

# NRP Phase I Plan Review

Prospect Park/East River Road Neighborhood

February 2004

# Contents

- Pages 3 – 28 NRP Phase I Progress Report as of April 2003, by Susan Gottlieb
- Pages 29 – 30 Reallocation Process and results as of Feb 2003, compiled by Joyce Barta
- Pages 32 – 35 Phase I Evaluation Survey, written Spring 2003 by students from the Carlson School of Management and implemented Fall 2003
- Pages 36 – 42 Phase I Evaluation Survey Report, February 2004 by Joyce Barta

# NRP Phase I

## PROGRESS REPORT

### HOUSING

When developing their NRP Action Plan in 1993-95, the residents of the Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood envisioned the preservation, improvement, and expansion of housing in the immediate area. They set a vision toward housing redevelopment at three particular large formerly commercial/industrial sites: Unocal Oil site (Thornton and Franklin Avenues), Watkins Trucking site, and Kampa Tire corner (both on Southeast Fourth Street). PPERRIA, the neighborhood association and NRP fiscal agent for the neighborhood, established a Housing Development Committee which sought housing development at the three identified sites, and a Housing Improvement Committee, which worked to facilitate housing improvement efforts in the area. It was originally anticipated that funds remaining after the redevelopment of these previously commercial sites to housing would be made available for the improvement of existing housing in the neighborhood through a home loan or grant program. However, in the 10 years since the Plan was conceived and written, neighborhood changes and growth (such as the re-opening of Pratt Community School) forced a re-evaluation of remaining funds in early 2003. At a neighborhood reallocation meeting in February, 2003, an overwhelming majority of attendees (191 total residents were in attendance) voted to reallocate housing funds to other strategies.

#### Housing A.1.Develop housing

#### **HOUSING REDEVELOPMENT: Watkins Trucking Site**

In the mid-1990's, one hurdle was crossed when the owners of Watkins Trucking Company sold its property to its immediately contiguous neighbor Hubbard Broadcasting Company. Hubbard razed the site and developed plans for its own satellite division office campus there. However, a few years later Hubbard sold its satellite division and today the site remains undeveloped. Prospect Park residents still hope that a housing and office use is possible there one day.

#### **Kampa Tire Corner and Unocal Oil Site**

The following is a condensed history of the development of this site:

- Σ Late 1995-early 1996 - The neighborhood approved \$4,000 in NRP funds to be used to complete a feasibility study for the redevelopment of housing on Fourth Street. Seward Redesign completed this study.
- Σ 1996-1998 – Separate housing subcommittees worked on two remaining housing redevelopment sites mentioned in the NRP Action Plan: the Unocal site and the Fourth Street (Kampa Tire) site. Each

made some progress, but the Fourth Street Housing Committee attracted an urban redeveloper, Brighton Development Corporation, to look at new ownership housing on the Fourth Street site. The Unocal Committee tried, unsuccessfully, to negotiate a “Right of First Refusal” with the Unocal Oil Corporation to have some leverage with development on that site.

- Σ August, 1998 – Newly merged housing subcommittees (Unocal Oil Site committee and Fourth Street Housing committee), renamed the PPERIA NRP Housing Redevelopment Committee, formed to look at the possibility of working with one developer, Brighton Corporation, on housing redevelopment projects at both remaining sites mentioned in the NRP Action Plan.
- Σ February, 1999 – Housing Development Committee signed a letter of understanding with Brighton Corporation, outlining a vision of townhomes and other types of housing on both the Unocal and Kampa sites.
- Σ Mid-1999 – PPERIA approved spending \$600,000 in NRP funds for the construction of 12 townhomes on Kampa and adjacent sites, with the verbal understanding that Brighton would continue to work diligently toward a purchase agreement with Unocal.
- Σ Early 2000 - The recently named Bedford Townhomes housing project at Southeast Bedford and Fourth Streets advanced, despite difficulty in land acquisition by the developer. Construction began in late spring 2002. Plans for redevelopment of the Unocal site on Southeast Franklin Avenue moved forward, as well, with Brighton Corporation negotiating a purchase agreement with Unocal Oil Corporation.
- Σ April, 2003 – Brighton Corporation announced that the purchase agreement for the Unocal site had been signed by both parties and the developer now has site control. The developer has been approved for both TIF and redevelopment for 53 housing units, including 38 townhouses and 15 condominium units (five of which will be affordable). An additional six off-site affordable housing units will be built as well. Site cleanup was completed in fall 2002, with construction to begin spring 2003. The name of the development is East River Mews.

Remaining NRP funds (\$538,000) were reallocated within the plan in a neighborhood-wide vote process on February 4, 2003.

#### Housing B.1. Inventory condition of residential properties within neighborhood boundaries

The PPERIA Housing Improvement Committee obtained a map from the City of Minneapolis in 1996 detailing properties within the neighborhood boundaries. The committee plans to update the map, beginning in the summer of 2002 by having three teams of volunteers walk through the neighborhood and note the conditions of properties. Using this information, any future housing improvement efforts can be targeted to those properties most in need of help.

#### Housing B.2. Facilitate improvement and rehabilitation of existing housing

Since the NRP Plan was written, the Housing Improvement Committee has been gathering materials on home improvement loan and grant programs available through the MCDA and other agencies. While the information is gathered, distribution has not yet taken place. The committee plans to publicize this information on the PPERIA website beginning in 2002-03.

### **HOUSING IMPROVEMENT:**

## **Motley Area Improvement Program**

Although the original NRP Action Plan did not include funding for housing improvement, the PPERRIA NRP Housing Improvement Committee did envision that funds be made available for just that purpose through the recycling of housing redevelopment money. Before that could occur, a separate need for a specific housing improvement program emerged in the Motley area of the Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood. PPERRIA reallocated \$100,000 to this strategy in February, 1997, in order to preserve ownership housing in Motley in the face of plans by the nearby University of Minnesota to sell houses that it owned to the general public.

The PPERRIA NRP Housing Improvement Committee worked with the Minneapolis Community Development Agency (MCDA) to form a Motley Home Buyer's Deferred Loan Program, targeted to potential homeowner-occupants of the houses offered by the University. When the University sold the majority of the houses to developers, the neighborhood shifted gears somewhat and changed its guidelines to include individual and cooperative homebuyers in the program. Prospective homeowner-occupants could obtain loans for up to \$5,000 with which to purchase the property. These deferred loans would become grants once the homeowner remained in the property for at least seven years. The program was renewed and refined several times. Applicants for both Loan Programs were owner-occupants, residing in homes built before 1940. Home Improvement Loan applicants also must qualify within income guidelines based on a percentage of the Minneapolis median income for 2000. To date, four buyers have taken advantage of the program—three in 2000. The program was combined with the new Motley Home Improvement Deferred Loan Program, launched in August, 2000, with the Greater Metropolitan Housing Corporation (GMHC) chosen as its program administrator by RFP process. This program rolled over remaining funds from the Homebuyers Assistance Program and now provides loans for both programs. To date, four home improvement loans totalling \$18,100 have been paid. The contract with GMHC has been terminated as of 12/31/02. Neighborhood support for this program was moderate to high, but other neighborhood priorities and tepid response to the program brought an end to both programs after five years. The remaining funds of \$56,940 were reallocated on February 4, 2003, at a neighborhood-wide meeting/vote.

### B.3. Facilitate improvement and rehabilitation of rental property

To date, no action has been taken on this strategy.

### B.4. Encourage block clubs to provide community service

The PPERRIA Housing Improvement Committee has determined that it is not within the capacity of the block club volunteers to organize community service projects; it is the primary responsibility of block club volunteers to disseminate information to their neighbors about safety and security issues.

### B.5. Ensure compatibility between commercial/industrial and residential property

The PPERRIA Zoning and Plan Review Committee has attempted to ensure compatibility between commercial/industrial and residential property by:

- ∑ Actively participating in the development of the new city zoning code by serving on committees, submitting written comments, meeting with planners and attending community-wide land use and zoning meetings;
- ∑ Holding regular and special meetings of the zoning committee to review all development projects;

- Σ Working with developers and the city planner;
- Σ Presenting the PPERRIA Zoning Committee recommendations to the PPERRIA Executive Committee and PPERRIA members and Board of Directors;
- Σ Presenting the PPERRIA recommendations in writing and in oral testimony to the appropriate decision makers, and
- Σ Appealing land use and zoning decisions that do not ensure compatibility between residential and commercial/industrial property.

## TRANSPORTATION

The broad vision of Prospect Park East River Road in the area of transportation was to “provide efficient, practical and environmentally appropriate means of transportation”, both within our own neighborhood and within Southeast Minneapolis. The hope was to implement measures that would enhance traffic calming and safety while reducing the negative impact of motor vehicles throughout the neighborhood. Because of its location (bounded by railroad tracks to north, freeway to south, river to west, and St. Paul to east) and because of larger arterial streets/freeways nearby (University Avenue between St. Paul and Minneapolis, Franklin Avenue which connects to Highway 280 and I-94), there is a larger than normal amount of truck and car traffic daily on neighborhood streets. In order to lessen the impact of traffic on the neighborhood, we used NRP funds to reconfigure two intersections, reduce freeway noise, and reduce speed within the neighborhood. Much of the effort at traffic calming is still in progress, although some funds (\$19,328) have been reallocated in 2003 to other strategies in the plan.

### Transportation A.1. Develop community transportation plan\*

\*Note: Funds were reallocated to this strategy to encompass:

- Σ the writing of a transportation plan (A.1.),
- Σ reduce impact of truck and business traffic on the community (A.2.),
- Σ reduce speed and volume of automobiles in neighborhood (part of B.1.),
- Σ improve pedestrian friendliness within community (B.2.),
- Σ increase non-motorized linkages, pathways and bike lanes through the neighborhood (C.2.)
- Σ encourage and facilitate the use of public transportation (C.3.)

### **REDESIGN OF INTERSECTIONS AT FRANKLIN/EAST RIVER PKWY/E. 27<sup>TH</sup> AND MALCOLM/ORLIN**

The following is a condensed history of transportation efforts:

- Σ October, 1998 - The Minneapolis Department of Public Works, Transportation Division produced the “Prospect Park Neighborhood Transportation Management Plan,” the result of months of collaboration with the neighborhood on transportation and public safety issues. The PPERRIA Board of Directors and especially the PPERRIA Transportation Committee worked with the Transportation Division to devise this plan, which addresses key problem areas in the neighborhood. The result of this plan was the redesign and construction of two key intersections within the neighborhood:

1. The intersection at East Franklin Avenue, 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and East River Parkway, and

2. The intersection of Malcolm and Orlin Avenues Southeast.

Σ 1997-98 - These two intersections were redesigned for a total of \$199,750. The Prospect Park Neighborhood Transportation Management Plan identified six additional problem intersections and included staff recommendations for improving safety:

<b>Intersection</b>	<b>Neighborhood Ideas</b>	<b>Transportation Division Recommendations</b>	<b>Transportation Changes Made</b>
Franklin Avenue/ East River Pkwy/ 27 <sup>th</sup> Avenue SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ Provide better signage to direct traffic towards U of M, I-94 and University Ave.</li> <li>Σ Keep intersection traffic from circumventing the traffic light</li> <li>Σ Change timing of signals on Franklin and E. River Pkwy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ Reconfigure intersection now to coincide with storm drain separation project by City (achieving some cost savings, too)</li> <li>Σ Redesign intersection to be more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly</li> <li>Σ Encourage traffic to use 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE rather than Franklin Ave. whenever possible</li> <li>Σ Continue to accommodate Metro Transit buses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ Recommendations were followed per Public Works redesign, with the exception that the “slip channel” between Franklin Avenue and 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue was retained at the request of business owners and residents.</li> </ul>
Franklin Avenue & Bedford Street SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ Install traffic signal at this location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ No recommendation at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ No traffic signal installed (see below)</li> </ul>
Franklin Avenue & Emerald Street SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ Enforce City speed laws; close connector streets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ Install stop signs for east- and westbound Franklin Avenue traffic (NOTE: In 1999, the City worked with St. Paul to install a blinking red light at this intersection)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ In 1999, Public Works worked with St. Paul to install a blinking red light at this intersection.</li> </ul>
University and St. Mary’s Avenues SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ Relocate transit shelter</li> <li>Σ Trim trees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ Relocate Transtop shelter to east side of St. Mary’s</li> <li>Σ Trim boulevard trees</li> <li>Σ Paint pedestrian crosswalk across University Ave.</li> <li>Σ Post “No Parking Any Time” 60’ from west edge of sidewalk on neighborhood side of St. Mary’s</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Σ Shelter relocated, but pedestrian crosswalk was never developed</li> </ul>

