

# DOWNTOWN MINNEAPOLIS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

**Minutes from the internal Board Meeting of Tuesday, July 13, 2010**

*Hennepin County Central Public Library*

**300 Nicollet Mall**

**Room N-202, Minneapolis, MN**

## **I. Call to Order and Introductions**

Board Chair Carletta Sweet called the Phase II Housing Strategic Planning Session to order at 6:03 p.m.

Other board members in attendance included: Andrea Christenson; Gerry Ewald, Vice Chair; Andy Hauer; Corey Kline; and Wally Swan, Secretary.

Excused absentees were Paula Klimek, Treasurer; and George Rosenquist.

NRP Specialist Barb Lickness and DMNA staff member Christie Rock were also present.

## **II. Consideration of the Agenda**

Sweet asked if there were any changes or additions to the agenda. Christenson requested an opportunity to talk about Survivors Resources and Swan requested the opportunity to discuss the DMNA becoming a member of the Minnesota Council of Nonprofits. Sweet advised that Christenson's topic would be placed under Outreach and Collaboration during her slated time and that Swan's topic was already on the agenda under that same section. Rock asked to talk about the date of the August board meeting as well as the annual meeting date and location.

*Hauer moved and Christenson seconded a motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion passed.*

## **III. Staff Report**

Rock summarized her activities for the period 6/5/10 to 7/9/10 from the report she previously submitted via email. She has spent quite a bit of time working with NRP Specialist Barb Lickness on refining the language of the goals, strategies and objectives in the DMNA Phase II NRP Plan. She also added some additional information based on recommendations from NRP Director Bob Miller. Rock noted that Mike Norton, the NRP attorney, gave his approval for the plan at the end of June 2010. The next steps will be to present the plan to the community, and then forward the plan to the NRP Policy Board for its consideration and approval.

## **IV. Housing Options and Analysis Documents Review with NRP Specialist Barb Lickness**

Sweet introduced NRP Specialist Barb Lickness who was invited to discuss sustainable options for the DMNA NRP Phase II housing dollars. Lickness stressed the importance of developing Phase II

housing programs that provide a “return on investment” to the organization as opposed to only offering grants. This will become more important as the DMNA depletes its NRP allocation. The City’s new Neighborhood and Community Relations Department (NCR) citizen engagement program will provide significantly less monies to neighborhood organizations. Lickness stated that developing Phase II housing programs that revolve NRP dollars back to the neighborhood would help sustain the DMNA over the long term. Furthermore, the DMNA can redirect NRP housing dollars that revolve back to the neighborhood to other non-housing strategies and programs.

Lickness suggested the following “revolving loan program” ideas as potential uses for the DMNA Phase II dollars:

- Assist condo associations with maintenance projects and/or condo owners with improvement costs that might normally be assessed;
- Encourage condo associations and/or apartment owners to make green improvements to buildings, e.g., green roofs, energy efficient lighting in common areas;
- Help apartment owners make improvements and/or repairs to buildings;
- Help developers cover pre-development and construction costs.

Lickness indicated that Rock could work with CPED staff to develop guidelines and an RFP process, if required, for these programs. The DMNA could also contract with a program administrator, such as the Center for Energy and the Environment, to oversee the management of the funds.

Lickness and Rock agreed to work together to modify the language in the DMNA’s NRP Phase II Plan to reflect housing revolving loan type programs.

Following up on a discussion held at a previous housing strategy session on May 24th, Christenson inquired as to whether the DMNA could use its Phase II funds for St. Stephen’s Human Services homeless outreach program. Lickness advised that the DMNA could use its non-housing funds (totaling \$273,950) for programs like St. Stephen’s, but that it must use its housing funds for “bricks and mortar” type projects. Lickness then inquired as to how much the DMNA was considering allocating to St. Stephen’s work in downtown. Christenson stated that since the costs per outreach worker is \$60,000 (salary and benefits), and that St. Stephen’s would like to add two outreach workers for the downtown neighborhoods, the DMNA should allocate \$120,000 to this project then asked if it were possible to do so right away.

