renovation of Dania Hall, a historic neighborhood landmark. Dania Hall was lost to a fire in 2001 prior to completion of the project, after NRP expenditures of \$1,068,166.78. Sale of unused materials purchased for Dania Hall recovered \$4,350.00 of those expenses, leaving \$486,183.22 for reallocation. The Cedar Riverside First Step Plan reallocates \$216,000 originally allocated unspent funds for the Dania Hall project.

In 2003, \$48,000 of the neighborhood's Phase I funds were allocated for continued development of the First Step and full Action Plans. The Cedar Riverside NRP Steering Committee will continue developing a full Cedar Riverside Action Plan to allocate the remaining \$1,208,377 of the neighborhood's NRP Phase I allocation.

I have reviewed the Cedar Riverside NRP First Step Plan that has been prepared by the Cedar Riverside NRP Steering Committee with the assistance of NRP staff, and find that:

- Adoption of the plan will allocate \$350,000 of the neighborhood's Phase I allocation.
- Adoption of the Plan will reallocate \$216,000 of the 1998 Early Access request for

the Dania Hall renovation;

- Housing and safety strategies account for 59% of the First Step allocation (\$205,500 of \$350,000), or 54% of the First Step allocation and the Dania Hall reallocation (\$304,000 of \$566,000).

Given these findings, I recommend the following resolution to the NRP Policy Board for action at its May meeting:

RESOLVED: That the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Policy Board (Board) hereby accepts and adopts the Cedar Riverside First Step Plan dated April 19, 2006; and

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Board hereby authorizes the Director to request that the City Council and Mayor [a] amend the 2006 General Appropriation resolution by increasing the Community Planning and Economic Development Department agency Fund CNR- NRP Program Fund (CNR0-890-3550) by \$350,000.00 and [b] authorize the appropriate City officers to enter into any contracts or agreements necessary to implement the activities above;

CEDAR-RIVERSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD FIRST STEP PLAN

ACTIVITY	1998-Early Access		2004-Early Access		2006-First Step		98-06	PROGRAM INCOME	OTHER FUNDS	CHANGES
	NRP HOUSING	NRP OTHER	NRP HOUSING	NRP OTHER	NRP HOUSING	NRP OTHER	NRP TOTAL			
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE (page 11)										
1.1.1. LRT Station Enhancements		32,500					32,500		357,500	1
2.1.2. Home Improvement/Ownership Program					182,000		182,000			
3.1.1. Dania Hall Redevelopment		1,334,000					1,334,000	4,350.00		1
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND SAFETY (page 15)										
4.1.1. Somali/East African Police Officer						5,000	5,000			
4.1.2. Improve MPD Substation						500	500			
4.2.1. Regular Meetings with Police						1,000	1,000			
5.1.2. Inventory of Neighborhood Resources						500	500			
5.1.3. Form Block Clubs						1,500	1,500			
5.2.1. Safety Coordinator						15,000	15,000			
6.1.1. Install Safety Cameras		66,000					66,000		182,000	1
7.1.2. Physical Enhancements		15,000					15,000			1
7.1.3. Reduce Graffiti and Trash						500	500			
7.1.4. Establish Special Service District		10,000					10,000			1
8.1.1. Community Gardening Coordinator		5,000					5,000			1
HUMAN OPPORTUNITIES (page 29)										
9.1.1. Human Resource Coordinator						30,000	30,000			
9.2.1. Community Space Study						80,000	80,000			
9.3.1. Quarterly Service Directory						4,000	4,000			
9.3.2. Community Service Web Site						500	500			
10.1.1. Youth Sport Teams Uniforms						2,500	2,500			
11.1.1. Youth and Senior Coordinator/Interns						16,000	16,000			
12.1.1. Community Shuttle System		20,000					20,000			1
COMMUNITY BUILDING AND NEIGHBORHOOD RELATIONS (page 39)										
14.1.1. Community Gathering Tent						3,000	3,000			
14.1.2. Community Events/Gatherings						8,000	8,000			
14.1.3. Community Events Coordinator		10,000					10,000			1
14.2.1. Welcome Packets		500					500			1
14.2.2. Banners and Signs		5,000					5,000			1
IMPLEMENTATION (page 45)										
15.1.2. Program Planning and Implementation		52,000		48,000			100,000			1
TOTAL	0	1,550,000	0	48,000	182,000	168,000	1,948,000	4,350.00	539,500	
APPROVED EARLY ACCESS		1,550,000		48,000			1,598,000			
FIRST STEP REQUEST						350,000	350,000			
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS IN PLAN		52,500		48,000		0	100,500	5.16%		
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS FOR HOUSING							9,900			
TOTAL HOUSING ALLOCATION							191,900	9.85%		

NOTE: Allocations to activities within each year are subject to change depending upon timing and other project-related issues, but totals for each activity and for each year will not exceed approved levels.

NOTE: Other Funds listed on this spreadsheet are projected in the Action Plan, but are not committed by NRP, any public jurisdiction or other entity unless noted in the Comments section below.

CHANGES:

1. Adoption of the First Step Plan modified the Dania Hall Redevelopment 1998 Early Access request (Economic Development, Housing and Infrastructure 3.1.1.) by reallocating a total of \$212,000 in 1998 to ten strategies: (1) \$32,500 (1998 Early Access) to LRT Station Enhancements (Economic Development, Housing and Infrastructure 1.1.1.); (2) \$66,000 (1998 Early Access) to Install Safety Cameras (Physical Environment and Safety 6.1.1.); (3) \$15,000 (1998 Early Access) to Physical Enhancements (Physical Environment and Safety 7.1.2.); (4) \$10,000 (1998 Early Access) to Establish Special Service District (Physical Environment and Safety 7.1.4.); (5) \$5,000 (1998 Early Access) to Community Gardening Coordinator (Physical Environment and Safety 8.1.1.); (6) \$20,000 (1998 Early Access) to Community Shuttle System (Human Opportunities 12.1.1.); (7) \$10,000 (1998 Early Access) to Community Events Coordinator (Community Building and Neighborhood Relations 14.1.3.); (8) \$500 (1998 Early Access) to Welcome Packets (Community Building and Neighborhood Relations 14.2.1.); (9) \$5,000 (1998 Early Access) to Banners and Signs (Community Building and Neighborhood Relations 14.2.2.); and (10) \$52,000 (1998 Early Access) to Program Planning and Implementation (Implementation 15.1.2.).

CEDAR-RIVERSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD FIRST STEP PLAN

ACTIVITY	Comments	Contract Administrator					
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE (page 11)							
1.1.1. LRT Station Enhancements	Other funds from City, County and others	Public Works					
2.1.2. Home Improvement/Ownership Program		DFD					
3.1.1. Dania Hall Redevelopment	Of total allocation, only \$1,068,166.78 was spent	MCDA (CPED)					
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND SAFETY (page 15)							
4.1.1. Somali/East African Police Officer	Funds for outreach, training, etc.	Police, NRP					
4.1.2. Improve MPD Substation		Police, NRP, DFD					
4.2.1. Regular Meetings with Police		NRP					
5.1.2. Inventory of Neighborhood Resources		NRP					
5.1.3. Form Block Clubs		NRP					
5.2.1. Safety Coordinator		NRP					
6.1.1. Install Safety Cameras	Other sources not defined	Police					
7.1.2. Physical Enhancements		Public Works, CPED					
7.1.3. Reduce Graffiti and Trash		NRP					
7.1.4. Establish Special Service District		Public Works, NRP					
8.1.1. Community Gardening Coordinator		NRP					
HUMAN OPPORTUNITIES (page 29)							
9.1.1. Human Resource Coordinator		NRP					
9.2.1. Community Space Study		NRP					
9.3.1. Quarterly Service Directory		NRP					
9.3.2. Community Service Web Site		NRP					
10.1.1. Youth Sport Teams Uniforms		Park Board					
11.1.1. Youth and Senior Coordinator/Interns		NRP					
12.1.1. Community Shuttle System		NRP, Hennepin County					
COMMUNITY BUILDING AND NEIGHBORHOOD RELATIONS (page 39)							
14.1.1. Community Gathering Tent		NRP					
14.1.2. Community Events/Gatherings		NRP					
14.1.3. Community Events Coordinator		NRP					
14.2.1. Welcome Packets		NRP					
14.2.2. Banners and Signs		NRP					
IMPLEMENTATION (page 45)							
15.1.2. Program Planning and Implementation		NRP					

CEDAR RIVERSIDE NRP FIRST STEP PLAN

Approved by the Cedar Riverside Community:

April 6 and 8, 2006

Approved by WBCC Board:

April 19, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section:</u>	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements	ii
Executive Summary	iii
BACKGROUND	
West Bank Community Coalition	1
Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program	2
Neighborhood Description	3
West Bank Community Coalition & NRP Chronology	8
GOALS, OBJECTIVES & STRATEGIES	
Economic Development, Housing & Infrastructure	11
Physical Environment & Safety	15
Human Opportunities	29
Community Building & Neighborhood Relations	39
Implementation	45
Budget	46
Appendices:	
Appendix A: Map of Cedar Riverside Neighborhood	
Appendix B: First Step Plan Vote Summary	
Appendix C: First Step Plan Survey Summary	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Cedar Riverside Neighborhood Revitalization Program's First Step Plan would not be possible without the leadership and participation of many dedicated community members and volunteers.

