

Logan Park Neighborhood Phase 1 NRP Review

**Completed by the Logan Park
Neighborhood Association
Board of Directors
March 25, 2002**

**In cooperation with
Vohs Consulting & Management Services**

Table of Contents

Overview, Method, Inclusivity	Page 1
NRP Strategies Description, Highlights	Pages 2-8
Housing Review and Survey	Attachment A
Problem Property Progress Report	Attachment B
Arts & Culture Activities Summary	Attachment C
Enterprise Facilitation Program Report (BRAIN)	Attachment D
Business Seminar Series – The Art of Business	Attachment D2
Community Health Program Review	Attachment E
Street Lighting Program Report	Attachment F

Logan Park Phase 1 NRP Review

Overview

In total the Logan Park NRP Action Plan provided \$812,550 for all housing programs, \$140,000 for street lighting, \$134,000 for arts and culture programs, \$75,000 for a multi-neighborhood community health program, \$61,950 in park programming and physical improvements, \$34,000 for business and economic development programs, and \$6,000 for implementation.

Total NRP rehab funds of \$855,800 (this total includes all NRP Action Plan funds and \$201,300 in NRP Transitional funds) leveraged non-NRP funds of \$605,500, or 70 cents for each NRP dollar.

In summary, the most significant improvements in the neighborhood aided by NRP funds were:

- The establishment of Logan Park and the surrounding immediate area in Northeast Minneapolis as an artists community
- Physical improvements have been made to 185 (or 38%) of the 490 residential structures through various NRP housing programs and private investment leveraged by these funds. We feel this contributed heavily to the substantial increase in Logan Park property values.
- Significant improvements completed at 64 of the “worst” 94 properties in the neighborhood (LPNA’s work here earned them the “Best Housing Program” award in NRP Phase 1).
- Access to home health care programs and volunteer-assisted services for seniors (and others) that contributed to their ability to remain in their homes.
- Facility and staffing improvements at Logan Park Recreation Center have made the Park a much more viable neighborhood asset.

Method

This review was conducted by the Logan Park Neighborhood Association Board of Directors, with overall coordination and writing done by Kim Vohs of Vohs Consulting & Management Services. There are many different methods and formats used in the review. Different strategies required different methods of assessment and the information available from participants varied depending on the strategy. We also wanted to make use of information that was already available about the results of NRP-funded projects.

Overall, this is a very comprehensive review, especially for the housing strategies which include most of NRP funds. Having the Board of Directors members conduct the review means that the evaluative information was heard and gathered by those who need it the most.

Inclusivity

Overall the NRP funds in Logan Park funded a wide variety of programs. Comments heard from several sources appreciated the inclusivity not only in the planning stages, but in the strategies implemented. Many different parts of the community - businesses, homeowners, seniors/disabled, distressed property owners, children (who use the improved Park facility), and the growing

Northeast artists community benefited from the NRP strategies. This inclusiveness gave the action plan an eclectic mix that helped everyone get something on their wish list. Spreading the NRP funds over numerous strategies was the natural effect of the very democratic process used to allocate the funds.

Logan Park NRP Strategies

(In all 18 strategies were funded in various areas)

I. HOUSING PROGRAMS

Home Improvement Matching Grants

NRP AMOUNT: \$325,000

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$568,185

IMPLEMENTED BY: Vohs Consulting & Management Services

REVIEW METHOD: Housing Committee Review, Recipient Survey (attached)

DESCRIPTION:

The Home Improvement Matching Grant program provided grants of up to \$5,000 for exterior improvements through a neighborhood-wide lottery. Grantees with incomes less than 60% of the area median income did not have to match their grant amount, while those over 60% were required to provide a dollar-for-dollar match for their grant funds.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Of the 97 homeowners who applied for these funds, 77 received grants. Also, many applicants who weren't selected for grants still did work to their property. The grants provide a greater incentive than low interest loans for some homeowners to invest in home improvements, and they attract a lot of attention to home improvement activities throughout the neighborhood. And, by targeting the grants to exterior work, the program makes the improvements visible to the entire neighborhood. The neighborhood believes that this program, in combination with the problem properties program, contributed substantially to the significant increase in Logan Park's property values. Attachment A details responses of grant recipients surveyed about the program.