Lickness reminded Christenson that Phase II funds could not be immediately accessed because the final draft of the plan had to be first presented to the downtown community for approval then submitted to the NRP Policy Board for approval, and if the DMNA wanted to fund this project at that level, it should assess its remaining Phase I non-housing dollars. Currently, \$25,000 remains in the Restorative Justice line item of the Implementation contract, and \$15,000 remains in Downtown Development. Lickness suggested leaving the Downtown Development monies alone due to the criteria for qualification, and moving the \$25,000 in Restorative Justice dollars back to the original Phase I Crime and Safety strategy, then rolling the dollars over to Phase II Crime and Safety strategy to make those funds available for programs like St. Stephen’s.

*Christenson moved and Swan seconded a motion to remove the \$25,000 remaining in the Restorative Justice line item from the Phase I Implementation Contract and roll them over into a Phase II Crime and Safety strategy.*

Sweet cautioned the board in rushing to deplete the funds from any particular strategy in order to fund just one project, generally because it does not make long-term fiscal sense when future City funding is not guaranteed, and particularly in the instance of St. Stephen's, since the City, in collaboration with the County (i.e., Heading home Hennepin), Downtown Improvement District, Minneapolis Police Department and others have launched a fundraising campaign called Give Real Change. At the very least the DMNA should await the results of this campaign. Furthermore, since the final Phase II Plan has yet to be approved, either by the community or by the NRP Policy Board, there will be ample time to consider the merits and successes of each proposed program.

## **V. Old / New / Other Business**

- **August Board Meeting.** Rock questioned whether the board should meet on primary election night, Tuesday, August 9 (the next regularly scheduled board meeting) since Minnesota State Statute 201 A.19 **[insert web link here]** prohibits public organizations from holding meetings on election nights between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. Although the DMNA is a nonprofit, it is publicly funded and therefore falls under the jurisdiction of this Statute. Hauer mentioned that Ward 7 Council Member Goodman prefers neighborhood associations refrain from holding meetings on election nights. Following a brief discussion on how to handle any urgent matters (i.e., via email or special meeting) as they arise between now and the September board meeting,

*Christenson moved and Hauer seconded a motion to cancel August's board meeting and to meet on the next regularly scheduled date of Tuesday, September 14th. Sweet called for discussion. The motion passed.*

- **Annual Meeting.** Since Council Member Goodman is unavailable the second Tuesday in November, the 2010 annual meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 14, a regularly scheduled board meeting date that is convenient for Goodman. Rock asked board members to consider locations as well as speakers for the annual meeting. Hauer stated that he would contact Hennepin County Commissioner Peter McLaughlin about using one of the larger meeting rooms at the Central Library free of charge. Sweet then suggested that McLaughlin should also be invited as a speaker. Christenson suggested inviting Sarah Harris from the Downtown Improvement District. Board members were encouraged to consider additional ideas prior to the September board meeting. *[In a subsequent email from Hauer, he confirmed reserving Pohlad Hall for the annual meeting at no charge to the DMNA.]*
- **Survivor Resources.** Christenson discussed and distributed information on Survivor Resources ([www.survivorresources.org](http://www.survivorresources.org)), a private, nonprofit organization providing immediate and long-term emotional and practical support for families and friends of those who have died by homicide, suicide or accident. She asked the board to consider making a contribution to the organization. Sweet suggested first inviting the executive director of Survivor Resources to the September board meeting to give a presentation on the work of the organization. Christenson agreed to do so.

- **Minnesota Council of Nonprofits (MNCN).** Swan gave a brief presentation on the Minnesota Council of Nonprofits ([www.mncn.org](http://www.mncn.org)) and requested that the DMNA considering joining the organization. The fee for membership was estimated to be \$50 for an organization with a budget less than \$99,000.

*Christenson moved and Ewald seconded a motion to approve a membership with the Minnesota Council of Nonprofits. Since the fee of \$50 was an estimate, Sweet amended the motion to include the membership fee "not to exceed \$200". Sweet called for discussion. The amended motion passed.*

- **Email voting procedures.** Hauer and Christenson brought up the issue of receiving what they considered excessive responses during an email vote when board members clicked "respond to all" and asked to change the email voting procedures wherein members would only send their responses to the staff member unless they raised a significant issue concerning the topic being considered.

*Hauer moved and Christenson seconded to institute the new email voting procedures. Sweet called for discussion. Sweet advised that for transparency purposes she would like to be copied on all the responses as well. The amended motion passed.*

## **VII. Adjournment**

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Signed this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary