

MINNEAPOLIS NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

LOWRY HILL EAST

NRP PHASE II

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION PLAN

Legal Opinion Reference Date: March 19, 2008

Date Adopted by the Policy Board: April 28, 2008

Date Adopted by the City Council: May 2, 2008

Published in Finance & Commerce: May 10, 2008

THE WEDGE

LOWRY HILL EAST

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Hennepin
Lyndale

Lake

**LOWRY HILL EAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION PROGRAM**

PHASE II ACTION PLAN

MARCH 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INTRODUCTION	3
LHENA MISSION	3
NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION	3
PHASE II PLANNING PROCESS	4
History	
Gathering Neighborhood Ideas	
Identifying Neighborhood Priorities	
Developing Neighborhood Goals	
Translating Goals into Strategies	
Final Stages: Springing into Action!	
GOALS, OBJECTIVES, STRATEGIES	
Housing.....	7
Infrastructure.....	12
Crime and Safety.....	17
Youth, Arts and Commerce.....	20
Administration.....	24
APPENDIX A: Funding Allocation Spreadsheet	i
APPENDIX B: Neighborhood Map	ii
APPENDIX C: Phase I Survey Comments	iii
APPENDIX D: Visioning Session Ideas	v
APPENDIX E: Phase II Survey Results	viii

**LOWRY HILL EAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION (LHENA)
NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION PROGRAM (NRP)
PHASE II ACTION PLAN**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following document culminates fourteen months of planning by the NRP Steering Committee on behalf of the Lowry Hill East neighborhood. The Committee worked through a number of methods to develop this Phase II Action Plan which aims to promote a neighborhood vision through stakeholder-identified goals and strategies.

The Action Plan is divided into five areas: Housing; Infrastructure; Crime & Safety; Youth, Arts & Commerce; and Administration.

Housing:

Over 70 percent of the \$747,852 Phase II NRP funding allocation is assigned to strategies within this category. Programming includes historic preservation matching forgivable loans, low-interest home improvement loans, and matching grants for both exterior and environmentally-friendly home improvements. The Plan also commits to exploring an historic district, providing green home seminars, hosting a workshop to educate landlords and tenants of rights and responsibilities, supporting adoption of the LHENA Rezoning Study, and promoting 311 as a resource to improve livability.

Infrastructure:

Strategies under this heading include removing tree stumps from neighborhood boulevards and promoting new tree planting, installing pedestrian lighting south of 28th Street, encouraging utility companies to bury wiring through alleys and streets, providing reimbursement for trash receptacles and bicycle racks, increasing pedestrian awareness, and hosting a neighborhood clean-sweep day.

Crime & Safety:

Crime prevention and safety are a top priority. Strategies include facilitating crime prevention awareness communication, promoting block clubs and a volunteer walking patrol, and continuing to fund extra neighborhood bike and beat patrols through the Minneapolis Police Department.

Youth, Arts & Commerce:

Strategies include support for youth arts programming, promoting youth employment options, installing a message board outside Jefferson Community School, hosting a neighborhood sale, and providing matching grants to businesses for exterior renovations and improvements.

Administration:

The Action Plan provides funding for staff, office, and communication expenses.

The LHENA Board of Directors voted to approve the Action Plan on February 20, 2008, pending a decision at the March 10, 2008 neighborhood-wide meeting, where it was approved unanimously.

INTRODUCTION

The following Lowry Hill East Neighborhood Association (LHENA) Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) Phase II Action Plan promotes a neighborhood vision through stakeholder-identified goals and strategies. The opportunity to actively engage in both its development and implementation fosters a sense of pride, ownership, and community in this place, this neighborhood, which connects so many.

LHENA MISSION

LHENA exists to represent the interests and values of its residents, property and business owners to the larger community and government.

NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Lowry Hill East is an eclectic neighborhood located in the Calhoun-Isles area. Because of its roughly triangular shape, Lowry Hill East is sometimes called “the Wedge.” Active commercial corridors form the geographic boundaries of the neighborhood with Hennepin and Lyndale Avenues and Lake Street. Two key shopping and entertainment activity centers cross through the southern corners of the neighborhood: Uptown and Lyn-Lake. A variety of establishments line the Wedge’s edges, including restaurants, bars, coffee shops, bakeries, grocery stores, boutiques, galleries, theaters, and a range of service businesses. Several schools, including Jefferson Community School and Wellstone International High School, are located in Lowry Hill East. Neighborhood residents and visitors also enjoy such amenities as Mueller Park, the Bryant Avenue Bikeway, and the Midtown Greenway.

A variety of housing options can be found in the Lowry Hill East, ranging from 19th century Victorian homes and 1920s bungalows to modern apartment buildings and, more recently, high-end condominium developments. The neighborhood has approximately 3,625 residential structures. A majority of the housing units are renter-occupied, with owner-occupied units forming only 15 percent, according to the data from the 2000 Census.

Many are drawn to the diverse mix of housing offered, resulting in a densely populated neighborhood. Of the nearly 6,000 people who called Lowry Hill East home in the year 2000, 85 percent were European-American, seven percent African-American, one percent Native-American, three percent Asian-American, and four percent claimed Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. The majority of Lowry Hill East’s population is between 20 and 34 years of age, representing 61 percent of neighborhood residents. Residents between 35 and 54 years of age make up the second-largest group at 24 percent.

PHASE II PLANNING PROCESS:

History:

Phase II planning initially grew from the 2006 LHENA-NRP Phase I Evaluation. As the NRP Steering Committee assessed the effectiveness of strategies implemented during Phase I, they asked neighborhood residents to identify issues yet to be addressed and projects yet to be accomplished. This identification was performed through a survey distributed to every address in the neighborhood by its inclusion in *The Wedge*, our neighborhood newspaper. It was also distributed at neighborhood meetings, National Night Out events, and through emails to past meeting attendees and interested persons. Respondents identified a range of areas for improvement from zoning and livability issues to crime and safety concerns, and from improvements on Lyndale Avenue to the need for additional youth programming.

Gathering Neighborhood Ideas:

Once the Phase I Evaluation had been approved and the Phase II Participation Agreement accepted, LHENA officially began the process to develop an Action Plan for Phase II NRP funding. This process kicked off with two visioning sessions held at Jefferson Community School which gave stakeholders, including residents, business and property owners, a chance to submit potential ideas for Phase II projects. Participants were encouraged to think broadly about their visions of how to improve the neighborhood and best utilize Phase II funds.

Ideas generated through these sessions covered a vast range of topics. The NRP Steering Committee decided to recycle the same headings used under the Phase I Action Plan (Arts & Commerce, Crime & Safety, Housing, Infrastructure, Youth & Education, and Administration) for the sessions as they seemed to encompass most suggestions, but they also added a “Miscellaneous” heading for those which went beyond previously-identified categories.

Identifying Neighborhood Priorities:

Once the Steering Committee had collected ideas through the visioning sessions, they sought to identify neighborhood priorities and asked stakeholders to rank the ideas at the April 2007 LHENA Annual Meeting through a concept known as a “Dot-mocracy.” All of the submitted suggestions, along with comments received through the LHENA-NRP Phase I Evaluation survey, were posted on the walls for review. Attendees were given green and red stickers to identify those suggestions they wanted to see continued in or eliminated from the planning process.

During the mid-1990s, the original Phase I NRP Steering Committee developed a comprehensive survey to identify neighborhood issues. The 2006-07 Steering Committee decided to distribute an identical Phase II survey at the April 2007 LHENA Annual Meeting and on the LHENA website in order to compare the results with those of the earlier version and determine remaining areas of concern.

Another important activity of the April 2007 Annual Meeting: the neighborhood elected new members to the 2007-08 NRP Steering Committee. This group would be responsible for completing the Phase II planning process.

Developing Neighborhood Goals:

The newly-elected NRP Steering Committee accepted the challenge and tackled the planning process head-on. They began by reviewing the results of the Dot-mocracy and the Phase II survey, which identified neighborhood priorities. In June 2007, they held two sessions in Mueller Park to further solicit neighborhood feedback. It should be noted that through this prioritizing process, while all ideas were valued, certain suggestions were eliminated due to feasibility associated with cost or overlap with existing programming.

The Committee worked to shape these prioritized ideas into Action Plan goals. In addition to publicizing them through *The Wedge* newspaper and the LHENA website, the Committee utilized events such as the LHENA Neighborhood Garage Sale, Annual Ice Cream Social, Walk the Wedge Home Tour, and National Night Out as opportunities to present the proposed Action Plan goals to the neighborhood.

Translating Goals into Strategies:

From mid-August through October 2007, the Steering Committee met weekly to develop actionable strategies which aimed to achieve the Action Plan goals. *The Wedge* newspaper and LHENA website published updated drafts of both goals and strategies as they were written. During this period, it became apparent that additional time would be needed for neighborhood feedback and plan development, so the Committee modified the Participation Agreement in accordance with the procedures laid out therein.

In November 2007, the Steering Committee drafted a budget to correspond with the projects listed in the Action Plan. Throughout December 2007 and into January 2008, the Committee further refined strategies in hopes to clarify intent without restricting future programming. They revised the budget in order to meet the requirement that 70 percent of funding be allocated to housing-related strategies. They also created objectives, the means by which to measure the success of a strategy once implemented.

Final Stages: Springing into Action!

A nearly finished draft of the Phase II Action Plan was posted on the LHENA website in February 2008 along with a summary published in *The Wedge* newspaper. A final draft was submitted to the LHENA Board

of Directors for approval on February 20, 2008. The LHENA Board voted to approve the Action Plan, pending neighborhood-wide approval at a March 10, 2008 meeting, which it received unanimously.

Throughout the course of the Phase II planning process, the NRP Steering Committee has worked diligently to accurately identify neighborhood priorities and maintain communication with neighborhood residents, business and property owners. Their overarching mission has been to make Lowry Hill East a better place and they have aimed to be good stewards of neighborhood funds. The Committee hopes that this Phase II Action Plan is a reflection of the time, thought and energy they and other community members have dedicated to it.

