

## **Request for City Council Committee Action**

Date: December 13, 2005

To: Community Development Committee  
Referral to: Ways & Means / Budget Committee

Prepared by: Carsten Slostad (Phone 673-5150)

Approved by: Robert D. Miller, Director \_\_\_\_\_

**Subject: Standish Ericsson Neighborhood  
NRP Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan**

**Summary of the Request:** The Standish Ericsson Neighborhood has completed their NRP Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan. It has been reviewed by NRP's legal counsel and City staff, staff of participating jurisdictions and adopted by the NRP Policy Board. The plan requests a total NRP appropriation of \$1,087,274, which is consistent with the allocation approved for this neighborhood on April 19, 2004. Of that amount, \$86,723 has been advanced to the plan from the NRP Phase II Plan Development Fund. City Council action is now being requested for final approval of the Neighborhood Action Plan and the appropriation of the balance of these funds (\$1,000,551).

### **Recommendation:**

- (1) Approve the Standish Ericsson Neighborhood NRP Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan ("Plan") attached to this report, specifically those parts of the Plan which fall under City jurisdiction, in an amount not to exceed \$1,087,274;
- (2) Amend the City of Minneapolis 2005 General Appropriation Resolution by increasing the Community Planning & Economic Development Department (CPED) agency Fund CNR—NRP Program Fund (CNR0-890-3550) appropriation by \$1,000,551;
- (3) Authorize the appropriate City officers to enter into any contracts or agreements needed to implement this request.

December 13, 2005

The Honorable Lisa Goodman, Chair  
Community Development Committee  
Minneapolis City Council  
315 City Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

The Honorable Barbara Johnson, Chair  
Ways and Means Committee  
Minneapolis City Council  
315 City Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

**Re: Standish Ericsson Neighborhood  
NRP Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan**

Dear Chairpersons Goodman and Johnson:

At its meeting on November 21, 2005 the Neighborhood Revitalization Program Policy Board approved and authorized funding for the Standish Ericsson NRP Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan.

The Standish-Ericsson Neighborhood Action Plan requests a total NRP appropriation of \$1,087,274. Of this amount, \$86,723 was advanced to the Standish-Ericsson Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan from the NRP Phase II Plan Development Fund on September 9, 2003 (\$39,578) and on May 4, 2004 (\$47,145). The 81% housing allocation in the NAP exceeds the required allocation from the April 19, 2004 Policy Board resolution. A draft of the plan was circulated to public staff earlier this fall and comments received have been incorporated in the final NAP. External counsel has also reviewed the plan and needed modifications have been incorporated.

The Phase II Participation Agreement was entered into on September 9, 2003. A random sample survey conducted in the fall of 2003, community input meetings (i.e. "Your 2 Cents" February 2005) and lessons learned in Phase I informed the plan development process.

Plan strategies build on a vision that the combination of amenities, location, physical appeal and housing cost will continue to be driving forces encouraging and attracting neighborhood investment. This theme is rooted in the response to the question, "*Why do you live in the neighborhood?*" The top five choices with the percentage of respondents choosing the asset are:

- Proximity to parks and lakes (63.7 %)
- Appearance of neighborhood (38.8 %)
- Housing is affordable (59.2 %)
- Proximity to downtown (37.4 %)

- Proximity to workplace (43.3 %)

The Honorable Lisa Goodman  
 The Honorable Barbara Johnson  
 December 13, 2005  
 Page 2

The neighborhood was able to look at issues and opportunities identified through the random survey from an overall vantage point and by segments. 38% of survey respondents lived in Households With Income < 80% of the Metropolitan Median Income and 35 % lived in Households With Incomes > 100 % of MMI. 28% lived in Households With Children < 18 years old.

The ability to segment was particularly helpful in the Housing and Development discussions and decisions. The survey asked, *“Since public resources will be limited in the future, neighborhoods may have to make difficult choices about what is important to them. For each of the following categories, please check the box next to one of the four choices you feel is the top concern in that category.”*

As you will see in the following table, the most significant difference between segments is that the Households With Children < 18 chose “eliminating problem properties” equal to “maintaining/improving single family homes.”

	Overall	Households < 80% MMI	Households > 100% MMI	Households w/children < 18
Maintain/improve existing single family housing	42.6	40.0	45.5	32.1
Eliminate problem properties	24.9	20.9	29.7	32.1
Provide home improvement information and resources	14.5	17.3	9.9	22.2
Provide affordable housing	13.5	16.4	12.9	12.3

Other survey information used by the neighborhood to help craft the Neighborhood Action Plan include,

- 1 out of every 3 households agree their home needs some major repairs both inside and outside.
- 5 out of 10 respondents agree with the statement, “All public funds for home improvements should be based on income.” 3 out of 10 disagree with the statement.
- 7 out of 10 respondents disagree with the statement, “ I support increasing the density (more housing units, more households) in the neighborhood.”
- 4 out of 10 people chose Lake Hiawatha Park in response to “Which Park does your household use the most?” They chose water quality and walking/bike paths as the top two improvement needs.
- 7 out of 10 Households With Children < 18 chose either Lake Hiawatha Park or Sibley Park are the park they use the most.
- 8 out 10 people read the SENA newsletter, and 3 out of 10 had attended a SENA event or meeting.

- 44 people were willing to become a SENA volunteer

The Honorable Lisa Goodman

The Honorable Barbara Johnson

December 13, 2005

Page 3

- 66% chose either Nokomis Library or Hiawatha Library in response to “Which Library does your household use the most?”
- 20% of the Households With Incomes < 80% of MMI disagree with the statement, “My monthly housing cost is affordable.”
- 7 out of 10 Households With Children < 18 disagree with the statement “Traffic speeds in my neighborhood are not a problem.” Overall 5 out 10 disagree with the statement.
- 4 out of 10 respondents agree with the statement, “I support building a new Roosevelt Library.” 3 out 10 disagree with the statement.
- 3 out of 10 respondents agree with the statement, “I will regularly use light rail transit (LRT).” 5 out of 10 disagree with the statement.
- 5 out of 10 respondents agree with the statement, “LRT's positive benefits on the neighborhood outweigh the negative.” 2 out of 10 respondents disagree with the statement.

I commend the Standish-Ericsson Neighborhood Association on their diligence in seeking out resident input, analyzing the information they gathered, and preparing and presenting a Neighborhood Action Plan that clearly reflects neighborhood concerns, issues and opportunities.