Special thanks to:

2006 NRP Steering Committee Members: Abia Ali, John Bueche, Emily Cheesebrow, Margot Imdieke Cross, Stuart Cross, Rhonda Eastlund, Eunice Eckerly, Robin Gillette, Rosemary Knutson, Lamont Newman & Laura Silver;

2006 West Bank Community Coalition Board Members: Africa Abdi, Hashi Abdi, Abia Ali, Xan Cassiel, Susannah Dodge, George Gammans, Mohamed Issa, Rosemary Knutson, Marvin Loxterkamp, Mary Mellen, Robert Metcalf, Brian Monroe, Jim Ruiz, Todd Smith & Doris Wickstrom;

All past NRP Steering Committee Members, WBCC Board Members, NRP Work Group Members, Focus Group Participants, Survey Respondents and partnering organizations;

Linda Alton, The Institute of Cultural Affairs;

The Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) including Bob Miller, Director, and Robert Thompson, Neighborhood Specialist.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The Cedar Riverside First Step Plan

The Cedar Riverside First Step Plan is the result of a partnership between the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program and the West Bank Community Coalition. The Cedar Riverside Neighborhood First Step Plan identifies neighborhood goals, objectives and strategies developed through a two-year planning process conducted by the West Bank Community Coalition in partnership with the NRP. This document establishes priorities for the Neighborhood, allocates funds for implementation and identifies potential sources of funding.

The Phase I NRP allocation for the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood is \$3,156,377. Early access requests approved and expended for Dania Hall and for the continued planning for Phase I total \$1,598,000. The Cedar Riverside First Step Plan allocates \$350,000 of the Neighborhood's NRP allocation as allowed by the NRP First Step Policy and will reallocate up to \$216,000 of unexpended Dania Hall funds. Additionally, the First Step Plan identifies nearly \$500,000 in matching funds from neighborhood institutions, the City of Minneapolis and Hennepin County that will be used for implementation of the strategies in this plan.

After approval of the First Step Plan, the Cedar Riverside NRP Steering Committee and the West Bank Community Coalition will continue developing the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood Action Plan, which will allocate the final \$1,208,377 of NRP funds.

This Document provides background on NRP, the West Bank Community Coalition, the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood and the process used to develop this plan. The Cedar Riverside Neighborhood First Step Plan also includes four sections that identify strategies and uses of NRP funds.

The Economic Development, Housing and Infrastructure section of the Cedar Riverside First Step Plan allocates \$214,500 of NRP funds to three strategies, including physical improvements to the Cedar Riverside LRT station (\$32,500); forming a Housing Committee (\$0) and a home improvement/ownership program (\$182,000). This section also incorporates the Dania Hall redevelopment strategy previously approved for a 1998 Early Access request (\$1,550,000). Dania Hall was lost to a fire in February, 2000, after neighborhood expenditures of \$1,068,666.78.

The Physical Environment and Safety section allocates \$115,500 of NRP funds to thirteen strategies. Many of the strategies focus on improving neighborhood safety by improving relationships with the Minneapolis Police Department (MPD). The Neighborhood will encourage the MPD to hire an East African Police Officer by providing financial support for tuition and equipment (\$5,000); review the status of the current Police Substation and make recommendations for either closing or improving its operations (\$500); establish regular meetings with Police officials (\$500); develop block clubs and a crime watch (\$1,500); and hire a part-time Safety Coordinator (\$15,000). Neighborhood NRP funds will also match a City contribution to install Safe Zone cameras along Cedar Avenue (\$66,000). The Neighborhood will also seek to improve neighborhood appearance and accessibility by organizing community clean ups (\$0);

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

providing funds for physical improvements such as trash cans and accessibility improvements (\$15,000); and starting initiatives to reduce trash and graffiti (\$500). Additionally, the neighborhood will study the feasibility of establishing a special service district for maintaining the streetscape along Cedar Avenue (\$10,000). The Neighborhood will also fund a Gardening Coordinator and establish a Gardening Committee to support community gardens (\$5,000).

The Human Opportunities section allocates \$152,000 to eight strategies. A Human Resources Coordinator will help identify and promote neighborhood programs, increase utilization and reduce redundancy (\$30,000); initiate a community space study to identify community gathering spaces and needs in the Neighborhood and to potentially assist with raising funds for community spaces (\$80,000); publish a Quarterly Service Directory and Community Service Website (\$4,500); support youth programs and promote the Neighborhood by providing uniforms to neighborhood youth teams (\$1,800); and form Youth and Senior Councils to tap into the ideas and experience of these groups (\$16,200). The Neighborhood will also establish a pilot community shuttle system to identify interest in a neighborhood shuttle bus (\$20,000).

The Community Building and Neighborhood Relations section allocates \$28,500 to five strategies for building better relationships and fostering communication. The Neighborhood will purchase a community gathering tent for supporting community gatherings around the Neighborhood (\$3,000); resume community gatherings and events such as CedarFest (\$8,000); hire a Community Events Coordinator (\$10,000); create and/or distribute welcome packets (\$500); and design and install neighborhood banners and signs to welcome people and help with navigation (\$5,000).

The implementation section allocates \$52,000 of NRP First Step funds for activities related to continued Phase I planning and implementation of First Step strategies.

THE WEST BANK COMMUNITY COALITION

The West Bank Community Coalition (WBCC) is the designated Citizen Participation organization recognized by the City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program as representing the interests of the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood of Minneapolis. The WBCC is directed by a volunteer board of 15 directors elected at an annual meeting.

The Cedar Riverside Neighborhood Revitalization Program's (NRP) Steering Committee is a committee of the WBCC, whose representatives were initially appointed jointly by the WBCC and NRP. The Cedar Riverside NRP Steering Committee is charged with gathering information from the community in order to develop and implement the goals, objectives and strategies detailed in this document and the full Cedar Riverside Neighborhood Action Plan.

The West Bank Community Coalition Mission Statement is:

To strengthen and celebrate the Neighborhood by promoting connections between its residents, businesses, institutions, and organizations.

The WBCC is dedicated to preserving its Neighborhood's strengths, identifying and helping to address the Neighborhood's changing needs and bringing positive improvements to all.

The Vision Statement of the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood NRP is:

Partnerships are key for us in Cedar Riverside in the next 10 years since we have one of the most diverse populations in Minneapolis with very diverse types of stakeholders. We need to help each other. Cleaner and safer streets, with well-managed traffic, will be important in creating a family friendly neighborhood in the future. We need housing options and help in getting access to these options to encourage people to stay in this neighborhood. Basic services have been removed in the past ten years (such as a post office, library, health clinics, and schools). They need to be returned in strength.

THE MINNEAPOLIS NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

The Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) is a unique effort to make the City's neighborhoods better places to live, work, learn and play. Neighborhood-based planning and priority setting are at the heart of the NRP.

Residents and other neighborhood stakeholders identify and address concerns in partnership with government and others by developing a Neighborhood Action Plan. Discovering new partnerships and renewing old ones can lead to creative solutions. The partnerships created through involvement in the NRP are as varied as the people and interests involved in the planning process. Residents are learning to work with City, County, Parks, Library and School staff to better develop these resources in their neighborhood.

Minneapolis residents are using the NRP planning process to identify and meet their neighborhood's housing, safety, economic development, recreation, health, social service, environment and transportation needs. NRP builds a foundation for the future of a neighborhood by supporting neighborhood organizations that organize residents, gather information, prioritize needs, brainstorm solutions and implement the Neighborhood Action Plan they develop.

From increasing the amount of quality housing to improving the environment, building community centers to job creation, residents are the creators and catalysts of change - change aimed at renewing a sense of common purpose in their community.

Six primary goals are addressed through the development and implementation of the Neighborhood Action Plans:

- Create a greater sense of community so people who live, work, learn, and play in Minneapolis have an increased sense of commitment to and confidence in their neighborhood and City.
- Sustain and enhance neighborhood capability in order to strengthen the civic involvement of all members of the community.
- Ensure that neighborhood-based planning remains the foundation of the program, is informed and leads to creative and innovative approaches.
- Strengthen the partnerships among neighborhoods and jurisdictions to identify and accomplish shared citywide goals.
- Ensure that government agencies learn from and respond to neighborhood plans so that public services ultimately reflect neighborhood priorities.
- Develop and support life cycle housing citywide through the preservation of existing housing and new construction by reaffirming our commitment to the state mandate that 52.5% of NRP funds be spent on housing.

NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

The Cedar Riverside Neighborhood is located on the west bank of the Mighty Mississippi River. Home to artists, entrepreneurs, students and more, it has one of the most diverse populations in Minneapolis. Its citizens aim to help each other build a family-friendly community that is cleaner and safer with well-managed traffic and many housing options. The Cedar Riverside NRP exists to help citizens get access to these resources and stay in this Neighborhood.

Named after the intersection of the two main avenues of the neighborhood, Cedar and Riverside, the boundaries of the Neighborhood are I-35W on the northwest, I-94 on the south and the Mississippi River on the northeast. A map of the neighborhood is attached as Appendix A.

POPULATION

According to the 2000 census, the population of the neighborhood is 7,545. This represents an increase of 18.5% from the total found in the 1990 Census, 6,368.

Since the 1990 census, Cedar Riverside has experienced two massive influxes of immigrants and refugees; between 1992 and 1994 there was a large influx of Vietnamese and between 1994 and the present there has been an equally large influx of Somali.

It is estimated that the Neighborhood has the largest concentration of Vietnamese, Korean, Ethiopian, and Somali immigrants and refugees in the state of Minnesota.

RACIAL/ETHNIC COMPOSITION

According to the 2000 Census, 42.1% of the population is white and 57.9% is all other races, compared to 1990 when 68.6% were white and 31.4% were all other races. The population breaks down as follows: 42.1 % white, 32.2% African American, 0.9% Native American, 15.8% Asian American, 3.7% some other race and 5.3% two or more races.

AGE DISTRIBUTION

The age group under five years old shows the largest increase from 1990 to 2000 with a 135% increase (239 to 562). The next two largest increases are the 45 to 54 year age group (up 74.3% from 272 to 474) and the 5 to 9 year age group (up 72.7% from 172 to 297). The under 20 year-old population is 31.4% (2,366) compared to 21.8% (1,390) in 1990. The 20 to 24 year-old group, many of whom are students, declined 8.8% from 1990 to 2000 (1,978 to 1,804).

HOUSING STOCK

According to the 2000 Census, the Neighborhood had 2,918 housing units compared to 3,056 in 1990. 2,838 of the 2,918 units were occupied. 291 units are owner occupied and 2,547 are renter occupied. Of the 291 owner-occupied units, 206 were located in the Riverview Tower Condominiums.