University Avenue and Bedford Street SE	Program signal to give pedestrians more time to cross University Ave.	∑ Change intersection to increase pedestrian time to cross , decrease distance	∑ Signal was programmed per recommendations
Malcolm and Orlin Avenues SE	∑ With Pratt renovation for accessibility, need to reconfigure intersection to give Pratt a “front yard” and increase traffic safety measures at intersection	∑ Reconfigure intersection as suggested to increase safety for cars and pedestrians	∑ Reconfiguration of intersection was completed after traffic study and public meetings were held as required

Transportation B.1.a. Institute traffic calming measures

**INSTALLATION OF SPEED HUMPS**

While efforts at reconfiguring two intersections involved a lot of community input and City know-how, a grass-roots effort emerged within the neighborhood for implementing traffic calming measures within the neighborhood. Parents of children waiting for school buses on Bedford Street SE became activists for better signage and traffic calming to ensure safety. By working with the Transportation Division and petitioning for neighbor support, these parents were able to have two sets of speed humps installed on Bedford Street SE in June, 1998, for \$7,000 in NRP funds. The success of this project encouraged the PPERRIA NRP Transportation Committee to set aside more funds (both within the Transportation section and reallocated from other areas) for speed humps on other roads in the neighborhood. Other activities petitioned for and had installed speed humps on Erie, Ontario, and Dartmouth Streets Southeast at a cost of \$12,500. Some additional streets under consideration for these humps are:

- ∑ Delaware Street Southeast
- ∑ St. Mary’s Avenue Southeast
- ∑ Williams Avenue Southesat
- ∑ Arthur Avenue Southeast

The Transportation Division has conducted studies of speed on these roads. What remains is for the Glendale Residents Council (GRO) and Arthur Avenue residents to petition their neighbors for support of these measures. Because of the diversity within Glendale, the petitions will be translated into Hmong, Somali, Oromo and Spanish. The total expected cost of these projects will be no greater than the \$16,000 NRP funds remaining.

One other traffic calming measure was implemented by the City to address problems with speed and safety at the Franklin and Emerald Avenues intersection. The City erected a permanent blinking red light at this intersection. This involved no cost to the neighborhood.

Transportation B.2. Improve “pedestrian-friendliness” within the community

The neighborhood sought to control the timing of walk lights at intersections within the community to allow for safer street crossing for pedestrians. This was mainly accomplished at the newly redesigned Franklin/27<sup>th</sup> Ave. /East River Parkway intersection. The City Transportation Division also adjusted crossing times for lights at various intersections on University Avenue Southeast.



In addition, the City repaired broken and uneven sidewalks in the community in 1999. Property owners were assessed for this repair.

#### Transportation B.2.c. Improve Tower Hill Park

### **REPAIR OF STEPS AND INSTALLATION OF FENCE AT TOWER HILL PARK**

The PPERRIA Tower Hill Park Committee worked with the Park Board to replace/repave the Tower Hill Park steps and erect a split rail fence to provide erosion control in late 1996/early 1997 for a total cost of \$22,700. The committee feels that the new steps provide much safer ways to enter and leave the park. The fence has worked to control erosion by encouraging people to walk on the stairs and pathways.

#### Transportation C. Reduce dependence on automobiles in neighborhood

PPERRIA continues to monitor plans and proposals for light rail transit (LRT) along the Central Corridor, which is currently proposed to be along University Avenue. In spring 2001, PPERRIA established an LRT Task Force which has reviewed options and provided recommendations for a neighborhood position on the various issues related to LRT. In addition, other neighborhood residents will formulate alternative proposals for neighborhood consideration on this issue. Development of bike lanes throughout the neighborhood continues to be a goal. The Minneapolis Park Board plans to extend the bikeway along East River Parkway and held community meetings in fall 2001 to determine public input. When Pratt Community Center was renovated in the mid-1990's, bike racks were installed near the new Village Green playground space. Efforts could still be made to expand and encourage the use of public transportation.

## **ENVIRONMENT**

PPERRIA has a significant role to play to increase the health and safety of humans, animals, and plants in the area by improving the environment. Special efforts have been made to work with known area business polluters to decrease air pollution and to de-contaminate soil so that land may be redeveloped. Part of the overall strategy over the past six years has been to combine study with action. Following are examples of how this has worked:

- Σ We began work on an environmental inventory of polluters/polluted land in the Southeast area and, at the same time, negotiated decreased emissions from known air polluters such as Pechiney Packaging Corporation (a.k.a., American National Can Corporation).
- Σ We accumulated information on more environmentally-friendly building materials to offer developers within the Southeast Industrial Area, while we hired a Southeast Environmental Coordinator to manage environmental projects within the Southeast Como and Prospect Park neighborhoods.

Such dual efforts have only begun to make a difference; more work is needed far into the future. Some of these efforts have involved expenditure of NRP funds; some have not. While the Southeast area, and Prospect Park in particular, are certainly not pollution-free, there have been great strides in creating relationships with polluters and educating residents about environmental issues.

#### Environment A.1. Reduce air and chemical pollution

Efforts made under A.2. to protect the area from contamination resulted in a reduction in air pollution.

## Environment A.2. Protect sites from contamination

### **ACOUSTIC MEASURES AND ENVIRONMENTAL INVENTORY**

PPERRIA has initiated several projects to protect our neighborhood and the Southeast Minneapolis area from noise and air pollution. These projects include:

- Σ **Acoustic measures** - In early 1997, the Minnesota Department of Transportation repaved a large stretch of Interstate 94 that runs through the Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood. This resurfacing resulted in grooves being cut into pavement to improve traction and commuter safety. Unfortunately, a secondary effect was to create a significant increase in traffic noise for the neighborhood, as well as an annoyingly shrill and piercing whine from cars traveling through on the highway. Only certain neighborhood streets were buffered from this increase in noise pollution by existing sound walls. Concerned neighbors and staff effectively worked with a number of jurisdictions—from MnDOT to the Park—to have the sound wall at Luxton Park extended and the I-94 pavement ground down to mitigate the effects of traffic noise on residents and business owners in the area. This was all done at no cost to the neighborhood. In this effort, the neighborhood commissioned an acoustic study, at a cost of just over \$4,000, for both Luxton Park and East River Terrace, which showed sound levels well beyond the legal limit in both areas. While the group was successful at Luxton Park, there were no funds available for noise reduction (other than the pavement re-grooving) on East River Terrace. The problem of noise pollution remains an issue for East River Terrace and Bridal Veil residents and workers, particularly as traffic has increased yearly on I-94 and I-280.
  
- Σ **Environmental pollution inventory** - A second initiative also began in early 1997: the creation of a pollution inventory for the area. This effort stopped after a few months of work by an environmental intern; the new Southeast Environmental Coordinator has completed the inventory at a total cost of \$3,000.
  
- Σ **Good neighborhood agreement** - Concerned residents and staff initiated a “Good Neighbor” relationship with Pechiney Plastic Corporation (formerly, American National Can). Pechiney subsequently reduced its HAPS (hazardous air pollutants) by over 80%.

All remaining funds in this strategy were reallocated in June, 2002 for additional support of the Southeast Environmental Coordinator (currently Justin Eibenholz), along with Como Neighborhood.

## Environment A.3.b. Research toxin-absorbing plants and A.4.c. Restore wetlands

The PPERRIA Environment Committee spent \$202 to look at ways of including toxin-absorbing plant species in neighborhood landscaping projects. They determined that it was not feasible for the neighborhood, and they reallocated funds to pollution control measures.

After reallocating some funds from A.4.c., the Committee looked at the possibility of creating a wetland area, perhaps at Pratt Center. They published several informational articles for residents through the PPERRIA newsletter about ways to create rain gardens in private yards, but found no suitable public site for an area-wide project. Funds were ultimately reallocated.

#### Environment A.4.d. Protect ground water, rivers and streams

##### **STORM DRAIN STENCILLING**

One successful project completed in 1997 in the Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood was the stenciling of storm drains throughout the area. Area youth and volunteers participated in this program, which cautions residents about water pollution through the use of excessive fertilizers and not removing leaves from the boulevard (or raking into the street). The stencils read: "Do Not Dump; Drains to Mississippi River."

#### Environment A.5. Coordinate efforts at pollution in Southeast Minneapolis

##### **PROSPECT PARK AND SECIA'S ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR**

In February, 1999, Prospect Park and Como neighborhoods combined resources to hire a Southeast Area Environmental Coordinator. Prospect Park contributed \$14,000 over two years for this position. The professional staff person is responsible for completing the environmental inventory, negotiating Good Neighbor Agreements with known area polluters, and education of Southeast area residents and workers about polluted sites and hazards, among other jobs. Unfortunately, the third Southeast area neighborhood, Marcy-Holmes, has no representation in this effort. The work performed by the Environmental Coordinator is administered by SECIA (Southeast Como Improvement Association). Over the long term, these talks and inventory should result in cleaner air and less exposure to toxic chemicals in ground, air, and water. In June, 2002, PPERRIA reallocated \$12,297 to this strategy for additional support of the Southeast Environmental Coordinator.

#### Environment 6. Restore lost habitat

##### **WILDLIFE STUDY**

The Environment Committee has decided to use the \$500 allocated for habitat restoration, combined with additional private funds, for a habitat project on East River Flats Park with students from Pratt Community School. This is expected to take place in 2001-04 and will involve students using field guides and a spotting scope to study wildlife along the Mississippi River. Volunteers may eventually build a limited number of nesting boxes and bird feeders with donated materials.

#### Environment 7 and 8. Maintain/improve recycling and eliminate litter

##### **LITTER CLEANUP**

The bulk of the original allocation of \$1,500 in NRP Funds for education and outreach efforts directed at establishing community compost sites were reallocated to support the major efforts of the Environment Committee (develop environmental inventory and hire Southeast Environmental Coordinator). As a community service, volunteers have participated in Operation CleanSweep over the past 5-6 years in spring to eliminate debris and waste from area households. Residents put garbage at their curb and volunteers from the neighborhood follow garbage trucks to pick up the waste. This eliminates waste not normally removed by the Minneapolis Solid Waste and Recycling program. Approximately \$61 was spent in an effort to promote the removal of litter from area streets, homes, businesses and parks. No further efforts are planned for this strategy.

# EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

As one of the three top-funded focuses of the NRP Action Plan, Education and Human Services initiatives have arguably been the most successful, yet least controversial to date. Among its many accomplishments, the PPERRIA Education Committee (along with the Pratt Council, which oversees issues related to Pratt Community Center) counts the renovation of Pratt Center and the reopening of Pratt Community School as its most successful and renowned achievements within the past eight years. The focus for the committee through the NRP Plan was to bring educational and social service opportunities to the community through such diverse efforts as:

- ∑ a newly opened K-5 school (in fall, 2000),
- ∑ the Neighbors Educating Themselves (NET) program,
- ∑ regularly scheduled Bookmobile stops in the neighborhood at several locations,
- ∑ school-aged childcare,
- ∑ teen club,
- ∑ Somali women & family educational and other resource program,
- ∑ neighborhood food shelf and
- ∑ services for seniors.