On November 21, 2005 the Policy Board passed the following resolution:

**WHEREAS:** On April 19, 2004, the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Policy Board (Board) established the Phase II allocation available for the Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods at \$1,087,274 based on the Phase II revenues projected for NRP;

**WHEREAS:** The Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods have conducted an extensive and inclusive Phase II plan development process;

**WHEREAS:** the submitted Standish-Ericsson NRP Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan requests an allocation of \$1,087,274 and dedicates 81% of that allocation to housing programs, projects, services and activities;

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Policy Board (Board) hereby accepts and adopts the Standish-Ericsson Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan dated November 21, 2005;

The Honorable Lisa Goodman  
The Honorable Barbara Johnson  
December 13, 2005  
Page 4

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Board hereby authorizes the Director to: 1) request the City Council and Mayor [a] amend the 2005 General Appropriation Resolution by increasing the Community Planning and Economic Development Department agency Fund CNR – NRP Program Fund (CNR0-890-3550) appropriation by \$1,000,551, and [b] authorize the appropriate City officers to enter into any contract or agreements necessary to implement the activities above; and,

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That up to seventy percent (70 %) of the amount approved for this plan (\$761,092) shall be available for obligation in the first three (3) years after approval of the appropriation for this plan.

Pursuant to this resolution, I make the following recommendations for consideration by your committees:

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- (1) Approve the Standish Ericsson Neighborhood NRP Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan (“Plan”) attached to this report, specifically those parts of the Plan which fall under City jurisdiction, in an amount not to exceed \$1,087,274;
- (2) Amend the City of Minneapolis 2005 General Appropriation Resolution by increasing the Community Planning & Economic Development Department (CPED) agency Fund CNR—NRP Program Fund (CNR0-890-3550) appropriation by \$1,000,551;
- (3) Authorize the appropriate City officers to enter into any contracts or agreements needed to implement this request.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Miller  
Director

## STANDISH-ERICSSON PHASE II NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION PLAN

ACTIVITY	EARLY ACCESS (2002/2005)		2005		NRP	PROGRAM INCOME	PHASE I ROLLOVER	CHANGES
	NRP HOUSING	NRP OTHER	NRP HOUSING	NRP OTHER	PHASE II TOTAL			
<b>HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT (page 4)</b>								
1.A.1. Low/Mod Income Home Improvement Loan Program			200,000		200,000			
1.A.2. Affordable Housing Development			111,000		111,000			
1.A.4. Affordable Housing Education			17,500		17,500			
1.B.1. Senior Housing Needs Market Study			15,000		15,000			
1.B.2. Down Payment/Closing Cost Assistance					0			
1.C.1. Home Improvement Loan Program (>80% MMI)			200,000		200,000			
1.C.3. Emergency Housing Repairs			15,000		15,000			
1.C.5. Problem Properties			1,500		1,500			
2.A.1. Mixed-Use Developments			70,000		70,000			
<b>COMMUNITY AND SAFETY (page 14)</b>								
1.A.1. Implementation Support		86,723		200,551	287,274			
1.A.2. Inform Residents				13,500	13,500			
1.A.3. Neighborhood Review of Projects				1,500	1,500			
1.B.1. Support Community Events				7,000	7,000			
1.B.2. Greet New Neighbors				1,500	1,500			
2.A.1. Support Youth Programming at Parks				6,000	6,000			
3.A.1. Reduce Excessive Traffic Speed				44,000	44,000			
3.A.2. Community Oriented Public Safety Initiative		see ** below			-			
4.A.1. Support Senior Programming				7,500	7,500			
<b>PARKS AND ENVIRONMENT (page 22)</b>								
1.A.1. Protect Water Quality				60,000	60,000			
2.A.1. RiverLake Greenway				10,000	10,000			
<b>LEARNING (page 25)</b>								
1.A.1. School and Community Initiatives				9,000	9,000			
<b>TRANSPORTATION (page 28)</b>								
1.A.1. Pedestrian and Cyclist Improvement Projects				10,000	10,000			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>86,723</b>	<b>630,000</b>	<b>370,551</b>	<b>1,087,274</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	
APPROVED EARLY ACCESS - PLAN DEV'L	86,723				86,723			
<b>ACTION PLAN REQUEST</b>	<b>86,723</b>		<b>1,000,551</b>		<b>1,087,274</b>			
APPROVED COPSI RESERVE FUND **	33,428.57				33,428.57			
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS IN PLAN	86,723		222,551		309,274	28.44%		
ADMIN FUNDS FOR HOUSING					250,443			
TOTAL HOUSING ALLOCATION					880,443	80.98%		
AMOUNT AVAILABLE (70%) IN 1ST 3 YEARS *	86,723		674,369		761,092			

\* - On March 22, 2004, the NRP Policy Board adopted a policy that requires each neighborhood to limit its Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan obligations to no more than 70% of their neighborhood allocation during the first three years following approval of its action plan.

\*\* - The Bancroft, Bryant, Central, Corcoran, Powderhorn Park, Standish and Ericsson Community Oriented Public Safety Initiative (Community and Safety 3.A.2.) was funded through the NRP Community Oriented Public Safety Initiatives Reserve Fund (COPSIRF) for a total of \$117,150; Standish-Ericsson's portion of the allocation is \$33,471.43. Final expenditures for this initiative are \$117,002.02; Standish-Ericsson's share of these expenditures is \$33,428.57. Since the allocation is from the Community Oriented Public Safety Initiatives Reserve Fund, the allocation is not included in the total Action Plan Request calculated above, nor does it count against the neighborhood's Phase II allocation.

## STANDISH-ERICSSON PHASE II NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION PLAN

ACTIVITY	COMMENTS	CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR
<b>HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT (page 4)</b>		
1.A.1. Low/Mod Income Home Improvement Loan Program		Development Finance Division
1.A.2. Affordable Housing Development		CPED Housing Policy and Development Division
1.A.4. Affordable Housing Education		NRP
1.B.1. Senior Housing Needs Market Study	Program Income from 1.A.1. and 1.C.1. may be used	NRP
1.B.2. Down Payment/Closing Cost Assistance	Program Income from 1.A.1. and 1.C.1. may be used	Development Finance Division
1.C.1. Home Improvement Loan Program (>80% MMI)		Development Finance Division
1.C.3. Emergency Housing Repairs		Development Finance Division
1.C.5. Problem Properties		NRP
2.A.1. Mixed-Use Developments		CPED Housing Policy and Development Division
<b>COMMUNITY AND SAFETY (page 14)</b>		
1.A.1. Implementation Support		NRP
1.A.2. Inform Residents		NRP
1.A.3. Neighborhood Review of Projects		NRP
1.B.1. Support Community Events		NRP
1.B.2. Greet New Neighbors		NRP
2.A.1. Support Youth Programming at Parks	\$3,000 for each park	MPRB
3.A.1. Reduce Excessive Traffic Speed		Police, Public Works
3.A.2. Community Oriented Public Safety Initiative		Police
4.A.1. Support Senior Programming		Hennepin County
<b>PARKS AND ENVIRONMENT (page 19)</b>		
1.A.1. Protect Water Quality		DFD, MPRB
2.A.1. RiverLake Greenway		Public Works
<b>LEARNING (page 22)</b>		
1.A.1. School and Community Initiatives	\$3,000 for each school	MPS
<b>TRANSPORTATION (page 25)</b>		
1.A.1. Pedestrian and Cyclist Improvement Projects		Public Works