Basic Improvement Grants / Problem Properties Program

NRP AMOUNT: \$239,550 (for both strategies)

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$344,802

IMPLEMENTED BY: Vohs Consulting & Management Services

REVIEW METHOD: Housing Committee Review, Recipient Survey (attached)

DESCRIPTION:

Through the Basic Improvement Grants (BIG) program, the Logan Park Housing Committee identified the neighborhood's worst properties (based on a windshield survey of exterior conditions) and carried out a series of steps -- including letters, phone calls and financial incentives -- to encourage the property owners to make improvements.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Due to its unique approach and proven results, this program was selected to receive a city-wide NRP award for "Best Housing Program" for Phase 1 NRP (1993 – 2000). Some of Logan Parks worst

properties were significantly improved without using the traditional (and costly) “acquire and rehabilitate” approach often used by governmental housing programs.

Initially, the “problem property” owners were sent a very tactful letter encouraging them to contribute to the rising neighborhood property values by maintaining their properties and identifying the resources available for them to do this.

Next, the housing staff followed up with a friendly phone call to encourage the improvements, work with the owners to get financing through existing programs, and monitor progress on each targeted property. These staff efforts were a major factor in motivating problem property owners to participate in home improvement activities that they had not previously utilized. Finally, Basic Improvement Grants (BIG) were made available to property owners -- similar to the Home Improvement Matching Grants, except that absentee owners of the problem properties were also eligible under this for assistance. Some of the more resistant owners received personal visits from housing staff to assist them in completing the BIG application by the deadline.

The results were significant -- 30 problem properties were improved enough to be removed from the “problem” list, and another 32 had some improvements done. This targeted approach for problem properties was a very cost effective way to prevent further deterioration. Attachment A details the responses of grant recipients who were surveyed about their feelings regarding the Basic Improvements Grant program. Attachment B shows the decrease in problem properties.

Down Payment Grants

NRP AMOUNT: \$10,000

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$10,000

IMPLEMENTED BY: Logan Park Neighborhood Association (LPNA)

REVIEW METHOD: Housing Committee Review

DESCRIPTION:

The Down Payment Grants program utilized down payment incentive grants of \$5,000 to encourage buyers of rental properties to convert the properties to homestead status.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Down payment incentive grants were provided to only 2 rental property buyers through this program. The availability of these incentives proved to be difficult to market to potential buyers because it was difficult to determine the best way to find these buyers and communicate with them. And, the grants that were made were awarded after the home purchase had been made, so it was hard to determine if the grant was really an incentive to the potential home buyer, since the buyer was probably not aware of the grant before making the home purchase. With the changing housing market in Logan Park, incentives are not really needed to encourage buyers to purchase the “fixer-uppers.” This is happening without any incentives.

Revolving Loan Fund

NRP AMOUNT: \$205,000

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$638,000

IMPLEMENTED BY: Center for Energy & Environment
REVIEW METHOD: Recipient Survey, Housing Committee Review

DESCRIPTION:

The Revolving Loan Fund program was designed to provide low interest (4%) loans of up to \$15,000 to homesteaded property owners for a range of home improvements. The loan funds were also available as the property owner's match for the two Logan Park matching grant programs.

HIGHLIGHTS:

To stretch the NRP loan funds whenever possible, the Center for Energy and the Environment (CEE) utilized Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) loan funds first to assist program applicants. The last \$25,000 of NRP funds set aside under this program were stretched further by utilizing them only to buy down the interest rate of MHFA loan funds available to Logan Park property owners. This leveraging of MHFA funds through an NRP interest rate buy down resulted in the last \$25,000 of NRP funds leveraging over \$300,000 of MHFA loans! Future NRP loan funds should consider this mechanism as a way to maximize the leverage of NRP funds and reach as many properties as possible without having to wait for loan funds to revolve. To date 40 loans have been made and the funds will continue to revolve.