Alone, each program was a big success. As a group, they have unified the neighborhood by addressing the needs of a wide spectrum of groups and ages. Each program has contributed to making Prospect Park a vital urban core with the school as an anchor.

## Education A.1.a. Create a neighborhood learning center

### **PRATT COMMUNITY SCHOOL**

One of the largest successes within the first phase of NRP for the neighborhood, Pratt Community School was re-opened (after being solely a community center since 1982) in fall 2000. It is a small school, which will grow to K-5 over six years and have an enrollment of under 200 students. Pratt shares staff and principal with Tuttle Community School in Southeast Como neighborhood, yet retains its unique vision as part of a larger community within the building. NRP funds have been used in the following ways to ensure the growing success of this small school:

- ∑ **Feasibility study** (\$3,374) – The PPERRIA Education Committee, along with the Minneapolis Public School District (MPS) commissioned a feasibility study to determine whether Pratt could reopen a school in the midst of its already busy community center. The study showed that, while spatially it was possible to do so, all programs would be enhanced by opening the attic to relieve space congestion for the future.
- ∑ **Pratt reopening and first year of all-day kindergarten** (\$94,282) – In order to reopen Pratt as an elementary school, MPS requested that PPERRIA contribute some NRP funds toward first-time expenses, including school equipment and furniture and the salary of the full-time kindergarten teacher. In its second year, the district has paid for further operational expenses for the school.
- ∑ **Playground improvements** (\$10,000) – The PPERRIA Education Committee, along with school and community representatives have met periodically since fall, 2000, to determine future needs for the Village Green area. In the summer, 2001, they retained architect Kent Simon to look at ways to

improve drainage on the northern edge of the site, while providing additional running and play space near the gym entrance. Improvements are expected to be completed in 2003-04.

- Σ **Library/curriculum improvements** (\$10,718) – Funds have been set aside to increase media holdings and invest in curriculum materials for the school. These funds may also be used for increasing space at Pratt to have a larger media space and/or to purchase additional equipment.
- Σ **Neighborhood Education worker** (\$15,000 over two years) – Believing that “the school should enhance the community and the community should enhance the school,” the Education Committee may soon hire an education leader to work with Pratt parents and families on educational and practical social service issues (see Education B.1.b.) Note: As of Feb 2004, a Neighborhood Lead Education Worker had been hired jointly with SEMCOL (Southeast Minneapolis Council on Learning) to work with the Pratt and Tuttle communities.
- Σ **Education Committee Staff position** (\$5,198) – The committee has chosen a staff person to look at further resources for expansion into the Pratt attic, thus ensuring that spatial constraints do not negatively impinge on programming needs.
- Σ **Pratt School intern during school growth transition** (\$20,486) – Funds were designated from the original allocation to provide staff supervision during the 2002-03 school year as the school added one grade (3<sup>rd</sup>).
- Σ **Architectural redesign for Loft space at Pratt** (\$2,400) – In order to determine minimum requirements for renovation of the former Loft space at Pratt Center to house 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades, architect Kent Simon provided redesign estimates to the Minneapolis Public School District in 2002.
- Σ **Interior/Exterior Pratt improvements** (\$535,500) – Funds remaining in this strategy (\$39,272) have been added to funds reallocated from housing and elsewhere (\$495,628) to provide for a complete renovation of the former Loft space and other necessary interior renovations (for 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> grades), staff support during the two years until Pratt achieves K-5 status, and necessary compliance with safety and fire codes for the entire building as it grows its school.

#### Education A.1.b. Encourage the development of a K-12 neighborhood school

At present, the Minneapolis Public School District has no known plans for creating a K-12 school in Southeast Minneapolis. Because of statewide budgetary constraints, it is unlikely that this strategy will be implemented in the near future.

#### Education A.1.c. Provide mentors, tutoring, apprenticeships and community service

### **NET PROGRAM**

Co-sponsored with the Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota, PPERRIA established the Neighbors Educating Themselves (NET) program in 1994 for \$40,000. Workers for this program advocated for, translated for, and worked with families, particularly in the Glendale area, on educational and life issues. Staff established a vital link between Glendale and the rest of the neighborhood, which provided needed support for the reopening of Pratt School.

#### Education A.1.d. Initiate mobile library services in neighborhood

## **BOOKMOBILE**

NRP funding of just under \$20,000 provided by PPERRIA allowed the newly revamped Minneapolis Bookmobile to increase its collection and begin to operate in this under-served area of Southeast Minneapolis. Currently, the Bookmobile has more stops in this neighborhood than in any other in Minneapolis, providing service six times per month at several stops. NRP funds enabled the purchase of a collection to specifically serve the demographics of our community.

### Education A.1.e. Ensure school choice in Southeast

By re-opening a school at Pratt, the MPS district has ensured that students from this neighborhood have a community school choice.

### Education 2. Develop quality, affordable, accessible childcare

## **CHILDCARE STUDY**

In Fall, 1996, the PPERRIA Education Committee and a coalition of neighborhood and Southeast representatives met with the Development Corporation for Children to identify strategies to implement quality childcare in the neighborhood. The study, which cost \$6,000, showed that only a limited number of in-home providers, childcare centers and other means were available to parents and none to second-shift workers.

## **CHILDCARE AT PRATT**

Based on the results of the study, in the fall of 2001, Pratt Community Center began a collaboration with Minneapolis Kids, the childcare program through the Minneapolis Public School district. This program addresses the care issues for school-aged children both before and after school. The before-school component is necessarily limited to students at Pratt Community School (because of busing and schedule issues). Pratt Community Education supervises the after-school component, and it is open to school-aged students throughout the neighborhood. Reallocated NRP funds of \$9,500 were used for the first year of this program.

### Education 3.a. Develop youth entrepreneurial programming opportunities

## **IMPULSE TEEN CLUB**

A majority of funds in this strategy were reallocated when the PPERRIA Education Committee and Pratt Council determined that it was unfeasible to provide a “coffee cart” at Pratt. Instead, the committee supported a separate venture located in a nearby office space: Impulse Teen Club. This club was the brainchild of two young local women, who, along with the help of their parents, established a non-alcoholic “hangout” for youth ages 12-15 (i.e., those too young to drive). Along with \$3,000 in NRP funds, they secured matching private funds to ensure that security and other needs were met. All duties associated with the club – including keeping membership records and supervising Friday night dances/gatherings – were performed by volunteers. This teen club received an overwhelming response from youth in the entire metro area and garnered positive media attention. Unfortunately, growth created space problems, and after the founders became 16, the club ended when no volunteers could be found to maintain it.

### Education 3.b. Establish a neighborhood-based youth council

Luxton Park was the first group to establish such a youth council. Their group is called Glendale Neighborhood Youth Council and is supervised by East Side Neighborhood Services. The Luxton Park Youthline Director coordinates with East Side and the Youth Council on many projects throughout the year.

### Education B.1.a. Support and expand the NET program through intergenerational neighborhood programs

This strategy has yet to be implemented and had no funding.

### Education B.1.b. Provide parenting education and support groups

Southeast Area Way to Grow provided parenting education and support programming for our neighborhood and all of Southeast Minneapolis between 1995 and 2001. They created a babysitting cooperative and Play Zone and formed a collaborative between PPERRIA, SECIA and various childcare business representatives to advise the organization.

### **SWIM PROGRAM (Somali Women In Minnesota)**

In February, 2003, the Prospect Park neighborhood voted to reallocate funds from housing and elsewhere to support a Somali women's program at Luxton Park. Details of this program will be worked out in 2003.

### Education B.1.c. Assist the Care and Share Food Shelf in its new facility

### **CARE AND SHARE FOOD SHELF**

NRP funds of just under \$42,000 were spent between 1995-2001 to help the neighborhood Care and Share Food Shelf in its new facility at 92 St. Mary's Avenue Southeast. Neighbors continue to access the food shelf as needed and area churches continue to contribute both goods and money. Although it was originally staffed with volunteers overseen by an advisory committee, eventually paid staff were hired to manage the food shelf. Responsibility for operations then shifted to the Glendale Residents Organization (GRO).

### Education B.2. Address domestic violence issues

This strategy has not yet been implemented.

### Education B.3. Renovate Pratt and make it accessible

### **PRATT CENTER RENOVATION**

Both Early Access and regular NRP funding, along with private matching funds from the Minneapolis Public Schools allowed the interior and exterior renovation of the Pratt Community Center in mid-1996. Included in the renovation were elements to make Pratt fully handicapped-accessible, wired for technology and energy efficient. The NRP funding of \$321,975 enabled the center to establish a "Village Green" place for neighborhood gatherings, including a play area, arbor and more. Additional renovation work has been completed subsequent to the reopening of the school component, and additional renovation

work is needed to meet the needs of the growing school and community offerings. The school district is working with Pratt Council, the Pratt School Leadership Team, architect Kent Simon to create a plan for maximum space use at Pratt.

Education C.1. Support Southeast Seniors/Living at Home Block Nurse Program

**SOUTHEAST SENIORS**

NRP funds of \$37,600 have been dedicated since 1995 to enhancing the programming offered by Southeast Seniors/Block Nurse Program housed at Pratt Community Center. Initial funds were used to purchase needed equipment, but most of the money has funded staff during a transitional time of adding more volunteer, service coordination and health promotion services. Southeast Seniors enables senior citizens to continue to live in their homes in Prospect Park and throughout Southeast Minneapolis by:

- ∑ Using volunteer services for companionship and to reduce isolation,
- ∑ Offering volunteer transportation,
- ∑ Subsidizing in-home nursing and home health aide services on a sliding fee scale,
- ∑ Providing limited volunteer chore services,
- ∑ Developing a list of vendors for specific needs,
- ∑ Setting up a small phone-visiting program, and
- ∑ Purchasing a laptop computer to manage client records.

Additional funds of \$25,640 were added in a neighborhood reallocation in February, 2003.

## SAFETY AND SECURITY

The vision for creating more security in Prospect Park East River Road in 1993 involved strategies suggested by the city, the Minneapolis Police Department's SAFE team and common sense. One vital component offered for improving safety and security included the organization of neighborhoods by block club which encourages neighbors to meet one another, discuss safety issues, and be a physical presence in the neighborhood as they watch out for one another. Another element was to increase the amount of light on city sidewalks, thereby encouraging residents to feel safe walking throughout the area and, thus, discouraging criminal behavior. These primary objectives have been met by Prospect Park East River Road, yet have given rise to controversy and bitter disagreement among neighbors. In particular, the sidewalk lighting initiative has created some division and mistrust among neighbors and property owners, because first, it was the only strategy within the NRP Action Plan to require property owner subsidy and second, there were some inconsistencies in presenting the lighting plan to owners and residents.

Safety & Security A.1. Revitalize existing block clubs and encourage new block clubs to form

**BLOCK CLUB COORDINATION**

For several years between 1993 and 1997, PPERRIA entrusted NRP resources and volunteer time to efforts aimed at increasing the number of block clubs. The number of clubs increased by ten and peaked in 1996-97 when 23 block clubs operated throughout the Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood. Block club leaders were trained through CCP/SAFE and, to varying degrees, held meetings to discuss ways in which residents could achieve better safety and security on the block. Over time, some leaders moved or became unable to continue their efforts and passed the responsibilities onto a new leader, and



some block clubs became leaderless. The number of clubs dwindled. With \$15,000 in funds for staff to revitalize the network depleted, efforts at addressing safety issues became less frequent.