Standish-Ericsson Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan (Standish-Ericsson 2.xls)

Date Created: September 27, 2005

Last Revision: November 9, 2005

Prepared By: Robert Cooper, Finance, 673-5239

# Standish-Ericsson NRP Phase II Neighborhood Action Plan

November 21, 2005



SENA – Standish-Ericsson Neighborhood Association  
4000 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue South  
Minneapolis MN 55406  
612-721-1601  
[www.standish-ericsson.org](http://www.standish-ericsson.org)  
[sena@goldengate.net](mailto:sena@goldengate.net)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>Housing &amp; Development</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Community &amp; Safety</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Parks &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>Learning</b>	<b>25</b>
	<b>Transportation</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Attachment A</b>	Random Sample Survey Results	
<b>Attachment B</b>	“Your Two Cents” Open House Results	
<b>Attachment C</b>	General Demographic Characteristics	

# INTRODUCTION

## Neighborhood Description

The Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods are located in south Minneapolis. The neighborhood's boundaries are 36<sup>th</sup> St. on the north, Minnehaha Parkway on the south, Hiawatha Ave. on the east and Cedar Ave. on the west. Standish, to the north, is separated from Ericsson, to the south, partly by 42<sup>nd</sup> St. and partly by 43<sup>rd</sup> St.

The Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods have several established commercial nodes. With the opening of two light rail stations – one in Standish at 38<sup>th</sup> St. and one in Ericsson at 46<sup>th</sup> St. – new commercial and residential development is occurring along the Hiawatha corridor.

The Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods are stable communities. The population, according to the 2000 census, numbers 7,900 people in 4,145 households. The median household income is \$47,700. Eighty families in Standish and twenty families in Ericsson have incomes below the poverty level defined by the Census Bureau.

According to SENA's random sample survey, 59% of the residents of the Standish-Ericsson neighborhood live here because they consider the housing to be affordable. There are 4,288 housing units in the neighborhood, with 78% being owner-occupied and 19% renter-occupied. One out of three respondents to the random sample survey felt that their home needed major repairs. Problem properties and increasing housing density were also found to be of great concern for survey respondents.

The 2000 Census figures show 79% of Standish-Ericsson residents consider themselves Caucasian. Eight percent consider themselves African-American, 7% Hispanic, while 3% are Native American and 3% Asian.

The Standish-Ericsson neighborhood is also home to Lake Hiawatha Park, Lake Hiawatha Public Golf Course, Sibley Park, Minnehaha Creek, the 40<sup>th</sup> St. Greenway and Hiawatha YMCA. Most Standish-Ericsson residents (63.7%) consider the neighborhood's proximity to parks and lakes as the number one reason to live in the area.

Two grade schools, Ericsson (public) and St. Helena's (private), Folwell Middle (public) and Roosevelt High (public) are also located within the neighborhood boundaries. It should be noted that while the John Ericsson Community School's program was closed in 2005, the Ericsson building is now home to Northrop Urban Environmental Elementary School, formerly located in the Northrop neighborhood. Roosevelt Library and Sibley Park further the area's educational opportunities by providing homework and computer assistance. Nokomis Healthy Seniors and the Early Childhood Resource Center also contribute to Standish-Ericsson's quality of life.

## **Neighborhood Planning Process**

The NRP Phase II Steering Committee using information gathered from the community using several methods developed the Neighborhood Revitalization Phase II plan.

First, a random sample survey was distributed and the data collected in the fall of 2003. As a result of this survey, it became apparent that housing was a major community concern. Continuing and strengthening the neighborhood association was also a top priority of residents. Problem properties, life cycle housing, the quality of existing housing stock and the desire to have new housing “fit” into the neighborhood, concern for parks and green spaces, light rail and traffic were all issues that were identified by the survey. During community meetings, dots were used by participants to vote on and confirm these issues as important to the community.

Participation in the survey was by random selection. Every effort was made by the committee to encourage citizen participation in the follow-up process. Notification of meetings was given through the neighborhood newsletter, postcards and e-mail. Various stages of the Phase II plan were also available through the neighborhood association website. The final copy of the plan is available on the SENA website, at the office or by mail upon request.

The final plan was presented to the community for public approval at SENA’s annual board meeting on September 12, 2005.

## **Phase II Allocations**

The proposed Phase II allocations were developed from priorities set by residents in the neighborhood’s random sample survey and at community meetings. However, the Neighborhood Revitalization Program has required that all neighborhoods spend 70% of their Phase II funds on housing and housing-related issues. The Phase II Steering Committee attempted to distribute the funds according to the issues deemed most important by residents while still meeting the 70% housing requirement. Overall, the Phase II plan accurately reflects the concerns and priorities of Standish-Ericsson residents.

## **Future Strategies**

SENA and the Standish-Ericsson residents are aware that the Phase II plan has several un-funded strategies. With the uncertainty of future funding for NRP, SENA has begun to explore options such as low-interest loans in an effort to regenerate program income. If some SENA programs become revenue producing, or if another source of funding, such as foundation or corporate grants could be secured, then several of the un-funded strategies of Phase II could be activated.

# HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT

**GOAL 1.** Help increase the city’s population and tax base by developing and supporting housing choices through preservation of existing housing and new construction.

---

**OBJECTIVE A** Preserve and increase housing that is affordable to low and moderate incomes households.

**Affordable Housing:** In order to expand housing choices for residents who face economic constraints, it is essential to increase the supply of affordable housing. This is particularly important not only for the very poor. Working families at a range of income levels benefit from housing that does not consume too great a share of the household income that leaves resources available to attend to the many other important human needs. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.4.10)

---

**STRATEGY 1** Offer low-interest home-improvement loans to owners of existing 1-4 unit properties who have incomes at or below 80% of the metropolitan median income (MMI, i.e., \$61,600 for a family of four in 2005).

---

## “Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005

Residents ranked the strategy as the 2nd highest housing priority out of 16 choices.

## Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003

42.6 % chose as their top Housing concern - “Maintaining and/or improving existing single-family homes”. Ranking #1 out of four choices.