West of Cedar Avenue, Riverside Plaza and The Cedars Public Housing are the primary

BACKGROUND

residential areas. Together, these two high density residential complexes have a population of nearly 4,000 residents, or over half of the population of the entire Neighborhood.

East of Cedar Avenue, between Interstate 94, Riverside Avenue and Augsburg College, is another residential area consisting of a mix of single-family and multi-family owner-occupied and rental properties.

The University of Minnesota West Bank and Augsburg College campuses also have some student housing. A small percentage of the neighborhood's housing is located above commercial storefronts along Cedar and Riverside Avenues. More high-density housing is also located north of Washington Avenue to the north and west of the University of Minnesota's West Bank campus.

The far eastern corner of the Neighborhood (known as Riverside Park), contains a mix of single-family and multi-family owner-occupied and rental properties.

INCOME & POVERTY

The 2000 Census data showed that the median family income in Cedar Riverside was \$14,367, compared to the Citywide median of \$37,974. As with much of the statistical data for the Neighborhood, these figures may be explained, in part, by the large number of students living in the Neighborhood, as well as the substantial immigrant and refugee populations.

OTHER

Approximately 5% of the residents of Riverside Plaza are people with disabilities. Of these, 100% have incomes at or below 50% of the median income for the City.

Many people with disabilities undoubtedly came to Cedar Riverside because of its proximity to the University of Minnesota and Augsburg College and because Riverside Plaza was designed to provide accessible housing. Since then, they have found that the community provides the resources they require and takes pride in providing an accessible environment.

In 1993, the West Bank Community Development Corporation and the business community initiated a program to improve accessibility to businesses. This program, utilizing Neighborhood Economic Development Funds, was to be completed in 1997.

(Note: The statistics for Riverside Plaza are from a study conducted in 1995 by Riverside Plaza. Riverside Plaza does not certify the accuracy of this information for its present occupants.)

HISTORY

Cedar Riverside was one of the first neighborhoods in Minneapolis, originally settled in the 1850s. Many of Cedar Riverside's first residents were Scandinavian immigrants who worked at nearby mills. Cedar Riverside remained a mostly Scandinavian enclave until the late 1950s and early 1960s. Despite nearly a century of a mostly Scandinavian

BACKGROUND

population, few reminders of this heritage remain in the neighborhood today. The last major remnant, Dania Hall, was destroyed by fire in 2000.

While many Scandinavian immigrants were known for temperance when it came to alcohol, Cedar Riverside nonetheless gained a reputation for being an exciting place to be on weekend nights. The Neighborhood had a large number of saloons along Cedar Avenue, otherwise known as “Snoose Boulevard”, patronized by people from all over the city.

Cedar Riverside remained a popular destination until the late 1950s and early 1960s, when the character of the Neighborhood began to change. Like the nation itself, the Neighborhood underwent radical social changes. In 1962, the University of Minnesota expanded west over the Mississippi, beginning construction of the West Bank campus. With the University came large numbers of students, many of whom were involved in the counter-culture movement of the period. The infiltration of students pushed the original inhabitants out of the Neighborhood.

More major changes also came to the Neighborhood during the late 1960s and early 1970s with the construction of Interstates 35W and 94 and the interstate-like realignment of Washington Avenue from downtown to the University. Interstates 35W and 94 separated Cedar Riverside from downtown, while the Washington Avenue realignment separated portions of the Neighborhood along Cedar Avenue to the south from the Seven Corners area in the north.

Around the same time, the construction of Riverside Plaza designed by Ralph Rapson in the early 1970s was another major change to the Neighborhood. Originally planned as a large, modernist community encompassing the entire West Bank area, it provided places to live, work and recreate. The entire project was linked through skyways and open air plazas. The project met strong opposition from University students after the construction of the first phase (the current Riverside Plaza). The project was stopped through a series of environmentally-related lawsuits. Mounting costs eventually drove the original developers of Riverside Plaza into bankruptcy, stifling the rest of the project.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

University of Minnesota

The University of Minnesota was founded in 1851 on a site just below St. Anthony Falls. In 1962, having exhausted its available land on the Main Campus, the University expanded across the Mississippi River to establish the West Bank Campus and become a part of the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood.

The University of Minnesota West Bank campus consists of the Carlson School of Management, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs and several buildings associated with performing arts, such as the Rarig Center, Ted Mann Concert Hall, and the Barker Center for Dance, which comprise the West Bank Arts Quarter.

The total student enrollment of the University (East Bank, West Bank, and St. Paul campuses) is 48,150 as of Spring 2006.

BACKGROUND

Proposed expansion includes a new Carlson School of Management building on Riverside Avenue and a new residence hall.

Augsburg College

Augsburg College has been part of Cedar Riverside since 1872 when the College moved from Marshall, Wisconsin, to Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Augsburg promotes an image of a liberal arts college in the city, easily accessible by transit and freeway and advantageously located adjacent to the Riverside Campus of the Fairview/University of Minnesota Medical Center, University of Minnesota West Bank Campus, West Bank Theater District, the Mississippi River and the downtown areas of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

As of Fall 2004, the total student enrollment was 3,375, approximately 1,826 of these students were daytime attendees, 1,090 were weekend college or nontraditional, and 459 were graduate students.

Proposed expansion includes a new Gateway Center on Riverside Avenue, which will include retail and community space as well as classroom facilities.

Fairview/University of Minnesota Medical Center, Riverside Campus

Fairview Medical Center, which presently includes Fairview Hospital, Health Partners Clinic and St. Catherine's nursing school, has been a part of Cedar Riverside since its founding in 1887. In 1996, Fairview and the University of Minnesota Hospitals restructured, with Fairview Riverside Medical Center being renamed Fairview/University of Minnesota Medical Center, Riverside Campus.

The Fairview/University of Minnesota Medical Center is a 1,100 bed medical complex with significant community service programs focused in part on the Cedar-Riverside Neighborhood. Fairview is a charitable services institution that pursues its origins with a commitment to communities and maintains a policy of forming partnerships with community organizations (such as establishing community health committees).

Fairview has a staff of 1,125 physicians and 3,300 other employees and volunteers (1995).

Impacts

The University of Minnesota, Augsburg College, and Fairview/University of Minnesota Medical Center all have long histories in the Neighborhood and a stated pride in their locations in the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood and in the heart of the Twin Cities.

The presence of these major institutions provides a concentration of academic and professional expertise as well as large numbers of students, patients, staff and faculty attracted to the community.

While the University, Augsburg and Fairview/University of Minnesota Medical Center are all supportive members of the Neighborhood, they have varied levels of involvement with the community as well as varied interest in integrating their physical plants with the

surrounding neighborhood.

Finally, it must be recognized that, along with the significant benefits brought by the presence of these major institutions, come the corresponding demands on parking, streets, transit systems and commercial and residential areas.

Others

Other noteworthy neighborhood institutions include the cultural, social service and arts organizations located throughout the Neighborhood. Social services agencies include: the Brian Coyle Community Center, the Cedar Riverside People's Center, the Children's Gospel Mission, the Children's Home Society, the Korean Service Center, Mimi's Gallery-African Refugees, Confederation of Somali Communities of Minnesota and the Oromo Community Center. Theater and arts organizations include: Augsburg College Theater Department, Cedar Cultural Center, Mixed Blood Theater, Southern Theater, Cedar Riverside People's Center Theater, Theater in the Round, University of Minnesota School of Music and Ted Mann Concert Hall, University of Minnesota Theater Arts and Dance Departments at the Rarig Center and the West Bank School of Music. Other neighborhood organizations include: the Riverside Plaza Tenants Association, Cedar Riverside Business Association, West Bank Community Development Corporation and the West Bank C.O.P. (Community Oriented Policing) Shop.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

Green and open spaces are few and disconnected in the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood. Currie Park is the principal city park in the Neighborhood. Murphy Square, one of Minneapolis' first parks, is a block-sized green space inside the Augsburg College campus and bounded on the south by Interstate 94. While technically a public park, its location defines the park as more a part of the Augsburg College campus, rather than an easily accessible neighborhood park. The only other significant green and open spaces are Riverside and Bluff Street Parks, both located along the Mississippi River.

(A portion of this Neighborhood Description was taken from "Expanding Horizons in Cedar Riverside: Opportunities for Walking, Biking, Open Space and Community and Economic Development", Metropolitan Design Workshop, University of Minnesota, Department of Landscape Architecture, 2004.)

WBCC & NRP CHRONOLOGY

August 1998	First Cedar Riverside Participation Agreement approved by NRP Policy Board.
December 1998	Cedar Riverside Early Access request for \$1,550,000 for Dania Hall rehabilitation approved by NRP and City Council.
April 1999	Cedar Riverside NRP Steering Committee begins to meet.
August 1999	NRP Funding Agreement approved for Dania Hall.
February 2000	Dania Hall burns down. Total NRP funds spent on Dania Hall totals \$1,068,166.78.
June 2001	NRP allows First Cedar Riverside Participation Agreement to Expire.
October 2001	WBCC holds Annual Meeting and Board elections. The community elects a new board.
February 2003	WBCC adopts new bylaws and approves new NRP Participation Agreement.
July-August 2003	WBCC forms NRP steering committee. Several community leaders are pulled together to brainstorm list of names of potential Steering Committee members. Volunteers interview prospective Steering Committee members, and ask for two year commitment. Nine Steering Committee members are selected from approximately 30 applicants.
September 2003	Second Cedar Riverside NRP Participation Agreement contract is approved and becomes effective.
January-June 2004	Steering committee conducts over 100 individual and small group interviews throughout neighborhood.
August 2004	Steering Committee hires consultants Linda Alton and Jonathan Bucki to facilitate focus groups.
Winter 2004	Steering Committee convenes 15 focus groups which are facilitated by consultants with assistance of translators. Priorities are identified based on number of individual responses and responses from multiple focus groups.

