

Track 2: Community Engagement Task Force

Nov. 8, 2007 Minutes (DRAFT - To be approved) 4:00 p.m. - Room 132 City Hall

Task Force attendees: Russ Adams, John Bernstein, Mark Fox, Don Fraser, Elena Gaarder, Jeremy Iggers, Matt Perry (co-chair), David Rubedor, Jeffrey Strand, Long Yang, Shirley Yeoman

Task Force attendees absent: Mohamed Ali, Diann Anders, Kathleen Anderson, Diana Hawkins, Mary Keefe, Anne McCandless, Repa Mekha, Chris Morris, Jessie Saavedra, Joyce Wisdom

City staff in attendance: Tamara Downs-Schwei, Luther Krueger, Jennifer Lastoka, Cara Letofsky, Barb Lickness, Council Member Robert Lilligren (co-chair), Alicia Scott, Greg Simbeck, Pa Vang

City staff absent: Council Member Cam Gordon, Erik Hansen, Council Member Diane Hofstede

Facilitators in attendance: GrayHall - Nora Hall, Karen Gray

Administration

Co-chair Lilligren noted that with 10 task force members we don't have a quorum and that if we may have to consider evoting or something (enough task force members showed up for a forum).

A task force member noted that we voted last time as a group with 10.

Co-chair Perry said to clarify that at the last meeting when we voted it was as recommendations to the committee, but we didn't vote on minutes.

Lilligren said that we are considering the meeting a celebration. Thank you so much. I can't believe how committed everyone has been and how good our attendance has been. On behalf of the City Council, thank you.

Discussion Voting and discussion

The task force was presented with an agenda with several outstanding items to vote on.

VOTE 1: DISCUSSION ITEM #2 FROM 10/31 & PART OF THE E-VOTE - The nature of the report is a statement of "what" should be done rather than "how". The report makes numerous references to "what" should receive resources but does not specify amounts or sources. While the detail would be valuable, to maintain the scope of the report there will be no modifications that specifically respond to the comments from the community that suggest more detail.

E-vote results: • Green- 7 and • Yellow -7

Discussion points:

- Staff Lastoka pointed out that this is not a specific recommendation that will go in the report.
- Co-chair Perry noted that as a result of community input, the point was raised about why there was not
 more specificity about resource allocation. My response is that if we had more time and resources, we
 might be able to begin talking about this. Our report really doesn't talk about implementation. I looked
 back through the report and I saw many areas where we say "what" but not "how".
- This seems pointless because we don't have time to draft anything to put in there.
- It is worthwhile to add in language that we acknowledge that this is the state of affairs. Should we add some language that there might be insignificant detail.
- Staff Lastoka we need to vote on whether we put something in or not.
- Would it be fair to say the task force didn't have time to identify a specific structure or details.
- I would broaden it to a lack of specificity about more than just finances.
- I do not want to make any changes to the report that would add more detail.
- I think some statement acknowledging what we didn't do would make me feel a whole lot better. My gut reaction is that we are saying you should take input seriously but we are saying we don't have time.
- We did community outreach. Last weeks minutes say we have input, but now we're saying we don't have time. We should say we didn't get to that but we feel that it's important. I think a lot of people are

frustrated that it doesn't get to the "how." We want to say that we do want the City to engage the community in the "how." The City has to hear that message. I think we should put something in there that says it wasn't our charge but we think it's important.

- I recommend that someone draft something (staff Lastoka asked staff Downs-Schwei to draft something).
- Co-Chari Lilligren I believe it is important to include something like this not so much about time but about scope. I would like to mention that today was the first meeting of the track 3 work group and every member references our report. That is in some ways the "how" group and then to have that go to the community.
- The text would appear on the bottom of page 9? (it was indicated that it would).
- I think we could shorten it by saying "report" instead of "nature of the report."
- Can we approve the idea of the text with the agreement that the language will be more concise.

Pass - vote to add a more concise version of this language: The nature of this report is a statement of "what" should be done rather than "how." The task force acknowledges that the Track 2 charge necessitated a wider scope, but it will be crucial for decision-makers to thoughtfully consider the "how" of funding and implementation with ample and diverse community input.

● Green- 11 and ● Red-0

VOTE 2: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT COMMISSION - Discuss possible responsibilities for the Community Engagement Commission. Responsibilities of a community engagement commission should include but not be limited to:

- Actively assisting in short and long-term planning, development and implementation of the City's community engagement system.
- Working with and advising the City on the development of policies related to community engagement.
- Advising the Mayor, City Council and City Departments on community issues and needs related to community engagement and the City's community engagement system.
- Reviewing those organizations seeking official support from the city for the purpose of community engagement
- The composition should reflect the diverse interests and perspectives of the Minneapolis community.
 The recruitment process should be designed to ensure diversity of representation and ideas and take
 into consideration the City's commitment to civil rights, affirmative action and geographic distribution
 wherever possible.
- The Commission should be provided the necessary City staff to meet these responsibilities.
- The Commission should evaluate its work and responsibilities every 3-4 years to evolve with the needs of the City's community engagement system.