34.0 % agree that their home needs some major repairs on the outside, and 34.6% agree that the inside of their home needs major repairs.

110 Households With Incomes Less than 80% of Metropolitan Median Income (MMI) responded to the survey. Major home repair is significantly higher for these households. 46.4 % agree that they need major outside repairs and 43.5 % major inside repairs.

Major home repair is also significantly higher for Households With Children Less than 18 years old. 41.9 % need major outside repairs and 45.7% major inside repairs. 60 % of Households With Incomes Less than 80 % of MMI agrees with the statement, “All public funds for home improvements should be based on income.” 30.9 % disagree.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$200,000 of neighborhood NRP dollars to the strategy.
- Utilize NRP *Housing Fund #1 NRP/MHFA Home Improvement Program* for program delivery, or select a third party program administrator similar to the Phase I home improvement implementation experience.
- Structure repayment provisions to revolve these limited funds within the neighborhood so that more low-income households gain access to a source of home improvement financing.
- Structure financing options with terms appropriate to the population being served.
- Allow up to 25% of the allocation to assist 1-4 unit properties that are not owner-occupied but provide rents affordable to individual/families with incomes less than 50% of MMI.

**STRATEGY 2      Work with developers to redevelop blighted properties into affordable housing, and work to bring about new development of affordable housing in the Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods**

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked “Redevelop blighted properties into affordable housing” the 3rd highest housing priority out of 16 choices.

Residents ranked “Assist the development of new affordable housing units in the Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods” as the strategy as the 10th highest housing priority out of 16 choices.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

24.9 % chose as their top Housing concern - “Eliminating problem properties”. Ranking #2 out of four choices.

32.1% of Households With Children Less than 18 years old chose “Eliminating problem properties” as their top housing concern, equal to “Maintaining and/or improving existing single-family homes.”

13.5 % of all respondents chose as their top Housing concern - “Providing affordable housing”. Ranking #4 out of four choices. 16.4 % of Households With Incomes Less than 80% of MMI chose it as their top housing concern.

16 % of all respondents disagree with the statement, “My monthly housing cost is affordable.” 20 % of Households With Incomes Less than 80% MMI disagree with the statement.

### Action Steps

- Allocate \$ 111,000 of neighborhood NRP dollars to support strategy implementation.
- Permit funds to be used to help demolish hazardous properties.
- Utilize *Housing Fund #8 Lot Acquisition & Redevelopment Fund* when appropriate. The Program is a redevelopment tool designed to address redevelopment needs within and in partnership with neighborhoods. The City has committed up to \$1.2 million to match neighborhood NRP Funds. No more than \$250,000 of the City match can be used in any one neighborhood. Eligible properties for the Lot Redevelopment program include:
  - Industrial or commercial properties with existing uses that are obsolete or incompatible with revitalization of the neighborhood,
  - Existing land use that clashes with structures in the surrounding area,
  - Lots that can be redeveloped for homeownership,
  - Redevelopment opportunities that will be marketed to first timer homebuyers, seniors or households with incomes of less than 80% of Metropolitan Median Income (MMI),
  - Development designs that fit the neighborhood and are consistent with existing neighborhood approved redevelopment plans,
  - Acquisition of properties that will result in development of ownership housing units that are affordable at 50% of MMI in non-impacted areas of the City,
  - Projects that are designed to maintain unit and dwelling affordability for at least 15 years.
- Target assisting 14 new affordable housing units by 2010. (7 units for individuals/families with incomes less than 50% of MMI and 7 units to individuals/families with incomes less than 30% of MMI). *The Minneapolis Plan* projects household growth between 1990 and 2020 for Powderhorn and Nokomis communities combined to be 406 households. From 1990 to 2000, there was a net gain of 33 households in the Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods.
- Permit funds to be used for acquisition of blighted property for multifamily corridor development in addition to scattered site single family. Utilize *Housing Fund #9 Corridor Housing*.
- Develop dialog with community members about appropriate locations and design standards for new affordable housing.
- Foster partnerships with housing developers, financial institutions, faith communities and others to extend the capacity to create affordable housing

**STRATEGY 3      Seek resources to help low-income and fixed-income residents with property tax increases.**

---

### “Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005

Residents ranked the strategy as the 6th highest housing priority out of 16 choices.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

Households With Incomes Less than 80% of MMI comprises 41.5 % of all respondents. 97 of the 110 these households were owner-occupied households.

6 out of 10 respondents “Housing is affordable” as one of the reason why they live in the neighborhood.

“Housing is affordable” ranked #2 out of 18 choices to the question – “Why do you live in the neighborhood (check all that apply)?”

**Action Steps**

- Form a study group of interested community members to research the issue and propose action steps.

**STRATEGY 4      Educate people about affordable housing.**

---

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

20.1% chose as their top People and Community concern - “Informing residents about issues ”. Ranking #3 out of four choices.

13.5 % chose as their top Housing concern - “Providing affordable housing ”. Ranking #2 out of four choices. 16.4 % of Households with incomes less than 80% of MMI chose it as their top housing concern.

16 % of all respondents disagree with the statement, “My monthly housing cost is affordable.” 20 % of Households with incomes less than 80% MMI disagreed with the statement.

69.9 % of all respondents disagree with the statement, “I support increasing the density (more housing units, more households) in the neighborhood.”

8 out of 10 households read the SENA NEWS newsletter.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$17,500 of neighborhood NRP dollars to support strategy implementation.
- Make articles on affordable housing subjects a regular feature in the SENA NEWS newsletter.
- Coordinate education efforts with the Corridor Housing Initiative process.
- Develop a close dialogue with the community about new affordable housing.

**OBJECTIVE B      Improve the availability of housing options for residents.**

**Life Cycle Housing:** The Sierra Club defines life-cycle housing as “a housing supply designed to meet the needs of individuals and families as they go through different stages of life so they can, if they wish, remain in the same community throughout their lives.” (Source: *Citizens’ Guide to Local Land Use Planning*)

---

---

**STRATEGY 1      Conduct a market study on the current and future housing needs of the neighborhood’s senior population, and support projects and program consistent with the study’s recommendations.**

---

---

**2000 Census**

The 62 and over age group dropped from 19.2% of the Standish and Ericsson neighborhood population in 1990 to 12.9% of the population in 2000.