HOUSING:

1. GOAL:

Support the preservation of neighborhood homes and buildings with architectural and historical significance.

1.1 OBJECTIVE:

Preserve historic properties by providing at least ten matching forgivable loans, establishing an historic district, and supporting the LHENA Rezoning Study.

1.1.1 STRATEGY: HISTORIC PRESERVATION LOANS

In order to preserve historic homes and thus maintain the integrity and character of the neighborhood, LHENA will continue to offer revolving, matching forgivable loans for properties previously identified by the Mead & Hunt property survey during LHENA-NRP Phase I.

This program will be reviewed annually and may be reallocated in accordance with neighborhood need and NRP guidelines if there is no further need. Guidelines for eligible applicants and improvements will be determined annually. Income limits would be open and need-based. Eligible expenses will include exterior improvements, and could be expanded to include interior renovation. Consultant services will be provided to applicants.

The program will begin with the most significant properties and could be expanded to include additional properties within the neighborhood. Interest repaid on loans will go toward administration costs and repaid loans will be recycled for future use. LHENA-NRP Steering Committee will select a professional outside agency to administer program. Minimum loan size of \$2,500 and maximum of \$10,000. The NRP-funded loan must be matched by funds from the property owner on a 1:1 basis, up to the maximum NRP loan amount.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$235,000.

Leveraged Funds: Matching contribution from recipients.

Timeline: LHENA anticipates that all loans will be contracted by 2010.

Partners: Housing service agency to act as program administrator.

Contract Manager: DFD/CPED

1.1.2 STRATEGY: EXPLORE HISTORIC DISTRICT

In order to preserve historic homes and thus maintain the integrity and character of the neighborhood, LHENA will explore the possibility of designating the Lowry Hill East neighborhood as an historic district by building on the Historic Context Study performed by Carole Zellie during LHENA-NRP Phase I. LHENA will select consultants to research the eligibility of the neighborhood for historic designation. LHENA may explore networking with nearby neighborhoods which share similar interest, goals and needs related to historic preservation.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$10,000.

Timeline: Continuing through 2010.

Partners: Possible network with adjacent neighborhoods.

Contract Manager: DFD/CPED

1.1.3 STRATEGY: PROMOTE REZONING STUDY

In order to preserve historic homes and thus maintain the integrity and character of the neighborhood, LHENA will continue to support the LHENA Rezoning Plan as approved by the LHENA Board in 2004, and encourage the City of Minneapolis to adopt this plan.

This support is particularly important for “critical properties”, identified as those built as single- or two-family near the turn of the 20th century, currently zoned multifamily, and still used as single-family, duplex or triplex.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$0.

Timeline: Ongoing.

Partners: City of Minneapolis.

Contract Manager: DFD/CPED

2. GOAL:
Encourage integration of “green” solutions.

2.1 OBJECTIVE:
Inform at least 300 additional people of simple methods to reduce their carbon footprints.

2.1.1 STRATEGY: GREEN SEMINARS

LHENA will provide ongoing programming, including seminars and other educational opportunities to inform residents, including renters, of green solutions, such as recycling, waste and energy reduction. Volunteers will assist with program planning. Industry professionals will conduct workshops and seminars to educate neighborhood residents on various environmentally-friendly actions. Workshops will likely be held at public spaces located in the neighborhood. Funds may be used for promotional materials, research, educators’ fees, and space rental charges.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$2,000.

Timeline: By 2010.

Partners: Possible partnerships with the University of Minnesota, MN Energy Challenge, Xcel Energy, Minnesota Environmental Partnership.

Contract Manager: NRP/DFD

2.2 OBJECTIVE:
Provide at least 10 matching grants for green property improvements.

2.2.1 STRATEGY: GREEN IMPROVEMENT MATCHING GRANTS

To encourage property owners within the neighborhood to think about environmentally-friendly and sustainable ways to improve their homes, LHENA will establish a matching grant program (providing one dollar for every two dollars invested by the property owner) for green property improvements, such as raingardens, solar panels, and the removal/decrease of impervious surfaces. LHENA volunteers and staff will oversee the program. Property owners will make environmental improvements to their homes. They will then submit receipts for reimbursement by LHENA. LHENA will reimburse one dollar for every two invested.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$40,000. (\$2,500. limit per property)

Leveraged Funds: Matching contribution from recipients.

Timeline: By 2010.

Partners: Possible partnerships with Minneapolis Blooms, Green Institute, University of Minnesota Master Gardener Program, Minnesota Environmental Partnership.

Contract Manager: DFD

3. GOAL:
Support the improvement of housing stock.

3.1 OBJECTIVE:
Improved housing stock.

3.1.1 STRATEGY: HOME IMPROVEMENT LOANS

To maintain and improve neighborhood housing stock, LHENA will continue a revolving, below-market-interest loan program for residential property improvements. Eligible applicants and improvements will be determined annually. Income limits will be open and need-based. Eligible expenses will include exterior improvements (and common interior spaces for rental units), and could be expanded to include interior renovation. Interest repaid on loans will go toward administration costs and repaid loans will be recycled for future use. LHENA-NRP Steering Committee will select a professional outside agency to administer program. Minimum loan amount of \$2,500 and maximum of \$25,000. Property owners are eligible for more than one loan per property as long as the previous LHENA loan on that property has been completely paid off.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$145,000.

Timeline: Ongoing, revolving program.

Partners: Housing service agency to serve as program administrator.

Contract Manager: DFD

3.1.2 STRATEGY: MATCHING EXTERIOR GRANTS

To maintain and improve neighborhood housing stock, LHENA will establish a matching grant program (providing one dollar for every two dollars invested by the owner) for exterior renovation of houses, duplexes and apartment buildings. LHENA volunteers and staff will supervise all aspects of the matching grant program, including guideline development, program administration, marketing, application processing/review/approval, inspections, and payment for improvements.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$75,000. (\$2,500. limit per property.)

Leveraged Funds: Matching contribution from recipients.

Timeline: Ongoing until funds exhausted.

Partners:

Contract Manager: DFD

4. GOAL:
Promote communication and education for landlords and tenants.

4.1 OBJECTIVE:
Host a workshop to inform tenants and landlords of rights and responsibilities.

4.1.1 STRATEGY: LANDLORD/TENANT NETWORK

Given our large renter population, it is vital to clarify rights and responsibilities of both landlords and tenants. LHENA will create a network for sharing information and educating landlords and renters about their respective rights and responsibilities. An initial contact with all other neighborhood organizations of the Calhoun-Isles Planning District will be the basis for planning a public forum and determining future need and interest.

Funds may be used for mailing and promotion of meetings. If need and interest continue, it is hoped that other neighborhood organizations would share in future expenses.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$1,000.

Timeline: 2008.

Partners: Possible partnerships with nearby neighborhood organizations.

Contract Manager: NRP

5. GOAL:
Improve enforcement for livability issues.

5.1 OBJECTIVE:
Improved neighborhood livability.

5.1.1 STRATEGY: PROMOTE “311”

In order to increase awareness of property inspections process and “311” system, LHENA volunteers and staff will submit articles to appear in The Wedge newspaper and on the LHENA website. Through this awareness, LHENA hopes to increase livability and enjoyment of the environment and to direct residents and property owners to appropriate outlets for solving problems.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$0.

Timeline: Ongoing.

Partners: City of Minneapolis 311 system.

Contract Manager: DFD/NRP

INFRASTRUCTURE:

6. GOAL:

Address loss of boulevard trees and remaining stumps, and promote reestablishment of the tree canopy.

6.1 OBJECTIVE:

Remove remaining stumps throughout the neighborhood on “plantable sites” as identified by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) in 2007 and encourage new tree planting.

6.1.1 STRATEGY: TREE STUMP REMOVAL AND PLANTING

Revitalize and preserve the urban forest by removing tree stumps as needed and focusing future boulevard plantings on size-appropriate, disease-resistant trees.

LHENA will contribute up to \$3,000 of NRP funds for tree stump removal on neighborhood boulevards deemed “plantable” by the MPRB in 2007. The MPRB will select a contractor, based on bids, and will serve as Contract Manager for the tree stump removal. The MPRB will inform property owners of their need to request a tree for spring planting. LHENA will encourage property owners to request trees through articles in the Wedge newspaper. The MPRB will provide a final report to the Lowry Hill East Neighborhood Association upon completion of the project, and will receive approval from the LHENA-NRP Steering Committee prior to final payment on the contract.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$15,000.

Timeline: 2008.

Partners: MPRB

Contract Manager: MPRB

7. GOAL:
Continue the standard of neighborhood pedestrian lighting south of 28th Street.

7.1 OBJECTIVE:
Light all blocks in the neighborhood south of 28th Street with standard of neighborhood pedestrian lighting.

7.1.1 STRATEGY: PEDESTRIAN STREETLIGHTING SOUTH OF 28TH

To reduce crime and improve the pedestrian environment, LHENA will encourage the completion of the neighborhood lighting standard south of 28th Street as promised through Urban Village developer and City Council commitments. LHENA will also request that any new Urban Village developer commit to a contract stating they will abide by LHENA lighting standards.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$0.

Leveraged Funds: Provided by developers and/or Minneapolis Public Works and City Council.

Timeline: Ongoing.

Partners: Urban Village developers, Minneapolis City Council

Contract Manager: Public Works

8. GOAL:
Move unsightly utility wiring underground.

8.1 OBJECTIVE:
Utility wiring will be buried underground throughout the neighborhood.

8.1.1 STRATEGY: UNDERGROUND UTILITY WIRING

LHENA will advocate that utility companies bury wiring underground throughout the neighborhood. LHENA will explore with Xcel Energy, Reliant Energy, Comcast, and Qwest the opportunity to bury wiring in a common trench as roads and alleys are resurfaced and sidewalks are redone. This is necessary not only for the aesthetics of the neighborhood but also to save trees from unnatural pruning which results in reduced shade, diseased trees, and lessening of the canopy.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$0.