A Brush With Kindness

NRP AMOUNT: \$33,000

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$39,000

IMPLEMENTED BY: Habitat for Humanity, LPNA

REVIEW METHOD: Housing Committee Review

DESCRIPTION:

Through this program, the neighborhood worked with A Brush With Kindness -- a Habitat for Humanity program -- to organize volunteer teams to carry out painting, minor repairs, and clean-up efforts to make improvements to the houses of low income homeowners in the neighborhood.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Through this partnership, A Brush with Kindness organized several volunteer teams and addressed 12 houses of low income homeowners. Two of the volunteer teams came from the neighborhood. While the program was effective in addressing some of the worst properties in the neighborhood at a reduced cost, its cost effectiveness with some properties was questioned, given the quality of the work and the cost of sponsorship. If this approach is to be more successful in the future, more technical assistance to support the volunteer teams would be helpful.

II. YOUTH AND SOCIAL

Logan Park Youth Workers (2 strategies)

NRP AMOUNT: \$32,000

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$56,423

IMPLEMENTED BY: Logan Park Rec. Center

REVIEW METHOD: Interview of Park staff and Parents

DESCRIPTION:

NRP funds have helped the Park enhance its youth-oriented staff by increasing the hours and stability of two staff positions.

HIGHLIGHTS:

With NRP funds, the park expanded its youth outreach staff from part time to full time – helping retain a consistent role model for the youth and expanding staffing during the critical after-school hours. Through the youth outreach worker, Club Logan has involved over 50 youth in planning events and rewarded the youth for helping park staff. NRP funds were also used to upgrade the pay for the outside playground supervisor, making it possible to hire an adult, rather than youth peer, for this important supervisory position. Youth at the park are more likely to challenge the authority of a peer playground worker than an adult. Adult staffing has been important to deal with problems at the basketball court and secluded areas of the park. Parents have expressed relief.

Community Health Program

NRP AMOUNT: \$75,000

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$142,000

IMPLEMENTED BY: Northeast Senior Resource Center

REVIEW METHOD: Complete report by NESRC

DESCRIPTION:

This program has provided health care services and basic assistance (i.e. snow shoveling, lawn mowing, cleaning, etc.) to hundreds of residents in the Logan Park and St. Anthony East neighborhoods.

HIGHLIGHTS:

In addition to helping many older residents remain in their homes, rather than seek more costly residential care treatments, the program has also provided inter-generational services such as disease prevention education, classes for kids, immunizations, baby-sitting training, and other family programs. Child and senior vaccinations were given to 228 individuals. Two health fairs were held. Numerous people received health care education and referrals, home visits, and transportation to their medical provider.

Community volunteers provided many of the services, and significant corporate donations and County services were brought to Northeast Minneapolis through this program.(See Attachment E)

III. ARTS AND CULTURE PROGRAMS

Arts/ Culture Classes/ Arts Festival / Administrator

NRP AMOUNT: \$78,400

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$210,000

IMPLEMENTED BY: LPNA & NEMA (NE Mpls. Arts Assoc.)

REVIEW METHOD: Measuring attendance at events and participation in planning

DESCRIPTION:

NRP funding has supported a variety of volunteer-organized arts activities with minimal coordination by paid staff. And, from 1998 to the present, NRP funds have supported arts & culture classes from languages to arts & crafts to cooking.

HIGHLIGHTS:

NRP funds have made a substantial contribution to near NE Minneapolis emerging as the latest artists community. This has led to substantial economic development activity and attracted people from outside the area to NE Minneapolis. Crowds of 75-500 have been drawn to a variety of community events, including an outdoor movie night, interactive performances by Bare Bones Productions, a Kiddie Parade, performances by Heart of the Beast and Chicks on Sticks, John Phillips Sousa Band, and Bob DeFlores, Shakespeare in the Park, public art events by *Pesto!*, and Lights of Logan. The events are a real community-builder for the Logan Park community

Foremost among the sponsored events is the annual art crawl, Art-a-Whirl, which now attracts 10,000 - 15,000 to NE Minneapolis each year and has been supported by Logan Park NRP funds since 1999. 300 NE artists participated in the event in 2001. LPNA sponsors events for children at the Park as part of Art-a-Whirl, including community cabarets, a family art making festival, a community parade and performances during this growing event.