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the #1 housing priority out of 16 choices.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

14.9 % chose as their top People and Community concern - “Providing services for seniors”. Ranking #4 out of four choices.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$15,000 of neighborhood NRP dollars to support strategy implementation.
- Use program income generated from Strategy 1.A.1 and/or Strategy 1.C.1 to support strategy implementation.
- Seek collaborations with adjoining neighborhood on the senior market study.
- Create a Task Force to lead the senior housing efforts.
- When appropriate, conduct a “Request for Proposals” process to select a market study consultant. Include as deliverables recommendations that may involve but are not limited to: programs/projects that will help seniors live independently, and development options and locations for new senior housing.
- Present findings and recommendations of a study to the community, public officials, and other interested individuals/organizations.
- Work in partnership with housing developers, financial institutions, faith communities and others to create new senior housing

**STRATEGY 2 Offer down-payment/closing cost assistance programs for first-time home-buyers.**

---

**2000 Census**

Family households represented 61.1 % of total households in 1990. In 2000 the family household percentage dropped to 54 %. Non-family households grew from 38.8 % to 46% of total households from 1990 to 2000.

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the 10th highest housing priority out of 16 choices.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

23.5% of all respondents chose “Someplace Else” to the question – “Where do you think you will be living 5 years from now?” 31.5 % chose “Don’t know”.

6 out of 10 of the respondents in the 25 - 44 age group chose “Someplace Else” to the question – “Where do you think you will be living 5 years from now?”

**Action Steps**

- Publicize and / or distribute information about existing programs and resources including the availability of NRP Housing Fund #5 *First Time Homebuyer Assistance Fund*.
- Use program income generated from Strategy 1.A.1 and/or Strategy 1.C.1 to support strategy implementation.
- Consider in 2006 the use of Phase I program income to support strategy implementation.

**OBJECTIVE C Maintain the quality and unique character of the neighborhood’s housing stock.**

**Housing Quality:** The condition and quality of housing in a given neighborhood influences its character considerably. Making it easier to install conveniences such as a remodeled kitchen, a second bathroom or remodeled plumbing and other major renovations are important initiatives that will encourage residents to invest their time and equity in housing to preserve the character of their homes. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.4.12)

---

**STRATEGY 1 Offer lower-than-market-rate home-improvement loans to homeowners with incomes above 80% of the metropolitan median income (MMI, i.e., \$61,600 for a family of four in 2005).**

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the 4th highest housing priority out of 16 choices.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

42.6 % of all respondents chose as their top Housing concern - “Maintaining and/or improving existing single-family homes”. Ranking #1 out of four choices.

156 Households With Incomes Greater than 80 % of MMI responded to the survey. 46.8 % chose as their top Housing concern - “Maintaining and/or improving existing single-family homes.”

28.8 % of Households With Incomes Greater than 80 % of MMI agree that their home needs some major repairs on the outside, and 32.7 % agree that the inside need major repairs.

50.6 % of all respondents agree with the statement - “All public funds for home improvements should be based on income.” 33.2 % disagree.

34.6 % of Households With Incomes Greater than 80 % of MMI agree with the statement - “All public funds for home improvements should be based on income.” 50 % disagree.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$200,000 of neighborhood NRP dollars to support strategy implementation.
- Select a third party program administrator similar to the Phase I home improvement implementation experience.
- Structure repayment provisions to revolve funds in the neighborhood as quickly as possible. Direct 50% of program income to affordable housing strategies.

**STRATEGY 2                      Develop a program to help restore deteriorating foundations of homes.**

---

**Phase I Neighborhood Action Plan**

The SENA Housing Committee found this problem to be an issue while monitoring the Phase I Home Improvement Programs.

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the 9th highest housing priority out of 16 choices.

**Action Steps**

- Consider foundation restoration as a program priority for home improvement funds.
- Collect, distribute and present resource information to community members.

**STRATEGY 3            Create a fund for emergency building repairs for people with difficult financial circumstances.**

---

---

**Phase I Neighborhood Action Plan**

The SENA Housing Committee found this problem to be an issue while monitoring the Phase I Home Improvement Programs.

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the 7th highest housing priority out of 16 choices.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$15,000 of neighborhood NRP dollars to support strategy implementation.
- Utilize NRP *Housing Fund #3 Emergency Repair Fund* for program delivery, or select a third party program administrator. Housing Fund #3 limits access to households with incomes equal to or less than 50% of Metropolitan Median Income (MMI).

**STRATEGY 4            Offer low-interest loans and grants for home-safety projects.**

---

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the 13th highest out of 16 choices.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

34.5 % of all respondents chose as their top Crime Prevention and Safety concern - “Improving residential and personal safety.” Ranking #2 out of four choices.

**Action Steps**

- Work with the Crime Prevention Specialists from the Third Precinct to help implement a program.
- Structure the program to reward the use of solar security lighting and solar street numbers when providing awards.
- Secure funding sources through grant writing.
- Utilize program income generated from Strategy 1.A.1 and/or Strategy 1.C.1 when appropriate.

**STRATEGY 5**      **Assist with organizing regular meetings with the Minneapolis City Council members, government staff, and others to identify and resolve problem properties.**

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the 5th highest priority out of 16 choices.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

24.9 % of all respondents chose as their top Housing concern - “Eliminating problem properties.” Ranking #2 out of four choices.

Households With Children less than 18 years of age feel “Eliminating problem properties” is just as important as “Maintaining / improving existing single family housing.” Each was chosen by 32.1 % of these households.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$1,500 of neighborhood NRP dollars to support strategy implementation.
- Continue to participate in the Problem Properties Initiative with Council Members and Minneapolis Police Department’s Third Precinct Crime Prevention Specialists.
- Address behavior and physical condition when working to resolve problem properties.

**GOAL 2**      **Facilitate the location of new economic activity.**

Good design must be in place to ensure that mixed-use development is well used, pleasant and aesthetically attractive enough to withstand the test of time. Successful mixed use buildings and areas attract pedestrians by bringing their storefront to the sidewalk’s edge, orienting building design to the street, and respecting traditional urban form by keeping building heights to a maximum of four or five stories. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.9.6)

---

**OBJECTIVE A**      **Invest in new development that is attractive, functional and adds value to the physical environment.**

---

**STRATEGY 1**      **Invest in mixed-use developments that are compatible with adjacent areas and with approved plan.**

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the 2nd highest priority out of 50 non-housing choices.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

7 out 10 respondents disagree with the statement – “I support increasing the density (more housing, more households) in the neighborhood.”

7 out 10 respondents disagree with the statement – “I support increasing the density (more housing, more households) along 38<sup>th</sup> Street, Cedar Ave and 42<sup>nd</sup> Street”.

6 out 10 respondents disagree with the statement – “I support construction of new buildings with 3 or more stories.”

22.1 % of all respondents chose as their top Commercial concern - “Attracting new businesses.”  
Ranking #2 out of four choices.

31.9 % of respondents disagree with the statement – “My neighborhood has a good selection of stores and services that meet my needs.”