In 2001, the neighborhood reallocated \$5,000 to enable a new staff person to revitalize block clubs and to enact another measure: the installation of Watch Force signs and motion sensing detectors throughout the neighborhood (approved at the cost of \$5,000 in 1996 but never implemented). This new staff person has begun to meet with current block club leaders and will continue to encourage residents on blocks without leaders to consider becoming a leader. Ultimately, the \$5,000 for signs and motion detectors was reallocated to other strategies by the neighborhood in February, 2003.

#### Safety & Security A.2. Remove graffiti in neighborhood

### **GRAFFITI REMOVAL EFFORTS**

Funds of \$200 have been dedicated to graffiti removal efforts within the neighborhood. To date, \$129 has been spent on removal materials. Primary efforts within the interior part of Prospect Park East River Road (i.e., not on business property along the arterial roads, which are handled by the businesses themselves) have included graffiti removal from the Prospect Park water tower, alleyways and Pratt.

#### Safety & Security A.3. Increase effectiveness of police in neighborhood

PPERRIA provided parking stickers to all interested residents and workers throughout the neighborhood at a cost of \$387. It was intended that the stickers be placed in vehicles to show that the car belongs to a resident or to someone who belongs in the neighborhood. These stickers are available at many PPERRIA membership meetings.

#### Safety & Security A.4.a./b. Improve/increase lighting on streets and sidewalks

### **SIDEWALK LIGHTING PROJECT**

The city Public Works Department worked with the neighborhood to trim low-hanging branches of trees on neighborhood boulevards. In addition, the department and former City Council member Joan Campbell worked with PPERRIA to assess the need and desire for what the city said was improved lighting: lower-level boulevard lights to replace the high-level streetlights. These lower-level lights were already installed in a few areas around the city, but not on the scale proposed by Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood. Because installation of such lights would mean a significant special assessment of property owners in addition to NRP funds of \$372,500 (at the time, NRP funds could only be used for up to 25% of the total cost), PPERRIA undertook an educational and petition process to assess owners' preferences. The decision of whether to install lights or not actually rested with the council member. At that time, the city did not require a consistent percentage of owners to agree to the assessment (by signing a petition), and PPERRIA undertook its task carefully in order to attempt to explain the choices to owners. Unfortunately, those careful efforts, enacted by over 26 block club leaders and other neighborhood volunteers, were undermined by a lack of trust in the process by a vocal contingent of property owners. At a special meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> of April 1999 a majority of neighborhood residents in attendance passed a motion to ask the city of Minneapolis to reassess the actual amount of support for new streetlights; at a subsequent meeting the following Monday PPERRIA members voted to rescind this motion. Council Member Campbell determined that a simple majority of petition signers would determine that lights should be installed. In fact, just over 52% of the property represented in the lighting plan area agreed that it would be a good idea. The time lag between turning in the petitions to the city and the city approving

and installing the lighting was three years. During that time, properties changed hands and new owners were sometimes less informed about the process.

After many contentious meetings to discuss alternatives to assessed lighting improvements, opponents filed grievances with PPERRIA and legally challenged the city's decision. Ultimately, the grievances were dismissed when the parties filing the grievances refused mediation offered by PPERRIA at PPERRIA's expense. The legal action with the city was dismissed in court. The lights were installed, and an additional \$14,300 (reallocated to allow non-profits in the neighborhood to also receive NRP assistance; later, approved by PPERRIA for use on the project as a whole) was applied to the assessments. Property owners received approximately 20-25% assessment relief by the use of NRP funds on the project.

#### Safety & Security A.4.c. Increase lighting and visibility along bikeways

PPERRIA identified three bikeways within the neighborhood:

1. Along I-94 freeway wall between Franklin Avenue and Melbourne Avenue Southeast,
2. Along I-94 freeway wall between Luxton Park and Arthur Avenue Southeast, and
3. Between Williams Avenue and Arthur Avenue Southeast

In 1993-94, the CCP/SAFE officer noted that increased lighting would provide more safety for pedestrians and bicyclists in these paths. Years later, other officers argued against simply providing lighting, which would only afford criminals an easier way to target victims. The cost for eliminating the bikeways was prohibitive, and PPERRIA reallocated its funds of \$23,000 to other strategies.

#### Safety & Security A.5. Improve lighting levels in two community parks

In summer 1996, the PPERRIA Tower Hill Park committee implemented lighting improvements at Tower Hill Park at a cost of \$86,000. These improvements included installation of seven pedestrian-level lights (identical to the ones later installed throughout the neighborhood) around the perimeter of the park and at the base of the water tower. By having better lighting, decreased graffiti because of almost immediate removal efforts, and an increased presence of residents within the park, vandalism diminished significantly.

Remaining funds in this strategy of \$3,300 were reallocated in 2001 to other strategies.

## LIVABILITY

Writers of the NRP Plan hoped and planned that, by strengthening the appearance, resources, and public gathering spaces within Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood, more people would be drawn to live and work within the area. Such "livability" factors would include both products (such as new physical public spaces) and services (such as neighbor-to-neighbor contact about crime and community resources). A key factor in making the neighborhood more livable has been to increase and improve green spaces within our borders. Since Prospect Park lies adjacent to the University of Minnesota, I-94 and other major transit arteries, and the Mississippi River, volunteers have sought to define the character of the neighborhood separate from yet connected to these forces.

#### Livability A.1. Increase number and variety of community-wide events

The PPERRIA Community Events Committee has worked with other groups to enhance the neighborhood social events of longstanding (such as the Prospect Park Ice Cream Social at Pratt) while creating new events to appeal to a multigenerational, multicultural community. Some of the newly created events since the NRP Plan was approved have included the following (with their sponsors):

- Σ **Fire and Ice Festival** (*Luxton Park Council*) – established as part of Winter Splash youth program in 1995-6 and annually the first Saturday of February since then
- Σ **Pratt Winter Event** (*Community Events Committee*) – all ages dance at Pratt School, March
- Σ **Black History Month Celebration** (*Luxton Park*) – to honor African American leaders, February
- Σ **Mississippi River Cleanup** (*East River Gorge Committee*) – to celebrate Earth Day, April
- Σ **Neighborhood Spring Cleanup (Operation CleanSweep) and PPERRIA Garage Sale** (*PPERRIA*) – for all neighborhood residents, usually May
- Σ **Prospect Park Garden Walk** (*Garden Club*) – to appreciate the number and variety of urban garden spaces within the neighborhood, July
- Σ **Prospect Park Summer Concert Series** (*Community Events Committee*) – to bring together many generations and cultures to enjoy music in outdoor venues, usually two during June-August
- Σ **National Night Out Block Parties** (*Block Club Network*) – for neighbors to meet and greet one another, August
- Σ **Pratt Rummage Sale and Pancake Breakfast** (*Pratt Council*) – a fundraising event for Pratt Council, September
- Σ **Halloween Party & Haunted House** (*Luxton Park Council*) – to help youth enjoy a safe holiday, October
- Σ **Harvest Dinner** (*Luxton Park Council*) – for all neighborhood residents to celebrate fall harvest and Thanksgiving, November
- Σ **East Side Holiday Store** (*East Side Neighborhood Services*) – for youth from Glendale to purchase holiday gifts for family, December
- Σ **Prospect Park Community Choir** – two concerts per year, December and May

In addition, a neighborhood traditional event, the Pratt Ice Cream Social, held in June, has continued to thrive. There are other events sponsored by churches and other groups within the neighborhood. The Community Events Committee offers both a community events calendar and publicity via e-mail list for upcoming events.

#### Livability A.2. Empower block clubs and neighbor-to-neighbor activities

### **WELCOME PACKET**

In order to ensure that new residents are oriented to the many area resources, businesses, and neighborhood history, PPERRIA compiled a Welcome Packet at a cost of \$148, which PPERRIA members distribute as needed.

#### Livability A.3. Educate property owners and residents about community resources

### **NEIGHBORHOOD DIRECTORY**

In May, 1998, PPERRIA staff and volunteers completed a neighborhood directory of area businesses and services to distribute to every household in the neighborhood. The previous directories were produced in 1970 and 1978. At an initial cost of \$2,570, the 32-page directory was distributed to over 2,000 property owners and residents and is a visually attractive, information-intensive document which features usability, visual clarity and minimal advertising. NRP organizers in other neighborhoods have offered positive

feedback. A second printing in 1999 at a cost of \$700 enabled the directory to be included in the Welcome Packet, which new neighbors receive. Advertising revenue from the directory will be used to fund a future, updated issue.

#### Livability B.1. Develop a landscaping plan for neighborhood

### **LANDSCAPE PLAN**

PPERRIA contracted with Minnesota Green, an outreach program of the state Horticultural Society, in 1996 to develop a landscape plan for public lands throughout the neighborhood and to provide training and technical assistance for landscape projects. The total spent for training and planting projects, which included the training of several Master Gardeners in the neighborhood and the purchase of trees for individual gardens via a Tree Trust grant, was \$9,397. Horticulturists provided resources for homeowners who wanted to add landscape plantings, as well as training and guidance for larger public planting projects at Tower Hill Park and elsewhere. PPERRIA's contract with Minnesota Green ended by mutual consent after several years as the focus of both organizations evolved. The money remaining from that contract was available for further neighborhood landscaping efforts.

#### Livability B.2.a. Support the Landscape Committee

For some time after the NRP Action Plan was approved, PPERRIA sponsored a Landscape Committee to oversee the public planting projects in the neighborhood in coordination with Minnesota Green. All told, the committee incurred expenses of \$90 in printing and postage. In 2000, this committee was subsumed by the Prospect Park Garden Club, which also works on neighborhood green spaces. Members of the Garden Club help to plan the annual Prospect Park Garden Walk in July of each year.

#### Livability B.2.b. Plan and install landscape projects within the neighborhood

### **LANDSCAPE PROJECTS**

Several large planting projects have been coordinated through the Landscape Committee/Garden Club in a variety of areas within the neighborhood:

- Σ A local Master Gardener developed a design in cooperation with the Minneapolis Park Board landscape designer to design trees and shrubs for the gateway to Minneapolis at the city line on East River Parkway. The project was planted by neighborhood volunteers and park board employees.
- Σ Volunteer residents worked with children from Glendale and other areas of Prospect Park to implement childrens' ideas into a Luxton Children's Garden.
- Σ The Garden Club cooperated with Glendale to establish a Glendale Garden Club and planted shrubs and perennials throughout Glendale area.
- Σ Volunteers worked on design and plantings at Pratt Community Center after the building was renovated.
- Σ The Garden Club Oval Team placed benches and plantings on the Oval on Franklin Avenue.
- Σ Volunteers led efforts to plant shrubs and perennials near the footbridge by the Mississippi River.
- Σ Volunteers planted and maintained a garden at the East River Parkway triangle, with plant materials provided by the Minneapolis Park Board
- Σ The Garden Club hired a local Master Gardener to lead a neighborhood-wide effort to educate residents about and eradicate buckthorn from individual properties

Planned future projects include the following possibilities:

- Σ Plant 5 oak trees on Tower Hill Park,
- Σ Research possibility for making a labyrinth on Franklin Oval grass (cut grass shorter in certain areas, thereby creating a pattern), and
- Σ Purchase trash/cigarette butt receptacle for Franklin Oval and East River Parkway triangle.

A total of \$20,603 has been allocated to achieve these planting projects. Because of the efforts of volunteers, plants from the Park Board, donations from individuals, free plants through Minnesota Green, and grants from the Tree Trust for boulevard trees, these funds have been stretched to complete a wide array of projects.

Livability B.2.c. Plan and install landscape projects at Tower Hill Park

**TOWER HILL PROJECTS**

The Tower Hill Park Committee has overseen several planting and renovation projects at the park. Several projects have incorporated use of volunteer and free labor and materials. Planting of wildflowers in May, 1998, have helped prevent erosion and created a more attractive environment. One project carried out by the Park Board was for pavers and plantings at the pump house at the base of the tower.