BACKGROUND

May 2005	Community meetings held at Brian Coyle Community Center and People's Center to announce outcomes of focus groups, form work groups to develop strategies.
June 2005	Four work groups begin meeting to develop strategies for First Step Plan.
October 2005	Work groups complete work on draft First Step strategies.
November 2005- January 2006	Feedback on the draft First Step Plan strategies is received through focus groups, surveys and community meetings.
February 2006 Plan.	A joint work group meeting is held to revise the draft First Step
April 6 & 8, 2006	The Cedar Riverside Neighborhood votes on First Step Plan strategies. Balloting is carried out over two days at several locations in the neighborhood. Over 275 neighborhood stakeholders vote on strategies in the plan.
April 19, 2006	The WBCC Board approves the First Step Plan strategies.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE

GOAL 1. Improve LRT Station

Objective 1.1. Enhance Lighting and Streetscape Around LRT Station.

Strategy 1.1.1. Match County and City investment in lighting, safety and navigation enhancements for Cedar Riverside LRT station by 2006.

The WBCC will develop a partnership with neighborhood institutions, businesses and foundations to raise \$130,000 to match funds provided by Hennepin County and the City of Minneapolis.

Funds will be used for improved lighting, streetscape, security and other improvements identified in the Cedar Riverside Transit Area Study.

Funding:

City of Minneapolis	\$130,000.00
Hennepin County	130,000.00
NRP funds	32,500.00
Other funds	98,500.00
Total funding	\$390,000.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$32,500.00
-----------------------------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

Public Works

Possible Partners: Hennepin County, City of Minneapolis

GOAL 2. Improve Neighborhood Housing Stock.

Objective 2.1. Establish a Neighborhood Program for Home Improvements and Home Ownership by 2006.

Strategy 2.1.1. Establish a Housing Committee.

The WBCC will establish a Housing Committee to implement the Neighborhood's home improvements and home ownership program which will address the needs of 1 to 4 unit dwellings in the First Step Plan and may include assistance for higher-density dwellings in the full Action Plan, such as improved laundry facilities, accessibility, etc.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$0.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	
Total funding	\$0.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$0.00
-----------------	--------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners:

Strategy 2.1.2. Home Improvements/Ownership Loans and Grants.

A. The WBCC will select a vendor or use one or more of the NRP housing fund programs to provide home improvement loans, deferred loans or grants for home improvements. Guidelines will be based on the following principles:

- Eligible buildings will have one to four units;
- \$10,000 ceiling for a single project;
- Low-interest loans available to all applicants;
- Deferred loans available with an income limit, based on the City's income guidelines);
- Uses include exterior work, some interior work, energy-efficiency improvements and accessibility improvements;
- Interior work must be structural, such as furnaces, roofs/ceilings, etc.;
- Interior work that meets energy or accessibility goals will be accepted as well, because they meet a goal other than interior improvement;
- Most exterior work will qualify for loans or deferred loans, but painting will be capped at \$3,000 and will be eligible only for loans.

B. The WBCC will select a vendor or use one or more of the NRP housing fund programs to provide home ownership assistance. Guidelines will be based on the following principles:

- Will take the form of down-payment assistance;
- Low-interest loans/deferred loans will be administered according to income, as in strategy 2.1.2.a;
- May partner with other existing programs, to provide matching loans;
- Will develop an option for Muslims who cannot pay interest;
- A program for this may already exist at Freddie Mac; if so, we can work to make it more easily available.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$182,000.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	
Total funding	\$182,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$182,000.00
-----------------	--------------

Contract Manager:

DFD

Possible Partners:

GOAL 3. Restore Dania Hall.

Objective 3.1. Identify developer and support redevelopment of Dania Hall

Strategy 3.1.1. Dania Hall Redevelopment.

In 1998, the Cedar Riverside neighborhood submitted an Early Access request for \$1.5 million for the redevelopment of Dania Hall. The neighborhood secured architectural services and identified a developer to carry out the restoration work. Unfortunately, Dania Hall was lost to a fire in February, 2000.

Total NRP funds expended on Dania Hall is \$1,082,666.78. Windows and other material intended for Dania Hall were sold for \$4,350.00.

Funding:

NRP Funds	\$1,550,000.00
Expended	-1,068,166.78
<u>Program Income</u>	<u>4,350.00</u>
Remaining for reallocation	\$486,183.22

NRP Funds:

1998 Early Access	\$1,550,000.00
<u>Reallocated with First Step Plan</u>	<u>216,000.00</u>
Remaining 1998 Early Access	\$1,334,000.00

Note: The remaining balance of \$270,183.22, after deducting the funds expended on Dania Hall, the reallocation in this First Step Plan, and the program income generated from the sale of materials intended for Dania Hall, will be reallocated in the neighborhood Full Action Plan.

Contract Manager:

MCDA (CPED)

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT & SAFETY

GOAL 4. Improve Community Relations with the Police

Objective 4.1. Develop Community Friendly Police Officers.

Strategy 4.1.1. Provide incentives for an East African Officer to be assigned to the Neighborhood by 2006.

The WBCC Safety Committee will work closely with the Minneapolis Police Department (MPD) to assign East African officers regularly to the Cedar Riverside neighborhood. In partnership with the MPD, the neighborhood will work to improve connections with police officers, such as providing incentives for officers to become residents in the neighborhood or providing tuition support for neighborhood residents who would like to pursue a career in the police force.

Officers or trainees receiving tuition support or other assistance will be asked to provide volunteer time in the Cedar Riverside neighborhood.

NRP funds can be used for activities such as outreach, publicity, meetings, housing or hiring incentives for police, education and training incentives, assistance with tuition for police training at Metro State University or other local police training programs or assistance with purchasing equipment (i.e., uniform, gun, belt, etc.).

Funding:

NRP funds	\$5,000.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$5,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$5,000.00
-----------------	------------

Contract Manager:

Police, NRP

Possible Partners: Minneapolis Police Department

Strategy 4.1.2. Review and improve Neighborhood's MPD Substation.

The WBCC Safety Committee will work with the MPD to review the effectiveness of the substation and develop recommendations for either closure or continued operation and possible relocation and/or upgrades to make the substation more attractive and useful for the neighborhood and police.

The WBCC Safety Committee will seek other funding (through neighborhood donations, grants, etc.) to pay for maintenance, utilities, special events and other promotions.

Eligible uses for NRP funds will include expenses related to a study of the substation, renovation of existing or new facilities to include furniture, equipment, accessibility improvements, installation of bathrooms and conducting special events to promote and encourage use of the substation by police and the community.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$500.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	
Total funding	\$500.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$500.00
-----------------	----------

Contract Manager:

DFD, NRP

Possible Partners: Minneapolis Police Department

Objective 4.2. Encourage Opportunities for Resident Contact with Police.

Strategy 4.2.1. Initiate regular meetings between neighborhood and police.

The WBCC Safety Committee will work with the MPD to identify and organize opportunities for neighborhood residents to meet and partner with police.

Strategies might include:

- Organizing multi-neighborhood "criminal justice round tables" with judges, city and county attorneys, Police Chief, precinct commanders and others involved in the law enforcement system to discuss how the neighborhood might partner with various agencies to promote more effective results;
- Organizing Police ride-alongs to help community leaders gain better understanding of police work;
- Make use of city worksite to develop Community Impact Statements and to help ban offenders from neighborhood;
- Create neighborhood CARE committee to coordinate and improve responses of various jurisdictions to neighborhood issues.

NRP funds may be used for expenses related to these activities such as promotion, outreach, meetings and training.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$1,000.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	
Total funding	\$1,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$1,000.00
-----------------	------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Minneapolis Police Department

GOAL 5. Increase Community Involvement

Objective 5.1. Educate Residents and Build Relationships within Neighborhood.

Strategy 5.1.1. Create a Safety Committee.

The WBCC will create a Safety Committee to implement the safety strategies of the First Step Plan.

Funding:

NRP funds	0.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$0.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$0.00
-----------------	--------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners:

Strategy 5.1.2. Develop inventory of neighborhood resources.

The WBCC Safety Committee will coordinate with the Human Resource Coordinator as s/he investigates, visits and interviews other neighborhood group programs and as s/he develops a Youth Council and a Senior Council. The task of the Safety Committee will be to develop an inventory of neighborhood safety resources such as: what are CRNSP, Somali elders and other groups doing, how can they be supported, how can other residents be included, how can other be informed about these efforts without disrupting the effectiveness of the current groups.

NRP funds may be used for expenses related to these activities such as promotion, outreach, meetings, and training.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$500.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$500.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$500.00
-----------------	----------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners:

Strategy 5.1.3. Form block clubs.

The WBCC Safety Committee will work with the MPD and the Crime Prevention Specialist to organize block clubs, block watches and patrols and to post signs (such as "Crime Watch" and "No Drug" signs).

NRP funds may be used for block club related expenses, such as outreach, promotion, events, training, signage and block patrol equipment and material, and related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$1,500.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$1,500.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$1,500.00
-----------------	------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Minneapolis Police Department

Objective 5.2. Provide Staff Support for Neighborhood Safety Activities.

Strategy 5.2.1. Hire a Safety Coordinator.

The WBCC will hire a Safety Coordinator to organize and support the Safety Committee and help organize, coordinate and promote neighborhood safety initiatives. Funding will be provided for up to three years.

NRP funds may be used for: Staff expenses, such as payroll, rent, phones, postage, etc.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$15,000.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$15,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$15,000.00
-----------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Minneapolis Police Department

GOAL 6. Create a Safer Neighborhood

Objective 6.1. Reduce or Eliminate Violent Crime in the Neighborhood.

Strategy 6.1.1. Install safety cameras at key locations in Neighborhood by 2007.

The WBCC Safety Committee will work with the Minneapolis Police Department and neighborhood businesses to identify appropriate locations for installation of Safe-Zone cameras that will join with the existing downtown system used by the 1st Precinct Station. Cameras will be operated and monitored by the MPD.

The total cost of the project is \$248,000. The City of Minneapolis will contribute \$108,000. The Safety Committee will seek contributions from sources such as neighborhood businesses and other institutions, community donations, foundations and County or State grants to match the City commitment.