Timeline: Ongoing.

Partners: Utility corporations, such as Xcel Energy, Reliant Energy, Comcast, and Qwest.

Contract Manager: NRP/DFD

9. GOAL:
Reduce littering and improve cleanliness of the neighborhood.

9.1 OBJECTIVE:
Neighborhood appears cleaner through the addition of up to 20 trash receptacles and semi-annual clean-up days.

9.1.1 STRATEGY: TRASH RECEPTACLES

To improve the cleanliness and appearance of the neighborhood, LHENA will promote additional trash receptacles throughout the interior by reimbursing property owners up to \$100 per container, if they make a commitment to the City of Minneapolis Adopt-a-Litter-Container program. Reimbursement will be provided on a one-time basis.

Property owners will apply for the Adopt-a-Litter-Container program offered through the City of Minneapolis to have a public trash receptacle installed on street boulevards, corners, etc. Property owners will be responsible for the container as specified in their agreement with the City of Minneapolis. LHENA will offer an incentive of up to \$100 per trash container if property owners provide proof of their commitment to the City program. LHENA will publicize this program in The Wedge newspaper and on the LHENA website.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$2,000.

Leveraged Funds: Property owners will be responsible for receptacle maintenance and trash removal fees. LHENA financial incentive will help offset these costs.

Timeline: 2008-2010.

Partners: City of Minneapolis and neighborhood property owners.

Contract Manager: DFD

9.1.2 STRATEGY: NEIGHBORHOOD CLEAN SWEEP

To improve the cleanliness and appearance of the neighborhood, LHENA will organize a semi-annual trash removal/neighborhood clean-up day through the City of Minneapolis Neighborhood CleanSweeps program. LHENA will contract with the City of Minneapolis for one truck and driver to pick up refuse throughout neighborhood. Neighborhood volunteers will walk alongside the truck to load accepted items.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$1,000.

Timeline: Spring and fall of 2008/09.

Partners: City of Minneapolis.

Contract Manager: DFD

10. GOAL:
Increase safety and awareness of pedestrians.

10.1 OBJECTIVE:
Provide resources where needed to improve pedestrian safety.

10.1.1 STRATEGY: PEDESTRIAN AWARENESS COMMUNICATION

To increase awareness of pedestrian safety, LHENA will promote communication through the Wedge newspaper and the LHENA website with current information and frequent updates. LHENA volunteers and staff will write articles for the Wedge newspaper reminding residents about pedestrian awareness. This and other information will be posted on the LHENA website.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$1,054.

Timeline: Ongoing.

Partners: City of Minneapolis.

Contract Manager: NRP

11. GOAL:

Designate additional bicycle parking throughout the neighborhood.

11.1 OBJECTIVE:

To subsidize the cost of up to 20 bicycle racks throughout the neighborhood.

11.1.1 STRATEGY: BIKE RACKS

To discourage the improper attachment of bicycles to trees and other surfaces and promote bicycle use, LHENA will encourage business and property owners to provide storage racks. Property owners will receive bike racks through City of Minneapolis bike racks in public places program.

Through this program, the City subsidizes 50% of the cost. LHENA will reimburse business/property owners for up to 50% of their remaining cost on the City-issued bike racks.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$7,000.

Leveraged Funds: City of Minneapolis and property owners will contribute to the bike rack costs.

Timeline: Through 2009-10.

Partners: City of Minneapolis and property owners.

Contract Manager: DFD/Public Works

CRIME & SAFETY:

12. GOAL:

Increase awareness of crime prevention strategies.

12.1 OBJECTIVE:

Increase awareness of crime prevention strategies.

12.1.1 STRATEGY: CRIME AWARENESS COMMUNICATION

To help decrease crime in the neighborhood and increase safety awareness, LHENA will promote communication through the Wedge newspaper and the LHENA website with current information and frequent updates and promote the MPD Community Crime Prevention crime alert email distribution list. LHENA volunteers and staff, along with MPD 5th Precinct Sector 1 CCP-SAFE staff, will write articles for the Wedge newspaper reminding residents about crime prevention tips. The crime map, crime alerts, and information on the email distribution system will also be published. This and other information will be posted on the LHENA website.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$0.

Timeline: Ongoing.

Partners: MPD 5th Precinct

Contract Manager: NRP

13. GOAL:
Reinvest in block clubs.

13.1 OBJECTIVE:
Increase the number of block clubs and the number of people participating in them.

13.1.1 STRATEGY: BLOCK CLUBS

To increase awareness and build both communication and community among neighbors, the LHENA Crime and Safety Committee will provide promotional materials or reimbursement thereof for block club organization and development, including sponsoring an annual block club rally.

A sign-up table will be located at the LHENA Annual Meeting. Neighborhood residents will be encouraged to locate their block on a large-scale map to find out whether they have an active block club. LHENA and the MPD 5th Precinct will inform residents of the process of forming a block club and encourage them to participate. Information will be published in the Wedge newspaper and on the LHENA website.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$2,000.

Timeline: 2008.

Partners: MPD 5th Precinct.

Contract Manager: NRP

14. GOAL:
Encourage a volunteer walking patrol.

14.1 OBJECTIVE:
Establish volunteer walking patrol.

14.1.1 STRATEGY: VOLUNTEER WALKING PATROL

To reduce crime and improve communication, especially with the high percentage of renters in the neighborhood, the LHENA Crime and Safety Committee will establish a volunteer patrol of residents to walk or bike in small groups, wearing bright, easily recognized clothing. NRP funds will be used for materials. MPD 5th Precinct Sector 1 CCP-SAFE staff will advise.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$2,000.

Timeline: Ongoing.

Partners: MPD 5th Precinct.

Contract Manager: NRP

15. GOAL:
Promote community policing.

15.1 OBJECTIVE:
Continue funding “buy-back” police bike and beat patrol service in Lowry Hill East for at least two years.

15.1.1 STRATEGY: POLICE BIKE AND BEAT BUY-BACK

To reduce crime, improve safety, and increase police visibility and communication in neighborhood, LHENA will continue to contract with the Minneapolis Police Department to receive “buy-back” police bike and beat patrol service in Lowry Hill East.

The Lowry Hill East NRP Steering Committee, with neighborhood staff assistance, will annually evaluate guidelines, scope of services, and progress of the program with the Police Department.

MPD 5th Precinct will notify officers of buy-back hours available for this program, schedule hours with officers based on times and locations requested by neighborhood representatives, and provide typed (not hand written) reports monthly to the neighborhood association about the officers’ participation and arrests or incidents derived from the patrols, including notation of business contacts. Police officers to use MPD-provided bicycles (Lowry Hill East NRP funds not allocated for cost of bicycles).

Phase II NRP Funds:	\$56,000
COPSIRF*:	+ 19,525
Total:	\$75,525

Timeline: Ongoing until funds exhausted.

Partners: MPD 5th Precinct

Contract Manager: MPD

**Community Oriented Public Safety Initiatives Reserve Fund*

YOUTH, ARTS, & COMMERCE:

16. GOAL:

Promote a sense of community and support neighborhood businesses and schools.

16.1 OBJECTIVE:

Improve the exteriors of 20 neighborhood businesses in order to stabilize and maintain economic base.

16.1.1 STRATEGY: BUSINESS EXTERIOR MATCHING GRANTS

In order to improve property appearance and stabilize the economic base in the neighborhood, LHENA will establish a matching grant program (providing one dollar for every two dollars invested by the business) for exterior improvements to businesses.

LHENA volunteers and staff will supervise all aspects of the matching grant program, including guideline development, program administration, marketing, application processing/review/approval, inspections, and payment for improvements.

Business properties located within the Lowry Hill East Neighborhood, which is bordered by Hennepin Avenue on the west, Lyndale Avenue on the east, Lake Street on the south, and I-94 on the north, will be eligible to participate. Both owner-occupied and leased properties are eligible; either the property owner or business owner may apply. Only permanent, visible, exterior improvements will be considered for the grant and owner's match.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$35,000. (\$1,500 limit per business.)

Leveraged Funds: Matching funds from recipients.

Timeline: Ongoing until funds exhausted.

Partners: Business and property owners.

Contract Manager: CPED

16.2 OBJECTIVE:

Hold a temporary outdoor sale on three Saturdays, one each month, during June, July and August 2009.

16.2.1 STRATEGY: TEMPORARY OUTDOOR SALE

In order to promote a sense of community, LHENA will explore the reestablishment of a summer temporary outdoor sale on the Jefferson Community School playground. An RFP will be issued to find an Event Coordinator. This person will be responsible for organizing the three events over the course of the summer 2009, including identifying vendors, establishing a vendor fee, advertising, and planning security. A generator as well as restroom facilities must be provided. NRP funds may be used for the coordinator's fee and event expenses.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$5,000.

Timeline: Summer 2009.

Partners: Minneapolis Public Schools

Contract Manager: NRP

16.3 OBJECTIVE:

Install a secured exterior changeable message board outside of Jefferson Community School.

16.3.1 STRATEGY: JEFFERSON EXTERIOR CHANGEABLE MESSAGE BOARD

In order to promote both school and community events, LHENA will contribute up to \$10,000 toward the purchase and installation of an exterior changeable message board for Jefferson Community School. LHENA-NRP Steering Committee members and Jefferson Community School representatives will work with Minneapolis Public Schools to select an appropriate message board and determine cost and installation procedures.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$10,000.

Timeline: 2009.

Partners: Jefferson Community School; Minneapolis Public Schools

Contract Manager: MPS

17. GOAL:
Support youth programming with arts organizations.

17.1 OBJECTIVE:
Build a program of art, music and culture for children and young adults, ages 5-25.

17.1.1 STRATEGY: YOUTH ARTS PROGRAMMING

To provide creative outlet and connections to neighborhood youth, LHENA will work with organizations in and around the neighborhood to create year-round programming in theater, art, and music for children and young adults, ages 5-25.