Discussion points:

- Staff Lickness As a non-voting member I encourage you all to say no. It wouldn't replace NRP, but I think we have enough commissions. (She apologized later, stated she hadn't realize the notion of having a commission had already been approved.)
- Co-chair Perry Some of these came from community outreach. I wrote some and some came from staff
 work. During outreach, whenever I talked about the commission, people had blank stares. We voted last
 time to keep the notion of the committee in. Today, we are not voting on keeping the commission in. I
 think we need to give the Council some idea of what was going on in our head. I think they will take this
 as advisory.
- The current NRP Policy Board, who are elected by community members, is functioning well and is effective. To me this is a step back saying we're going to have a new one just for the City, to heck with including the County, etc. But, if we do keep the commission notion, I do like adding this.
- The report does say create a commission.
- I also voted against having this in there, but if it's in there, we should add some detail.
- It presupposes that there is a community engagement system and I don' think there is a system.
- To me, we could put a line in there that says that suggests this commission should have some representation from other independent boards such as parks and schools "The commission should have representation from the County, the Park Board and the School Board."
- Co-chair Perry I understand the intent of the interest to add that. I have not ever assumed that this is a
 replacement for the NRP Policy Board or any joint powers board that comes to be. I don't want to try to
 mimic that in the City. I'm uncomfortable adding those others. The purpose of the commission would be to
 help the City develop that system.

- This has to do with practicing what you preach. If we want them to be involved, they have to have a seat
 at the table.
- Staff Lickness I think former mayor Don Fraser has been attempting to get us to see that there are
 issues with the schools and schools don't have to address that in a silo. I think it will make the city
 stronger to have relationships between those independent boards.
- Co-chair Perry The notion of the commission is that it is citizen based. From a pragmatic point, the notion of that commission changes when you introduce elected officials. Part of the commission's job is to finish the job we've started here.
- Staff Letofsky I fairly agnostic, but I don't think I heard it had to be an elected representative.
- I specifically changed the wording to say a representative not a member.
- This brings to the table an important voice; people who really understand what is going on. People who work within these groups have good points of view.
- I agree with non-elected and am trying to figure out how non-elected will work.
- This will be critical. If the Mayor and Council have to vote to create such a commission, I will bet it will be an appointment process and you could have puppets. That wouldn't necessarily happen, but you need to look at how independent it will be. Rubber stamping figure heads is not achieving much.
- We could say a certain percentage need to be residents.
- We could add a residency requirement.
- Co-chair Lilligren How about that it includes resident appointees from the Park Board, School Board and County?
- The two last bullets on don't seem to fit as responsibilities for the commission they may need separated out. (Staff Lastoka noted that she would work on this.)
- I have questions about saying every 3-4 years.
- We want the commission to integrate some kind of evaluation. I would hope it wouldn't be every 3-4 years. I would either say we don't reference a specific time period or shorten it.
- I'd make a motion "The commission should continually evaluate its work and responsibilities to evolve with the needs of the City's community engagement system."

Pass - vote to add this list of responsibilities for the community engagement commission.

Aye-11 and Nay-0

Pass - amendment to add a bullet - "The commission will include resident appointees from the Park Board, School Board and County."

Pass – amendment to change the "every 3-4" year evaluation bullet to read "continually" - "The commission should continually evaluate its work and responsibilities to evolve with the needs of the City's community engagement system."

VOTE 3: APPROVE REPORT AS A WHOLE.

Discussion points:

- I wish I knew what I was about to vote on. It's the nature of the process the lack of time, the piecemeal.
- Can we have a category to approve with reservations?
- Staff Letofsky I think you were all picked to be a representative and you have to vote yes or no.
- Co-chair Lilligren I would invite task force members to include a letter with your position. That's a way of voting with some reservations. As a co-chair, I would offer that.
- To clarify, the letters would not be part of the report but would be submitted with the report? (Co-chair Lilligren noted that this would be the case.)
- I have a lot to discuss (if time permitted.)
- Are the core principles ours? I think those are a good addition.

Pass – Task Force members may submit comments attributed to them, by 9 a.m. on Nov. 13th, to be submitted with the full report.

Pass – Approve submitting the report to the Committee of the Whole by Nov. 15th.