And through the arts and cultural classes, the neighborhood has held approximately 30 classes serving over 300 residents of all ages. Because of the success of these initiatives, other neighborhoods now look to LPNA for guidance in arts programming. (See attachment C)

NE Community Center - Art Space

NRP AMOUNT: \$30,000
TOTAL AMOUNT: \$20,000,000
IMPLEMENTED BY: City of Minneapolis
REVIEW METHOD: To be determined

DESCRIPTION:

NRP funds are set aside for a community artists display area in the new NE Community Center

HIGHLIGHTS:

These funds have not been utilized to date. Development of the Center is now being planned by a community task force.

IV. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Enterprise Facilitation Program

NRP AMOUNT: \$15,000
TOTAL AMOUNT: 5 other Northeast neighborhoods provided \$32,000 in NRP funds
IMPLEMENTED BY: Business Resource and Information Network (BRAIN)
REVIEW METHOD: Report by BRAIN (Attachment D)

DESCRIPTION:

This multi-neighborhood collaborative was designed to provide start-up or business expansion counseling to fledgling businesses throughout Northeast Minneapolis.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Since 1998, the program has provided start-up or business expansion counseling to 259 Northeast businesses. Of these, 184 have been start up businesses, many of which are new arts-related businesses flourishing all over Northeast. Many notable new Northeast businesses got started with help through this program, including the Crescent Moon, Dabble Gift Shop, Eva’s Europol Polish Delicatessen, and PUSH Studio. This program has also advised the Eastside Food Cooperative initiative, the Art Collective gallery and gift shop on Central Avenue, and the Coffee Shop Group of “corporate-free” owners (locally owned businesses).

Business Seminar Series

NRP AMOUNT: \$8,560

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$12,000

IMPLEMENTED BY: NE Mpls. Arts Association (NEMA)

REVIEW METHOD: NEMA Report, see attachment D2

DESCRIPTION:

With NRP funds, the Art of Business/Business of Art program has sponsored a series of workshops for artists and small home-based businesses to assist them in developing sound business practices.

HIGHLIGHTS:

206 individuals have attended the first 2 rounds of workshops which have featured classes on public relations, sales, accounting, and a variety of other topics. Because of the success and popularity of the program, NEMA will continue the program on its own with a new grant from the Jerome Foundation.

Central Avenue Corridor Study

NRP AMOUNT: \$10,000

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$80,000

IMPLEMENTED BY: Northeast Neighborhood Organizations

REVIEW METHOD: Review of completed study, Making Central Avenue Great

DESCRIPTION:

This strategy produced a detailed plan for improving Central Avenue that addressed retail and housing considerations, design guidelines, and a development framework.

HIGHLIGHTS:

This collaborative was funded by four neighborhoods and several corporations. Representatives from various elements of the Northeast community participated in the process. It serves as a “blueprint” for redevelopment of Central Avenue.

V. PARKS AND ENVIRONMENT

Logan Park Rec. Center Upgrades and Additions

NRP AMOUNT: \$65,950

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$350,000 by Park Board

IMPLEMENTED BY: Mpls. Park Board

REVIEW METHOD: Interviews with Park staff, Park users

DESCRIPTION: NRP funds were used to supplement the renovation of Logan Park Recreation Center and Playground and upgrade the facilities in a way that better reflects the historic look desired by the neighborhood.

HIGHLIGHTS: The upgrades carried out with NRP assistance include benches, tables, fencing, a tot-lot, and a flower garden. The garden, which borders Broadway Avenue, provides some very visible color to the recreation-oriented park, welcomes users to the park, and reflects the neighborhood's being part of the Historic Garden District. Volunteers planted and maintain the garden and donated plants. The renovation has been very well received in the neighborhood, with some concerns about maintenance issues.

VI. NEIGHBORHOOD LIVABILITY

Install Safety Street Lighting

NRP AMOUNT: \$140,000

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$560,000 (est.)

IMPLEMENTED BY: City of Minneapolis

REVIEW METHOD: Attachment F

DESCRIPTION:

This project is still in its early implementation phase.