LHENA will hire a professional grant writer to leverage additional funding and collaborate with various local artists and organizations to develop programming. NRP funds may be used for grant writer fees, instruction fees, and materials.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$30,000.

Leveraged Funds: Grant writer to explore additional funding.

Timeline: 2009

Partners: (Possible) Minneapolis Public Schools/Jefferson Community School, Intermedia Arts, Jungle Theater, Highpoint Center for Printmaking, Walker Art Center, Garage Theater, Kevin Kling/Michael Summers of Eye Dream Theater at 19th and Portland, Wendy Lehr of Children's Theater, West Bank School of Music, and other neighborhood artists.

Contract Manager: MPS

18. GOAL:
Facilitate employment opportunities for neighborhood youth.

18.1 OBJECTIVE:
Encourage teenagers to find part-time community service and employment opportunities.

18.1.1 STRATEGY: YOUTH EMPLOYMENT DIRECTORY

To inform youth of existing opportunities and promote positive activity, LHENA will work to create a directory of existing programs. LHENA will hire a contractor to research available local employment and programming opportunities and compile them into a directory. This directory will be posted on the LHENA website and may be published as a brochure/flyer. LHENA may utilize an existing intern program, e.g. through CURA. Funds may be used for contractor fees, research, and printing expenses.

Phase II NRP Funds: \$4,000.

Timeline: 2009

Partners: (Possible) Local business community, MPRB, City of Minneapolis, area hospitals, community service organizations, NIP, LHENA garden organizer: Donovan Harmel.

Contract Manager: NRP

ADMINISTRATION:

19. GOAL:

Provide support and coordination for neighborhood volunteers in the implementation of Action Plan strategies and planning for undesignated funds.

19.1 OBJECTIVE:

To maintain office staff and office/communication expenses through 2009 (at minimum).

19.1.1 STRATEGY: STAFF, OFFICE, COMMUNICATIONS

LHENA will continue to maintain full-time staff and cover costs for office expenses and written communications. Staff will coordinate planning and implementation of all projects by recruiting volunteers, organizing meetings, providing written documents needed by volunteers to execute projects; organizing application processes for specific NRP projects; serving as liaison between the neighborhood and the City and other agencies; helping to develop scopes of service and contracts; managing office duties including phone, mail and email contacts, files, and assisting treasurer and bookkeeper with documentation; and creating and organizing distribution of written communications to neighborhood at large, including newspaper articles, flyers and postcards.

Phase II NRP Funds:	\$52,000
Phase II Early Access Funds:	+ 17,798
Phase II Subtotal	69,798

Phase I Program Income (25.1):	+ 70,000
Total	\$139,798

Timeline: Ongoing through 2009.

Contract Manager: N

APPENDIX A: FUNDING ALLOCATION

<u>LHENA-NRP Phase II Budget</u>	<u>Phase II NRP Funds</u>	<u>Other Funds</u>	<u>Notes</u>
HOUSING			
1.1.1 Historic Preservation Loans*	\$235,000		
1.1.2 Explore Historic District	10,000		
1.1.3 Promote Rezoning Study	0		
2.1.1 Green Seminars	2,000		
2.2.1 Green Improvement Matching Rebates*	40,000		
3.1.1 Home Improvement Loans*	145,000		
3.1.2 Matching Exterior Grants*	75,000		
4.1.1 Landlord/Tenant Network	1,000		
5.1.1 Promote "311"	<u>0</u>		
*Coded as "Housing" Subtotal (Strategies 1.1.1/ 2.2.1/ 3.1.1/ 3.1.2)	\$495,000		73%
Housing Subtotal	\$508,000		
INFRASTRUCTURE			
6.1.1 Tree Stump Removal/Planting	15,000		
7.1.1 Ped. Lighting/S of 28th St	0		
8.1.1 Underground Utility Wiring	0		
9.1.1 Trash Receptacles	2,000		
9.1.2 N'hood Clean Sweep	1,000		
10.1.1 Ped Awareness Communication	1,054		
11.1.1 Bike Racks	<u>7,000</u>		
Infrastructure Subtotal	\$26,054		
CRIME AND SAFETY			
12.1.1 Crime Awareness Communication	0		
13.1.1 Block Clubs	2,000		
14.1.1 Volunteer Walking Patrol	2,000		
15.1.1 Police Bike/Beat Buyback	<u>56,000</u>		
		+ \$19,525 from COPSIRF;	
		(Total = \$75,525)	
Crime and Safety Subtotal	\$60,000		
YOUTH, ARTS & COMMERCE			
16.1.1 Business Exterior Matching Grants	35,000		
16.2.1 Temporary Outdoor Sale	5,000		
16.3.1 Jefferson Exterior Changeable Board	10,000		
17.1.1 Youth Arts Programming	30,000		
18.1.1 Youth Employment Directory	<u>4,000</u>		
Youth, Arts, and Commerce Subtotal	\$84,000		
Subtotal	\$678,054		
ADMINISTRATION			
Phase II Early Access (Planning)	17,798		
19.1.1 Staff, Office, Communications	<u>52,000</u>		
		\$70,000 (from Phase I 25.1)	
		(Total = \$140,000)	
Administration Subtotal	\$69,798	9%	
TOTAL	\$747,852		

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBORHOOD MAP



APPENDIX C: LHENA-NRP PHASE I REVIEW SURVEY COMMENTS (2006)

PHASE II: How do you think Lowry Hill East could most effectively use the funding allocation for Phase II of NRP? What issues would you like to see addressed? What projects would you like to see accomplished?

Infrastructure:

- “Encouragement/help with organizing local residents to do trash clean up (like periodic trash collection days) or like walk around, spotting issues, helping eyes be on the street (cuts crime, sees if people need help, etc.)”
- “A left turn signal at 28th Street and Lyndale Ave. S. for southbound traffic. Less traffic on Lyndale Ave. S.”
- “Future zoning is key to keep the established neighborhood.”
- “Growth planning. Concerned about traffic and density with too many condo buildings.”
- “Any efforts to study and promote mass transit in greenway. Anything to make it happen.”
- “1) Better painting of PEDESTRIAN stripes in Lyndale/Franklin/I-94 intersection area. (Hennepin and Franklin, too.)
2) Any ideas regarding street parking improvements.
3) SIDEWALK tree and bushes trimming along Lyndale (tough to walk on sidewalk).
4) Programs for older residents.”
- “Maintenance of trees and grass. Maybe raingardens or some lower maintenance grasses/landscaping.”
- “Education and encouragement to respect city ordinances and neighbor comfort. Encouragement to keep a clean city free from trash, garbage and graffiti.”
- “Boulevard restoration. Many boulevards are paved or cemented over. Especially at commercial corners (i.e., 22nd and Lyndale, 24th and Hennepin, 27th and Hennepin, etc.)”
- “Lights!!! Add streetlights to Lyndale Avenue between Franklin and Lake, similar to Hennepin Ave. I feel safe at night on Hennepin, but not on Lyndale. Also, on the side streets. Trees could be trimmed to prevent the dark streets.”
- “More traffic calming and safety.”

Crime and Safety:

- “Petty crime, vandalism, graffiti.”
- “P.R./billboard, etc. Campaign to reduce RUDENESS, RUDE behavior, RECKLESS driving, arrogant bicyclists and pedestrians, at grocery store aisles, etc.”
- “Safety cameras to deter graffiti criminals, more cops around to deter criminals of increasingly violent crimes, signage asking partiers NOT to throw their trash and bring their noise to our neighborhoods, possible PERMIT PARKING only.”
- “I’m concerned about crime.”
- “Crime prevention, graffiti removal, noise control.”

Housing:

- “Amounts for apt. blg. should be raised for each loan.”
- “Make our Lowry Hill East into an historic preservation district. Protect the Victorian look of our neighborhood.”

Youth and Education:

- “More summer programs for the children of this neighborhood. More after school programs for 7th grade and up. Busy kids stay out of trouble.”

Multi:

- “Continue funding home renovation, increase police presence, matching grants, lights to areas south of 28th St.”
- “More funding for home improvement/renovation. Contribution to public transportation, esp. Greenway streetcar.”
- “Light rail impact study along 29th Street corridor from downtown and then out to the ‘burbs. Affordable housing availability. Crime and safety issues.”
- “Graffiti reduction, panhandling, robberies, vandalism, other petty crime. More summer programs in parks or schools to give youth an outlet/stake in the neighborhood.”
- “Patrolling; parking.”
- “Crime – first and foremost violent crime encroaching on the Uptown area followed by property crimes and graffiti. Housing stock.”
- “More speed bumps. More youth services at Mueller Park. A Lyndale Avenue Strategic Plan.”

- “Crime. Home exterior improvements grants based on financial need. Source for color consulting on exteriors. Alley cleanup and improvement. Sidewalk repair.”
- “Youth programming at Mueller Park during the summer. Alley cleanup. More policing. Crime prevention, police presence. School – upgrade computers, fix fence, community sign at the school.”
- “Transit planning in neighborhood – trolley on Greenway? Affordable housing initiatives.
- “I would like to see more lighting, especially along Lyndale. I would like to have more go towards youth and education as well as crime and safety and of course the improvement of the beautiful old houses so they do not get torn down. I think residential parking/traffic problems would decrease if Uptown had Free Parking lots.”