Livability B.2.d. Train volunteers as Master Gardeners

These funds have paid for several neighborhood residents to become Master Gardeners. Once trained, Master Gardeners have helped coordinate planting sites throughout the neighborhood. Their energy and expertise greatly contributed to the many accomplishments of the Landscape Committee/Garden Club.

Livability B.2.f. Replace trees in neighborhood

**BOULEVARD TREES**

Prospect Park spent \$15,000 in NRP funds to replace and add 142 boulevard trees throughout the neighborhood. This effort was in addition to the regular control and replacement of trees by the city public works department. Additional trees were added in subsequent years by a Tree Trust grant awarded to the Garden Club.

Livability C.1. & 2. Create identifiable entrances/gathering places & promote the urban village concept

**TOWER HILL PARK DOOR/PLAQUE**

In February 1997, PPERRIA approved the installation of a steel door and plaque on the water tower. This improvement has lessened vandalism and ensured that the tower remains inaccessible except for special events.

**NEIGHBORHOOD KIOSKS**

A total of \$8,000 was set aside to install the first neighborhood kiosk at Pratt when the Village Green project was completed in 1997. This kiosk is attached to the building and protected. A second neighborhood kiosk is planned at Luxton Park and is expected to cost \$6,000 (or more). This kiosk will detail opportunities at Luxton.

## NEIGHBORHOOD SIGNS

A signage committee worked with the city to create and install neighborhood signs at 10 locations at the edges of the Prospect Park East River Road area which will identify the neighborhood for those entering the area. The design was produced by neighborhood resident and renowned designer/architect Ralph Rapson. The cost for signage and installation was under \$1,800.

## PRATT PERFORMANCE CIRCLE

As a true gateway to the neighborhood, Pratt Community Center was renovated as described above. In fall 1998, as an addition to the original renovation, the Pratt Performance Circle was added to address the northern slope. The Performance Circle allows residents, Pratt users, and school children a space in which to perform, learn, and gather. The cost of the project was \$21,200.

# BUSINESS, JOBS & EMPLOYMENT

The vision for the business and jobs initiatives was to “sustain and increase the economic viability of businesses and the number of job opportunities for residents.” The neighborhood’s goals were as follows:

- ∑ “Enhance and maintain relationships” between local residents and businesses, including the University of Minnesota;
- ∑ “Identify employment opportunities in Southeast Minneapolis” and work to have residents tap those opportunities; and
- ∑ “Encourage retention and growth of compatible commercial and industrial business in the Southeast Industrial Area” and other commercial areas.

Although a Business/Jobs/Employment Committee never materialized at PPERRIA or elsewhere, various individuals took on the challenge over the years to realize most of the original vision.

### Business/Jobs A.1. Encourage neighborhood businesses/residents to foster and maintain communication to solve mutual problems

Although the original idea was to participate, along with SEBA, Stadium Village Business Association, Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association, Como Neighborhood Improvement Association and others, in the creation of a “Southeast Coordinating Council,” this venture materialized only briefly if at all. However, as years have passed, it has become clear that communication with other neighborhood associations – even in St. Paul and Seward – have become vital. Currently, Prospect Park neighborhood has representatives who meet regularly with the following groups:

- ∑ University of Minnesota University Relations Office
- ∑ SEBA (Southeast Business Association)
- ∑ St. Anthony Park Neighborhood Association

In addition, we are in contact with or coordinate ventures with Como, Marcy-Holmes, and Seward neighborhoods. The idea of having a business column in the *Southeast Angle* never materialized, although there are occasional and even regular features on area businesses and business owners.

### Business/Jobs A.2. Maintain liaison with University of Minnesota

In recent years, the University Relations Office has reached out to surrounding neighborhoods to work together to solve mutual problems and to publicize events and construction issues at the university. The University representative has, in particular, increased the visibility of the University in the neighborhood by meeting regularly with PPERIA officers, attending neighborhood meetings, and communicating by mail.

Business/Jobs B.1.a. Match area business employment needs with Southeast Residents

**GLENDALE JOB READINESS PROJECT**

The Glendale Residents Management Corporation (GRMC – currently known as Glendale Residents Organization – GRO) developed and managed an initial jobs readiness project. It was designed to prepare Glendale residents to enter the work force and to give them a support system during their first year of employment. Glendale is a federal public housing community in Prospect Park. Throughout 1994 and beyond, this project served approximately 40 residents, who participated in a series of workshops designed to increase their job readiness skills. After training, some residents continued in training to start and run a small business; others found employment in the Prospect Park area. In 1995-96, the NET (Neighbors Educating Themselves) Program took over this vital objective, and neighborhood staff worked closely with Glendale residents to help with language translation, job readiness skills, and matching residents with area jobs. In total, \$86,794 was spent on this project. Many residents now find jobs with the aid of East Side Neighborhood Services and other agencies.

Business/Jobs B.1.b. Start an employment clearinghouse

An additional \$4,000 from this strategy was also used by the NET Program through the Glendale Job Readiness Project. The remaining \$1,000 was reallocated within the NRP Plan.

Business/Jobs B.1.c. Provide a process for youth to find employment

**YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROJECT**

The Prospect Park community followed the lead of Southeast Como neighborhood in establishing a youth employment project for area youth over one year. A total of \$2,500 was used in this project to match youth with job opportunities in the neighborhood. The rest of the funds were reallocated.

Business/Jobs C.1. Attract compatible commercial/industrial developments in the SEIA

**SEIA STUDY**

Between 1994-99, PPERIA and other Southeast neighborhood groups sought help in planning for the area north of University Avenue adjacent to the University of Minnesota known as the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial Area (SEMI). The Southeast Economic Development (SEED) committee was developed with representatives from all Southeast Minneapolis neighborhoods, St. Anthony Park neighborhood of St. Paul, the University of Minnesota, and many city departments. This committee collaborated with consultants, who produced a Master Plan for the Southeast Industrial Area and an Alternative Urban Area-Wide Review (AUAR), which will serve as an Environmental Impact Statement for development in the area as the Master Plan is implemented. This plan was adopted by the SEED committee and formally approved by the City Council. Working with an architectural city design group, PPERIA and the SEED committee began to detail the construction techniques and materials that would

be environmentally sound and economically feasible for potential developers within the Southeast Industrial Area. The total cost for both projects was \$29,475. The remainder of funds was reallocated within the plan.

Business/Jobs C.2. Conduct a study along University Avenue business corridor

PPERRIA convened a number of University Avenue business representatives, as well as members of the Southeast Business Association (SEBA) to discuss and address concerns about further development along University Avenue. Ultimately, however, the funds allocated to study this commercial corridor further were reallocated elsewhere in the plan.

## PARKS, ARTS, RECREATION AND CULTURE (PARC)

While there is no single PPERRIA committee devoted to the development and management of area parks, arts, recreation and culture, a variety of groups have overseen the funds in this section of the NRP Plan. The Tower Hill Park Committee has worked to not only beautify and increase safety at Tower Hill Park, but has taken on the additional challenge of preserving the historic buildings and green spaces within the neighborhood boundaries. The Luxton Park Council is composed of neighborhood residents and interested parties who provide funds, organization and coaches, and support for Luxton Park's staff and programs. Pratt Council and Pratt Community Education have been involved in supporting youth programs both at Pratt and Luxton, especially Summer Splash and Winter Splash. A number of popular activities and new programs have originated through the use of neighborhood NRP funds and these groups have reported successful results in their programming efforts.

PARC A.1.a. Provide Luxton Park Council staff person and support programs at Luxton

### **LUXTON PARK COUNCIL STAFF AND PROGRAMS**

Between 1995-98, Luxton Park supervised a part-time staff person, who worked closely with Luxton Park staff to facilitate and run youth programs and special events at the park. This staff person coordinated existing programs, but did little grant writing or outreach. In mid-1998, the Council decided to address the need for outside funding (besides NRP) and provide volunteer outreach and program opportunities to the community. In 2001, additional funds were reallocated to this strategy. Some of these funds will provide activities such as youth fishing clinics; others will be used to purchase audiovisual equipment for community movies at the park and other uses. In February, 2003, the Council and PPERRIA approved a reallocation of remaining funds (\$10,919.85) to other PARC strategies and Luxton Park kiosk).

### **MOTHERREAD/FATHERREAD**

In late 1997, \$10,000 was set aside to start a Motherread/Fatherread program at Luxton Park. This nationally acclaimed program features a trained parent/reader who provides free books for children and a related art or craft activity as part of an ongoing reading support process. Southeast Area Way to Grow facilitated this program and provided trained readers, books and activity materials during 1998. They also distributed free books during the neighborhood Fire and Ice Festival in February 1998. All unspent funds were reallocated in 2001.



#### PARC A.1.b. Support sport camps at Luxton

##### **LUXTON SPORTS CAMPS**

Luxton Park Council sponsored several sports camps during 1995-97 with the use of \$5,000 in NRP funds. These clinics acted as a feeder for park program participation during the year. The basketball camp for girls was especially successful. Youth have enhanced their skills to the point where they have now experienced out-of-town tournaments. Because children in the neighborhood attend so many different schools, participation in park programs not only has increased their skills but also has provided an opportunity to meet other children from the neighborhood. The children also benefited from having contact with numerous player-coaches who modeled both good athletic performance techniques and good attitudes toward school and work. However, despite publicity efforts, many neighborhood children remain unaware of the camps/programs. Also, many clinics are held at off-site facilities and require transportation. Luxton Park Council plans to sponsor several more clinics with the remainder of its funds and will look into transportation arrangements.

#### PARC A.1.c. Ensure adequate equipment/facilities to maximize participation in sports

##### **LUXTON SPORTS EQUIPMENT**

NRP funds of \$3,180 have enabled Luxton Park to update the Luxton Park scoreboard, purchase uniforms for new sports teams and provided needed equipment for sports and classes at Luxton. The uniforms have been particularly important to build a sense of park identity, thereby increasing self-esteem and enthusiasm among youth participants. They have helped to establish programs, so that those programs and activities can be more self-sustaining. For example, the basketball and soccer programs at Luxton have become increasingly popular and well attended. Funds have been used to upgrade and purchase equipment for basketball, soccer, field hockey, baseball, and adult aerobics classes. In February, 2003, PPERRIA approved a reallocation of \$3,919.85 for additional purchases of sports equipment for the park. Remaining funds will be used to inventory park equipment in order to identify future needs.

#### PARC A.1.d. Develop a computer skills classroom at Luxton Park

##### **LUXTON COMPUTER CLASSROOM**

Luxton Park Council has used \$12,225 in NRP funds and additional funds from private sources for hardware and software in the Luxton Computer Classroom. This classroom has been a significant asset to the community, and to date, volunteers have supervised the room. Youth use the computers for homework and adults have used them for help with resumes and job seeking. Funds reallocated in 2001 and 2003 (additional \$5,000), along with some private grants, will enable Luxton Park Council to continue to upgrade the equipment and provide a paid staff supervisor to oversee the room.

#### PARC A.1.e. Develop new youth program during winter months

##### **WINTER SPLASH**

Over two winters in 1996-8, PPERRIA spent \$30,000 to develop and implement a new school-age youth program based at Luxton Park. This program, "Winter Splash," was modeled after the successful summer youth activities program sponsored by Pratt and Luxton, with the use of community education, school, park, and private resources. Although the participants had fun on the outings, attendance was not as great as hoped. During the school year there are many activities in which kids may participate, and Winter

Splash had trouble competing. A key component to participation was the offer of subsidies to low-income youth. The first year saw more attendance per event than the second. No further Winter Splash programs have been planned or implemented.