NRP funds may be used for: purchase and installation of Safe-Zone cameras.

Funding:

City of Minneapolis	\$108,000.00
NRP funds	66,000.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>74,000.00</u>
Total funding	\$248,000.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$66,000.00
-----------------------------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

Police

Possible Partners: City of Minneapolis, Minneapolis Police Department

GOAL 7. Clean Up Neighborhood

Objective 7.1. Community Takes Ownership Over Appearance and Cleanliness.

Strategy 7.1.1. Organize a community clean-up day(s).

The WBCC Safety Committee will work with neighborhood businesses and organizations to organize community clean-up day(s). The Safety Committee will also work with institutions, such as the CCNP Restorative Justice program and police juvenile work groups, to organize work crews for neighborhood clean ups.

NRP funds may be used for expenses related to organizing community clean-sweeps, including outreach, promotion, materials, etc.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$0.00
Other funds	0.00
Total funding	\$0.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$0.00
-----------------	--------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Public Works, Hennepin County

Strategy 7.1.2. Install physical enhancements to support a clean, neat and accessible neighborhood by 2006.

The WBCC Safety Committee will develop partnerships with neighborhood institutions, businesses and others and seek contributions from these sources and others such as foundations, and City, County or State grants to clean up and improve the physical appearance of the neighborhood.

Specific actions will be to:

- Reduce litter by installing and maintaining garbage cans.
- Increase wheel chair access for area businesses by supporting installations of automatic doors, accessible restrooms and lifts.
- Explore options for re-paving Cedar Avenue sidewalk to improve appearance and accessibility.
- Provide matching grants for facade improvements on Cedar Avenue businesses.

NRP funds may be used to purchase trash containers, provide grants to businesses for appearance and accessibility improvements, general streetscape improvements that improve appearance or accessibility, promotion and outreach and other related activities.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$15,000.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	
Total funding	\$15,000.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$15,000.00
-----------------------------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

Public Works, CPED

Possible Partners: Public Works

Strategy 7.1.3. Reduce graffiti and trash throughout Neighborhood.

The WBCC Safety Committee will work with neighborhood businesses and institutions to report graffiti and reduce trash. The Safety Committee will work with available institutions, such as the African Development Center, to develop effective ways to approach businesses and talk about trash and graffiti.

NRP funds may be used for: expenses related to organizing above activities, including outreach, promotion, materials and supplies, etc.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$500.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$500.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$500.00
-----------------	----------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Public Works

Strategy 7.1.4. Establish Special Service District.

The WBCC will develop partnerships with neighborhood institutions, businesses and others to establish a Special Service District within the neighborhood. The Special Service District could provide additional garbage collection, lighting, snow removal, landscaping and other services usually provided by special service districts.

NRP funds may be used for: consultants, organizing, promotion and outreach, meeting expenses and other related activities.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$10,000.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$10,000.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$10,000.00
-----------------------------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

Public Works, NRP

Possible Partners: Public Works

GOAL 8. Community Gardens

Objective 8.1. Improve Community Appearance through Gardens.

Strategy 8.1.1. Create Community Gardening Committee and Coordinator.

The WBCC will hire a gardening coordinator and organize a committee for the purpose of overseeing community gardening efforts. Work of the committee will include at least:

- Cedar Avenue trees;
- Exploration of tree assessment programs used by other neighborhoods;
- Development of rain gardens;
- Resurrection of gardens on Cedar Avenue (e.g. Triangle Park, Edna’s Park, Riverside Plaza, 6th and Cedar, 5th Street);
- Exploration and development of other gardening opportunities throughout the community.

NRP funds may be used for the hiring of staff and expenses related to organizing and development of community gardens, including outreach, promotion, materials and supplies, etc.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$5,000.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$5,000.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$5,000.00
-----------------------------------	------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Park Board, CUE, U of M horticulture school

HUMAN OPPORTUNITIES

GOAL 9. Build and Improve Community Program Capacity and Program Access to Meet the Needs of Multi-Generations.

Objective 9.1. Hire Staff to Help Meet the Needs of Multi-Generations, Respect Cultural Diversity and Form Partnerships with Others in the Community.

Strategy 9.1.1. Identify/hire resource person by summer 2006.

The WBCC will hire a Human Resource Coordinator (HRC) to help build and improve community program capacity and access by performing activities such as:

- Conducting a study and developing a vision for community space;
- Creating a quarterly service directory;
- Creating a community service website;
- Supervising interns for the Youth and Senior Councils; and
- Developing a transportation pilot program.

NRP funds may be used for staff or consultant expenses, benefits, office expenses, promotion, outreach and communication, evaluation, and other related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$30,000.00
Other funds	0.00
Total funding	\$30,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$30,000.00
-----------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Hennepin County

Objective 9.2. Increase Available Space for Community Programs and Services.

Strategy 9.2.1. Conduct study to identify vision for community space and implement vision.

The HRC will organize groups of social service providers and community representatives to develop a vision for community space and develop a plan for acquiring land/property. Proposed outcomes could include a community planning process, a feasibility study for acquiring property, site selection, design, purchase/construction and capital campaign program.

NRP funds may be used for promotion, outreach, meeting expenses, evaluation, communication, and other related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$80,000.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	
Total funding	\$80,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$80,000.00
-----------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: CPED, Park Board

Objective 9.3. Better Promotion and Utilization of Current Services, Reduced Duplication of Services and Identification of Gaps in Services.

Strategy 9.3.1. Quarterly Service Directory

The HRC will develop partnerships with community institutions, businesses and services to develop and maintain a comprehensive directory of neighborhood services. The directory will be used to promote and support existing programs and services available in the Cedar Riverside neighborhood.

NRP funds may be used for promotion, outreach, meeting expenses, collection of information, assessment, evaluation, translation, printing, and distribution.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$4,000.00
Other funds	0.00
Total funding	\$4,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$4,000.00
-----------------	------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Cedar Riverside Business Association

Strategy 9.3.2. Community Service Web Site.

The HRC will develop partnerships with community institutions, businesses and services to create and maintain a web-site to promote services and opportunities available in the Cedar Riverside neighborhood.

NRP funds may be used for promotion, outreach, meeting expenses, collection of data, development and upkeep of web site, internet expenses, evaluation, and other related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$500.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$500.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$500.00
-----------------	----------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: University of Minnesota

GOAL 10. Promote Neighborhood Identity through Sports Teams.

Objective 10.1. Provide Support for Neighborhood Youth Teams.

Strategy 10.1.1. Provide uniforms for neighborhood youth sports teams by Summer 2006.

The WBCC will provide funding for neighborhood youth sports teams organized by neighborhood partnerships such as FOLC and Brian Coyle Community Center. Uniforms will promote the Cedar Riverside neighborhood.

NRP funds may be used for purchase of uniforms and related equipment, promotion, and evaluation.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$2,500.00
Other funds	0.00
Total funding	\$2,500.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$2,500.00
-----------------	------------

Contract Manager:

Park Board

Possible Partners: Park Board

GOAL 11. Encourage Active Participation in Community Improvement.

Objective 11.1. Form Ongoing Youth and Senior Councils to Serve as a Catalyst to Build a Community Where Youth and Elders Live with Dignity, Mutual Respect and Shared Responsibilities Across Generations and Cultures.

Strategy 11.1.1. Develop programs with local colleges and universities for paid internships for students interested in working on Youth and Senior councils and programs.

The WBCC will hire Youth and Senior Coordinators/Interns to staff advisory Youth and Senior Councils.

NRP funds may be used for intern stipends, staff or consultant expenses, benefits, office expenses, promotion, outreach and communication, evaluation, and other related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$16,000.00
Other funds	0.00
Total funding	\$16,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$16,000.00
-----------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Minnesota Campus Compact

Strategy 11.1.2. Form Youth Council with 20 or more youth.

The WBCC will form an advisory Youth Council to help develop future leadership, identify opportunities for future youth programs, engage youth to participate actively and effectively in civic affairs and community improvement efforts and assist with evaluation of existing human services programs.

NRP funds may be used for promotion, outreach and communication, meeting expenses, evaluation, and other related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$0.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$0.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$0.00
-----------------	--------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Brian Coyle Community Center

Strategy 11.1.3. Form Senior Council with 20 or more seniors.

The WBCC will form an advisory Senior Council to identify opportunities for future senior programs, engage seniors and assist with evaluation of existing human service programs.

NRP funds may be used for promotion, outreach and communication, meeting expenses, evaluation, and other related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$0.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	
Total funding	\$0.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$0.00
-----------------	--------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Minnesota Senior Federation, Confederation of Somali Communities of Minnesota

GOAL 12. Improve Accessibility and Transportation Within and Around Neighborhood for Access to Programs.

Objective 12.1. Provide Transportation of Community Members, especially Youth and Seniors, to Programs and Services.

Strategy 12.1.1. Research and develop a community shuttle system pilot project.

The HRC will partner with community institutions, businesses and services to explore and develop a pilot project for a community transportation system. This will include conducting a study to identify the need for and the interest in a neighborhood shuttle/transportation system, assessing available services and recommendations concerning the feasibility and possible structure of a community shuttle system pilot. The experiences of other neighborhoods will be considered.

NRP funds may be used for promotion, outreach communication, assessment and evaluation, meeting expenses, payment of services for buses or vans, street signs and signs for buses, and other related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$20,000.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	
Total funding	\$20,000.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$20,000.00
-----------------------------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

NRP, Hennepin County

Possible Partners: MTC, Hennepin County

COMMUNITY BUILDING & NEIGHBORHOOD RELATIONS

GOAL 13. Improve Neighborhood Participation.

Objective 13.1. Plan, Assess and Evaluate Neighborhood Relations.

Strategy 13.1.1. Establish a Neighborhood Relations Committee.

The WBCC will organize a Neighborhood Relations Committee to determine goals and outcomes, plan for and evaluate community gatherings and increase neighborhood participation.

The Neighborhood Relations Committee will assess measurable outcomes and provide recommendations for improving participation in terms of numbers as well as diversity in age, cultures, etc.