APPENDIX D: VISIONING SESSION IDEAS

February 28, 2007 (Session I)

March 20, 2007 (Session II)

Arts and Commerce:

Session I:

- Neighborhood orchestra/jazz band
- Grants to Jungle Theater, Soo Gallery, Intermedia Arts, etc.: Compile a list and find out who needs what; Perform a survey to determine what they want – they tell us what they need; Allocate funding and then request proposals
- Lyn-Lake Street Fair: Help support; Leverage funds
- Movies/music in the park (Mueller)
- Mural to discourage graffiti
- Engage businesses to participate in light, lock, etc. rebate programs

Session II:

- Mural on the Greenway: more visible art
- Coffeeshops to display artwork (student, etc.)
- Dance, actors, in addition to music in Mueller Park
- Encourage Lyndale businesses to clean sidewalks (Lyndale Business Association???)
 - Clean trash, cigarette butts, etc.
 - Flower pots on street: beautifying

Crime and Safety:

Session I:

- Businesses at 27th and Dupont (Late hours/massage parlor)
- Bicycle and beat cops increased (particularly late - near bar closing time; from 10pm to 4am)
- Noise ordinance more strictly enforced
- Crime and Safety Committee to act as an advocate with the Minneapolis Police Department, 5th Precinct
- Lawn signs to identify 5-10 safety points, e.g. "Lock your car," "Lock your garage," etc. Each Board member would get one to post.
- Survey to find who has dogs, security systems, then post them to warn criminals.
- Graffiti mural to discourage the amount of graffiti.
- Gather data on how often cops are/will be /should patrol the neighborhood thru post signs around the neighborhood for would-be criminals.
- Lights for security (motion detectors) and locks for security (deadbolts).
- Tornado warning that can be heard at night.

Session II:

- Neighborhood watch: walking patrol, especially on Friday/Saturday evenings
- Cop Shop: Police Sub-Station
- Neighborhood providing own enforcement for parking, police, etc.
- Front-of-house rebate program for lighting, including decorative

- Traffic officer, particularly late night: 2am

Housing:

Session I:

- Historic Preservation:
 - Possible designation of historic districts
 - Markings, signage, etc.
 - Possible opening of grant program to larger group (with new criteria, e.g. age of home)
- Green solutions: (Contract for special rates, grants)
 - Solar panels, shingles (especially on large buildings and schools)
 - Wind turbines
- Land trusts to retain and increase/create affordable housing, gardening (Hennepin County) → PPL, possible partner
- Renew “This Old House” program
- Green roofs; raingardens; permeable driveways to eliminate/lessen runoff
- Burying power lines

Session II:

- Hire enforcement for livability issues, especially on rental properties and to ensure code compliance (e.g., building codes, rental licenses, recycling, yard issues, snow removal, etc.)
- Hire an engineer to identify structural problems
- Create housing strategies that reinforce the neighborhood housing plan for critical properties (defined as those which were built as single-family homes near the turn of the century and are currently zoned R5 or R6)

Infrastructure:

Session I:

- Pedestrian-scale lighting between 28th and Lake Streets
- Partner with landscaper architect to use native plantings
- Buckthorn removal
- Garbage cans to discourage littering
- Recyclables containers
- Composting
- Eliminate newspaper boxes on street corners
- Speed bumps/humps
- Restriping pedestrian areas; Crosswalk lights
- Increase pedestrian safety
- Audible traffic light systems to aid the sight-impaired (Collaborate with Vision Loss Resources?)
- Boulevard trees: specifically near Jefferson (Session II Addition: Should be hybrid version of American Elm: disease resistant and proportionate to house size)
- 27th and Hennepin: Eliminate parking on the NE corner
- Complete the Bryant Avenue Bikeway (Session II Addition: Add clearer markings, blinking light, signage)
- Greenway signal at entrance to bikers of other bikes
- Dutch elm immunization
- Lyndale Avenue improvements (to match investments made on Hennepin Avenue)

Session II:

- Signage and/or painting of curbs at every corner to indicate no parking allowed
- Speed ramps at crosswalks (raised pedestrian crossing) (e.g. Humboldt and 28th Street)
- Repair City-owned retaining walls in alleys

Youth and Education:

Session I:

- Getting kids together: need to connect since attend various schools
- Projects: community building, gardening, painting, snow shoveling. Goals: getting kids to give back, assisting the elderly, community service hours, mentoring program. 4-H club.
 - Recycling bin/composting (ties in w/): constructing from wood and chicken wire. (Promotes green living)
 - Bike rebuilding: people donate bikes, kids rebuild
- Places to hang out: non-scheduled activities:

- Need to have park personnel: takes time to build program
- Possible parent volunteers to staff
- Hold at Mueller/Jefferson

Session II:

- Provide activities for teenagers
- Goal: make Jefferson the academic school of choice for SW Minneapolis
- Afterschool programs
 - Look at revising the policy that kids can't go to their neighborhood schools for afterschool programming
 - Volunteer neighborhood tutoring program
 - Afterschool study hall

Office/Admin:

Session II:

- Need to be sure to include in plan:
 - Lease with School for space
 - Admin salary
 - Accountant
 - Office costs/expenses (phone, computers, etc.)

Miscellaneous:

Session I:

- Community building
- Spring cleaning: monthly clean-out/pick-up; trash pick up
- Flea Market at Jefferson: mix of artisans and people getting rid of stuff
- Garage sale (neighborhood-wide)
- Home tour (especially with historic preservation projects); calendars, tie in with fundraising
- Garden tours
- Movies/music in the park
- Progressive dinner
- Gardens in the Greenway; picnic
- Bike ride
- Greenway trash pick up
- Find partner for Greenway gardens
- Tree planting event
- Wedge Newspaper

Session II:

- Ice Cream Social: tie in with arts ideas
- Neighborhood picnics in the park; potlucks

APPENDIX E: PHASE II SURVEY RESULTS

Q1. How would you rate our neighborhood as a place to live?

Results	Percent	
Excellent	11	52.4%
Good	8	38.1%
Fair	1	4.8%
Poor	0	0.0%
No Answer	1	4.8%
	21	

Q2. Please place a "check" next to the three main reasons why you live in this neighborhood?

Results	Percent	
Check only three.		
Sense of neighborliness	5	7.4%
Closeness to friends or family	1	1.5%
Quality schools	1	1.5%
Safe place to live	3	4.4%
Near my (our) church, synagogue, or place of worship	1	1.5%
Historic character	5	7.4%
Good public transportation	10	14.7%
Parks	4	5.9%
Recreation or entertainment	2	2.9%
Close to work	7	10.3%
Neighborhood services within walking distance	13	19.1%
Diversity of lifestyles and people	10	14.7%
Attractive homes	3	4.4%
Well-maintained homes	2	2.9%
Affordable places to live	1	1.5%
	68	

Q3. In the time that you have lived here, how has our neighborhood changed as a place to live?

Results	Percent	
Check one.		
More desirable	13	61.9%
Remained the same	5	23.8%
Less desirable	3	14.3%
No opinion	0	0.0%
	21	

Q4. How concerned are you about the following in our neighborhood?

Circle one answer for each item.

a. General neighborhood appearance		
1-Very Concerned	5	23.8%
2-Somewhat Concerned	13	61.9%
3-Not Concerned	2	9.5%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
b. Maintenance of homes and apartments		
1-Very Concerned	5	23.8%
2-Somewhat Concerned	9	42.9%
3-Not Concerned	5	23.8%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	
c. Appearance of neighborhood businesses		
1-Very Concerned	4	19.0%
2-Somewhat Concerned	8	38.1%
3-Not Concerned	7	33.3%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	
d. Litter/graffiti		
1-Very Concerned	9	42.9%
2-Somewhat Concerned	8	38.1%
3-Not Concerned	2	9.5%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	
e. Parks and recreation		
1-Very Concerned	1	4.8%
2-Somewhat Concerned	10	47.6%
3-Not Concerned	8	38.1%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	
f. Auto traffic/traffic lights and signs		
1-Very Concerned	5	23.8%
2-Somewhat Concerned	9	42.9%
3-Not Concerned	6	28.6%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
g.		
1-Very Concerned	6	28.6%
2-Somewhat Concerned	7	33.3%
3-Not Concerned	7	33.3%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
h.		
1-Very Concerned	6	28.6%
2-Somewhat Concerned	7	33.3%
3-Not Concerned	8	38.1%

4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
	21	

i. Bike routes		
1-Very Concerned	4	19.0%
2-Somewhat Concerned	7	33.3%
3-Not Concerned	9	42.9%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
j. Neighborhood noise		
1-Very Concerned	7	33.3%
2-Somewhat Concerned	6	28.6%
3-Not Concerned	8	38.1%
4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
	21	
k. Alley maintenance		
1-Very Concerned	3	14.3%
2-Somewhat Concerned	7	33.3%
3-Not Concerned	11	52.4%
4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
	21	
l. Zoning		
1-Very Concerned	14	66.7%
2-Somewhat Concerned	4	19.0%
3-Not Concerned	3	14.3%
4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
	21	
m. Historic Preservation		
1-Very Concerned	8	38.1%
2-Somewhat Concerned	10	47.6%
3-Not Concerned	3	14.3%
4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
	21	
n. Pedestrian environment (trees, streetscapes, bus shelters)		
1-Very Concerned	10	47.6%
2-Somewhat Concerned	8	38.1%
3-Not Concerned	3	14.3%
4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
	21	
o. Accessibility (stroller, wheelchair, rollerblade)		
1-Very Concerned	4	19.0%
2-Somewhat Concerned	6	28.6%
3-Not Concerned	10	47.6%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
p. Appearance of public buildings		
1-Very Concerned	4	19.0%
2-Somewhat Concerned	10	47.6%
3-Not Concerned	7	33.3%
4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
	21	
Social Environment		
q. Education		
1-Very Concerned	4	19.0%
2-Somewhat Concerned	8	38.1%
3-Not Concerned	6	28.6%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
	21	
r. Crime and safety		
1-Very Concerned	8	38.1%
2-Somewhat Concerned	11	52.4%
3-Not Concerned	2	9.5%
4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
	21	
s. Drug and alcohol abuse		
1-Very Concerned	6	28.6%
2-Somewhat Concerned	11	52.4%
3-Not Concerned	4	19.0%
4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
	21	
t. Senior citizen issues		
1-Very Concerned	2	9.5%
2-Somewhat Concerned	9	42.9%
3-Not Concerned	9	42.9%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
u. Youth issues		
1-Very Concerned	8	38.1%
2-Somewhat Concerned	6	28.6%
3-Not Concerned	6	28.6%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
v. Childcare		Auto parking
1-Very Concerned	2	9.5%
2-Somewhat Concerned	7	33.3%
3-Not Concerned	8	38.1%
4-No Opinion	4	19.0%
	21	
w. Discrimination		Public transportation
1-Very Concerned	5	23.8%
2-Somewhat Concerned	5	23.8%