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$70,000 of neighborhood NRP dollars to support strategy implementation. Work with private and public sector partners.
- Collaborate with the Corridor Housing Initiative on mixed-use development along the commercial and transportation corridors.
- Consider distributing some or all the NRP dollars through *Housing Fund #7 Affordable Housing* and/or *Housing Fund #9 Corridor Housing*.

**ROLES & RESPONSIBILITES**

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Planning, Monitoring &amp; Citizen Participation</b>	<b>Program Implementation</b>	<b>Contract Administration</b>
1.A.1	SENA	3rd Party Administrator	Development Finance Division
1.A.2	SENA	Non Profit/ For Profit Partners	CPED Housing Policy & Development
1.A.3	SENA	SENA	
1.A.4	SENA	SENA	NRP
1.B.1	SENA	Non Profit/ For Profit Partners	NRP
1.B.2	SENA	Housing Fund Administrator	Development Finance Division
1.C.1	SENA	3rd Party Administrator	Development Finance Division
1.C.2	SENA	SENA	
1.C.3	SENA	Housing Fund Administrator	Development Finance Division
1.C.4	SENA	MPD Third Precinct	
1.C.5	SENA	SENA	NRP
2.A.1	SENS	Non Profit/ For Profit Partners	CPED Housing Policy & Development

# COMMUNITY & SAFETY

**GOAL 1**                      **Strengthen the participation of all citizens, including children, in the economic and civic life of the community.**

Building a sense of community relies on residents being able to share values and interests. Most people who seek these connections with others find they have the same desire to earn a living wage, live in peaceful neighborhoods, allow their children to play in safe parks close to home, enjoy high quality education and make use of recreational facilities that encourage people to play, learn and relax. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.1.1)

---

**OBJECTIVE A**                      **Encourage people to participate in common projects, and to work collaboratively on issues that affect the well-being of the neighborhood and the city as a whole.**

---

**STRATEGY 1**                      **Strengthen the Standish Ericsson Neighborhood Association’s (SENA) abilities to serve as a vehicle for neighborhood-based planning, outreach, communication, and citizen participation.**

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the #1 priority out of 50 non-housing choices.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

30 % of respondents have attended a SENA meeting or event.

43 people (15 %) are willing to become a SENA volunteer.

8 out 10 respondents read the *SENA News* newsletter.

20 % of all respondents chose as their top People and Community concern- “Informing residents about issues”. Ranking #3 out of 4 choices.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$86,723 to support the development of the Phase II plan.
- Allocate \$200,551 of NRP Funds support implementation planning, outreach, communication, and citizen participation.
- Provide organizational support to Strategy 1.B.3.

**STRATEGY 2            Help inform residents on issues, program, projects and opportunities.**

---

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

8 out 10 respondents read the *SENA News* newsletter.

20 % of all respondents chose as their top People and Community concern- “Informing residents about issues”. Ranking #3 out of 4 choices.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$13,500 of NRP Funds to support strategy implementation.
- Use the *SENA News* newsletter serve as the primary communication approach, augmented by other approaches such as workshops, brochures, flyers, community meetings.

**STRATEGY 3            Assist neighborhood review and monitoring of private development projects and public capital improvement projects.**

---

**Your Two Cents Open House: February 2005**

“Ensuring LRT Station Plans are implemented” - ranked #6 out of 50 non-housing strategies.

“Developing policies to guide neighborhood review” - ranked #9 out of 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

7 out 10 respondents disagree with the statement – “I support increasing the density (more housing, more households) in the neighborhood.”

7 out 10 respondents disagree with the statement – “I support increasing the density (more housing, more households) along 38<sup>th</sup> Street, Cedar Ave and 42<sup>nd</sup> Street”.

6 out 10 respondents disagree with the statement – “I support construction of new buildings with 3 or more stories.”

3 out of 10 respondents agree with the statement – “I will regularly use light rail transit”.

46.7 % of respondents agree that LRT’s positive benefit outweigh the negative while 20.8 % disagree.

21.1 % of all respondents chose as their top Transportation concern – “Managing the impact of LRT.” Ranking #3 out of four choices.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$1,500 of NRP Funds to support strategy implementation.
- Action steps will include but are not limited to: drafting policies outlining review procedures and project guidelines; presenting policies to the neighborhood for review and recommendations; creating and supporting “watch dog” groups to follow projects such as LRT Station Area Plans implementation.

**OBJECTIVE B**      **Promote opportunities and activities that allow neighbors and residents to get to know each other better.**

---

**STRATEGY 1**      **Support community events.**

---

**Your Two Cents Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy the 12th highest priority out of 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

14.5 % of respondents chose as their top Crime Prevention and Safety concern – “Fostering a sense of community.”

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$7,000 of NRP Funds to strategy implementation.
- Support involves sponsorship as well as lead organizer activities.
- Events may include but are not limited to the Lake Hiawatha Festival, Southside Housing Fair, Teen Job and Opportunity Fair, Midtown Public Market.

**STRATEGY 2**      **Greet new neighbors.**

---

**Your Two Cents Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy as the 17th highest priority out of 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

14.5 % of respondents chose as their top Crime Prevention and Safety concern – “Fostering a sense of community.”

6 out of 10 respondents (66 %) agree with the statement – “People on my block look out for one another.”

7 out of 10 respondents (76.5 %) know the first name of 5 or more people on their block.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$1,500 of NRP Funds to strategy implementation.
- Action steps may include but are not limited to preparing and providing welcome packets, personal contact, and partnerships with real estate professionals and landlords.

**STRATEGY 3      Help residents gather, do projects and communicate at the block level.**

---

**Your Two Cents Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy as the 12th highest priority out of 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

14.5 % of respondents chose as their top Crime Prevention and Safety concern – “Fostering a sense of community.”

6 out of 10 respondents (66 %) agree with the statement – “People on my block look out for one another.”

7 out of 10 respondents (76.5 %) know the first name of 5 or more people on their block.

**Action Steps**

- Support provided by SENA through Community & Safety Strategy 1.A.1

**GOAL 2                      Promote community-based initiatives in youth programming.**

Providing a positive, supportive environment for children and youth is the most critical responsibility we shoulder as a community. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.1.4)

---

---

**OBJECTIVE A                      Provide leisure, recreational and educational programming that offers positive community-based experience to youth.**

---

---

**STRATEGY 1                      Support youth programs and opportunities at Lake Hiawatha Community Center and Sibley Park.**

---

---

**2000 Census**

21.5 % (2,107) of the Standish and Ericsson total population is less than 18 years old.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

Lake Hiawatha Park at 49.4 % and Sibley Park at 21 % are the top two responses from Household with Children less than 18 years old to the question – “Which Park does your household use the most?”