NRP funds may be used for outreach, communication, meeting tools and expenses, promotion, and related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$0.00
Other funds	0.00
Total funding	\$0.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$0.00
-----------------	--------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners:

GOAL 14. Increase Neighborhood Interaction.

Objective 14.1. Organize Community Gatherings.

Strategy 14.1.1. Purchase a community gathering tent.

The WBCC will purchase one or more portable tents for the purpose of creating a flexible gathering space. The neighborhood has a shortage of community meeting and gathering spaces, and perceived barriers prevent people from one part of the neighborhood from attending meetings in other parts of the neighborhood. The tent can be relocated to support local events and gatherings or for community forums and hearings.

NRP funds may be used for tents, chairs, tables, signs, supplies, storage and related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$3,000.00
Other funds	0.00
Total funding	\$3,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$3,000.00
-----------------	------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners:

Strategy 14.1.2. Organize up to four community events/gatherings annually.

The WBCC will partner with other institutions, businesses or organizations to organize up to four (quarterly) events in the neighborhood designed to bring the diverse communities together, strengthen relationships between individuals and groups and attract people from outside the neighborhood.

Examples of possible events include a "festival of nations", biking/walking tours of the neighborhood, "visit the neighborhood" festival and/or poetry or other art festivals.

NRP funds may be used for outreach, communication, meeting expenses, materials and supplies, event consultants, marketing and promotion.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$8,000.00
Other funds	0.00
Total funding	\$8,000.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$8,000.00
-----------------	------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners:

Strategy 14.1.3. Events Coordinator.

The WBCC will hire a part-time events coordinator who will assist with developing partnerships, coordinating events, managing use of the tent and other activities in order to create fun and attractive events and encourage neighborhood participation.

NRP funds may be used for advertising, personnel, rent, phones, promotion, outreach and communication and other related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$10,000.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	
Total funding	\$10,000.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$10,000.00
-----------------------------------	-------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners:

Objective 14.2. Promote, Welcome and Orient People to the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood.

Strategy 14.2.1. Develop, Print and Distribute Welcome Packets and Information

The WBCC will partner with other institutions, businesses and others to develop and distribute materials designed to welcome and orient people to the neighborhood. The WBCC will especially take advantage of opportunities presented by the LRT station and local institutions to distribute materials and promote the neighborhood.

NRP funds may be used to develop, print and distribute materials, as well as for other promotional activities and related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$500.00
Other funds	0.00
Total funding	\$500.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$500.00
-----------------------------------	----------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Cedar Riverside Business Association

Strategy 14.2.2. Create and Install Banners and Signs

The WBCC will develop partnerships with neighborhood institutions, businesses and others to develop and install signs to provide a sense of neighborhood identity, enhance a positive neighborhood image, promote and market the neighborhood and welcome to and orient people around the neighborhood.

NRP funds may be used to develop, create and install signs and for related expenses.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$5,000.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$5,000.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$5,000.00
-----------------------------------	------------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Possible Partners: Public Works

IMPLEMENTATION

GOAL 15. Implement Phase I Plan.

Objective 15.1. Plan, Implement and Review Phase I Plan.

Strategy 15.1.1. Continue and Support the NRP Steering Committee.

The WBCC will recruit additional members to the NRP Steering Committee which will continue to oversee the planning, implementation and review of the NRP process.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$0.00
Other funds	0.00
<hr/>	<hr/>
Total funding	\$0.00

NRP Funds:

2006 First Step	\$0.00
-----------------	--------

Contract Manager:

NRP

Strategy 15.1.2. Program planning and implementation.

The WBCC will hire staff and recruit volunteers and partners to complete development of the Phase I Neighborhood Action plan, implement Phase I strategies, and conduct a review of the Phase I Action plan.

NRP funds may be used for recruitment, personnel and benefits, promotion and outreach, meeting expenses, rent, printing, postage, and other expenses which may be relevant to other strategies in the Cedar Riverside First Step Plan.

Funding:

NRP funds	\$100,000.00
<u>Other funds</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Total funding	\$100,000.00

NRP Funds:

Reallocation from strategy 3.1.1.	\$52,000.00
<u>2004 Early Access</u>	<u>48,000.00</u>
Total NRP funds	\$100,000.00

Contract Manager:

NRP

BUDGET

BUDGET

Budget

A. Economic Development, Housing and Infrastructure Work Group	Page	Estimate
Strategy 1.1.1 LRT station lighting and safety improvements	11	32,500.00
Strategy 2.1.1 Housing Committee	11	0.00
Strategy 2.1.2 Home improvement/ownership loans and grants program	12	182,000.00
Strategy 3.1.1 Dania Hall Redevelopment	13	1,334,000.00
		1,548,500.00
B. Physical Environment & Safety Work Group	Page	Estimate
Strategy 1.1.1 Somali/East African officer assigned to neighborhood	14	5,000.00
Strategy 1.1.2 Review and improve neighborhood COPP Shop	14	500.00
Strategy 1.2.1 Regular meetings with MPD	15	1,000.00
Strategy 2.1.1 Safety Committee	16	0.00
Strategy 2.1.2 Inventory of neighborhood resources	16	500.00
Strategy 2.1.3 Block Clubs and Crime Watch	16	1,500.00
Strategy 2.2.1 Safety Coordinator	17	15,000.00
Strategy 3.1.1 Install Safe-Zone Cameras	17	66,000.00
Strategy 4.1.1 Community Clean-Up Day(s)	18	0.00
Strategy 4.1.2 Physical enhancements	18	15,000.00
Strategy 4.1.3 Reduce graffiti and trash	19	500.00
Strategy 4.1.4 Special Service District	19	10,000.00
Strategy 5.1.1 Community Gardening Committee and Coordinator	20	5,000.00
		120,000.00
C. Human Opportunities Work Group	Page	Estimate
Strategy 1.1.1 Human Resource Coordinator	21	30,000.00
Strategy 1.2.1 Community Space Study	21	80,000.00
Strategy 1.3.1 Quarterly Service Directory	22	4,000.00
Strategy 1.3.2 Community Service Website	22	500.00
Strategy 2.1.1 Youth Sports Uniforms	23	2,500.00
Strategy 3.1.1 Youth/Senior Program Interns	24	16,000.00
Strategy 3.1.1 Youth Council	24	0.00
Strategy 3.1.2 Senior Council	25	0.00
Strategy 4.1.1 Community Shuttle System Pilot Project	25	20,000.00
		153,000.00

BUDGET

D. Community Building / Neighborhood Relationships Work Group	Page	Estimate
Strategy 1.1.1 Neighborhood Relations Committee	26	0.00
Strategy 2.1.1 Community Gathering Tent	26	3,000.00
Strategy 2.1.2 Community Events	27	8,000.00
Strategy 2.1.3 Events Coordinator	27	10,000.00
Strategy 2.2.1 Welcome Packets	28	500.00
Strategy 2.2.2 Banners and Signs	28	5,000.00
		26,500.00
E. Implementation Draft Strategies	Page	Estimate
Strategy 1.1.1 Steering Committee	29	0.00
Strategy 1.1.2 Staff and Resources	29	100,000.00
		100,000.00
TOTAL		<u>\$1,948,000.00</u>

APPENDIX A: Map of Cedar Riverside Neighborhood

APPENDICES

APPENDIX B: First Step Plan Vote Summary

On April 6th & 8th, 275 people voted on the NRP First Step Plan. Six balloting locations were held throughout the neighborhood (Mapps Coffee & Tea, Augsburg College, The Cedars Highrise, Middlebrook Hall, Riverside Plaza and Brian Coyle Community Center) to ensure an inclusive, community-wide process; and voters cast their vote by secret ballot to ensure a safe and judgement-free environment in which voters could express their individual view points. To be eligible to vote, one needed to live, work or own a business or property in the neighborhood. Of the 275 voters, 93 were employees or business owners. 182 were residents of Cedar Riverside.

All strategies were voted on individually or by line item. Every strategy was approved with at least 64% approval. 29 strategies (85%) received greater than 70% support, 21 strategies (62%) received greater than 80%, and 3 strategies (9%) received greater than 90% support. In addition to this, the voters voted at 74% to approve the reallocation of Dania Hall funds to the First Step Plan strategies.

Strategy 1.1.1: LRT Safety and Navigation Enhancements	89.7% Yes 10.3% No
Strategy 2.1.1: Housing Committee	81.2% Yes 18.8% No
Strategy 2.1.2: Home Improvements/Ownership Loans and Grants	80.6% Yes 19.4% No
Strategy 3.1.1: Reallocate Unused Dania Hall Funds	74.2% Yes 25.8% No
Strategy 4.1.1: Incentives for an East African MPD Officer	85.2% Yes 14.8% No
Strategy 4.1.2: Review and Improve MPD Substation	80.3% Yes 19.7% No
Strategy 4.2.1: Regular Meetings with MPD	87.0% Yes 13.0% No
Strategy 5.1.1: Safety Committee	92.0% Yes 8.0% No
Strategy 5.1.2: Inventory of Neighborhood Resources	80.9% Yes 19.1% No
Strategy 5.1.3: Block Clubs & Crime Watches	84.4% Yes 15.6% No
Strategy 5.2.1: Safety Coordinator	81.4% Yes 18.6% No
Strategy 6.1.1: Install Safety Cameras at Key Locations	64.6% Yes 35.4% No
Strategy 7.1.1: Community Clean-Up Day(s)	91.5% Yes 8.5% No
Strategy 7.1.2: Physical Enhancements for Cleanliness & Accessibility	88.4% Yes

APPENDICES


Strategy 7.1.3: Reduce Graffiti and Trash	11.6% No 89.4% Yes
Strategy 7.1.4: Special Service District	10.6% No 69.8% Yes
Strategy 8.1.1: Gardening Committee and Coordinator	30.2% No 77.1% Yes
Strategy 9.1.1: Human Resource Coordinator	22.9% No 70.2% Yes
Strategy 9.2.1: Community Space Study & Vision	29.8% No 65.8% Yes
Strategy 9.3.1: Quarterly Service Directory	34.2% No 67.5% Yes
Strategy 9.3.2: Community Service Web Site	32.5% No 77.8% Yes
Strategy 10.1.1: Uniforms & Equipment for Youth Sports Teams	22.2% No 90.5% Yes
Strategy 11.1.1: Hire Youth and Senior Coordinators/Interns	9.5% No 89.1% Yes
Strategy 11.1.2: Youth Council with 20 or More Youth	10.9% No 88.2% Yes
Strategy 11.1.3: Senior Council with 20 or More Seniors	11.8% No 84.7% Yes
Strategy 12.1.1: Community Shuttle System Pilot Project	15.3% No 73.4% Yes
Strategy 13.1.1: Neighborhood Relations Committee	26.6% No 85.5% Yes
Strategy 14.1.1: Community Gathering Tent	14.5% No 69.0% Yes
Strategy 14.1.2: Community Events & Gatherings	31.0% No 83.5% Yes
Strategy 14.1.3: Events Coordinator	16.5% No 71.4% Yes
Strategy 14.2.1: Welcome Packets and Information	28.6% No 77.3% Yes
Strategy 14.2.2: Banners and Signs	22.7% No 71.9% Yes
Strategy 15.1.1: NRP Steering Committee	28.1% No 85.8% Yes
Strategy 15.1.2: Program Planning and Implementation	14.2% No 82.9% Yes
	17.1% No

APPENDIX C: First Step Plan Survey Summary

Cedar Riverside Base map



Scale: 1:8,000
February 2005



FIRST STEP PLAN VOTER INFORMATION

VOTING ELIGIBILITY		
Student Only		5
	University of Minnesota	1
	Augsburg College	4
Lives Only		145
	Riverview Tower	9
	Augsburg Housing	7
	Middlebrook Hall	7
	Riverside Plaza	63
	The Cedars Highrise	25
	Riverside Park	7
	Other	27
Owns Business/Property Only (other than a home)		1
	Palmer's Bar	1
Works Only		76
	VOA	1
	WBCDC	2
	People's Center	1
	Riverside Plaza	1
	CSCM	3
	Trinity Lutheran	1
	Nomad World Pub	4
	North Country Co-op	1
	KFAI	1
	Korean Service Center	5
	Midwest Mountaineering	11
	Minneapolis Highrise Representative Council	7
	Mixed Blood	4
	Augsburg College	13
	Bedlam Theatre	3
	Brian Coyle Community Center	10
	University of MN	7
	Hard Times	1
Works and Owns Business/ Property (other than home)		12
	Hard Times	1
	Bedlam Theatre	1
	Red Sea Restaurant	2
	Nomad World Pub	2
	Global Village	1
	Midwest Mountaineering	2
	WBCDC	1
	Ubah Restaurant	1
	Other	1
Lives and Owns Business/ Property (other than home)		1
Lives and Works		24
	Middlebrook Hall	2
	Riverside Plaza	10
	The Cedars Highrise	3
	Riverside Park	1
	Other	8
Lives, Works and Owns Business/Property (other than a home)		11

	Riverside Plaza	5
	Riverside Park	2
	Other	4
Total Voters		275

GENDER	
Male	125
Female	105
AGE	
18-20	17
21-30	44
31-40	51
41-50	39
51-60	47
61-70	20
71-80	14
81-90	7
ETHNICITY/RACE	
Somali	69
Oromo	3
Eritrean	4
Other African	2
Hispanic	2
Korean	15
Vietnamese	5
Other Asian	2
Native American	4
White/Caucasian	131
Black/African American	8
Other	2
EDUCATION	
None	13
Grade School	9
High School	33
Some college	68
College Graduate	74
Graduate School or higher	42
Student	38
EMPLOYMENT STATUS	
Full-Time Employed	113
Part-time Employed	54
Homemaker	11
Retired	34
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME	
0-19,000	79
20-29,999	32
30-39,999	21
40-49,999	20
50-59,999	13
60-69,999	5
70-79,999	6
80-89,999	4
90-99,999	4
100,000 or higher	18