HIGHLIGHTS:

VII. IMPLEMENTATION

Neighborhood Staff

NRP AMOUNT: \$6,000

TOTAL AMOUNT: \$6,000

IMPLEMENTED BY: LPNA

REVIEW METHOD: Monitor plan implementation

DESCRIPTION:

NRP funds have provided staff support for the Phase 1 Review and several NRP plan modifications.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Minimal neighborhood staffing for administration of the NRP implementation efforts was required outside of the housing staff position due to extensive volunteer commitment.

Logan Park Neighborhood NRP Phase One Housing Review

Overview

The focus of the NRP Phase 1 housing activities was exterior housing rehabilitation, with some extra attention given to properties viewed as problems based on their exterior appearance.

NRP rehab funds of \$855,800 leveraged non-NRP funds of \$605,500, or 70 cents for each NRP dollar (this includes an NRP transition fund grant program).

The most significant achievement of Logan Park's NRP housing programs was the Problem Properties Program which won an award as the Best Housing Program funded by NRP during Phase 1 (1992-2000). 61 of the original 94 problem properties have shown at least some improvement (see attached chart for details of progress).

A total of 6 housing strategies were funded - a revolving loan fund, a home improvement grant program, a grant program for problem properties, down payment assistance grants, a home painting program done in conjunction with A Brush With Kindness, and contracted housing staff who worked primarily on the Problem Property Program.

This review was conducted through a telephone survey (results attached) of a large sampling (57 of 127) of the recipients of the 3 major home improvement loan and grant programs. Other programs were reviewed by the Housing Committee and by interviews of the agency staff serving as a vendor for each program.

Revolving Loans, Home Improvement Grant Programs, Problem Properties Grants

The attached table details the responses of those surveyed about the 3 loan/grant programs. Based on the recipients responses, and the observations of the Housing Committee, loan and grant programs need to be continued, especially those that target improvements for some of the most rundown properties.

Down Payment Assistance Grants

The down payment assistance grants however were difficult to market. The grants were often awarded after the home purchase had been made, so the grant was not really an incentive to the home buyer. With the changing market for homes in Logan Park, incentives are not really needed to encourage buyers to purchase the fixer-uppers. This is happening without any incentives.

Home Painting Program (A Brush With Kindness)

This program was effective in addressing some of the worst properties in the neighborhood. Its cost effectiveness and the quality of the work were questioned however. More technical assistance to support the volunteer teams would have been helpful. In the future, such programs need to be able to handle minor repairs and clean up activities as well.

Housing Staff

The major work of the housing staff was administering the problem properties program. Given that this program received the award from NRP, we feel confident that this was effective use of funds. Staff efforts were a major factor in motivating problem property owners to participate in home improvement activities. The staff, Kim Vohs, also administered grant programs for LPNA and received positive comments from grant recipients

surveyed.

Survey Responses from Recipients of Logan Park Home Improvement Loans/Grants - March 2001

Respondents: 37 of the 70 1999 Grant Program recipients, 10 of the 30 Basic Improvement Grant Program recipients (both managed by Vohs Consulting & Management Services), and 10 of the 27 Revolving Loan Program recipients (managed by Center for Energy and the Environment).

1. How did you hear of the program?	Neighbor	Flyer	Northeaster Newspaper	Nghbrhd Meeting	Other
1999 Grant Program	5	20	9	9	6
BIG	3	5			3 - Kim
Revolving Loan	2	4		4	
2. How was the application process?	Clear	Complicated	Too Long	Easy	Comment
1999 Grant Program	30	3	2	17	
BIG	8	5	1	2	
Revolving Loan	6	2		5	
3. Were deadlines appropriate?	Yes	No	Reason		
1999 Grant Program	33	4	Getting contractor bids was a problem		
BIG	8	2	Getting contractor bids was a problem		
Revolving Loan	8	2	Bids and completion time a problem		
4. Was the grant/loan size sufficient?	Yes	No	Reason		
1999 Grant Program	33	4	needed a little more		
BIG	8	2	not enough		
Revolving Loan	8	2	not enough		
5. Based on your experience, would you apply for another matching grant or loan?	Yes	No	Reason		
1999 Grant Program	37				
BIG	10				
Revolving Loan	10				
6. Was the administrator available and easily accessible?	Yes	No	Comment		
1999 Grant Program	35	1			