3-Not Concerned	8	38.1%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
21		
x. Diversity issues		
1-Very Concerned	3	14.3%
2-Somewhat Concerned	6	28.6%
3-Not Concerned	11	52.4%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
21		
y. Poverty and homelessness		
1-Very Concerned	5	23.8%
2-Somewhat Concerned	9	42.9%
3-Not Concerned	7	33.3%
4-No Opinion	0	0.0%
21		
z. Arts and culture		
1-Very Concerned	3	14.3%
2-Somewhat Concerned	9	42.9%
3-Not Concerned	8	38.1%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
21		

Q5. Pick three choices (a-z) from Question 4 that you believe are the most important issues to address in our neighborhood. Write the letters of the items on the lines below.
 1st Choice 2nd Choice 3rd Choice

Government Services

Q6. Rate each of the following city/county services in our neighborhood. Circle one answer for each service.

a. Parks		
1-Excellent	1	4.8%
2-Good	12	57.1%
3-Fair	5	23.8%
4-Poor	1	4.8%
5-No Opinion	2	9.5%
21		
b. Library Service		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	7	33.3%
3-Fair	11	52.4%
4-Poor	1	4.8%
5-No Opinion	2	9.5%
21		
c.		
1-Excellent	2	9.5%
2-Good	7	33.3%
3-Fair	6	28.6%
4-Poor	0	0.0%
5-No Opinion	6	28.6%
21		
d.		
1-Excellent	3	14.3%
2-Good	10	47.6%
3-Fair	4	19.0%
4-Poor	0	0.0%
5-No Opinion	4	19.0%
21		
e. Fire protection		
1-Excellent	5	23.8%
2-Good	13	61.9%
3-Fair	2	9.5%
4-Poor	0	0.0%
5-No Opinion	1	4.8%
21		
f. Garbage and recycling		
1-Excellent	4	19.0%
2-Good	11	52.4%
3-Fair	4	19.0%
4-Poor	1	4.8%
5-No Opinion	1	4.8%
21		
g. Housing inspections		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	5	23.8%
3-Fair	7	33.3%
4-Poor	6	28.6%
5-No Opinion	3	14.3%
21		
h. Snow removal on streets		
1-Excellent	1	4.8%
2-Good	5	23.8%
3-Fair	10	47.6%
4-Poor	4	19.0%
5-No Opinion	1	4.8%
21		
i. Street maintenance		
1-Excellent	1	4.8%
2-Good	6	28.6%
3-Fair	10	47.6%
4-Poor	2	9.5%
5-No Opinion	2	9.5%
21		
j. Street lighting		
1-Excellent	4	19.0%
2-Good	10	47.6%
3-Fair	5	23.8%
4-Poor	1	4.8%

5-No Opinion	1	4.8%
21		
k. Alley lighting		
1-Excellent	1	4.8%
2-Good	8	38.1%
3-Fair	6	28.6%
4-Poor	4	19.0%
5-No Opinion	2	9.5%
21		
l. Boulevard landscaping		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	4	19.0%
3-Fair	9	42.9%
4-Poor	6	28.6%
5-No Opinion	2	9.5%
21		

Q7. Biggest government services problem: Solution:

Housing

Q8. How do you rate our neighborhood on the following housing issues? Circle one answer for each item.

a. Condition of housing on my block		
1-Excellent	5	23.8%
2-Good	8	38.1%
3-Fair	6	28.6%
4-Poor	1	4.8%
5-No Opinion	1	4.8%
21		
b. Affordable homes/ownership opportunities		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	4	19.0%
3-Fair	5	23.8%
4-Poor	9	42.9%
5-No Opinion	3	14.3%
21		
c. Affordable rental opportunities		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	6	28.6%
3-Fair	5	23.8%
4-Poor	5	23.8%
5-No Opinion	5	23.8%
21		
d. Re-sale value		
1-Excellent	5	23.8%
2-Good	9	42.9%
3-Fair	5	23.8%
4-Poor	1	4.8%
5-No Opinion	1	4.8%
21		
e. Stability (length of residency)		
1-Excellent	4	19.0%
2-Good	7	33.3%
3-Fair	7	33.3%
4-Poor	1	4.8%
5-No Opinion	2	9.5%
21		

Public Schools
Police

Q9. In your opinion, how has housing changed in our neighborhood during the time in which you have lived here? Circle one answer for each item.

a. Condition of housing on my block		
1-Improved	12	57.1%
2-No Change	6	28.6%
3-Worse	1	4.8%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
21		
b. Affordable homes/ownership opportunities		
1-Improved	2	9.5%
2-No Change	6	28.6%
3-Worse	10	47.6%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
21		
c. Affordable rental opportunities		
1-Improved	0	0.0%
2-No Change	7	33.3%
3-Worse	10	47.6%
4-No Opinion	4	19.0%
21		
d. Re-sale value		
1-Improved	13	61.9%
2-No Change	5	23.8%
3-Worse	1	4.8%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
21		
e. Stability (length of residency)		
1-Improved	3	14.3%
2-No Change	13	61.9%
3-Worse	1	4.8%
4-No Opinion	4	19.0%
21		

Q10. Which of the following best describes you?

Check one.

Owner occupant	19	90.5%
Property owner (not living in the Wedge neighborhood)	0	0.0%
Renter	1	4.8%
Other	0	0.0%
No Answer	1	4.8%
	21	

Q11. What type of building do you live in?

Check one.

Single family home	15	71.4%
Duplex	2	9.5%
3 or 4 plex	1	4.8%
5 to 9 unit building	0	0.0%
10 or more unit building	2	9.5%
Rooming house	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%
No Answer	1	4.8%
	21	

Q12. Do you think the following are problems in our neighborhood?

Circle one answer for each item.

Absentee landlords

Yes	15	71.4%
No	4	19.0%
No Answer	2	9.5%
	21	

Irresponsible landlords

Yes	14	66.7%
No	4	19.0%
No Answer	3	14.3%
	21	

Substandard housing

Yes	12	57.1%
No	7	33.3%
No Answer	2	9.5%
	21	

Illegal duplexes

Yes	10	47.6%
No	8	38.1%
No Answer	3	14.3%
	21	

Q13. What condition do you think your house or building is in?

Check one in each column.

INTERIOR

Excellent	5	25.0%
Good	14	70.0%
Fair 1	5.0%	
Poor0	0.0%	
	20	

EXTERIOR

Excellent	4	20.0%
Good	13	65.0%
Fair 3	15.0%	
Poor0	0.0%	
	20	

Q14. Does your residence (house or apartment) need maintenance or repairs in the following areas?

Check all that apply.

Electrical	6	6.6%
Plumbing	5	5.5%
Windows/doors	8	8.8%
Heat3	3.3%	
Air conditioning	4	4.4%
Dehumidifying	3	3.3%
Major appliances	4	4.4%
Roof	4	4.4%
Interior paint	7	7.7%
Exterior (paint, stucco, siding)	8	0.0%
Carpet/flooring	4	4.4%
Cleaning	3	3.3%
Yard4	4.4%	
Elevators/stairways	2	2.2%
Insulation/caulking	8	8.8%
Foundation cracks	5	5.5%
Asbestos abatement	2	2.2%
Lead abatement	2	2.2%
Porch	6	6.6%
Other _____	2	2.2%
No Answer	1	1.1%
	91	

For Homeowners and Property Owners

Q15. Are low interest loans or grants necessary in order for you to afford additional repairs?

Yes 11	52.4%	
No 6	28.6%	
No Answer	3	14.3%
Renter	1	4.8%
	21	

Q16. What improvements or enhancements would you be most likely to make to your property in the next two years?

Check all that apply.

Add another bathroom	4	10.8%
Remodel current bathroom to master bathroom	2	5.4%
Add a family room	1	2.7%
Remodel/extend kitchen	4	10.8%
Add a deck	5	13.5%
Finish basement	4	10.8%
Landscaping	5	13.5%
Add a fence	2	5.4%
Renovate attic	3	8.1%
Add/replace garage	3	8.1%
Other _____	4	10.8%
	37	

Q17. Do you intend to structurally change your building in order to increase or decrease the number of housing units?

Increase	0	0.0%
Decrease	0	0.0%
No change	18	85.7%
No answer	2	9.5%
Renter	1	4.8%
	21	

For Renters

Q18. If you rent, how satisfied are you with your current building management or landlord?

Check one.