26 % of all respondents chose as their top People and Community concern – “Enhancing educational services for children and teens.” Ranking #2 out of 4 choices.

15.9 % of all respondents chose as their top Parks and Environment concern – “Maintaining park and recreation programming”. Ranking #4 out of 4 choices.

27.3 % of all respondents chose as their top Parks and Environment concern – “Maintaining park and recreation facilities”. Ranking #1 out of 4 choices.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$6,000 of NRP Funds to strategy implementation.
- Target \$3,000 for each park.
- Financial support will not replace existing funding sources. Program support will focus on new programming and / or increasing the service of existing programs.
- Scopes of service will contain provisions for reports and evaluations.
- Opportunities may include facility upgrades and equipment purchases.

**GOAL 3**                      **Increase safety and confidence through effective and efficient law enforcement and prosecution.**

The greatest success in developing pro-active strategies about promoting safety in city neighborhoods originates within the community. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.1.6)

---

---

**OBJECTIVE A**                      **Improve residents’ actual and perceived sense of safety and security.**

---

---

**STRATEGY 1**                      **Reduce excessive traffic speed.**

---

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Ranked #9 out of 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

30.1 % of all respondents chose as their top Transportation concern “Calming traffic in residential areas”.

34.3 % of respondents chose as their top Crime Prevention and Safety concern –“Improving residential and personal safety.”

55.5 % of respondents disagree with the statement – “Traffic speeds in my neighborhood are not a problem.”

72.8 % of Household with Children less than 18 years old disagree with the statement– “Traffic speeds in my neighborhood are not a problem.”

Traffic ranked #1 as the “Big Concern” to the question – “Here are some problems people often mention as problems for urban neighborhoods. For each problem, please indicate if it is a big concern, somewhat of a concern, or no problem at all for your neighborhood.” 13 problems were listed.

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$44,000 of NRP Funds to strategy implementation.
- Work with the MPD Third Precinct on direct traffic enforcement.
- Work with Minneapolis Public Works and area residents on locating, developing and installing appropriate traffic calming measures.

- Explore designing and implementing a pilot program which may include other neighborhoods that uses NRP Funds to seed the purchase of increased traffic enforcement services followed by the ticket revenues generated being used to support future service.

**STRATEGY 2      Initiate community oriented public safety measures.**

---

---

**Action Steps**

- The Bancroft, Bryant, Central, Corcoran, Powderhorn Park, Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods submit a joint proposal for Community Oriented Public Safety Initiative Reserve Funds (COPSIRF). The proposal received \$117,150 for high visible patrols, special police operations, CCP/S.A.F.E. activities, traffic enforcement/police patrol visibility, and problem solving tactics.
- COPSIRF allocations need to appear in the appropriate Phase II Neighborhood Action Plans to qualify as eligible NRP activities.
- Final expenditures attributed to the Standish Ericsson portion are \$33,428.57.
- The allocation is not included in the total Action Plan Request, nor does it count against the neighborhood's Phase II allocation.

**GOAL 4      Protect and improve residents' health.**

A healthy community is one of the most important investments in the city's future well-being. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.1.7)

---

---

**OBJECTIVE A      Offer services and programs that enrich the physical, mental and emotional health of residents.**

---

---

**STRATEGY 1      Continue to support seniors programs.**

---

---

**2000 Census**

18.1 % (1,778) of the Standish and Ericsson total population is 55 years old and over.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

14.9 % of respondents chose as their top People and Community concern – “Providing services for senior citizens”.

**Phase I Neighborhood Action Plan**

Provided \$55,000 to expand the services of Nokomis Healthy Seniors (NHS) in the Standish and Ericsson neighborhoods, including the block nurse program and a volunteer network.

Provided \$5,700 to support the "Senior Helpline" run by Nokomis Healthy Seniors (NHS). The Helpline acts as an information clearinghouse for seniors seeking assistance.

Provided \$5,300 to support the transportation costs for Standish and Ericsson seniors who use the "Grocery Shopping Transportation" program offered by Cooperative Older Adults Ministry (COAM)

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$7,500 to strategy implementation.
- Explore funding collaboration with other neighborhoods.
- Program support will first focus on maintaining program relationships with NHS and/or COAM, followed by other program providers.
- Scopes of service will contain provisions for reports and evaluations.

**ROLES & RESPONSIBILITES**

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Planning, Monitoring &amp; Citizen Participation</b>	<b>Program Implementation</b>	<b>Contract Administration</b>
1.A.1	SENA	SENA	NRP
1.A.2	SENA	SENA	NRP
1.A.3	SENA	SENA	NRP
1.B.1	SENA	SENA & Community Partners	NRP
1.B.2	SENA	SENA	NRP
1.B.3	SENA	SENA	NRP
2.A.1	SENA	Mpls Park & Recreation Board	Mpls Park & Recreation Board
3.A.1	SENA	MPD Third Precinct / Public Works	MPD / Public Works
3.A.2	SENA	MPD Third Precinct	MPD
4.A.1	SENA	Service Providers	Hennepin County

# PARKS & ENVIRONMENT

## GOAL 1

### **Preserve, enhance and create a sustainable natural environment.**

The entire community has inherited a valuable legacy of natural riches in land, air and water that are found in the city. Establishing a principle of sustainability to guide future decision-making encourages us to think of the legacy that we will leave for future generations. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.7.1)

---

---

## OBJECTIVE A

### **Protect and sustain water resources.**

---

---

## STRATEGY 1

### **Undertake community-based measures to protect river, lake and stream water quality by managing storm water run-off, employing erosion control measures and other best practices.**

---

---

#### **“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

“Partnering with the Blue Water Association and other groups” ranked #9 out of the 50 non-housing strategies.

#### **Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

24.6 % of respondents chose as their top Parks and Environment concern – “Improving air, land, and water quality.”

6 out of 10 respondents (63.7 %) selected “Proximity to parks and lakes” as a reason to why they live in the neighborhood.

6 out of 10 respondents (60.6 %) agree to the statement – “Lake Hiawatha’s water quality needs improvement.”

5 out of 10 respondents (51.3 %) who chose Minnehaha Parkway as the park their household uses the most, agree with the statement – “Erosion along Minnehaha Creek needs improvement.”

#### **Action Steps**

- Allocate \$60,000 NRP Funds to strategy implementation.
- Action steps may include but are not limited to: partnering with the Blue Water Association on water quality projects; promoting and/or undertaking erosion control projects along Minnehaha Creek; promoting and/or undertaking planting projects at Lake Hiawatha; and collaborating with other neighborhoods

**OBJECTIVE B**      **Invest in the health of the urban forest.**

---

---

**STRATEGY 1**      **Encourage the planting and replacement of trees on public and private property.**

---

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy #7 out of the 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

1 out of 10 respondents (11.6 %) agree with the statement – “I need financial help to remove a diseased tree from my property.”