Aye-10 and Nay-1

Closing

- Votes were taken to approve the minutes from Sept. 12 and Oct. 29. There were some changes to the Oct. 29 minutes.
 - o In these sentences: "A task force member noted that on one of our lined we talked about requiring City staff to have training. One of the suggestions she heard was to require neighborhood boards to also have training. I really do this there are some issues in some neighborhoods." the word "lined" was changed to "lines" and the word "this" was changed to "think."
 - There was a request to add vote totals to the pass/fail indications.
 - A task force member submitted replacement text for a closing remark she made the new text is: A task force member noted, for the record, that she had concerns about the process of voting on the report line by line. We didn't step back and look at the report as a whole to see where we might have missed the mark.
- Discussion about other ideas from the community input that might not have been captured:
 - Regarding community input, as I recall one of the pieces we put in the report was that it be "thoughtfully considered." As long as it was thoughtfully considered, the rubber does hit the road.
 - Co-chair Lilligren People don't realize the impact their comments have.
- Discussion about assumptions. The agenda included the following proposed list:

Draft of possible assumptions to begin the discussion

- 1. Build on the community engagement system that is already in place recognizing that improvements do need to be made.
- 2. Priority was given to what improvements to make over how to implement them.
- 3. Citizen engagement in the process of improving the community engagement process is necessary.
- 4. Good community engagement requires money and people resources at all levels.
- Political commitment and leadership will be a key component to making improvements to community engagement
- Co-chair Perry I think that I am going to presenting, and it would help those hearing it to know the assumptions. What I heard today, that is not included, is that we thought we could do more than we could. On number one, I know there is controversy that we don't have a system.
- o Co-Chair Lilligren It could say "build on what we have."
- Discussion about presenting the report:
 - Co-Chair Lilligren It is the Committee of the Whole, so the whole City Council will be there. There will be a staff presentation likely Jennifer (Lastoka). There will be a cover letter. It will likely be a "receive and file." Matt (Perry) has volunteered to be part of the presentation team. The Council will have the opportunity to ask questions. It's televised.
 - Staff Lastoka I will do the background and Matt (Perry) will do the specifics. We will pull out some recommendations to highlight similar to highlighted things at the community forums (she handed out the worksheet). If anyone has ideas for recommendations to highlight let us know.
 - Co-Chair Lilligren There is a strong Council interest in this. There will be a policy discussion highlighting
 which of the recommendations is launched first or how the report is likely to be used. I'm guessing the
 presentation could be 20 minutes and then 40 minutes of discussion.
 - Co-Chair Lilligren Since it's the start of Track 3, I think you'll see a lot of council members starting to connect the pieces.
 - I would stress the core principles. Does the City really value community engagement? If the electeds
 don't value it, it will fall flat. I would also highlight resources that they should be directed and that the
 community should be involved in how they are directed.
 - From the outreach it sounded like there is a lot of concern that nothing will happen with this. It will be a
 "receive and file" and that's it.
 - Facilitator Would it be good for those who submit additional comment to be there?
 - Co-Chair Lilligren Task Force members are welcome to come and may be asked to comment. The Committee of the Whole is a committee so audience members can speak. It's not like this at Council Meetings.

- Staff Letofsky Robert (Council Member Lilligren) is the chair of the COW, so he sets the tone for allowing speaking.
- Regarding the additional comments, I would discourage members from picking apart the process or the report. We have to make compromises. What we came up with is something that most feel comfortable with. It won't do community engagement any good if we show up and say we hate this and we have a problem with this.
- o Co-chair Lilligren People really underestimate the power of their presence.
- IS the 10 a.m. time certain? (Co-chair Lilligren noted that it is.)
- Handouts Staff Lastoka handed out a <u>letter from Sheryl Senkiw</u>, <u>Organizer</u>, <u>Coalition of Minneapolis Neighbors</u>
 <u>to Save the NRP</u> stating that the author wanted all voting members to have it, as well as information about how
 you can listen to the meeting if you cannot attend.
 - This letter is asking us to do something ("recommend that the city fully fund phase two of the NRP by stopping the transfer of money to the Legacy Fund, and to ask the legislature to extend funding for the NRP to at least 2029 by re-certifying and extending the Common Project Tax Increment Districts to 2020.") I would ask that we acknowledge the receipt of this letter and acknowledge that we can't do anything with it.
 - We already discussed Track 3 earlier and decided what was outside our scope. We did recommend allocating resources and staff for adopted NRP action plans.
 - What we talk about is existing plans, what she is asking about is the future Track 3.
 - In the letter it does say fully fund phase two and we have responded to that.
 - She is saying it in a very specific way, so it is not the same.
 - There is a "how" suggestion there.

Thank you:

- We should emphasize a thank you to staff and Karen (Gray) and Nora (Hall) (the facilitators). I think the final product is useful.
- Co-Chair Perry I want to thank you for making me the co-chair. I feel very privileged to have worked with all of you. I didn't know you...I've made some important relationships and that's maybe even more important.
- Co-Chair Lilligren Thank you Karen and Nora and Jennifer and the other staff. And thank you to the members – thanks for sticking with it even when it wasn't very much fun.
- Staff Lastoka This has been very educational. I wanted to comment on the attendance. These last two
 meetings, some people just weren't available but I think people were still committed to the process in
 general.
- Congratulations to Shirley (Yeoman) who had perfect attendance.
- Co-chair Lilligren And a special thank-you to Matt (Perry) who has done so much.

Adjourn.