#### PARC B.1. Increase arts and cultural activities in neighborhood

*See Livability A.1.*

#### PARC B.2. Increase appreciation and preservation of neighborhood landmarks

### **HISTORIC DISTRICT SURVEY**

The Water Tower was designated an historic building by the Minneapolis Preservation Commission. Through the efforts of the Tower Hill Park Committee, the Water Tower and the Park were placed on the National Registry of Historic Places. The cost for the work on the National Registry was \$5000. The Committee then sought a designation of an historic district within the Prospect Park East River Road neighborhood. In mid-2001 the firm of Hess Roise completed Phase I of a two step process. This used \$23,310 in NRP funds and additional private funds. (A small amount of NRP funds were spent to prepare greeting cards of Tower Hill Park in order to raise additional private funds.) The boundaries for the historic district were determined. As of Feb 04, fund raising for the second phase was underway to complete the work needed to have Prospect Park placed on the National and Local Registry as a Historic District. The committee strongly believes that designation of a majority of the neighborhood land as historic will preserve the residential nature of the area and protect the neighborhood from unwanted encroachment by industry or development. Several residential areas were left out of the designation. The committee hopes to raise additional funds for a future survey of the East River Parkway area to determine its historic significance.

### **NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY PROJECT**

Various residents and members of the PPERRIA NRP History Committee have worked since early 2000 to write the history of the neighborhood from different perspectives. Currently, the group has a working outline of the project, and an editor has been hired to complete the writing and editing of the book. Publication is expected by June, 2003, for a total NRP expenditure of \$4,000. Remaining NRP funds of \$2,001 will be used for expenses related to the writing and publishing of the book.

#### PARC C.1. Continue development of East River Gorge Park

The Minneapolis Parks Department expanded the boardwalk extending from East River Gorge to East River Flats Parks. This was independent of NRP action or funds. Although a citizen advisory group advocated a narrow, ecologically-sensitive footpath, the Park Board worked with the Minneapolis Public Works Department, Sewer Division, to create the paved walkway which was eventually built.

#### PARC C.2. Develop bike facilities in and through the neighborhood

Three bike initiatives have been accomplished in the neighborhood:

1. Bike racks have been installed at Pratt School;
2. The re-designed intersection at Franklin/East River Parkway/27<sup>th</sup> Avenue has provided better lane definition for both drivers and bicyclists; however, sensors installed to detect presence of a car in a lane in order to expedite traffic signal changes during different times of the day are

unable to detect the presence of bicyclists, resulting in cyclists having difficulty moving through the intersection;

3. A policy to prohibit bicyclists from riding on sidewalks was enacted in Stadium Village and Dinkytown in accordance with an already long-standing Minneapolis city ordinance to that effect. Signage was painted on sidewalks near curb cuts and notices posted in numerous business windows and some violators have been ticketed.

In fall 2001, a citizen advisory committee was convened to review plans for expanding the bicycle paths on East River Parkway in Minneapolis to continue the path from St. Paul. There was considerably controversy and disappointment about the design the Park Board had submitted for funding, as it differed significantly from the East River Gorge Master Plan. Construction is planned for 2002.

None of the above projects have required use of NRP funds. In addition, none of the development of further bicycle facilities in and throughout the neighborhood (including the Stone Arch Bridge connections, University bikeways, Midtown Greenway, completion of the Park Board's Grand Rounds Parkways, and bike facilities identified in the East River Gorge Master Plan) has been fully or optimally implemented as envisioned in the NRP Plan.

## ADMINISTRATION AND STAFF SUPPORT

As a part of its NRP Action Plan, PPERRIA chose to maximize use of volunteers and committees/groups to oversee projects and to minimize paid staff and office support. As a result, only approximately 4% of NRP Plan funds (or 7% when funds from other strategies involving staff are added in) have been earmarked for administration. This figure is low when compared with other neighborhoods with full-time paid staff and which rent or own office space and equipment. PPERRIA has managed to leverage support through dedicated and active volunteers throughout the community, including a volunteer board, executive committee and officers.

### Administration 1.a. Provide coordinated staff support

#### **IMPLEMENTATION COORDINATOR**

Since 1995, PPERRIA has had at least one part-time Implementation Coordinator, whose duties range from coordination of projects with committees to liaison with city offices and affected jurisdictions to support of PPERRIA functions (such as meetings, newsletter, calendar, use of equipment, mailings, publicity, and clerical support) to coordination of the work of specific project staff. All staff, including the Implementation Coordinator, are paid as independent consultants and are solely responsible for billing PPERRIA and paying their own taxes and benefits. A total of \$107,425 has been set aside specifically for the Implementation Coordinator and staff, of which approximately \$150,000 has been spent by March, 2003.

### Administration 2. Provide administrative services and neighborhood resource center

#### **OFFICE AND RESOURCE CENTER**

The NRP Implementation Coordinator and PPERRIA Treasurer (as well as the PPERRIA Executive Committee and Board) oversee the use of funds for office supplies, advertising, newsletter production, bulk mailing expense, telephone expense, and insurance. Total funds allocated to this strategy are

\$31,500, which have currently been spent. PPERRIA has recently reallocated an additional \$3,000 to cover expenses required to implement the plan for the coming 2003-04 year. Currently, as the NRP Plan strategies have mostly been implemented, the Implementation Coordinator is working with the Board to review options for sharing office expenses more evenly with the organization. This will enable PPERRIA to continue to provide a newsletter and purchase supplies even when the NRP funds are depleted. The PPERRIA Treasurer, a volunteer, does the accounting for NRP funds as well as for PPERRIA.

### Administration 3. Establish a neighborhood foundation

The intent of this strategy was to provide legal consultation for a neighborhood foundation to provide funding for a variety of Southeast area organizations. The Consumer Association for Community Action (CACA) is such a foundation, and was formed from the proceeds of the sale of a former Southeast Food Cooperative. Ultimately, CACA received legal advice for free, and funds from this strategy were reallocated elsewhere in the NRP Plan.

## CONTINGENCY FUNDS

All \$60,000 of funds in this strategy were reallocated elsewhere in the NRP Plan and are reflected in the programs described above.

# Reallocation Process 2002-03 for Prospect Park/East River Road Neighborhood Redirection of Housing Funds

Neighborhood changes and growth and the success of many projects forced a re-evaluation of the funds remaining in the Action Plan for Prospect Park/East River Road in early 2003. A total of \$606,268 was eventually identified for reallocation: \$528,000 from Housing A.1, Develop Housing; \$56,940 from Housing B.1, Rehab of Existing Housing; \$5000 from Safety and Security A.1, Block Clubs; and \$16,328 from Transportation B.1, Traffic Calming.

One of the three major sites identified for housing development Kampa Tire corner now has 10 completed housing units, named Bedford Townhomes. This project used \$600,000 of NRP funds and was tied to a second major site, Unocal. That site is currently being developed into East River Mews. The third site, the Watkins Trucking site, is unavailable for housing at present. The amount remaining and identified for reallocation in Housing A.1, Develop Housing was \$538,000. Another \$56,940 was left in Housing B.1, Rehab of Existing Housing, the Motley Area Improvement Program, due to lack of response and the expiration of the contract. In Transportation B.1, Traffic Calming, there are several ongoing projects, but they were not expected to require all the remaining funds and \$16,328 was identified for reallocation, along with \$5000 from Safety and Security A.1, Block Clubs.

Using a neighborhood wide process required by NRP, these funds were reallocated to the following projects: \$495,628 to Education A.1, Neighborhood Learning Center for the expansion of Pratt School, \$85,000 to Education B.1.b, Provide Services for the Somali Women in Minneapolis, and \$25,640 to Education C.1, S.E. Seniors. The reallocation vote was taken at a neighborhood meeting in February, 2003. An overwhelming majority of attendees (191 total residents were in attendance) voted to reallocate the funds as outlined here. As of March, 2004, these funds have all been contracted. However, the future of Pratt School and the funds contracted for its expansion are uncertain due to a proposal by the Minneapolis School Board Superintendent to close the Pratt and a number of other schools. A surge of public protest over the proposal and support for neighborhood schools has forced the School Board to reevaluate the proposal, but given the current budget shortfall in the Minneapolis Public schools, the future of Pratt is currently as risk.

The timetable used for the Reallocation Process: is as follows:

**Summer, 2002** – Brighton Development Corporation and MCDA announced the successful approval of the East River Mews townhouse development project with NO use of NRP funds needed to complete site renovation & cleanup or construction of market-rate housing

**September 9, 2002** – PPERRIA Executive Committee approved a task force to direct the process by which over \$600,000 in unspent NRP funds would be reallocated. Task force included: Steve Cross, Mary Alice Kopf, and Implementation Coordinator Susan Gottlieb.

**September 11, 2002** – Task Force met with NRP Staffer Barbara Lickness to review necessary procedures and guidelines for reallocating funds. Barb indicated the consequences for using housing funds other than for housing strategies.

**September 23, 2002** – Linda Donaldson of Brighton Development Corporation briefed PPERRIA Board and members on tentative timetable for site renovation (fall 2002) and start of construction (anticipated spring 2003). Susan Gottlieb informed the Board and membership about the NRP Reallocation Process.

**October, 2002** – Task Force established tentative meeting agenda, amount to be considered for reallocation, forms for proposal submission, and process by which individuals and/or committees in the neighborhood could submit proposals for consideration by the neighborhood.

Ad regarding a series of meetings was published in the *Southeast Angle*.

Using labels provided by Council Member Paul Zerby for all residential and business addresses in the neighborhood, Task Force sent meeting notice, tentative agenda, consequences, and proposal forms to all area households and businesses by bulk mail. Meeting date at which proposals would be *discussed* set for December 10, 2002.

**December 10, 2002** – Neighborhood-wide meeting 7:00-10:00 PM at St. Frances Cabrini Church, to discuss 25 proposals for reallocation. In attendance were 141 neighborhood residents and 18 non-residents/guests, as well as Barb Lickness. At meeting, a straw poll of preference demonstrated an overwhelming support for three proposals in particular: Pratt School Renovation, Somali Women in Minnesota (SWIM) program, and Southeast Seniors program. Motion was made to include these three proposals as the starting-point for discussion in the next meeting at which a vote would be taken.

**December, 2002** – Second bulk mailing to all area households and businesses sent. Notice also given in *Southeast Angle* and PPERRIA newsletter. This notice informed residents of second meeting on February 4, 2003 at which vote for reallocation would occur.

**January-February, 2003** – Some proposal sponsors amended their proposals to better reflect legal guidelines issued by NRP/city lawyer.

**February 4, 2003** – Neighborhood-wide meeting held 7:00-9:00 PM at St. Frances Cabrini Church and attended by 195 residents, including 33 PPERRIA Board members, and 24 non-residents/guests. Also in attendance were Barb Lickness from NRP and Somali translator to help communicate proceedings and information to large contingent of Somali women and men present. A number of possible combinations of strategies to be funded through reallocation, including two involving housing loan/grant programs, were suggested and failed to secure a majority of votes. Final vote was taken to fund Pratt School Renovation, SWIM program, and Southeast Seniors program and passed by large majority.

**February 6, 2003** – Letter reflecting neighborhood and PPERRIA Board vote on February 4, 2003, was written and sent to NRP.

**March 3, 2003** – Memorandum sent from Robert Miller, NRP Director to the NRP Policy Board informing the Board of the reallocation request, affirming that the correct NRP procedures were followed, and recommending that the Policy Board approve the request to modify the Prospect Park Neighborhood Action Plan as Plan Modification #17.