Very satisfied	1	4.8%
Somewhat satisfied	0	0.0%
Somewhat dissatisfied	0	0.0%
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0%
No opinion (Homeowner)	0	0.0%
	20	95.2%
	21	

For Everyone

Q19. Biggest housing issue:

Solution: Transportation

Q20. Please rate our neighborhood on the following transportation issues. Circle one answer for each item.

a. Level of traffic on neighborhood streets

1-Major Problem	9	42.9%
2-Minor Problem	7	33.3%
3-Not a Problem	2	9.5%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
	21	

b. Speeding vehicles

1-Major Problem	11	52.4%
2-Minor Problem	5	23.8%
3-Not a Problem	2	9.5%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
	21	

c. Traffic congestion

1-Major Problem	6	28.6%
2-Minor Problem	6	28.6%
3-Not a Problem	6	28.6%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
	21	

d. Traffic noise

1-Major Problem	7	33.3%
2-Minor Problem	9	42.9%
3-Not a Problem	3	14.3%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	

e. Air pollution from vehicles

1-Major Problem	11	52.4%
2-Minor Problem	4	19.0%
3-Not a Problem	4	19.0%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	

f. Parking availability

1-Major Problem	8	38.1%
2-Minor Problem	8	38.1%
3-Not a Problem	2	9.5%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
	21	

g. Bus service and access

1-Major Problem	3	14.3%
2-Minor Problem	5	23.8%
3-Not a Problem	10	47.6%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
	21	

h. Lack of commuter bikeways

1-Major Problem	5	23.8%
2-Minor Problem	6	28.6%
3-Not a Problem	7	33.3%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
	21	

i. Truck traffic on residential streets

1-Major Problem	5	23.8%
2-Minor Problem	4	19.0%

3-Not a Problem	9	42.9%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
j. Stoplights and traffic signs	21	
1-Major Problem	3	14.3%
2-Minor Problem	8	38.1%
3-Not a Problem	6	28.6%
4-No Opinion	4	19.0%
	21	

k. Pedestrian environment		
1-Major Problem	5	23.8%
2-Minor Problem	9	42.9%
3-Not a Problem	5	23.8%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	

Q21. What is your primary mode of daily transportation?
Check one.

Walk	5	22.7%
Bike 2	9.1%	
Rollerblade	0	0.0%
Bus 3	13.6%	
Taxi 1	4.5%	
Car (driving alone)	10	45.5%
Carpool	1	4.5%
Other	0	0.0%
	22	

Q22. Why do you choose this method of transportation over other methods?

Q23. How often do you use public transportation?
Check one.

Daily1	4.8%	
Weekly	5	23.8%
Monthly	6	28.6%
Seldom to Never	9	42.9%
	21	

Q24. Are there any barriers you experience in getting around in the neighborhood (stroller/wheelchair access, lack of snow removal, etc.)?

Q25. Biggest transportation issue:
Solution:

Arts and Culture

Q26. How important are the following cultural, historical and art features or activities to the quality of life in our neighborhood?
Circle one answer for each item.

a. Ethnic restaurants		
1-Very Important	9	42.9%
2-Somewhat Important	10	47.6%
3-Not Important	1	4.8%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	

b. Variety of coffee shops		
1-Very Important	6	28.6%
2-Somewhat Important	11	52.4%
3-Not Important	3	14.3%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	

c. Culturally diverse food stores & shops		
1-Very Important	8	38.1%
2-Somewhat Important	9	42.9%
3-Not Important	2	9.5%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	

d. Synagogues, churches, and other religious institutions		
1-Very Important	11	52.4%
2-Somewhat Important	4	19.0%
3-Not Important	4	19.0%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	

e. Public cultural, ethnic, music, and art festivals		
1-Very Important	12	57.1%
2-Somewhat Important	8	38.1%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	

f. Theater, music, and comedy events		
1-Very Important	14	66.7%
2-Somewhat Important	5	23.8%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	

g.		
1-Very Important	13	61.9%
2-Somewhat Important	6	28.6%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	

h.		
1-Very Important	15	71.4%
2-Somewhat Important	4	19.0%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	

i.		
1-Very Important	14	66.7%
2-Somewhat Important	6	28.6%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	

Q27. What is the most valuable artistic, cultural or historical feature of the Wedge neighborhood?
Schools and Education

Q28. Please rate your satisfaction with the following education issues:
Circle one answer for each item.

a. Quality of education in Minneapolis Public Schools		
1-Very Satisfied	6	28.6%
2-Somewhat Satisfied	6	28.6%
3-Not Satisfied	3	14.3%
4-No Opinion	6	28.6%
	21	

b. Range of school choices		
1-Very Satisfied	6	28.6%
2-Somewhat Satisfied	7	33.3%
3-Not Satisfied	1	4.8%
4-No Opinion	7	33.3%
	21	

c. Neighborhood involvement with local school		
1-Very Satisfied	4	19.0%
2-Somewhat Satisfied	9	42.9%
3-Not Satisfied	3	14.3%
4-No Opinion	5	23.8%
	21	

d. Sensitivity toward diversity		
1-Very Satisfied	8	38.1%
2-Somewhat Satisfied	5	23.8%
3-Not Satisfied	1	4.8%
4-No Opinion	7	33.3%
	21	

e. Availability of community education programs		
1-Very Satisfied	5	23.8%
2-Somewhat Satisfied	7	33.3%
3-Not Satisfied	2	9.5%
4-No Opinion	7	33.3%
	21	

Q29. Do you have children in the Minneapolis Public School system?

Yes	5	23.8%
No	14	66.7%
No Answer	2	9.5%
	21	

Q30. If you have children in private school, what does your private school offer that is lacking in the public schools?

Q31. Biggest issue related to education:
Solution:

Business

Q32. How would you rate our neighborhood on the following business and commercial issues?
Circle one answer for each item.

a. Variety of stores providing goods and services		
1-Excellent	3	14.3%
2-Good	10	47.6%
3-Fair	4	19.0%
4-Poor	0	0.0%
5-No Opinion	4	19.0%
	21	

b. Quality of stores and businesses		
1-Excellent	2	9.5%
2-Good	11	52.4%
3-Fair	4	19.0%
4-Poor	0	0.0%
5-No Opinion	4	19.0%
	21	

c. Willingness of business to respond to community needs and concerns		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	12	57.1%
3-Fair	4	19.0%
4-Poor	0	0.0%
5-No Opinion	5	23.8%
	21	

d. Maintenance of commercial areas		
1-Excellent	1	4.8%
2-Good	12	57.1%
3-Fair	4	19.0%
4-Poor	0	0.0%
5-No Opinion	4	19.0%
	21	

Q33. What other businesses are needed in or near our neighborhood?

Q34. Do you prefer one-of-a-kind businesses or businesses that are part of a chain or franchise?

Check one.		
One-of-a-kind businesses	10	47.6%
Businesses that are part of a chain or franchise	0	0.0%

Mix of both	8	38.1%
No preference	0	0.0%
No Answer	3	14.3%
	21	

Q35. Do you think that efforts should be made to increase employment opportunities in our neighborhood?

Yes	14	66.7%
No	2	9.5%
No Answer	5	23.8%
	21	

Q36. Biggest business issue:
Solution:

Children and Family Services

Q37. How would you rate our neighborhood on the following family service issues?

Circle on answer for each item.

a. Affordable quality childcare		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	1	4.8%
3-Fair	2	9.5%
4-Poor	3	14.3%
5-No Opinion	15	71.4%
	21	
b. Support services for single parents		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	0	0.0%
3-Fair	3	14.3%
4-Poor	2	9.5%
5-No Opinion	16	76.2%
	21	
c. Parenting classes		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	1	4.8%
3-Fair	4	19.0%
4-Poor	2	9.5%
5-No Opinion	14	66.7%
	21	
d. Networking opportunities for families with children		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	4	19.0%
3-Fair	1	4.8%
4-Poor	2	9.5%
5-No Opinion	14	66.7%
	21	
e. Parent/child activities		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	5	23.8%
3-Fair	2	9.5%
4-Poor	2	9.5%
5-No Opinion	12	57.1%
	21	
f. After school activities for children		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	5	23.8%
3-Fair	1	4.8%
4-Poor	3	14.3%
5-No Opinion	12	57.1%
	21	
g. Parks, playgrounds, and open spaces		
1-Excellent	1	4.8%
2-Good	8	38.1%
3-Fair	2	9.5%
4-Poor	1	4.8%
5-No Opinion	9	42.9%
	21	

Youth Opportunities

Q38. How important do you think the following are for youth growing up in our neighborhood?

Circle one answer for each item.

a. After school activities		
1-Very Important	11	52.4%
2-Somewhat Important	4	19.0%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	6	28.6%
	21	
b. Jobs		
1-Very Important	11	52.4%
2-Somewhat Important	4	19.0%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	6	28.6%
	21	
c. Alternatives to violence and crime		
1-Very Important	14	66.7%
2-Somewhat Important	1	4.8%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	6	28.6%
	21	
d. Protection from crime		
1-Very Important	10	47.6%
2-Somewhat Important	4	19.0%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	7	33.3%
	21	
e. Drug and alcohol prevention programs		

1-Very Important	11	52.4%
2-Somewhat Important	3	14.3%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	7	33.3%
	21	

f. Having a role and voice in the community

1-Very Important	8	38.1%
2-Somewhat Important	6	28.6%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	7	33.3%
	21	

g. Educational opportunities

1-Very Important	9	42.9%
2-Somewhat Important	5	23.8%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	7	33.3%
	21	

h. Cultural awareness programs

1-Very Important	7	33.3%
2-Somewhat Important	7	33.3%
3-Not Important	1	4.8%
4-No Opinion	6	28.6%
	21	

i. Summer activities

1-Very Important	11	52.4%
2-Somewhat Important	3	14.3%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	7	33.3%
	21	

j. Weekend programs

1-Very Important	9	42.9%
2-Somewhat Important	5	23.8%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	7	33.3%
	21	

Safety and Crime Prevention

Q39. Please rate our neighborhood on these crime and safety issues:
Circle one answer for each item.

a. Personal safety in your home		
1-Excellent	7	33.3%
2-Good	12	57.1%
3-Fair	1	4.8%
4-Poor	0	0.0%
5-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
b. Personal safety outside your home		
1-Excellent	4	19.0%
2-Good	10	47.6%
3-Fair	5	23.8%
4-Poor	1	4.8%
5-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
c. Safety in neighborhood parks		
1-Excellent	3	14.3%
2-Good	7	33.3%
3-Fair	7	33.3%
4-Poor	2	9.5%
5-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	
d. Safety on, or waiting for, the bus		
1-Excellent	2	9.5%
2-Good	7	33.3%
3-Fair	7	33.3%
4-Poor	0	0.0%
5-No Opinion	5	23.8%
	21	
e. Security of property (cars, garages, etc.)		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	9	42.9%
3-Fair	8	38.1%
4-Poor	2	9.5%
5-No Opinion	2	9.5%
	21	
f. Lighting in streets and alleys		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	11	52.4%
3-Fair	8	38.1%
4-Poor	1	4.8%
5-No Opinion	1	4.8%
	21	
g. Active and visible block clubs		
1-Excellent	0	0.0%
2-Good	3	14.3%
3-Fair	8	38.1%
4-Poor	7	33.3%
5-No Opinion	3	14.3%
	21	

Q40. How has neighborhood safety changed during the time you have lived here?

