

Comments regarding Community Participation Program guidelines

1. Composition of the reconstituted NRP Policy Board should have the four community members be selected from the elected members of NCEC board. The NRP board is already top heavy with appointed members and selecting additional appointed members would leave extremely limited input from neighborhoods.
2. The allocation formula doesn't appear to take into account the fact the while we have had foreclosures, and our population had shrunk by at least one third or more, we are still sitting with a huge number of vacant and board houses, which detract from the neighborhood, reduce market values, and provide a disincentive for people to move into the neighborhood.
3. Eliminating the 52% cap on housing seems to defeat the legislative purpose that NRP funds be used to improve the housing stock in Minneapolis.
4. I am still unsatisfied on the data which is used to compute the number of people in our neighborhood who are "English as a second language" students, since at least half if not more of our students attend suburban schools through the choice is yours program and so are not counted in the formula.
5. It is very important that we continue to have access to group rates for Directors and Officers insurance and for audit services.
6. Since the NRP funds are supporting the CPP in 2012 and 2013 it would appear that all the money we lost from the NRP phase II allocation is being funneled to other more prosperous neighborhoods in the city.
7. The whole concept of Neighborhood Priority Plans is mushy, since it creates double the amount of work for us to create a PP when we are still working on the priorities we created in our Phase II NRP plans. Since there is no money to implement priority plans other than what we have already budgeted for in our CPP application, it now begins to appear like the triple the amount of work with no realizable gain.

JoAnne Kelty

Chair, Hawthorne Board of Directors