**April 21, 2003** – NRP Policy Board approved the request for Plan Modification #17 to the Neighborhood Action Plan.

#### Important Considerations in Vote:

- Throughout the process, the neighborhood was informed (in both mailings and at both meetings) as to the consequences for moving housing funds to other strategies. Despite these consequences, the neighborhood and PPERRIA Board voted to move the funds.
- One strong reason cited for moving Housing Redevelopment funds was the fact that private development, along with the MCDA, had already addressed, without NRP help, the large redevelopment sites identified in our Prospect Park East River Road NRP Action Plan, approved July, 1995. Also, the Motley Housing Home Ownership and Home Improvement Loan program had been available to residents in that area of the neighborhood between 1998-2002. Despite active appeals by the program administrator – MCDA in the first segment of the program, GMHC in the second – statistically few homeowner occupants applied for the loans.
- Another argument, cited by many neighborhood residents, for not supporting a local, broader home improvement loan/grant program centered on:
  - currently low interest rates,
  - high housing values in the area,

- limited numbers of residents who might qualify under the income guidelines and other home ownership requirements suggested by each housing improvement program proposal submitted for consideration. *(For example, none of the proposals suggested a way in which Glendale residents might qualify for home improvement funds, yet Glendale residents would strongly benefit from social service and school-related investments)*

## NRP Phase I Evaluation Survey of the Prospect Park/East River Road Neighborhood

The following survey is being conducted in an effort to evaluate the Prospect Park/East River Road Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP). This survey was created with the assistance of the Carlson School of Management, at the University of Minnesota. Your responses are vital to the future of this program, and all responses are confidential. The results of this survey will be included in our report to the City of Minneapolis NRP committee, and will be published in the Southeast Angle, the PPERRIA Newsletter, the neighborhood e-list and the PPERRIA website.

Completed surveys should be sent to PPERRIA, 66 Malcolm Ave. SE, or dropped off at Pratt Community Education Center, Schneider Drug or Luxton Park. The deadline to submit a survey response is November 30<sup>th</sup>.

### Part 1: NRP Program Awareness / Involvement

In this section, we are looking for your awareness of the NRP program, your involvement with the program, and your satisfaction with the communication of planning meetings. Please rate the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all to 5 being very:

Not at all	Some what	Very
---------------	--------------	------

How familiar are you with the NRP program?  
1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How involved have you been with the NRP planning/implementation?  
1-----2-----3-----4-----5

Have you been notified of planning meetings for the NRP?  
1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied have you been thus far with the communication of NRP programs?  
1-----2-----3-----4-----5

Do you have any comments you would like to share regarding your knowledge, involvement, or awareness of the NRP program?

### Part 2: Reactions to NRP Phase I Projects

In this section, we are looking at particular projects that have been accomplished through the use of the NRP program. Please consider each project individually. These projects are listed in no particular order. Please rate the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all to 5 being very.

#### Project 1: Pratt Community Center Renovation/Improvements

In the fall of 2000, the Pratt Community School was re-opened. By 2006, the school will host grades K-5 and remain under 200 students.

Not at all	Some what	Very
---------------	--------------	------

How aware are you that the Pratt Community School re-opened in fall of 2000?  
1-----2-----3-----4-----5



How aware are you that the NRP program was vital in this accomplishment?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used in the funding for this program?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied were you with the ability to have your voice heard during the planning of this program?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

Do you have any additional comments regarding this project?

**Project 2: Tower Hill Park Improvements**

The Tower Hill Park Committee has overseen several planting and renovation projects at the park, including the planting of wildflowers to help prevent erosion and create a more attractive environment, and to install pavers and plantings at the base of the tower.

Not                      Some                      Very  
at all                      what

How aware are you of the Tower Hill Park Improvements?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How aware are you that the NRP program was vital in this accomplishment?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used in the funding for this program?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied were you with the ability to have your voice heard during the planning of this program?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

Do you have any additional comments regarding this project?

**Project 3: Improved Sidewalk Lighting**

PPERRIA worked with the city of Minneapolis to install lower-level lights to replace the high-level streetlights.

Not                      Some                      Very  
at all                      what

How aware are you that the lower-level street lights were installed?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How aware are you that the NRP program was vital in this accomplishment?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used in the funding for this program?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied were you with the ability to have your voice heard during the planning of this program?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

Do you have any additional comments regarding this project?

#### **Project 4: Luxton Park Computer Classroom**

The Luxton Park Council purchased new hardware and software for the Luxton Computer Classroom. NRP funds and additional funds from private sources were used for this program.

Not                      Some                      Very  
at all                      what

How aware are you that the Luxton Computer Classroom replaced hardware and software?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How aware are you that the NRP program was vital in this accomplishment?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used in the funding for this program?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied were you with the ability to have your voice heard during the planning of this program?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

Do you have any additional comments regarding this project?

#### **Additional Projects:**

For these projects, please rate your awareness of the project and your satisfaction with the use of NRP funds for each project. Following these projects there is room available for comments specific to any particular project.

Not                      Some                      Very  
at all                      what

How satisfied are you with the redesign of the intersections at Franklin/East River Pkwy/E. 27th, and Malcolm/Orlin?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used for the redesign of these intersections?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied are you with the neighborhood directory?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used for the neighborhood directory?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied are you with the support of Care & Share Foodshelf?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used to support the Care & Share Foodshelf?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

What other projects are you aware of that the NRP has accomplished?

How satisfied are you with those projects?

Any other comments regarding the NRP projects that you would like to share?

### Part 3: Future Programs

Is there anything you would suggest to improve your neighborhood should future NRP funds be available?

Is there anything you would suggest to improve the process by which NRP funding is used?

### Part 4: Demographic Information

This information is only used for the analysis of the study.

Gender:        \_\_\_ Male                    # of Children Living at residence \_\_\_  
                 \_\_\_ Female                # of Adults Living at residence \_\_\_

Age:  
\_\_\_ 18-24                    Do you rent or own your home?    Rent \_\_\_                    Own \_\_\_  
\_\_\_ 25-34  
\_\_\_ 35-44

\_\_\_ 45-54                    How long have you lived in the Prospect Park/ East River Road  
\_\_\_ 55 +                      Neighborhood?    \_\_\_ years

Ethnic Background: \_\_\_ American Indian    \_\_\_ Chicano (Mexican American)  
                         \_\_\_ Asian                                    \_\_\_ Other Hispanic Origin  
                         \_\_\_ Black                                    \_\_\_ White (non-Hispanic Origin)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey for the PPERRIA Neighborhood Revitalization Project (NRP) evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will be a part of the information included in the Phase I report and will help put in place the Phase II NRP process.

# Summary of the Results of the Phase I Evaluation Survey of the Prospect Park/East River Road Neighborhood

A survey of the Prospect Park/East River Road Neighborhood was taken during the month of November, 2003. The survey was conducted in an effort to evaluate neighborhood reaction to the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) in the Prospect Park/East River Road neighborhood. The survey was created with the assistance of students from the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota, who selected the projects to be included in the survey, the questions to be asked, and the numerical ratings. The survey was made available to the community in a number of ways. Copies of the survey were placed at Pratt Community Education Center, Luxton Park, and Schneider Drug Store and at the Bazaar and Art Fair held at the Prospect Park United Methodist Church. It was sent out via e-mail to neighborhood residents who signed up to be on the Community e-list, and it was available on the PPERRIA website. Surveys were also available at the October and November Membership/Board of Directors meetings of PPERRIA. The survey was announced on the e-list, at PPERRIA meetings and by flyers at various neighborhood locations.

A copy of the survey is attached. It was composed of 3 types of questions: 1) questions with a numerical rating system, i.e. participants were asked to rate a question on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all to 5 being very, 2) questions with space for written comments, and 3) questions asking for demographic information. All survey responses were anonymous. Note: A category of response, N/A, was added during analysis of this study. This category was used for those survey questions which were left blank on completed surveys.

As of the Nov 30, 2003 deadline, 75 completed surveys were submitted. A summary of the results follows. Percentages do not always add up to 100 due to rounding.

## Part 1: NRP Program Awareness / Involvement

Numerical ratings:

1 (not at all)    2                      3(somewhat)    4                      5 (very)            N/A

How familiar are you with the NRP program?

4 %                  7 %                  32 %                  23 %                  34 %                  0 %

How involved have you been with the NRP planning/implementation?

26 %                  29 %                  19 %                  7 %                  19 %                  0 %

Have you been notified of planning meetings for the NRP?

7 %                  8 %                  12 %                  30 %                  41 %                  3 %

How satisfied have you been thus far with the communication of NRP programs?

5 %                  8 %                  16 %                  31 %                  36 %                  3 %

Looking at the responses of 3 to 5, somewhat to very, the majority of the respondents, 89%, were familiar with the NRP program, 83% were notified of planning meetings and 83% were satisfied with the communication of NRP programs; only 45% were involved with the NRP planning and implementation. Looking at it from another angle, more than 5 times as many respondents were familiar with the program, were notified and were satisfied with the communication (as indicated by a response of 4 or 5) than those who were not familiar with the program, not notified and not satisfied (as indicated by a response of 1 or 2). Twice as many respondents were uninvolved (a response of 1 or 2) than involved (response of 4 or 5).

Of 13 written comments in this section, 5 were positive, 5 were negative, and 3 were neutral. They ranged from satisfaction with the communication process, involvement by neighbors, and the projects carried out to dissatisfaction with NRP, the city, and/or the neighborhood people involved. Two respondents felt the survey should have asked separate questions on the planning and implementation processes.

## Part 2: Reactions to NRP Phase I Projects

Seven projects were specifically included in the survey. Listing the projects from the highest average numerical rating to the lowest, they were: 1) Pratt Community Center Renovation/Improvements, 2) Improved Sidewalk Lighting, 3) Tower Hill Park

Improvements, 4) Care & Share Foodshelf, 5) Neighborhood directory, 6) Intersection redesign, and 7) Luxton Park Computer Classroom.

Listing the same projects from the highest to lowest number of comments, they were: Improved Sidewalk Lighting (21 comments), Pratt Community Center Renovation/Improvements (17 comments), Neighborhood Directory (13 comments), Tower Hill Park Improvements (12 comments), Luxton Park Computer Classroom (9 comments), Care & Share Foodshelf (8 comments), and Intersection redesign (6 comments). Only Improved Sidewalk Lighting and Intersection redesign had a majority of negative comments.

**Project 1: Pratt Community Center Renovation/Improvements**

Numerical ratings:

1 (not at all)    2                    3(somewhat)    4                    5 (very)            N/A

How aware are you that the Pratt Community School re-opened in fall of 2000?

0 %            0 %            8 %            7 %            85 %            0 %

How aware are you that the NRP program was vital in this accomplishment?

4 %            3 %            11 %            10 %            71 %            1%

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used in the funding for this program?

1 %            0 %            10 %            15 %            70 %            4 %

How satisfied were you with the ability to have your voice heard during the planning of this program?

8 %            5 %            10 %            19 %            49 %            8 %

This was the project with the highest approval rating, both in numerical responses and in written comments. Looking at those who selected a rating of 4 or 5, 92% were aware that the school was reopened, 81% were aware that NRP funds were vital for the project, 85% were satisfied that NRP funds were used, and 68% were satisfied with their ability to be heard in the process.

Of 17 written comments in this section, 10 were positive, 3 were negative, 2 were neutral, and 2 were difficult to categorize. Those with positive comments felt that it was important to have a school in the neighborhood and that it was a very good use of the funds. The 3 negative comments concerned the process used to plan/decide on this project.

**Project 2: Tower Hill Park Improvements**

Numerical ratings:

1 (not at all)    2                    3(somewhat)    4                    5 (very)            N/A

How aware are you of the Tower Hill Park Improvements?

12 %            1 %            23 %            30 %            34 %            0 %

How aware are you that the NRP program was vital in this accomplishment?

18 %            3 %            20 %            20 %            38 %            1 %

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used in the funding for this program?

3 %            0 %            20 %            19 %            58 %            1 %

How satisfied were you with the ability to have your voice heard during the planning of this program?

11 %            4 %            18 %            21 %            37 %            10 %

Of 12 written comments in this section, 6 were positive, 1 was negative, 4 were neutral, and 1 was difficult to categorize. The neutral comments were that the respondents were not involved, and the 1 negative comment was from a respondent who would have preferred a playground over a tennis court. The positive comments stated that the project was necessary and worth the money spent.