Check one.

Safer place to live	6	28.6%
Remained about the same	9	42.9%
Less safe place to live	5	23.8%
No opinion	1	4.8%
	21	

Q41. How often are you concerned about your personal safety in our neighborhood?

Check one.

Very often	2	9.5%
Quite often	5	23.8%
Not very often	11	52.4%
Never concerned	2	9.5%
No Answer	1	4.8%
Total	21	

Q42. Do you participate in a block club?

Yes	3	14.3%
No	17	81.0%
No Answer	1	4.8%
Total	21	

Q43. How important are each of the following things for dealing with crime and safety issues in our neighborhood? Circle one answer for each item.

a. Resident councils, neighborhood watches, and citizen patrols

1-Very Important	9	42.9%
2-Somewhat Important	9	42.9%
3-Not Important	1	4.8%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
Total	21	

b. Police who walk on a regular beat

1-Very Important	14	66.7%
2-Somewhat Important	6	28.6%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
Total	21	

c.

1-Very Important	15	71.4%
2-Somewhat Important	5	23.8%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
Total	21	

d.

1-Very Important	16	76.2%
2-Somewhat Important	3	14.3%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
Total	21	

e.

1-Very Important	15	71.4%
2-Somewhat Important	3	14.3%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
Total	21	

f.

1-Very Important	13	61.9%
2-Somewhat Important	6	28.6%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	2	9.5%
Total	21	

g.

1-Very Important	13	61.9%
2-Somewhat Important	7	33.3%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
Total	21	

h.

1-Very Important	16	76.2%
2-Somewhat Important	4	19.0%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	1	4.8%
Total	21	

i.

1-Very Important	9	42.9%
2-Somewhat Important	9	42.9%
3-Not Important	0	0.0%
4-No Opinion	3	14.3%
Total	21	

Q44. Pick the five issues that most affect our neighborhood. Check up to five.

Auto theft	7	8.3%
Theft from autos	11	13.1%
Burglary	10	11.9%
Robbery	8	9.5%
Assault	6	7.1%
Vandalism/Property damage	15	17.9%
Drugs	4	4.8%
Prostitution	2	2.4%
Enforcement of traffic violations	6	7.1%
Loud parties	11	13.1%
Disputes between neighbors	2	2.4%
Domestic abuse	0	0.0%
Rape	0	0.0%
Other	2	2.4%
Total	84	

Q45. Biggest crime problem:

Solution:

Zoning

Q46. Please rank the top three zoning issues in our neighborhood. Use 1 for highest priority, 2 for the next highest priority, and 3 for the third highest priority.

___ **Downzoning – decreasing allowable size of new developments which can be built on a given block or property**

1	10	76.9%
2	2	15.4%
3	1	7.7%
Total	13	

___ **Upzoning – increasing allowable size of new developments which can be built on a given block or property**

1	4	80.0%
2	0	0.0%
3	1	20.0%
Total	5	

___ **More area for parking**

1	0	0.0%
2	1	20.0%
3	4	80.0%
Total	5	

___ **Less area for parking**

1	0	0.0%
2	1	50.0%
3	1	50.0%
Total	2	

___ **Enforcing current zoning laws**

1	4	40.0%
2	2	20.0%
3	4	40.0%
Total	10	

___ **Height restrictions – limiting new development to existing scale of neighborhood, 2-3 stories**

1	1	10.0%
2	11	78.6%
3	2	14.3%
Total	14	

___ **Signage – controlling size and location of local advertising signs**

1	0	0.0%
2	0	0.0%
3	1	100.0%
Total	1	

Q47. If there are development pressures in our neighborhood for new single family houses and duplexes, please rank the top three areas in which that development occur.

Use 1 for the highest priority, 2 for the next highest priority, and 3 for the third highest priority.

___ **Along neighborhood perimeter (Hennepin Avenue, Lyndale Avenue, Lake Street, Lagoon Avenue)**

1	7	58.3%
2	4	33.3%
3	1	8.3%
Total	12	

___ **In the neighborhood core**

1	8	80.0%
2	4	40.0%
3	2	20.0%
Total	14	

___ **No new development**

1	2	28.6%
2	4	57.1%
3	1	14.3%
Total	7	

___ **No preference**

1	1	25.0%
2	0	0.0%
3	3	75.0%
Total	4	

Q48. If there are development pressures in our neighborhood for new small apartment buildings and townhouses (3-8 units), please rank the top three areas in which you would prefer that development occur. Use 1 for the highest priority, 2 for the next highest priority, and 3 for the third highest priority.

___ **Along neighborhood perimeter (Hennepin Avenue, Lyndale Avenue, Lake Street, Lagoon Avenue)**

1	14	87.5%
2	2	12.5%
3	0	0.0%
Total	16	

___ **In the neighborhood core**

1	1	20.0%
2	1	20.0%
3	3	60.0%
Total	5	

___ **No new development**

1	2	22.2%
2	6	66.7%
3	1	11.1%
Total	9	

___ No preference		
1	1	50.0%
2	0	0.0%
3	1	50.0%
	2	

Q49. If there are development pressures in our neighborhood for large apartment complexes, please rank the top three areas in which you would prefer development to occur.

Use 1 for the highest priority, 2 for the next highest priority, and 3 for the third highest priority.

___ Along neighborhood perimeter (Hennepin Avenue, Lyndale Avenue, Lake Street, Lagoon Avenue)		
1	7	53.8%
2	6	46.2%
3	0	0.0%
	13	

___ In the neighborhood core		
1	0	0.0%
2	1	33.3%
3	2	66.7%
	3	

___ No new development		
1	12	80.0%
2	2	13.3%
3	1	6.7%
	15	

___ No preference		
1	0	0.0%
2	0	0.0%
3	1	100.0%
	1	

Q50 Do you think the property adjacent the Midtown Greenway (29th Street railroad corridor) should be zoned:

Check one.		
Residential	8	32.0%
Retail/Commercial	3	12.0%
Light industrial	1	4.0%
Mixed	10	40.0%
Other	2	8.0%
No Answer	1	4.0%
	25	

Q51. If there are development pressures in the neighborhood for more businesses, please rank the top three areas in which you would prefer that development occur. Use 1 for the highest priority, 2 for the next highest priority, and 3 for the third highest priority.

___ Along Lyndale Avenue		
1	8	50.0%
2	3	18.8%
3	5	31.3%
	16	

___ Along Lake Street/Lagoon Avenue		
1	6	42.9%
2	5	35.7%
3	3	21.4%
	14	

___ Along Hennepin Avenue		
1	4	26.7%
2	8	53.3%
3	3	20.0%
	15	

___ Along 29 th Street Greenway Corridor		
1	2	50.0%
2	1	25.0%
3	1	25.0%
	4	

___ No increased development		
1	0	0.0%
2	0	0.0%
3	3	100.0%
	3	

Q52. For development of business structures along Hennepin Avenue, Lake Street, and Lyndale Avenue, which of the following would you prefer?

Check one.		
Buildings close to the street	11	64.7%
Buildings set back from street with landscaping in front	5	29.4%
Buildings set back from street with parking lots in front	1	5.9%
No preference	0	0.0%
	17	

Q53. Biggest zoning issue:

Solution:

Demographics

Q54. How long have you lived in your present dwelling?
Average=18 years

Q55. How long (total) have you lived in the Wedge neighborhood?
Average=22 years

Q56. How much longer do you plan to stay in this neighborhood?
_____ years _____ months

Q57. How old are you?
Check one.

19 or younger	0	0.0%
20-29	0	0.0%
30-34	0	0.0%
45-59	10	47.6%
60-74	5	23.8%
75-84	2	9.5%
85+ 0	0.0%	
35-44	3	14.3%
No Answer	1	4.8%
	21	

Q58. Are you:

Male	7	33.3%
Female	13	61.9%
No Answer	1	4.8%
	21	

Q59. How many children do you have

Age 0-5	9	
Age 6-12	0	
Age 13-18	5	
No Answer	8	

Q60. What was your total household income in 2006 before taxes?
Check one.

Under \$10,000	0	0.0%
\$10,000-\$19,999	0	0.0%
\$20,000-\$29,999	0	0.0%
\$30,000-\$49,999	6	28.6%
\$50,000-\$74,999	6	28.6%
\$75,000-\$99,999	2	9.5%
\$100,000+	5	23.8%
No Answer	2	9.5%
	21	

Q61. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
Check one.

Elementary school	0	0.0%
Some high school	0	0.0%
High school or GED	2	9.5%
Some technical school	0	0.0%
Technical school graduate	0	0.0%
Some college	2	9.5%
College graduate	8	38.1%
Post graduate	7	33.3%
Other _____	0	0.0%
No Answer	2	9.5%
	21	

Q62. Which of the following racial/ethnic categories describes you best?
Check all that apply.

White	19	90.5%
Black/African American	0	0.0%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0.0%
Asian	0	0.0%
Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0%
Other _____	0	0.0%
No Answer	2	9.5%
	21	

Q63. In your opinion, what are the three most serious problem properties in our neighborhood (i.e., the most poorly maintained and/or poorly managed residences, businesses, public buildings, or other structures)?

Q64. Are there any other comments, suggestions, or questions you would like to add?