**Action Steps**

- Secure resource assistance through grant writing.

**GOAL 2**      **Develop and support a system of urban parks and greenway connections throughout the city.**

Preserving existing connections and creating new corridors that connect different sectors of the city encourages us to travel by means other than automobile to destinations that were previously unknown territory on residents “mental maps” of the city. ... These “greenway” corridors can serve both as open spaces for city neighborhoods by providing open, accessible, secure places for residents to recreate, and also as transportation networks, allowing travel by alternative means, such as bicycles. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.6.2)

---

---

**OBJECTIVE A**      **Preserve existing connections and create new corridors.**

---

---

**STRATEGY 1**      **Support the connections, especially the RiverLake Greenway Project.**

---

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked the strategy #3 out of the 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

6 out of 10 respondents (63.7 %) selected “Proximity to parks and lakes” as a reason to why they live in the neighborhood.

**Capital Budget Request: 2006-2010**

Minneapolis Public Works has submitted a budget request for funding in 2009 to support the project.

**Phase I Neighborhood Action Plan**

Allocated \$4,000 to an east/west bike route strategy.

**Action Steps**

- Contribute \$10,000 of neighborhood NRP dollars to help match city, state and federal invest in the project.
- Continue to work with Public Works and other neighborhoods on the project.

**ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES**

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Planning, Monitoring &amp; Citizen Participation</b>	<b>Program Implementation</b>	<b>Contract Administration</b>
1.A.1	SENA	Mpls Park & Recreation Board	Mpls Park & Recreation Board
1.B.1	SENA	SENA & MPRD	MPRD
2.A.1	SENA	Public Works	Public Works

# LEARNING

**GOAL 1**                      **Improve the quality, access and type of lifelong learning experiences.**

Learning is a community-wide responsibility. It's success relies on partnerships and involvement among a variety of participants in order to be truly successful at providing all residents with 'lifelong learning' experiences. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.5.3)

---

---

**OBJECTIVE A**                      **Encourage the further development of community connections to public schools.**

---

---

**STRATEGY 1**                      **Invest human and financial resources in school and community initiatives.**

---

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked - “Strengthen relationships and communications between neighborhood schools and residents.” - the 17 priority out of the 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

26 % of respondents chose as their top People and Community concern – “Enhancing educational services for children and teens.”

59 people were willing to tutor high school students.

76 people were willing to tutor elementary children.

5 out of 10 respondents (52.9 %) agree with the statement – “The schools in my neighborhood are an asset to the community.”

46.7 % of respondents agree with the statement – “The schools in my neighborhood are good neighbors.”

**Action Steps**

- Allocate \$9,000 of NRP Funds to strategy implementation.
- Invest up to \$3,000 in each school (Roosevelt High School, Folwell Middle School, and Ericsson Elementary School)
- Initiative may include but are not limited to: nurturing healthy children; providing a safe school environment; making areas around schools and walking routes to school safer; responding to and resolving student behavior and neighborhood complaints; increasing school to community and community to school volunteerism; and improving student achievement.

**OBJECTIVE B**      **Support a strong library system with excellent services, programs and collections to meet a variety of informational and educational needs.**

---

---

**STRATEGY 1**      **Remodel, expand or replace the Roosevelt Library to meet the library neighborhoods' library service needs.**

---

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked - “Establishing a Roosevelt Library Task Force.” - the 5th priority out of the 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

32.5 % of respondents chose as their top People and Community concern – “Maintaining library services.” Ranking #1 out of 4 choices.

26 % of respondents chose as their top People and Community concern – “Enhancing educational services for children and teens.” Ranking #2 out of 4 choices.

The top three choices to the question “Which library does your household use most?” are – Nokomis (29.4%), Roosevelt (27%) and No library (21.8%).

The top three choices to the question “Which library does your household use most?” for the Household With Children less than 18 years old segment are – Nokomis (35.8%), Roosevelt (33.3%) and Other library (9.9%)

4 out of 10 respondents (38.8 %) agree with the statement – “I support building a new Roosevelt Library.” 3 out of 10 (27.7 %) disagree with the statement.

**Capital Budget Requests: 2006 –2010**

Library Board has submitted a 2006-2010 Capital Improvement Project Plan for \$3 million to either remodeled Roosevelt Library or build a new facility.

**Action Steps**

- Establish a Roosevelt Library Task Force, recruit members, provide operating support, and keep neighborhood informed on project status.
- Work cooperatively with the Library Board and neighborhoods within the Roosevelt Library service area on meeting the neighborhoods' library service needs.

**ROLES & RESPONSIBILITES**

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Planning, Monitoring &amp; Citizen Participation</b>	<b>Program Implementation</b>	<b>Contract Administration</b>
1.A.1	SENA	Minneapolis Public Schools	MPS
1.B.1	SENA	Minneapolis Library Board	

# TRANSPORTATION

**GOAL 1**

**Enhance and maintain a transportation system that balances the interests of economic development and neighborhood livability.**

The existing transportation system must be balanced to strengthen transit and other non-automobile forms of transportation, such as bicycles. Moving around as a pedestrian, transit rider or cyclist must remain safe, though not necessarily more convenient. (Source: *The Minneapolis Plan* – page 1.8.1)

---

**OBJECTIVE A**

**Build, maintain and require a pedestrian, cyclist, transit and information systems which achieve the highest standards of connectivity and amenity.**

---

**STRATEGY 1**

**Support pedestrian and cyclist improvement projects.**

---

**“Your Two Cents” Open House: February 2005**

Residents ranked - “Ensure transit plans include provisions for pedestrians and bicyclist.” - the 4th priority out of the 50 non-housing strategies.

Residents ranked - “Work to ensure the components of the LRT Station Area Plans developed from public input are implemented.” - the 6th priority out of the 50 non-housing strategies.

Residents ranked - “Support and plan pedestrian-oriented projects.” - the 12th priority out of the 50 non-housing strategies.

**Random Sample Survey: Fall 2003**

18.7 % of respondents chose as their top Transportation concern – “Developing pedestrian/bicycle friendly routes.” Ranking #4 out of 4 choices.

**Action Steps**

- o Allocate \$10,000 of neighborhood NRP dollars to strategy implementation.

**ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES**

Strategy	Planning, Monitoring & Citizen Participation	Program Implementation	Contract Administration
1.A.1	SENA	Public Works	Public Works