BIG	10		
Revolving Loan	7	3	
7. Was the administrator responsive with your questions and payments?	Yes	No	Comment
1999 Grant Program	37		
BIG	10		
Revolving Loan	10		
8. Was the administrator knowledgeable of the program and did he/she communicate well?	Yes	No	Comment
1999 Grant Program	35	1	
BIG	10		
Revolving Loan	10		
9. Any other comments about the administrator	Comment		
1999 Grant Program	bent over backwards, great, helpful,		
BIG	lots of help, tenacious, works with inspectors well		
Revolving Loan	helpful, efficient, personal, flexible, helped prioritize		
10. Have you noticed changes to some of the worst properties in the neighborhood?	Yes	No	Comment
1999 Grant Program	32	4	
BIG	6	1	
Revolving Loan	8	2	
11. Do you feel that the neighborhood has improved because of the loan/grant programs?	Yes	No	Comment
1999 Grant Program	37		
BIG	9		
Revolving Loan	10		
12. Without the NRP funds, I would not have made the improvements to my property.	Agree	Dis-agree	Comment
1999 Grant Program	18	10	9 said eventually/some improvements
BIG	7	3	
Revolving Loan	7	3	
13. Did the program allow you to address your most important housing need?	Yes	No	Comment
1999 Grant Program	25	12	7-8 people wanted \$\$ for interior work, 1 for mechanical systems
BIG	8	2	

**NRP Phase I Review Plan
Social/Health Programs**

Strategy: Community Health Program

Description: Establish a community health care service and volunteers to assist older and single parent families who would otherwise not have access to healthcare. This is a cooperative program with St. Anthony East and Hennepin County.

Participants: Executive Director: Rick Stelter. Service Coordinator, Jennifer Gisslen Lee. Outreach Coordinator: Donna Draves. Steering Committee members: Clareyse Nelson, Margi Orman, Donna Norberg, Doug Davis, Mary Jane Partyka.

Outcomes:	<u>Direct Care Clients</u>	1999	2000	2001
	Vaccinations <i>(child immunizations and senior flu shots)</i>	0/0	156/278	72/158
	Foot Care	0/0	6/13	7/26
	Other Nursing	0/0	5/14	2/15
	Prescription Drugs	0/0	11/63	11/105
	Transportation	9/50*	13/80*	13/128
	Chores	2/4	6/70	7/84
	Insurance Applications	1/1	1/1	0/0
	Blood Pressure Clinics	0/0	0/0	20/138

(numbers provided are # of clients/# of visits per year)
* estimated

Volunteer Matches

10 in 1999, 7 in 2000, 3 in 2001 (for walking, visiting, rides, pet care, massage)

Referrals

Phone records are kept by the receptionist, who probably answers 80% of calls to the office; approximately 11-15 calls per month estimated for the Community Health Program, about half of those are requests for information. Mental health referrals: 5. Asbestos information: 8.

Education

Resource Directories: mental health resources, child and teen resources, resources for seniors, hidden treasures.
2002 Community Health Program calendar
2001 Coloring Contest: Webster Beacons Program, Logan Park Rec Plus:
44 participants
Prescription drug information
Prescription drug seminar: Catholic Eldercare & Rainbow pharmacist
Y2K presentation: American Red Cross
Babysitter training class: American Red Cross and Webster Open School,
10 participants
Catholic Eldercare Wellness Fair (CHP participates annually)
Senior Health & Resource Fair (CHP participates annually)

Community Building

Brush with Kindness (sponsored 2 Logan Park families)

Volunteer recruitment via mailings, group contacts, etc.
National Night Out high-rise event sponsorships and organizing:
150 participants annually at two high-rises.
Volunteer Projects: Solicited donations and had volunteers assemble 450 adult personal care and baby care kits for Make A Difference Day 2000; Solicited donations and assembled 73 birthday party kits for National Family Volunteer Day 2001. Teamed with Silver Angel Thrift Store.
Outreach: door knocking and leafleting of CHP information. Visited 40 homes in isolated areas of the neighborhoods as a special project.
Community Health Surveys: Intern published "Needs & Expectations for a Healthy Community" - a survey done in 1998-99 (100+ survey respondents), report is available in CHP office and online. Intern did survey of teenager health issues in summer 2001 (30 participants and 10 adults), report available in CHP office.