**Project 3: Improved Sidewalk Lighting**

Numerical ratings:

1 (not at all)    2                    3(somewhat)    4                    5 (very)            N/A

How aware are you that the lower-level street lights were installed?					
5 %	0 %	3 %	5 %	86 %	0 %
How aware are you that the NRP program was vital in this accomplishment?					
5 %	0 %	7 %	11 %	74 %	3 %
How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used in the funding for this program?					
7 %	0 %	8 %	11 %	73 %	1 %
How satisfied were you with the ability to have your voice heard during the planning of this program?					
7 %	4 %	9 %	12 %	58 %	9 %

This project sparked much controversy in the neighborhood. Looking at those who selected a rating of 4 or 5, 91% were aware of the project and 85% were aware that the NRP program was vital to accomplish this project. Given the controversy, it might be expected that far fewer respondents would give a positive response to the next 2 questions, yet 84% were satisfied that NRP funds were used for this project and 79% were satisfied with their ability to be heard in the planning of the lighting.

Of 21 written comments in this section, some were directed toward the lights, some toward the decision process, and some commented on both, so for purposes of analysis, each comment was rated positive, negative or no comment for each aspect. Lights: 10 were positive, 2 were negative, and 9 did not comment on the lights specifically. Decision process: there were no positive comments, 16 were negative, and 5 did not comment on the process specifically. Of those 16 negative comments on the decision process, 5 blamed NRP, PPERRIA, and/or the city, 5 blamed those opposed to lighting, and 6 did not specify who they thought was to blame but noted the controversy.

**Project 4: Luxton Park Computer Classroom**

Numerical ratings:  
 1 (not at all)    2                    3(somewhat)    4                    5 (very)            N/A

How aware are you that the Luxton Computer Classroom replaced hardware and software?					
32%	13%	23%	12%	20%	0%
How aware are you that the NRP program was vital in this accomplishment?					
28%	13%	15%	16%	23%	5%
How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used in the funding for this program?					
4%	7%	20%	27%	36%	5%
How satisfied were you with the ability to have your voice heard during the planning of this program?					
16%	5%	20%	12%	24%	22%

There was not a broad awareness of this project. In the first two questions on awareness, roughly equal numbers of respondents used a rating of 1 or 2 and 4 or 5. However, 63% used a 4 or 5 when asked if they were satisfied that NRP funds were used, and 21% used a 1 or 2 when asked if they were satisfied with their voice being heard in the planning.

Of 9 written comments in this section, 5 were positive, 2 were negative, and 2 were neutral. One of the negative comments concerned Luxton as a whole and not the computer classroom specifically.

**Additional Projects**

Fewer questions were asked concerning the following three additional projects.

Numerical ratings:  
 1 (not at all)    2                    3(somewhat)    4                    5 (very)            N/A

**Intersection Redesign**

How satisfied are you with the redesign of the intersections at Franklin/East River Pkwy/E. 27th, and Malcolm/Orlin?					
15%	9%	31%	23%	14%	7%
How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used for the redesign of these intersections?					
11%	12%	24%	24%	25%	4%

In the 6 written comments in this section, several rated the two projects individually. There were 1 positive and 3 negative comments on the Franklin/East River Road E. /27<sup>th</sup> intersection and 1 positive and 1 negative comment on the Malcolm/Orlin

intersection. One comment was contradictory – it said the latter was a poor compromise and the latter was good. One respondent was not aware of the redesign project.

### **Neighborhood Directory**

How satisfied are you with the neighborhood directory?

9%            5%            13%            24%            32%            16%

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used for the neighborhood directory?

7%            4%            13%            24%            41%            11%

Of the 13 written comments in this section, 9 had never heard of the directory, 2 were very pleased with it, 1 felt it should be updated and 1 respondent never had occasion to use it. Of the 9 who hadn't heard of the directory, 1 would be delighted if it were available and 1 felt it was "apparently done for a few people and not for the benefit of all residents." It may be noted that the directory was one of the first projects completed and was perhaps forgotten by some people.

### **Care & Share Foodshelf**

How satisfied are you with the support of Care & Share Foodshelf?

7%            3%            19%            18%            39%            15%

How satisfied are you that NRP funds were used to support the Care & Share Foodshelf?

8%            1%            18%            16%            41%            16%

Of 8 written comments in this section, 5 were unaware of the food shelf, 2 were unaware that NRP funds were used (of which was dissatisfied with the level of support for the food shelf), and 1 stated it should have been federally funded.

### **Other Projects:**

When asked what other projects NRP has accomplished that they were aware of, 25 respondents replied, listing a total of 17 projects. Projects listed, with the number of respondents naming it in parenthesis include: housing or housing redevelopment (7), SWIM (4), SE Seniors (4), gardens (4), speed bumps (4), remodel Pratt (3), signs (3), history project (1), Luxton sports equipment (1), music programs (1), environmental coordinator/anti-pollution efforts (4), jobs program at Glendale (1), Bookmobile books (1), buckthorn removal (1), neighborhood cleanup (1), and "various" or no specific projects listed (6). There were 31 positive comments on specific projects and 2 negative (SWIM and housing).

### **Other Comments:**

When asked for any other comments, 18 people responded. Since these responses varied greatly, they are listed here, in no particular order:

1. NRP projects have greatly improved neighborhood and encouraged residents to make improvements.
2. Be very cautious about "the process". The street light process was divisive.
3. The volunteers and paid staff did a great job. There were hundreds of volunteer hours. I appreciate their efforts especially those who worked on reopening the school and getting the streetlights.
4. NRP has made a very important positive difference in our neighborhood.
5. Things happen with NRP funds. You write you're trying to help people. Programs need to be monitored and Glendale needs more help with the care and share food shelf.
6. I think NRP decisions are made by a small group and that ordinary citizens are not involved.
7. Basically NRP has really helped in reversing the downward slide of our neighborhood.

8. See letter about Care and Share food shelf and not many supporters (This comment was written at the very bottom of the survey, not under any question – it seems to fit under this question. No indication was given as to where the letter referred to may be found.)
9. Reallocation process was painful and frustrating; number of projects proposed from outside neighborhood was staggering.
10. Housing development was the biggest capital project. How come this survey completely fails to mention housing?
11. Plan funds needed for housing improvement went to other programs.
12. The design of the Franklin bridge intersection is OK, but the painting of lane lines is NOT OK at all.
13. NRP funds that are used to accomplish improvements that local agencies would be (or should be) doing anyway pit organized groups against each other and don't reflect special neighborhood needs. In the process, more heat than light can be generated.
14. I live on East River Terrace and save for the lighting, am unaware of any other funds having been spent in that area.
15. The answers above should allow for "I don't know" you ask how satisfied I am about something, such as the food shelf, and I don't know anything about it. How can I be "satisfied"?
16. The neighborhood can be very proud of the many NRP projects accomplished in spite of frustration and long hours of hard work. The reopening of the elementary school at Pratt and the renovation of the Pratt building and support for continuing use for the whole community will assure the continued viability of the Prospect Park/Glendale neighborhood.
17. The NRP funds have been a huge boon to our neighborhood and I am opposed to any move by the city of Minneapolis to diminish this program in favor of more centralized fiscal management. This program brings balance between city hall and the neighborhoods. It is essential that NRP continue to be funded.
18. Eliminate the NRP!

### Part 3: Future Programs

#### **Is there anything you would suggest to improve your neighborhood should future NRP funds be available?**

There were 31 responses to this question, many of which concerned the neighborhood's appearance (landscaping/green space, railroad tracks, power lines, lighting), housing, support for neighborhood groups and institutions (Pratt, SE Seniors, Luxton, Glendale, Care and Share Foodshelf), and traffic and noise issues (sound walls, traffic calming, work on intersections, parking). Also mentioned were community building events, community learning and historic designation. One respondent wanted to abolish NRP.

All of the following ideas were mentioned by one respondent, unless another number is noted in parenthesis: preserve green space; remove weeds on park land near E River Rd and railroad bridge; buckthorn removal; add landscape definition to Tower Hill Park entry; replace retaining wall on Williams Ave; add boulevard plantings on University Ave; attract neighborhood friendly retail, especially on University Ave (2); remove railroad tracks across Franklin; monitor undesirable activity near railroad tracks; bury power and phone lines (2); add lighting in dark areas; pedestrian lighting on East River Road; add welcome signs at the Franklin Ave entrances to Prospect Park; housing (loans for exterior home repair, housing on edges of neighborhood, loans and grants to improve housing, especially for the elderly) (3); air conditioning for Luxton (3); support athletic teams at Luxton; more help for Glendale and Care and Share Foodshelf; more help to SE Seniors (2); more support for Pratt (2); more support to develop 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of Pratt (2); expanded playground at Pratt; put a playground in the park; add a sound



wall on Interstate 94 (2); improve the Franklin/East River Road intersection; possibly add more traffic lights on Franklin Ave; work on traffic/speeding problems (3); traffic calming on the river parkway and University Avenues; a road(s) through the SE industrial area from University to Como; upkeep of intersection of Cecil and E River Parkway; control and monitor parking; community building events; community learning; historic designation for the neighborhood; abolish NRP.

### **Is there anything you would suggest to improve the process by which NRP funding is used?**

There were 13 responses to this question, which are transcribed below.

1. No, PPERRRIA leans over backwards to be fair.
2. Continue to publicize and welcome community input.
3. There is a major problem with a few very angry residents – there may be no solution, since they do not want to help the process, they want to win and to beat everyone else up. But is it very unfortunate for the neighborhood. I cannot propose a solution.
4. Make sure that the rules used to carry out a process are not changed during the process! This happened during the street level lights project because Council Member Campbell arbitrarily intervened – and angered many neighbors
5. Ethics, New Leadership
6. Deliver notice to everyone in the neighborhood at least a month in advance. Funds allocated for operating expenses or agencies that extend beyond the neighborhood should only be eligible for funds left over after activities/improvements are funded. Or put it back into the city funds to restrain tax increases.
7. More logistic assistance from city offices that have less responsibility since volunteers and NRP employees are doing the work of neighborhood revitalization.
8. Eliminate the NRP and return the funds to the city budget. This is not to say that neighborhood input should not be solicited and considered, but rather that professionals should be running these projects, not the very selfish and non-representative officers of neighborhood associations. Even bureaucracies are more responsive than PPERRRIA has been!!
9. Have planning development done by city planners and professionals, not neighborhood fanatics.
10. Better integration of process with normal city government through neighborhoods or regional area coordinators working directly with citizens instead of a centrally based NRP staff, i.e., less people downtown and more accessible to folks.
11. Reduce the amount of paperwork required for funding projects
12. More sensitivity where there is the prospect of increasing tax levy
13. Support NOISE Barrier all along the freeway!

### **Demographics**

Gender: 36% male, 63% female, 1% no answer.

Number of children in household: 73% no children, 9% 1 child, 7% 2 children, 1% 3 children, 9% no answer.

Number of adults in household: 24% 1 adult, 63% 2 adults, 3% 3 adults, 11% no answer.

Age of respondent: 0% under 25, 1% 25-34, 13% 35-44, 25% 45-54, 56% 55 or over, 4% no answer. (81% were age 45 or older)

Home ownership: 81% homeowners, 8% renters, 11% no answer.

Number of years living in the neighborhood: 7% 0-2, 9% 6-10, 17% 11-20, 13% 21-30, 31% 30 or more, 17% no answer. (62% had lived in the neighborhood over 20 years.)

Ethnic background: 7% Black, 87% white, 7% no answer

Results were tabulated and summarized by Joyce Barta, NRP Implementation Coordinator for the Prospect Park/East River Road neighborhood.