Cedar Riverside First Step Survey

Survey still in process

STRATEGY	# resp.	> 50%?	% Yes	Priority Rating	Comments
Economic Development, Housing & Infrastructure Strategies					
1 LRT Station Improvements	261	yes	91%	2.23	To and from 6th St pkg?; street approach; cancel, waste of money (very low priority); Should it be more? Security personnel/police; We need special lighting from theatre entrances to theatre parking; from LRT to Mixed Blood; and in the area between Mixed Blood and Bedlam; Improved lighting at LRT Station is good idea; Could the amount for LRT be more? We wouldn't want to lose the project just because the institutions wouldn't contribute; Could the LRT \$ be used to hire safety personnel?; Franklin LRT is very well kept. Many residents of Cedar Riverside use it; The Cedar Avenue LRT is not very accessible. It needs more lighting; We need more lights for LRT because it is a safety issue.
2 Housing Committee	231	yes	82%	1.76	Get feedback from other neighborhoods.
3 Home improvement/ownership loans and grants	253	yes	89%	2.15	other sources for this; Set up a loan fund to help residential property owners make improvements that are specifically requested by the residents; Would it more appropriate for an individual co-op to apply directly for funding or for the limited partnership that owns the property; Should be mindful of this relationship when designing housing strategies: A program to provide amenities to residents should be done without just giving money away to a landlord that a positive force in the neighborhood. Need to have an inducement and not just give money away; Could housing dollars be used to help people with rent and security deposits; if not, the program doesn't make sense for this neighborhood because of the high rental property; Housing improvements are important; How would a home ownership program work in this neighborhood?; Could housing \$s be used to lobby private owners to sell property?; This neighborhood is deprived of private ownership. Could we focus on home ownership exclusively?; Is it possible for our housing committee to have examples of what other housing committees have done?; Do we have to spend the housing money before we get other money?; What happens if people don't do what they said they would do with home improvement funds?; Dollars for home improvement and ownership loans and grants program could be increased. The neighborhood needs a contact person for this so that people know who to call for more information; Housing is very important, especially home ownership. Home improvements are also needed, a lot of old houses are in this neighborhood; Does landscaping qualify as a housing improvement?
Safety & Physical Environment Strategies					
4 East African officer assigned to neighborhood	253	yes	86%	1.98	Safety is the biggest issue in the neighborhood; All safety strategies are most necessary; Gangs are a problem; Safety strategies are most necessary; Safety is the #1 issue; We need a multi-pronged approach to safety concerns; Safety and security is #1; Bar owners need to take care of their own safety issues.
5 Review and improve neighborhood COPP Shop	236	yes	79%	1.71	Don't know; yes, but why should this cost \$5,000? low priority if \$ attached; Beat Cop! Beat Cop!; pick it up; move \$ to Safety Committee; needs to be more than one; be careful with use of language; rephrase meetings & officer to facilitating relationships; East Africa is larger community, very different cultures and languages, requires different approaches, be sensitive to issues of different communities; Beat Cop; We need 24 hour availability of an East African officer or interpreter in the least; Somali officer is great. We need someone we can understand; We need an East African officer assigned to Cedar Riverside who is easily recognizable and who Somali and white European Americans will both see as a good guy; We need an East African police officer or at least more interpreters; We need more dollars attached to the East African officer, not enough money.
6 Regular meetings with police	248	yes	93%	2.04	Substation is useless; Used to be safety center in Coyle; \$500 is not very much for the COPP Shop; COPP Shop is important—people can go there and report things that happen.
7 Safety Committee	235	yes	88%	1.96	What's money for?; ?; Yes, same (why should this cost)-low priority if \$ attached; educational, promotional materials; educational materials, promotional materials, not food; do we need to spend money?; they are already meeting with neighborhood; It is a good idea to meet with the Police. \$1,000 is too much for this though. Maybe some of this could go to the COPP Shop; We need better relationships with the Police; The Police do not come when they are called; Police and community relations are important.
8 Develop inventory of neighborhood resources	243	yes	85%	1.77	\$\$\$; may need some funding
9 Form Block Clubs and Crime Watch	258	yes	88%	2.07	How coordinated would all these be (inventory, block clubs, safety coordinator); \$\$; An inventory of safety resources is a good idea; Project Look Out works well. Three to four buildings at the Cedars are involved.
10 Safety Coordinator	240	yes	76%	1.74	How would Project Look Out work with the block clubs and crime watch?; I like block clubs.
11 Install Safe-Zone Cameras	261	yes	52%	1.53	?; We should combine the safety coordinator and East African officer; We need a safety coordinator.
12 Clean up neighborhood	235	yes	89%	1.88	**;; More input from comm.; waste of money!; Safe zone cameras at LRT; availability of pepper spray; concerned about use of cameras; No!!!; * Safe-zone cameras will not effectively stop crime in our neighborhood - I suspect more crime would happen in the neighborhood (like residential areas) or in other areas not with cameras - money could be better spent 7 cameras might make the businesses feel better but not the neighborhood safer (I feel the businesses should pay for their own cameras). Neighborhood watches, etc. would probably help more than cameras; We need safe zone cameras; it is good for safety. The Cedars have cameras and they work; There is no need for safe-zone cameras. We have no business robberies; The safe-zone cameras need not to be an excuse for police not coming to the neighborhood; The safe-zone camera strategy needs more community feedback. Will the crime just end up being pushed away from Cedar Avenue?; The safe-zone cameras would be a good idea. The bar owners should pay for the cameras too; The safe-zone cameras may be one approach; Cedar residents have had negative experience with security cameras. Cameras were installed but now they do not function and do not provide any benefit to the community; We need more education about the Safe-Zone cameras; Safe-Zone cameras benefit businesses and not residents; Against cameras; The expense for cameras seem excessive. The total amount of the cameras is more than all the other strategies combined; The cameras in the neighborhood ought to be revisited; One person feels so strongly against the cameras that he would vote against the whole plan if it was included; Many people in the room (at the January 18 Community Feedback Meeting) opposed having cameras in the neighborhood; Concern about how much percent in favor would be enough for the SC to recommend the camera strategy in the revised version of the FSP.
13 Physical Enhancements	243	yes	84%	1.87	***; make streets visually appealing; every day!; We need a community clean up day; it needs dollars attached to it; Clean Up Day(s) is very important; The Clean Up Day(s) needs to include Riverside Park.
14 Reduce graffiti and trash throughout neighborhood	253	yes	89%	2.02	What is this?; We need more dollars for physical enhancements; we need sidewalk improvements—they have holes and bumps and this is hard for people with disabilities; Benches and garbage cans would be a nice improvement; ?
15 Establish Special Service District	241	yes	75%	1.65	Littering fines should be issued; If the \$500 for reduction of graffiti and trash is going to be used for staff time, it is too much. If it going to be used for supplies, it is not enough; Graffiti and trash need to be addressed.
16 Community Gardening Committee and Coordinator	257	yes	84%	1.85	(????); ?; CRBA?; Has been debated, should be struck; allocation for business clean up; special service districts don't help; If we have a special service district, does it mean we have less attention from the City?; If we have a special service district, does it mean more attention from the City?; In regard to the Special Service District, we need better snow removal for wheelchairs; Snow removal is a problem; ?-Business pays, were against it
Community Building & N'hood Relations Strategies					
17 Neighborhood Relations Committee	237	yes	71%	1.61	Very few tenants can have gardens of their own or plots; great for old people in the community to do something together; more money; move money from meetings with police; more to gardens; more \$ here; We need landscaping. This would increase traffic to the neighborhood. There is a city ordinance in place that requires beautification of parking lots. Is this enforced?; Community gardens would be very nice; it needs more dollars; Flowers on Cedar Avenue would be nice; More money for Gardens & flowers.
18 Community Gathering Tent	239	yes	62%	1.46	\$\$\$; We need to put more dollars into Neighborhood Relations Committee to analyze space; The neighborhood relations committee is needed.
19 Organize Community Events	247	yes	83%	1.80	Building; the tent is a good idea, maybe we can get a smaller one for less than \$5,000.; Purchasing a tent would be more economical as opposed to renting tents; Where will we keep the tent?; Buy a couple of smaller "pop-up" tents; Safety considerations regarding tents, something to think about; The dollar amount is too high for the tent; but do like the idea; Could the tent be used for culture-specific events?; Community gathering STRUCTURE not tent.
20 Events Coordinator	238	yes	75%	1.64	Not 4; Bring back CedarFest!; A new neighborhood-orientated Cedarfest; Focusing on one event would make it more likely to be successful and memorable. Better to be successful on one event rather than fail at four events; Question about whether the street could be closed off; More effective to have one event rather than four; 1 event or 2 events; Four Community Events is overly ambitious. There is not enough dollars attached to the events; The Fringe Festival is reinvesting in Cedar Riverside. (Two other participants agreed with this.); A new neighborhood-oriented Cedarfest; Could money for the event coordinator strategy be used also for the event(s) itself; We need more dollars for events.
21 Welcome Packets and Information	239	yes	74%	1.49	4??; Could money for the event coordinator strategy be used also for the event(s) itself; There is not enough dollars attached to the Events Coordinator; ?
22 Banners and Signs	234	yes	71%	1.51	People need to know more about the community. We need to be better at welcoming new people; The neighborhood needs a welcome wagon. It could give out a gift, information for a neighborhood contact person and information about the neighborhood's history. We need someone to greet you at the door.
Human Opportunities Strategies					
23 Human Resource Coordinator	240	yes	74%	1.69	Unless it was more of a gateway sculpture project-I know a sculptor who make one for the Powderhorn Park neighborhood & made it a community project; Banners and signs are good; Those would be nice over by the light-rail station; Good to coordinate with LRT lighting and signage strategy; Awnings; nice to have; I like banners & signs pointing to locations/landmarks; Like banners; Like signs/directions to key locations; Like more signage; it is difficult to navigate Seven Corners; Banners and signs are good. Those would be nice over by the light-rail station; Good to coordinate with LRT lighting and signage strategy. Need to have signs pointing to LRT and signs at LRT pointing to neighborhood attractions; Banners are a good idea.
24 Community Space Study	243	yes	73%	1.72	Neighborhood needs more youth programming in addition to equipment and uniforms; We should be putting dollars into existing organizations; Need more youth programming in neighborhood; The WBCC might be trying to take over the work of the human service providers through the human opportunities strategies; There are not enough dollars for youth programming, especially for youth between the ages of 18 to 22.
25 Quarterly Service Directory	234	yes	75%	1.60	???; Mediation, Resorative Justice?; Already happening; ?
26 Community Service Web Site	242	yes	82%	1.75	Too much \$; ?; No!!!; Should be possible to achieve most of the goals of the space study without spending all the money that is allocated; could work with University to do the study; What are the actual space needs in the neighborhood, what is available, what are the opportunities? This strategy is not necessarily the purchase of property; Make full use of students and volunteer services around the community space study; make sure to do things in the correct order; Not clear what is meant by community space – park, building, what? Work group was envisioning a building for meeting space and exercise space. I doesn't seem like the community is not lacking in meeting space, it might be better to explore the aspect of having a larger event space or hang out space; The social service providers lack program space (no way of expanding programs); Difficult to find space for dinners, weddings, banquets. The university has restriction on the use of their rooms (bringing in outside food); Master Plan; The dollars attached to the Community Space Study are too high; There are enough spaces in the neighborhood that could be accessed with better coordination. We do not need to create a new one. (Two other participants agreed with this.); We need to change the language to: "identify a vision for community space"; Question the need for acquiring property; Need more places for youth and children to go; it is more important to have place for youth than seniors; A community space study is a good idea. We want to have a good study, but does the dollar amount need to be so high to have a good study done?; We need a banquet hall or a room for the entire community to come together; We need to make sure that if we put dollars into a community building, it can be sustained; A community gathering space/building is very important; We need more space for our youth; Master Plan in 2006.
27 Provide uniforms for youth sports teams	241	yes	84%	1.90	???; Quarterly service directory & website are similar; the directory would be like a hardcopy of the website; Best outreach to Somalis is verbal – video tape, TV. Look into alternative communications; Can we put funds to translation services? Is there enough funding allocated to include translation?
28 Youth/Senior Program Interns	242	yes	86%	1.94	Since many people and groups lack computers, hard copy information would be more helpful than a community services website; Can we put funds to translation services? Is there enough funding allocated to include translation?; More community access to the internet; There is not enough dollars attached to the community service website, i.e. websites are more costly than this. CRBA website might serve this purpose; I would like it if there was a specific website regarding services in the neighborhood, houses for sale in the neighborhood, issues at City Hall impacting the neighborhood, etc. Believe there to be huge potential for the website.
29 Form Youth Council	239	yes	85%	1.89	businesses should sponsor them; keep kids off street; Youth sports is good; Children are transient. I love anything involving children, like youth sports. Crime problems are less when people know each other, especially the kids in the neighborhood.
30 Form Senior Council	241	yes	84%	1.88	There are no senior programs and Currie center offers youth programs; It would be good to have seniors involved with the youth—intergenerational; Coyle?
31 Community Shuttle Pilot	243	yes	77%	1.78	\$\$\$; Youth and Senior Councils need dollars attached to the strategies to ensure that they get off the ground; Coyle?
Implementation Strategies					
32 Steering Committee	234	yes	76%	1.68	\$\$\$; Youth and Senior Councils need dollars attached to the strategies to ensure that they get off the ground; Coyle?
33 Staff and resources	239	yes	82%	1.87	would need more details in order to decide about this; Good!; Global Village; Would the \$20K go just to do a shuttle program study or to actually implement a shuttle; Shuttle of light-rail to within the neighborhood (along Riverside Ave); Where would people want to go shopping; The feedback that inspired this strategy began before light-rail opened; do not have enough info to understand who will be impacted by this program; We need better transportation. The current services are off the beaten path; Would the \$20K go just to do a shuttle program study or to actually implement a shuttle?; Shuttle to light rail within the neighborhood (along Riverside Ave); Where would people want to go shopping?; The University of MN has a circulating bus system. Think about a circulator like the University; Consider working on this with another neighborhood; Light rail could run along Cedar Ave and Riverside Ave and go to the Franklin Library; A shuttle is important in a lot of ways because of the cutback in buslines; coordinators could communicate to MetroTransit the need that this neighborhood has; could this project be a collaboration with MetroTransit? This could build ties into the community with MetroTransit; The neighborhood shouldn't have to provide a shuttle; the government should provide it for the greater good; We need more dollars for the shuttle system; it needs to be handicap accessible; The transportation shuttle is a good idea.

Other comments:

BEAT COP! BEAT COP! BEAT COP!; you need kid activities instead of police meetings; Youth Arts Programs-\$5,000 YES, High Priority; We very much need a teen center; Set up a loan fund to help commercial property owners make improvements to their property; There are issues of "unclaimed space"; You have brought up a lot of misunderstanding about Riverside Plaza – RP is not a slum; Create a Master Plan instead of a community space study; ; Housing committee jointly integrates with the WBCC Housing Committee; Use awnings on Cedar Ave businesses which promote CR Neighborhood. Awnings are Energy Efficiency; Listening and comparing, particularly in contrast to ten space study & safety cameras, my main comment is that community bldg & neighborhood relationships is underfunded in this plan. Events and efforts that connect neighbors—that's the biggest challenge facing the West Bank—most important for safety & most important for moving forward w/ NRP plan including what a "community space" that serves "whole community" would look like. Improve lights and install cameras on 14th Ave next to 7 Corners Apartments to reduce car breakins on the street!; When will we know how much \$ was actually spent on Dania?; Use local resources to the fullest first; Need to keep to 52% housing; need to either pair down some of the strategies or to include some the Dania Hall funds; Please publicize the revised plan well before the next vote; Will the vote be by line item or for the whole plan?; The First Step Plan does not include any arts initiatives that were mentioned in the original focus group; this is a slap in the face; A weakness of the Plan seems to be that there was not a lot of business input.