Community Partnerships

Northeast Senior Citizen Resource Center, Inc.
NEST Way to Grow
Silver Angel Thrift Store
Minnesota Department of Health
Fremont Community Health - Sheridan Clinic
1717 Washington St. NE - high-rise resident council
828 Spring Street NE - high-rise resident council

Financial Contributors (non-NRP funds)

North Memorial - \$1,000
Community Initiatives Program - \$10,000
Wal-Mart - \$1,000
Sci-Med - \$6,500
St. Luke Presbyterian - \$4,000
Individuals - \$2,000
Medtronic - \$5,000+

Attachment F

Logan Park Street Lighting Program

Background

The Logan Park Street Lighting Program was developed in 1998 as a result of two separate neighborhood committees, Safety and Livability, identifying a common benefit from replacing the existing streetlights. A

lantern style lighting was selected that would improve safety because they were closer to the ground, under the tree lines, and provide a look that was more consistent with the common age of the housing in the neighborhood. Discussions with the City about options, costs, and requirements resulted in developing a proposal to light up to 13 blocks along 5 of the streets in the neighborhood with the neighborhood reserving \$140,000 of its NRP funds to defray some of the expense. These blocks were later identified as including 395 individual buildings. No funds were set-up for administration of the program.

Program Management

Original planning committee members turned the execution of the program over to a follow-on committee which had the City develop a petition and related information for communication to the individual property owners in the selected area. The committee executed various strategies to contact the owners. The primary strategy was to have teams of people visit every property in the area and present the plan. Every building in the lighting area within the Logan Park neighborhood was visited at least once, some up to four times. Some of the 395 structures were located in the Sheridan neighborhood because one of the streets was a border street and the city required that both sides be lighted. The majority of these people were not contacted because it became obvious that the required approval percentage set by the City Councilman would not be reached. If no one was available a flyer explaining the goals and costs was left with contact numbers. This was supplemented with:

- Periodic publication of the information in the monthly neighborhood flyers
- Updates and petitions being made available at monthly Neighborhood general meetings
- Booths at neighborhood events staffed by volunteers
- Direct public meetings with property owners

By November, 2000, the committee was able to turn over to the City signatures covering eight of the original 13 blocks. An open meeting was called to communicate the current status and a further attempt made to contact all property owners not directly contacted to this point by mail. 116 properties throughout the project area were sent a mailing. The mailing included the current status and communicated that the entire Neighborhood fund would be allocated to those blocks that approved the process. Petitioners again tried to visit the homes on the blocks lacking signatures. In July a final letter was to all Logan Park property owners on those five blocks announcing the end of the petitioning on July 27. Eventually the five blocks that had not received sufficient signatures were dropped from the lighting plan. On three of the blocks less than half of the homeowners or residents were ever directly contacted.

Overall summary

The initial plan called for approximately 100 streetlights to be placed on 13 blocks containing 395 separate structures. The final plan called for approximately 60 streetlights to be placed on eight blocks containing 245 structures. 200 personal contacts were made in this eight block area with only 16 of the contacts voting against the lighting. 257 contacts were made overall with 25 voting against the lighting.

Administrative Issues

This program encountered a number of issues about how the lighting would be installed that made program management difficult. Among these were:

Insufficient boulevard space on one of the streets to construct the lighting without going into the existing lawns and retaining walls.

The requirement to include lighting within another neighborhood.

Allocation of costs to four churches included within the initial lighting area.

Allocation of lighting costs to corner lots only partially covered by the lights.

The inclusion of three sides of a city park within the lighting area.

Program evaluation

Evaluation has not yet been completed. A phone survey has been prepared to give to committee members who participated during program formation and/or petitioning.